

lege of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, along with numerous other professional organizations. But the scurrilous literature, the wild stories and the misrepresentation circulated by the Birchers and similar groups have clearly cut into the effort of educators to mount such programs. Moreover, the sex struggle has left behind a bitter residue in communities across the nation. Says Anaheim's Superintendent Cook: "The results of all this go far beyond sex education. You don't turn off hatred just like that. It spreads and spreads. People in the community have stopped talking to each other. People come to school-board meetings now and question our textbooks on other subjects. Where will it all stop?"

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what will be the unfinished business before the Senate when it again convenes on Monday next?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R.

12781, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 19, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ernest V. Siracusa, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Eugene A. Gullledge, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Philip N. Brownstein, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 19, 1969:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A. Sydney Herlong, of Florida, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1971.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William H. Quealy, of Virginia, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 19, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God.—John 14: 1.

O Lord, our God, who art truth and love and who dost give Thyself to men to lead them in Thy way, grant unto us Thy spirit that we may give ourselves in service to our fellow men.

May nations and races feel their kinship with each other since we are Thy children and may we learn to work together for the good of all.

Bless those who are in need, all who are oppressed in mind and body and all who suffer. Particularly do we pray for our prisoners of war. Strengthen them and their families here at home, give them patience in suffering and a happy issue out of their affliction. May the day soon come when those now separated can be home together and enjoy their freedom in peace.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9526. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol," and providing for additional copies; and

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution to print a second listing of operating Federal assistance programs compiled during the Roth study.

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

S. 1471. An act to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children, and for other purposes;

S. 1479. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase from \$10,000 to \$15,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services;

S. 1650. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide double indemnity coverage under servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services assigned to extrahazardous duty, including duty in a combat zone;

S. 1857. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended;

S. 2003. An act to provide a special Government life insurance program for veterans of the Vietnam era;

S. 2186. An act to amend chapter 19, United States Code, so as to provide dismemberment insurance coverage under the servicemen's group life insurance program;

S. 2335. An act to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate compact on juveniles; and

S. 2546. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON BANKRUPTCY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled public hearings on the following bills:

Senate Joint Resolution 88, to create a Commission To Study the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States;

H.R. 6665, to amend the Bankruptcy Act, sections 2, 15, 17, and 38, to permit the discharge of debts in a subsequent proceeding after denial of discharge for specified reasons in an earlier proceeding to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability on nondischargeability of provable debts, and to provide additional grounds for the revocation of discharges; and

H.R. 12250, to amend sections 2, 17, and 38 of the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the discharge of debts.

These hearings will begin on October 1, 1969, at 10 a.m., room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

SCHOOL BUSING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to learn from an article in the Washington Post yesterday that HEW will make no change in their past policies concerning the

forced busing of students in order to achieve racial balance, notwithstanding the fact that Vice President AGNEW in a speech to the Southern Governors' Conference stated that he was opposed to such action and the White House confirmed the fact that President Nixon concurs in Mr. AGNEW's statement.

In the past administration we were frequently alerted to the fact that there was a credibility gap. Now there appears to be developing a control gap wherein faceless bureaucrats in HEW and their leader, Secretary Finch, are able to flout at will the wishes of President Nixon, Vice President AGNEW, and the American people with regard to forced busing of students in order to achieve racial balance.

As time passes, it is evident that the tail is wagging the dog and that the bureaucrats are more powerful in imposing their will on the American people than are the President and Vice President of the United States or possibly the President and Vice President do not have as much power to control their administration and direct the activities of their various departments as have administrations in the past.

The bureaucrats at HEW recognize no authority other than their own and unless President Nixon speaks out and insists that they follow the policies of his administration, then I can forsee nothing but confusion and bewilderment among the American people and a general disregard of any statement made by the President or Vice President.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 178]

Abbitt	Clausen,	Goldwater
Adair	Don H.	Gray
Addabbo	Clay	Green, Pa.
Ashbrook	Conyers	Griffiths
Baring	Corbett	Gubser
Belcher	Corman	Hagan
Biaggi	Coughlin	Halpern
Biester	Cowger	Hanna
Bingham	Cunningham	Hansen, Idaho
Blanton	Daddario	Harsha
Bolling	Daniel, Va.	Hays
Brademas	Dawson	Heckler, Mass.
Brasco	de la Garza	Hosmer
Bray	Delaney	Howard
Brock	Dent	Jones, Tenn.
Brotzman	Devine	Keith
Brown, Ohio	Edmondson	Kirwan
Broyhill, N.C.	Eshleman	Kluczynski
Burleson, Tex.	Farbstein	Koch
Bush	Fascell	Kuykendall
Byrne, Pa.	Foley	Kyros
Cahill	Fraser	Landgrebe
Carey	Frey	Leggett
Cederberg	Fulton, Tenn.	Lipscomb
Celler	Fuqua	Long, La.
Chisholm	Gallagher	Lowenstein
Clancy	Gaimo	Lukens
Clark	Gilbert	McCarthy

McClory	Pike	Stafford
McDonald,	Poage	Staggers
Mich.	Podell	Teague, Calif.
McKneally	Pollock	Teague, Tex.
McMillan	Powell	Tunney
Macdonald,	Price, Tex.	Udall
Mass.	Pucinski	Utt
MacGregor	Purcell	Vander Jagt
Mathias	Quie	Waggonner
May	Quillen	Waldie
Meeds	Railsback	Watkins
Mikva	Reid, N.Y.	Watson
Minshall	Reuss	Whalley
Myers	Roybal	Wiggins
Nelsen	Sandman	Winn
Nichols	Scheuer	Wold
O'Hara	Shriver	Wyatt
O'Konski	Sisk	Wylder
O'Neal, Ga.	Smith, Iowa	Yatron
Ottinger	Smith, N.Y.	Zablocki
Pepper	Snyder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 287 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SERVICEMEN REPORTED MISSING

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, you and more than 100 of my colleagues joined the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) during his special order on Wednesday in expressing our concern for our servicemen who are either in enemy hands or are listed as missing in action, and our deep sympathy for the courageous wives and families of these brave men.

I was one among many others of your colleagues who was present on that occasion. I listened to what was said. I saw what was felt so deeply by all of us, and by the wives and families of these men and the kind and grateful citizens of this country who filled the galleries of this Chamber.

In every part of this land there are wives and parents and families who are tortured by uncertainty as to the fate of their loved one. My own district is no exception. Yesterday, I met with one such wife. Mrs. Margaret Conklin, wife of Maj. Bernard Conklin and mother of four, waits for word of Major Conklin, an Air Force pilot, who has been missing in action for more than 3 years. But Hanoi remains silent. How true your words were, Mr. Speaker, when you said:

They violate not only international agreements but they violate the moral law and they violate the law of decency.

POSTPONING SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22 TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders granted to Members to address the House on Monday next may be put over until Tuesday next.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) and the gentleman from Iowa

(Mr. SCHWENGL) have special orders for Monday and they both have consented to this request.

I called the office of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSSTEIN) and his office has assured me he would have no objection to this request.

Mr. Speaker, this request is made as a predicate to a later request to go over from today until Tuesday since Monday is a religious holiday and there is no District business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S POWERS WITH RESPECT TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House, on yesterday I inserted in the RECORD, on page H8168, a complete analysis of the powers of the President with respect to the Selective Service System as contained in the recent Draft Act and the original Draft Act. I urge you to get that RECORD right now, copy down the number, page H8168, and it will answer a great many of the questions you may have with respect to the powers of the President, what he can do and what he cannot do under the act as it has been amended and as it was originally enacted many, many years ago.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11582, TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11582) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 18, 1969.)

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

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the matters in conference between the House and the Senate versions of this bill were only seven. Some dealt only with language and some with funds. The other body made a net increase of a little under \$8 million over what the House appropri-

ated, and in conference we split the difference almost exactly down the middle. Most of the increase over the House version will be used to provide some badly needed extra people for the Bureau of Customs, and, of course, the Post Office Department.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How did we wind up in this conference by comparison with the House figure?

Mr. STEED. It is \$3,900,000 more than the House had originally approved, and it is about \$3,963,000 less than the other body approved.

Mr. GROSS. How does this conference report compare with the spending for the same departments and agencies last year? Will the gentleman give us that figure?

Mr. STEED. The increase in the total amount for this year over the last fiscal year is almost all accounted for by automatic pay raises and increases in volume of workload. It is in the neighborhood of \$414 million total increase for this fiscal year over what was actually used for these agencies last year.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, nearly a

half billion more than was expended last year.

One further question, if the gentleman will yield: Are the salary increases for the departments and agencies covered in this bill?

Mr. STEED. Not the salary increase that went into effect on the beginning of this fiscal year. That increase will have to be included in a supplemental.

Mr. GROSS. So the \$414 million increase over last year does not include many millions of dollars represented by pay increases that will come in a supplemental later this session?

Mr. STEED. While no actual figure on what the additional amount would be has yet been determined, it is my understanding that it would be in the neighborhood of about \$340 million more than we are asking for here today.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$340 million?

Mr. STEED. That is correct. Then, of course, if additional pay raises are approved by the Congress, they would be added onto this amount.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. But the point I am trying to make is that there is not a dime in this bill for those raises. Nearly a half billion dollars more than was expended for the same general purposes last year, and yet there is

not a dime for the salary increases that went into effect on July 1 for these departments and agencies.

Mr. STEED. When the present budget was made up, these salary increases were not yet in effect, so they had no way of including them in the budget request. It has been traditional to take care of those by supplemental requests.

Mr. GROSS. But we are now getting along well through September. The fiscal year began on July 1. I am surprised—and no one has yet given me a good reason why these pay increases, effective last July 1, have not gotten into the appropriation bills that have been enacted since July 1 of this year. Why is all the cost of the salary increase effective July 1 going into a supplemental? Why?

Mr. STEED. When this bill was before us, the raises were not yet in effect, so they could not ask for that. It has been only since July that they could ask for the money, and this bill passed the House in May.

Mr. GROSS. This is 3 months later.

Mr. STEED. But this is a conference report on the bill that passed the House in July. I include the following table reflecting the details of the bill:

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1970 (H.R. 11582)

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 ²	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Office of the Secretary.....	\$7,925,000	\$8,680,000	\$8,600,000	\$8,600,000	\$8,600,000	+\$675,000	-\$80,000		
Federal law enforcement training center:									
Salaries and expenses.....		58,000	58,000	58,000	58,000	+58,000			
Construction.....		1,200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	-200,000		
Total, Federal law enforcement training center.....		1,258,000	1,058,000	1,058,000	1,058,000	+1,058,000	-200,000		
Bureau of Accounts.....	44,877,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	+798,000			
Government losses in shipment.....	400,000					-400,000			
Eisenhower College grants.....	5,000,000					-5,000,000			
Bureau of Customs.....	100,337,000	108,110,000	106,151,000	108,110,000	107,551,000	+7,214,000	-559,000	+\$1,400,000	-\$559,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing (air conditioning of building).....	400,000					-400,000			
Bureau of the Mint.....	14,700,000	17,630,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	+2,300,000	-630,000		
Construction of Mint facilities.....		1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	+1,770,000			
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	58,878,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	+1,492,000			
Internal Revenue Service:									
Salaries and expenses.....	22,055,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	+1,025,000			
Revenue accounting and processing.....	191,500,000	201,171,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+8,500,000	-1,171,000		
Compliance.....	545,300,000	581,715,000	576,715,000	576,715,000	576,715,000	+31,415,000	-5,000,000		
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	758,855,000	805,966,000	799,795,000	799,795,000	799,795,000	+40,940,000	-6,171,000		
Office of the Treasurer.....	7,045,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	+205,000			
Check forgery insurance fund.....		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+100,000			
U.S. Secret Service.....	22,708,000	27,400,000	26,871,000	26,871,000	26,871,000	+4,163,000	-529,000		
Construction of Secret Service training facilities.....	800,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	-100,000			
Total, title I, Treasury Department, new budget (obligational) authority.....	1,021,925,000	1,084,909,000	1,075,340,000	1,077,299,000	1,076,740,000	+54,815,000	-8,169,000	+1,400,000	-559,000

Footnotes at end of table.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1970 (H.R. 11582)—Continued

CONFERENCE SUMMARY—Continued

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 ²	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Authorizations and limitations on use of the postal fund:									
Administration and regional operation.....	(\$119,000,000)	(\$136,069,000)	(\$133,069,000)	(\$132,069,000)	(\$133,069,000)	(+\$14,069,000)	(-\$3,000,000)		(+\$1,000,000)
Research, development, and engineering.....	(35,500,000)	(51,338,000)	(46,338,000)	(51,338,000)	(48,838,000)	(+13,338,000)	(-2,500,000)	(+\$2,500,000)	(-2,500,000)
Operations.....	(5,977,071,000)	(6,141,711,000)	(6,141,711,000)	(6,143,615,000)	(6,141,711,000)	(+164,640,000)			(-1,904,000)
Transportation.....	(622,000,000)	(638,900,000)	(630,000,000)	(630,000,000)	(630,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(-8,900,000)		
Building occupancy.....	(210,000,000)	(235,323,000)	(230,000,000)	(230,000,000)	(230,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	(-5,323,000)		
Supplies and services.....	(110,000,000)	(114,917,000)	(114,917,000)	(114,917,000)	(114,917,000)	(+4,917,000)			
Plant and equipment.....	(200,000,000)	(215,761,000)	(210,000,000)	(210,000,000)	(210,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(-5,761,000)		
Postal public buildings.....	(50,000,000)	(174,223,000)	(170,000,000)	(170,000,000)	(170,000,000)	(+120,000,000)	(-4,223,000)		
Total, authorizations out of postal fund.....	(7,323,571,000)	(7,708,242,000)	(7,676,035,000)	(7,681,939,000)	(7,678,535,000)	(+354,964,000)	(-29,707,000)	(+2,500,000)	(-3,404,000)
Less net revenues (estimated).....	(-6,287,585,000)	(-6,507,013,000)	(-6,507,013,000)	(-6,507,013,000)	(-6,507,013,000)	(-219,428,000)			
Total, title II, Post Office Department, new budget (obligational) authority (indefinite).....	\$1,035,986,000	\$1,201,229,000	\$1,169,022,000	\$1,171,926,000	\$1,171,522,000	+135,536,000	-29,707,000	+2,500,000	-3,404,000

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Compensation of the President.....	\$194,584	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	+\$55,416			
The White House Office.....	3,229,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	+401,000			
Special projects.....	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	+1,000,000			
Operating expenses, Executive Mansion.....	823,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	+95,000			
Bureau of the Budget.....	10,050,000	12,084,000	11,650,000	11,650,000	11,650,000	+1,600,000	-\$434,000		
Council of Economic Advisers.....	1,130,000	1,182,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	+7,000	-45,000		
National Security Council.....	811,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	+1,049,000			
Emergency fund for the President.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000				
Expenses of management improvement.....	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000				
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President, new budget (obligational) authority.....	19,087,584	23,774,000	23,295,000	23,295,000	23,295,000	+4,207,416	-479,000		

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Administrative Conference of the United States.....	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	551,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	+\$24,000			
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.....	643,000	1,227,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	+457,000	-\$127,000		
Tax Court of the United States.....	2,563,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	+187,000			
Total, title IV, independent agencies, new budget (obligational) authority.....	4,007,000	4,802,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	+668,000	-127,000		

TOTAL, TITLES I, II, III, AND IV

Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,081,005,584	2,314,714,000	2,272,332,000	2,280,195,000	2,276,232,000	+195,226,416	-38,482,000	+3,900,000	-3,963,000
Consisting of—									
Appropriations (definite).....	1,045,019,584	1,113,485,000	1,103,310,000	1,105,269,000	1,104,710,000	+59,690,416	-8,775,000	+1,400,000	-559,000
Appropriations (indefinite).....	1,035,986,000	1,201,229,000	1,169,022,000	1,174,926,000	1,171,522,000	+135,536,000	-29,707,000	+2,500,000	-3,404,000
Memoranda—Grand total, titles I, III, and IV, new budget (obligational) authority and title II, authorizations out of the postal fund.....	(8,368,590,584)	(8,821,727,000)	(8,779,345,000)	(8,787,208,000)	(8,783,245,000)	(+414,654,416)	(-38,482,000)	(+3,900,000)	(-3,963,000)

¹ Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental, 1969 (Public Law 91-47). Amounts do not reflect reserves created pursuant to Public Law 90-354.

² Includes amendments contained in H. Docs. 91-50, 91-100, 91-113, and 91-117.

³ Excludes the proposed postal rate increase of \$315,800,000 reflected in the Sept. 17, 1969,

summer review of the 1970 budget. Also, this figure does not reflect a revision downward of some \$137,800,000 in postal revenues as estimated in the summer review.

⁴ Indefinite, because it represents the difference between specific authorizations on use of the postal fund and estimated postal revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: on page 9, line 8, insert: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated by this Act for postal operations, \$1,904,000 shall be for achieving a 2.6 percent increase in window service at large post offices, for business deliveries in business areas, \$3,145,000; and for expeditious delivery of special delivery letters, \$4,169,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That of

the amount appropriated by this Act for Postal Operations, \$5,500,000 shall be for additional window service at large post offices and for maintaining present levels of special delivery and multiple-trip business delivery services at locations where the Postmaster General shall determine such maintenance of service to be necessary or desirable".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the motion was laid on the table.

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a table.)

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. 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. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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. 13763, with Mr. MURPHY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the usual annual bill for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1970, which began July 1 last. It thus provides for one of the three branches of Government.

It provides for all activities except the appropriations for the other body; it is the custom to leave those for the decision of the Senate.

Like the rest of the Government, legislative branch activities have operated under the general continuing resolution since July 1. I might say here that we have made a number of reductions in the appropriation requests because of this slippage of time.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

The bill total is \$284,524,057.

It is \$26,850,216 below the budget requests. Much of that reduction is a deferral in connection with construction projects considered in the bill. Some of it, however, is a saving.

The bill total is, however, \$25,742,927 above last year's appropriations for corresponding purposes. I should say here that, following custom, there is nothing in the bill for the Senate. The other body will add its own requirements. If it adopts the budget amounts, the total of the bill would be about \$57 million higher.

And I should also make note of the fact that, as with all the appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, the individual items do not make specific provision for the general governmentwide employee pay increase that went into effect on July 1. Those added costs will be dealt with in a supplemental next session.

MAJOR INCREASES AND DECREASES

Mr. Chairman, a number of items account for the increase above last year and for the reduction from the budget total for the current year. If Members will turn to the committee report, beginning at the bottom of page 4 and continuing to the middle of page 7, they will find virtually the whole story; it is all listed there—virtually all the increases and decreases, and what they are in a nutshell.

INCREASES OVER 1969

I would like to mention just the principal items. You may ask, "Why is the bill \$25.7 million over last year?" Let me call off the main items:

First, \$3,938,000 is to annualize—that is, to put on a 12-month basis—the March 1969 pay raise for Members.

Second, \$5,807,000 is for clerk-hire in Members' offices. The figure is based on recent experience and makes a stab at the cost of the additional clerk voted by the House in June in House Resolution 357.

Third, \$1,850,000 is related to the costs of investigative functions. The House this session has voted for additional investigative funds for the various legislative committees.

Fourth, \$3,386,000 is for the General Accounting Office. This is an important area of the Congress. The committee report has some critical things to say about some of the lower priority things they are engaged in. We suggest they need to take a harder look, and perhaps reorder their priorities a bit.

Fifth, \$1,572,000 is additional for the Superintendent of Documents. He is swamped with work, especially in sales of Government publications. He makes money on that operation.

Sixth, \$688,000 is for added costs of congressional franked mailings. This is a bookkeeping item to reimburse the postal fund.

Seventh, \$2,800,000 is added to prepare detailed plans looking to future construction of the Madison Memorial Library building. I want to say something more on that in a moment.

Eighth, \$2 million is recommended for detailed plans for extension of the west central front of the Capitol. I want to come back to that item also.

SUMMER INTERNS

Mr. Chairman, the committee has also recommended continuation of the restriction against the special allowance for congressional summer interns. The committee is not against summer interns. The restriction goes only to the special, extra allowance of \$750 originally authorized in the 89th Congress.

Members can continue to employ interns on their regular office roll just as they did this summer and last summer. And they should have no difficulty finding the \$750; the clerk-hire authorization was raised by the House only 3 months ago by one more clerk and a basic increase of \$2,500.

There is a very interesting chart of statistics on this matter of interns on page 459 of the hearings.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee could elaborate on the matter, because the gentleman seems to be suggesting, that since we have a ceiling of 12 people, that we discharge a couple of our permanent employees. Would that not follow?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Well, you cannot go above the 12 unless you have a district of over 500,000, which would then give you 13 employees. I will discuss that with the gentleman later.

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to say to the gentleman, if I may, that this obviously does not permit us to add two interns if we have a full complement.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL SITE

Mr. Chairman, we were asked to appropriate \$1,250,000 to acquire the old Providence Hospital site, but we did not go along with that.

It is two blocks away from the east boundary of the grounds. There has been considerable talk about building a Capitol Police Academy over there. We are not impressed with that idea, and furthermore, we did not think this was a pressing item.

HOUSE RESTAURANTS

Mr. Chairman, there is less money in the bill this year for the House dining facilities than last year. We recommended \$159,000 at this time; \$211,000 was appropriated last year.

The actual operating loss in fiscal 1969 was \$172,000, which is a great improvement when compared to the \$366,000 deficit in fiscal 1968 and the loss of over one-half million dollars that was in prospect for fiscal 1969 when we considered the bill last year. The very sharp reversal in the loss figure is due to the economy actions recommended by the committee last year.

The \$159,000 recommended in the pending bill is somewhat of a guess at this point. There is, as Members know, a newly appointed select committee, headed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), that now has general direction over all House dining facilities. They have not yet put

their full stamp on the policies and procedures and practices to be followed in the dining operations, but undoubtedly they will in time.

NEW GPO PLANT

Another item that we had in the budget but did not recommend at this time is planning funds for a new GPO printing plant. A new site out in near-by Maryland was approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, but not until after our hearings had been held.

The committee is sympathetic to the economics of a new, modern printing plant. But there is an authorization problem. The cost has escalated considerably since the cost limitation for the project was approved by the two Public Works Committees in 1964 under the 1959 Public Buildings Act. Under the circumstances, the committee did not think it should recommend the funds at this time.

HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

Mr. Chairman, at the request of Judge GRIFFITH, chairman of the select committee in charge, we have included language in the bill to put the House beauty shop on a financial accounting basis somewhat similar to the House recording studio.

From all reports, the beauty shop operation is going along well. Under the language recommended, it is to be a self-sustaining fund.

MAJOR BUILDING PROJECTS

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, funds are recommended for two major projects on Capitol Hill—the Madison Memorial Library and extension of the west central front of the Capitol. In both cases, only planning funds are recommended at this time. No construction funds are included.

I would urge Members to read the hearings and the committee report on these two items—especially the west central front project, because it is controversial.

WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL

Let me explain briefly.

There is no controversy about the need to do something to make the building structurally safe.

There is no controversy about doing something about it—and doing it now.

There is no controversy about the esthetic design of the proposed extension. The outward appearance of the front would not be radically altered.

The sole controversy centers on how the reconstruction shall be done; that is, whether by extension and reconstruction of whether by restoration—whatever restoration means, and I may add that restoration can mean different things to different people.

Let me try to put one thing to rest. That is the matter of adding office and other space. The committee would not—and I would not—have recommended a dime for this project had it been sought to be justified on that basis at this time. The extension—rather than restoration—proposal rests on the recommendations of expert engineering and architectural advice that that is the best,

safest, and surest way of successfully strengthening the west walls.

All alternatives were explored.

The current hearings contain further, up-to-date information on the need for corrective action in accord with the 1964 outside engineering study which recommended the extension proposal. In summary, the committee was told that:

First. Restoration does not provide a permanent solution. Whatever the form of restoration or the method, it would result in a makeshift job.

Second. The appearance, if piecemeal repairs are made, would be more objectionable than the present painted surface.

Third. If refaced, the cracks and bulges would again appear after a few years.

Fourth. If the walls are rebuilt completely, the danger and risks would be too great.

Fifth. The whole west central portion of the building, between the House and Senate wings, including some interior rooms and spaces, would have to be vacated by the Congress over a long period of time.

Sixth. The costs of restoration were estimated several years ago to be between \$10 million and \$50 million. They have escalated since that time. Furthermore, a true cost figure is impossible to obtain. A leading advocate of restoration has stated publicly that restoration could exceed the cost of the proposed extension.

Seventh. There are so many uncertainties involved in restoration or rebuilding in place, the work would have to be done under a cost-plus contract, with leeway as to the ultimate total cost.

Eighth. No space would be gained in the Capitol for the vital operations of the Congress and for the use of the public.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of extension is now estimated at about \$45 million. No one knows what "restoration" would cost. The outside engineering expert who made the study of the west front estimated, as I indicated, that it would range from \$10 to \$50 million. It would have to be done under a cost-plus contract.

The Assistant Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Campioli, whose credentials as an experienced architect are impressive and who, in fact, is a "restorationist" at heart—for 8 years he was in charge of restoring Colonial Williamsburg—Mr. Campioli expressed his opinion that "restoration" would cost more than extension.

The leadership of the AIA, which so violently opposes this project, does not know what "restoration" will cost. The AIA had a five-man task force a couple of years ago make some sort of study of the question. They recommended "restoration," but they do not know what "restoration" would cost. And in testifying before the committee only recently, a member of that task force, representing the AIA, could not tell the committee just what they would do; they could not tell us precisely what "restoration" would entail. In fact, he said:

Let me say I cannot speak as a technical expert as to the provision of restoration, or the process of restoration. . . .

Mr. Chairman, we are not architects. We are not engineers. But in the face of the facts that the weight of the evidence is that "restoration" would be hazardous; that "restoration" would not be as permanent as extension; that "restoration" would be costly; with some expert opinion that it could cost even more than extension.

With these facts, Mr. Chairman, we concluded that extension was the only solution.

Now, one more point: Opponents of extension make much of the high square foot cost. One figure I saw was \$300 a foot.

But what about the cost per square foot under a "restoration" procedure? No additional space would be acquired under "restoration," so if we use the \$10 million to \$50 million range of cost put forth by the outside engineering expert, we would spend all that money and not get a single square foot of working space.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) is at heart a "restorationist." He preferred "restoration" but after exhaustive probing of all sides of the question, he came to the conclusion that extension was the only feasible course. He is especially well versed in the technicalities involved, and in a few minutes I am going to yield him time to explain what is involved.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The extension plans call for two or more additional restaurants and two movie theaters; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. All of them are illustrative uses of the interior space.

No firm plans have been made.

Mr. GROSS. I thought Congress was already having trouble with its restaurants and I thought it had enough money invested now in theaters down on the Potomac River—the thing they call the National Cultural Center.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It is going to take 18 months to complete the plans. The Congress will have plenty of time, and there will be opportunity to discuss the specific layout of the interior of the extension.

MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, let me say something about the \$2.8 million recommended for planning the Madison Memorial Library. These are planning funds only. There are no construction funds included.

The project is badly needed. Congress recognized the need back in 1965 when it authorized the project.

The Library is bulging at the seams. A library grows or it stagnates. The estimate is that its space grow by about 45,000 feet a year.

It is now scattered in 12 buildings—across the street; around town; over in Virginia; near Baltimore; and at Suitland, Md. The Government is now paying about \$1.8 million a year in rental and related expenses for library space.

We have appended to the \$2.8 million planning funds a provision making them

unavailable for use until the authorized limit of cost is adjusted to take account of construction cost escalation that has occurred since 1965. The authorized limit is \$75 million, but the current estimate is \$90 million. We did not feel we should recommend beginning the project until the authorization question is cleared up.

Actually, the whole ball of wax entails about \$110 million. The Capitol power-plant would have to be expanded to supply heating and air-conditioning, which might range up to \$10 million. Furniture, furnishings, and equipment might entail another \$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, one thing of interest on the Madison library project is that the design is completely flexible; that is, it is designed to be used either as all library; or all office space; or part library-part office space. I know of no plans to do so, of course, but if, say 20 years from now, it were decided to take a fourth House Office Building out of it, it could fairly easily be done.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to touch the more significant matters in the bill. I shall at the appropriate time seek permission to include additional material from the committee report. And we will be glad to try to answer any questions.

Mr. Chairman, let me just add a note here that in conducting the hearings and developing information on the various items dealt with in this bill, we have had good cooperation on the part of all concerned in the various branches of the operations dealt with—and I have in mind the Clerk of the House, Mr. Jennings and other officers and officials; Mr. Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol; Dr. Mumford, the Librarian; Mr. Harrison, the Public Printer; and the Comptroller General, Mr. Staats. They and their staffs have cooperated fully in every way. I believe the record of the committee hearings bears witness that the various items were generally well documented and well presented. We always appreciate full cooperation in securing orderly consideration and dispatch of the many items dealt with.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that in my opinion Mr. Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol—and he has held that responsible position since 1954—has been subjected to a lot of unwarranted and unfair criticism and even personal abuse, not only in connection with the west central front project but on other projects.

The Architect of the Capitol cannot drive a nail, or dig a hole, or spend a dime for anything that is not approved by some commission or committee of the Congress, or that is not voted by the Congress, and that is not appropriated by the Congress. All he can do is recommend. All he can do is carry out what Congress approves and appropriates.

He is often the "whipping boy," the one who is the object of much personal abuse. I get a little tired of it. I do not agree with everything Mr. Stewart recommends, but neither do I think members of the press ought to seek to hold

him responsible for the decisions of others. It is not fair. It is not right. I have a high regard for Mr. Stewart's integrity. In my opinion, he does what he thinks is right. He loves the Capitol. He loves the institution of Congress and all that it represents under our system of government.

Speaking for myself, I prefer—on the basis of my experience with him and my knowledge of him—to speak well of Mr. Stewart, but to disagree with him on occasion without being disagreeable about it.

I will say also that on his staff he has one of the finest architects in America, Mr. Campioli. Read his qualifications in the hearings. Mr. Campioli was the architect in charge of the restoration of the colonial Williamsburg project. He had 52 people under him, mostly architects and engineers. When they restored the White House several years ago, the architect in charge of the job went down to Williamsburg to see Mr. Campioli.

Mr. Chairman, we have a man on the committee who has rendered yeoman service in this matter of the west front. He has worked night and day. He started as a restoration man and he concluded that the logical, reasonable, and economical thing to do today is to follow the committee's recommendations. He is now a party to our recommendations.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to my friend, one of the most valuable members of our committee, who has done a great job in this work of deciding what should be done, the able gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

WEST FRONT PROJECT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) for his very generous remarks.

Our good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) does such an outstanding job as chairman of this committee. He has suggested I tell you about my efforts in the committee to get at the facts and the truth about the west wall. It is a serious controversy. It requires serious consideration. And it requires action now. I was opposed when our hearings started to the extension of the west wall of the Capitol. I wanted a restoration of the wall. I did not want to spend all the money proposed in the plan approved by the Commission. I do not want to spend \$45 million to extend the Capitol. I wanted a restoration, because I thought that was most feasible and most economic method retaining as well this record of the historic past.

This building belongs to every American in this country. I consider this building to be our No. 1 national treasure. It has a priceless link with the past. Upon that west wall, as the American Institute of Architects has said so well, is the architectural record that has been written over the years of what has occurred in connection with a significant portion of the construction of this building. I hoped to restore that wall. And so I attacked the Capitol Architect when he came before us with questions which

might show the weakness in his proposal. I tried to ascertain from him the logical, the best way to do the job, and I believed it was restoration.

When the American Institute of Architects appeared before us, they testified in favor of the restoration, I tried to find out from the American Institute of Architects why they insisted upon the restoration and how they proposed to do it. I wanted them to give me some peg to hang my hat on so I could support their point of view. I wanted help from them. I would have been a dissident in my own subcommittee to their position. I would have attempted to get an appropriation for restoration of that wall. After listening to the testimony, I could not do it. When all the testimony was in, I could not convince myself that restoration was the logical course.

I have told you why I considered this to be America's most important building. Obviously something has to be done. These pictures I am going to show you were taken a short time ago. All of you have seen the west wall of the Capitol. It would probably be redundant to show you these photographs. Look at these holes in the walls. Take a look at this [exhibiting a photograph], the way the stones are separated. You can see how the paint is peeling off. I think to the disgrace of Congress, we have done only a slapdash, hit-or-miss repairing job over the last 2 or 3 years. The reason we have done that is because we could not agree on what to do.

The committee decided the time has come to do something. Let us get on with the work. It is about time we did something.

Having decided that action must be taken, we looked for the best people to advise us. Obviously, for this important building we want the best brains in the country. I must confess I was suspicious of the Architect. I think that the Rayburn Building is something less than beautiful. I join those who think a much better job could have been done in connection with the architecture of the Rayburn Building. I was skeptical of the qualifications of the Architect and his plans.

As my chairman has said, he is a lovable old man. I like George Stewart very much. But I did not consider I would want to take his decision on so important a matter.

But I listened to his assistant, Mario Campioli. Read the record on the qualifications of Mario Campioli, the one who has been working on this project. On pages 2 and 3 of the hearings you will see his qualifications, first his educational background, his associations, his experience. Then he went to Williamsburg to head the restoration work.

He had 52 architects under him. Listen to this. On page 3 he said:

As director of architecture, I was responsible for all architectural and engineering work required for the Williamsburg restoration project, including restoration, reconstruction, and new construction.

Where in the country can you get a man who has the experience to match this record of the Assistant Capitol

Architect? I was impressed by what Mr. Campioli said and, as I stated, I fought for a renovation. He said with experience and background he, too, would prefer a restoration. It is too difficult under the circumstances. You cannot gut the Capitol. I said, "Mr. Campioli, why can't you get a renovation?" And he showed us this drawing [exhibiting a drawing]. He proceeded to explain to us what the structural conditions of the Capitol was. These are sandstone on the outside that are not the finest quality. They are beautiful but they are aqueous sandstones that were placed in the wall in 1820 at the time the wall was constructed. These were put together with an inferior kind of limestone mortar. That has cracked and crumbled over the years.

On the inside we have what is known as a wall of rubblestone, and that, too, is an inferior type of stone. And what they did between those two walls, the inner and outer walls, was just dump in all the refuse and all the rubble they could to provide weight.

The Architect of the Capitol tells me there are even old pieces of wood and other kinds of refuse dropped in to add weight.

As you sit in your committee rooms in the Capitol, you will see the ceilings are arched. This picture shows a cross-section of the arch. Here is sandfill. Above that is flagstone, or the brick floor, that is the floor we are standing on, rather it is the floor close to the west wall. The weight of the building rests on those arches. That arch rests on the west wall.

There are cracks in that wall, as I pointed out, 21 cracks extending the height of the wall. The stones are loose. If those stones were to give way—and I do not think it will happen suddenly with the buttressing placed against the wall, but something might break—but if those stones were to give way and the wall weakened, the arch would give way.

This arch is composed of bricks in compression. The weight keeps those bricks together. So if this were to give way, those bricks would become decompressed, and the floor above it would fall down.

What would have to be done for restoration? I said the White House was restored. Why not the Capitol?

He said, "Congressman, the White House was gutted, and all that was left standing for restoration of the White House were the four walls. If we could do that for the Capitol, sure, we could restore that west wall, but we cannot take the 8 or 10 years that would be necessary for a building of this size, in order to complete the restoration, let alone vacate and close off the portion of the Capitol that would be necessary to do this work.

Then I said, "Are there any alternatives other than emptying the Capitol or a major part of it?" He said, "Yes, there is an alternative for restoration," He said, "In those rooms that adjoin the west wall, we can build scaffolding, we can build the structural scaffolding, and let the ceilings rest on this scaffolding while we release the weight on the west wall so that we can go at the wall stone

by stone. What would happen in the interim is that the ceiling would then rest on the scaffolding rather than on the wall while we do our work on the stones."

But what would happen after the scaffolding is removed? That would present a very serious question, after restoration was completed, as to whether the arches which had been decompressed by resting on the scaffolding, could be recompressed so that they would not collapse when the scaffolding were taken away.

Yet, I still was not convinced, just as the American Institute of Architects was not convinced. I called the Office of the American Institute of Architects. I said, "In whom would you have confidence to do the kind of study you want to do on this west wall, so we can tell with finality whether there should be a restoration?" I talked to Mr. Hutchinson at that office. He appeared here with Mr. Lethbridge of AIA. He said he would check around the country and let me know the names of engineers recommended by leading architects all over the country who they would like to see do the work on this important building.

He called me back later and gave me the names of six different engineering firms. He said he had checked throughout the country at various offices and he gave me the list of engineers as the architects ranked them. Without exception, he said the name of one firm was mentioned invariably: the name of Fred Severud of New York City.

So I called Mr. Severud. I said, "Mr. Severud, I have a problem. You can help. You are held in greatest respect by your colleagues. I want to talk to you about the Capitol west front. I am trying to find out whether restoration of the west wall is possible. I am told it is not possible. Can you help me?"

We talked for a while, and I learned he has been retained by Mr. Campioli to do the structural engineering work. At least one must give credit to the Architect of the Capitol for selecting the person considered to be on the top level by other structural engineers and architects in the United States.

I asked, "Mr. Severud, what should we do?" He said not to touch the wall. Extension was the proper route.

He sent me a telegram, and this is it:

Confirming our conversation I am the engineer of record in connection with the extension of the Capitol project. I would not have permitted my name to be associated with it as engineer of record if I did not approve of the recommended procedure. It is my function, to determine what should be done. If I did not agree with the recommendation, I would say so. I have frequently overruled recommendation from various consultants, with which I differed.

The west wall supports brick arches which support the floor above. I am very uneasy about these arches. Dealing with them would be very treacherous. Any attempt to strengthen the construction while trying to support the arches would be very hazardous. If an attempt were made, to strengthen the wall by drilling this again would be utterly inadvisable.

Mr. Lethbridge of the AIA, speaking in favor of restoration, pointed out that a restoration process could be undertaken, a process in which they drill holes through the supporting walls, through

the stones, and put in a grouting under pressure. It may destroy the interior wall in the process.

I may say in passing, the original condition of many of the rooms in this building might be destroyed. Many of these rooms are historical, and we would not want them injured any more than we would want to injure the west wall. Members may wish to consider this when they consider the extension of the west front.

He said he would not touch that wall. He said:

It is best to leave the wall alone and then provide further support against the lateral thrust of the arches.

As this arch bears down here it has a lateral thrust to the outside. The extension proposed would be built right against that wall and would reinforce that wall so as to take care of the lateral thrust. This is what Mr. Severud said.

It is contended by the American Institute of Architects that there has not been a proper study on the question of restoration. We have already spent several hundred thousand dollars with one of the outstanding firms of the country, Thompson & Lichtner of Brookline, Mass. The head of that firm, Dr. Clair, is accepted as one of the qualified experts in the country on this subject.

The American Institute of Architects accepts the study as being competent. In connection with their testimony before our committee 2 years ago, Mr. Yerkes, a member of the Commission, said this:

I do not think there is any argument between us and the Architect of the Capitol or Thompson and Lichtner. It is a matter of fact the Thompson and Lichtner report is a very complete survey. That is my impression and, Don, you have studied it more carefully than I have.

Mr. LETHBRIDGE. A very complete survey of existing conditions.

The architects complain because Dr. Clair's report recommended extension and disposed of restoration in only one paragraph. Extension was discussed in only one paragraph. What is unusual about stating each conclusion in one paragraph? It was considered. It considered the question of restoration as opposed to extension and recommended extension. Because it did not fully delineate the reasons for deciding against the restoration, the architects say that another study is needed.

Well, how many studies should we have, really? Should we continue to have study after study because of the possibility there may be an engineer somewhere in this country who is in favor of restoration? We now have the advice of qualified experts. They are outstanding experts in the country. One is the man who was found by the American Institute of Architects to be perhaps the outstanding structural engineer in the country. They have six names but he is the No. 1 expert in this field. I decided that I had no recourse except to vote for extension.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield on this one point?

Mr. YATES. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. He referred to Mr.

Severud as a very distinguished architect.

Mr. YATES. As a structural engineer.
Mr. STRATTON. A structural engineer.

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. STRATTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that Mr. Severud made the assertion that the only way to preserve this wall was to include an extension that would have 43 large offices, 55 medium offices, two dining rooms, two cafeterias, two escalators, 12 elevators, 12 men's toilets, 12 women's toilets, and 14 private toilets, and two auditoriums?

Mr. YATES. I do not think the gentleman helps his case with that kind of an approach.

Let me reiterate what my chairman said. We were not and are not interested in this space made available by the proposed extension. If it were only a question of space, we would not be here today. The critical point is what should be done with the west wall.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. YATES. Surely.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman concede that it might be possible to save the west wall without adding all of these various facilities I referred to?

Mr. YATES. Oh, come on, Mr. STRATTON. I will not even answer that kind of a question.

Mr. STRATTON. Would not the gentleman concede that that is the crux of it?

Mr. YATES. It is not the crux at all. The crux of it is whether we restore the west front or have an extension.

I decline to yield further for the moment. You will have your own time.

I said the question of space is not involved, what is involved here is how to support that wall, whether by restoration or extension. As far as I am concerned, the space could be vacant, but is it not silly to leave it vacant when the opportunity is presented to use it. I do not like the plan but I am assured the plan is only illustrative. It need not be approved and I hope it will be changed.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Is the gentleman maintaining that the only kind of an extension is a 4½-acre extension?

Mr. YATES. Yes, according to the advice we have received.

Mr. STRATTON. Twice the size of one of those plush building lots in Potomac, Md.? Is that the only kind of an extension that is possible?

Mr. YATES. I am glad you asked that question. I asked Mr. Campioli that. I said, "Mr. Campioli, the east front has been extended approximately 32 feet. Then why do you have to have 4½ acres on the west front, extending that 88 feet?" The explanation is in the RECORD. Is it necessary to build that far in order to protect the corners of certain extended portions of the west front. That is a technical question, and I cannot give you a better answer than that. It is an architectural question.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Campioli, of course, is an employee of Mr. Stewart.

You are talking about Mr. Severud who is supposed to be an independent engineer.

Mr. YATES. Let me say this, Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Campioli's qualifications are very good, Mr. Severud's are superb. The testimony before us is now before the House for the Members to consider. I respect your opinion. I wanted to side with you. In the face of the testimony, I concluded I could not. I will tell you this further—

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YATES. I will in just a minute, as soon as I make my point. I want to tell you what Mr. Severud said about what happens when you start the process of taking stones out in order to see whether they should be replaced or not. That wall is going to be hammered. It will be hit with hammers. Strong blows will be needed in order to get those stones out. What will happen to the wall in the process? What will happen to those arches? You can have a very dangerous condition there.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman has given a very persuasive statement for saving the west front.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for saying that.

Mr. STRATTON. And I share his views that we ought to save the west front. But the basic question that he has still not answered is whether we have to have just this kind of an elaborate extension project to save the west wall. Is that the only way that we can save it? I do not believe that Mr. Severud, unless he is now on the payroll of the Architect, would really maintain that this is the only way you can do it. You did say he was being retained by Mr. Campioli, I believe.

Mr. YATES. I do not believe the gentleman wants to impugn Mr. Severud's integrity because he has been hired by the Architect of the Capitol?

Mr. STRATTON. If Mr. Severud is an employee or a paid consultant of the Capitol Architect, as you say he is then I would hardly think his advice is entirely impartial. A lawyer certainly takes the side of his paying clients. I would assume an engineer would do the same.

What is a conflict of interest?

Mr. YATES. I read you what he said. He said, if I did not agree with the Architect of the Capitol, I would have rejected the plan.

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

Mr. YATES. I decline to yield further.

Mr. STRATTON. Did he say that he supported the 4½-acre extension?

Mr. YATES. I do want to say with respect to the interior of the extension, I reserved on the interior space problem because I am not satisfied with the proposed plans. I would like to believe the extension and the interior development will not change the character of the Capitol. I do not want the Capitol modernized. I think we would lose something vital in the process.

The point is—and I have discussed this informally with the minority leader although I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the distinguished Speaker, but I would suggest that the Building Commission seek to obtain the advice of Members of the House and the Senate on what they think ought to go into the extension's interior. We on the committee do not act finally on this proposed plan; Members of Congress ought to be heard on what should be on the inside of that extension. If we do not think there ought to be so many offices, we ought to be able to tell the Building Commission so. If you do not think there ought to be reception centers—and incidentally let me tell you those are the theaters about which the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) asked—one of the witnesses testified that he had visited Williamsburg and as he came to the visitor centers they were shown information on Williamsburg so that they could more fully appreciate what they were going to see on their tour. Some thought that it might be well to give the background of the Capitol so that they would more fully understand the operations of the Congress and what they saw as they went through the Capitol. That is the so-called theater.

I do not know whether we should have a reception center or not. I do not think it would be too bad. I, personally, do not want another restaurant, although I think there may be a public need for one, because you and I know how crowded the restaurant facilities are. However, I have reservations about the cost of the operation. We now have large deficits, and as to what the food would be like, I would hope it would be better than it is now. I might say that the extension is the proper route to follow. I am convinced that the studies which have been made today have been made by reputable, qualified people. I am convinced they are people of integrity and I think the extension of the west front ought to be approved.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his excellent statement on this subject.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a postcard mailed from Whittier, Calif., on September 2, 1969, addressed to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C. It was brought to the attention of our committee. This will illustrate to the members of the committee how one American feels about his Capitol, and I believe it is typical of the general feeling. The postcard is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I just returned from my first trip to Washington and there is something I want to write about. I was shocked to see that the rear of our Capitol Building must be supported by wooden bracing, as if the Nation were falling apart. Is this necessary? What must foreign visitors think? People told me it has been like that for a long time. Whom could I write to, possibly to prod someone along on this matter. Be assured that if you were to let me know, I would write and write often until I got some sort of acceptable answer. Thank you for your attention to my letter. I know how busy you must be.

Very respectfully yours,

PETER J. LAMBERT.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you in all sincerity it is later than you think. We could have a catastrophe on the western front of this Capitol at any time. I do not want to be a party to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 47 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, somebody has been talking about this as being the "Andrews Brothers Show," and after Cousin George's performance I wonder how one can follow an act like that.

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege, of course, to work with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) and the members of the subcommittee.

Because I recognize that the attention of this House is focused on the subject of the western wall, I will dwell but briefly on the other matters and mention some of these provisions, and then confine the bulk of my time to the western front.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL SITE

As was pointed out, we disallowed \$1,250,000 for the purchase of the Providence Hospital site. It was felt that this site was too many blocks away from the Capitol, and the use for which it was determined to be put at this time was not our first priority. But I believe the House should be aware, and the Architect of the Capitol should be aware, that the hold he has on this block of land should be released so that the individuals now owning it may put it to beneficial use. It simply is not fair for the Government to tell the private investors you cannot use this for anything because we might need it in the future.

HOUSE RESTAURANTS

We have dwelt on the accomplishment of savings made in changes in the restaurant, and our chairman has pointed out the efficiencies that we have affected with a meat ax by forcing the Architect of the Capitol to cut back on the deficit financing that has been going on there for many years.

CLAIMS ON UNDERGROUND GARAGES

There has also been considerable publicity about certain claims filed by contractors involving the construction of the underground garages behind the Rayburn Building.

This committee pointed out in its record last year—and I wish the press would take the time to examine the record instead of printing hearsay on most of these occasions—and they pointed out that it expected the Architect, and I quote:

To spare no reasonable engineering, architectural or legal effort to make sure that the government interest is fully protected—

It went on to say:

and wants progress reports from the Architect as significant decisions are taken.

On page 11 of our report the Members can observe the correspondence concerning these claims.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

I would also like to direct the attention of my colleagues briefly to the discussion we have had on the General Accounting Office, an increasingly important arm of the Congress. Its auditing capability has been of great service in insuring that the taxpayers' dollars are well invested. On many occasions, however, we found the justifications of the current fiscal year based upon work they did on expenditures of 4 or 5 years ago.

It would seem to me that the GAO could be of far better value if its investigative work were kept more up to date, and the reports that come into Congress were timely enough so that errors were caught while still correctable in on-going programs.

WEST FRONT PROJECT

Now, finally, of course, we come to the matter of current interest in the House today, the one of extending the west front of the Capitol. It has been a matter of some controversy in the past few weeks, and actually we are faced with a situation that most any farmer—and I am not an architect, I am a farmer—would recognize because if he had a shed on his farm that was falling down and was going to continue falling down, that he either would patch up that shed or find somebody who could patch it up, and he would not sit around talking about it with his neighbors until it fell, and he had all manner of problems on his hands.

We are not dealing with a shed when we are dealing with the Capitol of our Nation, but with the remarks that the press has been giving to this project one might think we were.

I read a recent editorial that pointed out if Williamsburg had been handled in the fashion of the Capitol's west wall we never would have had the great restoration we had in colonial Williamsburg. Yet the man chiefly responsible for restoring colonial Williamsburg is the man who is directing the restoration of the western front of this Capitol.

The question of extension versus restoration has been thoroughly examined. This part was not brought out before. It seems that the press and certain Members of this House feel that the Speaker of this great body said:

I want the Front extended so that we can get 4½ acres of additional space.

Nothing could have been further from the truth. In 1964 the Architect of the Capitol requested an outside engineering study. It was contracted with the Thompson & Lichtner Co. of Brookline, Mass. It cost over \$100,000.

They were asked these questions, and they were asked specifically these four questions:

First. Whether the existing wall, if found deficient, can be repaired in its present condition;

Second. Whether the existing wall can be refaced with marble in its present location;

Third. Whether remedial action requires extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble;

Fourth. Whether any other means of

preservation are deemed feasible and advisable.

If that is a directive to expand the west front, it certainly does not sound like it.

This broad latitude of study gave them an opportunity to come back with any reasonable recommendation. They came back with the overwhelming recommendation that the only way to renovate and preserve the west front is by expanding it.

During the testimony before our subcommittee, a representative of the AIA, Mr. Lethbridge, pointed out that they were very much concerned, and I quote his words, with "preserving intact the west wall with all of its historic significance."

I asked which west wall he was concerned with, the inner wall or the outer wall, and this has not been brought up, as I can point out, if I may, with this chart again which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) used.

You know that the western wall of our Capitol has a great deal of historical significance from the outside, but so does the inside of that west wall. The paintings by Brumidi, the Italian artist who came over here and labeled himself as a free American are largely on the inside of these walls, particularly on the Senate side of the west front. They are priceless paintings. In fact, I think most fair-minded people would say that their value and their historic significance are equal to if not greater than the outside wall.

Now if we, as was pointed out, block up these brick arches and try to strengthen the outer wall; what do we do? The way to strengthen it is to make it one solid wall. That is the only way we can strengthen it now.

You drill holes in the outer sandstone and you pump gunite in under pressure. You know this modern technique of pumping gunite in under pressure. The gunite spreads into this loose sand fill and goes wherever it can go to create a solid bond. In going wherever it can, it penetrates through the walls and brick arches.

The engineers have told us that there is no doubt that all of the inner plaster work and the paintings by Brumidi would be lost by any attempt to so strengthen the west wall in place.

This is a price that we cannot afford to pay—even if you could strengthen the outer wall in place at less cost than extending it.

Then comes the question, perhaps in many minds, if this wall is in such jeopardy, how has it managed to stand for all of these years? Of course, the answer to that is it has not stood for all of these years under the conditions that presently exist. This Capitol was built prior to 1820. The first part of this western wall was put up in 1793 when George Washington laid the cornerstone of the remarkable building, which at that time housed our entire Capitol. It was built as well as it could be built in those days. It contained the House and the Senate and the Supreme Court and all of the other functions of our Government.

About 10 years later the House decided it did not have quite enough room so it

built another identical building on this side of the original building which was separated from the first building by a wooden portico.

During the War of 1812 the British came and burned this Capitol down. That was one tragedy these walls had to go through. We left those two original walls there, and that is two-thirds of the west wall. In 1823 we constructed the rotunda which Lafayette dedicated shortly afterward, and that gave us the final one-third of the western front.

What changes have occurred since that time? We have installed central heating and in the 1930's we air-conditioned the Capitol, something that no one thought of back in the early days. In doing so, we changed the temperature from relatively constant inside and outside, because the heating was with fireplaces, and during the colder part of the winter Congress did not meet, to a point where now we have a temperature inside which is relatively constant at 75°. We have a temperature outside varying from 100° in the summer down to about 10° in the winter, and the differential in temperature is what has caused the damage in the last 25 years to the western wall.

If you repair this wall in place, and if you replace the damaged sandstone and gunitite the inside core and make a solid wall, you will lose the insulative quality, and the cracks that now exist in the outer wall, engineers say, will penetrate through the inner wall within a generation, within 20 years.

So even if we could restore the wall as it was originally built, it would serve our country for only a generation. This Republic is going to be in business, the Lord willing, for a good many years to come. This Capitol will continue to serve as the seat of Government. And the only way to reinforce the west wall is to move out, and build a new wall erected under modern construction techniques, a wall that can stand the heat and the air conditioning, using the concrete floor slab as reinforcing wall—pressure standing barricades to stiffen up this wall at many points up and down its entire expanse.

The wall will be additionally stiffened by then being an inside wall and by having vertical columns of reinforced concrete cast in place against it to further buttress it.

Then also will come about the possibility of maintaining a constant temperature on both sides of this old wall, so the coefficient of expansion and contraction that exists today because of the differential in temperature between the inside and the outside wall will no longer be there, and by underpinning and giving it a new foundation, this wall will then, by being relieved from strain and bring protected by a new outside wall, should be able to last for the millennium.

I think we ought to consider the question that was raised before as to why a smaller extension was made to the east and a greater extension in acreage or square feet, so to speak, is proposed for the west wall. Why the difference?

Those of you who have taken a look at the western front realize that it was not

constructed straight across as the eastern front was. The two original buildings are indented considerably. The rotunda was extended on the western front to give a view over Washington at the time it was constructed and they tell me that when Lafayette came here to dedicate that historic rotunda, this grand portico overlooking Washington was and is a very significant part of the architecture and the use of the Capitol. Therefore, the center section projects a significant way out, and in order to include the old west walls and surround them with this new reinforcing and temperature-containing extension, we have to significantly increase the size of the extension as compared to the east side.

I would like to point out another important fact, and that is this picture, here in the well not of the Capitol as it exists today, but the Capitol as it will exist when this extension is brought about.

Many Members I have talked to have looked at this picture and have said to me:

It is a beautiful Capitol. Why do you want to change it?

This is, of course, the changed version of the Capitol, the Capitol extended.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have had a model of the proposed extension of the west front in Statuary Hall since November 1966. They have received many comments on it, mostly all favorable. To the naked eye it is difficult to tell the difference.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to tell the difference, except for the pediment that is being placed there. As one can see in the before and after pictures the gentleman has on the stand, in the top picture, which is of the existing front, there is no pediment, and in the lower picture, there is a pediment on the extension.

This was recommended by a number of earlier Architects of the Capitol. Thomas U. Walter, an architect and founder and second president of the AIA, fourth Architect of the Capitol, left a plan for extending the west central front, and he went farther out, and suggested an enlarged portico. And Olmstead—who was said by a member of the American Institute of Architects as having developed the noble terraces which he says are now subject to destruction by the extension but which actually are not—himself combined an extension with the terraces in a proposal during the time he was Architect. So this is not the first time this has been under consideration.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure my colleagues agree that the "Andrews Broth-

ers' production" has been very enlightening. We share their concern for the preservation of this great national monument.

My aim is the preservation of that concept. Sometime ago this body considered a Visitors' Center to be appropriate for the introduction of our visitors to the significance of our Nation's Capital and its history. I recall the theater to which reference has been made was suggested as being incorporated in that venture, as it is at Williamsburg. Therefore, some of the criticism that may have been directed toward the concept of expansion is really to emphasize opposition to a Visitors' Center being located here in this building.

I think there is serious doubt as to whether that would be in the best interest of Government or the visitors. It is to that point I feel some attention should be directed as the plans are being developed, so as to avoid criticism at a later date.

I trust people will not be too arbitrary about what is architecturally necessary or desirable here. I wish to retain a very open mind on that and give support to the protection of the building. However, I would hate to see its character too changed. It is a national shrine which we all love.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for those remarks. I share his feelings completely.

I think one of the things that should be crystal clear is that we are not building elevators and men's toilets and women's toilets and theaters and all the rest. We are trying to save this Capitol by the only method which we have been able to ascertain through study of architects and engineers, the most competent ones in this country we could find, and they have told us we have to extend to correct the temperature coefficient and because of the buttressing we can get from the new floor slabs and new walls to protect the old walls. The space gained is an incidental feature of restoring this section.

I am sure all the Members will want to assure that the rooms that are built inside this extension will be built in keeping with the present structure of the Capitol and in keeping with the purposes of our Capitol.

Certainly a visitors' center can well be located in the railroad building which has been taken over for this purpose, and the rooms within the Capitol can be kept within the same type of concept we presently have.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for that very fair statement.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL SITE

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the gentleman's remarks he referred to the old Providence Hospital site. As the gentleman knows, the owners of that property have been restricted in what they could do with it for at least 8 years.

They have been denied the right to develop the property. As recently as last year, I believe, the House Buildings Commission formally notified the owners that they intended to acquire the property. After 8 years it seems no more than fair that the owners be released of any future restrictions or be paid for the property.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the Appropriations Committee is not going to recommend appropriating the money now or in the near future, and we should notify the owners that the property will not be required in the future?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. What I said was that our subcommittee decided against appropriating this sum and felt that we should instruct the Architect of the Capitol to release his hold on this particular site, since we would not be using it in the near future, because it was obviously and patently unfair to put private individuals under a restriction of this type, when the Government did not have any immediate use for the land.

It was also brought out in the hearings before our subcommittee that when, as and if we needed land the appropriate land could be gained through the obvious method of condemnation, and perhaps located more closely to the present Capitol.

WEST FRONT PROJECT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to congratulate the gentleman and those who have preceded him. I believe they have given us not only the history but also the very pertinent reasons why we should go forward with the extension of the west wall.

Let me point out to the gentleman that buildings get old, like people, and have to be refurbished every once in a while.

Twenty-five years ago, when I came here, there were steel trusses across this room. The steel trusses were across it because of the danger of the ceiling falling in. This was one of the buildings which had cast iron trusses, and the dowels that secured the trusses had worn almost through.

We had them on display downstairs later. We had to completely refurbish this room.

We also had a Brumidi picture which was over there on that wall. It is not there now. It is now in the dining room. It cost \$18,000 to take that picture down and to replace it in the dining room. They had to take off the back of the wall to do it.

So, with new techniques and new management, we can do this thing.

May I point out, we do have to accept change. The great Jefferson, who undertook and supervised the building of the original Capitol, if Members will read the history of the Capitol, was the man who said, and it is engraved on his monument:

We might as well ask a man to wear the cloak that fitted him as a boy as to be gov-

erned by the regime of his barbarous ancestors.

It is about time we come to do this and to do something constructive about saving this historic building.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

MADISON LIBRARY BUILDING

Mr. GROSS. Where in the bill do I find the start of construction of the new House Office Building?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. There are no funds in the bill for the start of construction of any new House Office Building.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) led me to believe there was some provision here for the start of a new building, a structure that would be built and converted into a House office building.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. There are funds in the bill for planning of the James Madison Memorial Library, a building it was felt should be designed so it could be used for office space as well as library stock space.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is to be found on page 21 of the bill, with a \$2.8 million start. What would be the total cost of this structure?

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would you enlighten our colleagues as to the space that would be taken out of circulation on the west side in the event of a restoration job?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I will be more than happy to, Mr. Speaker.

However, the gentleman from Iowa raised the point as to how much the memorial library would cost. I would like to answer that first, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to my chairman for that figure.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. There is a legislative limitation of \$75 million at the present time on the proposed library. Our information is that the project is now estimated at \$90 million, which is the projected cost over the next 5 years of the building. That is cranking in an assumed annual 7-percent inflationary escalation.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the added requirements on the powerplant?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No, sir; it does not.

Mr. GROSS. So you are embarking here upon another \$100 million House Office Building, to all intents and purposes?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is a good figure for those two things. The committee report mentions \$110 million, including furniture and furnishings.

Mr. GROSS. And it all comes in under

the guise of an annex to the Library of Congress, the James Madison Memorial Building. Why the subterfuge?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I assure the gentleman that the purpose of this building is for the Library. Some suggestion was made around here years ago that we needed an additional House office building. I never had any such thought as that, and I share the hope of the gentleman from Iowa that we will never have to build another House office building. So I hope that the gentleman will support me when we try to defeat the so-called intern amendment, which might lead to a need for an additional office building. However, the way it has been planned, if somewhere way out in the future, additional House office space were needed on Capitol Hill, the library building could be converted into an office building.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the hearings are replete with testimony, that this building would be constructed so that it could be converted into a House office building. Let us not quibble over this thing. That is what is contemplated and at a cost of \$100 million. What did the President say recently about a 75-percent cut in Federal construction?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. He announced there would be a 75-percent reduction in certain construction.

Mr. GROSS. Are we not here in the Congress then going ahead with construction projects that are denied to other parts of this Nation and to citizens of this Nation?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I can assure the gentleman that there is not a dime in this bill for constructing the library building. It is planning money, and it will be at least 18 months or so before they would be completed.

Mr. GROSS. Once the planning is started you are off and running. You have \$2.8 million in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would think the gentleman from Iowa would be happy to see that there is a convertible way of treating this building. In the Congresses of generations hence when he and I will not be here.

Mr. GROSS. Do not be too sure of that.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. And in generations hence they would not have to find it necessary to tear down and replace this library with a House office building. We may thus be saving money here for future generations.

WEST FRONT PROJECT

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the question of the distinguished Speaker at this time with respect to how much of the west front of this Capitol would be removed from beneficial use if an attempt were made to restore the west wall in place.

If this could be done without damaging the ceilings, and mindful of the fact that it might cost more than the extension and also mindful of the fact that it would only last for 20 or 25 years—I would like to refer again to this chart. As you can see the outer rooms have these brick arches. The next room over has another brick arch. So you would have to take two

rooms in or the room and the hallway and take them out of use for a period of up to 10 years across the entire west front of this Capitol from the basement up to the attic floor.

It, of course, would raise the question of where to put all the functions of our branch now using this space as you try to replace the outer wall, the reason for removing these rooms from service is obvious. You would have to brace up the underside of the arches in order to hold them while they were removing stones from the outer wall which now keep them in place. Another problem is this: You come into an interesting fact of construction. When you have bricks in compression—concrete, mortar, or bricks in compression—they have great strength; however, mortar and brick or concrete in tension is a different matter. They are very weak in tension. If the pressure were removed from these arches in their normal conformity and you then took the scaffolding down after restoring, there is no reason to believe that many of these arches might not crumble when you tried to restore them to compression. In fact, many of the arches did collapse in the earlier construction of the Capitol when they took the scaffolding out, and had to be rebuilt. This could very well happen again.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do want to understand the fact that the west wall of the Capitol is not built in a straight line as is the east wall, and in order to get outside of the entire west wall and in order to retain the entire west wall with the present west wall, how many feet would the gentleman think the west wall would have to be from the old west wall?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. An average of 44 feet across the center, a greater distance on each side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And how much of this 4½ acres would be required by this 44 feet?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. All of it. This is where you get your 4½ acres of floor space. It is 4½ acres because when you multiply the footage in the subbasement, the basement, the first floor, the second floor, the third floor and the attic, that is what you are talking about when you speak of the 4½ acres. In other words, we are not going out into the south 40. We are only going 44 feet west of the present farthest west section. The acreage mounts because of the multiplicity of the number of floors.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand it, you have to go the 44½ feet from the present west wall with the new west wall in order to get outside of the entire old west wall?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. In order to get outside of the entire old west wall and in order to get enough reinforced floors and walls and to achieve the bridging and the honeycombing effect solidly up against the wall.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The testimony with respect to the question asked by the gentleman was to the effect that the center position is 44 feet, and the connecting wings 56 feet. Because of the indentations which the gentleman from North Dakota spoke about it requires a variation of the length. In other words you have the three different lengths of the different parts of the west wall.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota upon a very careful and illuminating statement. It is obvious that he has been in consultation with a number of architects in the course of his investigation.

I think many of us are deeply troubled by the opposition of the AIA which has been fairly well expressed either directly or in newspaper ads. This group, I believe, is a responsible group. I am wondering if the gentleman could summarize the reasons for the opposition and the extent to which they have participated in the hearings leading up to this recommendation to the Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. This group was understood to be in opposition to the extension of the west front. We invited their spokesmen to appear and testify before our subcommittee. They gave no factual testimony as such. They provided no refutation for the engineering studies that have already been taken and which had been laid out in the hearings of this subcommittee, not only this year, but in years past. They merely suggested that we throw it all out for a new study.

My point is that such a study has already been made. It was done in 1964. We do indeed today have the results, and to continue with further study seems painfully a waste of the taxpayers' money, as well as a waste of time in preserving the west front, which is rapidly crumbling.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman familiar with the extent for which they speak for the architects of America? Does it have a wide reputation in the architectural profession?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. They have a wide reputation, I understand, but there are also other professional groups in the architectural profession who agree with the extension. One must remember one thing, I believe above all else: this is far more an engineering problem than it is an architectural problem, and a designer—and that is mainly what an architect is—can take a look and think how wonderful it would be to be able to replace the west front where it is, as it is. But an engineer takes a look at it and examines the coefficient of expansion and contraction, and all of the rest, the type of stone and the brick arches, and comes up with the answer of what is possible rather than what would be merely desirable.

For instance, they said we could clean

off this wall, make it look as it was originally. This west wall has been painted over since the British set fire to the Capitol, and the paint has accumulated on it to such a degree that if you were to take the paint off, the detail work of much of the stone carvings would come with it. So the opportunity to restore in place the west front to its original condition simply is not there from a structural engineering standpoint.

Mr. CONABLE. In other words, to the knowledge of the gentleman in the well, the American Institute of Architects has not made any opportunity, or had the opportunity, nor have they asked the opportunity to make any careful study of the conditions?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Architects are a lot like politicians. There are the ins and the outs, and those who are on the outside are always second guessing about what those who have the responsibility have done—and this is perfectly proper.

We have hired architects and we have hired engineers, the best we could find in this country, and they have come up with their conclusions. And obviously there is nothing to prevent other architects from potshooting because they do not have the responsibility, they have not been asked specifically to provide the hard facts and figures which their colleagues who have been retained have. I would suspect that if the questioning architects had the full facts at their disposal, most of them would favor the extension as did those we retained.

When Mr. YATES asked the AIA who was the most respected engineer that the AIA would recommend to give an opinion on these walls, the one name that came forward time and time again, and the man Mr. YATES contacted, was the man who said you must not restore in place, you must extend.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the hearings before our committee in 1967 contained on page 783 a letter from the then president of the American Institute of Architects. Its task force had come to the Capitol, talked to the Architect of the Capitol and his staff for a day, and then examined the wall the following afternoon. Later on they had a meeting and presented a report. In that report they came to the conclusion that restoration was possible. In this letter by the president of the AIA it is stated:

The AIA unequivocally states in its report that the west wall can be restored, and its structural stress corrected without unacceptable risk.

Mr. Severud—he is the person to whom I referred before, and had been working on the walls and on the study. He said this:

As your structural consultants, we are particularly concerned with the elements that involve safety and practicality, and offer our comments as follows:

1. It is obvious that the addition would protect the present walls from the elements. It would also furnish the opportunity of providing added lateral stability wherever this

would be considered of importance. These factors would result in the minimum amount of repair to and maintenance of these walls.

2. The safety of the brick arches that constitute the floor construction is largely dependent upon resistance to lateral thrusts at their supports. They are also very sensitive to any movement of the supports. Since these arches are not open to inspection, we are not in a position to determine their structural soundness. However, we can state categorically that their safety is enhanced very materially by the external buttressing effect that the addition would provide.

3. Any removal of part of the present walls is a hazardous operation, since, as mentioned above, the brick arches are dependent for safety upon the lateral resistance offered by their supports.

There is a difference of opinion between the AIA task force and Mr. Severud. The AIA task force did not believe there is a significant lateral thrust from the inside through that wall.

Mr. Severud disagrees. He believes the wall must be buttressed with the extension.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the gentleman for giving the House this information. I do believe the American people are distressed to find architects arguing about this and it is important to have in the RECORD some statement of what the issues are.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am sure the gentleman from New York realizes that architects argue just as much as politicians.

I would like to conclude and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman later.

In conclusion, I would like to say merely three things.

One, this has been examined thoroughly by the best brains in America in the field of architecture and engineering.

Two, we feel sincerely that this is the lowest cost method of preserving the Capitol.

Third, the time is here. We have waited too long already and we simply cannot afford to wait while we engage in idle rumor and talk back and forth about things that are nonfactual.

Certainly it would be my hope that this House will vote to move ahead on this most necessary renovation for maintaining the structural integrity of the Capitol of this country.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the opinion of anyone with reference to the matter being discussed, I think the entire House of Representatives feels it owes a debt of gratitude for the tremendous amount of work and the excellent job in presenting its case that has been done by the subcommittee this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) has consumed 43 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all agree that this session here

today is most unusual in the House, to have so many Members sitting so far forward, and everyone paying such very careful attention. I think it is something that few of us have had an opportunity to experience on many occasions and it certainly speaks well for the interest of the membership in this very vital question.

Fools, they say, rush in where angels fear to tread. I fully recognize the problems involved in opposing this appropriation of \$2 million for the extension of the Capitol. I have no particular desire to rack up any record for foolishness. Many Members have advised me that this was an impossible job—to take on both sides of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations.

But I have felt very strongly about this particular subject for more than 4 years. I first came to this Capitol Building in 1941 as a congressional secretary, and I have been interested about this great building ever since. This particular proposal I have been fighting since 1966, and rather successfully, so far at least. I know the odds today. But I am not a summer soldier nor a sunshine patriot. Therefore, I do not intend to run from this fight, even though the odds may seem to be substantial.

I believe that the case against extension is a very sound one. Certainly those who favor it have done a very creditable job. I think the final decision has to be made based on what the issues are rather than who is behind it or even the particular day of the week when we are considering it.

Let me make one thing clear: I am not trying to pose as any expert on architecture. I am not going to go into the esthetics of the west front. I do not intend to say anything about the Architect of the Capitol. I do not intend to discuss the east front or even the Rayburn Building. I am certainly not trying to challenge the Speaker of the House. I have known him for 28 years. I supported him in January, and I am still behind him. Rather I am trying to fight for what I sincerely believe to be right, but I believe that in spite of the very eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from North Dakota, some of the really critical points in this particular issue have just not been presented.

The gentleman from Illinois said he was for this extension but he was not for all the space involved, well, you just cannot have it both ways. I think it is perfectly clear, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) said a moment ago, that if we vote the \$2 million for plans and specifications, then we are going down the long road to construction, and there are not going to be any more seminars like this when we can get up and discuss our individual views on architecture and space requirements. Those decisions will be made by the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol, not by this House.

This proposal has been kicking around this House and this Capitol for a long time, and everybody knows what is behind it, and what we are doing today is

to give the green light or withhold the green light on building this particular extension.

This is the proposal that I call for an incredible 4½-acre extension of the Capitol, including two restaurants, two auditoriums, and two- or three-dozen hideaway offices. In fact here are the specific details contained in the printed hearings. There would be 43 large offices, 55 medium offices, two dining rooms, two cafeterias, two auditoriums, two escalators, eight elevators, 12 men's toilets, 12 women's toilets, 14 private toilets. This is the proposal that we are acting on, and although the Architect of the Capitol has said it will cost \$45 million, his track record on estimates for the east front and the Rayburn Building would lead you to expect a total final cost, I would say, at somewhere from \$60 to \$70 million. And we are being asked to do all this at the very time that the President of the United States has cut back on construction in the executive branch by 75 percent because of inflation.

The real issue is, Do we really need anything this elaborate at this particular time when they are cutting back projects in cities, in our schools, in our hospitals, and on our highways? This extension, if we approve it, will turn out to be the most costly building every constructed. You have all heard about the Rayburn Building and how expensive that was. Let me give you some figures—and these are based on the Architect's own figures—as to the cost per square foot of this particular extension project.

The cost per square foot of this particular extension project is almost five times the cost per square foot of the Rayburn Building. The cost per square foot of the Rayburn Building was \$34.26. The cost of the west front, on the Architect's own figures, is \$166.95.

There has been some argument as to whether this Congress was or was not a do-nothing Congress. Whatever we may say on that score, we have indeed taken a number of actions that might be construed as being in our own interests: a salary increase, an increase in our staff, a boost in our retirement program.

Are we now going to go on record as paying five times the cost of what is regarded generally as the most expensive building ever built, to create 98 hideaway offices for ourselves, two auditoriums, two restaurants, and two cafeterias? That is the basic question here. It is not a question of whether we want to preserve the west front. I am in favor of that. It is not a question whether we want to do it or not do it by buttressing. I would be in favor of that too if we could have from some independent engineering firm a statement that that is the only thing that can be done to save the west front.

But surely it is not necessary to put in two escalators and two auditoriums and destroy the Olmstead terraces and go out 88 feet just to save the west front.

I defy anybody to find in all the studies that have been presented to the Architect and to the Commission—at a cost incidentally of \$447,000 to date—any statement that says that proposed exten-

sion is absolutely necessary to save the west front.

Let me make just two other points. We are told the Capitol needs more space. We already have the Rayburn Building; we have, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE) pointed out, a moment ago, the Visitors' Center down in Union Station. Surely we do not need more office space—particularly at \$166 a square foot.

So we finally come to the issue whether this building is going to collapse or not. I am not myself convinced the danger is quite as dramatic as has been presented. I have some personal doubts whether this danger is quite as imminent as the Capitol Architect would have us think, but I am as anxious as he is—I am sure we all are—to do everything that is really necessary to save this historic structure.

Yet the odd, the amazing fact is that in all these years that we have been discussing the west front extension, nobody has ever yet made any careful study of just what is the minimum we have to do to preserve the west front. All we have is that elaborate study about adding on 4½ acres. An amount of \$447,000 has already been spent on plans and studies, yet all we have is someone's unsupported statement that this particular extension plan is the only possible way to keep the west front from falling. Surely this cannot be true. Surely we do not need escalators and restaurants at least just to keep the west front from falling down.

So I say, then, let us do the one thing that has not yet been done in all these years that we have spent nearly a half a million dollars on this west front expansion plan. Before we decide to go down this long road to spend \$60 to \$70 million, let us just have a look at the other side of the story. Let us commission an independent engineering study of just what really does need to be done to save the west front—instead of extending it—and let us see just how much it will cost.

The AIA, with 80 percent of the professional architects in the country, says such a study can be made. We may not get a precise figure, but we can get a pretty darned good estimate. And we can get such a study done in the next 6 to 9 months. Even if we appropriate this \$2 million for plans and specifications today it will be a year at least before anything is done to keep the west front from collapsing.

My amendment would knock out that \$2 million for plans and put in its place \$100,000 for a study of just how cheaply we can save the present structure.

Then a year from now we will all be in a much better position to judge just how much we ought to spend. We will have the \$70 million, the \$166 a square foot, expansion project on the one hand. And we will have some other plan that will preserve the Capitol without altering it, probably a lot more cheaply, on the other.

I say that if by spending \$100,000 now, we can save \$10 or \$15 million later on that is a darned good bargain for the taxpayers. I just do not see how this Congress can afford not to take it, even though the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) may be for it, and all the

other brass in this Chamber are on the other side.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I speak with some feeling on this subject. Somehow I have developed a love for this place. I speak also as one who opposed the east front and the west front. I introduced a resolution to block passage during consideration of the east front. Then I did what I should have done first: I did some research.

As I studied the need and as I considered the problems, I changed my mind. Then one day I took the floor—I guess it was in 1958—and explained to the House during a special order why I changed my position. Time will not permit me to talk about all this—I have only 10 minutes.

Let me first say the members of the committee have done their homework. We should all be impressed with what they have told the Members of the House. They have counseled with good people. I know something about this, because I too have counseled with some good people. People who are engineers, architects, and authorities.

I, too, opposed Mr. Stewart and the office there, but I have changed my mind about them, too.

But the more I looked into the problem, the more I saw the need. I will not go into the detailed reasons that have already been explained to the Members so well, but let me rather talk first about this place as a place of great import.

I say to student groups who visit here—and I think this can be proven—that more has happened in the shadow of the dome of the Capitol to bring the Biblical promise of an abundant life to people as a nation, while we have developed as a nation, more than has happened in all time. That makes this an important place. All of this happened through and with people of our kind—elected representatives of the people.

The first speaker here was a President. His name was Adams. He had not been reelected that year, and his election depended upon what the Congress would do in January 1801. But he came here and spoke. Among the things he reminded the Members of Congress in 1800 was that this was the "Temple of Liberty" for us and for the world.

At that time the Capitol was no larger than your courthouse in your hometown, yet he declared this a Temple of Liberty.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is what it has been in a very real sense.

Oh, we have made our mistakes.

Getting to the Capitol in particular, as the Capitol grew—and that has been referred to—every time there was a debate. Read the RECORD, to see what some of our predecessors said about the dome, when they considered this dome. This is the second dome atop this Capitol. They said it was all out of proportion, how needless it was, how much empty space there was, that it could never be used and all of that.

We would not move it now, would we? Read the debates when the Congress changed from gas light to electricity, to

see what some of our colleagues said about this fad called electricity:

It is dangerous. It is not going to last. What is wrong with gas, anyway?

The people who voted to give us electric lights look better in the light gas service.

I respect the opposition, because I believe when we have opposition we do the job better. I believe the architects, knowing they had opposition, did the job better. They were challenged because there were men like SAM STRATTON here, who, too felt strongly about the need for questioning, and for considering some other ideas.

So it is understandable that we are having an argument today. We have done that through the years.

This extension needs to be because of the reasons that have been expressed by those who spoke on the technical side, but there is another reason and there are other reasons.

Our west front should be presentable. I like to speak on this front question. Think of this for a moment. We are in a building that has no back doors. We speak of the east front and of the west front, and of the most open Capitol in this world. It should be more presentable from the west, for more people see it from there than from anyplace else.

Do you know what? More people from all over the world visit this Capitol than visit any other capitol anywhere in the world. And I want to make it more accessible. It would be more accessible if we extended the west front.

Someone belittled the escalator. What is wrong with making an escalator available to a person on retirement income who has a bad heart? Or to anybody else, for that matter? We think nothing about having escalators in stores and in other public buildings. We have them for ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get started now, for the chairman of the committee was right when he said, "It is dangerous as it is."

The east front was dangerous. I walked by one day when a hunk of cement from the ledge fell off that we estimated weighed 67 pounds. That was when the east front was more open and accessible to the public. Thankfully, this is not true of the west front. But look on that ledge. The same thing could happen there today. So it is dangerous for people.

But the foundation needs strengthening also, because it has atop of it this dome. Just the iron in it weighs 9 million pounds.

Friends, help the leaders and help yourselves to put the last grand touch on this Capitol. It is the grandest place for freedom-loving people in this world. We could make it more grand still, if we will, and I think it will be if we proceed with the recommendations of the committee.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), has probably spent more time on the preservation of the beauty and the history of this Capitol than any

man in this Congress. Sometimes I think he came here just to serve on the Historical Commission. But for whatever reason, I know he has a deep love for this Capitol and interest in its preservation. I appreciate the remarks that the gentleman from Iowa made as well as the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). I have never heard a better technical explanation of the need for this extension than the gentleman from North Dakota has given us. Surely this work must go forward.

I have been privileged to serve with the gentleman in the well on the National Historical Society committee. I have been interested also in the creation of a Visitors Center, which I had previously authored. I am delighted that the Speaker and his committee have given us a chance, through the planning money of this appropriation bill, to go forward with this. I think we ought to do it immediately.

AMERICA'S CRUMBLING WEST FRONT

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman. The Capitol's first major structural change in nearly a century was completed in 1962 when a new marble east front, faithfully reproducing the design of the original sandstone front, was constructed 32½ feet east of the building's old walls. In 1956, when this enlargement of the building was under serious consideration, my interest in the Capitol's history and tradition moved me to introduce a bill against such an extension. Then followed hours of research and exploration to justify my position. I soon discovered that architectural defects, deterioration, as well as cracks and bulges in the sandstone, had greatly weakened the structural foundation beneath the 3,909,200-pound dome. Indeed, portions of the old stones were held in place by various temporary expedients that instantly convinced me that I had erred grievously in my judgment, and that the modification proposed was necessary to preserve the building. Consequently, I reversed my stand and became one of the leading proponents for extension of the Capitol's east front.

Today, extension of the Capitol's west front is contemplated, and again, I am one of its principal advocates. A close look at the building's sagging and crumbling west wall is convincing evidence of the need for such a modification. Built with soft sandstone blocks quarried from Aquia Creek, near Mount Vernon, the 174-year-old west front is now in a terrible state of disrepair. Bowed-out walls, buckled cornices, and great cracks extending upward from the ground to the top of the building, are all poorly concealed by the 35 coats of paint applied to the structure over the years. Keystones in the arches above the basement floor windows have dropped so far, in some instances, that the wood frames have been cut out to fit around them. Sandlime mortar used in the 18th-century foundation has long since disintegrated. To make a dark picture black, installation of modern lighting, heating, plumbing, and air conditioning has necessitated

the cutting through of walls and arches originally designed for the support of the structure.

In 1964 an independent firm of engineers from Brookline, Mass., conducted the most thorough examination of the Capitol ever completed. Results of their 8-month study indicated that—

The walls are leaning and must be replaced shortly or they will fall.

One hot summer day in 1966, a large piece of the dentil work from the west center cornice worked loose, landing 15 feet from the base of the wall. It could have been fatal had it fallen on one of the 7 million tourists who shuffle through the Capitol's historic Halls each year.

Plans for extension and reconstruction of the Capitol's west front date back to 1863, and more recently to 1904. Congress was so confident this would be done, that in 1905, they authorized Louis Amateis to design a bronze door to be installed in the new extension. The design of its transom was entitled "The Apotheosis of America." The entire concept was approved, the ensemble of doors, frame, and transom was produced and has been in storage since 1910.

In this place where tradition prevails, where precedent is so important, where rules seem unchangeable, it is interesting to note that the building's expansion has not yet been halted by these powerful safeguards of American heritage. Indeed, change, growth, and improvement have been the tradition of the Capitol. But because there is always debate when there is change, change has come slowly. For two decades, the House and Senate each had their own generating plant, and until January 1963, the building was lighted by a direct current system. Recently, the Capitol caught up with the rest of the world by installing a modern alternating current system.

Some claim this extension would do violence to the traditional architectural balance and symmetry of the Capitol. But I believe it not so. Replacing the blistering, peeling walls with gleaming walls of white marble can only enhance the building's beauty and furnish the lateral support necessary for the vast west central portion of the sagging structure. The House and Senate wings act as buttresses for the old south and north walls; the new east front, with plenty of reinforcing steel and concrete, buttress that wall. Nothing but the original masonry supports the decaying west wall.

Recent statements in the Washington press indicate that Frederick Law Olmsted, eminent 19th-century landscape artists, would be horrified to see the west front extended. Actually, Olmsted himself made designs for extension of the Capitol to the west, and his drawings are strikingly similar to those currently suggested.

Today's plan provides for addition of a central pediment, extension of the building's center portion by 44 feet, and extension of the Senate and House wings by 88 feet. In all, 162,500 square feet of floor space would be added to accommodate the growing needs of Congress. Increased House and Senate restaurant facilities, together with visitor and em-

ployee restaurants, would occupy some of this space.

Combined seating-capacity of these restaurants is 1,300 persons.

The remaining area would house five new committee rooms, 105 offices, 21 storage rooms, several additions to vertical circulation facilities in the building, including six passenger elevators, two freight elevators, and two escalators.

Like many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, I feel it is time we stop "sashaying" around with this problem. To correct the Capitol's deplorable condition and bring added beauty to the Nation's most visited building, we must proceed with the extension which the congressional Commission recently approved. To wait will only result in further deterioration and increased costs for something we know must be done.

THE LAST EXTENSION "BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE"—OUR CAPITOL, SUBJECT OF PERSISTENT DEBATE—THE CAPITOL, OUR MAJOR SYMBOL, OUR MAJESTIC EDIFICE

Mr. Chairman, the east front reconstruction was completed in 1962 and has successfully anchored that phase of the 140-year-old structure. That extension went through critical periods of debate too, but since its extension and the east front restoration, the people have almost universally applauded. The west front is now the subject of debate, in the Congress, and in the public. The purpose of this dissertation or this article, is to bring light and understanding to the present problems of our "majestic edifice." The mass of the dome weighs more than 9 million pounds. Its ceaseless twisting and turning as the sun moves across the sky continues to bring dangerous stresses on the unshored west front. An inspection tour with any competent architect is enough to convince any amateur that the west wall and foundations are in very bad shape. On one 40-foot stretch a few feet above the ground level, there is a conspicuous bulge of approximately 9 inches in the face of the wall.

In other places large slabs of heavy masonry have been forced outward as much as 3 inches from the vertical wall giving the surface a patched look. Great cracks crawl upward 10 to 15 feet above the ground line, poorly concealed by having been buttressed with mortar and painted over many times. Keystones in the arches above the ground front windows have dropped so far in some instances that the wood window frames have had to be sawed out to fit around them. A slab of stone in the architrave above the west portico ballustrade has slipped its moorings and appears an imminent danger of dropping altogether. The problem is that we have extra support on three of the walls holding up the dome, but none on the fourth. The House and Senate wings act like buttresses for the north and south walls, the new east front, with plenty of steel and concrete buttresses that wall, but there is nothing but the old original masonry for the west wall, and that west wall is built with sandstone blocks.

Foundations of the old building consists of trenches, approximately 15 feet wide by 10 feet deep, filled with bluestone

rubble, quarried in Rock Creek, Md., and hauled to the site by oxcart. Sand-lime mortar poured into these foundations has long since disintegrated.

The walls, 5 feet thick at the base, are constructed of blocks of brown sandstone quarried at the Aquarried Creek, not far from Mount Vernon. These blocks were laid without mortar or any bonding agent.

There are no lumber or material supports within the building. The floors are carried on a complex maze of masonry arches that make the dank and gloomy basement of the old building look like the setting for a Victor Hugo novel. Many of these interior arches frequently pierced by modern service conduits, are deteriorating also.

In this place where tradition prevails, where precedent is so important, where rules seem unchangeable, it is interesting to note that the building of the Capitol has not been bound by tradition. Indeed, change and growth and improvement have been the tradition of the Capitol. Because there is always debate when there is change, change has come slowly to the old Capitol. However, it frequently has been the bellwether in adopting modern improvements. Candles and oil lamps were abandoned in 1847 for a new type of illumination called solar gas, made of birch bark and resin and later from coal.

A gas explosion that gutted the old Senate wing on the night of April 6, 1890, caused the abrupt switch to a still newer fangled invention—electricity. For two decades the House and Senate each had their own generating plant on the Capitol Grounds, and indeed until a few years ago the Senate side was still being lit with a direct current system. It has finally caught up with the House and the rest of the world and it now has alternating current.

We could go on and discuss the debate about building the present dome. A substitution for the earlier low dome. The debate that came with the extension of the House and Senate wings. The debate on what should be in the Capitol in statue form, in art, and debating about the air conditioning. Indeed it can be said that our Capitol has a tradition for a change.

It is natural enough to have debate about our Capitol and what happens to it. First, because debate in that Capitol is so natural. Many of the transactions here, the results of debate and witnessed by the Capitol walls, still lift the hearts of men. Here Adams battled for the right of petition. Here the House was trying Sam Houston for assaulting a fellow Member; here Drayton of South Carolina spoke a great truth when he declared:

If freedom of discussion were restrained, the pillars of the Constitution would fall.

In fact, here more has happened to establish, to greatly extend the basic freedoms than has happened in any other capitol in all of history. The Capitol is history; it is the major symbol of the Nation, full of minor symbols but above all it is a mighty engine, tended and kept throttling by the indefatigable efforts of a select assembly

which represents very much more of our natural strength than of our natural weakness.

Because all of this and more is so true and the Capitol is visited by many people from all over the world than any other capitol in the world can boast of. We should not then discourage debate, decry discussions, or be impatient with those who disagree.

Some claim that this extension will do violence to the traditional architectural balance and symmetry of the Capitol. But I believe it not so.

The accompanying picture will show that possibly instead of doing violence it may even enhance the beauty. Make it even more admired and appreciated, and most certainly when and if this extension becomes a reality, the boys and girls will have an opportunity to learn more easily and be impressed more emphatically with its greatness, not only because of its exterior improvement but because of its improved facilities.

It may be interesting to note that the plans for the extension and restoration of the Capitol date back to 1904. The Congress was so confident they would go forward with this improvement that they authorized Lewis Amateis to do a design for a new bronze door to be installed on the new west front. The design was entitled, "The Apotheosis of America" and was accepted and has been in storage since 1907 awaiting the restoration and extension of the west front.

The proposed extension—which I approve and enthusiastically endorse—very briefly would provide for 94,320 additional square feet of floor space to accommodate the present needs of Congress with some allowance for future growth. It is proposed that the House and Senate restaurant facilities be moved to the west terrace together with an additional visitors' and employees' restaurant. The combined area would be 55,000 square feet with seating capacity for approximately 1,300 persons. In addition to the new Capitol restaurant space, the extension of the west front would provide for eight committee rooms, 55 offices, seven storage rooms and extensive additions to the facilities for vertical circulation in the building, including six passenger elevators, two freight elevators, and six escalators.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point comments on criticisms received in a letter dated September 11 from Congressman STRATTON:

Paragraph 1: "... This monstrosity ..." (referring to proposed west front extension).

Comment: From most all who have seen the rendering or the model in Statuary Hall of the proposed extension, we have heard nothing but favorable comments. Many including members of both Appropriations Committees have indicated they cannot see much change and actually believe it would be an improvement.

Paragraph 2: "... It would extend the Capitol over an additional 4½ acres."

Comment: This is an incorrect statement. The total of all floors added together will amount to 4½ acres. The total amount that the Capitol would be extended is less than one acre.

Paragraph 2: "... adding two new restaurants, two movie theatres, additional com-

mittee rooms, and about two dozen hideaway offices for more senior Members ..."

Comment: This is another misstatement. The report sent to all Members of Congress by the Speaker in 1967 and the recent testimony given before House Appropriations Committee clearly show that the plan can provide approximately 100 offices of various sizes.

Paragraph 3: "... on the basis of his estimates for the East Front and the Rayburn Building, I would expect the ultimate tag to be closer to \$60 or \$70 million ..."

Comment: In all fairness, the Architect of the Capitol has no control over escalation and if the percentage of escalation which is currently indicated of 1% a month holds, then the amount of \$45 million may very well increase.

I note from the House Appropriations recent Committee Hearings that the cost of construction of the Extension of the East Central Front of the Capitol is reported at \$11,353,722 in contrast to the estimated cost of \$10,100,000. I am also advised that the cost of construction of the Rayburn House Office Building was \$71,229,164, and that he estimated cost at the completion of preliminary drawings was \$66,000,000. Considering the inflation that took place up to the time of taking bids and the items that were added by the Commission such as Cafeteria, Gymnasium Swimming Pool, Health Suite, First Aid and other items, I find nothing out of line with regards to the increased cost of these projects.

Paragraph 4: "... With the Rayburn Building and the remodeling of the Longworth Building ..."

Comment: No funds have been appropriated for remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building.

Paragraph 5: "... Congress has never directed any survey of what would be the minimum we would have to do to keep the West Front from collapsing, and how much it would cost ..."

Comment: The Thompson & Lichtner Company, Inc., made studies of various alternative methods of rectifying the condition of the West Central Front. They indicated their reasons why they could not recommend any of the alternatives.

Page 2, paragraph 1, comment: The AIA makes this claim notwithstanding the fact that when a resolution was proposed at the Denver Convention in 1966, the resolution was tabled by a majority vote of the delegates. In addition, the representative of the AIA who is a member of the AIA Task Force on the West Front project indicated the cost of restoration could exceed the cost of the proposed Extension.

Page 2, paragraph 2, comment: Any study made "... in a few months ..." could not possibly have the validity of the more exhaustive and extended study made by Thompson & Lichtner and the knowledge acquired of this building by the Architects and Engineers who have now been associated with the Capitol project some one dozen years.

Mr. Chairman, the following is an article by a distinguished architect that sheds light and gives better understanding to the problem at hand:

DEATH IN THE U.S. CAPITOL
(By Wilfred J. Gregson, FARA)

Two years ago at a Congressional hearing on the West Front of the Capitol, I called attention to the number of dangerous conditions that existed in the Capitol. The one that caused immediate attention and action was the dangerously overloaded attic floor. After the hearing a reporter from the Washington Post asked if the attic overload was as serious as I had testified. I assured her it was. Here is the story as it appeared and subsequently received national and international coverage.

CAPITOL ATTIC IS OVERLOADED

Washington Post News Service,
Washington, August 8, 1966.

"An architect has told a House subcommittee that the attic of the Capitol building is so overloaded with old files that it could collapse.

"A Sword of Damocles is hanging over the building," Wilfred J. Gregson of Atlanta declared. "A national tragedy could occur."

Questioned later, Gregson, Founder of the Society of American Registered Architects, said the attic was never meant for storage and should not be used for that purpose.

"There are stacks and stacks of paper and stacks between the stacks," he said. "Boxes are piled two and three feet above the file cabinets overloading the floors and creating a fire hazard."

The dangerous condition of the attic was confirmed by assistant Capitol architect, Mario E. Campioli.

"I am amazed," he said, "that the building continues to be able to support the tremendous load."

Gregson appeared before the special House labor subcommittee in support of the proposal by Capitol Architect J. George Stewart to buttress the old walls of the Capitol by extending and rebuilding the West Front."

The blast of publicity had its immediate effect. The files and stacks of papers were removed the following week according to another news service release by the Washington Post.

Unfortunately, the other remarks made at the hearing appear to have been overshadowed by the urgency of the attic overloading. In any case, the remaining hazardous conditions were ignored. They still exist in a further state of deterioration and a more hazardous condition than was true two years ago.

For example, August, 1966, when I appeared before the hearing there were two shores holding up the West Central Front wall of the Capitol which had bulged $4\frac{1}{2}$ " into the court. Three more shores have since been added in an attempt to hold this wall from collapsing.

Two years ago there were two shores holding up the architrave; now there are five shores. Three additional shores have been added because of the danger of the architrave falling down. Hundreds of great fractures have appeared in lintels, sills, keystones and walls which have now been filled and painted. This hides the deplorable condition of the building, but has not corrected it. In the meantime, the old sandstone portico has deteriorated so that large pieces of stone have fallen off the exterior walls with a potential death dealing threat. Fortunately, no one has yet been killed or hit by these falling fragments.

As most architects are aware, the Capitol is constructed with a series of arches. The West Front restrains these arches with iron ties anchored into the stonework. There is sufficient evidence to show that these have slipped, reducing their buttressing effect on the arches behind the West Wall. Some of these arches, once semicircular, are now flattened at the top. They are composed of a single course of brick or stone and in many instances are filled with stand over the arch. At times this sand falls like rain through the brick joints. How long can this go before one of the arches collapses? When an arch collapses, it removes the restraint on the adjacent arch. How much of the Capitol will collapse and how many people will get killed when this happens?

It is inconceivable that so serious a condition can be permitted to exist and to get progressively more hazardous with each passing day. There is no way to project the extent of this impending catastrophe. As architects, we can only call attention to it

and insist that immediate action be taken to prevent so awful a tragedy. When the West Central Front wall bulges $4\frac{1}{2}$ " into the court, it is obviously overstressed. Shoring it to prevent it from bulging further adds additional and unpredictable stresses. The wall is composed of an outside layer of limestone with very poor, soft and crumbling lime mortar joints; the inside wall is built of the same material, but has not been subjected to the daily expansion and contraction action resulting from the heat of the sun followed by the cold of the night.

Between the exterior and interior walls of the Capitol, the original builders had dumped loose rubble rock without mortar. This adds neither tie nor restraint, but falls between the walls as the front wall bulges, increasing the stresses.

No building department in the United States would approve the Capitol today, even as it was originally constructed, and would condemn it in its present deteriorated and dangerous condition, barring the public from the building.

Why is it then that hundreds of legislators can exist in blissful ignorance in a building that is eminently dangerous and fast deteriorating? Why are they not disturbed by the prospects of immediate and awful death that faces them?

Something must be done and immediately to avert the most awful tragedy that this country has ever seen. It can be done by the united voice of architects who, as a group, are dedicated to see that all buildings are safe and free from hazardous conditions.

J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, has the responsibility of maintaining the building in a safe condition, yet his recommendations and warnings have been ignored. He knows, as does his assistant Mario E. Campioli, and every other engineer and architect who has studied the problem, that the best way to protect the West Front of the Capitol is by enclosing it so that the existing stone work maintains the same temperature on both sides and is no longer subjected to the deteriorating effects of daily expansion and contraction and the effects of winter freezings.

Thompson and Lichtner, consulting engineers, made the same recommendation in their 1964 report.

"Retention of the wall as an interior wall of an extended building is recommended as the least hazardous and as causing the least interference with the occupancy of the present structure. A properly designed and constructed extension would also provide desirable lateral support for the West Central portion of the Capitol."

The architects employed by the Government under contract for the purpose of analyzing the complex problems and recommending a solution are:

Roscoe Dewitt, Dallas, Texas; Alfred Easton Poor, New York City; Albert Swanke, New York City; and Jesse M. Shelton, Atlanta, Georgia. The Advisory Architects are John Harbeson, Philadelphia; Paul Thiry, Seattle, Washington; and Gilmore D. Clarke, New York. Their summation and recommendations are: "It is inescapable that the West Central Front of the Capitol must be extended to preserve the exterior walls."

The same action was taken to protect the East Front wall of the Capitol many years ago. In this way, the original East Front wall has been protected for all times. It has been preserved, and significant features of it are seen by thousands of visitors who go to the U.S. Capitol every day. Surely there is nothing wrong with the same treatment to protect the West Front?

Why, then, the outburst of indignation and opposing articles and editorials that suddenly appeared?

Check around and you will find that the

public was given the impression that a "modern" front was being planned. It was misunderstood that all that was necessary and recommended was to protect the existing West Front wall by building in front of it a structure with essentially the same architectural appearance. In no way was it planned to change the style of architecture. The misunderstanding which was widespread, came about because one report mentioned modern techniques of "design" when it should have said of "structural design."

The years of work and recommendations of the architects employed by the Government were ignored as the ranks of misinformed and uninformed swelled. Many architects joined in support of the uninformed. At an architect's convention in Denver, Colorado, they denounced their own members and their years of work.

Paul Thiry complained bitterly about the unethical treatment he and his associates received from his peers, who were in no way familiar with the project, yet rushed through a motion of condemnation in time to reach the press deadline. The sound, well-studied recommendations of respected architects of unquestionable renown was stalled by emotional actions.

Shall we, as architects, let it continue to be a windmill for uninformed tilting, or shall we take the action demanded of us by our profession?

We are charged with the responsibility of educating the public. There is no better place to start than the central building of our Government. There is no better time than now. We should call to the attention of our legislators that a shock wave from dynamite or gas explosion in the vicinity of the Capitol, or earth tremor, sonic boom or other of the 20th century shocks to which buildings are subjected, could result in a collapse of a large part of the Capitol.

J. George Stewart and Mario E. Campioli are continually refusing to grant requests of contractors to use dynamite near the Capitol. One day some ignorant contractor might fail to ask for permission. It could result in injury or death and burial in tons of rubble of legislators and visitors who might be in the building at the time.

The Society of American Registered Architects asks that each architect immediately write to his senator and congressman pointing out the need for action without further delay of this most important of all projects.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 5 minutes of our allotted time to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining 5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK) is recognized for 19 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much, both of you.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing personal in my position in connection with this matter despite the fact that there has been an effort made by some to place the responsibility on me alone. My consideration of this has been from the angle of what I thought was for the best interests of preserving the Capitol Building and of taking action in connection with the situation that exists.

Now, we hear a lot about the position taken by the AIA. Well, there are some architectural organizations that favor the extension of the west front. The American Registered Architects have reviewed the extension plans and strongly

endorse them. In fact, they have become strong advocates. The American Society of Landscape Architects, whose "patron saint" was Frederick Law Olmsted, a great man, designed the terraces on the west, south, and north sides of the building. They have reviewed the west front plan and find no fault with the plan, indicating that the project is in competent professional hands.

I believe it is rather interesting, my colleagues. When the east front was proposed the AIA opposed it. At that time they urged the extension of the west front. Now they are opposed to the extension of the west front. What is that old saying? Something about "Consistency, thou art a jewel." And some of our local press who have opposed the extension of the west front were also opposed to the extension of the east front in 1957 and 1958 and vigorously espoused the extension—not the restoration, the extension—of the west front.

And, by the way, this is the unanimous action of the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol. It was the unanimous action 3 years ago by the then Vice President Mr. Humphrey, the then Senator from Illinois, our late friend Everett Dirksen, and the minority leader of the House, my dear friend from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and myself. We went into this very extensively. We held public hearings. I think it was the first public hearing ever held by the Commission and we held such hearings so that this question could be brought out to the public.

Also, this year in asking the Subcommittee on Appropriations to appropriate planning money, which they have done, again it was the unanimous action of the present Vice President, Vice President AGNEW, the late Senator Dirksen who was alive at the time, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD), and myself. So it was a unanimous action.

Mr. Chairman, I had some hesitancy, and we all did with reference to this problem. But we all realized that that west front is in a dangerous condition and we all realize if as the committee well said in connection with a collapse of the west front—we do not say it will happen today but we cannot say that it will not happen, and that expresses my views which in my opinion this represents a very ominous state of mind to have because if there should be a collapse of the west wall, the west front, that would have a tremendous adverse effect upon American public opinion. So we need action now.

Now, later on when the money is necessary for construction, then the plans can be looked into and will be looked into.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When I read the inference, if not a direct allegation, that this project was the sole responsibility of the distinguished Speaker, I

could not believe the words that were in print.

As the distinguished Speaker has said, on two occasions—3 years ago one group, the Speaker, the then Vice President, the late Senator Dirksen, and myself, made a decision to recommend the extension, and again this year a slightly different group, Vice President Agnew replacing his predecessor, made a similar recommendation. It was unanimous in each and every case. So, there is no basis whatsoever for the charge that this is a project only of the distinguished Speaker. It is a project that is recommended by all of us who by law serve on this particular group and we, along with the Speaker, have recommended to the Committee on Appropriations that these funds be made available for this purpose.

May I add one other point? It just so happens that the office of the minority leader is right in the center of that area about which we are talking.

Mr. McCORMACK. You will be out of circulation for 5 years at least—I mean on space. I might say that the entire west side from the House right over to the Senate will have to be taken out of circulation for many years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list of them here which I will insert in the RECORD when we get back into the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished Speaker will yield further, I do not want to speak personally as the occupant of that particular part of the west front of the Capitol, but whether I will be there or whether, perhaps, we will have someone from the Speaker's party there, be that as it may, it is a dangerous part of this great building. If anyone doubts it, I ask you and, in fact, I invite you to come over to my office, sit at my desk, and after that visit you will be convinced of the need to extend the west front of the Capitol. You can no longer sit in my office and see the Washington Monument. It is blocked out by substantial scaffolding.

There is very substantial scaffolding. It is vivid evidence of the need for action. The gentleman from Illinois at my invitation came over and looked at it the other day. It just does not make sense. I fear for the safety of the public at some point if we go on and on like my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, said, like Tennyson's brook, not making up our mind.

I strongly support the Commission, and I wholeheartedly endorse the action of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

I want it understood that I thoroughly respect the views of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), but I have the right to disagree with him. This is where I do. His judgment and my judgment are different on this question.

Coming back to the AIA, it is funny how the printed record comes back as a

ghost to haunt one at times. In 1958 the AIA led the opposition to the eastern front extension, stating:

We have no reason to worry over the architectural changes of this sort in the less masterly Capitol west front and the concern of architects at this point can be dismissed into the realm of rhetoric.

They also said the real needs of Congress could in any event be carried on by extending the building to the west, where there is no great architectural masterpiece to be preserved.

That was the AIA.

Now, I happen to think that the west front is an architectural masterpiece, and we are preserving it by extension. The west front is located on a hill. As I remember, it is known as "Jenkins' Hill." At least, that is my recollection. This extension will give lateral support for many, many decades to come, whereas the restoration will last only a matter of a couple of decades at the most. Then there will have to be another major job done.

There is no guarantee that restoration will cost less than extension. It might interest my colleagues to know—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for the balance of the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it might interest my colleagues to know that we cannot get a competitive bid from a contractor or restoration. They will take it on a cost-plus basis. You cannot blame them, because they do not know what they are going to find when they penetrate this wall. The restoration is a cost-plus contract. Involved in this is not additional space, it is the result, as the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) and other members of the committee have so well stated, in a sense it is a dividend, and also as the subcommittee has stated, the space is needed, but it is the result of the action taken to insure a preservation of the west front.

And that is where the real preservation will be: by extending it, and giving it lateral support, and which will exist there for many decades to come.

So there is no guarantee that the extension will cost more than the restoration. You cannot get a figure on the cost of the restoration. You cannot get even an idea.

I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if that is correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The distinguished Speaker is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It varies anywhere from \$10 million to \$50 million. That is a wide scope. The evidence that we have is that the contractors will not submit a competitive bid because of the speculation involved.

There is the situation; danger is imminent; who knows when it will happen?

I hope it will not, for there is danger. I think we should act now, and take this first step by voting for the \$2 million planning money.

Let me tell you another thing. I think it is wonderful to see the millions of Americans come to the Capitol. I can remember several years ago going over to the Senate. I met a colleague of mine. There were crowds of people coming from the Senate side. He said, "There are too many people here." I said, "There are not enough for me."

I did not mind squeezing in between them. I was thrilled to see so many Americans and I am thrilled now, as I have been all through the years, to see so many Americans coming to the Capitol—men, women, and children.

It is estimated that 10 million people visit the Capitol. Of course, we have a problem there. We have to give consideration to that. But we are not doing this primarily for that purpose. But if in the extension of the west front we can give consideration to the needs of millions of Americans who are visiting the Capitol, and the problems that concern them as human beings, we are justified in doing so.

So this can be done as a result of the extension, and the extension is in the best interest of preserving the central west front for many decades to come. I want action. My theory is that the extension is the best type of action. But the situation is so critical and so dangerous—after all, anything can happen—we should take action of some kind whether it is an extension or a restoration—we must take action.

A restoration would probably save the west front for a couple of decades but an extension will save the west front for many decades to come.

A restoration will take out of circulation a big part of this Capitol for several years. But an extension will not—only a few places here and there, which can be picked up very quickly. So it seems to me, as a layman, and using my judgment and on the basis of evidence that I have received from men who are competent in this field, that the best thing for us to do and the wisest investment we can make is to extend the west front. We should not follow the course taken by those who opposed the east front a little over 10 years ago and urged the extension of the west front. Now that the east front is constructed and the problem of the west front comes up, because of its dangerous condition, they are opposing the extension of the west front.

So I urge my colleagues, for whatever value my opinion might be worth, to vote for the \$2 million for the planning fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I include herewith the material which I previously referred to from the Architect's office for the information of the Members:

RESTORATION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT
PROPOSED WEST CENTRAL FRONT
If a restoration project is undertaken on the west central front of the Capitol, the

minimum displacement of occupants before the work can begin will be as follows:

Floor	No.	Senate side—Occupant
Basement....	SB-13	Architect of the Capitol.
	SB-13A	Do.
	SB-14	Do.
	SB-15	Do.
	SB-16	Do.
1st.....	S-142	Senator McClellan.
	S-143	Senator Jordan.
	S-144	Senator Sparkman.
	S-145	Barbershop.
	S-146	Appropriations Committee.
	S-147	Architect of the Capitol.
	S-148	Senator Kennedy.
	S-149	Do.
	S-150	Do.
	S-151	Joint Committee on Printing.
	S-152	Do.
2d.....	S-230	Minority leader.
	S-231	Do.
	S-232	Do.
	S-233	Disbursing office.
	S-234	Do.
	S-235	Do.
	S-236	Senator Young of North Dakota.
	S-237	Senator Bible.
	S-238	Majority leader.
	S-239	Senator Magnuson.
	S-240	Senator Stennis.
	S-241	Senator Russell.
3d.....	S-326	Document room.
	S-330	Senator Aiken.
	S-331	Library.
	S-332	Do.
	S-333	Do.
	S-334	Senator Cannon.
	S-335	Senator Bennett.
	S-337	Minority secretary.
	S-337A	Do.
	S-338	Senator Ellender.
	S-339	Senator Jackson.
	S-340	Senator Church.
	S-341	Senator Talmadge.
	S-342	Senator Mundt.
Attic.....	S-416	Library.
	S-414	Do.

Floor	No.	House side—Occupant
Basement....	HB-25	Minority leader.
	HB-26	Architect of the Capitol.
	HB-27	Do.
	HB-28	Do.
	HB-29	Do.
1st.....	H-151	Post office.
	H-152	Clerk of the House.
	H-153	Doorkeeper's office.
	H-154	Do.
	H-155	Do.
	H-157	Enrolling clerk.
	H-159	Doctor's office.
	H-160	Do.
	H-161	Do.
	H-162	Do.
	H-163	Appropriations Committee.
	H-164	Do.
2d.....	H-226	Document room.
	H-227	Foreign Affairs Committee.
	H-228	Congressman Celler.
	H-229	Minority leader.
	H-230	Do.
	H-231	Do.
	H-232	Do.
	H-233	Do.
3d.....	H-325	Statuary Hall.
	H-326	Document room.
	H-327	Administration Committee.
	H-328	Do.
	H-327A	Do.
	H-328	Do.
	H-329	Do.
	H-330	Do.
	H-330A	Do.
	H-331	Do.
	H-332	Do.
Attic.....	H-419	Document room.

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT PROPOSED WEST FRONT

The following spaces will have to be vacated during the extension project. Temporary accommodations will be provided until the west central front is completed for occupants in the terrace level:

Floor	Senate side	House side	Occupant
Terrace at basement level....	ST-1, -3, -5, -7, -9, -11.		Capitol Police.
	ST-4, -6, -8, -15, -2M, -4M, -6M.		Senators.
	ST-2, -10.		Congressional Directory.
	ST-13, -17.		Sergeant at Arms.
	ST-16, -18, -19, -20, -22, -24, -28, -30.		Architect of the Capitol engineering shops (mechanical and electrical) and storage areas.
		HT-1, -3, -5, -15, -17, -19, -21; HT-2, -4, -6, -2M, -4M, -6M, -12, -14, -16, -18, -20, -26, -28.	Architect of the Capitol engineering, file room, flag room, shops, storage area, etc.
		HT-8, -10.	Pages.

The relocation of the following offices will be required towards the end of the project when new accommodations for such purposes can be provided in the new extended west front. These rooms were all part of the corridors originally and will be returned to that use in the new plan:

	Senate side	House side	Occupant
1st floor.....	S-149		Majority whip.
		H-148	Majority leader.
		H-161	Doctor's office.
2d floor.....	S-237		Senator Bible.
		H-229	Minority leader.
3d floor.....	S-337		Minority secretary.
		Between H-327 and H-328.	House Administration Committee.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) and to oppose appropriation of funds which would permit the drawing up of pre bid construction plans for the extension of the Capitol's west front. In opposing the proposed extension of the west front, I am joined by the thousands of members of the Ameri-

can Institute of Architects, the editors of the New York Times and the Washington Post, and I believe, by the President of the United States who recently announced a spending cutback on Federal construction.

By now it should be obvious to all Members of the House that a building project undertaken by the Capitol Architect predictably results in excessive expense and embarrassment for Congressmen. As a former builder, I can assure you that the Architects' estimated cost of \$166.95 per square foot for the west front, five times the cost of the catastrophic Rayburn Building, is beyond the wildest stretch of exorbitance. We know, in addition, that because the Architect is always from 25 to 50 percent off in his estimates, that the already incredible projected cost will be boosted to a point which will be scandalous. I say today that it is us, the Members of Congress, not the Capitol Architect, who will be held accountable for the excess. Perhaps more important than the money and the excess of the Capitol Architect is the fact that he proposes to bury the only re-

maining section of the original Capitol Building. For posterity, if not for thrift and political wisdom, we should preserve the Capitol Building and treat it as a great historic monument.

I would implore that House Members vote for the reasonable amendment of Congressman SAM STRATTON to provide nominal funds for planning of restoration of this historic building.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the provision in this appropriation measure earmarking \$2 million for a so-called study for the costly development and expansion of the west front of the Capitol should be eliminated.

The project is simply too costly and most inappropriate at this time. The public is going to utter a valid cry of indignation and disapproval that will ring with contempt if this project is approved. They will want to know just why this project is needed and there will be no justifiable reason forthcoming.

They will ask why the Congress must spend \$45 million for the expansion of the west front on the heels of the President's decision to cut back certain Government construction by up to 75 percent as an effort to slow inflation.

They will wonder why the Congress feels it so urgently needs two new restaurants, two movie theaters and some additional private offices so urgently, when inflation and increased interest rates, combined with a heavy tax burden, prevents them from purchasing and enjoying a few niceties of their own such as a home, a car, perhaps a new television set.

They are going to wonder how this expenditure is going to help them get that college loan to get junior or sister through school this year when the banks are not lending at 7 percent and the Congress still has not cleared legislation to ease this most urgent problem.

The public might say, and I would certainly agree, that if the west front of the Capitol is in urgent need of repair then let us repair it. But we should go no further than this.

The reasoning and case for those of us who oppose appropriating funds in excess of those necessary for repair was substantiated recently by the American Institute of Architects in a letter which I received from its President, Mr. Rex W. Allen. I include it in the Record at this point:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF ARCHITECTS,

Washington, D.C., September 9, 1969.

Re west front of the Capitol.

Hon. RICHARD FULTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: The West Front of the United States Capitol is in an advanced state of disrepair. This condition has been brought about by a combination of age and neglect. Corrective measures must be taken to insure the safety and structural soundness of the building.

One solution proposed by the Architect of the Capitol to correct the deficiencies of the West Wall is a 4.5 acre, \$45 million extension. Under this plan new office space, cafeterias and tourist facilities would be built with the West Front becoming an interior wall. We are opposed to this plan because, in our opinion, the safety, structural integ-

ity and historical significance of the building can be assured without an extension.

Soon you will be asked to approve, as part of the Legislative Branch appropriation bill, \$2 million to be spent on detailed architectural plans and specifications for the proposed extension project. We urge you to vote against this request.

To us it seems much more important to begin immediate repairs and restoration of the West Front. It is imperative that dangerous structural conditions be corrected as soon as possible. Accordingly, the \$2 million should be allocated to this purpose.

Furthermore, we believe funds should be appropriated to study the cost of and techniques for restoring the West Front. Only after such a study has been made can the Congress make a rational choice between restoration or extension of the West Front.

Sincerely yours,

REX W. ALLEN, *President.*

P.S.—Did you know that the extension of the west front of the Capitol will cost five times more than the Rayburn Building? Here are the facts:*

Rayburn building:	
Gross area (square feet)-----	2,375,000
Total cost-----	\$81,367,000
Square foot cost-----	\$34.26
West front extension project:	
Gross area (square feet)-----	269,528
Total cost (estimate)-----	\$45,000,000
Square foot cost-----	\$166.59

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman I want to make it clear that I strongly support any effort to preserve our Capitol, and I will give my endorsement to any proposal designed to save the Capitol's west front.

I also want to make it clear that I will not support any expansion of the Capitol, because I do not feel such an expansion is necessary.

It is understood that proposals for expansion involve about 4½ acres, upon which are to rest two new restaurants, two movie theaters, some additional committee rooms, and about two dozen auxiliary offices for designated Members of Congress. It is also understood that escalators would be provided for this complex, thereby adding considerably to the costs of the expansion.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see now an expansion of the Capitol can be justified. The simple fact of the matter is that there is just no need for any of the facilities involved in the proposed expansion.

It should be remembered that in March of 1968 the Congress passed legislation that authorized a National Visitor Center at the site of the Union Station. This act authorizes \$5 million for development of this Center, which will include theaters and interpretive displays for tourists—the facility will occupy 18.1 acres. In addition, \$11 million are authorized for the development of a garage with a 4,000-car capacity. Over and above this, it is expected that facilities will be set up to provide snack bars and other accommodations for visitors, thereby providing a maximum of visitor convenience.

It should be recognized, too, that there is no shortage of office facilities, for the new Rayburn Building provides a lot of office space and a bounty of committee facilities. In addition, the Cannon Building has been refurbished and provides very satisfactory accommodations for House Members. Over and above this,

the Longworth Building is presently being renovated and converted into ideal office quarters.

There is another thing that dictates against the expansion of the Capitol, and that is cost. Estimates range from \$40 to \$70 million on the costs of expansion, and it must be remembered that this is taxpayer money. Today we are talking a lot about cutting down on Federal spending and curbing inflation—if we are really serious about doing it, this is a good place to start.

In short, Mr. Chairman, my position is that I support preservation of the Capitol but oppose expansion. I am interested in preserving our Capitol—I am also interested in saving the money of the taxpayer. Let us not make an amusement center out of this historic building.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, so far as the west front of the Capitol is concerned, I believe the report of engineers is clear that an extension as proposed is best over the long run.

However, I vote in the negative because of the appropriation for extra staff assistance which I consider to be an inflationary example, and other purely legislative expenditures with which I cannot agree.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, my vote against the legislative appropriations bill, H.R. 13763, is my first opportunity to record my vote against the unreasonable salary increases provided under the Kappel Commission recommendations as provided by Public Law 90-206.

It was, and is, my strong feeling that the House, under provisions of the resolution, should have been afforded the opportunity to vote on this matter.

It is my firm belief that Congress poured gasoline on the fires of inflation by the untimely action it took on these excessive salary increases. I also believe that until we have established fiscal responsibility, we err in authorizing an additional clerk for our congressional staffs.

Further, it is my conviction that we should have a more firm cost figure on the restoration or rebuilding of the west wall of the Capitol before we appropriate huge sums for a large addition.

Mr. Chairman, during all of my public life, going over a third of a century, I have stood for the highest fiscal responsibility. I was elected to Congress on that platform. Not to vote against this legislative appropriation bill would be a betrayal of the trust of the people who sent me here to represent them.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Pearle Jean Bates, widow of William H. Bates, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, \$42,500.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, needless to say, I am for the extension of the west front. I am also for the new Madison Library and I think that has been discussed pretty thoroughly.

But I have a personal matter to take up with reference to the hearings. With

*Source: Architect of the Capitol.

reference to page 619, you will find a colloquy between myself and the chairman of the subcommittee relative to a country club maintained by one of our international organizations.

The chairman asked me if it was Mr. McNamara's bank. I thought at the time it was, since my memory was a little hazy since this occurred. It was first called to my attention by a story in the Washington Star in December 1966. One of the news services saw fit to engage in that favorite pastime of low rating a Member of Congress when he makes a little mistake. But I want this news service to know that I was not in complete error. What we have, Mr. Chairman, is a country club that was built in Montgomery County, Md., by the International Monetary Fund.

I stated they were using money that we had contributed. The news service story stated I was in error as to where the money came from. Do you know what the IMF said? The money came from their revenues, from interest earned on capital contributed to the Fund. Mind you, they considered revenues to be available to be used for country clubs or anything they want to use it for. I do not think that that was the purpose that this Congress or any previous Congress voted the \$5 billion capital that the United States contributed to their funds.

Also they stated I was in error about the fact that employees of the IMF and of the so-called World Bank do not pay income tax. Oh, yes, they pay income tax. They file a return. I am talking about American citizens. Foreign citizens do not, but American citizens, we were told, have to pay the income tax. They fill out their forms and pay the tax. Do you know what they then do? They notify their President, "I paid so much income tax," and they are refunded that income tax out of a special fund.

So no employee of the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund actually pays an income tax. You pay it for him.

The chairman (Mr. ANDREWS) asked me if they paid any club dues, and I said that I did not know, probably not. They claim they do. The membership is limited to the IMF, but other international organization employees stationed in Washington may get an associate type of membership. This club is known as the Bretton Woods Recreation Center. It is out River Road in Maryland, and the people of Montgomery County, Md., and the State of Maryland are subsidizing them, to some extent, because they are tax exempt. Their real estate is. But I understand they do make a voluntary contribution of some tax money to the State of Maryland. What they do in relation to Montgomery County I do not know. The Internal Revenue Service advises me that the club has filed no request for exemption as far as Federal tax is concerned. But neither have they filed a return.

The only point I want to make to the reporter who wrote that story and who tried to make it a little facetious is that his money is involved. Your money is involved. And I want to call the attention of the Congress to the facts. I hope there

is some way we can exert a little pressure on these international organizations so they do not feel that they do not have to be responsible in the expenditure of the money entrusted to them.

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

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am very pleased that my colleague from Texas has brought to the floor of the House the information concerning the Bretton Woods Country Club. I drive by it every day. It is the only way to the Capitol and return. It is at the end of River Road. I understand it cost \$4 million. I asked them what they were doing building this sort of a club, and they said, "The people we have coming here cannot play at Burning Tree, and they ought to have just as good a club as Burning Tree." So they have taken revenues earned by our money to build it. I am delighted the gentleman from Texas is bringing out the fact that it was partially your tax dollars and not somebody else's that built this country club. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CASEY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Frankly, the point I want to make is that these international organizations do not have to answer to anyone. If you call seeking information and they do not want to give it to you, there is no way you can get it, and this Congress has no control over so-called revenues from the money we have furnished these organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) that perhaps we should offer the pooh-bahs of the International Monetary Fund some of the plush offices that will be built in the west front of the Capitol and the use of the restaurants and theaters. Perhaps that international outfit would then divvy up the money to finance the west front.

Yes, the gentleman is correct. This international banking outfit, which the taxpayers of this country have heavily subsidized, bought some 280 acres of Maryland farmland at about \$4,000 an acre, put in a golf course, tennis court, and swimming pools—all for the benefit of officials and employees. Wonderful are the ways of the foreign aiders when it comes to spending other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect repair work is necessary on the west front of the Capitol, but that does not mean that we must now embark on a tremendous expansion program, costing millions of dollars and complete with all the frills that are here proposed to be built into the west front.

More particularly, we have no business whatever at this time loading upon the taxpayers of this country another \$100 million House Office Building under the guise and subterfuge of erecting an annex to the Library of Congress.

I ask those who support it: where do you propose to get money for all these works?

I might also ask where it is proposed to get the money to pay the salary increases for Members of Congress plus the leaders of Congress that are contained in this bill? No one has discussed that up to this point. I do not know the total cost of the salary increases. I assume it is around \$4 million. I ask the Chairman, What is the cost of the congressional pay increases plus the leaders' pay increases, some of which are more than 41 percent, and for which the money is provided in this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the amount to annualize the Members' pay and the leadership pay increases is \$3,938,300.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It is \$3,938,300 to annualize the increased rates of pay.

Mr. GROSS. That is approximately \$4 million.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It will not miss by much.

Mr. GROSS. And it is in this bill, is it not?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It is in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. This is the one bill, of all the appropriation bills we have had in this Congress this year, even after the July 1 pay increase went into effect for other employees of the Government that has contained money to fund the pay increase. This is the only one. Can the gentleman tell me why the pay increase on July 1 for other employees in the Federal Government has not been put in the appropriation bills, but is being held back for a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. All I can say is it is not being done in any appropriation bill. The increased pay increase that became effective July 1, 1969, will be handled in a supplemental bill some time in the future, and the same thing is true with the military bills and the other bills.

Mr. GROSS. I can get no answer as to the reason why the pay increases are not funded in the separate appropriation bills as they come along, rather than putting them in a lump sum into a later supplemental appropriation, this bill being the sole exception. I am curious to know why.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I can say this. It might be that some of the agencies will absorb part of the additional money needed for pay increases. That will not be true of the legislative branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is the House of Representatives absorbing any part of the cost of this pay increase?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. There is no supplemental money in here. We will take it up next spring.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman I am going to offer an amendment to strike the \$2,800,000 for the new House Office Building under the guise of a new Library of Congress annex. I have no doubt that the amendment will

be defeated for the \$100 million that the building will eventually cost is just more money to be spent. Then I will vote against this bill for the added reason that the pay increases are funded here, and then I am opposed to the expansion of the west front of the Capitol to include movie theaters and dining rooms.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I hope the gentleman will not be so pessimistic about his amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman is looking for office space, I remind him that the Federal Government owns a building just across the street, built at a cost of a few million dollars, which is rented to a hotel corporation for only \$17,000 a year, which amount of income this year was reduced by at least \$6,900 which we paid for the recaulking of some windows. That building is available.

Mr. GROSS. But that building is not plush enough, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JACOBS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, as a layman in the architectural world my education has been enchanched immeasurably here today. I have learned, for example, it is cheaper to add three walls and one roof than to add one wall.

I am reminded of the story President Lincoln told of the farmer who sued the railroad for flooding his ground. The farmer was represented by an old county seat lawyer, an older gentleman with years of practice. The railroad was represented by a young "city slicker" lawyer. At the close of the trial, during the closing arguments, the old country lawyer turned to the young railroad attorney and said, "It is not often in my career that I have had to concede to my opposition the absolute proof of his case; because the attorney for the railroad, the counsel for the defendant, has established beyond any reasonable doubt, by scientific evidence, by charts, by graphs, that the railroad right-of-way could not possibly have flooded my client's farm." He said, "But, young man, I have just one question for you. Have you ever been down on that farm when it was raining?"

We have depended, it seems to me, as a government and as a nation and as a society on the opinion of experts decade in and decade out. As I understand, it was the experts who told us that we could go to Southeast Asia and cause one dictator to prevail over another within a year or two because the idea machines said so.

As I recall, it was the experts, the very experts involved in this problem, who assured us taxpayers—I was a private citizen at the time—that the Rayburn Office Building could be put up with \$60 or \$65 million rather than \$70, \$80, \$90, or \$110 million—one can get lost in those figures as quickly as one can get lost in the Rayburn Building—whatever those figures might be.

One day I was on my way to work and I looked up at the Cannon Office Build-

ing and I noticed what I then thought was a railing but soon learned from the experts was a balustrade was being torn down, which seemed like a sensible idea, since it is a rather ugly appendage to that building, anyhow.

So I called the Architect's office and asked why. They said, "Well, the stone in the balustrade is sugaring." I clambered up to the top of the building with my old Polaroid and took a few pictures of the sugaring balustrade and showed it to some other experts, who told me, that was right; that in 75 or 100 years it might weaken enough to constitute a danger. A few weeks later, lo and behold, here came another balustrade on top of the Cannon Office Building. You could not miss that one, and you cannot miss it today, because it happens to be of nonmatching stone. So I called the Architect's office and said, "Why in the world are you putting up another balustrade? What useful purpose can it serve? It is not particularly pretty and it does not match." The Architect's representative told me, "Well, Congressman, it is because if we had workmen on top of the building, we have to provide for their safety or else they might fall off." I said that there is a hardware store down the street where you can buy clothesline and hook it around their waists, if that is your problem. Then I asked how much it cost. And the answer was, oh, just a half a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the parking places in the subterranean theater to the south of the office building only run \$10,000 per car. And I have not seen a \$10,000 car even parked in any one of those places yet. It was the experts who designed for the United States of America the B-70 bomber—at \$1 billion for two of them. The first crashed on takeoff. And the other is in a—

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. I commend the gentleman for his intense interest in protecting the taxpayers' dollar, but I think, if I could say to him, knowing him as I do—and he is a very distinguished and capable Member of this House—that if he had had the experience of coming to this Congress as I did 18 years ago and traveling literally through a slum—not just slum-looking but also slum-smelling—area in the place where those garages are now constructed and then, if after that rather degrading experience the gentleman could also have experienced as I did the search for a parking place when you got over here to Capitol Hill at 8:30 in the morning, I think that the able gentlemen would agree that the beauty we have created there and the filth that we have removed from the area of the Capitol of the United States is money well spent.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but I do not share it. I think that that filth could have been cleared away and an aerosol can of deodorant, or whatever is necessary, could certainly have done away with the smell without constructing these parking places at a cost of \$10,000 per car.

I happened to have been associated with a Member of Congress 20 years ago who had to park six blocks away from here in order to go to his office building. That was my father. He walked each day and stayed in good condition. I do not think \$10,000 spent for a parking place is at all necessary. And while we are at it, I do not believe that we needed to put a \$1 million park on top of the building so that the esthetic view would be enhanced on the outside of the office windows; especially since the people should be typing and not looking out of them. Instead, we should have provided parking spaces for those people who paid for the garage; namely, our constituents who come to visit here and still drive all over town trying to find a place to park.

I was here 20 years ago and sat in the gallery and saw the superstructure that the gentleman from California described. There was scaffolding throughout this Chamber. And here comes the confusion of a layman when he listens to experts speak on this subject. Of course, when you become confused, they then explain to you that if you could read it in the "original Greek," you would understand better. Twenty years ago the problem was that this ceiling was going to fall straight down. Now the problem is that the west front is going to fall over. Yet at that time they did not add any restaurants up there or add any toilets up there or add any honeycombing up there, and the ceiling seems to have held pretty well. Somehow they managed to get the job done without adding all of those posh things.

Now, with this \$45 million which, translated into overruns is \$65 million, if you count a 43-percent overrun, which is what you had better figure, it is the track record of the Capitol Architect. I think it constitutes a pretty expensive pay toilet. Perhaps, we could strike a new \$100 coin for a pay toilet or, perhaps, we can get shoe shines at \$70 a shine or something like that in order to be commensurate with the proposed cost of the new structure.

I think the formula for solving this problem is to take the west wall of the extension and move it east 40 and 80 feet at various points and let that do the job.

Now, unfortunately, the person who has the burden of the negative cannot bring up pretty pictures and graphs to show you. Only those who assume the positive burden can put up graphs and architectural drawings. However, very hastily I have prepared a couple of drawings—and they did not cost as much as those which have heretofore been presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. YATES) Mr. JACOBS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, the first drawing that I had prepared was a drawing showing that 45 million \$1 bills, laid end to end from Washington, D.C., would reach to Rome—which reminds me of an old architectural saying that, "if all of the architects in the world were laid end to end they would not reach a conclusion."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

There is a problem suggested, on page 262 of the hearings, which is a serious problem and which could become a more serious matter for the residents of the District of Columbia who lives near the Capitol.

Under the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 the Architect of the Capitol is authorized, with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States any publicly or privately owned property in the District of Columbia located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Grounds for additions to the U.S. Capitol Grounds. The Solicitor's opinion since that time has indicated that "in the vicinity" means anything at least up to 2 miles.

When the question was asked in the hearings regarding leapfrogging across private property in order to acquire a vacant piece of ground or an occupied piece of ground, people speaking for the Architect said that they would not do that all at one time. But, there was an insinuation that ultimately we would require all of the property between here and the Anacostia River and we would not be leapfrogging in such an operation. I am not trying to be facetious.

Mr. Chairman, there is the old Providence Hospital grounds which the committee decided not to buy at this time. The suggestion is made in the hearings that this would be used for the construction of a police academy or for additional accommodations for the House. I assume that that piece of property is what we in the neighborhood now call "South Mountain" because it is covered to a height comparable to about a three-story building with dirt from excavations around the Hill. But the man who owns it has a value in that property. As long as there is a threat of Government condemnation, the individual who owns that property cannot dispose of it. There is some discussion in the hearings that the appraisal which was done privately on that particular piece of property was about \$1.25 million and they said that this should be secret. Of course, once it is printed in the hearings, it is not secret any more.

The appraiser to whom I talked stated that based upon a per foot basis at this time this property probably is not worth \$1.25 million but probably \$2,260,000 up to \$3,225,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, the point at issue is this; the Government can acquire, under this act of Congress, any piece of property in the vicinity of the Capitol and this has a very definite effect upon the value of land in this area. As was mentioned before, if you own a piece of vacant property close to the Capitol and you have the threat of having the Government take it over by condemnation, the owner not only gets no return from this vacant property unless he can pay someone to dump dirt on because he cannot sell it or develop it due to the threat of future condemnation.

This gets to be a "people" problem rather than a property problem.

This is not the time or the place to undo this act of 1955, the Additional House Office Building Act, but I think in fairness to the people who live on the Hill, this body ought to take a look at that act and alter it, then, a man really does have some property rights when he holds title to areas on the Hill.

I did not want to have another opportunity pass without mentioning this situation which does work a hardship against individual ownership. The fact that we do not buy this land now does not take the threat away, because there was a strong suggestion in the hearings that we are postponing the action rather than killing the action. If we want to kill it for all time, we can, and then the gentleman could go to the zoning commission and receive approval for some kind of property development, and his property would then have a value.

Under the present situation the action taken by the House precludes that citizen from making any use of property that he holds.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that in the argument today and in the presentation—which, incidentally, I thought was excellent, and I want to particularly compliment the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlemen who are both the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee, for a beautiful explanation of this extension.

However, we spent about 90 minutes in justifying the proposal, and only 5 minutes in opposition or on a discussion of the alternatives, which were given by Mr. STRATTON. Or maybe he had 8 minutes.

I believe that this bothers me most of all because there apparently has been a great deal of controversy about this in the past but today we have not had a chance to hear the controversy because there apparently was no division in the committee. I want to hear both sides of this question.

One of the things that bothers me about that is that we are going out what has been described as 44 feet, 56 feet, 88 feet. I am convinced from the arguments that have taken place that something must be done to preserve this wall, either by restoration or the building of a new wall outside of it to enclose it. Not being an architect, I do not pretend to know all of the ways that this can be done.

It worries me that this proposal is perhaps a hybrid that has come out of the distant past that many of us do not know about. Apparently there was an idea to both build more additional space and enclose this wall because this was the plan that was agreed upon some time in the distant past.

I was hopeful today that someone would explain—and I intend to vote to preserve this wall in some fashion, either by preservation or a new wall outside, or maybe for the plan that is being presented—but I wish somebody would explain to me if there have been alternatives, or why the wall was simply not enclosed in a new wall instead of moving it out 44 feet.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman. I would just like an explanation. Is this a hybrid?

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Certainly, there is no question about the eloquence of those who spoke in favor of the committee proposal. It was impossible in even 8 minutes, eloquent as I am sure this Member tried to be, to answer all the points they made over almost 2 full hours.

The fact of the matter is, and this is the key, no study has ever been made of what is absolutely necessary to save this west front, without putting on all this gingerbread.

In spite of all that has been said about these other technical gentlemen, the only person who has been speaking out on these issues is the Architect of the Capitol or his assistant, or his paid consultants who are naturally dedicated to the extension project. There has never been, even with all the \$477,000 already spent on this project, any actual, professional study of what is required to save the west front.

My amendment, which I hope to be able to offer at the proper time, when I will have 5 minutes to explain it and can answer perhaps some of the other points that the gentlemen made, my amendment would take out this \$2 million and put in \$100,000 to undertake an engineering study to tell us what is the minimum we have to do to save the west front of the Capitol and how much it would cost.

We do not need all of these other facilities, just to save the west front, and it is ridiculous to maintain that we do. Nobody has ever made that study. All we are doing is going on statements made by Mr. Campioli who is himself an employee of the Capitol Architect and who, before he came here, he was in the architectural firm of Alfred Poor & Associates, who originally developed the west front extension plan and the east front extension, as well as the Madison Building, the Cannon Building renovation, and the Rayburn garages. Obviously Mr. Campioli is going to speak out for his employer's idea, and for the plans already developed by his prior employer.

Mr. ADAMS. This was the other point that concerned me. Has there been an independent study? I was concerned by the fact that the various professional groups that have supported this, and by groups I mean the architectural firms and engineering firms and so on—have all been hired by us through the Capitol Architect to do the job. That concerns me. I would appreciate the gentleman, and I probably will support his proposition answering this for me. I do not understand whether we need 44 feet or 88 feet—if we have to have it, I will vote for it. But was there any study or statement by the American Institute of Architects—or putting them aside—any other group that the gentleman has confidence in, other than one already hired to do the job who came in and gave us a report.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. YATES. First, let me say to the

gentleman that there was a dispute in our committee. I began in disagreement. My mind was changed by the evidence. The result was unanimous. But before we reached that unanimous result, I was opposed to the extension, as I pointed out, in my statement.

Mr. ADAMS. I understood that.

Mr. YATES. I wanted the restoration of the wall.

Mr. ADAMS. Did you consider another plan rather than this one?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. This plan of 44 feet or 88 feet. This I understand has been in existence for 3 or 4 years.

Mr. YATES. I thought of the possibility of building a marble wall for example to replace it, but I was told by the Architect and independent architects to whom I spoke that there would have to be a major job of underpinning the walls. But this would not satisfy the people from the AIA anyway because they do not want another kind of wall. They want the original wall restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I examined the AIA when they appeared before us. They did not doubt the adequacy or competency of a study that was made by the firm of Thompson & Lichtner.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Did they agree that if you do not go to the preservation of the wall that the proposal of 44 feet or 88 feet was the way to do it?

Mr. YATES. No.

Mr. ADAMS. Did they agree with that?

Mr. YATES. No. The AIA insisted on their position that the wall could be restored.

Mr. ADAMS. Was there ever any other proposition before the committee or any group who said, We can do this, it is possible? You see, all we have had are these two witnesses. That is what I want to know.

Mr. YATES. That is what I wanted to find out and that is why I called Mr. Severud.

First let me say this, the gentleman from New York says that there never was any study made of a restoration. That is not entirely true. The study that was made by Thompson & Lichtner was one that gave them an opportunity to declare their preference for the type of correction that ought to be made to the wall.

Finally, Mr. Severud, who told me if he did not agree with the architect's proposal he would have rejected it. He said he thought it was impractical. It might be possible, he said, but who knows what would be encountered in this wall.

He said that the wall had taken a beating from the fire that the British set in 1814; there had been an explosion some time later. Various cuts that had been made for air conditioning, for opening of rooms and doors and that sort of thing, that he would not do anything

but extend the wall in accordance with the proposal.

Mr. ADAMS. Did you discuss maybe going 5 feet, 6 feet, 10 feet, or some number other than the proposal that is before the committee?

Mr. YATES. As consultant engineer, the responsibility was his rather than that of the original architect or the original engineers to decide what should be done. If he did not agree with the proposal, he would have overruled it. As you will note in the telegram he sent to me he said, "It is my responsibility. If I did not agree with it, I would overrule it."

Now, with respect to the attitude of the AIA, I refer you to page 132 of the hearings—

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman does not have to do that.

Mr. YATES. I want to show you what the attitude is.

Mr. ADAMS. All I am asking the gentleman now is, Was there any other proposal than 44 feet?

Mr. YATES. Yes; originally there were three plans. They decided upon plan No. 2. There has been a slight change in that.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), has raised a most important point. The point is what study was made and were there alternatives suggested? There was and there were. I refer to page 14 of our hearings wherein the language is pointed out. The contract was entered into in March of 1964 with a firm of consulting engineers, Thompson & Lichtner. They were not told to design a plan to extend the front. They were told this: Would they include their findings and recommendations on—

First, whether the existing wall, if found deficient, can be repaired in its present condition;

Second, whether the existing wall can be refaced with marble in its present location;

Third, whether remedial action requires extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble as was done to the east front; or

Fourth, whether any other means of preservation are deemed feasible and advisable.

Then within this broad degree of latitude, and at a cost of \$100,000, which is the amount our opponents of the present bill are proposing now, that we spend \$100,000 to get an engineering survey, this firm of engineering consultants came back and said:

The only way to save the west wall is to extend the Capitol, and use the resultant walls, floors to buttress the old wall in place, taking the problem of temperature coefficients being unequal away from it, and shoring it up for all time.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Did they recommend the

44-foot and the 56-foot and the 80-foot extension, or just an extension?

If they recommended that, I think it is very important.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. They recommended that the Capitol west front must be extended as the most feasible and economic way of doing it. Then came the question of how far, and the question of how far was resolved first in realizing that we have to extend at least 30 feet in order to get the structural strength to buttress the old walls and floors.

Second, when we push out the wall, we have to go beyond the projection of the center section, which is 44 feet, and we have to build the sides out more than 44 feet in order to achieve structural harmony. The cost is not in the additional 10 feet, but the cost is in the fact that we have to go out from the old walls to strengthen them and buttress them.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in the record of the hearings at page 113, there is a technical explanation of what the gentleman just said. Mr. Campioli said:

The proposed projection is necessary to allow for sufficient extension of the old north and south wings beyond the existing west central wing in order to permit the development of a proper lateral buttressing action against the existing northwest and southwest corners of this wing, and also to provide a sufficient area for the development of a necessary and proper expansion joint in the new work at these corners.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the point is that this study was made in 1964, and this House did, indeed, instruct the Architect to find the best engineering firm and make this kind of study.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is talking about how a study was made over whether we should restore the west front and so on. Actually, the five volumes of the Thompson & Lichtner study are full of pictures of the details of cracks and so on, but the only place this particular restoration question is discussed is in a single paragraph. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) also mentioned in his eloquent statement that the assertion is contained in just one paragraph, and all it says is that we should extend the west front and not restore it. The fact is that no one has ever considered what would be the relative cost of restoring, or whether by extending the west front by 3 or 4 feet instead of 44 feet we might just as well accomplish our purpose of saving the west front. This is the primary lack in this particular case. We have spent a half million dollars in studies on the west front and we still do not have the information of what is needed to restore the west front.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. The gentleman points up quite correctly the five volumes show the cracks and defects and the firm concludes the only way we can preserve it is to extend it.

Mr. STRATTON. But it says nothing

about what would be involved in restoration or some lesser extension, or of its cost.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It is because we need the new walls and the floors to buttress the old floors and the walls.

Mr. STRATTON. For almost \$500,000 is that all the information we can get?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. We have that. Now the gentleman from New York wants to spend another \$100,000 to go out and have a new study to get the same facts. We are running out of the time we have to study this. The independent engineering study has been in, the facts have been placed before the Congress, and the time has clearly come to act.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman. I should like to turn very briefly to another matter, if I may. I refer to a matter that is contained in the report of the committee but is not included as part of the appropriation bill itself, and that is the section beginning on page 32 that refers to "Accrual Accounting and Accrued Expenditures." I am not going to talk at any length on this matter, first of all, because I am far from being an expert, and second, I know that time is of the essence here today.

I do want to point this out: There is very serious and sharp disagreement as to the conclusions that are stated in this report. There is a very marked difference of opinion as to the views that are expressed here concerning the value of accrual accounting.

Second, I would like to point out that this is a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Operations. It has been so since the original legislation was passed. Only last year the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Hardy, conducted extensive hearings on this matter and brought about substantial advances in executive branch practices in this important area.

The Comptroller General has very specific and definite opinions on this question and supports the Government Operations Committee position.

I rise only for this purpose; To point out to the Committee the potential conflicts and differences of jurisdiction which are involved, in the hope that there may be a meeting of the minds as to these so that all can move forward into the future in what will be the best way of accounting for the operations of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to comment further, not on the bill under consideration here, but on certain language in the committee report.

As you know, under the rules of the House, the Committee on Government Operations has jurisdiction over budget and accounting measures other than appropriations and has the duty of receiving, studying, and reporting to the House on reports of the Comptroller General. The law also requires the committee to exercise legislative oversight jurisdiction over the operations of the Comptroller General and of the General Accounting Office. The budget and ac-

counting laws which have been reported by the committee prescribe the basic methods of accounting for the Federal executive agencies and require that the agency accounting systems be approved by the Comptroller General.

The Committee on Government Operations has taken these responsibilities and duties very seriously. We have for several years maintained a continuous study of the development and improvement of agency accounting systems and, in fact, have been preparing to hold additional hearings on the subject in the very near future. In the 90th Congress we issued formal reports on the submission of agency accounting systems for GAO approval, on the relationships, between the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the General Accounting Office, and on GAO bid protest procedures. In addition, we held a meeting of Government financial managers to review the Labor Department's approved accounting systems and we maintained a continuous study of data processing management in the Federal Government, a subject very much involved in Government accounting. It is safe to say that we have more day to day discussions and conferences with the General Accounting Office than with any other Federal agency. The committee's record for earlier Congresses is at least equal to that I have just described for the 90th Congress.

Consequently, many members of the committee, including myself, were very much concerned to read the discussion of the General Accounting Office activities and of accrual accounting on pages 30 to 35 of the Appropriations Committee report on the legislative branch appropriation bill. It is obvious that the members of the Appropriations Committee are not entirely satisfied with the time and effort the General Accounting Office has been devoting to a number of studies made either on its own initiative or on request by congressional committees. The committee also questions the allocation of GAO resources in a number of respects and, to say the least, indicates some dissatisfaction with the virtues of the accrual accounting systems now prescribed by law for Federal agencies. In fact, the committee states that it will carry on an in-depth study of the desirability of these systems. This, of course, is a matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations.

What I want to state now merely is that we members of the Committee on Government Operations do take these expressions of the Appropriations Committee very seriously and we intend to study the report and the testimony upon which it is based very carefully. If these studies indicate that further action on the committee's part in the way of hearings, proposed legislation, or recommendations to the Comptroller General are in order, the House may be sure that the committee will take them.

During the last Congress, due to the efforts of the Government Operations Committee, the Comptroller General revised his bid protest procedures to assure fair and full participation by the interested parties in the consideration of bid protests. He also made a number of im-

provements in the defense contract auditing field and in the operation of his office in general. It is due largely to a cooperative effort on the part of the committee, the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President that considerable progress is being made in improving agency accounting systems.

We assure all concerned that the committee will continue to carry out its duties in a vigorous and responsible manner.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

ACCRUAL ACCOUNTING AND ACCRUED EXPENDITURES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I call special attention to the statements in the committee report in regard to the matter of accrual accounting, and also the so-called accrued expenditures. Under leave granted, I am including committee report excerpts on these questions:

ACCRUAL ACCOUNTING AND ACCRUED EXPENDITURES

There was considerable discussion in the hearings this year on the status of design, approval, and installation of accrual accounting systems in all agencies of Government and the major effort now underway to get the systems ready to attempt to provide accounting support for putting the fiscal 1972 expenditure budget on the so-called accrual basis rather than the checks-issued basis now used. The GAO, which under the law must establish the guiding principles and standards and approve the accounting systems developed under them, is currently devoting more than 200 man-years of effort to assisting executive departments and agencies in developing acceptable accounting systems and to the review and approval of them. This approaches 10 percent of the professional staff. It is another area where there is some basis for saying that some of the manpower could more usefully be shifted elsewhere. This is on top of countless others in the agencies.

Accrual accounting—but not accrued expenditure budgeting—was ordained in a law passed by Congress in 1956. The law also contemplated the development and use of so-called cost-based budgets for budget presentation as well as for agency operating and administrative purposes. The proposition of stating expenditures in the 1972 budget on the so-called accrual basis springs from a recommendation in the 1967 report of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts.

While accrual accounting has been legislatively ordained for some 13 years, there has been considerable foot-dragging, apparently because there has been something less than enthusiastic reception or acceptance of all the claims made on its behalf. A major effort is now underway in respect to a new accounting system in the Defense Department. In the civil departments and agencies, of 136 systems subject to GAO approval, the committee was told that 64, a little less than half, have received GAO approval.

The Committee on Appropriations has never been enamored with the idea that accrual accounting and so-called cost-based budgeting are necessary or even desirable in many agencies of government.

There is no inherent virtue in uniformity. For many agencies and activities, accrual accounting and "cost" budgeting as compared to the older, conventional bookkeeping systems in akin to a distinction without the benefit of the substance of difference. There

are many operations where the variation between costs incurred (cost-budgeting, i.e., resources "used") and obligations is not greatly different and of no appreciable significance to management in day-to-day decision-making or in the budgeting process. The same thing is even more so with respect to accrued expenditures (i.e., resources "acquired") vs. the conventional checks-issued basis of controlling, recording, and reporting expenditures. And accrual requirements are superimposed on top of the always essential commitment and obligation controls and on top of cash disbursement controls. The Committee agrees that in some agencies or programs with heavy inventory and contracting considerations accrued costs (cost-budgeting, i.e., resources "used") can be of significant use to management and review people in day-to-day operations and in the formulation of budgetary requests. Cost-control and cost-consciousness is of course vital in all areas, but securing these ends hangs far more on conscientious and intelligent management and administration and proper organization to go with it than it does on cost-budgeting.

There are good grounds, in the Committee's view, for doubting that accrued expenditures, i.e., resources "acquired," reported through a formal accounting process that rests on a complex procedure for determining and gathering the underlying data, will be of significant value to administration even in some areas where cost budgeting makes sense. Certainly it is questionable whether many of the countless managers of bits and pieces of the Federal budget will ever find it especially helpful on a day-to-day basis, or even periodically, to cultivate an intimate working relationship to "accrued" expenditure data. It seems more than likely that most of them will continue to think and act in terms of commitments and obligations, and, in the meaningful areas, in terms of performance or costs incurred. There are, of course, a number of major procurement and contract areas where "constructive delivery" (i.e., "liability incurred"—"accrued expenditure") data is of significance to managers and review levels, but a current flow of information of that sort does not need to come through a formal accounting system universally applied across the government.

The current crash drive for accrued expenditure reporting comes primarily from the recommendation to change expenditures in the 1972 budget from a checks-issued basis to an accrual basis. A not inconsiderable part of the thrust for that stems from a desire to sophisticate budget and fiscal data for purposes of economic analysis. It is said that accrued expenditures will make the budget more useful for understanding the economic impact of the budget. That may be so to a limited segment of users of budget aggregates, but it is commitments, and contracts, and obligations that set the wheels in motion. Contractual obligations of the government—in whatever form, with whomever entered into—are the leading edge, the first binding administrative step on which subsequent actions take place. And they are far from useless for economic analysis purposes. Congress authorizes and appropriates on the obligational authority basis. The President states his budget requests on this basis. The grant of authority to obligate, and the act of committing and obligating that authority once it is granted, are from most angles the most significant decision points in the whole fiscal process.

When the 1956 accrual accounting bill was under consideration Congress went out of its way to avoid requiring the use of the accrued expenditure concept in the budget. The floor manager of the bill in the House said:

"It would also require the accounts of the departments and agencies to be maintained

on an accrual basis so that if the Congress at some time in the future should decide on an accrued expenditure budget the necessary accounting foundations will have been laid."

Further, he said the bill had been amended:

"* * * to strike out that portion providing that the budget be submitted on an annual accrued expenditure basis."

The Committee, in July 1956, expressed general approval of the cost-budgeting idea as to significant areas of operation. The Committee was, however, in opposition to the accrued expenditure idea. It saw defects then. It sees defects now.

The Committee commented at the time. "The Committee is fearful that forcing the entire Federal fiscal structure to the accrued expenditure concept of appropriating is a professional accountant's dream that may well become the taxpayer's nightmare."

Anyone reading the hearings on the accompanying bill will have a hard time discerning the superiority of recording and reporting expenditures on the accrued basis as against the checks-issued basis used from way back—and which, incidentally, will still have to be kept in use. Judging from the instructional and illustrative material that has been issued to the agencies on the accrued expenditure question—appearing on pages 666-682 of the hearings—it is difficult to conclude that the accrued expenditure data will be as reliable and as accurate as the conventional checks-issued basis now used. Accuracy and reliability are high considerations. And there will certainly be far more time and effort expended across the government in gathering the information on accruals to put on the books.

In respect to the law which mandates installation of accrual accounting across the Executive branch generally, there are, in the committee's view, grounds for saying that the law ought to be amended to make it discretionary rather than mandatory, with the idea of requiring accrual accounting and cost-budgeting in the areas meaningful to management and review levels and of omitting it where it makes no significant contribution but does add to the accounting and reporting load. Incidentally, it may be noted that Congress has not seen fit to extend the requirement to the Legislative and Judicial branches, where the great preponderance of expenditures is for personnel and other current running expenses and where the accrual and cash concepts thus closely conform.

Accrued expenditures are not as easily understandable. Nearly anyone can understand what is meant by cash or checks-issued. The budget is submitted to Congress. It is Congress that must analyze it. It is Congress that must consider it. It is Congress that must act on it. Congressional understanding is therefore of high consideration.

It would seem wholly impractical if not impossible to audit and verify the accuracy of expenditures recorded and reported on the accrued basis, which would flow from hundreds or even thousands of points. Verifying checks-issued expenditure data would be far easier.

These considerations take on added importance with the growing attention and use in the Congress of budget expenditure data. For the last two years, overall ceilings on budget expenditures have been enacted into law, and may well receive continuing attention.

Executive reporting systems could be devised as determined necessary to compile summary data on significant spending areas, supported by some analytical detail, on the accrual aspects of overall budget expenditures for purposes of economical analysis. This could be published in the book of Special Analyses that now accompanies the annual budget or in the Economic Report or in

both. But that would not involve any departure in the Budget and Treasury statements from the traditional, easy-to-understand, more reliable, more precise cash (checks-issued) basis for stating budget expenditures that has been followed for so long, and which, in the opinion of the Committee on the basis of the record thus far, ought to be continued.

Accordingly, the Committee is taking steps to conduct an in-depth investigation and study into the whole question of the usefulness of accrual accounting as a government-wide requirement and of the relative accuracy and usefulness, and cost, of switching expenditure recording and reporting systems to the accrual basis. In the meantime, the Committee thinks the crash drive toward government-wide application ought to be suspended.

There may even be some refinements that can be introduced to the checks-issued expenditure concept now used in budget summaries. One of the most confusing innovations introduced in budget expenditure summaries in the budget is the offsetting of certain so-called "market-oriented" or "proprietary" type of budget receipts against cash expenditures rather than counting them as budget receipts. They currently amount to between \$4 and \$5 billion. They are budget income in every conventional sense of the word, but because they arise from nonsovereign types of governmental activity they are treated as minus expenditures with the object of stripping the net budget expenditure total down to governmental or "sovereign" purposes. This is an embellishment of noticeable consequence to congressional consideration of the budget but of periodic confusion in trying to summarize and relate congressional actions on the outgo side of the budget to the budget estimates. The same offset entry—with the same confusion—is made in the budget summaries of new budget spending authority.

THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, the accrual accounting question importantly involves the General Accounting Office as well as the executive branch. The committee had some other comments to make about how best the Congress might most appropriately exploit the important resources of the GAO for congressional purposes. I think these comments should be in this RECORD, especially because of the use made of the GAO by various committees.

Under leave granted, I include additional excerpts from the committee report:

The General Accounting Office is an important arm of the Congress in checking on the efficiency and economy of government operations and administrative practices and the propriety of government expenditures, and in assistance to Congress and its committees otherwise. In more recent years, the Comptroller General has been giving increasing attention to evaluating the effectiveness of governmental activities, as well as the economy and efficiency with which they are managed. Perhaps the most noteworthy case—mandated by specific statutory enactment—is the OEO (anti-poverty) study involving not only efficiency of administration of the program but also evaluation of the effectiveness of the entire program and recommendations for additional legislation.

As the Federal domain of interest manifested by the proliferation of many new and expanded programs with enlarged expenditures has increased, the area of continuing audit responsibility has likewise enlarged. Both defense and non-defense areas are heavily involved. The professional accounting and auditing staff of GAO increased some

32 percent between 1960 and 1968, and under current plans will have increased, by June of next year, by some 47 percent in 10 years. (Other GAO personnel will have come down by more than that.) But even with this increase, the Comptroller General does not think GAO has sufficient staff and says that to meet the most pressing obligations GAO continues to defer or delay work needing attention.

The Committee thinks the Comptroller General's policy of setting high standards of qualification for recruitment of new professional personnel is sensible. This means a more limited recruitment market but should pay dividends in the long run; quality is more important than quantity.

In total, some 1,100, plus, man-years of GAO professional staff—about 40 percent of the total—are currently assigned to Defense activities. This reflects a recent reallocation of an additional 190 man-years to the defense procurement area, including reporting on the status of major weapons systems—90 shifted from other defense areas and an increase of 100 by reassignment of that many that were previously programmed for non-defense work. This necessarily short-changes planned non-defense work and non-procurement defense areas.

OPTIMUM USE OF LIMITED GAO PERSONNEL

The question of optimum use of limited personnel resources of the GAO involves the compelling matter of priorities, of doing the most important and pressing things and letting the less important slide; more sharply drawing a line between what is absolutely essential and what is not.

By law, the General Accounting Office is required to investigate and report on such matters as may be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The law also requires the Comptroller General, on request of any such committee, to direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

Assistance in response to specific congressional requests of all kinds has increased sharply in recent years. The estimate is that nearly 500 professional staff, or about 18 percent of the total, will be engaged upon specific congressional requests in the current fiscal year.

In this context, the question arises as to the appropriate boundaries within which the important resources of the GAO should be utilized. There seems to be a growing tendency to engage and involve the GAO in ways at least more or less marginal to its traditional functions. The OEO study of last year heavily involved the GAO in the policy area of evaluating the *effectiveness* of the whole program, and called upon GAO to make recommendations for additional legislation in the anti-poverty area. Not only did the GAO not have the in-house capability for this kind of policy examination, forcing it to engage by contract outside firms to assist it at a cost of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, but it necessarily brought the GAO into the business of making recommendations in controversial legislative policy areas. The OEO study is but an example.

It is a good question as to how far Congress and its committees ought to drag the GAO into pre-authorization and pre-appropriation policy questions and areas. Calling on GAO to make detailed recommendations on pending policy legislation might well in time get them tangled—and mangled—politically, and thus in the long run risk impairing their effectiveness as an impartial, unbiased, independent arm of the Congress in examining and reporting on the adequacy, efficiency and economy of management of the countless programs of government and the propriety of government expenditures. Even conceding that it is not always easy or even possible to draw a fine line of delinea-

tion in these respects, nonetheless as a general proposition, it would seem that these latter are the more appropriate and profitable ways to exploit GAO resources for congressional purposes.

On this point, and with pressing audit needs that are going unattended or insufficiently attended, there are grounds for viewing GAO's increased attention to the progress of implementation by the Executive branch of the so-called PPB system (Planning-Programming-Budgeting-System) as of less than high priority concern to GAO—certainly at this stage. This system was devised by the Executive branch as a means of trying to improve the executive planning and decision-making process in matters of legislative and budget recommendations to Congress to meet national objectives as the Executive sees them. The committee generally has been favorably disposed to the fundamental thrust of the objective of PPB; namely, to improve the planning and choice-making machinery of the Executive branch. This is fundamentally an Executive concern and full flowering of the system, from what the committee knows, is a good distance away. There is certainly room for debate as to the wisdom of GAO *initiating* PPB-type systems analyses on its own, which it apparently has in mind doing.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the work done by the subcommittee, the very eloquent and persuasive statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from North Dakota, and others seem to me to neglect one essential issue.

Before proceeding to that I should like to point out that it is not really necessary to set up any strawman and to say that this is the idea of one particular individual and therefore if one wants to prove that he is not in favor of one individual having his way he must therefore support this to show he is not in opposition to one particular individual.

This matter has a long history. The Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, on July 26 and 27 and August 4 of 1966, in the 89th Congress, had extensive hearings on this subject. In those days the form was to establish a commission to study the whole subject as an amendment to the arts and humanities legislation.

I have read with great care, thanks to the courtesy of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), who sent me a copy well in advance, the subcommittee hearings. I exchanged the 1966 hearings with him.

I believe the gentleman from Illinois will concede that the testimony of Mr. Campioli and others in the intervening years since July of 1966 has not changed a word. The fact of the matter is that the genesis of this change goes back to the 84th Congress, when some \$5 million was authorized by the Commission to the Architect of the Capitol to come up with a scheme. He did so years ago. There is nothing new here.

The gentleman from Illinois, in response to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), said it is quite so that there were three schemes. As a matter

of fact, those recommendations, as reflected in the RECORD for July of 1966, set forth all of the subcommittee space, the lavatories, the escalator, and the whole bit. The estimates ran \$33 million, \$36 million, and \$31 million.

But one essential question has not been answered here. Conceding that the west front of the Capitol is in deplorable condition, it has been for many, many years, and the fact is that no conscientious effort has been made before this date to do anything about it but shore it up.

Mr. ADAMS. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Is this plan presented today the same plan that was presented back when you were studying it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Exactly. Not a word changed.

Mr. ADAMS. Thank you.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And, incidentally, there was never a definitive study made as to the cost of refurbishing or saving the west front as it is. No one knows the cost. That has always been conceded. I might ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) or any member of the committee if there is a definitive, positive, and absolute fixed cost—even cost-plus—which could be attributed to an 88-foot extension. Can the gentleman from Illinois answer that?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, well, I know any number of engineers who can give you an answer to that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But the gentleman is proposing an 88-foot extension without being an engineer.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman did not permit me to finish my answer.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am yielding.

Mr. YATES. I am not enough of an architect to know whether or not the estimates of the Architect are accurate. He says the cost of the entire structure is \$45 million. In the hearings you can find a breakdown of what the components of it are.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have read every word of that.

Mr. YATES. I know you did.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yet we hear the distinguished Speaker and others say that there is a momentary danger of the collapse of the west wall of the Capitol. Those of us who oppose the extension concede this, but is there any guarantee—and I do not think there is, and I have read the five-volume Thompson Co. report and all of the other literature on it—is there any assurance that during the time when the 88-foot extension is being built, that while they are out there putting up the marble 88 feet away from the west wall, it will not fall down on them?

Mr. YATES. Yes. That was the assurance given to us by the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad the gentleman answered that. If he can give the assurance that men at work are safe, working 88 feet to the west of the building, building a new wing, then I think the minority leader ought to be reassured that his office will not fall down

onto the Olmsted terrace during the process of refurbishing the west wing.

Mr. YATES. I do not think there is any question but that the west wing will be made safe enough to stand in its present condition, that is, I do not believe the wall will collapse. I do not know what the structural defects are entirely, but presumably enough work can be done to keep it in condition so that the minority leader will not fall down into the Olmsted terrace.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The minority leader has been a very close friend of mine.

Mr. YATES. And mine, too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Of course, neither of us want that. But I might say this—and I do not mean this colloquy to be facetious, but it demonstrates something. It demonstrates the complete uncertainty of those who advocate the 88-foot extension as distinguished from the uncertainty of those of us who say, for heaven's sake, whatever the cost, restore it without adding to it. Save it as it is without adding to it.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With not a word added to it.

Mr. YATES. Well, there are a few words added to it. You did not have the words of Mr. Severud.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Of whom?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Severud, the expert that I contacted.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But I have had other expert testimony. And, incidentally, I am consistent, unlike the AIA or the local newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I opposed the extension of the east front and I now oppose the extension of the west front. I suppose that leaves me in a lonely minority. I also opposed the construction of the Rayburn Building in which my office is now, for the sole reason that this is the only place I can find on Capitol Hill where I do not have to look at the outside of it.

Mr. YATES. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman in my dislike of the architecture of the Rayburn Building, but may I return to the cost of the wall? I fear the gentleman may not accept it because it comes from the office of the Architect of the Capitol, but I would like to read the memorandum of one of the Architect's engineers who took a group consisting of the following through the Capitol. It reads:

Excerpt from memorandum to me from Owen H. Ramsburg in regard to an architectural tour of the United States Capitol by members of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art, Mr. Francis D. Lethbridge of The American Institute of Architecture, Mr. Philip A. Hutchinson, an employee of the AIA, and Representative James H. Scheuer: ". . . Mr. Lethbridge said that restoration of a building of this age and this type of construction is by no means an easy matter and that such an undertaking cannot be gone into without much careful study. Costs and the time required for the work is very unpredictable. The cost could exceed the cost of the proposed extension."

That is perfectly clear to me.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. My argument, I say this respectfully, is one of the few times that I recall wherein the gentleman from Illinois and I disagree. I am not worried about the difference in cost as the gentleman expressed it. I am worried about the architectural appearance of this building. I am not persuaded that by adding an 88-foot extension to it would either save us money, add to the beauty of the building, or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. YATES) Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I asked the delegation of the AIA whether they had any objection to the design of the proposed extension, which is what the gentleman was talking about in his last comment. The representatives of the AIA said they had no objection to the esthetics or design.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey is not persuaded one way or the other by the opinion of the representatives of the AIA.

Mr. YATES. I thought you were.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey is simply saying that the amendment proposed, or to be proposed by the gentleman from New York, deserves consideration and deserves to be adopted and that the gentleman from New Jersey is opposed, in order to save the west wall, to spending millions of dollars to extend it 88 feet, notwithstanding the fact that it might cost just about as much to save the west wall in its present condition.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I will tell the gentleman that I was persuaded with the advice of the expert selected by members of the AIA as the outstanding expert in structural engineering. His advice was that the wall should not be tampered with.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the Speaker when he says we should take some action. However, I favor the restoration as against the extension if that can be done.

Mr. Chairman, concerning the effort to rebuild the crumbling west front of the U.S. Capitol, it seems to me we are faced with, on the one hand, a public outrage, or, on the other hand, a national disgrace.

First, in the face of crippling inflation, it would be reasonable to expect a public outrage if the west front were allowed to be extended with the proposed addition of 4½ acres of floor space including two restaurants, two cafeterias, two private dining rooms, conference, committee and document rooms, offices, a barber shop, and a visitors' center at a cost of \$45 million or more.

Mr. Chairman, no one in the House needs to be reminded of the President's 75-percent cutback on all Government construction to fight inflation, and it is outrageous that such an extravagant

proposal should be considered at this time.

Extension of the west front of the Capitol during this inflationary period is like embracing the thought that cutbacks in construction are good for the rest of the country, but not here in Washington, D.C.

But, to the matter of the need for strengthening the west front. Certainly, it would be a national disgrace should the Capitol collapse, and all indications are that the condition of the Capitol is that grave. The feasibility study made by the American Institute of Architects has recommended restoration of the west front, as opposed to extension, and to me this seems the most logical step to take.

The badly deteriorated condition of the west front is well documented, and we definitely cannot afford to allow it to collapse.

But, in these times of serious fiscal stress, we must consider the cost of such a huge undertaking as extension of the Capitol. I believe we should proceed with restoration of the west front, strengthening and preserving the original architecture as suggested by the American Institute of Architects.

Accordingly, I oppose the expenditure of \$2 million for a working plan on extending the west front of the Capitol as this legislation would allow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks before I approach the main interest for my rising.

I want to say that during my career in the House of Representatives I have never heard a better presentation and more justification for the position that the committee has taken on this west front project of the Capitol. I am just a country boy who is not troubled with the esthetics to the extent that he thinks the Rayburn Building is an ugly work of architecture. In my opinion it is many times more attractive than the many hundreds of glass and aluminum buildings that have been constructed in downtown Washington.

Mr. Chairman, having served in offices in all three of the buildings here at the Capitol, I am very pleased with my office in the Rayburn Building. It is the first time I have ever had an office that was correctly designed to take care of the public that comes in to see me, with a reception room and a generous workroom, an office with the files built into the wall, and with adequate space and the proper type of toilet facilities for both the personnel employed in my office and myself.

I am well pleased with the Rayburn Building. I guess I was not trained at the Juilliard School of Dancing or Architecture.

So I cannot appreciate the criticism of the Rayburn Building, and I like to look at it from the outside better than from working by my windows and looking at it from the inside.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise for that purpose, but I certainly want the committee to know that I appreciate the presentation they made. The gentleman

from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) made an excellent presentation, as did the Members from our side of the aisle. I want to speak about something that is in the report.

I believe the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN), my colleague on the Committee on Government Operations, spoke on the same subject matter which is contained in the report.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to read in the committee report submitted in explanation of H.R. 13763, the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1970, the view entertained by the Committee on Appropriations on accrual accounting and the role of the General Accounting Office—pages 30 to 35. The committee notes the increasing demands on the GAO by the Congress and questions the advisability of involving the GAO in controversial policy areas.

I am sympathetic to the committee's concern and believe that circumspection should be used in requests that are made of the GAO. In a very real sense that agency is faced with a dilemma. On the one hand it wants to be responsive to congressional requests, on the other hand if it undertakes investigations in controversial policy areas which are to be accompanied by recommendations, then the GAO is bound to be hurt by the political crossfire and to suffer in the end.

The committee also registers skepticism if not dislike of accrual accounting. At page 35 there is this statement:

Accordingly, the Committee is taking steps to conduct an in-depth investigation and study into the whole question of the usefulness of accrual accounting as a government-wide requirement and of the relative accuracy and usefulness, and cost, of switching expenditure recording and reporting systems to the accrual basis. In the meantime, the Committee thinks the crash drive toward government-wide application ought to be suspended.

With all due respect to the great Committee on Appropriations I would like to remind the gentlemen in charge of the bill that the committee is stepping out of its jurisdictional bounds. By rule XI, paragraph 8, of the House of Representatives, which sets forth the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations—see section 691 of the House Rules—"budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations" come within our purview.

I recognize that the Committee on Appropriations has a proper interest in Government accounting and the methods by which budgets are developed and budget categories are presented to the Appropriations Committees. At the same time this matter of accrual accounting has a long history of development and seems to be the accepted basis for improvement in the Government accounting programs.

Legislation on accrual accounting came through our committee. One of our subcommittees headed by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) monitors GAO activities in promoting improved accounting systems and methods in the executive branch. Other subcommittees are interested in the subject.

I do not believe it is effective and wise for the committees of Congress to be so completely at odds on this matter. Discordant voices on the Hill are to be expected when there are sharp disagreements on policy, but this matter goes to executive management and accounting systems. The committee's statements in the report can only cause confusion, uncertainty and lagging efforts among the departments and agencies toward better accounting systems. I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations would not run interference against our committee which clearly has jurisdiction in the field and is engaged in continuous study of the subject matter. Furthermore, as I understand it, the Blatnik subcommittee will review more intensively the issues mentioned in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, but I do want to serve notice that hereafter we propose to object to any requests for additional extensions of time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is within his right.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to have 1 or 2 additional minutes to say that the GAO is under mandate from the Congress to not only set up its own accounting system, but to set up uniform accounting systems throughout the agencies of Government, and the departments of Government.

Now, this is the present system of accounting, and it is a well-recognized system of accounting. It is not anything new. It has been approved by the American Association of Accountants for many, many years.

No complaints have been entered before our committee that I know of that the General Accounting Office is not doing a good job. They are certainly under the mandate of the Congress to do what they are doing and to extend uniform methods of accounting into all the other agencies of Government in the interest of uniformity and understanding by the Members of Congress and by the General Accounting Office of the type of accounting systems they use.

So I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations would go slow on this matter. I do not know where this interest arose on their part, but if they feel there is need for hearings, I can assure them we will have hearings in the Government Operations subcommittee that is charged with this responsibility and we will listen to the presentations of those who favor both accrual accounting and the regular accounting procedures that they now use.

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

COMPILATION OF PRECEDENTS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For compiling the precedents of the House of Representatives, as heretofore authorized, \$13,210.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 3, line 4, delete "\$13,210" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000".

COMPILATION OF HOUSE PRECEDENTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suspect most of the Members of this body like myself have on their bookcase in their office Hinds' Precedents and Cannons' Precedents.

The Hinds' Precedents were printed in 1907 and the Cannons' Precedents were printed 29 years later in 1936.

Well, it has now been 33 years since the Cannons' Precedents were printed. I know we all recognize the vital importance of rules of procedure and precedents and doubtless share my conviction that these precedents are actually the very foundation of individual liberty in this country.

The protection and advancement of the rights of the individual in the House of Representatives formed the very best safeguard of the rights of the individual elsewhere in the country in his daily life.

Of course, a knowledge of precedents, as well as rules, is a very key element in the advancement of the rights of the individual Member. If you, like myself, have had the experience of trying to press points of order or to protect the character of an amendment to a bill, you know that you are handicapped because of the absence of a readily available up-to-date set of books in which are indexed the precedents and the rulings of the Chair.

I have made inquiries during the 9 years I have been a Member of this body as to when we could expect to get a new up-to-date printing of the precedents. I would like to see the Deschler Precedents of the House printed—and soon.

The answer usually is, "We are working on it."

The House is in session almost continuously the year round and there is not adequate time for the parliamentarian and his regular staff to bring the precedents up to date and to get the material ready for the printer.

I am sure the problem is not the availability of printers because we have a tremendous GPO staff that probably could set the type overnight, if need be. The problem is getting the material ready for printing. Surely we all recognize it would be a big aid to us as individuals if we could have this up-to-date set of books with the precedents of the House. My amendment would change the amount of money available for compiling precedents to \$50,000. Maybe money is not the problem. I know that this is a task that requires skill. But surely we can employ some extra people with competence. A couple of young lawyers could be secured for a year for the extra money provided by this amendment, and I would hope that with the addition in

dollars, the precedents could be brought up to date, the volumes printed, and each of us better fitted for his responsibilities as a Member of the House.

I would like to ask a question of the committee. Can anyone inform me if there is an authorization for a new printing of the Precedents of the House?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am not certain, but I understand that there is such an authorization—I am so advised.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that some money made available for the purpose of compiling the Precedents of the House of Representatives, as provided on page 3 of this appropriation bill, would at least make the resources available if money is the problem; so I would urge support of the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There is no budget request for this amount. This is the first we have heard of it. We will be glad to talk with the gentleman, if the gentleman wants to come before our committee next year.

I ask that the amendment be defeated. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For a technical assistant in the office of the attending physician, to be appointed by the attending physician, subject to the approval of the Speaker, \$16,845.

ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I had intended during general debate to mention the matter of the attending physician. I do want to tell the Members of the House that the committee made an adjustment in the allowance for our physician. As our report shows, this will bring his total of pay and allowances to about \$40,000. He is doing a grand job. He has the welfare of all the Members at heart. I think it is money well spent.

We are fortunate to have a man of his professional ability here on duty to serve the House and the Senate.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. I think there has been a tremendous improvement in the House physician's office and I am very happy to see this recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of salaries unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, including the sum of \$159,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812); exchange, operation, maintenance, and

repair of the Clerk's motor vehicles, the publications and distribution service motor-truck, and the post office motor vehicles for carrying the mails; not to exceed \$5,000 for the purposes authorized by section 1 of House Resolution 348, approved June 29, 1961; the sum of \$600 for hire of automobile for the Sergeant at Arms; materials for folding; and for stationery for the use of committees, departments, and officers of the House; \$4,960,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 6, line 12, strike out "\$4,960,000" and insert "\$5,285,000" and strike out lines 13 through 16.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. While I do not expect them to agree with it, I want to thank them now for their very courteous treatment of me when I appeared before the subcommittee a few weeks ago in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment I offer in a bipartisan way. I think most Members received a letter in their offices from a group of us from both sides of the aisle, requesting that Members give attention to the intern program that is prohibited by the language of this bill, and the appropriation needed for it.

My amendment is not a real budget buster. It will not make a big spender out of anybody. In fact, compared to the \$104 million in this bill for the House of Representatives only, this is less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the whole \$104 million. That three-tenths of 1 percent is the maximum my amendment can cost. My amendment adds merely a maximum of \$325,000 to the figure there on page 6.

Actually, if experience means anything, only about two-thirds of that money will ever be spent, and it will be spent in the following manner: Each Member could employ for 10 weeks a college student and pay that student not more than \$75 a week. Past experience shows the most money that has ever been spent on this is \$230,000.

So we are talking about only a very small portion of this budget, but we are talking about a very big idea. Let us dwell on the idea for a while. The average age of this body is in the forties or late forties, and never in the history of this country have we had so many young people and they comprise now such a large portion of our population. I think anybody knows we have probably the best educated, perhaps physically the strongest, and the most wide-awake group of youngsters that has ever lived in our country. I do not doubt for a moment the patriotism and the love of their country most of these young people have, and yet we see the actions of a disaffected few, and we tend to judge all the others by that.

We have an opportunity here to bring to Washington some of these young people under a dignified program conducted by Members of the Congress to help bridge the generation gap and the communications gap. Of course, I know

the Appropriations Committee will say this can be done for free.

But I say, to all of us that puts a premium on the wealth of a man or a woman's family, rather than doing it on a democratic basis, and I am talking about a little "d" basis. I believe we should be able to pick young, energetic college students, bring them here and pay them a decent wage, so that they can, really, just pay for their room and board—for that is all it pays for—for them to work in the Capitol during the summer, to learn about the legislative process by actually participating in it and observing it, and to learn more about their country.

This is a very small amount of money for a very large project.

This is a very small amount of money to do something that so badly needs to be done in this country, and that is to heal this wound between the younger generation and our generation.

Perhaps this will not do it all. I would not stand here to try to say this would do it all. But this will help to heal that wound. I cannot think of a better investment we could make in doing a job which needs to be done than to appropriate this little amount of money and strike this restrictive language from the present appropriation bill.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement, and rise in support of his amendment.

During this past summer my office, and the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), were literally inundated with House interns. The reason for this influx was that our two administrative assistants were cochairman of the bipartisan intern program, which incidentally was cosponsored by the majority and minority leaders. Miss Lorraine Artuso served as staff assistant to the intern program, and was headquartered in my office. Mr. Kendall, Mr. Robinson, and Miss Artuso spent many hours counseling interns on housing, orientation, and the many problems encountered by the new interns arriving during the summer. Almost 150 interns found housing through a cooperative effort set up by the committee. Each intern was issued a personal identification card signed by the leadership, and all were kept informed by weekly notices of intern events on Capitol Hill.

The almost 900 interns in House offices represented over 300 colleges and universities, large and small, from all over the United States. The Bi-Partisan Committee held a series of weekly lectures which was extremely well received by the students. As a matter of fact one of my colleagues remarked that his interns got to talk to people in the new administration he had been trying to see since January. In addition, a subcommittee planned a series of seminar programs on various topics of interest to college people.

The lecture program opened with an orientation session on Friday, June 20, on the House floor. The Speaker, the minority leader and the majority whip

were the speakers. A second orientation session for late-arriving interns was held on June 27 at which time Representatives TAFT and BRADEMAs spoke.

At the opening session of the lecture series, Congressmen LOWENSTEIN and BROCK shared the platform for a session on "The College Campus, Students, and Politics."

The following speakers and the dates of their appearances are:

Wednesday, July 9: Peace Corps Director Joseph Blatchford.

Monday, July 14: Robert Novak, columnist.

Tuesday, July 15: John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Thursday, July 24: Senator HUGH SCOTT, minority whip of the Senate.

Wednesday, July 30: Daniel P. Moynihan, Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs.

Thursday, July 31: Ambassador Averell Harriman.

Wednesday, August 6: Senator CHARLES GOODELL.

Tuesday, August 12: Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

Wednesday, August 20: Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On July 30, Ambassador and Mrs. Chow invited congressional interns to a reception at the Embassy of the Republic of China. Refreshments and entertainment were provided at the lawn party attended by over 1,000 interns and guests. Incidentally, this is the third year the Ambassador has been host to our summer interns, and we are most grateful to him for his hospitality.

On August 13, under the sponsorship of the Intern Committee, 300 interns participated in a boat ride on the Potomac.

Others who were members of the bipartisan intern committee included: Mark Talisman, VANIK, Ohio; Michael Reed, ALBERT, Oklahoma; Jack Schuster, BRADEMAs, Indiana; Jeffrey Newman, COHELAN, California; Hector Alcalde, GIBBONS, Florida; John Calkins, ROBISON, New York; David Pruitt, EDWARDS, Alabama; Gregg Saputelli, CAHILL, New Jersey; Frank O'Gorman, McDADE, Pennsylvania; Laird Kirkpatrick, ESCH, Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bipartisan intern program can be continued and developed as an official House program for our college interns. To give these young students the opportunity to see and hear leaders in their Government is an invaluable experience for them and one which they will carry back to their campuses. I trust that the Members will support the amendment which will fund once again the program which was so successful in past years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GIBBONS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I ought to point out before I close, we appropriate money in other appropriation bills, not before us now, for 9,000 interns in another branch of this Government,

to work. I believe we can bring 435—we will never bring that many here—to work in our branch of Government, to find out what we do and how we do it, and to contribute with their own efforts and help push forward the idea of a representative Government, of a representative democracy.

This is no "budget buster," this is a little bit of an amount, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total amount of money to be appropriated here, only for the House of Representatives. But the issue is large and the need is great. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman from Florida's amendment to refund the intern program.

I recall voting for a resolution in the House Democratic caucus in April of this year favoring reinstatement of appropriations for fiscal year 1970 for the funding of House Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress, the intern program. I recall that the resolution was overwhelmingly passed by a 2-to-1 margin. This certainly indicates that many Members recognize the value of the program.

Three hundred and ninety-seven Members demonstrated their interest in hiring interns during 1967, obviously, it was thought to be worth funding them.

Due largely to the efforts of the bipartisan intern committee, the program is becoming an increasingly valuable and stimulating experience for the students selected to work in our offices.

An improvement would be to provide funding of the program in order to allow more students to take advantage of this excellent opportunity.

I, personally, have found the summer intern program to be a healthy experience for both the students and my office.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida for his leadership on this matter. He is entirely right, in my judgment.

The fact that a couple of years ago, a few of these interns may have caused offense to some Members should not keep us from giving to deserving young people this wonderful experience.

I believe the funding of this at a very modest level will strengthen the ties between the Members of Congress and deserving young people on college campuses. The amendment should be adopted, and I support it.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. I concur in the fine statement made by our colleague from Florida. I believe this program has been one of the most meaningful programs on Capitol Hill. It is a counterpart to what is done in the military academies, but this program is to help prepare young people for Government service. I believe we ought to try to prepare more people for public service in this way. We need to stimulate and to bring into service the best type of young people.

This is an excellent, inexpensive way to do just that.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of California. I support the amendment.

Our colleagues on this side of the aisle know the Democratic caucus requested our members of the Appropriations Committee to grant us the opportunity to make use of the internship program by funding this item. That request on our side obviously has been ignored.

I do not know if the Republicans in any formal way have requested their members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to do likewise.

I have one observation I would like to make with reference to this particular judgment of the committee. This particular judgment may be deemed by a good number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—and I am at least speaking for myself—to be evidence of a lack of concern that the elders in this Congress have for some of us who simply have not been around here for 20 or more years. Some of us, frankly, are getting pretty fed up on that particular count.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) for rising in support of the intern program. As the father of an intern this past summer, I had the chance to meet a great many of the several hundred young men and women who worked as interns here. They were really a splendid group. I think the fact that so many hundred did turn up despite the lack of a formal, financed intern program speaks eloquently of the value these young people ascribe to the opportunity. I think, also that in not financing it ourselves, we left it up to certain colleges to make arrangements for the students to come to Washington to live and to finance them. The point here is that only certain colleges were involved and all too often sent only those who could afford to pay their own way through the summer. We have closed the door this past summer to a great many college students who would benefit greatly from this exposure but who could only come here if they are paid.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. When you consider that this would amount to a total annual expenditure of only \$325,000—and less than that in proportion to the Members who do not wish to hire interns—I feel this is a very sound investment. Surely this small amount, which is about one-tenth of 1 percent of the entire amount in this bill, cannot be charged as being an excessive expenditure. We appropriate funds for hundreds of Executive Office interns, and should also allow a modest number to work on Capitol Hill during the summer. Such experience should not be confined to young men and women from independently wealthy families, but an opportunity should be afforded to young people from poorer families also. I feel that this

is an experience which is so worthwhile for the young people involved—and I have tried to bring into Washington these interns for the past 11 years—that I hope this amendment will receive strong support.

Mr. Chairman, I am distressed with the speed and reckless abandon with which we are voting for multi-million-dollar construction projects and large expenditures of other types, at the same time as some Members express fears that this very modest amount is an excessive expenditure. If we cannot afford one-tenth of 1 percent of this bill as an investment in the young people of this Nation, and as a means of enabling young people to understand their Government, then I believe our priorities are all mixed up.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROVISION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in late 1967 this Government faced a condition of fiscal stringency and there were cutbacks in many programs on the part of Congress in various departments of the Government. When it came to the bill for our own housekeeping and for our own salaries we eliminated special funds for the so-called intern program to show our willingness to reduce spending, at least to some extent. There were expressions of support at that time for the intern program. I spoke in favor of it, and I personally feel that Members generally strongly support the program.

I am enthusiastic about the intern program. I was here in the House when the Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert), and others spoke to the interns.

It has been said that there were about 900 interns here this summer, and I hope we have a great many of them next year. I wish to go on record as unequivocally in favor of continuing the intern program as it has operated this year.

The House decided to provide each Member, effective July 1 last, with a new clerk at the annual rate of about \$7,500, and this bill contains \$4 million to finance this. It was felt that this would be adequate additional help for this time.

Members are authorized to employ a total of either 12 or 13 employees, depending on the size of the Member's district. We decided it would be ill advised for the Congress to provide funds above the \$4 million in additional funds for office employees. However, most Members, apparently—or many Members, certainly—have availed themselves of the opportunity of using their clerk hire funds for the purpose of hiring summer interns. This is desirable.

Prior to the markup, I spoke to numerous Members of the House about the intern problem. I found no overwhelming sentiment for adding additional funds for this purpose at this time.

There will be remarks on the part of many with reference to adding the west front funds in the amount of \$2 million. However, this is not specifically for the Congress. This is to preserve a monument, the Capitol of the United States of America. It is for the American people.

So, I would hope that we would en-

thusiastically support the intern program and use as many of these youngsters as we can within the framework of our office allotment and employment limits.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to meet with intern groups this summer in give-and-take discussions. I believe such discussions are highly worthwhile.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the funds for the intern program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by complimenting the subcommittee on what I think is an excellent job of reporting this bill. The work that has been done on this bill represents some of the best work that has been done on any appropriation bill and I congratulate Chairman ANDREWS.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the intern program, because I think it is something we ought to do, something which is useful for us, and which will be of great benefit and assistance to these young people.

Someone said that if a Member had a staff vacancy now, he could use it in the summertime for the purpose of employing an intern. However, some people are fully staffed up and do not have that opportunity, even with the addition of a new staff position this year. Some offices have more volume of work to perform than others. I find in my own office that I need all of my regular people to carry on the full-time work of the office.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I think we should recognize the fact when it is placed upon an individual basis like this, that there are many Members who will not or who are not in a position to bring in these interns even if they have a vacancy. I think it is unfortunate. I think it is useful to have one or two of these youngsters in each office, because this country is very diverse and different areas of the country have different problems. I think it is also useful for the youngsters of this country to have an opportunity to come here and work in each congressional office and spend some time with us and see exactly what goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I recall earlier in the spring when 22 of the Members of this House went to the various college campuses and were amazed to find the resentment and hostility in so many of our young people. And we learn that a portion of it stemmed from the fact that they really did not know what was going on here. I think we have to accept a part of the responsibility for that.

Mr. Chairman, if we are doing something productive here which they know nothing about, I think we should take the initiative to get across to them this message through a program of this type.

I would like to see a program here where each of us could have one or two of these youngsters employed in our offices in the summertime because, frankly, in my opinion these youngsters have a lot to offer and a lot to say and we ought to listen to them with an open mind. I think there are some things they can learn which could be of great use when they return to their respective communities and schools in the fall.

I also think that this program, at this time, has symbolic importance because a good many of the young people in the country today are looking to see whether we who are in government and who are in positions of responsibility are really interested in them and are interested in what is on their minds. I know most of us are interested, but in my opinion this is one way, at a very minimal cost, that we can say, "Yes, we are interested; we are interested in hearing what you have to say, we are interested to have you see what we are doing and what is taking place in the legislative branch of government."

We should note that these interns come in order to work.

I know I worked my intern. I think everybody does. So we are not asking somebody to come here and loaf. We are asking somebody to come in here at a rather modest wage to work, and to learn, and to see how this Government of ours operates. I think this is good.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would stress again that I think this is the kind of sign that we can give to the young people today that says "yes, we are interested." And we are interested in the young person who is interested in working, and who desires to come here and make a contribution, who wants to come here and learn, participate, and be involved.

We talk about involvement. Let us create the opportunity to involve our young people. Certainly you may have a few interns who may go around and do things that we might not be comfortable about, but that is not the vast majority of them. The vast majority of these young interns do a fine job. They are great kids. I think that we benefit from them, and I think that these young people benefit if we have them around here in the summertime.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that if we do institute this intern program there is no Member who is under any obligation to actually bring an intern in if he should choose not to or does not want to do so for one reason or another; there is no obligation on him that says that he has to do this. But I still think it is important for us as a body to see that the young people of our country have such an opportunity, and that we say to them, "yes, we want to create such an opportunity, and we are interested in your participation, your ideas and your involvement."

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

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

I want to commend the gentleman on the fine statement that he has made in support of this amendment. I want to indicate that I agree with the gentleman in the statement he has made, and to indicate my agreement with the amendment that has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

I think it is a shame that the intern program was ever abandoned. I opposed its elimination, and I heartily support this move to reinstate the modest funds

required to give hundreds of young men and women each year the opportunity to work and learn in the Capitol Hill atmosphere.

Many of these young people have a great deal to contribute. By affording the practical learning experience of a summer of hard work in a congressional office to some of the most energetic and promising young people on our college campuses, I feel that we contribute a great deal to the future of this Nation.

Unfortunately, in recent summers, it has been impossible for Members of Congress without independent means to offer intern positions to any students who could not afford to support themselves as volunteer workers during several weeks of the summer.

I am sure many of our colleagues can remember the necessity as college students to earn money in the summer as an essential contribution to the costs of education.

We are effectively placing an economic barrier in the path of those youngsters who could profit so much from this experience in a congressional office.

Mr. Chairman, there is another provision in this Legislative Appropriation Act which I feel should be deleted and the funds applied to support of the congressional intern program. I am referring to funds in the bill for planning a mammoth extension of the west front of this beautiful Capitol building.

The distinguished Representative of the 35th District of New York, which is adjacent to my district, Mr. STRATTON, will soon offer an amendment to delete funds for this poorly conceived project. I intend to support the Stratton amendment.

Every single day in this Chamber, Members of Congress discuss the problems of budget priorities. At a time when the President has called for a nationwide slowdown in construction projects—which may even mean curtailment of essential projects—I think we must think of the west front extension in terms of priorities.

True, we are told that the west wall of this building is structurally weak. If that is so, then it should be strengthened so as not to endanger the safety of those who work and visit here, and so as to preserve the architectural beauty of this Capitol.

But this should not serve as an excuse to embark hastily on a project which has been denounced almost unanimously by the American architectural community.

At least, if an extension of the Capitol is contemplated it should be planned in concert with those in our country who are knowledgeable in this field, and who have much to contribute to any plan which would touch the historic splendor of this structure. There can certainly be no high priority put on completing a project which has drawn so much displeasure and even anger from the architectural community.

I will strongly support the Stratton amendment to defer expenditures for the west front extension, and recommend instead, that our colleagues apply some of these funds to the worthy purpose of reinstating the student intern program, so that its benefits are available to young people without economic discrimination.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. BURTON of California. I object, Mr. Chairman.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) and I as members of the committee stated our support of this amendment in the full committee, and we reserved on the subject. I regret that I cannot have enough time to make my case this afternoon.

However, I just want to say to the committee that, as the Members know, I represent perhaps one of the most active university communities in the country and I know the importance of funding this program.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) has stated the case quite eloquently and quite clearly and I agree with him. I believe with him that, as much as anything else, what we do today is symbolic. I intend to have interns in my office, whether we fund the program or not. But should we not fund the program, we are leaving a poor taste in the mouths of thousands of young people who feel that we simply do not care about them. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) said, this is by no means a budget buster. We funded it before, and some of us fail to understand why we stopped it in the first place. But, by all means, we should restore this modest program by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time with great regret to oppose an amendment offered by some of my colleagues with whom I have often sided over the years.

I have always supported the intern program. In fact, just last summer I had nine interns in my office. They did an excellent job, and I enjoyed having them. I think I may consistently have one of the largest intern programs on the Hill.

My opposition, Mr. Chairman, is not based upon what I think of the intern program. I think it is clear from what I have already said that I believe it is an excellent program. That, however, is not the point. The point is we are now going through one of the worst periods of inflation in our history.

The figures on inflation are simply frightening. The increase in the Consumer Price Index for 1969 is around 6 percent. I repeat, 6 percent. This is to be compared with an annual increase of only 1.2 percent from 1960 to 1964.

It is clear to me, and it must be to my colleagues, that we all have to pull in our belts and control spending in this

critical period. If we do not take these measures, I would hate to think of what could happen to our economy.

For this reason, I oppose spending the additional money at this time for the intern program. I would hope that we could continue to have interns by managing our salary allowances more carefully. I have done this in the past, and I intend to continue to do it in the future. It may take some organizing, but I think it is worth the effort, and I can speak from experience that it can be done.

I just want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose this amendment because of the inflationary pressures on our economy, not because I do not support the intern program. I regret that this is the case, but in all good conscience I must support the effort to cool down our dangerously overheated economy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to clarify my opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be granted to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reported to the Members of the House on September 3, 1969, the results of an inquiry conducted by my office in late June of this year on the value of the congressional intern program. I conducted the survey because there had been considerable discussion regarding the proper role of student interns, their contribution to the office, the value of their summer experience, and the need for funding.

I received 226 responses from a total of 283 offices employing interns this year. Over 87 percent of their offices said that from the perspective of their office's experience, both past and present, the general assessment of the intern program was favorable. Only three offices had unfavorable experiences.

The responses also showed that the cutoff of House funds previously set aside for compensating interns placed an increased financial burden on the college-sponsored intern programs, and their very limited financial resources necessarily prevent them from adequately bridging the expense gap.

My study shows there is great diversity in the amounts and sources of compensation available to interns in each office. An estimated 148 interns received no funding whatsoever; 326 received funding only from their congressional office.

It is sad, indeed, that the current program is closed to students with scant financial resources. Those who complacently point out that the program is doing well in spite of the fund cutoff fail to realize the truly unfortunate, far-reaching effects of that action. While the lack of funding has not resulted in a substantial drop in hiring, it has shifted upward the economic groups from which we draw our interns. The program has become a closed opportunity for those students who are eager and well qualified to

serve in congressional offices, but who simply cannot afford to come here in the absence of adequate funding.

There is no guarantee from year to year that salaries will be available through individual congressional offices to employ interns. The funding of a program of such importance should not be subject to the variations in regular staff hiring.

Reinstatement of the funding provisions in House Resolution 416, 89th Congress, would help to remove these inequities.

The intern program is clearly worth the additional expenditure. My seven interns this past summer were well-qualified, responsible young men, several of them holding leadership positions in their campus communities. I was very proud to have them working in my office.

I urge adoption of the Gibbons amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I came here prepared to oppose the extension of the west front and was prepared to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

I must say that the debate of the subcommittee has convinced me that we should extend the west front. I intend to vote for that. But I am disturbed that there are those who take the floor to say that the intern amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Florida is something that accrues to the benefit of the Members. That is totally wrong, it seems to me, in terms of the approach that one uses in looking at the intern program.

The intern program does not benefit the Member as much as it benefits the intern. That is the real purpose of it. That is why this amendment ought to be supported, to increase the opportunity available to young people to come here in a program that will be a benefit to them in better understanding the legislative process and as they return, hopefully, to participate more knowledgeably in the political process.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS), to restore the funding to the House congressional intern program.

Shortly after I entered the Congress in 1952, I had my first summer intern. Through the years many young people, undergraduate and graduate students, law students, and entering freshmen, have worked in my office during the summer.

I have always found these young men and women to be interested in the legislative process, willing to learn and work hard and anxious to contribute to the work of my office. They have performed many types of tasks, routine clerical work to research and legislative analysis.

I have always felt that their summers should be an educational experience.

They have attended committee hearings, sessions of the House and when the intern program was organized, lecture and discussion groups organized by the bipartisan intern committee.

These students have informed me after their summer experiences that they often learned more in one summer working with the Congress than they had learned in political science courses about the functioning of American Government.

I believe my colleague's amendment to restore the funds to the intern program is important and necessary to give full recognition to this program as an educational experience.

It gives us an opportunity to learn what the youth of America are thinking, what problems concern them and to present them with the opportunity to understand government and the political process.

I hope this amendment will be overwhelmingly passed so that more deserving students will have an opportunity to contribute to the workings of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the observations made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) is absolutely correct. That is that the most important significance of this amendment is the symbolical effect that it will have, for it would demonstrate that there is a willingness on the part of the Members of this body to achieve a healthy communication in relationship to the young people of this country. If we can make that impression as deeply as we can, the purpose accomplished by this very small amount, it will do a great deal and it will be money well spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear from the history of the summer intern program that it was eliminated because some Members objected to the views expressed by some of the interns, especially regarding the war in Vietnam. That is the reason it was canceled.

In December of 1967, the report on supplemental appropriations indicated why the intern program was cut out. In that report, although the words were blocked out in the committee print, beneath the ink, the language indicated that certain Members were unhappy with some of the views expressed by interns in the summer of 1967. The real reason that the intern program was eliminated was because Members of the House did not like the idea of interns expressing doubts over our Vietnam policy.

I do not think that Members should fear an intern program. We should welcome it. We should welcome the opportunity to enable the students on our college campuses to understand the processes of government.

Every summer, students from our colleges and universities come to Washington to gain experience in their Nation's Government. The result is a summer in

which both the students and the Government benefit.

The intern program is an investment in the future of this country. The young men and women participating learn about and become part of the legislative process. At the same time they contribute their talents and abilities by doing the research necessary to every Congressman's work.

According to a survey taken by Congressman JOHN MOSS, there were over 540 legislative interns on the House side this past summer. Almost 80 percent of these interns received compensation either from the Member for whom they worked or from their college.

However, it is almost impossible for a fully staffed office to provide compensation. Summer interns must pay for their transportation and living costs. As a result, many young people, who cannot afford this expense or who need to earn money in the summer to help finance their education, are prevented from taking part in the internship program.

I have had summer interns as part of my office operations for as long as I can remember. Except for the brief period when the summer intern program was in effect, they have usually been volunteers. Without the \$750, I have not been able to offer opportunities to many deserving and able applicants who need at least some compensation. I have always found that the work they do during the summer months far outweighs any administrative problem that their addition to the staff might cause. I also think that our interns have left feeling that they have had a valuable experience.

Many House Members have voiced concern about the alienation of our young people from our Government. But the House has gone out of its way to alienate young people by saying in effect: If you cannot agree with us, we do not want you working in the House of Representatives.

I do not think we can afford to continue restricting the participation of our young men and women in the legislative branch simply because their views may not conform with the views of some Members of the House.

It is important that the student intern program be continued. This program offers the practical experience and exposure necessary to interest and involve our youth in the governmental processes. We must also expand the program to give all young men and women, regardless of their economic background, the opportunity to participate in this combined work and learning program.

Too much alienation exists today, and we have an opportunity to close the generation gap. Let us not fail to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment providing for the congressional student intern program. In my office we have had many outstanding young people in the student intern program, who learned about the Congress and the operations of our Federal Government, its departments and agencies. This is invaluable experience for later life, and to interest outstanding young people in

careers in our Government at all levels, as well as public service.

My feeling is that if we knock this intern program out, we are then shutting the door to the students who are interested in learning about our Government and denying them this little opportunity they have to take part in our Federal Government. I believe it would be a tremendous mistake again to close out the congressional student intern program, when this student experience has been so valuable and so successful. I am proud of the success of our congressional office interns in their fine careers for which the congressional internship was such good experience and broad foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). Regardless of the merits or demerits or the altruistic values of the intern system, to the general public it is going to mean we are just hiring one more errand boy to help us in our work, to wash our cars and the like. I recognize there is some educational value, but while I am educating one intern, I do not want to have to educate 500,000 constituents who think I am just getting some more money out of their pockets. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER).

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Earlier this year I was privileged to be a member of the ad hoc group of 22 Republican Congressmen who visited a number of college campuses to inform ourselves on the dimensions of the problem of unrest among our Nation's young people.

The experience was indeed an eye-opener for us all. We were impressed by the intensity of feeling which we encountered among the students concerning the unresolved issues of peace and social justice which face our Nation. We were disturbed by the sense of despair and disillusionment which characterized the way in which they viewed the ability of our political institutions to come to grips with these problems.

A large part of the turmoil and unrest which grips today's student generation is due to a breakdown in communications between the students and their elected representatives. It was for the purpose of bridging this information gap that our group made the following recommendation:

We propose open communication to the university community. We have found that many were surprised by our visit and by our willingness to listen and learn. There is a need to expand lines of communication. We urge that Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, the White House staff, and others in the Executive Branch begin an increasing effort for this kind of two-way street of listening, learning and responding. Once our communication has become established it will be important to sustain it. . . . Some of the misconceptions of the system within which we operate desperately need correction. This can best be done, we believe,

through an ongoing program of communication.

The House bipartisan intern program forms a vital part of this "ongoing program of communication." At a time when the links between students and their Government are so tenuous and characterized by so much mistrust, I can think of nothing more ill-advised than any action which would have the effect of weakening these links and increasing this distrust.

Mr. Chairman, this will inevitably be the effect of the section of this bill which prohibits the use of funds for the student intern programs. Such an action will confirm the suspicions of those disillusioned young persons who believe that Congress is only interested in stifling dissent when controversial opinions are expressed.

I doubt that there is a single person in this Chamber who would argue that the intern program, as it has functioned through the years, has not been a great success. Just this past summer, over 800 young students spent their summer vacations, many of them on a volunteer basis or at levels of remuneration far below what they could earn elsewhere, working in congressional offices. I can say for myself that I personally profited from the insights which the presence of an intern in my office gave me into the things which are "bugging" young people today. And hopefully the interns will carry back to their campuses this fall a better understanding of the complexity of our governmental system and of the issues which it is called upon to solve.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the current generation of college students is the best our country has yet produced. Certainly they are the most passionately committed to bringing peace to the world and social harmony to our own society.

The vote on this amendment may be characterized as a vote of confidence in this generation of idealists, indeed a vote of confidence in the future of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of this amendment to appropriate funds to finance the House summer intern program.

Some may say that we cannot afford, what they consider, merely a way of helping college students. In fact, this appropriation helps us as Members even more than it assists the individual students.

My experience with college summer interns is that they have consistently been of tremendous assistance in the day-to-day workings of the office, in research, and in drafting background papers. We would just not be able to do as much if it were not for this type of assistance.

For the last 2 years, of course, it has been particularly difficult to obtain this type of assistance since House funds have not been available, as previously. All of our interns have had to rely on either their own resources or their

school's. This restriction has made it generally difficult, but particularly difficult for the economically disadvantaged students. As a result, the number of black students and others from minority groups, who have been House summer interns has dropped tremendously in the last two summers.

Certainly the money would be well spent. When the program was in operation, we probably derived more benefit per dollar spent on summer interns than for any other expenditure from the contingency fund of the House. Also, may I repeat again, that without House funds, it is particularly difficult to have any significant number of minority-group students placed as summer interns.

For these two main reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this quite small and reasonable appropriation.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I think it is interesting to note that out of a budget of \$258,981,130 the only substantive reason offered by the committee and those opposing the amendment is its cost. The cost of bringing 435 young Americans to Washington, D.C., for 10 weeks, at \$75 a week, to learn about the Congress and the Government presents about one-eighth of 1 percent of this appropriation. Few items in the bill are as small. I do not think many of us would like to stand before high school and college student bodies and explain as the reason this House voted down the amendment the need to economize. This issue is symbolic. As a statement of our sense of values and priorities it is most important that this amendment should carry. I am distressed that the committee chose not to include the program in the committee bill and that the committee is adamant in opposing this amendment on the floor.

We must not allow their unfortunate lapse of judgment to prevail.

The amendment must be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most serious mistakes we could make today would be to fail to pass this amendment. At a time that we are dealing with a bill that deals with many millions of dollars, if we fail to pass an amendment that calls for a few hundred thousand dollars, we will be speaking in a manner that cannot be misinterpreted by the young people of this Nation. They are going to distort that far beyond its true meaning, and they are going to say, "When you spend millions for yourselves, when you spend millions on physical construction, you failed to pay attention to us to the tune of a few hundred thousand dollars."

I associate myself with those of our colleagues who urge that we adopt this amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. For the last 6 or 7 years I have had interns in my office. I cannot say that those interns helped me very much.

But I can say with confidence that I think I helped them to understand what the process of government was about.

The actions of these young men who were picked by the faculties of the respective colleges of my district, after they went back to the colleges, in my opinion paid for every bit of the cost, whether it was on my salary or on the internship salary. I found them speaking up and taking the right side of law and order and doing a good job in the respective colleges of my district.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this intern program.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS). It is my firm belief that funds should once again be made available to finance the student congressional intern program under House Resolution 416, 89th Congress.

My support for the intern program comes from my personal experience with interns from Whittier College in my congressional district who have been in my office under this program. I have also participated as a speaker in the seminar series that was a major aspect of the bipartisan intern program this past summer.

As I stated before the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, I feel the intern program is an "extra" and should be funded as such. We should not have to use the basic clerk hire set aside for permanent staff assistance for the student congressional intern money. The interns may provide useful service, but they are primarily here during the summer for the purpose of our educating young people in the work and objectives of the Congress.

We should not try to weigh the intern program against permanent staff hire allotment, as the two are basically not comparable.

I know that many of my colleagues that I have spoken with are impressed with the caliber of students who come to Washington as interns. If their experience here has been a valuable one, they will share this with their fellow students when they return to their respective campuses.

The summer intern program should be refunded as a convenience to those Members who, like myself, are presently drawing upon clerk hire to meet the commitments with colleges and universities in the home district.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment for three reasons. The first is to allow the interns in offices which are already fully staffed, the second is to permit students to come here who cannot afford to come here on their own so that they may have the experience of being interns, and the third is to permit the Government to have the experience of these young people working in the service of their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. There were several thousand interns on the Hill this summer. Because they were not being paid, however, there were no interns here who came from poor families and who came from poor colleges.

If we want the message to go forth that Congress welcomes only rich men's kids and only those who go to rich colleges, then we ought to vote against the amendment. Otherwise, we ought to make it clear we are in support of a program which helps a few hundred young people understand their American Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken once, and I will not speak again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee are not opposed to the intern program. We have based our action on the fact that within the last few months we have given an extra clerk hire and there is some \$4 million in this bill for the extra clerk hire.

I had an intern in my office last summer and I paid him from my regular office clerk payroll.

I might point out as of last April 30, only 37 Members of the House were using the total number of clerks allocated to them. I think if we want an intern we can get one under our clerk allowance and call them interns or anything we want to.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. GIBBONS) there were—ayes 63, noes 67.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 71, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

For purchase, exchange, hire, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile for the minority leader of the House, \$14,250.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask someone on the committee if the amounts provided in the bill for automobiles for the leaders will be sufficient to provide all of them with the new 1970 Cadillacs that are just making their appearance?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We have no information about the cost of new 1970 Cadillacs.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think there is a sufficient amount to provide a new car for the individuals involved?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will inform the gentleman that all of the automobiles here for years have been leased at a certain rate per year. This amount that appears in the bill only includes the amount for the chauffeur, the upkeep, maintenance, and for the leasing of the automobile.

Mr. GROSS. So these automobiles are leased. Is that the story? They are not purchased?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That has been the practice for many years.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that it is a good practice to permit this kind of a bargain deal for the leaders of Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. It has been deemed to be the cheapest way. It is cheaper to lease them than to buy them.

Mr. GROSS. I thought perhaps with the \$19,000-a-year salary increases recently voted them, these Members, in the interest of economy, might drive their own cars rather than the taxpayers supply them with chauffeurs, gasoline, and all other maintenance. Is it possible that some of these Members will find they cannot qualify for a license to drive an automobile if they ever leave the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I would certainly hope not.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do not want them to lose the knack of being able to drive a Government-supplied Cadillac. It would be pretty rough if they did.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Many people find it rough when they leave Congress.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does think that there is sufficient money in the bill to take care of all the Cadillacs and drivers and whatever else goes along with it, such as oil and gas?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. According to the information I have. My information is that this custom of leasing cars, which has been found to be cheaper in the long run than buying them, was started back during the administration of the great late President Eisenhower.

Mr. GROSS. This provision does not include enough money to take care of the salary increases of \$19,000 a year, does it?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No. It goes to pay for the maintenance, the operation, and the leasing of the automobile.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think it should be understood that many big corporations lease cars for their executives rather than buy them.

Mr. GROSS. We are talking now about Government officials. Members of the House of Representatives. What is known as the leadership. We are not talking about private citizens.

Mr. MILLER of California. But it is much cheaper for Government officials to lease them than to buy them.

Mr. GROSS. Could I lease a Cadillac for \$500 a year?

Mr. MILLER of California. No, but you can lease a Continental if you are in the market for it.

Mr. GROSS. For \$500 a year?

Mr. BURTON of California. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BURTON of California. Does the gentleman from Iowa know, so that we can spread this information on the Record, what, if any, truth there is to the rumor—and those of us who have not been here for 20 years do not know whether it is truth or rumor—that there is a preferred lease arrangement for committee chairmen for automobiles and, if so, does the gentleman from Iowa know who pays for them and if the full committee chairmen have preferred automobile leasing privileges? I do not know whether such is the case, but I would like to know whether the gentleman from Iowa knows whether the ranking full committee members have this special privilege, also. If the gentleman does not know—and I ask this question in good faith, because I really do not know—why, perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee would respond to this question.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot give the gentleman an answer.

Mr. BURTON of California. If I may, may I address that question back to the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will say that this chairman does not have such a lease arrangement. You might ask the chairmen of the committees.

Mr. BURTON of California. No. I ask regarding the chairmen of the full committees. I do not know the answer. I am not referring, either, to the chairman of this particular full committee only, but I am wondering about it as a general practice.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot speak for other Members, but I own my own car and I do not lease a car and have not. You have referred to committee chairmen, hence my response.

Mr. BURTON of California. Does the distinguished chairman of the full committee know whether or not the chairman of the subcommittees have preferred leasing arrangements?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. BURTON of California. Does the chairman of the full committee know?

Mr. MAHON. I have no personal knowledge with reference to that.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am tired to death of hearing the innuendo and critical comments upon every action of the Congress of the United States and its officers.

There is not a single department of Government of the United States that does not have many, many times the number of automobiles that both Houses of the Congress of the United States operate.

Now, let me make it abundantly clear. I do not have a car supplied by the House nor paid for by the House. I do lease a car and not under any preferred system. It is the regular commercial

Ford leasing plan available to any Member of the House or to any member of the public. But I think it is time that making—well, I shall not use the term—but to try to take the House and make of it a whipping boy, I think is an underhanded approach to the problem of legitimate injection of issues in congressional debate. I have heard it for years and years and I say to my very good friend—and I hope we remain good friends—the gentleman from Iowa, that he seems to feel somehow compelled to take on this House whenever he can, to criticize its every action and to criticize its every privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I drive to work and I pass literally hundreds of chauffeur-driven automobiles, in many instances containing persons of the third, fourth or fifth echelons of Government in the executive department. And, I assume we supply such equipment for people out in the field.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of creating the impression on this floor that by some strange machination the House is out to fleece the public, that we are not worthy of the trust they have given us, I think does a disservice to every Member of this House. I have listened to it for years and I can no longer restrain myself from speaking out against it. I think we should have pride in the distinction which the people have accorded us. We should have pride in the service we render here. If you want to charge improper conduct, do it not by innuendo by the underhanded, undercutting method which I find repugnant to me in every sense of that word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 18, line 13, strike "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$100,000 to be expended solely for an independent engineering study to determine the methods and costs of preserving the present West Front of the Capitol."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have had a very interesting discussion on this west front topic. I am a little concerned, however, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) mentioned a moment ago, that on this very important subject we have had 2 hours virtually all allocated to those in favor and about 8 minutes to those against. With this division of time it has not been possible to answer all of the points, and some of them were plausible but misleading or inaccurate points that were made during those very eloquent discussions. But I recognize the temper of this House, and I would be presumptuous if I thought that I could

change that temper in 5 minutes that is now allotted to me.

The basic question here, however, as I have tried to indicate earlier, is whether we are going to try to save the west front from collapsing at the least possible cost in money, and the least possible damage to an historic structure, or whether we are going to proceed with this elaborate 4.5-acre extension, including all the facilities that have been added to it.

In spite of what has been said during this discussion, the fact of the matter is that in all the years that this plan has been kicking around here and the \$447,000 already spent in connection with studies of the west front extension, there has just never been any serious independent engineering study made of what would be the minimum required to fix the west wall, and how much it would cost.

Oh, the gentleman from Illinois has told us about his telephone conversations with engineers. He has told us about questions that he asked the American Institute of Architects. He has told us about his conversations with Mr. Campioli and with Mr. Stewart. But I submit to you that these phone conversations are not a careful, detailed study.

With all of the money that was spent for the so-called study by the firm of Thompson & Lichtner, none of it ever went into the question of alternate ways to deal with the problem of the west front. If you do not believe me, take a look at those five volumes. There is only one small paragraph, and it dismisses the proposals for restoration out of hand because obviously, like any good engineering firm, they already knew what their client, Mr. Stewart, wanted. They knew that he wanted to extend the west front of the Capitol, and that is what they came up with for his use.

Now my amendment is a very simple one. It would take this \$2 million for the west front out of this bill, and replace it with \$100,000 intended to get an independent engineering study on what is really needed to save the west front and what it will cost. Of course that job can be done. So let us get an answer to this basic question before we go ahead and spend this \$2 million. Let us take, instead, \$100,000 to find out exactly how little would be required to save the west front, to keep it from falling down around us, to avoid the tragedy that the gentleman from Alabama says he is so troubled about. We could have that report back to us in 6 or 7 months. It makes sense to spend \$100,000 if we can save \$10 million as a result.

This business of appropriating \$2 million is not going to save the distinguished minority leader, let me also point out. It is not going to prevent the west front from falling down. Those plans and specifications that we are ordering will not be available for 18 months. If we can continue to maintain this building for 18 months while they are drawing up another \$2 million worth of plans and specifications, then certainly we can be safe here long enough to wait for the preparation of a competent engineering study—not a telephone conversation with the gentleman from Illinois, elo-

quent though he may be, but a detailed engineering study by someone who is not on Mr. Stewart's payroll and who will face the question with an open mind. And then we will have the facts in front of us on which we can make a rational choice.

If we can restore the west wall as it stands, how much would that cost and just what would be required?

If we have to extend it about 2 or 3 or 4 feet so we can put up the solid abutments that have been referred to, how much would that cost? Certainly that would be better than extending the whole building 80 feet. We do not have to have these office spaces. And here a moment ago we were talking about improving our image by not voting a little money for interns. Yet on this item we are asked to go down the road for \$60 or \$70 million for a visitors center and for hide-away offices.

I think we ought to pause and to find out what the alternatives are. It is not going to cost us much money. It is not going to cost us any time. It is not going to cause any increased danger to ourselves or our visitors. We would look a whole lot smarter to ourselves and to the rest of the world if we took this cautious rational step and looked before we spent.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes with 1 minute to be reserved to the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident that all is not quiet on the western front.

It is also quite evident that the committee has done a good job on several portions of this bill. But it would appear that they have not had all the architectural advice that they need—and should have—on the west front of the Capitol or else they would not be in the position that they are in today.

So far as the American Institute of Architects is concerned, I have been home in the last 2 or 3 weeks and had occasion to talk with some of our architects who are constituents. I asked for this time because some of my architects have spoken to me. They said at least make a record against adding to the west front of the Capitol. That is what I am trying to do.

From a very recent letter written by the American Institute of Architects dated September 16, authored by Mr. Rex Whitaker Allen, president, who said:

For several years the American Institute of Architects has advocated that there be an engineering study of the conditions of the West Front of the Capitol that would be directed at the techniques for and cost of restoring the building.

Unfortunately, the engineering study commissioned by the Architect of the Capitol dismissed restoration as a means of correct-

ing the structural deficiencies of the West Front on the grounds that extension of the building is preferable. Thus Congress has not been given the opportunity of comparing a restoration versus an extension of the Capitol.

As you know, the American Institute of Architects believes that the building can be and should be restored. Accordingly, we welcome your amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for 1970 to appropriate \$100,000 for a careful engineering study of the considerations that must be weighed before restoring the building.

Then I want to quote from a letter of the former president of the American Institute of Architects dated February 18, 1969, which appears in the RECORD but which deserves further emphasis.

Mr. George E. Kassabaum, immediate past president of AIA, asks and answers two questions:

First. Will restoration of the existing structure entail vacating the entire west front for a period of 5 to 10 years?

His answer was that by using modern technological developments, the entire west front would not have to be vacated "for a period of 5 to 10 years." Only those spaces immediately adjacent to active restoration would have to be vacated.

Second. Is it true that there would be no limit on risk or cost, if the west front were restored rather than extended?

His answer was that, of course, there would be a limit to cost and risk of restoration. He firmly believes restoration will prove much less costly than extension—much structural repair must be done in either event. A feasibility study would provide Congress with cost information.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member has received a telegram from the American Institute of Architects urging that we do not start on this large extension to the west front. Surely we can accept the counsel and advice of the AIA. So far as I know none of us are architects. If there is one here in the Chamber today now is the time for him to raise his hand.

I have heard it seriously argued if we do not start today by approving this \$2 million the Capitol dome may come crashing down. Of course the thought that that might happen should be a source of worry and if there is a possibility of that there would be no recourse but to go ahead now regardless of the expense. The true facts are the west wall has nothing to do with the support of the Capitol dome. The dome is separately supported as provided for at the time of the addition to the east front of the Capitol. The dome was completely refurbished, strengthened and shored up as a part of that project.

I would not be surprised if there are many Members who are confused by the direction and the content of this debate. Those of us who oppose the west front extension certainly do not oppose the presently needed repairs to preserve the greatest of all our historic shrines, the U.S. Capitol. I had hoped more of us would be interested in the esthetic reasons for reconstructing the Capitol's west front in a duplication of its original appearance. This is the only por-

tion that remains as it was when the Capitol was built. Today we are not enmeshed in just a conflict between adequate restoration as distinguished from those minimum steps which would prevent the collapse of the west front, but we are talking about providing a new type of exterior and a lot of new space.

The question that must surely arise in the minds of those who listen to this debate is, why does the repair and restoration of one wall of the Capitol—the west wall—require that a 4½-acre addition be built to the west with new office spaces and no one knows yet what else will be included?

Mr. Chairman, the real issue before us is: Do we restore and make the west front safe, or are we going out 4½ acres—and I do not know how many—to create another office building with 43 large offices, 55 medium offices, or a total of 98 offices; and also two new dining rooms and two new cafeterias.

How can it be that we need any more office space? We have the Rayburn Building. We have the refurbished Cannon Building. We even have the Congressional Hotel if it becomes necessary to convert that into an office building.

It has been suggested here this afternoon that perhaps the new James Madison Library Building could be designed to be converted into another House office building if we ever need the space.

The argument comes down to this—let us repair the west front but not transform it. Let us not build more offices than we need at this time. The House has been overgenerous with itself this year. There was the pay increase for ourselves and the increase in clerk hire. We should not test the patience of our people by taking this first step on an addition to the west front that will change the historic appearance of the Capitol of our Nation at an estimated cost of \$45 million that may ultimately run up to \$60 million. If we approve the \$2 million today we take a step in that direction and from which there is no way to return. That is why we should consider so carefully what we do today.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to the lack of architectural advice. We have had plenty of architectural advice.

But I would like to ask a question, and not to take up too much time. The American Institute of Architects recommended the extension of the west front only a little over 10 years ago when they opposed the extension of the east front. Now they oppose the extension of the west front.

Will my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, for the benefit of myself and our colleagues try to reconcile those two positions taken by the American Institute of Architects?

Mr. RANDALL. I listened very carefully to the remarks of our beloved Speaker earlier. I must say the letter I hold in my hand is dated September 16 so it is quite apparent the leaders of the AIA must have had a change of heart.

They must have reappraised their views and reconsidered their former position taken 10 years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. But we can go back to 10 years ago and at that time they said, and I quoted what they said, they then urged the extension of the west front and they were in opposition to the extension of the east front.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Is not the letter that the gentleman holds in his hand from the president of the AIA?

I would point out that the statement the Speaker of the House refers to was not the position of the AIA. It was the statement by one member of the AIA, who was part of another committee.

Mr. RANDALL. I think that is correct. The letter which I hold has been signed by the President on the 16th of September.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman represented the AIA 11 years ago.

Mr. RANDALL. With all due respect to our Speaker, it occurs to me we have before us today an opportunity to restore the west front of the Capitol. Let us repair the west front—not transform it. That is what our difference is all about, and nothing more.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think most of you will agree with what I stated in the opening of the debate—all is not quiet on the western front. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 59, noes, 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

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 21, strike all of lines 3 through 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) will find what I have to say repugnant or not. And I do not particularly care. Since the gentleman saw fit to engage in personalities, let me say that some years ago he came into the Third District of Iowa to campaign for the Democrat candidate against me. He later told me that although he had traveled all the way from California by plane to the State of Iowa, he did not know he was going into the Third District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent. Under the circumstances, I question whether the gentleman would know the meaning of the word "repugnant" if he met it right square in the middle of the street.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to stop the start of another new House office building. That is what this provision in this bill means. It provides \$2,800,000 under the title of "Library of

Congress, James Madison Memorial Building."

The testimony in the hearings indicates that this building is to be so constructed that it can easily be converted into an office building. I leave it to you to judge what is about to take place if you provide \$2,800,000 to get this structure off the ground.

This building, remember, is to cost, as we were told earlier this afternoon, \$100 million. That is the figure put on it as of now, and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill on the floor says building costs are going up at the rate of 7 percent a year. By the time they get around to constructing this House office building, it can be far beyond that. But we start with \$90 million for this building, and approximately \$10 million will have to be spent on the Power Plant to provide the power necessary for the air conditioning, lighting, and so on. So we will have a minimum of \$100 million in this proposition before we are through.

Is it not about time to practice just a little bit of economy? Do we need to start a new House office building now—today? I do not believe the taxpayers of this country are prepared—and I do not think the Members think they are prepared—to support this kind of proposition here and now. Moreover, President Nixon has called for a cut of 75 percent in Federal construction.

In the name of fiscal sanity, I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have had an opportunity to review these particular plans. It is inconceivable to me that any conclusion can be drawn in any way that this could be converted to an office building. The fact is simply this: The Library of Congress desperately needs more space.

Mr. Chairman, this building is a building designed for certain specific uses. The areas are set aside for certain technical reasons. Some of the ceilings are very low and are designed primarily for the storage of reference materials. Other areas are designed for the legal section.

In order to convert this building to a House office building would, in my opinion—and I am not an architect, but I have seen the plans and I have gone through them in detail—probably cost 50 percent as much as the total cost of constructing the building.

We do not need a new House office building, but we do need a new building to house the records of this Government and for the Library of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I could not vote for a new office building.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM).

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Georgia is eminently correct. This building was never thought of and was never

conceived of and was never designed to be a House office building. It was designed to be, as the gentleman from Georgia says, an extension of the Library of Congress and to provide for storage and so on.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, the authorization of this was pushed through the House by one of the most distinguished former Members of this body, Mr. Howard Smith, of Virginia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. He is eminently correct. This is a special use building. The areas in it are designed for special use and are not readily adaptable to office space.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from Georgia read the hearings?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have not, but I have examined the plans in detail, and I have seen models of this particular building on each floor. It is a special use which is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is a library building. There is no question about that. A former Member of this body, Judge Smith, of Virginia, worked for this throughout the years. If you read the hearings and recall my remarks in the opening general debate, you know that the Library of Congress is located in 12 different buildings. The annual rental amounts to about \$1.8 million.

If we are to cope with the Library's growth, certainly this building is needed. What we are proposing is planning money only. It will take 18 months or so to prepare the plans.

So that this RECORD will be more complete, I will include at this point the explanation from the committee report:

In connection with the proposed James Madison Memorial (third) Library of Congress building, authorized by Public Law 89-260, October 19, 1965, to be constructed on square 732 just east of the Cannon House office building, the committee recommends \$2,800,000 for detailed plans and specifications and related expenses. \$500,000 was appropriated in 1965 for preliminary plans and designs and cost estimates.

The budget request is for \$18,410,000 which, in addition to the \$2.8 million, includes excavation and sheeting, the foundations and walls up to the first floor, and the contract for marble, granite, or other stone. But especially because of an authorization problem, noted below, and the lead time for preparation of the detailed plans, the committee sees no need to go beyond the \$2.8 million figure at this time.

The committee has coupled to the \$2,800,000 for plans and specifications a provision which says:

"That availability of these funds for obligation shall be contingent upon enactment of legislation adjusting the limit of cost of the project (fixed by Section 3 of such Act) to reflect projected escalated construction costs required to complete the project on the basis of the preliminary plans heretofore approved by the Committee and Commissions designated in such Act."

The reason is this: The 1965 enabling act, in section 3, carries a specific ceiling of \$75,000,000 on the project, and the floor debate in the House is quite clear and unequivocal that it was the intent at the time that nothing should compromise the option of the authorizing committee, or of course the House, to take another look at the matter if unforeseen or unforeseeable conditions should cause the cost of the complete project to breach that ceiling. Construction cost escalation has now done that. The project as projected in the preliminary plans has not changed, but costs have. And the assumption is that they will continue to increase. The currently projected cost, on the basis shown on page 177 of the hearings, is \$90,000,000.

The committee was told that no increase in the cost limitation had been sought. The effect of the proviso attached to the \$2.8 million is to render the funds unavailable until this situation is remedied.

The committee decided, despite the authorization problem, to put the \$2.8 million in the bill on the contingent basis in the thought that by doing so, initiation of the project would be expedited. It is badly needed.

This committee has been aware of the need, the overcrowded conditions in the Library for a good many years.

Congress formally recognized the need when it enacted the authorization law in 1965.

Twice before, a request for the project has been before the committee. Both times, it was deferred without prejudice.

But the Library continues to grow. Time is running. Growth of a great research library is inevitable. The committee has been told that present space needs increase by roughly 45,000 square feet a year.

The Library is now scattered in a dozen different locations. Rental and associated costs approximate \$1,820,000 in the current budget. The situation will get worse before it can get better. If the project moves forward this year, it will still be mid-1974 at the earliest before the building can be occupied.

A great deal of information about the details of the project appears on pages 157-184 of the hearings. Besides the \$90 million currently estimated construction cost of the project, furniture and furnishings including bookshelves would add roughly \$10 million, and the rough estimate of changes and additions at the Capitol power plant to supply heat and air-conditioning to the building ranges up to another \$10 million, for an approximate overall total of \$110 million.

Another noteworthy feature is that the preliminary plans call for a completely flexible design, that is, the building is to be designed so that it can be used as part library stack—part office building, all library stack use, or all office building.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 22, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considera-

tion the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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. TALCOTT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 13763 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes 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 178, nays, 94, not voting 158, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—178

Abernethy	Clay	Ford
Albert	Cohelan	William D.
Anderson,	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Calif.	Coughlin	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Galifianakis
Andrews, Ala.	Daddario	Garmatz
Andrews,	Daniels, N.J.	Gettys
N. Dak.	Davis, Ga.	Gialmo
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Gibbons
Beall, Md.	Dellenback	Gonzalez
Belcher	Dennis	Gray
Berry	Dickinson	Green, Oreg.
Bevill	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Blatnik	Dorn	Griffin
Boggs	Dowdy	Hamilton
Boland	Downing	Hanley
Bow	Dulski	Hansen, Wash.
Brinkley	Dwyer	Hathaway
Brooks	Eckhardt	Hawkins
Broomfield	Edwards, Ala.	Hébert
Brown, Calif.	Edwards, La.	Helstoski
Broyhill, Va.	Eilberg	Henderson
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Hollifield
Burke, Mass.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Hull
Burton, Utah	Fascell	Jarman
Button	Feighan	Johnson, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fish	Karth
Cabell	Fisher	Kazen
Caffery	Flood	Landrum
Chamberlain	Flowers	Langen
Clawson, Del	Ford, Gerald R.	Lennon

Long, Md.	Patman	Steed
McCulloch	Patten	Stephens
McDade	Perkins	Stokes
McEwen	Phillbin	Stubblefield
McFall	Pickle	Sullivan
Madden	Pirnie	Symington
Mahon	Preyer, N.C.	Taft
Mailliard	Price, Ill.	Taylor
Moss	Price, Tex.	Thompson, Ga.
Murphy, Ill.	Pryor, Ark.	Thompson, N.J.
Murphy, N.Y.	Reid, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Natcher	Reifel	Tieman
O'Hara	Rhodes	Udall
Olsen	Riegle	Vigorito
O'Neill, Mass.	Rivers	Wampler
Mann	Roberts	Watts
Martin	Robison	White
Melcher	Rodino	Whitten
Michel	Rogers, Colo.	Widnall
Mikva	Rooney, N.Y.	Williams
Miller, Calif.	Rosenthal	Wilson, Bob
Mills	St Germain	Wilson,
Minish	St. Onge	Charles H.
Mollohan	Sandman	Wright
Monagan	Schwengel	Wyman
Moorhead	Scott	Yates
Morgan	Slack	Young
Passman	Springer	

NAYS—94

Adams	Hagan	Obey
Alexander	Haley	Pelly
Ashley	Hall	Pike
Baring	Hammer-	Poff
Bell, Calif.	schmidt	Randall
Bennett	Harvey	Rarick
Betts	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Biester	Hicks	Rogers, Fla.
Blackburn	Hogan	Roth
Brown, Mich.	Hungate	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Ruppe
Burton, Calif.	Hutchinson	Ryan
Camp	Ichord	Satterfield
Carter	Jacobs	Saylor
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Schadegberg
Collier	Kastenmeier	Scherle
Collins	King	Schneebeil
Conable	Kyl	Skubitz
Conte	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Conyers	Lloyd	Stanton
Cramer	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Denney	McClure	Steiger, Wis.
Derwinski	Marsh	Stratton
Duncan	Mayne	Talcott
Esch	Meskill	Van Deerlin
Foley	Miller, Ohio	Vanik
Fountain	Mize	Whalen
Gaydos	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Goodling	Morton	Wolf
Gross	Mosher	Zion
Grover	Nedzi	Zwach
Gude	Nix	

NOT VOTING—158

Abbutt	de la Garza	Koch
Adair	Delaney	Kuykendall
Addabbo	Dent	Kyros
Anderson,	Devine	Landgrebe
Tenn.	Diggs	Leggett
Arends	Dingell	Lipscob
Ashbrook	Edmondson	Long, La.
Aspinall	Edwards, Calif.	Lowenstein
Ayres	Eshleman	Lukens
Barrett	Fallon	McCarty
Biaggi	Farbstein	McCloskey
Bingham	Flynt	McDonald,
Blanton	Foreman	Mich.
Bolling	Fraser	McKneally
Brademas	Frey	McMillan
Brasco	Friedel	Macdonald,
Bray	Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.
Brock	Fuqua	MacGregor
Brotzman	Gallagher	Mathias
Brown, Ohio	Gilbert	Matsunaga
Broyhill, N.C.	Goldwater	May
Burleson, Tex.	Griffiths	Meeds
Bush	Gubser	Mink
Cahill	Halpern	Minshall
Carey	Hanna	Mizell
Casey	Hansen, Idaho	Morse
Cederberg	Harsha	Myers
Celler	Hastings	Nelsen
Chappell	Hays	Nichols
Chisholm	Heckler, Mass.	O'Konski
Clancy	Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.
Clark	Howard	Ottinger
Clausen,	Jonas	Pepper
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Pettis
Corbett	Jones, Tenn.	Poage
Corman	Kee	Podell
Cowger	Keith	Pollock
Cunningham	Kirwan	Powell
Daniel, Va.	Kleppe	Pucinski
Dawson	Kluczynski	

Purcell	Sikes	Waggonner
Quile	Sisk	Waldie
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Watkins
Rallsback	Smith, N.Y.	Watson
Reid, N.Y.	Snyder	Weicker
Reuss	Stafford	Whalley
Rooney, Pa.	Staggers	Wiggins
Rostenkowski	Stuckey	Winn
Roybal	Teague, Calif.	Wold
Ruth	Teague, Tex.	Wyatt
Scheuer	Tunney	Wylder
Sebelius	Ullman	Wylle
Shipley	Utt	Yatron
Shriver	Vander Jagt	Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Casey for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Myers against.
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Eshleman against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Frey against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Wold against.

Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Weicker against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Wyle against.

Mr. Rallsback for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Keith against.
Mr. Shriver for, with Mr. Koch against.

Mr. Ruth for, with Mr. Ottinger against.
Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. McKneally for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Watkins for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Pettis for, with Mr. Lowenstein against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Blanton against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Reid of New York against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Foreman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Podell with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Burlison of Texas with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. McCloskey.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Mizell.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Watson.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Corman with Wiggins.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Winn.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Kee with Mr. MacGregor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11582) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 1394) entitled "An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PELL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SCHWEIKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. 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, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1969

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader if he is prepared to announce the program for next week.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished acting minority leader, we have finished the business for the week and will ask to adjourn over until Tuesday following announcement of the program.

As we indicated earlier, there are no District bills on Monday. Monday is a religious holiday, and in no event will there be any legislative business.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week we have scheduled the following bills:

H.R. 12549, to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, which will come up under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 474, to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate;

S. 574, to authorize feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, which will come up under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 850, to designate the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, Calif., under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 8449. Hours of Service Act amendments, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 12884, to assure confidentiality of census information, which will come up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I advise Members that, as is indicated here, we may, in fact, have conference reports, and we have a number of bills.

Members should be alerted to the fact that we may have to have Friday sessions from now on. I think the House should know that.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

NIX CHALLENGES MAILERS OF "JUNK CREDIT"

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, 300,000 credit cards are stolen from the mails every year. The vast majority of these credit cards are unsolicited and would be unwelcome in American homes if they had, in fact, ever arrived.

The theft of credit cards threatens American families who had not asked for them in the first place with bankruptcy, law suits, and ruined credit. A person in whose name a credit card is written is responsible for debts run up on that credit card unless he can demonstrate that the credit card has been stolen and that he, the mail patron, is not responsible for the purchases through the use of the credit card.

For this reason it seems to me that it is a matter of commonsense that the mailing of unsolicited and unwanted credit cards be stopped. This practice is a shoddy advertising device and a threat to the American family budget. It should be stopped.

I have instructed my subcommittee staff to begin a preliminary investigation in cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission, the Post Office Department, and the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. In October the Postal Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will open hearings on several bills which would make unsolicited credit cards nonmailable.

There is only one way to break up the use of unsolicited credit cards by racketeers—and that is by ending the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. Credit cards are supposed to stand for a high credit rating. With the mass mailing of unsolicited credit cards they stand for nothing at all. This practice must be ended.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD copies of telegrams which I have sent to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Postmaster General, and the White House. I would also like to submit for the RECORD a news story from the Washington Star, quoting a White House aide on this subject, as well as a column by America's outstanding humorist, Mr. Art Buchwald:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1969.

HON. ROBERT L. MEAD,
Director of Legislative Affairs, President's
Committee on Consumer Interests, the
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MEAD: I have read with interest your comments on unsolicited credit card mailings. My Subcommittee on Postal Operations will hold hearings on several bills which would make such mailings illegal.

I have directed my Subcommittee Counsel, Mr. Thomas Kennedy, to begin an immediate preliminary investigation into this matter in cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission and agencies of the Executive Branch.

I hope that it will be possible for you to appear before the Subcommittee when a hearing is scheduled and to cooperate with the Subcommittee in its preliminary work. Please contact my staff at your convenience on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postal
Operations.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1969.

HON. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have decided to hold hearings on bills that would declare unsolicited credit cards to be unmailable. Hearings on H.R. 13244 will begin in October.

Your Commission has done outstanding work on this problem. I hope that we will be able to call on you and your organization for testimony during the course of our hearings. In the meantime, would it be possible to have a transcript of your hearings and other background material forwarded to Thomas Kennedy, Subcommittee Counsel, Room B345b Rayburn House Office Building.

I would like to congratulate you and the Commission for its work on behalf of consumers, particularly in this regard.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postal
Operations.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1969.

HON. WINTON M. BLOUNT,
The Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL: The mailing of unsolicited credit cards has become a national problem, recognized by the Federal Trade Commission, various administration officials, and the press. Your department has been instrumental in breaking up a criminal ring which dealt in stolen cards.

I intend to hold hearings this fall on legislation which will make unsolicited credit cards nonmailable. I would like very much to have as much information from the postal service as possible on this problem. I also intend to call representatives of the postal service to testify on legislation of this type.

Thank you for all past courtesies.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, Subcommittee
on Postal Operations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
Sept. 10, 1969]

NIXON AIDE URGES POSTAL BAN ON UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

The Nixon administration today endorsed a proposal to outlaw unsolicited credit card mailing to consumers.

Robert L. Mead, director of legislative affairs for the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, also told the Federal Trade

Commission the ban should go much further than just the areas under FTC jurisdiction.

Mead suggested the FTC strongly recommend to Congress legislation covering the entire field of unsolicited credit cards. The FTC now has no jurisdiction over banks, airlines or common carriers.

He noted that outstanding consumer credit debts now total an all-time high of \$110 billion—"From the womb to the tomb on a credit card is now the case."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 18,
1969]

CREDIT PUSHERS VEX BREADWINNER

(By Art Buchwald)

A lot of people are being shaken up these days by receiving unsolicited plastic credit cards. In the past the consumer had the option whether to ask for credit or not. But now in the great battle for the hearts and dollars of the American customer, the banks, oil companies and hotel chains are shoving their credit cards at you whether you want them or not.

It isn't just the spectre of a wife or teenager receiving a credit card and going berserk that bothers most American breadwinners. It's the principle of the thing, and where will it all end? What is to prevent a company that sends unsolicited credit cards to your home from sending merchandise instead?

I don't believe it is too farfetched to see this happening in a few years.

You come home, and there on your front lawn is a complete dining room set with table, 12 chairs and cabinet. Attached to leg of the table is a note:

"Greetings. We are happy to inform you that we consider you an excellent credit risk and, to show our faith in you, we are leaving this dining room set on your lawn. Our credit reports on you indicate that you favor colonial furniture, and we have chosen this particular mahogany wood which we know will go well with the rest of your furnishings. If for some reason this particular dining room set does not meet your requirements, you may return it to our warehouse within 10 days, and you will not be charged for it. If it is not returned, we will assume that we made the right choice, and we shall start billing you monthly."

Or you could wake up in the morning and find parked outside your door a new "fire-eater" with the following letter taped to the windshield:

"Congratulations,

"You are now the owner of a new 'fire-eater,' the fastest, most comfortable economical automobile on the road. Because of your high credit rating, we have taken the liberty of registering this car in your name with the State Vehicle Bureau.

"If for any reason you change your mind and decide you don't want to be one of the 'with it' people, please call this number and we will have the car taken away, at no cost to you except for the towing charges.

"Also, if you do not accept this exceptional buy, you must go down to the State Vehicle Bureau and inform them of this decision. Otherwise we will start charging you interest beginning next week."

The final indignity would be to receive a registered letter from a development company which read:

"Dear Sir,

"We're happy to inform you that you are now the proud owner of a new ranch house in Paradise Acres. This extraordinary home (the deed is enclosed) has three bedrooms, two and half baths, a playroom and completely equipped kitchen and will be ready for you to move into within two weeks.

"A check on your credit rating shows that you can easily afford this remarkable buy, and we have taken the liberty of deducting

from your bank account the small down payment.

"If we don't hear from you by registered mail within the next 36 hours, we will assume that you will be joining us at Paradise Acres. On the other hand, if you return the deed, then we ask you to contact our lawyers so some equitable arrangement can be worked out for our time and inconvenience.

"Cheers."

SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon be reviewing the social security program to determine whether increased benefits can be paid out to the 23 million Americans who substantially depend on social security.

A study of the social security fund discloses terrible management as far as the interest of beneficiaries is concerned. The trustees of the fund—a close-knit administration group—has failed to carry out the prime purpose of a trust: to create maximum income with security.

Official projections on the operation of the old age and survivors interest fund for 1969 clearly show the fund with a net balance at the beginning of 1969 of \$26,475 billion which will earn \$985 million, a net rate of 3.72 percent. At the end of 1969, the fund will increase to \$28,734 billion.

If the proceeds of this trust fund were entirely invested in Treasury issues which are now reaching the market at 8 percent, the annual income of the old age and survivors trust fund could be increased by over 100 percent. The prudent investment of social security trust funds could earn an additional \$1 billion per year with today's high yield securities.

Yesterday, the Treasury sold \$8.88 billion in Treasury notes, most of which, \$7.6 billion, was sold to the general public, mostly banks. It is incredible that this Treasury issue and others like it should not have been entirely placed into the social security trust fund portfolios.

The cruel fact is that the social security trust funds which are the property of their contributors are used as the fiscal arm of the Treasury to absorb deadbeat and otherwise unmarketable Treasury issues, while the private sector of our economy picks off the high-interest Treasury plums.

What cruel trick to play on our senior citizens and our young people whose hard-earned money is supposed to be wisely invested for their retirement years.

Under normal conditions, any trust fund managers and trustees would have been removed long ago with this kind of an investment track record.

I think the time is ripe to rectify this unconscionable situation.

THE U.S.S. "CONNOLLE"

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on

August 30 the U.S.S. *Connole* was commissioned at the U.S. Naval Base, Charleston, S.C. A destroyer escort, the U.S.S. *Connole* is one of a new class of 47 ocean escorts specially designed for anti-submarine warfare. It is manned by 15 officers and 205 enlisted men and will be homeported in Norfolk, Va., with Destroyer Squadron 36.

While I was unable to be present at the commissioning, the ship has special meaning to me and the people of the 24th District of Illinois. It is named after Comdr. David Rickart Connole, U.S. Navy, deceased. Born in Madison, Ill., on September 8, 1912, Commander Connole's Navy career ended when the submarine U.S.S. *Trigger*, which he was commanding, was overdue from a war patrol in the vicinity of Nansai Shoto, Asiatic area, on April 21, 1945, and was presumed lost.

A 1936 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, Commander Connole served aboard cruisers until 1939. Then, following submarine instruction at New London, Conn., he served on the submarine U.S.S. *Pompano* which participated in the Battle of Midway. Subsequently, Commander Connole commanded the U.S.S. *Cuttlefish*, joined the Pacific Fleet submarine force in December 1944, and after one patrol on the U.S.S. *Sennett*, assumed command of the *Trigger* in February 1945.

For his valor and service, Commander Connole received the Silver Star Medal, the Bronze Star Medal, and Presidential Unit Citation which the *Trigger* earned for three war patrols.

Serving his country with selfless dedication, Commander Connole has been honored and his memory well served by the distinguished ceremony in which his beloved mother, Mrs. Mary Rickart Connole acted as sponsor of the U.S.S. *Connole*.

I am certain that Mrs. Connole was deeply moved by this tribute to her beloved son. I know his brother Paul, a personal friend of mine, shared his mother's feelings on this moving occasion.

Though the ship may be composed of machinery and a hull, let it be said that with its commissioning, especially for the people of Madison County, Ill., the U.S.S. *Connole* carries with it the spirit of a brave young patriot who paid the extreme sacrifice for his country.

THE PRESIDENT'S U.N. ADDRESS

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's remarks to the United Nations General Assembly deserve our most careful attention. The President has appealed to the world community to lend its efforts in our search for peace in Vietnam. In the President's words:

In the name of peace, I urge all of you here—representing 126 nations—to use your best diplomatic efforts to persuade Hanoi to move seriously into the negotiations which

could end this war. The steps we have taken have been responsive to views expressed in this room. We hope that views from this organization may now also be influential in Hanoi. If these efforts are successful, the war can end.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President is to be commended on laying this matter before the United Nations, an international organization formed over 20 years ago to preserve and promote peace in the world. If the United Nations is to remain a viable organization it must play a constructive role in achieving peace throughout the world.

I think the President was correct in pointing out to the United Nations that the United States has been more than willing to take the initiatives and risks for peace in Vietnam. But the avenue to peace is a two-way street and Hanoi has not responded to either the bombing halt in the North or American troop withdrawals. I am disturbed by reports that certain American war critics are now calling these steps "tokenism." These are the same people who last year told us that a bombing halt and deescalation would bring peace in Vietnam. And yet they persist in their irresponsible and one-sided attacks on American policy and remain silent on the question of enemy reciprocation.

President Nixon has also made it clear to the United Nations that America will not shirk its responsibilities as a major world power. In the President's words:

As for the United States, I can state here today without qualification: we have not turned away from the world. We know that with power goes responsibility. We are neither boastful of our power, nor apologetic about it. We recognize that it exists and that as well as conferring certain advantages, it also imposes upon us certain obligations. As the world changes, the pattern of those responsibilities changes.

The President has emphasized to the world community that those changes include "a new pattern of interdependence," which requires that "other nations assume a greater share of responsibility for their own security, both individually and together with their neighbors." In the President's words:

The great challenge now is to enlist the cooperation of many nations in preserving peace and enriching life. This cannot be done by American edict, or by the edict of any other nation. It must reflect the concepts and the wishes of those nations themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is the challenge which President Nixon has put to the world community and it is also the cornerstone of the new American foreign policy. It represents neither a retreat to isolationism nor a continuing reliance on major power dominance in international politics instead it represents a new reliance on cooperative and creative internationalism. And the United Nations can and should play a major role in implementing this new policy for world peace and progress.

In concluding his remarks, the President said, and I quote:

In that spirit, then, let us press toward an open world—a world of open doors, open hearts, open minds—a world open to the exchange of ideas and of people, and open

to the reach of the human spirit—a world open in its search for truth, and unconcerned with the fate of old dogmas and old isms—a world open at last to the light of justice, and reason and to the achievement of that true peace which the people of every land carry in their hearts and celebrate in their hopes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President's entire address to the attention of my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT NIXON BEFORE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Madame President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished foreign ministers and delegates—and my fellow citizens of the world community:

There is no nobler destiny, nor any greater gift one age could make to the ages that follow, than to forge the key to a lasting peace.

In this great assembly, the desirability of peace needs no affirmation. The methods of achieving it are what so greatly challenge our courage, our intelligence and our discernment.

Surely if one lesson above all rings resoundingly among the many shattered hopes in this world, it is that good words are no substitute for hard deeds, and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results.

We might describe peace as a process embodied in a structure.

For centuries, peace was the absence of war and stability was the absence of change.

PEACE WITH PROGRESS

But in today's world, there can be no stability without change—so that peace becomes a continuing process of creative evolution. It is no longer enough to restrain war. Peace must also embrace progress—both in satisfying man's material needs and in fulfilling his spiritual needs.

The test of the structure of peace is that it ensure for each nation the integrity of its borders, its right to develop in peace and safety, and its right to determine its own destiny without outside intervention.

As long as we live with the threat of aggression, we need physical restraints to contain it.

But the truest peace is based on self-restraint—on the voluntary acceptance of those basic rules of behavior that are rooted in mutual respect and demonstrated in mutual forbearance.

The more closely the world community adheres to a single standard in judging international behavior, the less likely that standard is to be violated.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES

I am well aware that many nations have questions about the world role of the United States in the years ahead—about the nature and extent of our future contribution to the structure of peace.

Let me address those doubts quite candidly.

In recent years there has been some criticism here in the United States of the scope and the results of our international commitments.

This trend, however, has not been confined to the United States alone. In many countries we find a tendency to withdraw from responsibilities; to leave the world's often frustrating problems to the other fellow and hope for the best.

As for the United States, I can state here today without qualification: We have not turned away from the world.

We know that with power goes responsibility.

We are neither boastful of our power, nor apologetic about it. We recognize that it exists; and that as well as conferring certain advantages, it also imposes upon us certain obligations.

As the world changes, the pattern of those responsibilities changes.

At the end of World War II, the United States for the first time in history assumed the major responsibility for world peace.

HELP AFTER WORLD WAR

We were left in 1945 as the one nation with sufficient strength to contain the new threats of aggression, and with sufficient wealth and industrial capacity to help the injured nations back to their feet.

For much of the world, those first difficult postwar years were a time of dependency.

The next step was toward independence, as new nations were born and old nations revived.

Now we are maturing together into a new pattern of interdependence.

It is against this background that we have been urging other nations to assume a greater share of responsibility for their own security, both individually and together with their neighbors. The great challenge now is to enlist the cooperation of many nations in preserving peace and enriching life. This cannot be done by American edict, or by the edict of any other nation. It must reflect the concepts and the wishes of those nations themselves.

The history of the postwar period teaches that nationalism can be dangerously disruptive—or powerfully creative.

Our aim is to encourage the creative forms of nationalism; to join as partners where our partnership is appropriate, and where it is wanted, but not to let a U.S. presence substitute for independent national effort or infringe on national dignity and pride.

It is not my belief that the way to peace is by giving up our friends or letting down our allies. On the contrary, our aim is to place America's international commitments on a sustainable, long-term basis, to encourage local and regional initiatives, to foster national independence and self-sufficiency, and by so doing to strengthen the total fabric of peace.

We do not pretend that the United States has no national interests of its own, or no special concern for its own interests.

However, our most fundamental national interest is in maintaining that structure of international stability on which peace depends, and which makes orderly progress possible.

TOWARD VIETNAM PEACE

Since I took office as President, no single question has occupied so much of my time and energy as the search for an end to the war in Vietnam—an end fair to the people of South Vietnam, fair to the people of North Vietnam, and fair to those others who would be affected by the outcome.

We in the United States want an end to the war, and we are ready to take every reasonable step to achieve it. But let there be no question on this one fundamental point: In good conscience we cannot, in the long-term interests of peace we will not, accept a settlement that would arbitrarily dictate the political future of South Vietnam and deny to the people of South Vietnam the basic right to determine their own future free of outside interference.

As I put it in my address to the American people last May, "what the United States wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What North Vietnam wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What is important is what the people of South Vietnam want for South Vietnam."

To secure this right—and to secure this principle—is our one limited but fundamental objective.

PARIS TALKS DISCUSSED

Both in public and at the Paris talks, we have offered a number of proposals which would bring peace and provide self-determination. We are ready to consider any other

proposals that have the same objective. The missing ingredient so far has been the willingness of the other side to talk on any terms other than those that would predetermine the result and deny the right of self-determination to the people of South Vietnam. Once that willingness exists, and once there is a genuine willingness by the other side to reach agreement, the practical solutions can readily be found.

This makes it urgent that the U.N. members who have long taken an active interest in peace in Vietnam now take an active hand in achieving it.

Many urged that if only we halted our bombing of the North, peace would follow. Nearly a year has passed since the bombing of the North was stopped.

Three months have passed since we began the process of troop replacement, signaling both our own genuine desire for a settlement and the increased readiness of the South Vietnamese to manage their own defense.

As I announced on Tuesday, by Dec. 15 our troop strength in Vietnam will have been reduced by a minimum of 60,000 men.

On Sept. 2, 1969, North Vietnam's chief negotiator in Paris said that if the United States committed itself to the principle of totally withdrawing its forces from South Vietnam, and if it withdrew a significant number of troops, Hanoi would take this into account.

I repeat here today that we are prepared to withdraw all our forces.

The replacement of 60,000 troops is a significant step.

The time has come for the other side to respond to these initiatives.

The time has come for peace.

In the name of peace, I urge all of you here—representing 126 nations—to use your best diplomatic efforts to persuade Hanoi to move seriously into the negotiations which could end this war. The steps we have taken have been responsive to views expressed in this room. We hope that views from this organization may now also be influential in Hanoi. If these efforts are successful, the war can end.

The people of Vietnam, North and South alike, have demonstrated heroism enough to last a century. They have endured an unspeakable weight of suffering. They deserve a better future. When the war ends, the United States will stand ready to help the people of Vietnam—all of them—in their tasks of renewal and reconstruction. When peace does come at least to Vietnam, it can truly come with healing in its wings.

In relations between the United States and the various Communist powers, I have said we should move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation.

I believe our relations with the Soviet Union can be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect, recognizing our differences and also our right to differ; recognizing our divergent interests, and also our common interests; recognizing the interests of our respective allies as well as our own.

It would be idle to pretend that there are not major problems between us, and conflicting interests. The tensions of the past 30 years have not been caused by personal misunderstanding. This is why we have indicated the need for extended negotiations on a broad front of issues.

Already, as you know, we have had extensive consultations with the Soviet Union as well as with others about the Middle East, where events of the past few days point up anew the urgency of a stable peace.

The United States continues to believe that the U.N. ceasefire resolutions define the minimal conditions that must prevail on the ground if settlement is to be achieved. We believe the Security Council resolution of November, 1967, charts the way to that settlement.

A peace, to be lasting, must leave no seeds

of a future war. It must rest on a settlement which both sides have a vested interest in maintaining.

We seek a settlement based on respect for the sovereign rights of each nation to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. We are convinced that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of substantial alterations in the map of the Middle East. We are equally convinced that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of anything less than a binding, irrevocable commitment by the parties to live together in peace.

MIDEAST ARMS SHIPMENTS

Falling a settlement, an agreement on the limitation of the shipment of arms to the Middle East might help to stabilize the situation. We have indicated to the Soviet Union, without result, our willingness to enter such discussions.

In addition to our talks on the Middle East, we hope soon to begin talks with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms. There is no more important task before us.

The date we proposed for the opening of talks has passed for lack of response. We remain ready to enter negotiations.

Since the United States first proposed strategic arms talks three years ago, the task of devising an effective agreement has become more difficult. The Soviet Union has been vigorously expanding its strategic forces; weapons systems themselves have become more sophisticated and more destructive. But as the difficulty of the talks increases, so too does their importance.

Though the issues are complex, we are prepared to deal with them seriously, concretely and purposefully—and to make a determined effort not only to limit the build-up of strategic arms, but to reverse it.

Meanwhile, I want to affirm our support for arms control proposals which we hope the Geneva Conference will place before this Assembly with regard to the seabed and to chemical and bacteriological weapons. We hope also that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty will soon enter into force.

We should be under no illusion, however, that arms control will in itself bring peace. Wars are fought by soldiers, but declared by politicians. Peace also requires progress on those stubbornly persistent political questions that still divide the world—and it requires other exchanges not only of words but of deeds, that can gradually weave a fabric of mutual trust.

We intend to conduct our negotiations with the Soviet Union soberly and seriously, neither encumbered by prejudice nor blinded by sentimentality, seeking to reach agreements rather than to make propaganda.

TALKS WITH CHINA

Whenever the leaders of Communist China choose to abandon their self-imposed isolation, we are ready to talk with them in the same frank and serious spirit.

For nearly a quarter of a century, the U.N. has struggled with the often thankless task of peace-keeping.

As we look to the future, however, keeping the peace is only part of our task. We also must concentrate on building the peace.

Let us be candid. There are many differences among the great powers, as well as among others, which as realists we know cannot be resolved quickly. But we also know there are five areas in particular of great concern to us all with regard to which there should be no national differences, in which our interests are common and on which there should be unanimity. These are:

Securing the safety of international air travel.

Encouraging of voluntary service.

Fostering economic development and population control.

Protecting our threatened environment.

Exploring the frontiers of space.

I. By any standards, aircraft hijackings are morally, politically, and legally indefensible. The Tokyo Convention has now been brought into force, providing for prompt release of passengers, crew and aircraft. Along with other nations, we also are working on a new convention for the punishment of hijackers. But neither of these conventions can be fully effective without cooperation; sky piracy cannot be ended as long as the pirates receive asylum.

I urge the United Nations to give high priority to this matter. The issue transcends politics; there is no need for it to become the subject of polemics or a focus of political differences. It involves the interests of every nation, the safety of every air traveler, and the integrity of that structure of order on which a world community depends.

CORPS OF VOLUNTEERS

II. The creative, dynamic kind of peace I have spoken of, of course, requires more than such basic protections.

To build this kind of peace, we must join together in building our societies—in raising a great cathedral of the spirit, which celebrates the infinite possibilities of man himself.

Such a peace requires a fuller enlistment not only of government resources, and of private enterprise resources, but also of the dedication and skill of those thousands of people all over the world who are ready to volunteer in the cause of human advancement. Our own Peace Corps has helped in many countries. I especially welcome the consideration the U.N. itself is now giving to establishment of an international volunteer corps. We stand ready to give this exciting new venture our full and enthusiastic cooperation.

III. As the U.N. looks toward the beginning of its second development decade, it faces a time of enormous challenge and enormous opportunity.

We can only guess at the new scientific discoveries the 70s may bring, but we can see with chilling clarity the gap that already exists between the world's developed and its developing economies—and the urgent need for international cooperation in spurring economic development.

If, in the course of the second development decade, we can make both significant gains in food production and significant reductions in the rate of population growth, we shall have opened the way to a new era of splendid prosperity. If we do only one without the other, we shall be standing still. If we fail in both, great areas of the world will face human disaster.

FIGHT ON POLLUTION

IV. Increasingly, the task of protecting man's environment is a matter of international concern. Pollution of air and water, upsetting the balance of nature—these are not only local problems, and not only national problems, but matters that affect the basic relationship of man to his planet.

The United Nations already is planning a conference on the environment in 1972. I pledge the strong support of the United States for that effort. I hope that even before then we can launch new international initiatives toward restoring the balance of nature, and maintaining our world as a healthy and hospitable place for man.

V. Of all man's great enterprises, none lends itself more logically or more compellingly to international cooperation than the venture into space. Here, truly, mankind is as one: As fellow creatures from the planet Earth, exploring the heavens that all of us share.

The journey of Apollo 11 to the moon and back was not an end, but a beginning.

There will be new journeys of discovery.

Beyond this, we are just beginning to comprehend the benefits space technology can yield here on earth. But the potential is enormous.

For example, we are now developing earth resource survey satellites, with the first experimental satellite to be launched sometime early in the decade of the 1970s.

Present indications are that these should be capable of yielding data which could assist in as widely varied tasks as the location of schools of fish, the location of mineral deposits and the health of agricultural crops. I feel it is only right that we should share both the adventures and the benefits of space. As an example of our plans, we have determined to take these five actions with regard to earth resource satellites, as this program proceeds and fulfills its promise:

The earth resource satellite program will be dedicated to producing information not only for the United States, but also for the world community.

We shall support the convening of a series of international symposia for reports on the work in progress in this field and on projections of future possibilities.

We shall cooperate in the establishment of international information centers to broaden the dissemination of satellite data.

We are prepared to work with other nations and specialized agencies in developing educational and training opportunities to meet future needs for specialists, especially in the use of earth resource satellite data.

We shall consider specific international arrangements for handling the data needs of other nations and specialized agencies.

We will be putting proposals to this effect before the United Nations.

These are among the positive, concrete steps we intend to take toward internationalizing man's epic ventures into space—an adventure that belongs not to one nation, but to all mankind, and one that should be marked not by rivalry, but by the same spirit of fraternal cooperation that so long has been the hallmark of the international community of science.

A survey of history might discourage those who seek to establish peace.

NEW AGE FOR MANKIND

But we have entered a new age, different not only in degree but in kind from any that has gone before.

For the first time ever, we have become a single world community.

For the first time ever, we have seen the staggering fury of the power of the universe unleashed, and we know that we hold that power in precarious harness.

For the first time ever, technological advance has brought within reach what once was only a poignant dream for hundreds of millions—freedom from hunger and freedom from want.

For the first time ever, we have seen changes in a single lifetime that dwarf the achievements of centuries—and that continue to accelerate.

For the first time ever, man has stepped beyond his planet—and revealed us to ourselves as "riders on the earth together," bound inseparably on this one bright, beautiful speck in the heavens, so tiny in the universe and so incomparably welcoming as a home for man.

In this new age of historic "firsts," even the goal of a just and lasting peace is a "first" we can dare to strive for. We must achieve it. And I believe we can achieve it.

In that spirit, then, let us press toward an open world—a world of open doors, open hearts, open minds—a world open to the exchange of ideas and of people, and open to the reach of the human spirit—a world open in its search for truth, and unconcerned with the fate of old dogmas and old isms—a world open at last to the light of justice, and rea-

son, and to the achievement of that true peace which the people of every land carry in their hearts and celebrate in their hopes.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH TO UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend President Nixon upon his speech yesterday to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

As a former delegate to the U.N., I am pleased that he used that important forum to enunciate in a constructive and conciliatory speech his views on problems the world faces today.

His appearance serves to underscore the continuing importance which our Government places on the United Nations, the part which it can—indeed, must—play in the resolution of today's tough problems.

I am glad that Mr. Nixon called upon the 126 member nations at the General Assembly session to join with the United States in the search for solutions to these problems.

While the President's remarks dealt with a wide range of world issues, including the Middle East, arms control, and other matters, his major emphasis was on Vietnam.

The President reviewed the many steps that our Government has taken in the pursuit of peace; steps which have brought too little response from Hanoi. He emphasized that the objective of our Government is to find an end to the war in Vietnam, an end fair to the people of South Vietnam, fair to the people of North Vietnam and fair to those others who would be affected by the outcome.

He pledged the United States when the war ends, "to help the people of Vietnam, all of them, in their tasks of renewal and reconstruction." In the name of peace, he urged all members of the U.N. to help persuade Hanoi to move seriously into negotiations which could end the war.

I congratulate the President upon his statesmanlike address. I hope that all those who are sincerely interested in an honorable and lasting peace in Southeast Asia will support our President in his difficult task.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to note the concluding remarks of President Nixon, for they offer all of us a worthy challenge and goal. The President said:

Let us press toward an open world—a world of open doors, open hearts, open minds—a world open at last to the light of justice, and the light of reason, and to the achievement of that true peace which the people of every land carry in their hearts and celebrate in their hopes.

This is a goal deserving of our support.

MICHAEL F. HARRITY

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, a man named Michael F. Harrity died in Mercy Hospital in the city of Scranton. He was one of the most extraordinary men in this century. He spent most of his life paralyzed, sickly, suffering, and yet people turned to him for consolation and help.

He graduated from the Scranton Preparatory School in 1950. It was his burning ambition to become a priest. He pursued his studies for the priesthood until 1955, when he was stricken with paralytic polio. He moved across a succession of hospitals, endured numerous operations, and finally returned to Scranton to the Mercy Hospital, where somehow he clung to the little bit of life that was left in him.

He watched his classmates ordained to the priesthood. He did not complain. He said that he understood that God has chosen to make his wheelchair his altar.

His friends came to visit him at Mercy Hospital. His friends sent their own friends who had never met Mike. They came away from his room astonished because they could never talk about his problems or his sufferings. He wanted only to talk about their problems, to see if there might be something that he could do to help them.

There is a story told of Francis of Assisi that a monk came to him once, and asked Francis how he liked the sermon which the monk had just delivered. Francis answered him:

I'm sorry. Your actions were so loud that I just couldn't hear what you said.

If the greatness of the ministry of a priest is to be measured by what he does rather than by what he says, then I think we can say that in his bed and in his wheelchair at the Mercy Hospital, Mike Harrity was a great minister of God.

There was only one thing Mike ever asked from his visitors—their prayers. And so I will do what Mike would do if he were here in asking that you pray for his departed soul. But I think that the prayers he said for all of us are far more valuable than any prayer we could say for him.

Mr. Speaker, I will append here two articles from the Scranton Tribune and the Scranton Times recording the death of this great and saintly man:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, Sept. 13, 1969]

MICHAEL HARRITY IS DEAD AT 37

Michael F. Harrity, stricken in 1955 by bulbar and paralytic polio, never really gave up hope that some day he would be a priest in the Roman Catholic Church. On Friday, Mike died in Mercy Hospital. He had fought the dread disease 14 years with a combination of faith, prayer and courage. He was 37.

Described by Mercy Hospital Chaplain Rev. John J. Turi as a person who never complained about his lot in life, Mike was considered a moving force in the lives of virtually thousands of persons stricken with polio.

Mike's studies for the priesthood began following graduation from Scranton Preparatory School in 1950. He completed two years at St. Charles Seminary, Catonsville, Md. and completed his philosophy at St. Mary's, (Paca Street, Md.). In 1955, just after he began studying at St. Mary's (Roland Park, Md.), he was stricken with polio, leaving him with only the use of his thumb and index finger.

Then began the hard years of suffering for Michael. He had four kidney operations; he suffered a lot with stomach trouble and couldn't breathe without the aid of a respirator. "But through it all," Father Turi said, "he never complained."

When first stricken ill, he was in critical condition in several hospitals in Washington, D.C. But following a stay of two years at Buffalo, New York's Chronic Disease Institute, he was transferred back to Scranton.

In 1958, Mike watched nine priests ordained into the Roman Catholic Church. If he had not been afflicted, he would have been the 10th. In a Scrantonian interview following the services he was asked about his feelings concerning the ordination as he sat chained to his wheelchair. "It was wonderful," he answered, "I enjoyed it very much."

Asked if he didn't experience any sorrow over his plight, he answered in a way which was his standard right up until his death. "It is God's will that my altar is on a wheelchair."

And even though his aspirations to the priesthood were never realized, during his years as a resident at Mercy Hospital he spread kindness and inspiration to many patients. "He loved to talk, even though it was a great effort," Father Turi said.

Mike, according to Father Turi, visited patients at Mercy Hospital whenever he could, spreading faith and never talking about himself. "He had a very good mind, and he was very capable," remembered Father Turi. "He was an inspiration to many people."

And during all his years of pain and heartache, Mike found time to work. Faith, linked with a determination to make the best out of his misfortune, enabled him to teach medical ethics to classes of Mercy Hospital student nurses. He also founded the Blessed Virgin Sodality for nurses at Mercy Hospital.

In 1961, working in conjunction with the March of Dimes Campaign, he was named chairman of mailers. He was in charge of the mailing of 54,000 letters to local residents for contributions to the efforts of the National Foundation to prevent birth defects, arthritis, and polio. He was in charge of a similar campaign in 1962.

He was always quick to express his gratitude to the National Foundation, Inc., which provided and maintained the expensive respiratory equipment needed to keep him alive.

Over the years the foundation provided Mike with a number of four kidney operations, special treatment, rehabilitation, and thousands of dollars worth of equipment.

Recently, according to Father Turi, Mike had completed a book on suffering and submitted it to a publisher but up to the time of his death, no word had been received.

Father Turi indicated that Mike liked the theater and went whenever it was possible. He went to the Pocono Playhouse Thursday night and when he died Friday at 5:30 p.m., it came as a shock to many of his friends at the hospital.

"I think," said Father Turi, "he knew this was serious, he had a great knowledge of medicine. He had no fear of death. He was resigned to the will of God."

Probably one of the most ironic twists of Mike's story was the announcement of an effective polio vaccine April 12, 1955, four months after he was stricken.

Born in Scranton, he was a son of the late Joseph and Emma Weber Harrity.

Surviving are three brothers, Rev. Vincent P. Harrity, pastor of St. Ann's Church, Shohola; Joseph C., Springfield, Pa., and Paul J., Scranton; a sister, Mrs. Elaine Pawing, Hamilton, Ohio, and several nieces and nephews.

The funeral will be Tuesday from the Vantson Funeral Home, N. Irving Avenue and Ash Street, with mass in St. Peter's Cathedral at a time to be announced. Inter-

ment, Cathedral Cemetery. Friends may call today 7 to 9 p.m., thereafter 2 to 5, 7 to 9 p.m.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Sept. 13, 1969]

MICHAEL HARRITY DIES; FOUGHT POLIO 14 YEARS

"If God wills it, that will be my vocation." Those words were spoken often by Michael F. Harrity after he was stricken in 1955 with bulbar polio while aspiring to the Roman Catholic priesthood.

Mike died Friday in Mercy Hospital at the age of 37 after fighting for 14 years the most virulent form of the crippling, paralyzing disease.

Following graduation from Scranton Preparatory School in 1950, Mike completed two years at St. Charles Seminary, Catonsville, Md., and received his philosophy degree from St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

It was when he was at St. Mary's that Mike was stricken with the disease. Paralyzed from the neck down, Mike was in critical condition at several hospitals in Washington, D.C. But following a stay of two years at the Chronic Disease Research Institute at the University of Buffalo, N.Y., he was transferred back to Scranton. "I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the people of the Chronic Disease Research Institute. I'll never be able to pay them back," said Mike.

From then on Mike made his home in a specially outfitted room at Mercy Hospital.

Never asking for sympathy he only asked for prayers. His religious faith thrived on his physical adversity. He ignored his own plight to immerse himself in compassion for others.

In 1958, he watched nine priests ordained into the Roman Catholic Church. If he had not been afflicted, he would have been the 10th. But Mike never gave up hope that one day he would be ordained a priest.

Mike was never idle. He lectured and conducted seminars and taught religion and medical ethics to student nurses at Mercy. He also was moderator of the Sodality of Our Lady of Mercy at the hospital.

Each Christmas, Mike sent an annual letter to friends and other polio victims. Throughout the years, the list grew to enormous length. He would explain his activities the past year, clearly showing what an invalid could accomplish through determination and faith.

When interviewed last March, Mike said that in an average month he would make five trips out of the hospital which included dining out, attending sporting events, lecturing and teaching engagements, visiting friends and relatives, and even taking in a few touring shows.

In 1961 and 1962, Mike was chairman of mails for the March of Dimes Campaign. He was in charge of the mailing of 54,000 letters to local residents for contributions to the efforts of the National Foundation to prevent birth defects, arthritis and polio.

Mike recently completed a book on suffering and submitted it to a publisher but up to the time of his death no word had been received.

Mike died at 5:30 p.m. on Friday. His death was unexpected and the cause is still not known.

Mike had been up to the Pocono Playhouse on Thursday.

Born in Scranton, he was a son of the late Joseph and Emma Weber Harrity.

He is survived by three brothers, the Rev. Vincent P. Harrity, pastor of St. Ann's Church, Shohola; Joseph C., Springfield, and Paul J., Scranton; a sister, Mrs. Elaine Pawling, Hamilton, Ohio, and several nieces and nephews.

The funeral will be Tuesday from the Vanston Funeral Home, N. Irving Ave. and Ash St., with Mass in St. Peter's Cathedral.

Interment, Cathedral Cemetery. Viewing, tonight 7 to 9; thereafter 2 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m. Memorial contributions may be made to the March of Dimes.

PRESIDENT NIXON A POPULAR PRESIDENT

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, complex, difficult problems confront our Nation today at home and abroad, problems which have been growing over the past several years and which will not be solved overnight. But President Nixon's strong, courageous leadership is doing much to bring about solutions to these problems, and the citizens of the United States are recognizing this fact.

An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of September 16 points up the positive approaches offered by the President's proposals for revenue sharing with the States, modernization of the postal system, and job training, and commends him for these "worthy goals" and his "pragmatic, practical" methods of dealing with the problems confronting the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point following my remarks:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 16, 1969]

POPULAR PRESIDENT

President Nixon, somewhat to his own surprise, finds himself a popular President. His public opinion ratings slumped, then rose again. Congressmen returning to Washington from their summer vacation report Mr. Nixon to be well regarded "back home." The nation apparently enjoys the cooling of the atmosphere under the Nixon regime. Inflation still threatens, and there's only a modest peace prospect in Vietnam; still the general public, so far, does not blame the President for problems he inherited.

This is intelligent and it is fair. Before long, Mr. Nixon will need to show significant results on Vietnam. And people will hold the President responsible for the uncooled inflation if it runs riot further. But for the moment, and while the sun shines, this pragmatic, practical President intends to make use of his popularity, in an effort to persuade Congress to enact key items of his legislative program.

We wish him success, because these items establish worthy goals, such as the sharing of federal tax revenues with the states, modernization of the postal system, and effective job training. Presidents have not found it easy to transfer personal popularity either to their preferred candidates or to their preferred programs. But Mr. Nixon can at least try.

Up to now the President hasn't made much use of the personal-endorsement technique. Maybe he didn't think he had the public with him. But now Republican politicians are telling him that is sufficiently popular so that he should play a personal role—speeches and pats on the back—in next year's congressional elections, too.

There was a time, shortly before last November's election, when Mr. Nixon's strategists, having taken a sharp look at the problems that would confront a president in the White House, very nearly concluded that he would be a one-term chief executive. Now

they look at his public image and revise their strategies.

But way this side of 1972, there are modernizing measures that ought to go through Congress. Mr. Nixon has personally tried to persuade Wilbur Mills and John Byrnes on the House Ways and Means Committee that federal revenue sharing with the states is a good idea. These powerful men are still opposed. So the President now may try appealing beyond them, to Congress and the public. Similarly the President will have to fight for welfare program, education policy, manpower training, and his tax reform version. The fact that the Nixon prestige graph hangs high—that the public thinks he has made an honest try so far—should help him a lot.

INFLATION'S HELPLESS VICTIMS: THE ELDERLY, THE YOUNG, THE FARMERS

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, inflation has dealt serious blows to three groups of Americans.

The three groups are the elderly whose social security and retirement pay have been made wholly inadequate by skyrocketing costs; the farmers and ranchers whose prices have not kept up with costs, and our youngsters. We are not keeping education funding up with the inflationary costs of running schools, even though the local taxpayers are already at the limit of their ability to finance schools.

I have already discussed on the floor the farm and ranch situation in relation to the general farm bill I introduced. And I have discussed educational problems in connection with the Joelsen amendment to meet the Federal Government's responsibility, as well as in connection with loans for college students.

I have not discussed our responsibility to older citizens yet, and I want to close that gap.

Older citizens on fixed incomes are often forgotten and their needs shoved aside. And now their rights are being ignored.

They paid for retirement benefits with dollars that bought one-fourth, one-half, and even twice more in goods and services as the dollars they are being paid back today. They are scrimping to exist. Millions live in deplorable housing; some have inadequate food. Though they were the builders of the very foundations of this affluent Nation many now can only look at the affluent society from afar. Their share of comfort for a retirement, bought and paid for in their productive years, is often meager.

Through none of their own doing, 25 million on social security, 1 million on railroad pensions, 3 million on veterans' pensions and compensation, and many, many millions more citizens on annuities are being cheated by inflation. Congress and the executive branch have both been dragging their feet on catch-up increases in benefits.

I am pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that the Ways and Means Committee intends to take up social security soon. It cannot

be too soon. Day before yesterday was far too late.

We have been taking care of pay increases for Government workers, Congress has taken care of its pay, and the President's. But there has been deliberate dilly-dallying about the old folks that cannot really be ended fast enough.

I was shocked at President Nixon's proposal to delay any social security increase until next April. We have an obligation to our older citizens now; it is dishonest not to acknowledge that obligation and speed substantially increased benefits to them at the earliest possible date, and certainly before winter weather adds cold to the other problems they must endure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be recorded as favoring action at once on social security, and all other legislation which will help the forgotten Americans in their retirement years.

CAUTION LIGHT FOR CRASH PROGRAMS IN SPACE

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

Mr. WYMAN, Mr. Speaker, as the time for fiscal 1971 appropriation requests draws nearer it furnishes the occasion for some straight thinking on the proper and advisable role for America's future programs in space. This becomes critical in view of the continuing debate over priorities in spending—or appropriating if one prefers the term—taxpayers' dollars, of which there are but limited amounts available.

One thing is reasonably clear both on reflection and on the record of the billions upon billions already spent in space. This is that it is much more expensive to attempt to meet target dates or undertake crash programs. There is no question but that America's first on the moon was a deservedly prestigious feat. No question but that it increased world respect for our technological proficiency.

But you cannot eat proficiency. Nor is it shelter against wind and rain. Nor does it improve conditions in urban areas in which living approaches desperation or futility.

More billions must be directed toward pressing domestic concerns than have heretofore been the case. This means something in the Federal spending spectrum has to yield somewhere.

If it is to be the space program, among others, we must be careful not to pare too thin nor to disperse a highly competent team of technicians whose morale was never higher than at this moment.

In this connection the lead editorial in today's Washington Post is interesting:

A SPACEMAN'S SENSE OF BALANCE

The report of President Nixon's Task Group on Space and, indeed, even the speeches to Congress of the three men who rode in Apollo 11 have brought some rationality back to the discussion of whether the space program. That report recommends that the President commit the nation to a "long-range goal of manned planetary exploration" aimed at a landing on Mars in the early 1980s, the mid-1980s, or the 1990s. Ac-

ceptance by the President of the basic recommendation would eliminate talk of abandoning manned space flight, which would be a foolish course of action, or of proceeding toward Mars in a crash effort to get there as quickly as possible.

It is difficult for anyone to reach any other conclusion except those who blindly opposed manned space travel or those who, equally blindly, favor giving it the nation's top priority. Space exploration ought to proceed in an orderly way, maximizing at every step the advance of knowledge and the utilization of it here on earth. In fact, it is not at all clear that the President should set a "goal" of a Mars landing in any particular year.

What is important is for the nation to push ahead on the immediate recommendations of the Task Group—exploring the moon, developing the tools that are needed for systematic exploitation of our space travel capability, and extracting from the space program more benefits for those of us who are earthbound. This means that NASA would continue its moon flights, perhaps reaching the day in the 1970s when semi-permanent colonies would be established on the moon's surface. At the same time, it would push development of a nuclear rocket engine, which would make long-range space travel more feasible, a space vehicle that could be landed on earth and used over and over again, which would reduce the costs of each mission sharply, and a space station to hold a dozen or so men that could be flown in orbit around the earth or the moon or, when the time comes, Mars.

This kind of program would keep NASA operating for a while on about the budget it now has. It would have the advantage of allowing the agency to keep together the remarkable team of scientists and engineers it has created by giving them new and interesting problems to solve. At the same time, it would encourage those in NASA who want to tailor the space program to produce more information directly useful in the solution of earthly problems—surveys of natural resources, weather prediction and control, and so on.

Although parts of the speeches the three astronauts of Apollo 11 delivered to Congress Tuesday were open pleas for money for future space flights, they were carefully balanced by the recognition each man gave to the needs of domestic programs for the funds that might otherwise be spent in space. The words of Neil Armstrong, the first man to walk on the moon, are worth repeating because they catch the spirit of the delicate balance that must be made between the dreams for adventure and the practical realities of life:

Several weeks ago, I enjoyed the warmth of reflection on the true meaning of the spirit of Apollo. I stood in the highlands of this nation, near the continental divide, introducing to my sons the wonders of nature and pleasures of looking for deer and elk. In their enthusiasm for the view, they frequently stumbled on the rocky trails, but when they looked only to their footing, they did not see the elk.

To those of you who have advocated looking high we owe our sincere gratitude, for you have granted us the opportunity to see some of the grandest views of the Creator. To those of you who have been our honest critics, we also thank, for you have reminded us that we dare not forget to watch the trail.

AIR POLLUTION ANTITRUST SUIT

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

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on

Wednesday, 15 of my New York City colleagues joined with me in calling on the city of New York to intervene in the Justice Department's air pollution antitrust suit against the major automobile manufacturers.

Our request was triggered by the Department's agreement last Thursday to a consent decree in its case charging conspiracy to delay development and installation of effective pollution control devices.

By accepting this consent decree, the Department of Justice is effectively sweeping the whole situation under the rug.

Now, the Justice Department spent more than 2 years gathering evidence before bringing suit and it must have felt that it had a good case. Why suddenly is it willing to let the automotive manufacturers hide behind a consent decree?

The most deplorable part of this whole mess is that, not only will there be no public airing of the facts now, but, under the provisions of the consent decree, no municipality or private citizen wishing to pursue a follow-up suit for treble damages will be allowed access to the evidence—evidence gathered by a public agency and intended for open trial. This is outrageous and we have requested that New York City insist in its intervention that, should the consent decree be accepted—as seems all too probable—it be amended to permit public access to the evidence.

My fellow Representatives and I have also asked that the city initiate its own suit, or join in an existing suit, in the air pollution area. This would make it clear that even if the Federal Government is willing to drop the whole issue, the city of New York is not. We also consider that the city has a responsibility to protect the rights of its 8½ million residents who suffer from a daily onslaught of noxious odors and pollutants from motor vehicles.

The text of the letter and list of signatures follows:

Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor.

Honorable FRANCIS X. SMITH,
President, City Council, City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: On September 11th, the U.S. Department of Justice announced its agreement to a consent decree in its air pollution anti-trust suit against the four major automobile manufacturers. This action effectively compromises rights of the 8½ million residents of the City of New York who suffer from a daily bombardment of noxious emissions from automobile engines.

New York has the dubious distinction, according to the National Center for Air Pollution Control, of having the highest concentration of pollution of any American city—higher even than smog-ridden Los Angeles—more than two-thirds of which is due to the 2½ million automobiles which use the City's streets each day.

Medical research has linked air pollution to the cause and aggravation of many serious diseases including lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma and other respiratory allergies, heart disease, genetic mutation and the common cold. The City is forced to spend large amounts of its annual medical care budget in treating victims of respiratory and pulmonary ailments.

High concentrations of pollution have al-

ready triggered several major city-wide catastrophes; the most recent, the inversion of Thanksgiving Day 1966, has been linked directly to the deaths of nearly 100 persons, and is presumed to be responsible for many more.

In 1966, the Mayor's Task Force on Air Pollution estimated that City residents were paying nearly one-half billion dollars per year in added expenses for the cleaning and upkeep of clothes and property and for the repair and protection of possessions against deterioration.

Air pollution and its attendant costs and problems has been a major contributor to large-scale residential and business exodus from the central city, from Manhattan in particular, with a resultant tax loss to the City.

The City's air pollution control program, on which more than 18 million dollars has been spent since 1953, has been thwarted in large part by the failure of automobile manufacturers to develop effective pollution control devices.

The Justice Department, in bringing suit against the major automobile companies charged that the manufacturers agreed to pursue research, development, manufacture and installation of pollution control devices on a non-competitive basis, that they agreed to seek joint appraisal of patents submitted by any persons not a party to the cross-licensing agreement, and that they agreed on at least three occasions—in 1961, 1962 and 1964—to attempt to delay installation of motor vehicle air pollution control equipment.

If the September 11th consent decree is permitted to go into effect at the end of the 30 day grace period, these allegations will never be tested in open court—and the evidence compiled over a two-year period by the Justice Department will be inaccessible to municipalities or private citizens interested in follow-up suits.

The City, which has purchased nearly 10,000 cars and trucks since 1953—the year the collusion alleged by the Justice Department began—has a responsibility to its citizens to see that their rights to a pollution-free city are not thwarted.

We therefore call upon the City of New York to intervene immediately in the Justice Department suit on behalf of its 8½ million citizens, requesting that the consent decree be rejected so that a free and open trial can be held. The City's intervention in this suit would express to the court the concern of the Nation's largest municipality in protecting the rights of its residents to be free from air pollution and stress the importance of this case to the attainment of that objective. This action would also give the City the opportunity, should the consent decree be accepted, to request that it be amended to allow evidence compiled by the Justice Department before bringing suit to be made available to the public and to speak out for the correction of other loopholes in the decree.

Los Angeles County has already intervened in the Justice Department suit. New York City, with a graver pollution problem, has at least an equal responsibility to take similar action.

We also call upon the City of New York to initiate separate suit, or join in existing suits, in the automotive air pollution area to make clear that New York is not willing to allow the basic issues of this case to drop, even though the Justice Department is willing to.

In recent anti-trust action against Charles Pfeiffer & Co. and several other drug companies, a settlement of \$120 million dollars was made in favor of municipalities, the Federal Government and private individuals.

The people of the City of New York are entitled to breathe the air that is free from

harmful pollutants, particularly those emitted from automobile engines, and we feel that the City has the opportunity to strike a blow for this freedom by taking immediate action.

Sincerely,
Leonard Farbstein, Joseph P. Addabbo, Mario Biaggi, Jonathan B. Bingham, Frank J. Brasco, Shirley Chisholm, James J. Delaney, Jacob H. Gilbert, Seymour Halpern, Edward I. Koch, John M. Murphy, Bertram L. Podell, Adam Clayton Powell, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, and James H. Scheuer.

GOVERNMENT OF CHILE HONORS CHAIRMAN OF MACK TRUCKS, INC.

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues an honor recently bestowed upon one of my congressional district's outstanding leaders, Mr. Zenon C. R. Hansen, chairman of the board and president of Mack Trucks, Inc., Allentown, Pa.

Not only is Mr. Hansen one of our Nation's foremost industrial go-getters, he also is a man who demonstrates deep personal concern for his fellow man. One of his humanitarian activities has just prompted the Government of Chile to pay him tribute.

Many of my colleagues have had the opportunity to witness presentations of coveted awards by foreign governments to American citizens who have performed outstanding services. Few, however, I am sure, have been as privileged as I to witness presentation of a foreign government's award to one of his constituents recognized for his work with orphans in a foreign country.

In ceremonies at the Chilean Embassy, Mr. Hansen received the Order of Bernardo O'Higgins in recognition of his work at St. Joseph's Children's Home in Talagante, Chile.

It came as no surprise to his friends, for he has been known throughout his life for his keen interest in youngsters, particularly disadvantaged. He is the longtime national treasurer of the Boy Scouts of America.

Chilean Ambassador Domingo Santa Maria made the award presentation. Father Joseph Doherty, founder of St. George School, spoke in appreciation of Mr. Hansen's work. Jorge Rizzo, a young resident of the home, offered the thanks of the children of St. Joseph's Home.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the remarks of the Chilean Ambassador and of young Jorge:

STATEMENT BY CHILEAN AMBASSADOR DOMINGO SANTA MARIA

The Government of Chile has entrusted me with the welcome task to confer upon Mr. Zenon Hansen, chairman of the board and president of Mack Truck Inc., of Allentown, Pennsylvania, "La Orden de Bernardo O'Higgins en el Grado de Oficial".

My Government wishes in this manner to acknowledge the valuable contribution of Mr. Hansen and of the company he presides to one of the most unique social endeavors

I know: "Hogar de Ninos San Jose". The children's home of San Jose, in the small town of Talagante in the central zone of Chile. If you allow me I would like to draw a parallel between the life histories of our guest of honor and the children's home we have just mentioned.

Mr. Hansen was born in Minnesota, and as a foresight of what his future activities in transportation would one day be, he showed from a very early stage in life an interest for travelling. We follow him from Florida where he attended elementary school to Iowa where he goes to high school. At the end of the "twenties" he travels in Europe and the north of Africa in the capacity of an active official of "International Harvester", establishing himself in Oregon at the beginning of the "forties", always with the same company.

About the same time a young Canadian priest of the Order of the Holy Cross arrives in Chile to work in a small religious school for boys under the name of Saint George.

The "fifties" find Mr. Hansen as an executive of transportation companies in Oregon and later in Illinois, while the young priest is taking over a parish in a Santiago district. The needs of the people in that particular district prompted the foundation of the San Jose home, but with a shade of difference from other institutions of this kind. From the start an additional end was sought, that of finding a formula which would allow the institution to finance itself, thus avoiding a permanent dependence on charity. To this end, the priest invested his own possessions in several "Mack" trucks . . . and started what has become today a prosperous transportation company whose profits cover the home's expenses.

While his company was growing and prospering his creator got in closer contact with the executives of "Mack" and who responded with ever increasing attention.

In the meantime Mr. Hansen had established himself in Illinois and was taking over more responsibilities within his enterprise at that time, the Diamond T Motor Car Company in Chicago. However, by the end of that decade, he moved again; this time to Ohio in order to run the White Motor Company of Cleveland, which he did until 1965, when he became President of Mack Trucks Inc.

The Government of Chile wishes to convey to Mr. Hansen, through the decoration we are awarding him today, that we share the gratitude of the home, of its promoters and beneficiaries, especially because they are helping an institution that not only seeks to shelter the homeless children, but also to turn them into men useful to society, giving them working opportunities within their own transportation company while supporting the home.

I consider it is proper to discharge this honorable task in the presence of you all, for I think you are linked in a direct or indirect way to the man whom we honor today. We have with us a small group of friends and collaborators of Mr. Hansen, among whom we see two distinguished congressmen. We also have a group of Chilean young men who received their education at the Saint George School in Santiago, the small school that the Canadian priest helped organize upon his arrival in Chile and which has become one of our secondary schools of higher prestige. Also present are three children from the home, in whose faces we can see the reflection of their feelings. With us is also a driver of the transportation company, and one of the most active directors of the foundation that manages the home. Someone else is also with us: the Canadian priest, Father Joseph Doherty.

In the name of Chile, I have the high honor of conferring upon you Mr. Zenon Hansen, the order of Bernardo O'Higgins.

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION BY JORGE RIFFO,
A YOUNG STUDENT AT THE SCHOOL

Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Hansen—Friends of Hogar San Jose: In the name of the big family called Hogar San Jose, I want to thank Mack Trucks, Inc.—that is Mr. Hansen and his collaborators for what you have done for us, because we, more than 100 boys and girls, are Hogar San Jose. Hogar San Jose is not an institution, not a boarding school—it is our home, our own home. It is an orderly home, and we are better off than most of our class-mates in the different schools which we attend.

We feel very honored that the government of Chile considers that what you have done for us is an outstanding service to Chile. That fills us with an intense desire to be worthy of this honor, by working hard to become good patriotic Chileans, real Christians, and people who know how to appreciate and feel grateful to our friends and benefactors.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S
FAILURE TO FIGHT WATER POLLUTION

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

MR. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 with the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act, we, in the Congress, believed that finally the Federal Government had declared war on water pollution. We all believed, and so advised our constituents, that the authorization for Federal assistance for construction of sewage treatment facilities—from \$150 million in fiscal year 1967 to \$450 million in 1968, \$700 million in 1969, and \$1 billion in 1970, and \$1.25 billion in 1971—would result in aiding our cities and towns in meeting the water quality standards which we had required to be established under the Water Quality Act of 1965.

However, we were mistaken. We learned again that authorizing a program does not insure that the program will be funded. In fiscal year 1968 instead of the authorized \$450 million appropriations were limited to \$203 million. In 1969, instead of \$700 million, appropriations were \$214 million. And now for fiscal year 1970 in lieu of the authorized \$1 billion, the administration in its budget requests asked for \$214 million. In my judgment, this is defaulting our obligations. We have promised assistance, instead the obligation for carrying out the water pollution control program has been shifted back to the cities and towns.

Perhaps the prime example of our failure to get on with what must be done is Lake Erie. There a once great lake is dying. Help has been promised by the Federal Government but it is not forthcoming under the present budget as proposed by the administration.

In the Saturday Review of September 20, 1969, there is an excellent article written by Peter Schrag which describes the deplorable conditions of Lake Erie.

The article follows:

LIFE ON A DYING LAKE

(By Peter Schrag)

North Central flight 940. We take off to the west from the Detroit Metro Airport, turn left in a large loop around the city, and emerge over the crotch of the Detroit

River where the patterned effluent spills into the waiting blue water of Lake Erie. Two weeks before the final countdown for Apollo 11, the supreme \$24-billion apotheosis of American technology; the greatest thing, Richard Nixon will say, since the creation. The brown waters hug the western shore, and beyond, through the thin haze from the Michigan stacks, the ore carriers cut white wakes to feed the factories. We cross the rectilinear fields of Pelee Island and pass Pelee Point on the Ontario shore to the north. Less than 150 miles to the south is Wapakoneta, Ohio, where the first man to set foot on the moon was born.

Man is destroying Lake Erie. [Says the report from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.] Although the accelerating destruction process has been inadvertent, it is as positive as if he had put all his energies into devising and implementing the means. After two generations the process has gained a momentum which now requires a monumental effort to retard. The effort must not only be basin-wide and highly coordinated; it must be immediate. Every moment lost in allowing the destruction to continue will require a longer, more difficult, and more expensive corrective action.

Prosaic language from Washington: eutrophication, secondary treatment, nutrient removal, algal blooms, biological oxygen demand. There is little romance in a sewage plant, and none in the technicalities of oxygen depletion, thermal stratification, or discharge of organic wastes. But the destruction of a lake is not merely a technical or a political problem. To think of it is to think of all America, of our love-hate relationship with our technology, about our ambivalence about who we are and what we are, about the Hudson and the Missouri, about the Santa Barbara Channel and nuclear bombs, about defoliation in Vietnam and DDT-poisoned fish in Michigan—about all the things we value, often in contradiction—in our past and our future.

As the plane descends over the murky waters along the Cleveland shore, the brown edging the blue, I have to imagine kids I know, kids like Corky Divoky years ago, scanning the skies for hawks and heron, or walking the ice in the winter, and now confronting the public servants of the draft board and the crusade for freedom in Asia. I hear the reminiscences of old men, telling fish stories about walleye and whitefish and blue pike, species that have all but disappeared. How much, you ask, setting down at Hopkins Airport, is this worth; how much is romance and sentimentality about a fading past, how much the price of progress, how much the comfortable guilt of safe men who can attack pollution as an undisputable evil (or war, or technology itself) while languishing in their benefits?

Some thirteen million people live in the basin of this lake, 90 per cent of them on the American side, the rest in Ontario, the polluters and the polluted, perpetrators and victims, all of them dependent on a body of water that according to the best evidence, is not yet dead but in danger. They drink its water, swim on its beaches, eat its fish, and sail from its harbors. At the same time, they, their cities, and their factories each day dump, leak, pipe, or drop into the lake several hundred million pounds of sewage, chemicals, oil, and detergents fouling beaches, killing wildlife, and imperiling the water itself. Some times you can smell and taste it as it comes out of the tap, sometimes you can see it on the beaches and often in the rivers—the Maumee, the Auglaize, the Ottawa—but most significantly, you fear, not what already exists, but what might—and could happen—if the process continues.

In parts of the western end of the lake, the blue-green algae, which thrive on the excess of nutrients from sewage, turn blue water to a murky green and accumulate in

heavy mounds on the shore; in Sandusky, once one of the largest freshwater ports in the world, a large fishing industry has been reduced to a couple of operators who truck their low-grade catch to Georgia (where, apparently, people are still hungry enough to buy it); and in Cleveland, the industrial stream called the Cuyahoga River is pronounced a fire hazard, a declaration that sounded hyperbolic until, last June, the oil on the river began to burn, damaging two bridges.

Cleveland's two fireboats travel the river periodically, hosing oil off docks and pilings so that the inflammable ooze will slowly make its way downstream and into the lake. At the same time, a broken city main is dumping twenty-five million gallons of raw sewage into the river each day. Periodically the main is repaired, and now the city, with a \$100-million bond issue voted last fall, is preparing to improve collection and treatment for its entire system and for the neighboring communities that it serves. (Cleveland, incidentally, may also be one of the few municipalities in the world that chlorinates its lakefront beaches so they will be safe for swimming.) But when it comes to pollution of the lake, Cleveland is more a victim than a culprit. Cleveland fouls its own nest with its dirty river and its inadequate sewage system, while Detroit, which dumps the waste of a huge industrial population into the Detroit River, stocks Lake Erie. Approximately 65 percent of the oxygen-depleting wastes in the lake come from Detroit; 9 percent from Cleveland. "When it comes to polluting the main part of the lake," said a researcher at the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, "Cleveland's hardly on the map."

And yet, in a way, everything is on the map. Everything contributes to, and suffers from, the condition of the lake: people in five states and a Canadian province—hundreds of towns and cities from Toledo to Buffalo: Akron, Erie, Cleveland, Lorain, Conneaut, Ashtabula. The federal government has identified 360 sources of industrial waste—power plants, steel mills, chemical companies, food processors, rubber companies. During every heavy rain, flooding sewers and silt spill into the lake, and even in normal periods silt and fertilizers and pesticides drain into its tributaries. But the greatest polluters may be the city sewage systems themselves. The federal government has estimated that with existing treatment facilities, the cities along the lake discharge effluent equal, in its composition and effects on the lake, to the raw sewage from a population of 4,700,000 people. Some cities are providing secondary treatment, some primary, some none at all. Lake Erie has been called a huge cesspool, an appellation that has at least marginal accuracy. What is absolutely accurate is the statement that in the past fifty years pollution has substantially altered the ecology of the lake, and that it has made the lake far older than its years.

The word, among the scientists, is eutrophication—the process of aging. All lakes grow old as they collect runoff and materials from the surrounding shores. Over thousands of years they eventually accumulate enough silt from erosion and organic materials to turn them into marshes and, finally, into dry land. In Lake Erie man has accelerated that process with his wastes and sewage. An excess of nutrients, primarily phosphates and nitrates, has produced great growths of algae in the water and impaired the oxygen supply, especially in the deeper water during the summer—and especially at the western end, which is hit hardest by the excrement from Detroit. (Biological degrading of the nutrients requires oxygen; when the nutrients are too heavy the oxygen becomes depleted.)

Mayflies, which once grew in huge numbers in the western, the shallowest, end of the lake, and which provided a food supply for fish—cisco, blue pike, walleye, and other

species—have declined; the water has been taken over by sheepshead, carp, and other types that are tolerant of low-oxygen conditions and whose eggs can survive the accumulation of sediments at the bottom. Some species that have surmounted changes in food supply and depleted oxygen now take longer to reach maturity. (The total volume of fish caught in the lake each year is as large as ever, but the catch is worth only half of what it was ten years ago; most of the fishing is now done by Canadians.)

On occasion there have been duck kills, flights of birds which have landed on oily water and never flew again, either (it is assumed) because the oil destroyed the birds' natural protection against the water, or because they were poisoned. (There has been some serious talk in recent years about oil drilling in the lake. So far the derricks of the Canadian Pacific Oil and Gas Company, which have been erected on the Ontario side of the lake, are producing only natural gas.) There is also a possibility that the algae, under certain conditions, can manufacture their own poisons, endangering wild life—and possibly human life.

Because the lake is relatively shallow, there is hope that once the rate of pollution is retarded (hopefully, but not certainly, through improved sewage treatment), the lake, with proper oxygen circulation, can recover, spilling its wastes into Lake Ontario and, ultimately, into the Atlantic. The certainty of that recovery and the effectiveness of the measures now being planned (which, among other things, include the removal of phosphates before effluent is discharged into the lake) are still matters of debate—and of time. What is not a matter of debate is that in the past fifty years, Lake Erie has aged 15,000 years.

Barry Commoner, a Washington University (St. Louis) biologist, who has long been concerned with the abuses of technology, writes:

The lake is threatened with death. . . . Since the area was first settled, Lake Erie has been increasingly burdened with organic wastes and with inorganic nutrients that the lake's algae convert to organic materials. These organic materials would long ago have asphyxiated most of the lake's living things had it not been for the peculiar power of Iron III [an iron compound called ferric iron] to form insoluble complexes with the materials of the bottom mud. The protective skin of Iron III has held the enormous accumulation of potential oxygen-demanding material in the muddy bottom of the lake. But this protective skin can remain intact only so long as there is sufficient oxygen present in the water over the mud. For many years this was so, and the layer of Iron III held the accumulating mud materials out of the lake water. But a serious oxygen depletion now occurs in the summer months. As a result, the protective layer of Iron III has begun to break down—exposing the lake to heavy impact of the accumulated algal nutrient long stored in the mud. If the process continues, we may face a sudden biological cataclysm that will exhaust, for a time, most of the oxygen in the greater part of the lake water. Such a catastrophe would make the lake's present difficulties seem slight by comparison.

The fear is that under existing conditions, Erie could, without warning, turn into a huge swamp. Among the officials of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), which is charged with enforcing pollution control measures, Commoner is regarded as a prophet of gloom, a false Cassandra who is trying to frighten people. Nonetheless, FWPCA paraphrased Commoner's statement in its own report on the lake. "Some of that," said one FWPCA official, "was a little exaggerated. We know that the Iron III tends to break down and to release nutri-

ents from the bottom, but there hasn't been any cataclysm, and there's not going to be one."

And yet, perhaps, that's not the issue—shouldn't be the issue. The trouble with conservation is that it has always been a matter of calamities and cataclysms. In the confusion of state, local, and federal anti-pollution responsibilities, there is always a large measure of sympathy for the company or the city that has to spend money for better treatment facilities, for the corporate taxpayer who might move somewhere else, for the time it takes, for the problems involved. The questions are thus always questions of resources, of priorities, of urgency and time. How much are fish worth? What's the value of a duck? What is the relationship between defoliants in Vietnam (or the price of automobiles in Detroit) and an acid discharge on the Cuyahoga or the Maumee?

If a major corporation can increase its earnings \$60-million a year by raising prices, then is the expenditure of \$18-million for new waste-treatment facilities at its plant in Cleveland something to brag about? How much passion and effort are required by the hypothetical impairment of a municipal water supply? ("The time's going to come," said an angry conservationist in Cleveland, "when they won't be able to put any more chlorine into the drinking water. What the hell are they going to do then?") And to what extent is water or air pollution a problem that only the comfortable can afford? The kids from Cleveland's Hough ghetto (and many others) rarely worry about swimming from polluted beaches; for them and their parents, urban pollution has other, more virulent forms. Their problem, among other things, is rats, not fish.

In the meantime, life on the lake goes on. In most places the problem is invisible; in others it becomes part of the background, an element of lore, like a volcanic mountain on a South Sea island. "People come here expecting to see a swamp," said a Cleveland newspaper reporter. "But there isn't any." On the west side of Catawba Island, near Sandusky, the cabin cruisers and the yawls luxuriate in their elegant marinas, and on the northern tip the Chevies back their trailer-borne runabouts onto concrete ramps for a few hours of fishing or a cruise to Put-in-Bay. At Huntington Park, just west of Cleveland, a kid pinches his toe on the beach and asks whether there's a species of crab that lives only in polluted water; and in Sandusky, Tony DeMore, one of the few remaining commercial fish operators on the American side, stands on his wharf and complains that the problem isn't pollution but overfishing and inequitable regulations that permit Canadians to haul what Americans have to throw back. "Now they're stocking the lake with coho salmon like they did Lake Michigan to bring the sport fishermen back, but they're driving out the small fish. If Lake Erie had been meant for big fish, the big fellow up there would have put 'em in. It wasn't pollution that drove the fish out. It was . . . nature. If somebody doesn't pull the coho out, they'll take over the lake."

On the Cuyahoga River, twice each day, the excursion boat *Goodtime II* takes tourists on a run of the industrial sites; a tape-recorded spiel piped over the *Goodtime's* loud speakers describes the adjacent activities of the Great Lakes Towing Co., U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, Sherwin-Williams Paint, National Sugar Refining, and Standard Oil. (No word about waste discharges, about the phenols and oils and acids that ooze into the river. "If you fall in," they say along the river, "you won't drown, you'll decay.") On summer evenings at the foot of the river, on the flats off Front Street, the customers of Fagan's Beacon House sit at their tables just above the ooze listening to Dixieland, drinking beer, and watching the ships go by. It is,

they say in Cleveland, one of the places "where everybody goes."

The lake is a presence, a landmark, an opening in the undifferentiated Midwestern landscape, a hole in the world. Every day the ships come through the seaway—the French, the Swedes, the Norwegians—unloading their cargoes on the city piers. In Vermillion, the lagoon, despite its murky surface, its oil slicks, and its junk, becomes a backdoor roadway to space. One ties his boat to the cleats in the back yard and takes the folks on a Sunday cruise; in Sandusky an octogenarian Negro sits on a pier with one of his twenty-one children, casting for sheepshead or carp or whatever cares to bite. The lake is not large, yet large enough to be infinite. It offers its lore of ships and waves and weather, the summer storms that drift across the water, driving the waves into the narrow beaches, perpetuating sailor stories and quarrels about which can be worse, the lakes or the Atlantic. Thus there are legendary events and records of disaster; huge steamboats that went down in flames, taking their immigrant passengers with them, Commodore Perry in 1814, Indians in their silent canoes.

The lake is life: Euclid Beach and Cedar Point, Catawba and Sandusky Bay, amusement parks, boats for hire, elegant summer houses tree-shielded from the curious roadway, beach-club privacy, and breakwaters spiny with the antennae of fishing poles. The beer cans collect between the rocks of the jetties, and behind them ragged rubber tires, twigs, and oily cartons undulate against the stones. A CLEAN BEACH IS A FUN BEACH reads a sign posted two hundred yards from Cleveland's own outfall of sewage. "Why can't we have swimming in Lake Erie?" the mayor asks his commissioner of public utilities, and so the water around the beaches is fenced in with heavy sheets of Dacron anchored to the bottom, the chlorine is piped in, and the black workmen rake the accumulated algae into little piles. On July 4 the beach is dedicated to safe swimming. "I have this vision," says a smart mouth. "The mayor arrives in a helicopter and climbs down a rope ladder onto the algae, while the Cleveland Orchestra plays 'Shifting Sands.'" Who controls this environment? Whose rights are invested in it? The mayor—in this case Carl B. Stokes of Cleveland—is accused of being more interested in creating an image through waterfront chlorination projects than in attacking the fundamental problems. After the Cuyahoga fire, he begins legal action to make the state enforce its own anti-pollution standards against the industries on the river (and perhaps to put a little pressure on the corporate managers); the state, in turn, accuses the mayor and the city of lagging behind in their own anti-pollution efforts: "It is obvious," said an official of the Ohio Health Department, "that Cleveland itself is a major contributor to the problems of the Cuyahoga River and that a major cleanup cannot be accomplished until the city corrects its own faults."

All the states claim that their industries are in compliance with state health and pollution regulations, which simply means that each year they issue a few admonitions, ask the corporations what efforts they propose to make, and let them continue to operate. "All they're doing," someone said in Cleveland, "is licensing the polluters. It seems that it's impossible for anyone to be in violation." (To which the federal people reply that industry is making more progress with waste-treatment than the cities.)

The buck is supposed to stop at the federally conducted enforcement conferences. Under the club of federal authority, all the states in the lake region—Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania—have committed themselves to upgrading their municipal waste-treatment facilities to the

point where 80 per cent of all phosphates are removed from sewage effluent before it is discharged into the lake. (Some cities are already behind schedule and have received extensions.) Detroit and Cleveland among others, are building new plants and collection facilities, using local, state, and a little federal money. At the same time, their officers are angry at the paltry federal contribution. While Detroit is scheduled to spend \$159-million and Cleveland has voted its \$100-million bond issue for better treatment and collection, the federal government spends barely more than \$200-million a year on pollution research and development for the entire nation. "The federal people are the biggest hypocrites in the bunch," said a Detroit official. "They go around the country making speeches. Maybe if they made as much noise about getting us more money as they do about dirt, we'd be able to move a little faster." The reply from Washington: "The people who are polluting are responsible."

So far, the lake has been unaffected, and there is doubt that even after the scheduled projects are completed they will be sufficient. In New York State, a Health Department advisory committee of scientists was asked the question: Will phosphate removal retard eutrophication in Lake Erie? The answer, in simple words: Don't expect too much. Nonetheless, FWPCA has committed itself to the process as a necessary first step: phosphates, which come largely from detergents, say the FWPCA technicians, are essential to the growth of algae and plankton, so (because it is relatively easy) phosphates will be removed. No one has yet figured out what to do with the phosphates once they are precipitated out. They will be trucked to . . . where? (Nor is it certain that nitrates, which flood into the lake from agricultural fertilizers, and other sources, are not major factors in eutrophication.)

"The scientists can raise all sorts of questions," says Murray Stein, who is charged with FWPCA's enforcement work. "It doesn't mean they aren't good questions, but every day's delay in studying means time lost forever. You can only hope." (In Ontario, the Water Resources Commission, which has its own problems, speaks about a "break-through" in sewage treatment—a chemical-physical process that is said to remove nutrients more effectively and cheaply than existing methods. But the process, so far, has only been tried under experimental, not operational, conditions.)

The FWPCA has estimated that it will cost \$1.1-billion in pollution control projects to arrest the process of eutrophication in the next twenty years. Some critics believe the figure is far too low, and a few believe that the job is already impossible, that the lake may already be too far gone.

Who controls this environment? Whose rights are affected, whose life? The issue of pollution creates its own bureaucracies, its own inertia, its own zones of indistinct responsibility. Even though there are federal laws dating back to 1899 that prohibit the dumping of oil and refuse into navigable waters, and even though the various states have established their own regulations, there has never been—in the memory of federal officials—one suit or one criminal proceeding against a polluter. "Pollution law is a little like antitrust law," a federal official tells you. "It's hard to establish a connection between discharges and damage." (Two weeks ago, the Interior Department began to show signs of impatience with the polluters. For the first time since the 1965 Water Pollution Control Act was passed, the government threatened to take court action against private corporations and municipalities that pollute Lake Erie and other bodies of water. Among those cited in the government's announcement were three steel companies—James & Laughlin, U.S. Steel, and Republic—and the city of Toledo.)

Whose rights are affected, whose environment is it? "Every year there's more talk," says David Blaushild, a Cleveland automobile dealer who heads a group called Citizens for Clean Air and Water. "The governor and the mayor come to the conferences, and make speeches, and go home, and the pollution goes on. You don't have to study anymore. You can smell and see it. It's time to file lawsuits. Why should people take this crap?"

Does the individual have a constitutional right to clean air and water? "It's going to take a disaster to wake people up," Blaushild says. "If this generation doesn't do it, the next generation won't know any better. They'll think that swimming in filth is the normal thing to do. They'll think the moon is supposed to be yellow. They'll think they're breathing clean air and drinking clean water, because they won't know any better." Blaushild writes the Cleveland science museums to ask why they don't take a stronger position against industrial polluters. (Among their trustees are directors of several local corporations.) One of them answers that Blaushild, by selling Detroit's products, has his own share of responsibility.

Who controls this environment? Pollution, pesticides, fallout. The world's experience with nuclear tests has begun to create a wholly new concept of civility and community. In a strange way pollution became a problem by analogy: we learned, for example, that the same ecological processes that concentrate strontium-90 in bones concentrate DDT in fish, that contamination in one place jeopardizes life in others. A bomb test in New Mexico kills infants in Mississippi and Alabama; pesticides on Michigan farms poison fish in distant lakes; sewage from Detroit fouls beaches in Ohio. One can respond cheaply by lamenting the fix that science and technology have gotten us into, but a bumper sticker proclaiming SAVE LAKE ERIE pasted barely a foot above a smoky automobile exhaust is more an illustration of the problem than a solution.

The burden of moral compromise symbolized by Hiroshima and Nagasaki will not be lifted by building a new sewer system in Detroit, however necessary that system may be. Technological amelioration of one facet of environmental destruction can be no more than a surrogate for continued acceptance of its larger and more catastrophic forms. Can one take seriously an organization whose interest in conserving fish is unmatched by a position on the ABM?

The questions are backwards: how much civility can we afford after we have paid for Vietnam? For the car? For our missiles? Can we sustain a decent welfare program despite the war? Can we clean the river without jeopardizing the profits of industry? Because we are trying to satisfy anew, though still unclear, sense of community with old priorities, evasion is inevitable. Which is to say that a professed commitment to protect an environment that ends with a squabble over sewer taxes is no commitment at all. The issue of pollution can produce a paranoid fanaticism just like every other; no one has died from swimming on a contaminated beach on Lake Erie or from drinking its water. Yet, somehow, if we cannot distinguish between fanaticism on behalf of a distant generation and that which defends immediate returns and private ends we have simply lost our claim to live.

As Barry Commoner wrote in *Science and Survival*:

The environment is a complex, subtly balanced system, and it is this integrated whole which receives the impact of all the separate insults inflicted by pollutants. Never before in the history of this planet has its thin life-supporting surface been subjected to such diverse, novel, and potent agents. I believe that the cumulative effects of these pollutants, their interactions and amplification, can be fatal to the complex fabric of the biosphere. And because man is, after all,

dependent on part of this system, I believe that continued pollution of the earth, if unchecked, will eventually destroy the fitness of this planet as a place for human life.

If the greatest thing since the creation is worth twenty-four billion clams, how much is the creation worth?

LIVING HISTORICAL FARMS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the American Revolution more than 90 percent of our people lived on farms and less than 10 percent lived in our cities and towns. Today, less than 200 years later, the situation has completely reversed with less than 10 percent of Americans living on the Nation's farms. As a result, interest in farming and in the history of American agriculture is growing as we seek to understand the vital relationship between the land and the people.

The Smithsonian Institution, under the direction of the Honorable S. Dillon Ripley, recognizes the great importance of agricultural history and has established a special living historical farms project, under the guidance of Dr. John T. Schleebecker, to study the development of a system of working farm museums throughout the Nation. These would be "living" historical farms depicting the various phases of American agriculture from early Indian farms to present-day mechanized farms—complete with historically accurate plants, animals, tools, barns, and dwellings—where visitors would be able to see fields being plowed, crops being sown and reaped, and animals being tended. The educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities provided by such a system of living historical farms are many and obvious.

Today, I am introducing a bill which incorporates the suggestions contained in the excellent Smithsonian booklet, "Living Historical Farms: A Walk Into the Past." This bill, developed in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution, is a very modest proposal. There is no attempt in this proposed legislation to finance the development of living historical farms. On the contrary, this would be done by local historical associations.

My bill would simply expand the existing Smithsonian program so that interested organizations would have ready access to expert assistance in historical research, planning and operation of living historical farms, methods of financing such a project, obtaining qualified architectural and agricultural advice, and designing the farm so that it would be of maximum interest and meaning to visitors. With this type of help, I feel that many historical groups throughout the country would be able to develop historically accurate "open-air museums."

In my own congressional district, the Shelby County Historical Society has taken the lead in reviewing the living historical farm idea and has given it strong support. Undoubtedly, many other

local historical associations will display a similar deep interest in this proposal. Clearly, a national system of working historical farms and ranches will someday be a reality, and it is my hope that the Congress will give thorough consideration to the bill I am introducing which would assure that the "open-air museums" which are developed are truly authentic re-creations of the agricultural life which has shaped our people and our form of government.

A GRAVE CONSEQUENCE OF MONETARY POLICY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a most important concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that action by the executive branch is urgently required to remedy the critical effects of current monetary restrictions upon U.S. industries whose products are used principally in residential and commercial construction. In view of the sharp reduction in construction caused by these restrictions, and the impelling public interest considerations that have arisen, I most respectfully urge every Member of the House to give this resolution his immediate and thoughtful study.

Every Member of the House is opposed to inflation and its crippling and destructive impact upon the economy and our citizens. Our only differences in viewpoint concern the remedies deemed most suitable to curb these effects.

Regardless of these differences, and there may be many, we can all agree that current monetary restrictions have resulted in a most drastic curtailment of residential and commercial construction starts throughout the country. Indeed, except for the so-called credit crunch of 1966, which marked the beginning of 3 years of restricted construction activity, the severity of the current construction decline is virtually without precedent in the three decades since World War II.

The National Association of Home Builders reports that housing starts will decline to a 1 million unit annual rate by the end of the year. Michael Sumichrest, the association's respected chief economist, states that builders are unable to obtain new commitments of money for future construction and that "the high price of money is forcing potential buyers to abstain from purchasing new homes and builders from building apartment projects."

Home mortgage costs, according to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, have risen sharply. In June, for example, they reached an average of 7¼ percent, three-quarters of a percent higher than June of 1968. In some areas of the country, home financing costs now average 8½ percent.

The flow of funds into savings and loan associations, which are the largest single source of home financing, has also dropped sharply. According to the Home Loan Bank Board, between June 26 and July 10, savings associations ap-

pear to have lost \$1.3 to \$1.5 billion in deposits. This compared with a drain of \$1.1 billion last year and \$2.1 billion in 1966. Total commitments for future lending outstanding at savings and loan associations continue to drop precipitously. The July 17, 1969, issue of American Banker reports the following:

FHA LISTS TIGHTEST PINCH ON FUNDS IN 3 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Housing Administration home loan program is caught in the tightest money squeeze in almost three years with only 62% of its offices reporting an adequate supply of funds, according to a government survey.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development Wednesday reported continuing increases in the cost of home mortgage money throughout the nation.

HUD said the number of FHA regional offices reporting sufficient funds to fill qualified loan applications was 80% on June 1.

The 62% figure on July 1 was the lowest since 42% in January, 1967, when the 1966 credit crunch was coming to a close.

HUD said the nationwide average interest rate on conventional first mortgage home loans increased from 7.75% in June to 8% this month on new homes and from 7.30% to 8.05% on used houses.

The survey also showed that secondary sales of 7½% FHA mortgages averaged \$93.30 per \$100 face value this month for an effective interest yield to the secondary purchaser of 8.35%. The effective yield in June was 8.06% on similar sales.

A significant related event was the President's recent announcement of steps that will be taken to reduce new contracts for Federal Government construction by 75 percent. The President also urged State and local governments to cut back their own construction plans for projects that are financed jointly by the Federal Government and State and local governments through grant-in-aid programs. At the Federal level, the President's program will mean, in dollar terms, a cutback in direct Federal construction projects of about \$1.6 billion during the remainder of the present fiscal year. As State and local governments carry out the President's suggestions and join in the cutback, the effects of curtailed construction will be vastly greater.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that these developments have had their principal impact upon citizens wishing to purchase homes, and upon U.S. manufacturers, including numerous small firms, which supply the products and commodities needed for those homes.

A prime example is the ceramic tile industry. This is an old, established and efficient industry, currently comprised of about 30 manufacturers, most of whom are small, independent firms with sales in the aggregate of about \$150 million. The vast majority of their output goes into new construction. During the housing collapse of 1966, 13 plants were forced to close their doors permanently. We cannot permit this history to repeat itself.

The tile industry's vulnerability to Government-induced contractions in the monetary market stems not only from its complete reliance on construction markets but also from the nature of the com-

petition it typically encounters from foreign suppliers, who account for over one-third of the U.S. market for ceramic tile. During the collapse of 1966, for example, the Treasury Department found that Japanese manufacturers of glazed wall tiles were engaged in widespread dumping of their products into the United States and was forced to take corrective measures. Now, the Treasury Department has once again instituted a major dumping proceeding—this time against the British tile industry. Imports from the United Kingdom increased from 8 million square feet in 1967 to almost 20 million square feet in 1968. As a result, the British doubled their share of the U.S. market by 1969 in a period of declining construction activity. This staggering increase was achieved by dumping at prices fixed and put into effect from the offices of a giant tile cartel located in the United Kingdom.

The U.S. balance-of-trade surpluses, which had averaged nearly \$5.5 billion for the first 5 years of this decade, changed by the end of 1968 and have, at best, been negligible in the first months of this year.

While exports have been increasing by 8 to 9 percent per year, imports have risen at more than twice that rate—24 percent in 1968, for example. An unfavorable balance of trade creates new inflationary pressures. It is contrary to efforts aimed at halting inflation to have imports account for a rising share of our markets, especially when American companies have substantial idle capacity stemming from the effects of monetary policies instituted to stop inflation.

The purpose of the resolution is to urge the executive branch to take immediate steps under the Trade Expansion Act, or under its general authority to negotiate voluntary quota arrangements with foreign countries, to effect such reductions in imports as are necessary to preserve intact the ceramic tile industry, and other industries similarly situated, until the current monetary emergency is over and free conditions are restored to the construction market. Since the Government's imposition of monetary restrictions has been the major factor contributing to the decline in construction starts, it is only fair that the executive branch utilize its other existing powers to bring about an equitable decrease in imports of the building products affected. The case of British tile would be an excellent place to begin.

All economists agree that there is a tremendous demand for housing throughout the country and that, when the period of Government restraint ends, there will be an unprecedented housing boom in which all can participate and benefit. If the needs of America are to be met at that future time, it is clearly essential and in the public interest that we have strong and viable firms in this country fully capable of meeting these needs. But, if many fine plants are forced to close in the meantime, we shall be hopelessly dependent upon industries in far distant lands that are either incapable or uninterested in meeting the dynamic demands of our citizens in the

quantity and at the low prices that are now available.

For all of these reasons, I most earnestly request all Members, on both sides of the aisle, to give their unqualified support to this most timely and important concurrent resolution.

NUCLEAR TESTS: BIKINI AND AMCHITKA

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, recently along with 15 colleagues I introduced legislation to suspend the series of underground nuclear tests scheduled to begin next month on Amchitka Island in the Aleutians.

My bill would halt these dangerous and possibly disastrous tests of ABM components pending a study by nongovernmental experts on the possible consequences of such detonations in a highly unstable seismic area. Amchitka, part of the Aleutian chain of islands off Alaska, is at the crux of an earth fault that runs down the west coast to California.

There is also danger that any earthquake touched off by the blasts could send huge tsunamis or tidal waves to Hawaii, California, Alaska, and other States. Tsunamis from past Aleutian earthquakes have caused immense damage in these areas.

Articles in the Washington Post have given details of the proposed Amchitka tests and the current status of Bikini Atoll that was leveled by an H-blast more than 20 years ago. Because of the interest of my colleagues in this matter I am including both articles at this point in the RECORD.

TWO ISLANDS IN THE NUCLEAR AGE: A TIME OF TRIAL, A RECOVERY—UNDERGROUND H-TEST WILL ROCK "LITTLE EDENS" OF AMCHITKA
(By Philip D. Carter)

AMCHITKA ISLAND, September 15.—The ancient Aleuts are gone, and wild flowers feast on the aboriginal mounds.

"Little Edens," an archeologist calls them; little flower gardens of the dead. But their season is past, winter is coming, and far beneath this distant, blighted island the Atomic Energy Commission will soon explode a bomb.

They prefer to call it a "device," just as radioactivity is simply "activity" and the subterranean shock and thunder as man's ultimate weapon blasts craters beneath the tundra will be merely a "seismic effect."

Yet, the test shot, called Millrow, has aroused public fears and even political objections. The AEC, however, seems certain that Millrow won't trigger a major earthquake in this earthquake region or send the great tidal waves called *tsunamis* crashing against Hawaii. The studies show . . .

But first comes the movie. Like others of its kind, it opens with a shot of Old Glory, blithe children in a playground, the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The message soon comes, voice friendly but muscular and firm:

"The maintenance of an assured deterrent against a nuclear attack on our country must be our first defense priority, and realistically our nation's primary priority. It is the absolute minimum required for maintaining our nation's security."

The theater where they show the film and brief occasional visitors is part of a great complex housing men and machines here at a cost of over \$100 million for the simple purpose of drilling holes in the ground and exploding hydrogen bombs.

The signs on the walls note the hours at Harry's barbershop, tonight's double feature, the fancy liqueur sales at Ptarmigan Liquor Store. The briefing officials are in their element, and they reply to questions with the weary patience of men privy to the deepest mysteries, most of them classified.

WILDLIFE REFUGE

Amchitka is part of the Aleutians National Wildlife Refuge. The facts are all on page 5 of "Welcome to Amchitka," a document prepared under Contract No. AT (29-2)-20.

"The fact that Amchitka is part of a National Wildlife Refuge makes it evident hunting of wildlife of any kind is definitely prohibited and any firearms landed on Amchitka will be immediately confiscated and held until the owner's time of departure," the document states.

Outside, an eagle soars against a startling sun, and the tundra, scarred by roads and drilling rigs, chewed and plundered in a hundred places, rolls away towards mountains, cliffs and sea. The printed schedule allows four hours precisely for seeing what may be seen.

There is too much to be seen in a year: rocks and bones, limpet shells and heath, feathers, fur, teeth and skins, scars and eagles' wings. Shimmering and refracted, the past and future of a race of men glances off the derricks. A drill bit whirls beneath the tundra.

"What do you mean, you don't have any control over the AEC?" the public relations man says. "Why do you think we have the vote?"

VOICE ON SOUNDTRACK

"As long as the means exists for another nation to destroy us, we cannot be without a strong nuclear deterrent," the voice on the movie soundtrack says.

On days like this, in places like this, it all begins to come home.

There are 75 of us, newsmen, conservationists, Jaycees, geologists, biologists, lawyers, natives, soldiers, state legislators, all flown west from Anchorage to Amchitka, 1,400 miles across the rough volcanic pearls of the Aleutian archipelago.

The weather is radiant, which makes for embarrassing public relations. The AEC emphasizes the remoteness and desolation of Amchitka, a rough-hewn place of near-constant fog and rain, home of the wild Aleutian winds called the williwaws.

No white man in his right mind would want to live here, and in the 19th Century, when the Russians came slaughtering after furs, they—like white Americans on the Plains—did their best to kill off the brown men they found in their way. By 1867, when the U.S. bought Alaska, almost all of the native Aleuts were gone.

NATIVES KNEW

But the natives knew how to live here. These ethnic cousins of the Eskimo fished and whaled from skin boats, gathered shellfish, and fashioned half-buried sod huts overlooking the coastal approaches.

When World War II came, the thousands of American soldiers who encamped here made dugouts of dozens of the huts and mounds and emplaced their guns on the same proud heights commanding the sky and sea.

The Japanese never attacked Amchitka. The men based here fought a few fitful battles to the West and then went home early thanks to the atomic bomb.

Behind them, the departing GIs left hundreds of Quonset huts and miles of barbed

wire, a potholed road, an airstrip, a rotting dock, and three tiny spruce trees, now called "the Amchitka Forest," which on this otherwise treeless island are perhaps the strangest intruders of all.

OTTERS WIPED OUT

Long before the soldiers came, indiscriminate hunting had reduced the herds of sea otters to almost nothing. Blue foxes introduced to Amchitka and other islands as a cash crop had decimated the Aleutian subspecies of the Canada goose.

Creation of the Aleutians Wildlife Refuge in 1913 helped undo some of the carnage, but the natural ecology of Amchitka was sharply unbalanced even before the war.

In the 1940s a handful of biologists and wildlife experts began the long hard task of undoing the past. And within 20 years after the war, Amchitka was emerging as a classic example of what can happen when a major ecological interruption is repaired and the balance of wildlife restored.

The island's sea otter population increased to its normal optimum, and the Aleutian geese seemed to be coming back after the blue foxes had been destroyed. Salmon spawned in the island's clear streams, and Amchitka's bald eagles coursed the heights.

HOLES DRILLED

Years have passed, and now we are here to be briefed. Eight exploratory holes have been sunk through the tundra, plus four "emplacement" holes for bombs, one of them abandoned when the drillers encountered a transverse fissure.

Besides these, there are shallower "satellite" holes for instruments, vast bins scraped in the earth to hold the drilling mud, and miles of instrument cables. On an island 42 miles long and three miles wide, there is room, says the AEC, for nine more bomb holes.

It all makes for a wondrous wildlife refuge. Down by the new dock in Constantine Harbor, 10 sea otters swim in a holding tank, awaiting transfer to a coastal pen a few thousand yards southwest of the place where in mid-October the AEC plans to set off its bomb.

There has been public concern about how shock waves might affect Amchitka's otters, so the AEC will station these 10 close enough to the blast to find out.

MYSTERIOUS STONES

The Commission has tried to be thorough, but mysteries remain. A team of archeologists has a contract to examine the Aleut refuse mounds and huts and burial chambers, and they have unearthed fresh secrets of the island's aboriginal past.

Perhaps, they say, men lived here far earlier than anyone had reckoned. They have found what seem to be grain-grinding stones deep beneath the Aleut junk piles, and they do not know who made them or how they got there.

The Aleuts had no grain. The archeologists are perplexed.

Off the coast, seismic crews from the United States Geological Survey are running last-minute checks of Amchitka's waters and the floor of the nearby Aleutian Trench. No one really knows what is down there, or what exactly triggers the devastating earthquakes that have shaken the Aleutians as long as man can remember.

A vocal group of geologists are concerned that, here in the heart of the North Pacific earthquake zone, a major fault runs deep beneath Amchitka. They are disturbed by the possibility—slim, but real—that a sizable blast would trigger some major upheaval. The government geologists review the evidence and seem puzzled.

MAJOR SURVEY

Scientists here from Battelle Memorial Institute, a major government contractor,

have conducted what is probably the most extensive bio-environmental survey ever made outside a major populated area.

They have infrared photographs of lichens and rocks and samples of every living thing. The point of their research is to determine the possible effects of a nuclear explosion.

But when they are asked what would happen if radiation accidentally spewed into the Bering Sea, they do not answer to the point. It seems their computer has never been asked that question.

But we are here for a briefing, not for answers to unanswerable questions. Millrow involves a 1.2-megaton device, emplaced in a hole 80 inches in diameter and 4,000 feet deep. Another hole soon to be ready for use will be 10 feet in diameter and 6,000 feet deep, but its megatonnage has not been disclosed. Nor has there been an announcement of how big the biggest bombs will be, or how many will be detonated on Amchitka.

SENATE RESOLUTION

Meanwhile, Sen. Mike Gravel (D-Alaska) has introduced a resolution asking that an independent commission of expert geologists with no ties to the AEC be formed to review underground testing. His proposal is still in committee.

Alaska is only now recovering from its crushing 1964 earthquake, and Hawaii whose Democratic Rep. Patsy Mink is also concerned—has had its own sad experience with tidal waves flung out of the northern sea.

The man on Amchitka who must cope with such eventualities is Dr. William E. Ogle, AEC's director of operations here. He is a scholarly man, given to talking in broader terms than are the cautious PR men who flank him. He is a man with an overview, and he has appeared on the cover of Time.

"If you wish to assume," he says with a small edge to his voice, "that the shot can trigger an earthquake of any magnitude larger than the shot itself, then you can imagine serious damage."

That is clearly not his assumption, but it is hard for a layman to know what to assume.

In 1950, government men came in secret to Amchitka to survey it for use as an atomic testing zone. For some reason, the island was not chosen.

In 1963, in secret, another crew came to Amchitka. After a secret fight, the Interior Department, administrator of the Wildlife Refuge, handed it over to the Department of Defense. In secret, a giant drilling rig went up near Cyril Cove.

After no public review at all, in 1964 the Defense Atomic Support Agency announced that Amchitka would be the site of a deep underground, low-yield atomic blast. The explosion, the Agency said, was designed to test methods of detecting underground nuclear explosions in the Soviet Union and differentiating between them and earthquakes.

OBJECTORS ASSURED

When objections were raised about the use of a wildlife refuge as an atomic testing ground, the objectors were assured that the shot would be the island's last.

The test, called Project Long Shot, came in October, 1965. The bomb was a small one, and shock effects did the island little harm.

Test over, the technicians pulled out, and although a great deal of the island had been scarred by heavy equipment and salmon spawning beds had been polluted and destroyed, the damage was not intolerable.

Senate ratification in 1963 of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty had intensified the pressures on Amchitka. The treaty did not cover underground tests, and the major signatories—the U.S. and Russia—accelerated their underground testing programs.

At first, the American tests were confined to Nevada. But, with windows soon rattling

in Las Vegas, it was apparent by 1966 that new test sites were needed. Amchitka was a convenient choice. For one thing, Howard Hughes didn't live there.

CONTRACTS IN 1967

In March 1967, the AEC awarded contracts for new holes on Amchitka, and by the end of the year the drilling rigs were in operation. Conservationists again complained, but the Commission pointed out that the island was only a "possible" test site. Under pressure, the AEC belatedly let a contract to Battelle Institute to survey the island's little-understood ecology.

Amchitka's fate, it developed, was directly connected to the state of the controversial program to develop an anti-ballistic missile. For a time, the new Nixon Administration deferred its decision on the ABM, but on March 14, the President announced the "compromise" Safeguard ABM system and the program passed the Senate by a narrow margin.

Millrow will be a comparatively low-yield test intended to check Amchitka's "suitability" for future testing, possibly of the ABM warhead. The AEC seems to have little doubt that it is suitable.

Those being briefed during this visit to Amchitka bring with them their own individual perceptions and concerns. Geologists mutter about fault lines, biologists ponder damage to tundra and otters.

State Rep. Eugene V. Miller, a squarely built Fairbanks attorney, is about as typical as anyone. "I felt about as helpless as a man with a sick goldfish as far as doing anything about it," he says.

"The premise is we have to do all this to maintain our security," says Kenal lawyer and conservationist Jim Fisher. "But we don't seem any more secure than when we started all this mess, and it's cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

"If that's true," he says, "it's not worth the life of one sea otter."

BIKINI ATOLL TIED UP FOR RETURN OF NATIVES EXILED SINCE 1946

(By George Zucker)

BIKINI ATOLL, September 15.—The first woman's land of the Atomic Age is ready to welcome back its people.

The Atomic Energy Commission reports this isolated Pacific atoll, ravaged by a dozen years of nuclear testing, has less radioactivity today than the U.S. mainland.

"We can't say there is absolutely no radiation danger," says AEC physicist Tommy McCraw, "but if there is we can't find it."

McCraw was among a team of experts who toured the atoll last weekend with a group of American and foreign newsmen. He said his atomic counter showed only faint signs of radioactivity, "less than in Denver, Colo."

Stripped of vegetation and badly scarred by 23 thermonuclear detonations between 1946 and 1958, the islands have sloughed off all visible effects of their former devastation.

Lush foliage has returned to the meager ring of islands, some 2,500 miles west of Hawaii, and its lagoons are clear and bountiful.

The rusted scrap metal and debris that littered the white sand beaches for more than 20 years are gone. A small force of U.S. military and civilian workers has been cleaning up the atoll since mid-February.

The 167 Bikinians who were evacuated amid weeping farewells on March 7, 1946, have since grown to 550 and most are eager to return.

The displaced Bikinians have been eking out a living on the tiny island of Kill, in the southern Marshalls.

Although rich in rainfall, Kill has no lagoon or sheltered sea approach. The islanders have been earning about \$20,000 annually

through the sale of copra and ladies' handbags made of coconut fiber.

Thirty Bikinians will arrive here next month to help plant coconuts, breadfruit and pandanus, making ready for the return of the others.

McCraw, 41, of Germantown, Md., said considerable testing has been conducted to determine the extent of lingering radioactivity. "There is virtually no radiation left," he said, "and we can find no discernible effect on either plant or animal life."

Radioactivity on the island of Airukiraru, across the channel from Enyu, where 13 nuclear shots were detonated, registered slightly below two microroentgens.

"An average reading on the U.S. mainland," McCraw said, "would range from 10 to 20 microroentgens."

McCraw said the reason for the low reading is that Bikini atoll rose from living coral reefs and has little natural radioactivity.

Responsibility for restoring and resettling Bikini is shared by the Department of Defense, the AEC and the Interior Department. The cleanup began Feb. 17 under the direction of the Defense Atomic Support Agency.

A tent city was established on Enyu, second largest island in the atoll, and workers cleared the tangle of scrub vegetation from the island's 4,600-foot airstrip, unused for a decade.

The first phase of the \$3.3-million restoration project was the removal of scrap metal and other industrial junk. Three hundred truckloads of scrap, all of it rusted or radioactive, were dumped into the sea or buried.

When the task force completes its work on Oct. 1, the Bikinians will fall heir to the tent city, the airstrip, a harbor, two barges and three landing craft.

The second phase of the restoration, already under way, involves the planting of the coconut, breadfruit, pandanus and arrowroot vital to the island economy.

George Nakanishi, who serves as district director of agriculture for the U.S. trust territory, has set up a nursery which eventually will yield 100,000 coconut palms to be replanted on the islands of Bikini and Enyu.

Copra, dried coconut meat, brings \$100 a ton.

The U.S. government plans to build a school, a community center and a warehouse for the Bikinians. A refurbished chapel already is in use on Enyu.

Also on the drawing boards are 60 three-bedroom homes the government will build for the returning islanders.

Bikinian leaders asked that they be of cinderblock construction with aluminum roofs. "Permanency is what they want," Nakanishi said. "Something solid."

OPPOSING CHEMICAL TESTS IN HAWAII

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosure that the Army has conducted four chemical tests of toxic agents in Hawaii has come as a shock to the citizens of my State.

The tests which were conducted in 1966 and 1967 concerned the nerve agent GB and the chemical incapacitating agent BZ. The agent GB, a World War II lethal nerve gas developed by Hitler is odorless, colorless, and kills by disorganizing and then paralyzing of the nerves and muscles. The incapacitant BZ slows down mental and physical activity,

brings on disorientation, hallucinations, and occasional maniacal behavior.

I am alarmed that the Department of Defense has tested these chemicals in Hawaii. I am dismayed that this was done without full public knowledge and disclosure at the time of the tests.

On August 11 this year the Department of the Army replied to my letter of August 4 forwarding a press inquiry concerning reports of tests of chemical and biological agents in Hawaii. The inquiry was in the form of a series of specific questions by Mr. Richard Hoyt, a reporter with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, who was unable to get his questions answered by the Army in Hawaii. One question asked:

Has the Army ever tested either chemical or biological warfare weapons or agents in Hawaii?

The Army's August 11 reply was:
No.

It added:

The Army has not tested either chemical or biological warfare weapons or agents in Hawaii. The Army has conducted limited chemical tests under strict safety precautions to obtain defensive information.

On July 19 I had written the Army asking for a complete list of all tests. The response on September 11 disclosed that four tests had been conducted. I feel that the Army's failure to give this information in its response 1 month earlier constitutes a disturbing lack of candor. Moreover, the disclosure that tests of these agents were conducted is in conflict with the Army's statement of August 11 that "no" tests were conducted.

I have written to the Secretary of the Army protesting this apparent contradiction and urging that all information on tests be made available to the public without delay or attempts at concealment.

The Army's statement of September 11 also said regarding the testing in Hawaii:

This was done with the concurrence and knowledge of State officials.

I have been unable to find any State official who knew that chemical agents were being tested in Hawaii, although I have talked in the last few days with many who are outraged that they were not given this information. It appears that the "concurrence and knowledge" of State officials were limited to approving a 5-year land use permit for jungle and environmental tests in the Waiakea Forest Reserve. I have been unable to learn of any prior disclosure of the nature of these tests to officials of my State. I have asked the Army to tell me who these officials were and to what extent they were advised of the actual nature of these tests.

The Army was asked by Reporter Hoyt:

Does the Army plan to test or store chemical or biological warfare weapons in Hawaii?

The Army's August 11 statement replied:

No. We have no knowledge of any such plans at this time. I cannot comment on future plans of any type.

I have written to the Secretary of Defense urging that no tests be permitted in the future in Hawaii.

For the RECORD I am including copies of the correspondence cited above. These facts indicate that tests of lethal chemical warfare agents were conducted in Hawaii without public knowledge and there is no guarantee that they will not be conducted again in the future under the same covert circumstances. The people of my State need to be fully informed of this matter and receive adequate guarantee that no such tests or storage of any kind of chemical or biological agents will be allowed in Hawaii.

The correspondence referred to follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1969.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This refers to your letter of August 4, 1969 to Secretary Laird concerning the delay in answering a press query on the storage of chemical and biological agents in Hawaii.

The information requested by Mr. Richard Hoyt of the *Honolulu Star Bulletin* was given to him about the 11th of August. The delay was occasioned by the need for extensive coordination within the Defense Department and among other government departments and agencies because of the intelligence implications and international interest in the subject.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the letter sent to Mr. Hoyt in reply to his letter to Secretary Laird.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. CAPEN, JR.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1969.

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Honolulu Star Bulletin posed questions to the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific (CINCPAC) concerning chemical and biological warfare in Hawaii. The following are their questions and the answers being given by CINCPAC at 1600 hours local, this date:

1. *Question A:* Does the Army have nerve gas or weapons containing nerve gas stored or stockpiled in Hawaii?

Answer: No. The Army does not have nerve gas stored or stockpiled in Hawaii.

2. *Question B:* Does the Army have biological warfare agents or weapons containing biological warfare agents stored or stockpiled in Hawaii?

Answer: No. The Army does not have biological warfare weapons or agents stored or stockpiled in Hawaii.

3. *Question C:* Does the Army plan to move the "poison gas" from Okinawa to Hawaii?

Answer: This Headquarters has no knowledge on this matter and is in no position to reply. I cannot comment on that question as the Army does not comment on future plans or operations of any type.

4. *Question D:* Has the Army ever tested either chemical or biological warfare weapons or agents in Hawaii?

Answer: No. The Army has not tested either chemical or biological munitions in Hawaii. The Army has conducted limited chemical tests under strict safety precautions to obtain defensive information.

5. *Question E:* Does the Army plan to test or store chemical or biological warfare weapons in Hawaii?

Answer: No. We have no knowledge of any such plans at this time. I cannot comment on future plans of any type.

6. *Question F:* Does the Army have any storage facilities in Hawaii capable of stockpiling chemical or biological warfare agents?

Answer: The Army has a limited capability to store chemical or biological warfare agents or weapons in Hawaii. There is a limited capability to store chemical or biological munitions on Hawaii.

7. *Question G:* Does the Army have any weapons in Hawaii capable of being armed with chemical or biological warfare agents?

Answer: Yes, the Army has weapons on Hawaii which are capable of delivering chemical or biological munitions.

Furnished by: Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

JULY 19, 1969.

HON. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army, Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Despite denials regarding the Army's participation in secret tests of nerve gases in my State of Hawaii, the belief that these tests have been conducted persist.

It would be most helpful to re-establish credibility if you would release the full and complete list of all test sites used by the Army in the last 20 years for testing of chemical-biological warfare substances, both offensive and defensive.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1969.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. MINK: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry concerning the nerve gas testing in Hawaii.

To the best of our knowledge, the Army has not denied that nerve agent tests have been conducted in the past in Hawaii.

For reasons of national security, the Army cannot release lists of all test sites used in the past. Limited small-scale testing of chemical nerve agent and incapacitating agent has been conducted in Hawaii. This was done with the concurrence and knowledge of State officials.

Four chemical tests were conducted on the Island of Hawaii at an Army jungle environment test site in the Waiakea forest reserve. Three of the tests involved the non-persistent nerve agent GB and were conducted during April-June 1966, March-April 1967, and April-May 1967. One test involved the non-persistent chemical incapacitating agent BZ and was conducted during May-June 1966. All of the testing was open-air and was conducted in a 1.5 square mile area.

All the tests were conducted within a fenced and regularly patrolled area, seven miles from the nearest habitation through thick jungle. Releases of the agents were made under strictly observed safety and meteorological conditions. Sampling devices placed throughout the area proved that the toxic material remained within the fenced area on every trial.

There has been no testing of biological research agents in the State of Hawaii in the past nor are there any plans to do so.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. REID,
Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of
Legislative Liaison.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1969.

HON. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 11, 1969, in response to an inquiry, the Department of the Army informed me that it has never tested either chemical or biological warfare weapons or agents in Hawaii.

One month later, in response to my in-

quiry of July 19, 1969, the Army has informed me "Four chemical tests were conducted on the island of Hawaii at an Army jungle environmental test site in the Waiakea forest reserve." These were during 1966 and 1967 according to your new statement.

I enclose copies of both Army letters for your information.

The news that the Army has conducted chemical tests in Hawaii comes as an apparent contradiction of the Army's previous statement that it has conducted no tests. I am surprised and disturbed by what appears to be a conflict between Army statements on two different dates.

Since these tests were conducted, the Army should have been more responsive to the issue in its statement of August 11. That inquiry was initiated by Mr. Richard Hoyt, a reporter with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in Hawaii, and I forward it to Defense Secretary Laird at Mr. Hoyt's request when he had received no response from the Army for two weeks.

As an opponent of the public danger of chemical and biological warfare tests, I protest the Army's lack of candor in this instance. Our citizens are entitled to know the dangers to which they may be exposed and the extent of safeguards taken. I am glad that the Army has now disclosed the facts in this matter, but this type of information should be made available to the public without delay or attempts at concealment.

I would appreciate knowing what State officials concurred with and had knowledge of these tests. I respectfully request that you provide me with this information.

Thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1969.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know the Army has disclosed four tests of chemical agents in Hawaii.

On August 11, in response to a press inquiry, the Army said with respect to future tests or storage of chemical or biological warfare agents in Hawaii: "We have no knowledge of any such plans at this time. I cannot comment on future plans of any type."

I protest the past testing and respectfully request your assistance in obtaining a guarantee that no future testing or storage of chemical or biological agents be permitted in the future.

Our citizens were not informed of the four tests in 1966 and 1967 of toxic agents and therefore were unable to protect themselves from possible adverse effects. The health and safety of the people of Hawaii require that the guarantee which I have requested be promptly issued.

Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will consider a piece of legislation which may hold a key to a practical, rational, and permanent solution of the controversy over budget priorities and over military versus domestic budget allocations. I am referring to H.R. 474, a bill to create a Government Procurement Commission which would be empowered to investigate procurement prob-

lems and procedures on a government-wide basis, and to make recommendations to the Congress for permanent improvements in the cost control and efficiency of the Federal Government's \$55 billion annual purchase from the private sector.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable and respected Members of this body, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, who is the prime sponsor of this bill, enunciated in the clearest and most compelling language the reasons for prompt enactment of this bill. At the luncheon of the National Security Industrial Association at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, he spoke plainly and directly to the issue of budget priorities as it relates to a modern, effective, and efficient Federal procurement structure. I would urge each of my colleagues to read Mr. HOLIFIELD's remarks carefully, for I have seen no better preparation for understanding the bill that will be before us next week. Upon reading his remarks, I think every Member will appreciate why they were received yesterday noon with a standing ovation.

Before inserting Mr. HOLIFIELD's speech, Mr. Speaker, I should add that last evening, in an address before the same association, Defense Secretary Laird praised our colleague's efforts in shepherding this bill through the House, and reiterated his Department's strong endorsement of a Government Procurement Commission.

The text of Mr. HOLIFIELD's remarks follows:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the National Security Industrial Association:

I am happy to be able to spend a few moments with you, enjoy your luncheon hospitality, and report on a matter of immediate interest. I refer to H.R. 474, the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. As I advised Charlie Weaver of Westinghouse back in June, after he invited me to speak to your association, the Commission on Government Procurement would be the subject of my remarks.

H.R. 474 was reported favorably on August 12, 1969, by the House Committee on Government Operations. The next legislative step, when a bill is reported from the Committee, is to request a resolution from the Committee on Rules, which authorizes the bill to be brought to the floor. This we did, and following the August recess, a rule was granted—on September 9 to be exact.

The outlook, as I see it, is this: H.R. 474 will be considered by the House in a matter of days. The bill will be passed. The Senate will follow suit—and if we don't move quickly, they will beat us to the punch. This is an idea whose political time has come.

A study commission is not exactly a new idea. Commissions are old hat in the American experience. But a commission distinctively and exclusively dedicated to Government procurement is new. We've never had one before. We will get one soon.

As you know, we reported a similar bill from the Committee on Government Operations two years ago. The time wasn't quite right. The need was there, but lacking was the politics of acceptance. There were misconceptions about what we were trying to do. The bill died in the Committee on Rules for lack of action.

This time we had a better reception. I was all set to explain to the Committee on Rules why the times had changed, and why they should give H.R. 474 the green light for floor

action, but they didn't want to hear about it. They were all on my side.

Had questions been raised in the Committee on Rules about the bill, I would have said something along the lines of my remarks today. The situation is worth analyzing. It is part of the legislative background of H.R. 474.

These remarks will serve to explain why a modest legislative proposal to set up a study group in Government procurement went from complete stall into high acceleration. This change tells us something about the procurement situation and the legislative environment today.

In the first place, action by the Committee on Government Operations on H.R. 474 was unanimous, whereas last time there were some dissenting voices. The bill now has complete bipartisan support within our committee, without any qualifications or exceptions whatsoever. Unanimity in a committee doesn't guarantee unanimity in the whole House, but it sure helps in getting favorable action.

Secondly, I have discussed this matter with Chairman Rivers of the House Armed Services Committee, and I believe he fully understands my position that the work of this Commission will be helpful to all committees, including the Armed Services Committee. That committee, as you know, has a big job on its hands with the military authorization bill and, looking down the road a bit, it needs all the help it can get through informed studies of the procurement process.

Thirdly, we have developed a much more substantial hearing record on the bill than we did last time. In the second round the bill was referred to the Military Operations Subcommittee (previously it had been handled by the Reorganization Subcommittee). We held 33 separate sessions and heard about 100 expert witnesses from Government, industry, professional and other organizations. Seventeen Government departments and agencies were represented.

It was not our purpose, nor within our means, to do the kind of job that the Commission would be mandated to do. But we wanted to go into these problems deeply enough to identify real issues and not just talk in generalities. The hearings are printed in nine separate parts, and we have received many requests for copies. I believe this extensive hearing record will be of interest and help to the Commission when it is established. Our hearing record may be considered, in one sense, a point of departure for the Commission's work.

The fourth point is that the Senate helped to crystallize the issue. Last time the Senate took no action but deferred to the House. The general idea was that since this was a House bill, it was up to us to take the initiative, and the Senate would act only after we did.

This time the Senate was not inclined to wait until final House passage. The Senate Committee on Government Operations held a brief hearing on Senator Jackson's companion bill, S. 1707, following our own extensive hearings on H.R. 474. I am advised that the Senate Committee is scheduled to sit this morning to mark up the bill. Personally, I would hope that the House acts on the bill before the Senate. In any event, favorable action is expected on both sides.

The fifth point is a noticeable change in heart among the executive departments and agencies. Last time most of them were rather lukewarm about the bill. Now they have expressed strong support—and this includes the major civil as well as the military departments.

This is another way of saying that the procurement study proposed in the bill is Government-wide. It is not limited to the military. The Defense establishment spends the bulk of the monies, but increasingly the civilian departments and agencies are being

thrust into the procurement process as they cope with the difficult problems of urbanized society. They are expanding their procurements of technical goods and services in such fields as health, housing, education, transportation, and crime prevention and control. The civil departments and agencies have a lot to learn by way of procurement training, organization and procedures, and there is a need for coordination among them. Not surprisingly, this bill is warmly endorsed by the Secretaries of the newer departments like DOT, HEW and HUD.

On the military side, Secretary Melvin Laird, our former colleague, has stated unequivocally that creation of a Commission on Government Procurement will be helpful to his department. He endorses this bill.

It is true that the Secretary has set up a so-called Blue Ribbon Panel to study various defense matters, including procurement. These other matters include departmental organization, command and control, research and development, and whatever else is assigned by the Secretary. The panel is too limited in tenure (one year) and too diverse in membership to give the time and bring the expertise to a comprehensive study of procurement that is contemplated in our bill. Moreover, the Blue Ribbon Panel does not have jurisdiction over the civil agencies, as does the proposed Commission. In sum, the Commission on Government Procurement would complement rather than compete with the Blue Ribbon Panel, and Secretary Laird has made this very clear.

The sixth point is that the need for a Commission is more graphically shown as cost overruns and contract performance problems are highlighted daily in the press and in the pages of the Congressional Record. Government procurement has become a major issue. With a Commission we can do something constructive about these problems. At least we can give it a serious try, and not be faced with the situations where procurement policies are legislated from the floor, in hasty, improvised fashion, without hearings or careful committee deliberations. What is happening in the Senate debate on the military procurement authorization bill for FY 1970 illustrates the point. More than two dozen amendments were introduced, and a number of them were adopted by the Senate. The House is yet to act, but some of these amendments would have far-reaching significance if finally enacted into law.

With all this furor over cost overruns and reported procurement mistakes, something is bound to be done. The demand is loudly heard for more stringent controls. The danger is that well-meaning but misguided efforts in some quarters will do more harm than good. We have already seen some evidence of this. Whereas the choice last time was between a Commission and no Commission, the choice now is between a Commission for constructive change and quick-fix legislative amendments from the floor—legislation that is uncoordinated, going off in all directions, not carefully thought out, compounding the ultimate problems that must be solved.

The seventh point is that we need a Commission for an important symbolic reason—to restore confidence among the people in the basic soundness of our Government (and particularly our military) institutions. One way to restore confidence is to let the people know that a serious and systematic study will be made—by experts—of the way the Government conducts its business and spends the taxpayers' dollars.

And not only a study, but findings and recommendations which can lead to definite improvements. It has become trite by repetition, but it is still true to say that when the Government spends \$55 billion a year for goods and services, even one percent im-

provement leads to savings in the hundreds of millions.

The eighth point, finally, is that public interest in the Commission proposal has broadened noticeably since the bill was first reported out almost two years ago. I refer not only to the strong support in the Congress and the Executive, but among professional, industrial, technical and business organizations of different kinds. This includes the National Security Industrial Association, and I want you to know that your support is welcomed and appreciated.

The unanimity of support does not mean all are agreed on the course of action and the right solution to the problems. The unanimity signifies that there are many problems that demand attention and that a concerted effort should be made to resolve them. In the committee report we highlight some 27 major problem areas in Government procurement. These are intended to be illustrative rather than prescriptive of the Commission's work, since the Commission will order its own priorities, according to its resources and collective judgment.

A further word about the Commission and its work. As proposed in H.R. 474, this will be a mixed Commission, with plural appointing authorities—the President and the presiding officer of each House. In this way it will have a blend of experience and expertise from different sources—the Congress, the Executive branch, and persons from private life. We make the point strongly in the committee report on H.R. 474, and I want to emphasize it again as my view, that we want a *working* Commission, not a window-dressing Commission. I would hope that the appointing authorities take this observation to heart and mind.

You know that commissions are established for all sorts of reasons—sometimes to study a problem to death rather than solve it; sometimes to give prestige and publicity to a preconceived policy or position; sometimes to do a straight-forward job of fact-finding, analysis and problem solving. As far as this Commission is concerned, there is no buckpassing to be done and no preconceived positions to be affirmed. We want a Commission that is objective and impartial. Its job will be to review and re-evaluate the procurement statutes, now 20 years old or more, the great mass of detailed procurement regulations, the procurement procedures and practices in many departments and agencies of Government.

This review and re-evaluation, as I see it, should do more than examine the rules of the game—the laws, regulations, procedures and practices. The Commission should examine the inner workings of the procurement process, the substantive issues—what we buy, how we buy, from whom we buy, whether we are getting our money's worth, and how we can do better in the future.

The Commission proposed in H.R. 474 would have a two-year tenure. How much work it can do in that time, how large a staff it will have, how its priorities of work will be arranged, will depend in large part on the resources made available. Funds for the Commission will have to be obtained by a separate appropriation. Departments and agencies are called upon by express terms of the bill to cooperate with the Commission's work and provide assistance on such terms as are arranged between the Commission and the cooperating agency. The Comptroller General is ex officio a member of the Commission and, of course, we expect that the General Accounting Office will be among those agencies which provide staff resources.

For a moment let me put the projected work of the Commission in broader perspective. We stand on the threshold of a new decade. There is a great questioning in the land, a searching and groping for new answers to old problems. Institutions of every kind are coming under critical scrutiny, even the most

venerable and traditional ones in American life. The churches, the labor unions, corporations, agencies of Government, schools and colleges—all have heard the voices of dissent and seen in their own halls the manifestations of protest, whether peaceful or violent.

The questioning and the criticism show up in the halls of Congress as well. The old tradition of respectful silence by the freshman member of Congress no longer holds. Committees and their chairman are no longer taken as the fount of all wisdom. There is a demand for more information, more timely information, more accurate information, more complete information, more widely disseminated information. These demands must be complied with, not only by the committees who are trying to preserve their jurisdictional responsibilities, but by the departments that expect the Congress to vote yearly authorization and funding measures.

In this case the demands for more and better information point largely to the Department of Defense. It is not only the largest spender of public funds, but the least exposed to public view because so many of its activities are classified. Nevertheless, the veil of secrecy is being lifted here and there, and justification is demanded for what was accepted before without question.

There is questioning because defense decisions have public impact. Will an ABM site be located in our backyard? Will the testing or transportation of war chemicals endanger our community? How long will the Vietnam war continue to take our sons and our tax dollars?

There is economic impact. Military spending or the lack of it, hits wide and deep—in communities, regions, the national economy, the whole world. A military weapon system today is not merely a gun or a tank or a plane, or any number of them. A weapon system today is more likely to be a multi-billion-dollar proposition, a proposition which involves the jobs and careers of thousands upon thousands of persons, which affects inflation and the balance of payments. It may take 7 or 10 years to bring to fruition.

There is a strategic impact. The weapon system we build, or do not build, shapes a whole military strategy of offense and defense. It influences relationships with our allies and negotiations with our adversaries. To paraphrase a famous statement: Weapon systems, like war, have become too important to be left to the military. And so the Congress insists on getting more fully into the act.

This new concern and involvement of the Congress can be bad and good. It is bad if reasoned debate gives way to emotional binges, and if the committee system of Congress is undermined in the process. It is bad if it interferes with orderly planning and funding and executive responsibilities in procurement. It is good to the extent that the debate is informed and members of Congress become better educated to the issues upon which, in the final analysis, they have to vote yea or nay.

The Commission on Government Procurement can help in this informing process. It can develop a body of information which will be turned over to the committees of Congress, who can take it from there. On their own, the committees of jurisdiction are so loaded with recurring chores that no one of them is in a position, whether in terms of jurisdiction or resources, to make a searching and systematic study of Government procurement in all its ramifications. The Commission can not only help the committees to do their work, but it can help the Congress and the public to better understand what procurement is all about and why we have so many problems today.

I will grant you that many characterizations we hear in the press and on the floor of Congress regarding Government-industry relationships are unfair. They are unfair but

they do exist. The Government is under an obligation to take the lead in examining this relationship and assuring that it is, or will be, maintained in such a fashion as to protect the public interest and safeguard the national security.

The Government has that obligation, but industry, too, has an obligation. After all, industry is the other half of the team—or complex, if you like. Industry has most of the expertise and the know-how, and if the Congress and the public lack confidence in military judgment of procurement matters, that is one step away from saying they lack confidence in industry judgment.

The industry part of the complex is in a tougher position. The military managers and their civilian helpers, whatever their mistakes of judgment, are supposed to be dedicated to the national defense. The industry managers, for their part, are interested not only in the national defense but interested in making a buck or two.

In wars of the past, there were good old profiteering scandals. In wars of the present, with such legislative tools of the procurement trade as the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Renegotiation Act, profiteering is not much in evidence, and substitute issues are sought. I would say that the cost overruns so heavily emphasized on the contemporary scene are the moral equivalent, in the public mind, of old-fashioned war profiteering.

The first pressing obligation of industry as well as Government, therefore, seems to be cost control. They need to get on top of this cost estimating business. If the experts can't reasonably tell what a system will cost, this opens up other areas of judgment to questioning. When the price of a military aircraft jumps from the original estimate by 50 to 100 percent, inevitably questions will be raised about the justification for the aircraft itself. And pretty soon a questioning public, an investigating committee, or a probing newspaperman, uncovers all kinds of seamy practices in the military. Industry carries part of the blame, whether deserved or not, because it is part of the complex.

So defense and other Government contractors, with the professionalism and skills which can send men to the moon, put satellite spies in the sky, house men in the ocean depths for weeks at a time, and do many other wondrous things, had better put some of these talents to work in the prosaic business of cost prediction and control.

The art of cost estimating must be improved for another reason. What has been called the *permissive* environment for costs in Government procurement is about to end. Priorities are shifting and budgets are strained.

Priorities are shifting because we have so many domestic problems which are acute and can no longer be postponed. Weary of a protracted and inconclusive war in a far-away place, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, are asking questions about the high cost of defense and developing the rationale for shifting of funds and energies to the civil sector.

In the perspective of the home front, a new waste disposal system is more important than a new weapon system. Techniques for command and control are as essential at the local police station as at military headquarters. Research and development should be looking toward mass transit rather than mass destruction. Threat analysis should be directed as much to identifying the hazards of technology in our living environment as to intentions and capabilities of potential enemies. The war room should be keeping tabs on city riots as much as on military maneuvers. System analysis makes as much sense for hospital administration as for weapon building. Computers are as important to the classroom as to the cockpit.

It comes down to this. There is hope—and even confidence—that our strategic weapons will deter nuclear war, and short of nuclear war, the rather widespread belief that the United States should not get involved again in wars of insurgency or attrition, which endlessly drain our resources and kill and maim our youth.

Whether, in fact, we can maintain our deterrent strength without continuing large expenditures; whether, in fact, the United States can draw down its commitments in a contending world, are questions now under sharp and bitter debate.

My own view is that strong defenses need not detract from full and proper attention to domestic needs. I am not one who looks upon this as an "either/or" proposition, but that is how it is made to appear today.

The battle of the priorities now raging in the Congress does not mean that there will be a definite victory for guns or butter any more than there will be a definite victory in Vietnam. The battle of priorities does mean, however, that given the pressures of inflation, the demands for tax reform, and the inevitable restraints on Government spending in the face of burgeoning social needs, something has to give.

Barring unexpected international crises or clashes, in the years ahead defense will get a smaller cut of the budget pie, and society's needs—using the term broadly—will get a larger cut. There will be relatively fewer defense dollars to spend, and persistent demand to get more from each dollar spent. Call it, if you wish, a period of austerity in defense spending.

As priorities shift, defense industry will adjust to the times. It will seek new markets in the civil sector of Government—state and local as well as national. Here prospective contractors will find that there is less technical sophistication, less procurement know-how—and less money. Dollars for domestic needs don't have the pulling power of dollars for defense.

Cost consciousness and better cost estimation, then, are important not only in the changing defense environment, but in preparation for assuming new tasks on the civil side. Our economy is resilient enough to take these changes in stride, and certainly the ingenuity and enterprise of American industry will be in full flower as the nation comes to grips with the problems of the 1970's.

The Commission on Government Procurement is one way to help industry, help Government, help Congress prepare for the years ahead. It is an instrument for constructive change and for validation of what ought not to be changed. It will affirm the viability of our institutions and the confidence of our citizenry in their Government. I thank you.

HEARINGS ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE WELCOME NEWS TO MILLIONS

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who joined in petitioning the Ways and Means Committee to schedule hearings this session on adjustments in social security benefits, I was particularly gratified to see the announcement the chairman made today which assured us, and the millions of beneficiaries, that extensive public hearings on the subject of proposals to amend the Social Security Act, including proposals to increase benefits and make other changes in the program, will be scheduled as soon as the

Ways and Means Committee can dispose of three other priority items on its hearings schedule.

This announcement, coming as it does on the heels of the President's recommendation that Congress increase social security benefits by 10 percent, gives hope and assurance to millions of our senior citizens who are having a difficult time making ends meet in the face of today's inflationary costs. Increases are needed as soon as they can be approved.

I commend the chairman and the members of the Ways and Means Committee for recognizing the urgency for immediate action and for putting these hearings on the agenda prior to adjournment.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 12549, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality.

There is little doubt that the United States must devote considerable public and private thought to the problems of environmental quality control. This thought and research must be complemented by determined efforts to reduce the destructive effects of modern technology on our atmosphere, our waters, and our land. Such an effort will require considerable public and private expenditure, but we must assure a livable environment for generations of Americans yet unborn.

President Nixon is to be commended for creating the Interdepartmental Council on Environmental Quality. His action was motivated by the obvious need to coordinate the efforts of all the agencies of the Federal Government to assure that duplication is not wastefully permitted and to assure that the Nixon administration is successful in committing its resources to the most challenging tasks in the most productive fashion.

The legislation before the Congress would complement the efforts of the Interdepartmental Council. It would create an independent Advisory Council with responsibility to report to the President, the Congress, and the people from time to time on the long-range needs for environmental improvement and pollution control.

The Advisory Council would be the spokesman for a nation deeply concerned about the technological proliferation and its "spin-off" effects.

As the New York Times stated in an editorial dated May 3, 1969:

By land, sea, and air, the enemies of man's survival relentlessly press their attack. The most dangerous of all these enemies is man's own undirected technology. The radioactive poisons from nuclear tests, the runoff into rivers of nitrogen fertilizers, the smog from automobiles, the pesticides in the food chains, and the destruction of topsoil by strip mining are examples of the failure to foresee and control the untoward consequences of modern technology.

I consider the establishment of a healthful and peaceful environment, conducive to life and human tranquility, to be one of the great challenges of the 1970's. Without a national commitment to this difficult task, there will be insufficient progress. We will do too little too late.

The proposed Advisory Council will serve as a valuable weapon in the fight against pollution. While Mr. Nixon's brilliantly conceived interdepartmental Council works to improve conditions today, the Advisory Council will look down the road to the future health and welfare of Americans in 1980, 1990, and beyond.

I urge my colleagues to support this significant step toward a better life.

**ANOTHER VANISHING AMERICAN—
THE SAVINGS BOND SAVER—BILL
INTRODUCED TO RAISE INTER-
EST RATE**

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this House has heard many speeches on the subject of our vanishing American shorelines, our vanishing wildlife, our vanishing clean air and water, and our vanishing natural resources. I know, I have delivered some of those remarks, but today I want to discuss a different kind of vanishing American resource—the American who invests his savings in U.S. savings bonds.

That American is not the rich man who can afford to buy blocs of tax-free municipal bonds, nor is he the corporate officer who invests large sums in private debentures, nor is he the fund or foundation magnate who scouts out the best interest deal in Government securities to put large sums of money to work. The American I am talking about is that much-maligned, mostly ignored, middle-income person who until recently tried to put a little money aside for a rainy day, or for his children's education, or for retirement, or for unexpected emergencies, by purchasing U.S. savings bonds.

Savings bonds used to be a pretty good deal for the average American saver. You remember of course the "bond a month" plan, the "payroll deduction" plan, the posters, campaigns, and hoopla of bond drives during the Second World War. It was a patriotic duty for people to invest in the United States and they earned a fair rate of interest. All that is gone now. The average American saver has started to add up the benefits of savings bond investment—he finds them lacking. Let me give you an example that is fairly close to home.

One of my staff member's families was recently increased by one. The doting grandparents of the new baby sent the parents a sizable U.S. savings bond with a note "to be used for—the child's—education." Now that is hardly a new phenomenon; savings bonds used to be quite a handsome gift to any new child and I suspect that many new grandparents have sent such gifts. Heretofore, the proud new parents would tuck that

savings bond away with the family papers or in a safe deposit box and let it mature, knowing that a start had been made for an education for the new child. And let me add that I continue to believe that the gift of a U.S. savings bond is one of the most thoughtful gifts that a person can make. However, the parents of the new child, more concerned with the child's educational fund than with sentiment, did not keep that savings bond gift. Rather, they cashed it in immediately and purchased a federally guaranteed certificate of deposit in an out-of-State bank that pays an interest rate which is almost three percentage points higher than the 4.25-percent annual rate of the savings bond.

If you had been asked for advice by these parents about the proper investment of this substantial sum of money, what would you have advised? Keep the bond—it is patriotic to invest in America. Or would you have advised the couple to invest—in America—the money so that it would return the greatest amount of

interest. Fortunately, I was not asked for such advice, but in light of today's interest rate on U.S. savings bonds, the new parents obviously did the right thing for their child.

This one example gives flesh to the dry but nevertheless important statistics which I will cite below. In brief, the rate of redemption of U.S. savings bonds is exceeding the rate of purchase of such bonds. Even more important, for the first time since 1959, the total of outstanding bonds—E, H, and Freedom Share bonds—has declined. In December 1968, the total outstanding was \$52.2 billion; as of August 1969 the total outstanding in all bonds was \$52.1 billion. A drop of \$108 million in 8 months' time may not seem like much, but it is indicative of a trend that could worsen if something is not done. The monthly statistics for E series bonds alone are even more dramatic. I am inserting a résumé of those statistics prepared by the Savings Bond Division of the Treasury Department to indicate the seriousness of the problem:

E BONDS SALES AND REDEMPTIONS

Month and year	Sales	Redemptions	Interest	Total, redemptions and interest
November 1968	\$335,009,000	\$294,705,000	\$64,691,000	\$359,397,000
December 1968	329,067,000	337,342,000	76,575,000	413,916,000
January 1969	372,787,000	424,887,000	123,354,000	548,242,000
February 1969	392,287,000	397,202,000	96,217,000	493,419,000
March 1969	336,907,000	394,116,000	94,742,000	485,859,000
April 1969	371,222,000	422,182,000	103,574,000	525,574,000
May 1969	369,494,000	358,136,000	94,056,000	452,192,000
June 1969	370,658,000	422,430,000	110,941,000	533,371,000
July 1969	374,213,000	446,232,000	111,558,000	557,789,000
August 1969	334,017,000	382,917,000	94,540,000	477,477,000

You will note that in only 1 month—May 1969—did the amount of purchases exceed the amount of series E bond redemptions. In every other month, more people cashed in bonds than purchased them. There has to be a reason and the reason is simple: the interest rate on U.S. savings bonds is too low to compete with other forms of savings open to the investor and particularly to the small or average investor.

Why is it that the middle-income taxpayer or investor is always the one who has to "take it on the chin?" It is the middle-income person who purchases the bulk of the U.S. savings bonds—and at the incredibly low annual rate of 4.25 percent. Talk about truth in lending—with an interest rate that low, the Federal Government should be advising investors not to invest in savings bonds rather than the other way around. Of course, the Government—and that means the Congress—could relieve this interest rate inequity.

Savings bonds have the connotation of "stepchildren" by Federal Government money managers in spite of the yearly drives to sell bonds. Interest rates have been moving up during the post-World War II period; prevailing market rates have been far above the 4.25-percent ceiling on savings bond interest for years. Other than on savings bonds, the Treasury has been paying more than 6-percent interest on short-term bills for years. If you saw the newspaper yesterday, you noticed that the Treasury said it will offer interest rates ranging up to 8 percent on three new issues of notes in ex-

change for \$8.9 billion of securities maturing in the next few months. The 8-percent interest rate on the new notes is the highest on a comparable Treasury security since 1859, when rates ranged up to 12 percent on some issues. In spite of these "facts of the marketplace," the Federal Government still pays only 4.25 percent on U.S. savings bonds. Even compared to other Treasury issues, interest on savings bonds is terrible, but compared to the private bond market there is no comparison whatsoever.

Top grade corporate bonds are currently paying around 7 percent, and many medium grade corporate bonds pay a much higher rate of interest. Some bonds carry convertible provisions that give the holder the option of converting them into common stock when the exchange ratio favors such an exchange. This conversion privilege, coupled with a high rate of interest, has made the corporate convertible debenture bond a popular form of investment—but basically, for the investor with large sums to invest. And using another comparison, interest on State and local bonds is exempted from Federal income tax provisions, meaning that a municipal bond paying an interest rate of 4 percent per annum actually carries an effective interest rate which is much higher. Again, municipal bonds are usually sought by the big investor, but why is the big investor the only one to benefit from the expansion of the economy as reflected in the higher interest rates? As it stands now, irrespective of the Gov-

ernment's promotional campaigns to sell the average American on the purchase of U.S. savings bonds, that small investor can earn more than 4.25 percent by simply depositing his money in banks and savings and loan associations.

I am particularly happy to note that the administration agrees that the interest rate on savings bonds should be raised. However, I am concerned that the administration is holding back on pressing for the necessary legislation. Treasury Secretary Kennedy has stated that he "wants to wait" until consideration of the tax reform bill is completed. Mr. Speaker, we all know that were we to wait that long, nothing would be done on the vital subject of raising the interest rates on savings bonds.

Fortunately, the Committee on Ways and Means is not going to wait on the Senate as Secretary Kennedy proposes. The committee has scheduled an executive session for next week wherein they will consider the subject of savings bond interest rates. As I understand the situation, consideration will be of a general nature and not on a specific legislative proposal. I believe it is important that the public know the administration plan, so I am introducing a bill which will "facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest-rate ceilings on Government bonds and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation has two principal purposes. First, it would enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a fair rate of return to holders of U.S. savings bonds. Second, it would provide the Secretary of the Treasury with authority to plan for orderly restructuring of the public debt in accordance with national objectives.

The legislation would accomplish these purposes by eliminating the interest-rate ceilings on Treasury bonds, including U.S. savings bonds. It would also make several minor conforming changes in the statutes governing U.S. savings bonds and notes.

I have appended to my remarks the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis prepared by the Treasury Department. There is also included a copy of a "fact sheet" dealing with the removal of the 4.25-percent interest-rate ceiling. I am sure Members will find the "Summary of Terms and Conditions of Savings Bonds" of particular interest in their consideration to raise the interest rate on savings bonds.

It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report a bill on this subject before this session concludes. The Congress has extended the surtax; now let us extend a helping hand to the Nation's small investors by increasing the interest rate on savings bonds.

A BILL TO FACILITATE THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT BY REMOVING THE INTEREST-RATE CEILINGS ON GOVERNMENT BONDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as

amended (31 U.S.C. 752), is amended by striking out " , not exceeding four and one-quarter per centum per annum,".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 22(b) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757c(b)(1)), is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence is amended by inserting "and at such rates of interest," after "prices"; by striking out the semicolon immediately preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and by striking out the proviso; and

(2) The third sentence is amended by inserting a period after "determine" and striking out the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 3. Paragraph (2) of section 22(b) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757c(b)(2)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to provide by regulations:

"(A) That owners of United States savings bonds and savings notes may, at their option, retain the securities after maturity, or after any period after maturity during which such securities have earned interest, and continue to earn interest upon them at such rates as he shall prescribe

"(B) That United States savings bonds on which the rates of interest have been fixed prior to such regulations will earn interest at such higher rates as he shall prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 25 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c-1) is repealed.

SEC. 5. The authority granted by the amendments made by section 2 of this Act may be exercised with respect to United States savings bonds bearing issue dates of June 1, 1969, or thereafter. The authority granted by sections 2 and 3 may be also exercised with respect to United States savings bonds issued before June 1, 1969, but in no case shall the interest rate or investment yield on any bond be changed pursuant to such authority for any period which begins before June 1, 1969.

SEC. 6. Paragraph (1) of section 22A(b) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757c-2(b)(1)), is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence is amended by inserting " , and at such rates of interest," after "prices"; and by striking out the comma after "prescribe" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and striking out the remainder of the sentence; and

(2) The third sentence is amended by inserting a period after "determine" and striking out the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 7. Paragraph (2) of section 22A(b) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757c-2(b)(2)), is amended by striking out "rates which are consistent with the rate of investment yield afforded by retirement and savings bonds," and inserting in lieu thereof "such rates as he shall prescribe."

SEC. 8. The heading and first sentence of section 454(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to matured United States savings bonds) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) MATURED UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS AND UNITED STATES SAVINGS NOTES.—In the case of a taxpayer who—

"(1) holds a Series E United States savings bond or a United States savings note at the date of maturity, and

"(2) pursuant to regulations prescribed under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, (A) retains his investment in such Series E bond or note in an obligation of the United States, other than a current income obligation, or (B) exchanges such Series E bond or note for another nontransferable obligation of the United States in an exchange upon which gain or loss is not rec-

ognized because of section 1037 (or so much of section 1031 as relates to section 1037), the increase in redemption value (to the extent not previously includible in gross income) in excess of the amount paid for such Series E bond or note shall be includible in gross income in the taxable year in which the obligation is finally redeemed, disposed of, or in the taxable year of final maturity, whichever is earlier."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The first section of the draft bill would remove the 4¼ percent interest-rate ceiling on transferable (marketable) Treasury bonds.

Section 2 of the draft bill would remove the 3.26 percent interest-rate limitation on United States savings bonds and the requirement that the denominations of such bonds be expressed in terms of their maturity values.

Section 3 would remove the rate limitations of 3.26 percent and 4¼ percent on extensions of savings bonds at further interest after maturity, would remove the same limitations on increases in rates for savings bonds on which rates have previously been fixed, and would authorize the extension of savings notes at further interest after maturity.

Section 4 would repeal the provision of existing law which permits the 3.26 percent limit to be exceeded up to 4¼ percent upon a finding by the President that such action is required in the national interest.

Section 5 would prohibit any increase in interest rates on savings bonds bearing issue dates before June 1, 1969, for any interest period which begins prior to that date.

Section 6 would remove the 5 percent interest-rate ceiling on United States retirement and savings bonds and the requirement that denominations be expressed in terms of their maturity values.

Section 7 would eliminate the requirement that interest on United States retirement and savings bonds extended after their maturity be consistent with the 5 percent rate.

Section 8 would give United States savings notes extended after maturity the same income tax deferral treatment as Series E savings bonds.

[Fact sheet]

**REMOVAL OF 4¼% INTEREST RATE CEILING
I. THE PRESENT SITUATION**

1. Congress placed a 4¼% ceiling on U.S. Government bonds in 1918, and the ceiling has been unchanged since that date.

2. Throughout most of the intervening fifty years, the ceiling posed no serious problems for effective debt management because

(1) long-term interest rates generally held below the ceiling level; and

(2) during brief periods of higher rates, the Treasury could issue shorter-term securities, such as Treasury bills or notes, to which the ceiling does not apply.

3. Since 1965, interest rates on longer term Government securities have continuously been above 4¼%. As a result the Treasury has been unable to sell any longer-term securities for the last four years. Instead, it has been forced to confine its issues to maturities of seven years or less.*

4. Because the interest ceiling precluded longer-term issues, the average maturity of the Government's marketable debt in private hands has dropped from 5¼ years in mid-1965 to about 4 years today.

5. In operational terms, this shortening of the debt meant that the Treasury had to refinance some \$21 billion of maturing notes and bonds in fiscal 1969, compared with less than \$14 billion in fiscal 1966, a jump of more than 50%.

*Five years or less prior to June 30, 1967.

II. ADVERSE EFFECTS OF THE 4¼% CEILING

1. Since the 4¼% ceiling applies to Savings Bonds as well as to marketable Government bonds, the Treasury has been prevented from paying an equitable and fully competitive rate of return to holders of Savings Bonds.

2. By forcing the Government to do all its financing in the short- and medium-term areas, the ceiling has put upward pressure on shorter term rates, thus complicating the problems of thrift institutions in competing for savings.

3. The pile-up of maturing notes and bonds added to the difficulties of orderly financing the Government's needs for new funds during periods of deficit.

4. The shortening of the Government's debt contributes to the inflationary potential of the economy by

(1) complicating the task of the monetary authorities in pursuing a policy of credit restraint; and

(2) providing investors with liquid assets that increasingly resembled cash-in-hand.

5. During the past four years, a period of generally rising interest rates, the ceiling has

probably added to the costs of carrying the public debt by

(1) concentrating Treasury financings in the shorter end of the market where rates have generally been higher than on longer-term securities; and

(2) preventing issues of longer-term securities during temporary periods of lower interest rates.

III. ADVANTAGES FROM REMOVAL OF CEILING

1. Removal of the ceiling would mitigate each of the adverse effects cited above.

2. Specifically, the Treasury would

(1) be free to pay a 5% rate of return to holders of Savings Bonds, as proposed by the Administration;

(2) be able to plan for orderly restructuring of the Government's debt when conditions permitted.

3. In general, removal of the ceiling will enable the Treasury to conduct the Nation's financial housekeeping in a way that supports national economic objectives rather than conflicting with them.

IV. USE OF LONGER-TERM BORROWING

1. Removal of the 4¼% ceiling would not cause the Treasury automatically to push

large amounts of debt out to the long-term area. Rather, it would permit the Treasury to take advantage of market opportunities gradually; to extend the maturity of the debt through longer-term issues in amounts that would not disrupt either the Government securities market or other segments of the capital market.

2. The experience of the first half of the 1960's is illustrative of what can be accomplished through flexible debt management. Mainly through the use of so-called advance refundings—offering of longer-term securities to holders of issues in advance of their maturity—the Treasury was able to increase the average maturity of the debt by more than 25% without adverse effects on the financing of local governments, house construction, or other activities.

3. Given the anticipated demands on capital markets to finance the high employment economy of the 1970's, there is little likelihood that longer-term interest rates will fall below the 4¼% level in the foreseeable future. There is no reason, therefore, to delay the removal of a ceiling that serves no purpose, but only stands in the way of the orderly planning of debt management.

SUMMARY OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SAVINGS BONDS SUBJECT TO ENABLING LEGISLATION

	Series E	Series H	Series E	Series H
Effective date.....	All bonds sold on or after June 1, 1969.	All bonds sold on or after June 1, 1969.	Negotiability.....	None.....
Issue price.....	75 percent of face amount.	100 percent of face amount.	Eligibility as collateral for loans.....	do.....
Issue date.....	1st day of month in which payment is received by an authorized issuing agent.	1st day of month in which payment is received by a Federal Reserve bank or branch, or by U.S. Treasury.	Eligible subscribers.....	Natural persons and public and private organizations, but not commercial banks.
Maturity.....	5 years 10 months from issue date.	10 years from issue date.	Annual limit on new purchases.....	Annual limit of \$5,000, issue price (\$2,000 face amount per participant in employee savings plans).
Interest:			Denominations.....	\$25, \$50, \$75, \$100, \$200, \$500, and \$1,000 (maturity value). Also \$10,000 and \$100,000 for certain employee savings plans.
New bonds.....	Accrues to approximately face amount to provide an investment yield of approximately 5 percent if held to maturity, lesser yields if redeemed earlier.	Paid semiannually by check. Provides investment yield of approximately 5 percent if held to maturity, lesser yields if redeemed earlier.	Bearer or registered.....	Registered only, natural persons may have coowner or beneficiary registration.
Outstanding bonds.....	Increased to provide 5 percent for remaining time to maturity or extended maturity.	Increased to provide 5 percent for remaining time to maturity or extended maturity.	Extension privilege.....	Extendable for 10 years at rate in effect at time of extension.
Redeemability prior to maturity:				Extendable for 10 years at rate in effect at time of extension.
By Treasury.....	Not callable.....	Not callable.....		
By owner.....	At any time not less than 2 months from issue date at any qualified paying agent.	At any time not less than 6 months from issue date at any Federal Reserve Bank or branch, or at the U.S. Treasury except during the month preceding an interest payment date.		

THE PROBLEMS OF OUR RURAL COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture and Rural Affairs has made a major start on the road to solving the problems of our rural communities. Many things have been suggested, from encouraging industrial economic investment to complete laissez-faire. With present governmental over-involvement in agriculture, a farmer has to adhere to governmental regulations and can hardly run his farm on a business-like basis.

One of my colleagues on this task force, the Honorable DURWOOD G. HALL, better known as "Doc" has shown his concern for these problems by proposing an ambitious program designed to improve the lot of the average American farmer today. Just this past August I was his guest in Missouri to see a working model of how his program was to operate.

The enthusiasm with which "Doc" HALL's active proposal for curing rural

problems was received in the Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press deserves special recognition. I only wish that others would take the same interest in rural America. The following editorial from the September 12 issue of the Springfield Leader-Press points out "Doc" HALL's leadership and concern in this area:

PRACTICAL DREAM

True to his word, Rep. Durward G. Hall has introduced his farm bill in Congress. Conservative though Rep. Hall always boasts he is, this is a revolutionary concept completely unlike any other ever offered to cure America's vast, chronic headache of agricultural surpluses.

In simplest terms, the bill would cast off all restraints on the American farmer who would be free to produce what and as he likes. It also would provide him alternative and, in a way competitive markets—something he hasn't known in decades.

A farmer could produce either for the regular markets for food and fiber, or he could produce for the markets of the future, through soil conservation—in brief, he would be able to produce for soil conserving and building purposes—store the productive capacity this country will one day need.

A wheat farmer in these times of world surpluses of the cereal grain might elect to

plow down part or all of his crop to build better soil, and be paid for the conservation crop—paid on a realistic, dry-poundage value. Other farm subsidies would be abolished.

Waste? That's how little urbanites know of agriculture; actually, farmers voluntarily and at their own expense grow crops for no other purpose than to plow them under—green manuring, it used to be called, and it can do wonders in building both fertility and tilth in worn-out soil.

The advantages are obvious: balanced production, parity prices—the consumer would regulate basic prices by his own demands—and creating and storing soil fertility that no one can doubt this nation will one day need to survive. Likewise, production adjustments would be seasonably possible to maintain balanced food and fiber supplies. Finally, it is aimed to save the marginal farmer.

Actually, the idea was not Rep. Hall's—as he is first to point out—but that of another Ozarker, E. M. (Gene) Poiró, a farmer-conservationist-philosopher.

A dream? Of course, but so were all practical theories at one time dreams. Practical? That is for a surplus-plagued country to determine. Prospects? Not really good at this moment, but Hall has done a tremendous selling job and his hopes for the future cannot be easily discounted.

We'll say this for the Ozarks congressman: When he went to Congress, probably few of

his colleagues knew less about agriculture than Durward Hall; today, few of them are better informed in this field.

TRICKLE DOWN POLICIES PREVAIL IN WASHINGTON AGAIN

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times makes mention of President Nixon's move to create a star-studded panel of conservatives to study "the extent to which the Federal tax structure may be too burdensome on business and to make recommendations for changes."

Many of us were afraid that the trickle down theories of the Eisenhower administration would unfortunately be resurrected under the Nixon administration. Some of us were naive enough to believe, however, that perhaps the Republicans had learned that trickle down approaches to the solution of economic problems such as taxes do not get people elected. It is strange to learn that the Nixon Republican administration has, in fact, not learned this lesson.

We all recall President Eisenhower's confidant and genius on this subject, Mr. Charles "Engine" Wilson who espoused and articulated this view—namely, that the best way to solve the problems of America and provide for the pursuit of happiness, domestic tranquillity and the common good would be to give everything to business and let the fat cats of our society pass on a few of the leavings to the population at large.

This became known around the country and the world as the trickle down theory approach to the solutions of our problems or as "Engine Charlie" said:

What's good for General Motors is good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this Nixon commission will come out with strong recommendations deploring the fact that corporations are taxed too much. They will wave the flag of self-righteousness and salvation and argue perhaps with new verbiage, but still the same old theme that "what's good for General Motors is good for the country."

No one should be led to believe that it takes any genius to arrive at this conclusion. The position taken by the Treasury before the Senate Finance Committee on the tax reform bill passed at the insistence of the Democrats of the House of Representatives gives clear indication of what this Commission will do. As we all know the Treasury took the position before the Senate Finance Committee that the House-passed bill provided too many benefits for American consumers and not enough benefits for corporations. The Republican position before the Senate Finance Committee, therefore, argues that the House-passed bill should be amended to provide billions of dollars less in tax reform for consumers and billions of dollars more for corporations.

The appointment of this Republican Commission and the position taken by the Republican administration on taxes bodes no good for our country. Mr.

Speaker, perhaps as a Democrat I should be delighted in the political advantage which the Republicans have handed us, but as an American, I must lament this approach. What is good for America is good for General Motors and all the rest of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of California), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today, on account of official business as member of House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MYERS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business as member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for September 19, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER, on Friday, September 19, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL, from 5 p.m. September 19, 1969, until noon, September 23, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN):)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN during his remarks under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCORMACK to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole on the legislative appropriation bill and to include extraneous material and charts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BUTTON.
Mr. HORTON in two instances.
Mr. WATSON in two instances.
Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. PODELL in six instances.

Mr. HULL.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. REES.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. DULSKI in four instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two 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. 1471. An act to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1479. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase from \$10,000 to \$15,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1650. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide double indemnity coverage under servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services assigned to extrahazardous duty, including duty in a combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2003. An act to provide a special Government life insurance program for veterans of the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2186. An act to amend chapter 19, United States Code, so as to provide dismemberment insurance coverage under the servicemen's group life insurance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6508. An act to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by major disasters;

H.R. 9526. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that Act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; and

H.R. 11582. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6508. An act to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by major disasters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 23, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1162. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of the Brown unit of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the landowners within the unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application by the St. John Irrigating Co., of Malad, Idaho, for a supplemental loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (70 Stat. 1044, as amended, 71 Stat. 48), pursuant to the provisions of section 4(c) of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1164. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enlarge the classes of persons eligible for servicemen's group life insurance, and to improve the administration of the program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13900. A bill relating to the Federal income tax treatment of losses sustained as the result of hurricane Camille; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 13901. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually repro-

duced plants and making them 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. BENNETT:

H.R. 13902. A bill to provide for a program of grants to State and local governments for the construction or modernization of certain correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13903. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code, so as to provide that the retired or retirement pay of retired officers of the uniformed services not be reduced because of certain other employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 13904. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARSTEIN:

H.R. 13905. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide pension to certain veterans of World War I who are 72 years of age or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13906. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the special monthly benefits which are payable thereunder to uninsured individuals at age 72 shall be payable without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13907. A bill to extend the fourth-class mail rate for books and educational materials to photographic prints mailed to and from amateur photographers and non-profit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 13908. A bill to provide that the United States disclaims any interest in a certain tract of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13909. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to promote the development of living historical farms in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13910. A bill authorizing the modification of the beach erosion control project for Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13911. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13912. A bill to facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest rate ceilings on Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13913. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits payable thereunder to a worker's former stepchild will not reduce any benefits payable to the worker's natural or adopted children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 13914. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13915. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's and mechanic's liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13916. A bill to improve education by increasing the freedom of the Nation's teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits through establishment of a Federal-State program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 909. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of copies of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution urging adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution condemning the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam and urging the President to initiate appropriate action for the purpose of insuring that American prisoners are accorded humane treatment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution urging adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 554. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Select Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13917. A bill for the relief of Col. and Mrs. Allen B. Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13918. A bill for the relief of Dr. Delfin Villa Simbra, Jr., and his wife, Norma Encarnacion Simbra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

255. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinbaum, New York, N.Y., relative to arms limitation talks; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

256. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting an open trial on charges that automobile manufacturers conspired to restrain and delay the development and installation of antimog devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.