

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns this evening, it stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMINISTRATION ACCEPTS INCREASED UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is time for the Nixon administration and its economic policymakers to specify the detailed plans and policies they have prepared to deal with added unemployment if the rate should continue to rise.

I have sent a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy asking for the administration's detailed plans to deal with such an adverse economic situation.

Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy testified before the Joint Economic Committee last week that the 4-percent jobless rate was acceptable. But he and Budget Director Mayo indicated that they had no plan or program to deal with a further rise in unemployment. They have no plans to deal with joblessness if it becomes a more serious problem than the present inflation.

Later the Secretary recognized the serious consequences of this position and said the administration is unhappy with any increase in unemployment including that suffered last month.

He also said the administration is prepared to act decisively if unemployment rises too sharply. But the administration was unable to give our committee any specific program to combat rising unemployment other than a termination of the President's public works cutback or-

der. This termination as Mr. Mayo admitted would have a minuscule effect on employment.

This is both a shocking and disheartening situation. Joblessness and unemployment are the most shameful wastes of all. They waste time, skills, and human resources which can never be recouped.

Furthermore, the Nation will be far less willing to take the unpopular steps to deal with the serious problem of inflation and the continuing steep rise in prices if there is no plan or no policy to head off a higher level of unemployment than now exists.

I have addressed my letter to the Secretary in the hope that it may induce some long overdue planning on the administration's part.

Any administration should be thoroughly prepared with specific plans for adverse economic eventualities. This is especially true for a problem as highly sensitive as increasing unemployment.

We no longer operate in the climate of the early 1930's. The Nation is as unwilling to purchase price stability at the expense of full employment as it is equally unwilling to purchase full employment at the expense of high prices.

But according to the testimony of two of its chief economic policymakers, Secretary Kennedy and Budget Director Mayo, the administration has no major program to halt inflation except high interest rates and tight money. Equally, they testified the administration has no plans to stop unemployment if the jobless rates continue to go up.

We now face a twofold danger. Not only does inflation exist but we also face the prospect that it will be combined with excessive unemployment.

That would be the worst of both worlds. We need leadership from this administration to combat both problems.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, October 15, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 14, 1969:

IN THE MARINE CORP

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Douglas J. Peacher
Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John R. Blandford
William J. Weinstein
Harold L. Oppenheimer

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 14, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Richard T. Gaul, S.J., director of development and alumni, Jesuit High School, El Paso, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Unless the Lord guard the city, they labor in vain who build it.—Psalms.

Heavenly Father, teach our lawmakers to hear their constituents but to heed their own consciences, to make laws the people can accept because You, Father, have already blessed them. Teach them to consult You on Capitol Hill as Moses consulted You on the hill of Sinai, that so You may deliver into their hands laws filled with Your knowledge, Your wisdom, and Your fatherly love.

Teach them that a public office is a public trust but that America puts all its trust in You who alone give us reason to trust one another as brothers of a common Father. Heavenly Father, bless our President, the Speaker of this House, and all its Members, as together we pray: Direct all our actions by Your holy inspirations, help us to carry them on by Your gracious assistance so that every word and work of ours may begin in You and happily find its completion in You, our Father in Heaven. Amen.

FATHER RICHARD T. GAUL, S.J.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today this House is honored to have Father Richard T. Gaul, S.J., deliver the invocation. It is apparent from the depth of the prayer and its poetic and theological balance that Father Gaul is a human being of considerable substance. His background, reflected in this prayer, is witness to the depth and insight resulting from years of dedication to mankind.

He was born 1903 in the western hills of Massachusetts at Pittsfield, where he was reared and was educated in his early years. From these solid beginnings of his New England upbringing, his motivations led him, after his graduation from Holy Cross college in Massachusetts to enter the Society of Jesus, in Macon, Georgia, in August 1921 to dedicate his life to his fellow man. The course of his life has taken him crisscross through the Southland and Southwest of the United States, each position being one of responsibility and service to men of all faiths. Among other positions, he served as dean of men

at Springhill College, in Mobile, Alabama, during the trying years of World War II. He then was made pastor of the Church of Immaculate Conception, in El Paso, Tex., and while in that capacity served as the first superintendent of Catholic Schools in El Paso, Tex.

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 agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

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.

The message also 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. 13194) 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."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

TO DECLARE A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND CONCERN FOR AMERICAN SERVICEMEN BEING HELD PRISONER IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 910) to declare a National Day of Prayer and Concern for American servicemen being held prisoner in North Vietnam, and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 910

Whereas the inhuman treatment of our military men who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam is now well documented; and

Whereas the families of many of these men are not sure whether or not these men are alive; and

Whereas the citizens of this Nation have a moral obligation to assure these families that they have not been forgotten: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 9, 1969, be declared a national day of prayer and concern on behalf of the American servicemen being held prisoner by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened today that the House has seen fit to pass the resolution calling upon President Nixon to declare Sunday, November 9, a National Day of Prayer and Concern for our airmen who are prisoners in North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago several hours were devoted on this floor to the plight of these men. Their wives and loved ones filled the gallery listening to our words of concern. We cannot let that be an isolated incident to be quickly forgotten in the face of those voices being raised for an immediate pullout. We need to call the attention of all Americans to the fate of these brave men. Here is an opportunity for people, no matter what their view of the war, to unite in prayer for the safety of these men. Here is an opportunity for us to bring this issue to the attention of the world and perhaps cause Hanoi to divulge the names of those men whom they hold captive.

I am pleased to note that the House leadership has unanimously endorsed this move, and I am writing to President Nixon at once urging him to take action as he has been requested.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously pleased that today the House will pass House Resolution 910, which was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST), and myself. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Speaker and the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and certainly nothing along this line could have been accomplished without the cooperation of the able chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), and the equally able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS). I would sincerely hope that the other body works as expeditiously so that we can meet the November 9 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, the authors of this resolution, as well as all the other Members of this body, were deeply moved when the wives and mothers of our men imprisoned in North Vietnam came to the Congress last month. With tearful eyes they came to us, not in anger, not in protest, but with feelings of concern and frustration. Their actions could never be deemed unpatriotic or un-American. No, indeed; they were in the finest traditions of Americanism. These young wives, some of whom have not seen or heard from their husbands for 3 or 4 years, were brave and understanding—and we were proud of them.

Our country is at war, whether it is formally declared so or not. But our war is one of defense and not one of invasion. We do not seek—and we never have—the lands or peoples of any other country. We are simply trying to aid the South Vietnamese in the defense of their country. We are honoring an international commitment made many years ago. Again, I emphasize we have no desire to conquer the country of North Vietnam and to decimate its people in so doing. I have no doubt that we have this capability. I have no doubt that we could literally destroy all that in North Vietnam in a very few days if this were our wish.

In the honoring of our commitment, it has been necessary to send over one-half million of our finest young men to Southeast Asia. Those brave human beings did not wish to be involved in the bloodshed of war, but they answered their country's call, as patriotic Americans have since the dawn of our country's existence.

Some of these men have been killed, wounded, or captured. This is the price of war, we know. But it is the status of the captured Americans that we cannot understand. If our enemy was a nation of barbarians, savages, or crazed people, it would not lessen our sorrow, but it would be more understandable. But North Vietnam is not such a nation. And how she can permit this inhumane treatment of her prisoners, I cannot understand.

I sympathize deeply with the wives and loved ones of our boys who are imprisoned in North Vietnam. They have

been brave and patient and there is no question that they love their country as deeply as their men.

This resolution simply states that November 9, 1969, be declared a National Day of Prayer and Concern on behalf of the American servicemen being held prisoner by the North Vietnamese. We hope it will give those brave young men encouragement and assurance that a grateful country still cares. We hope it will give them strength to endure their ordeal. We hope that somehow it will give them hope.

If it does those things our efforts will not have been in vain.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12781, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 12781, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-570)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (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," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 27, 31, 38, 42, 43, 54, and 55.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,899,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$176,703,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$48,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: "and including not to exceed ninety-seven for police type use, which may exceed the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year by the cost of air-conditioning and not to exceed \$300 for police type equipment; purchase of two aircraft, one of which shall be for replacement only, and acquisition from excess sources without reimbursement of two additional aircraft; and to provide, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at a cost not exceeding \$50,000, transportation for children in nearby communities to and from any unit of the National Park System used in connection with organized recreation and interpretive programs of the National Park Service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$192,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$99,481,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,790,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$192,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 15, 16, 20, 24, 35, 40, and 41.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 1: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$52,573,000 for management of lands and resources as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$52,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$2,899,000 for construction and maintenance instead of \$2,925,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,873,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$176,703,000 for education and welfare services instead of \$176,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$177,503,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes \$1,500,000 for kindergartens in public schools; \$392,000 for a college work-study intern program; and \$253,000 for community development programs. The conferees agree that none of the funds provided for kindergartens in public schools shall be used for administration by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The conferees further agree with the Senate Report language which stipulates that \$300,000 of funds provided for the improved curriculum program shall be utilized for additional dormitory personnel as indicated in the House Report.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$55,242,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate instead of \$55,692,000 as proposed

by the House. The conferees agree that \$100,000 of funds available for repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities shall be used for the work-learn program.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$26,264,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,373,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,090,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree to the continued use of not to exceed \$50,000 for expenses of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality pending action on authorizing legislation now in Congress.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$62,000,000 for payments to states as proposed by the Senate instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that payments to states should be accelerated when the backlog of Federal acquisition has been materially reduced. It is also the opinion of the conferees that those states which charge higher admission prices for out-of-state visitors to enjoy local recreation areas contravene the sense of the national recreation program.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$28,572,000 for the National Park Service cash program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,772,000 as proposed by the House. The amount provided includes the following: Assateague Island National Seashore, \$2,789,718; Biscayne National Monument, \$2,500,000; Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, \$2,000,000; Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, \$5,000,000; North Cascades National Park, \$250,000; Ozark National Scenic Riverway, \$558,100; Guadalupe Mountains National Park, \$115,000; Glen Canyon National Recreation area, \$150,000; San Juan Island National Historic Park, \$476,300; Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, \$743,100; Inholdings, \$674,182; Grand Teton National Park (JY Ranch), \$1,050,000; Court awards (Padre Island National Seashore), \$12,115,600; Wild and scenic rivers, \$100,000; and National trails system, \$50,000.

The conferees are in agreement that the fiscal year 1970 contract authorizations for the National Park Service be reexamined and resubmitted for Committee approval at a later date.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$13,700,000 for Forest Service acquisitions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,500,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$14,921,400 for administration of territories as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$40,612,000 for trust territory of the Pacific Islands as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$41,612,000 as proposed by the House.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$95,755,000 for surveys, investigations and research instead of \$95,628,000 as proposed by the House, and \$95,115,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$240,000 for artificial ground water recharge, and \$400,000 for initiation of a program to evaluate exploratory geophysical data of unleased Outer Continental Shelf areas.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$39,-

331,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$39,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,536,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$100,000 for research on synthetic fuels; \$600,000 for research on development of technology for mining methane laden coal deposits; and \$95,000 for initiation of a program of mine subsidence inventories and mine mapping.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates a \$14,332,000 for health and safety as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,782,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees' action in this connection is based solely on the fact that the reductions of \$130,000 for hiring and training of mine inspectors and \$320,000 for research on dust production and control made by the Senate were predicated on the unusual budgetary situation whereby the identical amounts for these activities were fully funded in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1969 in order to accelerate these activities. Since the supplemental funds did not become available until July 22, 1969, provision was made in the supplemental appropriations act for the funds to remain available until September 30, 1969. In other words, the sums in question represented a duplicated budget request. The conferees are keenly aware of the urgent need for early and incisive action to make the nation's mines a safer place in which to work. With the concerted emphasis now being directed in this connection, it is expected that a supplemental budget request will be received in fiscal year 1970 for mine safety work, in which case the conferees will be inclined to give it favorable consideration.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$24,000,000 for the helium fund instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$26,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$15,300,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$13,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides \$1,000,000 for the lignite gasification project at Rapid City, South Dakota, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$26,600,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$26,400,000 as proposed by the House, and \$26,345,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount approved by the House includes \$200,000 for initiation of research on a pesticide problem developing in the Great Lakes.

The Conferees are in agreement that \$150,000 of S-K funds shall be used to study conflicting Federal and State legislative and regulatory restrictions on commercial fisheries and to submit recommendations for bringing them into conformity and uniformity.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$2,325,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,025,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$4,590,000 for federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development as proposed by the House instead of \$4,027,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees direct that the full amount available for disaster relief under Section 4(b) of the Federal Aid for Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act shall be allocated as determined by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of priority requirements.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$48,850,000 for management and investigations of

resources instead of \$48,503,000 as proposed by the House, and \$48,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided deletes the \$100,000 for additional program needs at the Eastern Fish Disease Laboratory, Lee-town, West Virginia, and \$50,000 for technical assistance in sport fishery management at Valentine, Nebraska as proposed by the Senate, and restores the \$100,000 for visitor services at the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma, and \$30,000 for the Cortland Fishery Center, New York, which were deleted by the Senate.

While the conferees recognize the need for additional funding for sport fishery management activities at Valentine, Nebraska, the dictates of budgetary restrictions made it impossible to give this item favorable consideration along with many other worthwhile activities that did not receive conference approval.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$1,959,000 for construction, instead of \$1,686,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,773,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes \$180,000 for additional facilities at the Lahontan National Fish Hatchery, Nevada; \$203,000 for repair of Lake Darling Dam, North Dakota; \$136,000 for the Wolf Creek Hatchery, Kentucky; and \$100,000 for the San Marcos Hatchery, Texas.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$5,800,000 for the migratory bird conservation account instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$49,100,000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate instead of \$49,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$40,000,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities as proposed by the House instead of \$40,037,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$7,700,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,600,000 as proposed by the House.

The Conferees agree that \$100,000 of funds available for the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be used for establishing the center line of the extension of the Parkway from the vicinity of Beach Gap, North Carolina to the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain National Battle Field Park north of Atlanta and Marietta, Georgia.

Amendment No. 29: Provides for the purchase of 46 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 47 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Amends language substituted by the Senate for original House language.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$5,530,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,555,800 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$9,912,700 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,887,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Deletes the \$25,000 proposed by the House for the special foreign currency program.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$192,810,000 for forest land management instead of \$195,042,000 as proposed by the House and \$191,985,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$200,000 for range resource management;

\$150,000 for land classification; and \$475,000 for the Ozark (Blanchard Springs) Visitor Center, Arkansas.

The Conferees direct that recreation funds available as a result of deferred construction be used to the extent necessary for preliminary work programmed for the Ouachita (Kerr Memorial Arboretum) Visitor Center, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment that will provide \$42,137,000 for forest research instead of \$41,880,000 as proposed by the House, and \$41,326,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount provided by the Senate includes \$500,000 for the Forest Sciences Laboratory, Corvallis, Oregon; \$71,000 (planning) for the Forest Service Timber Marketing and Utilization Research Laboratory, Duluth, Minnesota; \$90,000 for timber and watershed research, Arcata, California; and \$150,000 for initiation of a new periodic appraisal of the timber situation and outlook.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$22,729,000 for state and private forestry cooperation as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$22,529,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$99,481,000 for Indian Health Services instead of \$98,581,000 as proposed by the House and \$100,221,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the Senate allowance includes decreases of \$250,000 for patient medical care; \$150,000 for field health services; \$125,000 for operation of the Phoenix Medical Center; \$40,000 for registered nurse training; and \$175,000 for contract dental care.

The Conferees agree that \$100,000 of funds available for field health services shall be utilized for additional community health representatives.

The conferees further agree that within available funds, an additional \$20,000 shall be earmarked for registered nurse training.

The conferees are in agreement that the program to train additional registered nurses needs to be accelerated on a nationwide basis. It is therefore suggested that the agency give this activity a high priority in the formulation of the 1971 budget estimate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$19,000,000 for Indian Health Facilities as proposed by the House instead of \$19,345,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$345,000 reduction below the Senate allowance shall be applied against the \$872,000 budgeted for special projects in all areas.

The Conferees are in agreement with regard to the use of \$1,025,000 previously appropriated for stabilization of the Anchorage Hospital for construction of Indian Health Facilities programmed in the 1970 budget submission.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$850,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$800,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment appropriating \$222,700 for salaries and expenses instead of \$22,700 as proposed by the House, and \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate language which provides for use of funds previously appropriated for land acquisition.

Amendment No. 42: Deletes \$77,300 pro-

posed by the Senate for the temporary commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, and restores House language.

The Conferees are in agreement that since this activity does not have congressional authorization, continuance of the program should be contingent upon the use of special funds available to the President that could be allocated for this activity.

Amendment No. 43: Restores House language.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$13,790,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,690,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$6,050,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities instead of \$6,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,950,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$100,000 over the Senate allowance is for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution Program.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$1,490,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$28,134,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$2,316,000 for museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$525,000 for restoration and renovation of buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$425,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$3,390,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,350,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES & ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$760,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT-PLANNING IN ALASKA

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$192,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House and \$235,000 as proposed by the Senate.

LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$5,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 55: Provides language proposed by the House instead of that proposed by the Senate.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11039, PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following conference report and statement

on the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 564)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$98,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "program" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "register".

Page 3, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of".

Page 3, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "registers".

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
W. MAILLIARD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 3 and 4. With respect to these amendments the House recedes. The remaining Senate amendments are discussed below.

Amendment No. 1: The House bill authorizes \$101,100,000. The Senate amendment authorized \$95,800,000.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of \$98,450,000—splitting the difference between the House and Senate figures.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill provided that no Peace Corps funds could be used to carry on the Volunteers to America Program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any similar program involving the service or training of foreign nationals in the United States.

The Senate amendment authorized the use of Peace Corps funds for the Volunteers to America Program.

The Senate receded.

Amendment No. 5: The Senate amendment authorized the use of not more than \$300,000 to encourage the development of and participation in any international pro-

gram which seeks to provide volunteers to serve in less developed countries or areas.

The House bill did not include a similar provision.

The committee of conference agreed to a provision limiting any contribution to an international program to the financing of an international register of volunteers which would provide information to interested organizations or governments as to the availability of volunteers.

It is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that the language agreed to does not authorize support for any international Peace Corps other than for such a register.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
W. MAILLIARD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WITH REFERENCE TO THE MORATORIUM ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, my position on the war in Vietnam has been clear to my colleagues since my election 3 years ago. The United States should seek an honorable peace in Vietnam and bring our boys home.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted where a small group of my colleagues intend to keep this body in session throughout the night in order to put their positions on Vietnam on record.

In the history of this Congress, only in the case of national emergency or in the instance of legislation which was of absolute urgency have the lights in this Chamber burned through the night.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I, myself, am for peace and for bringing the troops home. And I certainly recognize the right and need of every Member to state his position on Vietnam. And I will support any request by my colleagues to revise and extend his remarks at the end of the day, but I will not support keeping this body in session throughout the night—a gesture which could be construed by the people of this country and by the world that the entire Congress is in sympathy with an ultimatum to the President of the United States for an immediate withdrawal of all our troops from Vietnam.

Therefore, I serve notice now that after a reasonable amount of time at the close of today's business, I intend to move that the House be adjourned until noon tomorrow.

BIRTHDAY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of this body the fact that today is the birthday of the late Dwight David Eisenhower. It is a most appropriate time to draw inspiration from our memories of this great man, this beloved leader of

America whose steadfast character was the rock to which our country anchored itself during the 8 years he spent in the White House.

It is most appropriate that we speak today of Dwight David Eisenhower for we are even now plunging into a crisis of the spirit in America, a test of our determination to stand up for principles of international justice, a test of our ability to achieve peace with honor in Vietnam.

I hope desperately that we will meet and survive this test, just as Dwight Eisenhower met and conquered so many crises during his years in the Presidency.

I know that, as we mark the birthday of General Eisenhower, he would most have us remember him as a man of peace. He would also have us know that to be a man of peace does not mean to lie down supinely before our foes.

One of my most vivid recollections of President Eisenhower concerns his decisiveness, his determination to demonstrate this Nation's strength in time of stress, his wisdom in employing America's strength on behalf of peace.

Not since the 1930's had America enjoyed so long a period of peace as this Nation was blessed with under Dwight David Eisenhower, renowned though he was as World War II commander of the greatest expeditionary force for freedom and peace ever assembled by man.

Dwight Eisenhower ran for the Presidency as a man of peace. He was first and foremost a peacemaker in his conduct of the Presidency. His was the gift of peace—and it was peace through strength that he gave to a grateful nation.

I am sure that all Members of this House join with me today in saluting the memory of Dwight David Eisenhower, a great citizen, a great human being, a great patriot, a great American, a great President.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, October 14 of this year would have marked the 79th birthday of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States. It is appropriate, then, that we take a few moments to review and pay honor to the remarkable career of General Eisenhower.

We found in him more than a supreme commander, more than a U.S. President. We found a model citizen, a patriotic, dedicated, loyal American who was devoted to service to his country.

If any doubts existed about President Eisenhower's talents as an organizer and administrator, the success of the Allied invasion of France dispelled them. He made the cumbersome command arrangements of SHAEF function smoothly. According to one American commentator, his "friendly and dynamic personality" was the key to his success. He said:

Probably no one but Eisenhower could so rapidly have welded together such diffuse and often clashing groups of personalities and nationalities.

This achievement—the conduct of the French campaign without a major pub-

lic disagreement between Britons and Americans—represents perhaps the most successful practice of coalition leadership in military annals.

Yet mere command arrangements and physical preparation alone could not have assured success of the invasion. Eisenhower had to create the morale conditions of victory. He had to install in millions of Americans and British fighting men his own strong conviction that the hazardous stroke would be carried off.

The memory of Dieppe was still strong in many minds. Even Churchill was doubtful about the prospect of success until he saw the completeness of Eisenhower's preparations and the morale of the troops who shared the general's faith that the enterprise would succeed.

Because of his great attainments as a military administrator, there has been a tendency to disregard Eisenhower's role as a strategist or general. His studied "selfishness" doubtless encourages this tendency, but it does not do him justice. He was not simply a good-natured chairman of the SHAEF board of directors.

For, as supreme Allied commander, he alone was responsible for the major decisions of the campaign in France. Given General Eisenhower's qualities, it seems in retrospect that the outcome could not have been otherwise.

General Eisenhower grew in stature immensely after leaving Washington in 1942.

Those who frequently saw him say that he was almost totally unaware of the fact that he was a world figure. When he was made a five-star general he purposely waited until some time after Senate confirmation before wearing his new insignia. Modesty and commonsense were so genuinely a part of his makeup that they protected him from the most baleful and insidious influence in modern life—the publicity racket. He was not only a great soldier but a great man as well.

He brought warmth and compassion to the Office of the President of the United States. It is hardly necessary to review all the events of his 8 years in the White House to be convinced that his firm and patient leadership were of immediate as well as enduring value to this Nation he loved so much.

This type of leadership, more persuasive than coercive, was exerted by a man who on at least two occasions during his Presidency was close to death. Americans of all parties will long remember and pay tribute to the courage with which Dwight Eisenhower decided to go on with his job, even at the risk of his life.

As President, he had enlisted for the duration, and was determined to serve out his tour of duty. As people come to look back on the two administrations of President Eisenhower, I predict that they will remember them not only as an "era of good feeling" but as a time during which our people were led by a man whose whole career symbolized fortitude, patience, and a high sense of honor in the administration of the presidential office.

He will go down in history as one of the most dedicated patriots of this or any other era.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

THE YOUTH OF OUR TIME

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, to many people across this great land the dangers and difficulties confronting us today seem, at times, overwhelming. We are confronted with challenges at home and abroad. This is a testing time for all Americans of all age groups, for all our institutions.

There is now the utmost need for stability and strength, for adherence to the fundamental traditions and precepts which have made this country great. Restraint and discipline on the part of not just some of us but all of us are indispensable cornerstones of the success of our form of government and our way of life.

I am placing in the Extensions of Remarks of today's RECORD an address by a young woman, Miss Nonette Mayes, a senior at the Crosbyton, Tex., High School, made by her to a service club in my hometown of Lubbock, Tex. Miss Mayes speaks eloquently in behalf of our youth and in defense of stability and strength. We must remember that with our precious rights go heavy responsibilities.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 60 minutes for a special order either this afternoon or tomorrow morning immediately after the time allotted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), my time to expire prior to the regular time that the House will convene tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California please repeat his request through the microphone so that all Members may hear the gentleman's request?

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that I be given unanimous consent—rather, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the House for 60 minutes, either this afternoon or tomorrow morning immediately after the time allotted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), my said 60 minutes to expire prior to the regular time set for the convening of the House tomorrow morning.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to allocate time on this basis, whereas unanimous consent has already allotted time for other individual Members thereafter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from California is asking unanimous consent to follow the special order of another Member who has already received unanimous consent for his special order.

Is the Chair's understanding correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And that this special order would be prior to the time of other Members who have already received unanimous consent for special orders?

Is the Chair's understanding correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. No, Mr. Speaker. This would be immediately after the last special order that has been scheduled.

The SPEAKER. After the last special order?

Mr. LEGGETT. After the last special order, but prior to the regular convening of the House tomorrow morning, my special order to terminate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is then asking unanimous consent to proceed for 1 hour subject to the other special orders that have been heretofore obtained. Is that correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. As I understand from the Speaker's inquiry and the gentleman's request, this would not intersperse in other previously allocated time periods, but might impinge on the next calendar day if the legislative day is extended; is that correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. No, I have asked that my time terminate prior to the commencement of the calendar day tomorrow.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman's request amount to 22 or 23 hours of special orders?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to speculate on that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can the granting of this unanimous-consent request conceivably delay the convening of the House at 12 o'clock tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to speculate on that question.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT)?

There was no objection.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those among a group of our colleagues who have received special orders to speak today. It is our intention to speak about the war in Vietnam and the situation in Southeast Asia. We hope that all Members will have an opportunity and will choose to participate.

One point I would like to make clear is that all of us have obtained these special orders with legitimate intentions to discuss the great and important issues of the day. My own view is that it would be a reflection on the integrity of the House for a motion to adjourn to be made that might preclude Members from the opportunity to speak. I hope that we will remain faithful to our traditions. Since my 7½ years in this House, I have never once voted to cut off debate or deny any Member the right to talk regardless of what he was going to say. I hope others will follow that tradition this afternoon.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM DAY

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

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, up to this point, I have withheld comment on the so-called Vietnam moratorium day, but this I can do no longer.

Thanks to the promotional expertise of the national news media, this matter has gotten completely out of hand. What started out as an attempt at a nationwide strike or protest in the European tradition sponsored by the regular radicals of our Nation now is being made out as a patriotic display of the highest order. We even see Members of this House joining with the anarchists and disrupters, and thereby condemning orderly democratic process in favor of mob pressure.

Mr. Speaker, the right of legitimate protest is very broad indeed and it is just possible, barely possible, that this comes under that heading. It is also possible, barely possible, that the participants in the October 15 "Crusade Against America" are proving their support for our great Nation and the cause of world peace.

However, I should hope that any loyal American would have second thoughts about participation in a movement receiving such universal acclaim from the Communist world and those international gangsters in Hanoi.

SHOE INDUSTRY NEEDS
TARIFF RELIEF

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the U.S. Tariff Commission has sent an undisclosed number of questionnaires to certain members of the domestic footwear

industry, asking them to submit additional information. We all know, Mr. Speaker, the extent of the study, investigation, examination, and analysis to which the footwear industry has been subjected over the past months. My preliminary examination of this questionnaire indicates that there is nothing new here which can be added to the information already on hand, and I hope, I sincerely hope, that this will not delay by 1 hour the relief which the shoe industry must have on this terrible import problem.

I am disappointed to note, however, that this new questionnaire makes no inquiry into the principal cause of the import problem in the footwear industry—the enormous wage-rate differential between the domestic and foreign shoe worker. The Tariff Commission report of January 15, 1969, completely ignored this factor, and I should think that if any further questioning of the industry is to be conducted, it would at least come to grips with this basic point.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the House footwear steering committee for his statement, and join with him in this effort to get this agency to take some positive action so we can at long last get the kind of quota limitation on shoe imports for the protection of the industry that we need in this country.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

WINSTON CHURCHILL'S MAGNIFICENT
REMINDER THAT "SLAVERY
IS MORE HORRIBLE THAN WAR"

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow thousands of Americans will participate in programs designed to manifest opposition to America's involvement in Vietnam. Perhaps it would be wise to remind our Nation, on the eve of the moratorium on Vietnam, of Winston Churchill's gallant words when England was facing her darkest moment. The people of London were despairing. The war had reached its ugliest moment. Many in England, just as they will in America tomorrow, agonized over the horror of war, when Winston Churchill, in his finest moment, asked this question:

Nothing is more horrible than war?

Then majestically he replied:

Slavery is more horrible than war.

IDEAS TERRIFY DICTATORS

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill also said:

You see these dictators surrounded on all sides by the truncheons of their police and

the bayonets of their soldiers. Yet within their hearts is fear, unspeakable fear. They are afraid of words and thoughts, and words spoken abroad and thoughts stirring at home all the more dangerous because forbidden. These terrify them. A little mouse, a tiny mouse of thought appears in the room and even the mightiest potentate is thrown into panic.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the comparatively few Members of this body who has, as a combat infantry soldier, faced a Communist enemy on the battlefield, I ask regular order in calling into question my patriotism, because I do not believe one more American life should be wasted in defending a dictatorship against a dictatorship in Vietnam.

We ask our citizens to act within the system. And we mean it.

But what are we to tell them if the system is choked off from Members of Congress who have secured the right to speak tonight?

MORATORIUM INJURES THE CAUSE OF PEACE

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, those who are sponsoring this moratorium, sit-downs, and demonstrations against the Government are really against peace. They are encouraging a continuation of the war. They are encouraging a continuation of aggression. They are encouraging the massacre of Christians, and they are encouraging slavery for all Southeast Asia. Should the international forces of freedom hastily withdraw from South Vietnam, it will be followed by the bloodiest massacre in the modern history of the world since Hitler's concentration camps and gas chambers.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of the moratorium are advocating unilateral withdrawal of the American forces without any thought or regard for the future or the inevitable consequences. The Communists in Hanoi advocate the same thing. They want America to totally withdraw now.

Should we knuckle down, to the demands of these agitators? What will they advocate next? Would they demand our withdrawal from the road to Berlin? Would they demand our withdrawal of the 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean? Would they demand a free hand for Castro in South America and the Caribbean. What is behind this sinister movement?

The President and the responsible leaders in the Congress are entitled to know now what the real objective is of these moratorium leaders. Of course we want peace. President Nixon and our State Department are exerting every honorable means for peace. Our President last year halted the bombing and agreed to peace talks in Paris. Our President today is conducting an orderly withdrawal of our Armed Forces. The Communists have manifested no desire whatsoever for peace. They have stalled in Paris; they have argued and quibbled over inconsequential. The Communists could stop this war in 1 hour by agreeing

to a cease-fire. This they will never do as long as they are encouraged by moratoriums and demonstrations in the United States which offer them complete victory and slavery for Southeast Asia.

MORATORIUM IDEA SUPPORTED BY MANY

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, talk about the people he does not like who are involved in the moratorium.

I thought of some of the other people also involved in supporting the moratorium. There are some 47 Members of this body and 17 Senators and such disparate people as Cardinal Cushing and the former Ambassador to the Paris peace talks and Governor Sargent of Massachusetts and thousands and thousands of leaders of all walks of life throughout the country.

It seems to me the gentleman's complaint is that there are many responsible people supporting the moratorium, and somehow this is bad, because there may be some people who are not responsible who are also supporting it. I suggest that it will be a sad day in our history if we were ever to walk away from a right course of action or a right idea because somebody in Hanoi or some local Communist, for nefarious reasons or otherwise, also decided to join in supporting such an action or idea.

THE DIGNITY OF THE CHAMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(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, for one, certainly would protect the right of any American to free speech. However, Mr. Speaker, I, as a Member of this body, resent the attempt of a small number of this body to misuse this body for a purpose for which it was not intended.

This body was intended to be a legislative chamber with all the dignity which goes therewith. I will not support any effort for the misuse of this body such as the effort to make it a part of a demonstration directed against the administration now representing the American people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY) is recognized for the purpose of making a motion to adjourn, as he has announced he intends to, I will ask for a vote on that motion in order to place the Members on record.

Let it be known that those who vote in favor of adjournment will be voting to retain the dignity of this Chamber and the purpose for which this Chamber was intended, that of a legislative body and not a place for public demonstrations and in support of actions directed against the Government of this country.

REMARKS ON THE OCTOBER 15 VIETNAM MORATORIUM

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed that in all the discussion about the Vietnam moratorium very little effort has been made to draw a clear distinction between the means that will be used and the objective sought to be obtained.

Very few of us in this Chamber, I believe, certainly, would not favor the right of full debate and public discussion, but not enough attention has been paid to the objective of that moratorium.

Yesterday I asked the moratorium organizers for a formal statement of their objectives. I called Mr. David Mixner, one of the committee leaders down on Vermont Avenue, and this is the reply he gave:

We want to show that it is politically possible, and desirable—politically possible, and desirable, to support complete, immediate and unilateral withdrawal. We want out now, and this is not contingent on anything that Hanoi or the Vietcong might do.

I read a statement yesterday that maybe in 30 days, maybe in 3 weeks, we could pull a half million men remaining in Vietnam out of that country.

Is that what you want? Is that the objective you are supporting?

I hope that those who have formally endorsed this will make it clear, when the proper time comes, whether that is a fact and what they are asking this country to do.

This morning the House Republican conference, which I have the honor to chair, adopted a resolution in which they supported the President in the efforts that he is now making to bring that war to the earliest practicable conclusion. I think that his efforts will win the support of all of us Democrats and Republicans, or at least the vast majority of Americans.

REACTION OF NORTH VIETNAM TO PEACE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have been hearing quotations that were made by Winston Churchill and others who are planning to participate in the moratorium tomorrow. I would like to quote what Hanoi has had to say this morning about the moratorium. This was just taken this morning from the United Press International ticker out in the lobby, and I would invite those who wish to do so to read it. The United Press International said:

The struggle of the American people extends so deep it is supported even by Senators and Congressmen of the President's own party.

They said in Hanoi, "We warmly welcome and wholeheartedly support the great struggle of the American people against the unjust aggressive war being waged against the Vietnamese by the Nixon clique."

Mr. Speaker, I choose to stand back of my country and our fighting men. It does not take an intelligent person to know that the confusion of the past and that planned for tomorrow has already caused this war to be extended. The cost of such action can only be measured in the lives and bodies of American men.

ADDRESS AT EARLHAM COLLEGE, INDIANA, ON THE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, Earlham College of Richmond, Ind., which is located in my district and of which I am a graduate, has invited me to appear on the campus tomorrow, October 15, the so-called day of moratorium, for the express purpose, as stated in their invitation, of giving the student body the point of view of those who generally support the national administration's program and who oppose the idea of immediate and unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I would not have agreed to return to Earlham College tomorrow on any other understanding, but I believe that this point of view which I have been asked to express and which I hold, is a point of view which very badly needs to be expressed on our college campuses, and therefore I think that I ought to take this opportunity to express it. Moreover, I think Earlham College is to be commended for seeking to substitute a balance discussion for the one-sided protests which have been planned for some college campuses.

So far as I am concerned, I want to emphasize that I am opposed to the immediate and unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. I am also strongly opposed to proposals of fixing and announcing a deadline for withdrawal.

Moreover I believe, Mr. Speaker, that protests, moratoriums, and other actions favoring a policy of immediate withdrawal and surrender do a very real disservice to our country.

Whether these sentiments are popular with my audience or not, they are the sentiments which I shall express tomorrow to the student body of my old college.

MORATORIUM

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the October 15 moratorium, although supported by many well-meaning people, can only have harmful effects on our continuing commitment in South Vietnam, which, starkly stated, is to defend freedom against aggression. The moratorium will once again send false signals to Hanoi—it will undermine the efforts of our President to end the conflict. It will in all probability prolong the conflict. It will certainly add to the uncertainties that have undermined and plagued our

efforts from the outset to bring the conflict to an end.

The people who are supporting the moratorium seem to forget the sacrifices of those whom we have already lost in battle. They appear to forget the safety of those who are fighting there now. They also forget the millions of South Vietnamese who have fought with us and depended upon us and who would be murdered in cold blood in the event that we pull out as quickly as those who support the moratorium seem to feel we should.

PROMOTING AND ENCOURAGING YOUTH ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to my colleagues two outstanding men from my congressional district in New Jersey whose dedicated efforts have been responsible for promoting and encouraging youth activities in our area for a number of years. Both men are associated with the Woodbury Daily Times—Bob Shryock as managing editor and Stan Boody as sports editor. While giving fine coverage of activities in the First Congressional District and maintaining one of the most outstanding sports sections in the Delaware Valley, they have devoted their untiring efforts in organizing and developing activities for the benefit of the young people in our locale. They are an inspiration to all who have the pleasure of knowing them and an excellent example of selfless community spirit. I was delighted to note that Mr. Boody was recently named "Coach of the Year" by the Tri-County Midget Football League in recognition of his valuable time and service to the league. It was a well-deserved tribute to one of my most outstanding constituents from a grateful community.

NATIONAL STRIKE IDENTIFIED AS A MORATORIUM

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we are about to engage as a nation in a national strike identified as a moratorium by the conceivers of this operation.

It is my firm conviction that this operation was conceived by relatively immature minds whose sole purpose was to focus attention upon themselves. What really concerns me is that it has been embraced by politicians who apparently are willing to put their own temporary political profit above country at a time when it was never more critical.

Mr. Speaker, there can only be one predictable result of a national strike or moratorium at this time in protest against the war in Vietnam and that is to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we are a nation that is sorely troubled. But an attempt to rule by mob demonstrations can only deepen those troubles.

WE SHOULD SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON'S POSITION ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have heard observations made here this afternoon concerning the special orders that are scheduled for tonight and tomorrow morning. I gather there will be some sharp criticism of the President's plan to bring an end to the war in Vietnam.

Some who have been critical might do well to talk to a former Member of this body from the Democratic side of the aisle, a Member whose credentials as a liberal will match those of anybody on that side of the aisle today—our former colleague from the State of Michigan, Neil Staebler.

Neil Staebler has just returned from a personal-expense trip to Vietnam.

Those urging that we withdraw unilaterally from Vietnam should talk to Neil Staebler.

Neil Staebler said unilateral withdrawal would end up in the worst blood bath that you could imagine in South Vietnam. Three million Catholics who fled from the Communist dictatorship in North Vietnam are now in South Vietnam.

Neil Staebler will tell you that the South Vietnamese people today are turning in active support to the government in Saigon, and that it would be disastrous for the United States to unilaterally withdraw because this would mean the end of a responsible government that is getting broader based all the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional seconds, if I might.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that we are operating under the 1-minute rule, and that cannot be done.

WE SHOULD SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON'S POSITION ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Washington yielding me this time. I understand the distinguished Speaker's problem, insofar as extension of time under the 1-minute rule is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say in conclusion that the President of the United States is acting affirmatively to end the war in Vietnam. Twelve percent of the troops assigned to Vietnam when he took office in January 1969 are either home or on their way home. Twenty percent of the combat military personnel who were

there when the President took office are now out of Vietnam.

The President is working hard for peace, and we will get peace, either at Paris or through the phasing out of our troops and phasing in of South Vietnamese troops. I believe the American people support this plan for peace, and anything that undermines it will be most unfortunate for our men who are in Vietnam, and those who are fighting for freedom around the world.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports. The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate tomorrow, Wednesday, October 15.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if the request has been cleared with the minority leader?

Mr. ALBERT. It has been cleared with the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The matter has been cleared with me also. I strongly urge that the unanimous consent be granted. The subcommittee is working on the anticrime bill. We want it out, and this is one way to get it out.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RAISING INTEREST RATE ON SERIES E AND H BONDS

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Members that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has requested me to announce that sometime during this week he will seek to call up, under unanimous-consent agreement, the bill, H.R. 14020, to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act

to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds, a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. 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. 217]

Abbitt	Edwards, Calif.	Martin
Adams	Fallon	May
Arends	Farbstein	Meeds
Ashbrook	Fascell	Nedzi
Ashley	Findley	Nelsen
Aspinall	Fish	O'Konski
Berry	Fisher	Ottinger
Blatnik	Flynt	Patman
Bow	Foley	Pollock
Brock	Ford,	Powell
Brooks	William D.	Quile
Brown, Calif.	Frey	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Fulton, Tenn.	Rivers
Cahill	Gray	Rodino
Camp	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Griffin	Roybal
Casey	Haley	St Germain
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	St. Onge
Celler	Hastings	Saylor
Clark	Hays	Scheuer
Cohelan	Holifield	Sisk
Collier	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
Collins	Jacobs	Steed
Corman	Jonas	Steiger, Wis.
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Sullivan
Dawson	Jones, Tenn.	Taylor
de la Garza	Karth	Teague, Calif.
Delaney	Kirwan	Tunney
Devine	Kuykendall	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Kyros	Watson
Dingell	Lloyd	Whalley
Eckhardt	Lujan	Wold
Edmondson	McMillan	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FEDERAL SALARY COMPARABILITY ACT OF 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 576

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13000) to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the

five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and at the conclusion of my remarks yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) one-half hour.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 13000 to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

There are two basic purposes of H.R. 13000:

First, the setting up of a permanent method of adjusting the pay of Federal employees who are paid under GS, PFS, Foreign Service schedules and the schedules relating to doctors, dentists and nurses under the Veterans Administration; and

Second, the elimination of inequity requiring postal employees to serve 21 years before reaching maximum pay for their work. Under this bill they would reach top pay in 8 years.

A Federal Employee Salary Commission would be set up, composed of four representatives from the executive and four from employee organizations. For purposes of voting, the employee groups have only three votes; however, in the event of arbitrary behavior, aggrieved employees will have recourse through the Board of Arbitration.

The Board of Arbitration will be composed of four Members of Congress—two from each body—one representative each of the executive and the employees, and an impartial chairman selected by the other six. The Board will decide whether the decision of the Commission is in agreement with policy directives in the law.

In order to create more incentives in the postal service, the present system of in-step promotion before reaching the top step in grade will be reduced from 21 years to 8 years. All lower grade employees—PFS 1 to PFS 11—are given a 2-step advancement effective October 1, 1969. The higher levels—PFS 12 and above—will be given earned step advancement on July 1, 1970, as their first step in the acceleration program.

An allowance of not more than \$10 per day for commuting would be allowed employees of executive and independent establishments assigned to duty at remote worksites.

Corps of Engineers employees engaged in floating plant operations, when the employees cannot board vessels due to weather conditions or while a vessel is in the yard for repairs will be paid an allowance.

Premium compensation will be permitted for certain employees for Sunday, night, holiday, and overtime pay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 576 in order that H.R. 13000 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as is sometimes the case, I believe that the title of this particular bill, H.R. 13000, is somewhat deceptive in that it is called "the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969." I am certain that in the debate we have on this bill today, this afternoon, that much will be said about the pledge that the Congress made in 1962 to afford full comparability to those who are employed by the Federal Government, and particularly those in the Federal postal service.

However, I think that when I voted for comparability in 1962, along with, I believe, virtually the entire House of Representatives, I had no idea we would come to the point to which we have come in this legislation—to remove completely from the authority of the President to have an input on salary schedules for those in the executive branch and to so circumscribe the authority of the Congress that we have literally nothing left to say about the manner in which Federal salaries and Federal compensation is fixed. Therefore, I would suggest that we ought to examine with some care the provisions of this legislation, relating as they do to a Federal Salary Commission and to a Federal Arbitration Board, because I asked one of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Rules, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) just exactly how the President could ever frame a meaningful budget, considering, as we must, that we have something like 2 million Federal employees that would be brought under the purview of this legislation—I do not have the exact figure on the tip of my tongue, but the Federal payroll a few years ago was \$18 billion. I am sure it is much more than that today—how is the President of the United States ever going to be able to submit meaningful budget estimates when we take out of his hands completely, I repeat—anything to do or to say about the setting of Federal compensation.

Of course, if you have read the report and if you have read the views that were submitted on this bill by the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Postmaster General, you will find that it is precisely for this reason that they are in opposition to this legislation. I do not, for one, oppose what my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) said that for a long time we have neglected particularly those in the postal service, and I think my record is good in that regard.

Since I came to the Congress 9 years ago, I have voted, I believe, without exception for increases for postal workers.

But I do object, and I do object very fundamentally to the means that the Post Office Committee now seeks to employ as far as the fixing of Federal salaries and compensation is concerned.

Let me make one other point. I received a wire, as did all Members of the House, a few days ago signed by the president of some of the postal unions. The first line in that wire read:

H.R. 13000 is a significant first step toward postal reform.

I think this bill is going to move us farther away from the objective of postal reform. I think once this legislation becomes law, if it does become the law of the land; once we set up permanent machinery for the annual review and fixing by this Federal Salary Commission of salaries for postal employees and other Federal employees, we are going to be moving, not toward, but away from the goal of postal reform.

I noted also a document that came to my desk just over the weekend, a publication put out by the United Federation of Postal Clerks, the Federation News Service, in which is reported the granting of a rule on this particular bill H.R. 13000 and in which, referring to the 13-to-13 vote in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee which, in effect, defeated the administration's postal reform measure, the following is said:

Therefore, we must continue our efforts with PO&CS Committee Members and all Congressmen in support of the Dulski Postal Reform bill, H.R. 4, and remain "on guard" continually against H.R. 11750 and all corporation amendments!

Make no mistake about it. The people who are supporting this bill today are against postal reform. They are against the postal corporation and they are satisfied that once this bill becomes the law of the land and they have this commission fixing salaries, nobody is even going to talk any more about the kind of fundamental far-reaching basic reform of the postal system that not only I think we need, but also the people of this country are speaking of today with a rather loud voice to their Representatives in Congress, saying they are dissatisfied with the way the affairs in this department are being run. They want basic, far-reaching postal reform.

I feel this bill simply is not going to advance us one step in the direction of that reform.

The purpose of the bill is to set up a permanent method of adjusting the pay of Federal employees and to provide pay increases for postal workers.

The bill creates a Federal Employee Salary Commission of eight members, four appointed from the executive departments and four from Federal employee groups. The Commission shall make studies and draw up salary schedules. For voting purposes, the employee group will have only three votes so that the executive will control the Commission.

Also created by the bill is the Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration composed of two Senators and two Representatives, appointed bipartisanly, one

member appointed by each of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the employee groups, and one member appointed by a majority of the Board, who shall serve as chairman.

If any member of the Salary Commission shall disagree with the recommendations of the Commission, he can appeal to the Board, whose decision shall be binding and have the effect of law unless specifically overridden by the Congress within 30 days of the submission of such pay schedule recommendations. This is the only place where the Congress would become directly involved with the operation. The President is actually not involved at all in any direct manner. There is only one Executive-appointed member on the Board. Since the Executive has voting control of the Salary Commission and since any minority member of the Commission may appeal to the Board, the Board will almost always have the final say. Unless Congress would take affirmative action to stop such recommendations as the Board may submit, they become effective.

The bill also provides pay raises for postal employees. Current law requires 21 years for a postal employee to reach the top step in his grade. The bill reduces this period to 8 years.

All lower grade postal employees—grades 1 to 11—are given two-step advancement effective October 1, 1969. Higher level employees—grades 12 and above—will be given earned step advancement on July 1, 1970. The estimated cost of the advancement for lower grade employees in fiscal 1970 is \$244,000,000. This is not in the budget. The 1971 additional cost is estimated to be \$544,000,000.

There are several minor provisions contained in the bill. A \$10 per day payment is authorized to Federal employees working at remote locations to defray commuting expenses. The payment of premium compensation is also authorized for certain employees who must work holidays, Sundays, and at night. These include border patrolmen, customs officials, and agents of the FBI. These features are estimated to cost about \$100,000 per year.

Separate views are filed by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). He supports the concept of a permanent Salary Commission but believes it should be advisory to the President and the Congress and should not have its recommendations become effective until affirmative action by the Congress approves them. Nor does he believe the President should be bypassed because of the budgetary impact of salary increases. He opposes giving some Federal employees a raise when others do not receive equal treatment.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) have filed minority views strongly opposing passage. They believe the bill destroys the President's authority and responsibility to participate in determining pay schedules. They likewise believe the bill substantially removes the Congress from any effective voice in the same determination, leaving it about in the same position with respect to Federal employees as it now

is with respect to the salaries of Members, judges, and executive-level employees in the departments downtown. They oppose this.

They note that none of the pay increases for 1970 are budgeted and could easily reach \$2,000,000,000 in calendar 1970 if all Federal employees are given only a 5-percent increase.

They expect employee-members of the Salary Commission who do not get all they want to immediately appeal to the Salary Board. Board decisions are binding, on Congress and on the President. They believe that the responsibility of the Congress and the President must be maintained. They want the bill defeated.

The administration does not support the bill. There are two principle reasons: unbudgeted funding, and the loss of Executive authority in the area.

The bill is a committee substitute; the rule will have to reflect this.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have always had the greatest respect and admiration for the gentleman in the well, but when the gentleman says that postal reform is dead, I wish to inform the gentleman that today the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service met in executive session and the first section of an amendment giving the Postmaster General 9-year term of office to provide continuity in the top postal management.

Last but not least, the gentleman talks about what the bill will do, but is it not true what the gentleman in the well just said a few moments ago is the same thing the corporation would do? The corporation would take over the entire function of the Congress on rates and wages. A postal corporation would take pay out of the hands of the Congress, just the same as this bill does.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from New York, I would make this reply, and this is one thing I am sure his committee did not do in the executive session that the gentleman refers to. The bill is not going to leave it to free collective bargaining between representatives of the postal workers and other Federal employees and those who represent management on the Federal level. The gentleman is not willing to leave it to the process of free collective bargaining on the setting of these wage rates. If the gentleman was willing to do that I would be with him, because then I think we would bring the whole business of the Post Office Department down to the kind of working arrangement that is feasible and has been feasible for 180 years in the private sector. I cannot see why it would not work in the public sector.

I cannot for the life of me understand these people who are wiring me and the people who are signing their names to the communication I read a moment ago, who are exponents of the right of free collective bargaining for Federal employees, I cannot understand why they resist with every ounce of their

strength apparently the idea that we ought to have free collective bargaining in this area. It seems to me that ought to be the very function and purpose of these unions, to represent people in the setting of wages and terms and conditions of employment. Yet this is one thing they do not want.

What they want to set up is a Salary Commission. We are inevitably going to have an appeal from the Commission, and the gentleman knows that as well as I, and then whom do we have on the Arbitration Board? We have a majority of the Board consisting of Members of Congress, two from the House, and two from the Senate, appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate. These four people are going to be under the heaviest imaginable pressure to yield to the demands that will then be made to arbitrate the differences about areas of wages and compensation in the postal service and the Federal employment. I would suggest this is scarcely the best way to arrive at an objective determination of those questions.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I will not argue on the point about the Commission. I feel just as well as the gentleman does, that we must have real postal reform. In H.R. 4 we have the mechanism that will achieve real reform within the confines of the responsibilities of Congress. But let me tell the gentleman this much. I started hearings on April 22, and I have been working on these questions. When H.R. 4 comes out of the committee, with perfecting amendments added, it will provide truly meaningful postal reform.

I assure the gentleman that postal reform will not be killed so long as I stay as chairman of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am sure the gentleman is both sincere and honest in the convictions he has expressed. I do not for a moment impugn the sincerity of his position.

If I could believe, I say to the gentleman from New York, that the amendments he says inevitably will come and will be attached to this bill, H.R. 4, would include collective bargaining so far as wages are concerned, and if they would include taking the ratemaking process out of the Congress and putting it under the kind of ratemaking board the Postmaster General has asked for in H.R. 11750, then I think you would have a good bill. I have very little reason to believe that kind of bill will come from the committee.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. I just want to point out that I believe the gentleman in the well is mistaken on two accounts here.

First, the gentleman indicated if we were to pass this bill today we would take away from the President and the Congress any role in the fixing of salaries. That is true in terms of the salary-

fixing Commission. However, under the corporate setup the President and the Postmaster General have asked for the same kind of concept.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, it would be done by the process of free collective bargaining. That is my whole point.

Mr. BRASCO. That is not so. If the gentleman will take a look at the bill encompassing the corporate form, there is set up a disputes panel to complement the process of collective bargaining. The unfortunate part is that there is no true collective bargaining, because if there is an impasse, the disputes panel must say OK before an item can come before it. There is no guarantee to labor that the disputes panel will OK discussing any item, when there is an impasse, it must be resolved. So under the corporate bill there is no true collective bargaining. That is why labor could not support it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I cannot agree with the gentleman's statement there is no collective bargaining under that bill. I believe there is.

I shall not take time to continue this debate further, except to suggest, as I have already indicated, that this is not just a salary comparability bill. This bill represents a very fundamental change, and I think a total abdication of responsibility by the Congress. It takes the President out of the decisionmaking process altogether.

We ought to look very carefully and very closely at our action today before we vote finally on this measure.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13000.

The elimination of the longstanding inequity which has required postal employees to serve 21 years before reaching maximum pay for their work is long overdue. The best distribution clerks and letter carriers, the backbone of our postal service, can expect under existing law, is \$1,864 less than the minimum standard of a so-called moderate standard of living after 21 years, and at mid-range, PFS 5, step 4, they receive only \$111 more than the standard set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for a low standard of living.

This is patently unfair to thousands upon thousands of loyal devoted career employees, Mr. Speaker, and I urge our colleagues to correct it here today by adoption of this legislation.

I also support enthusiastically the creation of a Federal Employee Salary Commission, and of an Arbitration Board to resolve any conflicts which might develop within the Commission. I feel it is particularly important that representation on the arbitration board by afforded Members of the House and Senate.

The semiautomatic adjustments we effected in 1968 and 1969 were based on a survey done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics under the control of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, and I understand my colleagues on the committee are gravely concerned about whether or not true comparability was actually achieved under these adjustments.

The creation of a Federal Employee Salary Commission will eliminate in the future any bias which may have existed in the conduct of these surveys in the past. The Commission can also prevent future recurrences of the position, which has often been taken by the executive branch, that the congressional policy of comparability should be implemented only when a budget surplus permits. The Commission can guarantee once and for all that Federal employees will not be the first to suffer from budget limitations and that adequate compensation will be provided in order to maintain the high level of competence we need in the Federal Government. Further, we will establish once and for all the regular adjustments in salaries of Federal employees are an automatic cost of Government rather than an act of generosity.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation in its present form does not provide also for a comparability increase at the date of enactment for other Federal employees. By not including some adjustment at this time, we will, in effect, make it necessary for other employees to wait for consideration of such an increase until the Federal Employee Salary Commission the legislation creates can become operable and afford them relief.

It is my understanding that an amendment will be offered today which will include other Federal employees, and I shall certainly support that amendment when it is offered.

Mr. Speaker, I also support the provisions of this measure which provide for payment to defray commuting expenses of employees assigned to duty at remote worksites; for payment to employees engaged in floating plant operations who are prevented from boarding their vessels under circumstances beyond their control; and for payment of premium compensation to certain groups of employees who are not now compensated for work on Sundays, nights, holidays, and overtime.

Mr. Speaker, most of the provisions of this legislation are desperately needed, and I am therefore supporting it. As I said earlier, I sincerely feel we should include other Federal employees in its salary adjustment provisions, and I shall support an amendment to do so. However, regardless of whether or not the amendment is adopted, I shall support the bill on final passage.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any further requests for time?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. UDALL. 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. 13000) to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system,

to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13000, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of H.R. 13000 will represent the final step in carrying out one of the chief long-range legislative programs of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It achieves an objective that the committee has shared with the vast majority of our colleagues—the establishment of a permanent system for adjusting the pay of all Federal employees under the principle of comparability adopted by the Congress in 1962.

That is the chief—in fact the overruling—purpose of the bill.

A second most important advance in pay-setting also is accomplished by H.R. 13000.

The bill eliminates a serious inequity which now makes most of our postal employees serve an "apprenticeship" of 21 years before he is paid the "journeyman" top pay rate.

The bill reduces the 21-year apprenticeship to 8 years.

Mr. Chairman, our Subcommittee on Compensation, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), is to be commended for its fine work on this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is really an historic pay bill in every sense of that perhaps overworked term. To put it into focus, let me begin by summarizing for the Committee some of the features of the Government salary systems that the Federal Government has. I think there has been some confusion on this point.

The taxpayers of this country will pay out this year in salaries about \$41 billion. This is almost equally divided between civilian salaries and military salaries. I will insert the precise figures in the extension of my remarks in the table that I have here, but the military salaries are \$21 billion and the civilian salaries are about \$20 billion. I insert the following in the RECORD at this time:

PERSONNEL PAY INFORMATION

	Dollar amounts paid (billions)	Number of employees	Annual pay	Hourly pay
General schedule	11.03	1,300,000	\$8,648	\$4.16
Postal field service	4.42	735,000	6,932	3.44
Wage board	4.05	740,000	6,802	3.27
Military	21.103	3,458,000		
Other	.948	120,000	7,407	3.56

	Millions	Billions
Total civilian	2.75	\$20.448
Total military	3.458	21.103
Personnel	6.208	41.551

The civilian salaries are really divided into perhaps four main categories. It is important to keep them separate, because some of the features of this bill deal with one or another of the various salary systems. The general schedule is the largest of the civilian salary system. It is the so-called classified service. There are 1.3 million or 1½ million Federal employees in this classified service. The payroll for this year for these people will be roughly \$11 billion. Next we come to the postal field service. This service has 735,000 employees. The payroll for them this year will be about \$4.4 billion. Next we have a number of miscellaneous systems that are covered in this bill. We have the Veterans' Administration and the doctors, dentists, and officials who work for the Veterans' Administration. We have the Foreign Service, with the two Foreign Service salary systems. These miscellaneous systems amount to a little under \$1 billion and employ something on the order of 120,000 Americans.

On top of this we have the military where we have about 3.5 million men in uniform in the military. Their pay, as I indicated, this year will be about \$21 billion.

You simply cannot do the things this Government has undertaken to do and you cannot have the Military Establishment and you cannot have the Post Office Department that we have and a \$900 billion economy without a lot of employees, and you cannot have employees without salaries.

A continuing problem for the Congress has been how do you fix salaries; What are adequate salaries? These are the problems my subcommittee and our great full committee have wrestled with. In fact, because of an act passed in the last Congress, we now fix the policy, as it were, for the whole Federal Government, because there is a statute which says that once you adjust Federal civilian salaries in any specific amounts, then the military service automatically gets the same increases in proportion in the different grades of the military service.

So the decisions we make today in this bill and the decisions which we have made previously are vital decisions that involve billions of dollars, that involve fundamental government both with regard to the treatment of its employees and the service which they perform for their Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that this House consider these decisions and consider them very carefully.

What does this bill do? This is not just another pay bill. You have all been here, the oldtimers, and voted against the various pay bills. However, this is a very different bill. Indeed, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has put his finger upon some of the key aspects of the bill. This may be the last pay bill you ever vote for if you stay here for another 20 years. This is not a change; it is a fundamental change. It is not a change that has been ill considered and a change that was not made without deep and careful thought.

Mr. Chairman, the change advocated in this bill represents an achievement for me over the period of about a 5-year program because I have been personally working to bring about some kind of rational, sensible, permanent way of approaching the problem of the adjustment of Federal salaries. I say this because this problem is going to be with us every year. This is a plan of machinery, a method of adjusting the Federal, civilian, postal, classified, and military salaries. If you support this bill today, and I urge you do so, and if it passes, you will have, I think, made a historic achievement and brought to this whole problem a rationality and a permanence that it never had before.

Mr. Chairman, what does the bill do? The bill really does two major things. First, it deals with the postal people only; and, second, you are dealing generally with the Federal employees across the board. There are inequities and I shall first deal with the postal provisions because there was some controversial thought but was supported widely in our committee when finally understood and that is the plight of the letter carriers, the plight of the clerks, and there are over, I think, nearly one-half million of these people. These are men engaged in dead end employment. The statistics show that over 90 percent of them begin and end their careers—their 20 to 30 years of service careers—in the same grade. They begin at level 4 or 5 and end their careers at that level. It is a dead end employment. Less than 1 percent of them in any one year expect a promotion in their grade level.

Mr. Chairman, the postal field service is constructed so that there are 12 steps and in order to become a full-fledged letter carrier one must serve a minimum of 21 years, until they are appointed to the top level. In other words, they serve an apprenticeship, really, for 21 years before qualifying for the top salary step.

Take for example, if I am a carpenter, at the end of 2 or 3 or 5 years I then become a full-fledged carpenter. If I am a policeman employed under most city or State governments, I am a full-fledged policeman at some point in 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years. But if you are in the postal field service, you are still classified as a rookie.

Mr. Chairman, this bill shortens the time of such service from 21 years to 8 years during which it takes a new man coming into the postal field service to reach the top step. This is crucial, because we must begin to recruit the good

people we need. The turnover has been something frightening for the whole postal service because next year one man out of every four working for the postal service will be gone from some type of postal activity. The substitute clerks, for example, the turnover is 45 percent. How would you like to run an efficient business with a turnover of 45 percent in a category of employees who sort the mail, who know the streets and addresses and all the rest that goes with the proper and efficient handling of the mail?

Mr. Chairman, the first thing this bill does is to change the structure and to correct a longstanding injustice and to shorten the period of that service from 21 years to 8 years.

The second major feature of this bill—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he goes to the other feature?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that only a couple of years ago or, maybe, 3 years ago an effort was made to reclassify the postal workers and the majority on the committee voted it down?

Mr. UDALL. We reclassified the grade 4's in 1967; we made them grade 5's so we did reclassify in that sense, it was not a full grade 5, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GROSS. That may well be, but the attempt was made at that time to reclassify and, as far as I am concerned, it should have been passed. I supported it, but for some strange reason it was voted down. I am not going into the particulars of what happened on that occasion, the gentleman is well aware of them, and so were others on this committee.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Iowa always attempts to keep me on the straight and narrow path, so I certainly appreciate his contribution because he always corrects me if I make an error, and if in the future I make an error he will correct me or call me to account.

The second major change this bill makes is the most vital one, and is the most controversial, and the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Committee on Rules, spoke about it just a few moments ago.

What this bill does is to take Congress out of the nonsensical position of fighting year in and year out a Federal pay bill. Each year since 1962, with the exception of the last 2, we have had pay rallies in Washington, the corridors have been filled with postal employees coming to Washington to petition for redress of their grievances. We have argued and battled whether or not the budget would stand for it, and we have fought the White House, and the employee unions, and we have been caught in the middle of this thing year in and year out.

So now for the first time we are going to put this on a rational basis, and establish a salary commission. This commission is not given a blank check. Congress does not abdicate its responsibility. The President is not taken out of the picture as it has been alleged.

This Commission will carry out the policies that Congress makes.

Let me give you an example. Suppose you are the president of a very busy bank—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As I started to say, suppose you are the president of a very important and busy bank, and you find that you are spending about two-thirds of your time attempting to haggle with every bookkeeper, teller, and clerk in the bank on whether their pay should be increased, and as a result you find you cannot attend to the really important problems of the bank.

As a result, I think what you might do would be to call in a trusted lieutenant, and you would say to him that it is the policy of this bank to pay the tellers in this bank what the tellers are paid in other banks in this city, and to pay the janitors in this bank what the janitors in other banks are paid, and to pay the bookkeepers what other bookkeepers in other banks are paid. Do not bother me with all these problems. You take some time and attempt to find out what the salary schedules are for bookkeepers in other banks, or companies, or industries, that are comparable to the banking industry, and bring those in to me and I will put them in effect; lay them on my desk for my consideration, and then I will check them, and if I like them I will put them in effect.

That is what we do here. Congress fixes our policy, and we say that a bookkeeper in the Veterans' Administration or a bookkeeper in NASA or a bookkeeper in the Defense Department ought to get the same pay that a bookkeeper receives in private industry who has that kind of responsibility.

We do not take the time of the Congress to do this; we put it in the hands of experts who go out and study it and find out what it is, and who then come in and lay it before us, and we can take it or leave it.

This is the delegation that some will object to. This is the abdication of congressional responsibility that some will object to.

I emphasize that under this bill the House and the Senate will still have the veto authority. We will set the policy, as I have indicated.

Let me ask you a question or two about this: During 1968 and 1969 did any of you feel like you had abdicated your responsibilities? Did any of you feel lonely because we did not have pay rallies? 1968 was the first year on record when we have not been confronted with a pay bill. The last was in 1967 when we wrote a bill as kind of a test where we said, let us test a new idea, we can work out a formula, and we said to the President when July 1968 comes, you take a look at private enterprise and with the BLS statistics, and all the other information that is available, and let us put them together and come up with the results.

This the President did, and it was the fairest and best, most rational and least cumbersome pay raise we have ever had.

The President did the same thing this year. Did any of you feel guilty? Did any of you feel lonely? Did any of you

feel like we had abdicated our responsibilities? Or did you feel like I felt, that we in the Congress had set the policy in 1967, and set up the mechanics and the details of carrying it out?

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. ABERNETHY. Would this Commission be comparable to the Commission that now regulates or really fixes salaries of Members of Congress, the judiciary, and so forth?

Mr. UDALL. It would be quite comparable in its purpose. In fact, they would work together. This is part of the whole idea to have a rational construction of the federal systems.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would it be the same Commission?

Mr. UDALL. It would be an entirely different commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How would this Commission be designated?

Mr. UDALL. The Commission would be designated as follows: There would be really seven votes on the Commission—four would be controlled by the President—and I say that to those who are saying that you are taking the President out of the picture. The four are appointed as follows: the Bureau of the Budget, the Postmaster General, the head of the Department of Defense, and the Civil Service Commission. These are four votes.

The other three votes are to the two largest postal union employees, so it is a half vote each. Then you have one for the classified union and then the independent Federal union representative is to be picked by the Civil Service Commission—and there you have seven votes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then the Commission will be quite different from the present congressional Commission but it will still be a salary determining commission.

Mr. UDALL. Oh, indeed.

Now that brings us to the second step. The employee unions were very afraid they were giving up what they thought to be the ultimate protection that they had.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman say there would be three union members on the Commission?

Mr. UDALL. Three out of seven.

They were most apprehensive that they were giving up their access to the Congress and felt that in the final analysis the Congress had to pull them out, when the present Postmaster General would not come up with a raise. We said, All right, if the Salary Commission does not carry it out—and that is the only question before the Salary Commission, to make proper petitions giving them comparability—then the employee unions can appeal to the Board of Arbitration and the Board of Arbitration has seven votes. Four of those votes are Members of Congress, two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate.

There is one Government representative selected by the Civil Service Commission—and one union representative and a chairman from the American Arbitration Society.

So these people, seven members of the

Arbitration Board finally determine whether the Salary Commission is applying the policy that the Congress lays down.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If they do not like it, they would still be coming back? If they do not like the recommendations of the Commission, of course, you anticipate that they will still be back walking the Halls, do you not?

Mr. UDALL. In any event, the findings of the Commission or the Board of Arbitration come back to the Congress for veto or for other action. In my opinion, based on 1968 and 1969 experience, I do not think so very much because this is exactly what we did in the last 2 years. They will not be back at all. They will accept this.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that congressional, executive, and judicial pay raises are dovetailed with this bill?

Mr. UDALL. Yes in a sense, that has been my aim, to get Congress out of this hassle.

As I pointed out, the Congress has already raised its salary eight times in 108 years and Congress never got around to this. So my judgment is that this is now rational, orderly, and regular review every 4 years, and the Congress approved this.

If you get a rational and orderly and annual adjustment of these other systems tied into it, then you have a whole pay system of the Federal Government dovetailed together. Then they will be working together on a rational and orderly basis. This has been my goal as my colleague knows, and I am sorry the gentleman does not share it.

Mr. GROSS. Then you favor this dovetailing of legislation?

Mr. UDALL. Indeed, it dovetails very nicely together and I hope the gentleman will help to put in order these joints so we can finally put this into place.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUPPE. The gentleman will recall that 3 years ago the subcommittee did a great deal of work preparing a salary schedule level in line with the rate increase proposed by this and other subcommittees at the time.

I recognize the need to bring the two in order. I understand that this present legislation will cost about \$500,000,000 in the next year. In the fiscal year now ending is there any revenue measure that will be brought along to achieve the same revenues we are quite anxious to reach? Does the gentleman think we are going to secure the necessary revenue in 2 years to cover the cost of this legislation?

Mr. UDALL. The President sent some days ago, my friend will recall, urging a rate increase on first-class mail which has been before our committee, and this bill by the President would produce around \$600,000,000 in additional revenue.

The distinguished gentleman from Montana chairs that subcommittee and

has been holding hearings on that bill. I am prepared to face up to my responsibility on the question of postal reform and other things but I regret that we have not been able to be together on this bill.

It was a rather unprecedented thing. The gentleman was a very valuable member of that subcommittee and the committee. It was kind of unprecedented to combine a pay bill and a rate bill.

Mr. RUPPE. They were acted on very much in parallel at that time.

Mr. UDALL. There was very little enthusiasm for a marriage between these two bills at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I make this final point to those who are troubled, as some may be, about the delegation of authority, the abdication of congressional responsibility, and so on. If you feel badly about it, you might reflect that this is—in fact, the gentleman from Iowa stated in the Rules Committee, or someone up there, that it is unconstitutional. I said:

There are \$5 billion or \$4 billion that is going to be paid out this year in the same unconstitutional fashion. There are 740,000 Federal employees who are paid under a system called "Wage Board."

In that Wage Board system the President plays no role. The Congress plays no role. I hear no complaints on those when adjustments have been made, and we have not had a chance to vote on them. The President did not know about them. This Wage Board has been in existence since the time of Ulysses S. Grant. For more than 100 years we have had the Wage Board. It has worked. It has been delegated with authority by Congress to determine how much carpenters are paid in the building industry, in order to pay Federal carpenters in the same way. That is what we are doing in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today in support of H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969.

For over 5 years I have been working toward this day. It has been my long-held belief that the employees of our Government deserved and needed a dependable, rational method of pay adjustments in order to plan their careers in the Federal Service. For too many years we have tried to hire and retain competent employees by saying to them, "give us the best years of your life in return for an unknown system of pay adjustments." In accordance with the best-accepted private enterprise policies, we are today going to pass an act that says to the Federal employee, "From now on you can be assured that each year your pay will be adjusted in line with any changes in private enterprise."

No longer will the almost 2 million employees covered by this bill have to sit back and hope or pray, that their salaries will be adjusted.

We in Congress began this process in 1967 by passing that historic pay bill which allowed the Executive, in partnership with the Congress, to automatically set pay in 1968 and 1969. During that debate, there were objections which raised a variety of ominous problems. During 1968 and 1969, those straw men were laid to rest. Now the members have seen how smoothly and efficiently that law worked.

The employees of all branches of Government are satisfied with the principle established in that act.

Now we come before you with the natural extension of that act. Naturally, there are some changes—experience has shown us that certain structural modifications were necessary—but the principle remains the same. Congress must set the policy and establish the machinery for its smooth enactment. The Executive must administer that policy—not make it—and the Congress must continue the review and control of the policy.

In addition to this policy of congressional control, we will reiterate today the fundamental personnel policy of comparability. This policy simply says that Government workers doing the same work as their counterparts in private enterprise must be paid substantially the same amount of money. This policy was established in 1962, restated in 1967, and repeated again today in this act. A computer programmer in the Department of Defense should get the same amount of money as a computer programmer working for IBM, if they do the same kind of work.

These two fundamental policies—congressional review and comparability of pay—form the bedrock of the act we vote on today.

The act itself is fairly simple—it has two major parts—one affects all Federal workers, and the second adjusts the promotion policy concerning postal workers.

The major provision of this act concerning all Federal employees sets up a Federal Employees Salary Commission. This Commission is established to annually recommend to the Congress adjustments in the pay of employees under the general schedule, the postal field service, the Veterans' Administration, and the Foreign Service. This Commission is composed of a regular representative of the President from each of the following: Civil Service Commission, Bureau of the Budget, Defense Department, and Post Office Department. In addition, the employees are represented by four members as follows: one representative for general schedule employees, two representatives for postal employees, and one representative from independent unions on a rotating basis.

Each of the Presidential members will have one vote—a total of four—and the employee representatives will have three votes—(postal representatives will have one-half vote each. Thus, the Presidential members will have a majority of the Commission. This is a deliberate policy so that the President can make sure his personnel policy is carried out. At the same time, the employees will have representation so that the employees will have some voice in this policy of setting pay.

In addition to these eight regular members, there are three associate members. These associate members are selected by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and do not have a vote. They will be selected to present the views of the specialized employee groups, such as the Air Traffic Controllers or the Federal Professionals and will be rotated annually by the Civil Service Commission.

In the event that any regular member

of the Commission feels that the congressional policy of comparability has not been carried out, this act provides for an appeals procedure.

The appeal is made to an Arbitration Board composed of four Members of Congress—two from the House and two from the Senate—one Presidential representative, one employee representative, and an impartial Chairman selected by the first six. This arbitration board will review the decisions of the Salary Commission and decide if the congressional policy has been carried out. If it has not, the board will make the necessary changes, and send the revised changes on to Congress for final approval. If it finds that the recommendations of the Commission are in accord with the principle of comparability, it will so certify to Congress—again for final approval.

This entire procedure is designed so that it should not take more than 60 to 90 days each year to adjust Federal salaries. This is in vivid contrast to the months and months it previously took under the old system.

This, then, is the historic and precedent-setting comparability system we vote on today. I believe it will become a landmark act in progressive personnel policymaking for Federal employees.

POSTAL PROMOTION POLICY

A second major provision of this act rectifies a longstanding and major problem facing postal employees, particularly clerks and letter carriers.

The Post Office Department has long complained of the difficulty in hiring, training, and retaining competent employees. All of the Members of the House have heard from their constituents on the deteriorating service in the post office. A primary cause of these problems lies in the fact that it takes over 21 years before a postal employee reaches the top step in his grade. This is similar to being a rookie after 20 years.

All available evidence indicates that the postal employee is stymied on two fronts in trying to get ahead in the Post Office Department:

First. There are not enough promotions to go around. For instance, only one employee in every 100 gets promoted to a different position each year in the post office. The average for all other Government agencies is one in four.

Second. The vast majority of postal employees thus remain in the same grade level throughout their career. It is in this grade level—usually grade 5—that the 20-plus years are spent.

This problem is resolved in the following manner: We reduce the 20 year problem to a maximum of 8 years. Thus, the new employee will know that he will make top grade in his pay by the eighth year rather than by the 20th.

Second, we begin this process by advancing the lower grade postal employees by two steps, effective October 1, 1969. This will provide an additional \$412 per year. Add this to the average \$298 per year already allotted, and you have the postal employee getting a total of \$59 for the months of October, November, and December of this year, up from \$24.80 per month. This is in contrast to the average General Schedule employee

who has been—since last July—and is currently receiving an additional \$69 per month.

This problem has been a grievance that both management and the employees of the Post Office Department have been mentioning to our committee for some time. We believe that our solution should assist the Department in retaining and recruiting additional quality employees for the foreseeable future.

In addition to resolving this particular problem facing the postal employees, H.R. 13000 has three other sections.

These sections also resolve specific problems facing particular groups of employees serving in other branches of the Government. The first of these authorizes the payment of an allowance, not to exceed \$10, to defray the cost of commuting to remote worksites. Many times an employee must travel to a remote worksite, perhaps to build or repair a facility, and presently must pay his own way from his normal work place. This bill will help defray part of this additional expense. This bill is identical to H.R. 12881, which passed the 90th Congress unanimously.

Another provision provides a living allowance for certain employees who work on floating plants operated by employees of the Corps of Engineers. This section is identical to H.R. 7406, which passed our committee in the 90th Congress.

The final special problem is one that affects various agents employed by the FBI, the Border Patrol, and others. It allows for them to be paid for regularly scheduled overtime, Sunday and holiday duty that is presently not received. This inequity is removed by this section and is supported by the administration.

All of these three miscellaneous provisions are estimated to cost less than \$100,000 per annum.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a variety of objections raised to this legislation. Many of them are a rehashing of previous pay legislation. In order to alert my colleagues to these "straw men," I will outline and rebut some of them.

First. This act will bypass the President and take away from him his constitutional authority.

This is patently inaccurate. In 1967, the same opponents objected to that bill for precisely the opposite reason—we were giving the President too much power and taking it away from Congress. We now provide for more congressional review in this act and the same opponents now say, "Let the President keep his longstanding authority." Exactly what is the President losing? According to my reading of this act, he has four Presidential representatives on the Salary Commission, with the controlling votes. As is well known, the President does have something to do with appointing his Cabinet, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. In addition, he will be represented on the Arbitration Board.

Furthermore, Congress has delegated authority to set wages totaling \$4.05 billion under the coordinated Wage Board system. The President does not have a personal representative sitting on those boards—he does have agency representa-

tives, however. This act continues and expands on that same principle.

Second. This act places Congress in a meaningless and subordinate position.

Again, this is the same argument that has been used over and over again by the same opponents. This act strengthens and expands the congressional role in setting pay policy as compared to the 1967 act. This is the primary reason why the President opposes this act. The Chief Executive's idea of a good law is to give the President complete authority to set employee pay. I would be interested to know the viewpoints of the opponents of this bill to that proposal.

Let me quote the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget on this matter of congressional versus Presidential control:

Although the Congress would be given the opportunity for review of the commission's pay determinations and those of the board through procedures similar to those contained in the reorganization statute . . . the President would . . . have no authority or responsibility to deal with this vital executive function. We believe this would be highly objectionable and unwise.

My position is clear: I believe the President has ample representation on the Salary Commission and Board—much more than he has under the coordinated Wage Board system. Furthermore, Congress has additional mechanisms for review through the Appeals Board and the final vote. This is a balance that should be maintained and continued.

Third. This act is discriminatory against certain employees under the general schedule.

This allegation deals with the section revising the step-advancement policies within the postal service. This change in policy is to attack a particular problem unique to postal employees.

It is a fact that the vast majority of postal employees remain in the same grade throughout their careers. The same cannot be said of classified employees. Further, only one in 100 postal employees gets promoted out of his grade annually. The comparable figure for classified is one in four. Thus, the facts are completely different for these two groups of employees when it comes to in-step advancement. In-step advancement is simply not relevant for advancement in the classified service—the same cannot be said for postal employees.

Therefore, a different policy is called for and this bill makes that policy. We provide for a particular solution for a particular problem. This is exactly the same situation in sections 6, 7, and 8 of this bill where we provide particular solutions to particular problems for other employees concerning remote worksites, overtime pay, and hardship allowances. These provisions do not affect postal employees but no one claims discrimination in these cases.

As a direct result of this change in in-step advancement policy, postal employees will receive an additional \$412 per annum effective October 1, 1969. In July of this year, postal employees received an average of \$298 per year raise. Classified employees received an average of \$825 per year raise. Even when we add the \$412 from the month of October onward,

no one can believe that the classified employees under the general schedule will be shortchanged.

No representatives of the classified employees have ever said that the in-step advancement policies have been a serious detriment to hiring and retaining personnel. The reverse is the truth—all available evidence indicates that the movement within the civil service is very good and the advancement opportunities ample. If a different position is taken and the case made for that position, I am sure the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give sympathetic consideration to a proposal to alleviate such a situation. To this date, no such action has occurred. It was for this reason that the allegations of unfairness toward general schedule employees was such a surprise to the members of the committee. It was assumed that we were alleviating a longstanding grievance that everyone agreed should be eliminated.

It must be clear to all Members that we cannot have a shotgun approach to solving personnel problems. We must solve specific problems with specific solutions. We cannot apply blanket solutions that do not apply to everyone. This is precisely what would occur if the in-step advancement policies were changed for the entire civil service. We would be solving a problem that does not exist.

Fourth. We have also discriminated against middle- and top-level supervisors.

This is untrue. In committee we resolved the major problems in conjunction with representatives of the supervisor employees. I refer my colleagues to page 42, lines 1 to 20 of this bill. This section rectified any temporary inequities that might occur. Furthermore, if any such problems do develop, I have been told that they will not number more than a few hundred from the more than 735,000 postal employees. This is a minor problem indeed.

Fifth. It is alleged that irregular committee procedures were followed in bringing this bill to the floor.

The identical complaint was lodged against this committee during debate in 1967. We find it repeated again. Let me just outline the procedures during which all kinds of testimony was heard, both pro and con, and during which time the opponents of this bill had an opportunity to be heard—and were in many cases.

On September 16, 17, 18, and 20, 1968, the Compensation Subcommittee heard testimony which was completely directed toward potential legislation during the 91st Congress.

Then, on June 16, 17, and 26, 1969, additional testimony was heard. This was continued on July 15, 16, 18, and 19, 1969. After 11 days of open, public hearings on this subject, the subcommittee reported the bill on July 22 to the full committee. This bill was before the members until August 7, at which time, by a vote of 22 to 2, it was reported for floor action. I do not believe that this action is indicative of haste or unfair activity. It is a typical record for any responsible committee of this House and I am sure my colleagues are aware of the work

done by our committee over the years. We produce good legislation, notwithstanding the views of opponents of this bill.

Sixth. It is alleged that this bill is unduly inflationary and should not be passed for that reason.

This question has been raised every time Congress prepares to raise the salary of the Federal employee. The Federal employee is always the first to feel the effect of the inflationary spiral and the last to get relief. We too often forget that these are human beings—with wives, children and the same costs of living as the rest of us. Further, the Federal employee does not cause inflation. The causes, whether governmental or private in nature, are due to the war in Vietnam, the current lack of wage-price guidelines and an infinite number of related actions. All this bill does is say, "If inflation occurs in the private economy, and its effects are measured in the wages paid in the private sector, then the Government employee should have wages affected in the same manner and to the same degree."

This bill says we should help the employee offset the ravages of inflation—it is the least we can do as the employer.

One additional point should be made clear on this issue: The administration witnesses indicated that they would be willing to have two additional salary increases during the next 2 years. Their suggestion was July of 1970 and then January of 1971 and each January thereafter. We are proposing the same thing in this bill, with one exception: The first increase would be in January 1970, rather than July, a change of 6 months. So there is no substantial departure from the administration's position on this matter.

I would hope that my colleagues would review this bill carefully—in doing so, they will see the great care and work that went into this bill and will ultimately support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT).

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are now considering is one that is of major importance and critical concern to all postal and other Federal employees. It is a real milestone in the long and often rough road we have had to travel here since 1945 in attempting to see that our Federal employees are paid decent salaries.

As one who has actively participated in every legislative pay raise effort for the past 25 years, I am very proud to be a cosponsor of this particular bill and I urge its prompt passage.

In brief, H.R. 13000 would accomplish two very important objectives which those of us who are charged with responsibility for Federal pay matters have long been trying to achieve.

First, the bill would set up a permanent system for adjusting the pay of all Federal employees, except those now covered by the so-called wage board system, in accordance with the principle of pay comparability which this Congress adopted in 1962.

Second, the measure would eliminate

a very serious inequity in existing law which, in effect, requires a postal employee to serve an apprenticeship of 21 years before he can be paid the top pay for his work. The waiting period for receiving top pay is reduced in this bill to 8 years.

In addition, H.R. 13000 will give most postal employees a two-step pay increase effective this month to make up for their failure to receive an adequate adjustment last July when other Federal employees received far more, on the average, than the 4 percent which was given to postal workers.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of devising some type of permanent system for setting the pay scales for our large Federal workforce in a responsible, rational, and orderly manner is one that has concerned me and the members of our committee for many years.

For all practical purposes, all pay raises since the end of World War II until 1967 were awarded as separate acts of Congress on a "shotgun" type approach and most often only after long, bitter fights.

The first significant milestone was reached in 1962 when Congress adopted the very sound principle that the pay rates for Federal employees should be comparable to the pay rates of employees in private industry for the same types and levels of work.

However, it was really not until 5 years later—in our act of 1967—that we made a significant start in implementing this principle.

The Federal Salary Act of that year provided for a three-phase pay raise what was intended to bring Federal employees automatically closer to full comparability by July 1 of this year. Nevertheless, because of the timelag in gathering and assessing the pay statistics, Federal employees are still more than a year behind in achieving full current comparability.

The 1967 act set an extremely good precedent. It also proved that an orderly system for adjusting Federal salaries automatically and without excessive congressional involvement was not only workable but a much more preferred system.

In essence then, the establishment in H.R. 13000 of the Federal Employees' Salary Commission is a result of the successful operation of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 and H.R. 13000 also embodies most of the principles laid down in that act.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize that what we are attempting to do with this legislation is to keep the pay of Federal employees on the same level as the pay of employees in private industry. This is not a big giveaway in which Federal employees are being singled out for some type of preferred treatment. H.R. 13000 only establishes the machinery that will permit Federal workers to catch up and stay caught up with their counterparts in the private economy.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that some Members have valid questions with respect to the mechanics involved in the operation of the Salary Commission and the Board of Arbitration. However, I believe that we should proceed as the bill

is now written and, after a reasonable trial period of operation, if improvements and refinements are deemed to be in order, I am confident that our committee will promptly initiate them.

I would urge then that we enact this bill since it will go far in solving one of the most vexing problems that has consistently faced our committee and the Congress.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse H.R. 13000 and urge my colleagues to give this important piece of legislation their wholehearted support.

In 1962, the Congress enacted a landmark pay bill which established the principle that Federal employees should receive salaries comparable to their counterparts in private industry. It would be difficult to see how anyone could disagree with this sound policy because, to me, it is axiomatic that if we are to have good, efficient Government agencies we must provide adequate incentive to attract the best employees.

Unfortunately, in the years which followed, the principle of comparability was honored more in the breach than in the observance. It became clear to us that we must devise some system of pay setting which was isolated from the day-to-day exigencies of political maneuvering.

While it is incumbent upon us in Congress to establish basic pay-fixing policies, we are not well suited to the administrative task of determining and fixing pay schedules.

In 1967, we established a semiautomatic pay-fixing mechanism designed to bring Federal salaries up to comparability by this year. With a few exceptions, we were successful. However, we are now again faced with the prospect of exhausting and time-consuming annual fights over pay bills. It is my opinion that these annual fights are of no real benefit to Congress, the Federal employee, or the taxpayer.

Therefore, I am very enthusiastic about the approach contained in H.R. 13000. For the first time, we are presented with an opportunity to provide a mechanism for the automatic adjustment of Federal pay schedules.

The bill is carefully drafted to protect both the interests of the taxpayer and of the Federal employee. The Salary Commission established by the bill will consist of representatives from the administration and employee organizations. If any member of the Commission representing employee organizations disagrees with the findings, that member may refer the disagreement to a Board of Arbitration consisting of Members of Congress, and representatives from employee organizations, the Civil Service Commission, and the American Arbitration Association.

Congress will maintain ultimate control by retaining the right to veto recommendations of the Commission or Board within 30 days after the proposed salary rates are submitted.

There is another important aspect of

this bill, Mr. Chairman. When the final adjustment of the three-step increase was announced earlier this year, postal employees were left out in the cold. Through the outdated process of the construction of pay schedules, postal employees were shortchanged by as much as \$800 a year. We all know that an emergency situation exists in the postal field service. Part of this emergency exists because of the low pay received by letter carriers and clerks, as well as other employees in the middle and lower levels of the postal service. This bill, therefore, provides emergency relief to those employees who were discriminated against in the last pay raise by providing that all postal employees in levels 1 through 11 be advanced by two pay steps. Simple equity demands that this be done.

The bill will also reduce the amount of time it takes for a postal employee to rise to his top salary step. This provision is necessary in view of the extremely limited promotional opportunities in the postal field service, where some 80 percent of the employees retire in the same level they entered.

Taken as a whole, Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a tremendous step forward in Federal pay-fixing policies. I am proud that I had a part in developing this legislation, and its passage will be a proud moment in the history of congressional concern for the dedicated employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he requires to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) never spoke truer words when he said that this may be the last bill of this nature on which you will vote because the committee has written into this bill the same formula for voting on pay increases that were contained in the congressional, executive, and judicial pay bill. I do not need to remind any of you of the fate of those of us who attempted to obtain a vote on that bill earlier this year—in February to be more specific. We were defeated at every turn in our efforts to get a record vote in the House on that salary grab.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the enactment of H.R. 13000, which, by any objective standard, defies fiscal integrity and administrative commonsense. I point out to you in passing that if this bill is enacted, it will be the ninth pay raise for postal employees in 7 years.

The views that I express are detailed in the minority statement which accompanies the report on this bill. I take this time only to reemphasize features of the legislation which I feel are especially offensive. The principle of pay comparability for Federal employees was established by the Congress in 1962. It is reasonable that employees of the Federal Government be paid salaries comparable to their working counterparts in private industry. In addition to stating this policy and incorporating it into law, the 1962 statute also provides for annual review of rates of pay in private industry to determine whether Federal employees remain on a comparable level and it instructs the President to

make such recommendations for the revision of statutory pay schedules as he deems advisable. Now, for all practicable purposes, the President is to be written out and made a nonentity in this matter.

Since enactment of the 1962 law, there have been seven salary adjustments, all of them upward, for Federal employees. The final adjustment in July 1969, placed Federal workers at full comparability in keeping with the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures then available.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa chided me earlier just a little bit and I wanted to return the compliment. In the 1967 bill we gave to the President the power to make these computations in 1967 and 1968. I was quite moved by the words of the gentleman from Iowa in that debate here in this Chamber just 2 years ago. The gentleman said in that debate:

The committee would have Congress completely abdicate its obligations and responsibilities in the field of Federal salaries and it would, in effect, be giving the President a postdated blank check to be cashed in the future in any amount. In view of what has happened here lately, we cannot afford the luxury of such irresponsibility.

Today the gentleman says we are cutting the President out of this.

I wonder if the gentleman would comment on this seeming inconsistency.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any inconsistency at all. How many years ago was that?

Mr. UDALL. This was in 1967, in which bill we gave the President the power to fix the 1968 and 1969 pay raises, and the gentleman thought that was an outrageous thing. Now the gentleman says we are taking the President out of it entirely.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think I voted for the bill.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman did not vote for it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see anything inconsistent in my position.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us carries the principle of comparability one step further. It is an important step which I urge all of my colleagues to consider. While the legislation restates in substantial form the present policy of pay comparability, it also states that it shall be the policy of Congress that "rates of pay shall be adjusted annually."

This departure from the policy of pay comparability is one which I regard as tremendously important and one which we should carefully examine.

Under the language of this legislation, should it be enacted, the pay of each Federal employee in the four statutory pay systems would be adjusted each and every January 1, from this day forward. I might add that, while the "adjustment" can conceivably be downward, I choose to regard it as a euphemism for an annual salary increase.

The fact of the matter is, that under current law, each employee in the first three grades of the General Schedule receives an annual step increase in pay

providing his service is satisfactory. And, under postal law, employees in the first six levels of the Postal Field Service also receive an annual step increase, also based on satisfactory service.

Why, then, is it necessary to destroy this incentive step advancement by replacing it with an automatic round of pay advancement each and every January 1?

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to other provisions of this legislation which recommend its defeat.

It denies the President any authority or responsibility in Federal employees' pay determinations. Under this bill, the Chief Executive would be powerless to deal with this vital executive function. The final recommendations of the Federal Employee Commission or the Board of Arbitration under this bill become effective without the President's recommendation and without regard to the national priorities established through his annual budget.

I do not subscribe to the proposition, advanced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, that pay increases for Federal employees should be as "automatic as the payment of interest on the national debt." To suggest this analogy shows an unfortunate disregard for the role of the President, who is the head of the Federal Establishment and is responsible for managing the national debt and curbing inflation.

This legislation places the Congress in a subordinate and almost meaningless role in governing the tremendous expenditures required for Federal salary adjustments. The current annual expenditure for civilian and military payrolls is \$42 billion. This legislation will add to that figure in untold amounts, for even its proponents cannot foresee what the additional cost in January 1970 will be, and every January thereafter.

It is argued, Mr. Chairman, that under this bill the Congress has the final say on pay adjustments. I submit that the provisions which relate to congressional disapproval of salary increases are a sad rehash of the same scheme under which the salaries of Members of Congress can be increased without any opportunity for a congressional vote.

The pending bill provides for the submission of proposed salary adjustments to the Congress on February 1 of each year, and then gives either House 30 days in which to adopt a resolution or disapproval. In the opening days of a new Congress, the House committee having jurisdiction of such a resolution might not even be organized within this time period and, therefore, could not even consider a resolution—as we all learned when the recommendations of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries were submitted early this year to the 91st Congress.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. As I understood the gentleman, he said this recommendation would come to the Congress on February 1. I call his attention to the statement that it is not later than February 1, and ask if it is his understanding that

it could be submitted earlier than February 1?

As I look at page 32 of the bill I see the language:

Not later than February 1, 1970, and subsequent reports pursuant to such paragraph (5) not later than February 1 of each year thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded by the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I submit this could be submitted on January 1, and then we would have 30 days in which to veto the proposal. That makes it even worse than the gentleman just said.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Under the terms of the language the gentleman cited that is so. I take it, however, that we would expect some time to be consumed in January in the preparation of the recommendations. But the whole ball of wax might be put together before January 1 and announced immediately thereafter. It is entirely possible.

Mr. Chairman, by authorizing windfall pay increases retroactive to the first of January of each year, this legislation will require annual supplemental appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars and will adversely affect any annual budget of the President.

I call attention to the fact that in only one bill, the congressional house-keeping bill, among those that have been passed by the House thus far in this session, has there been any provision for the salary increases. Not one other appropriation bill has included the salary increases that went into effect the first of this year, and thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is so defective and poorly conceived that I will not reiterate all of the comments which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) and I have set forth in our minority views, as part of the committee report.

I would emphasize that on July 23, 1969, the Civil Service Commission expressed firm opposition to the enactment of this legislation citing some of the reasons which I have already stated. The Bureau of the Budget furnished similar views at the same time.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House would reject this legislation. Should it be approved by both Houses and sent to the President, he would, in my estimation, have more than sufficient reasons for exercising his veto powers.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is probably the most practical pay bill that has been presented to the Congress. I recollect with our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), that great objection was made that the President was setting the salaries for people in the 1967 Pay Act. I can understand that that had to be done in 1967, but we were talking about higher salaries than the comparability salaries here. We were talking about the rank and file of the Federal employees as well as the Congress there,

but in that instance of the Congress we felt that the President should be the one to make the recommendation on our pay. In this instance, however, in this bill, the pay of the letter carriers and postal clerks and other employees in the Post Office Department and the classified workers in the general service can be a much more mechanical thing. There is nothing so urgent about whether the date should be February 1 when the decision must be made. However, I think that is convenient enough, because the mechanics are that the Bureau of Labor Statistics sends these proposals to this Commission and it must be done by January 1. It can easily be done. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is working every day at the proposition of what the pay should be in these classifications. The Commission can only meet for a very few days in January to determine that they will adopt the mechanical findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Now, the real quality of this system is that it is absolutely mechanical and has been every year. It has all of the emotion taken out of it where there is a really big increase. Our big fault in the Congress is we have delayed pay raises for such lengthy periods that the increase becomes big and it becomes so big that it becomes a big political issue and a very hot one. What we want to do is make it a very logical thing if we are being truthful with our employees, and I hope we are. If we are really being truthful with our employees, we are telling them that they will be paid comparably to private enterprise.

That being so, we should engage the mechanical facilities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to do this. I do not find that far removed from the very system we have in the Committee on Public Works. In that committee when we talk about highways, do we talk about the thickness of the concrete? No. Do we talk about the width of the highways? No. The mechanical thing about what we appropriate for the highways of America is decided by the Department of Transportation. We do not go into these details in the Congress. I think we ought to make the salaries of Federal employees just as remote, that is, that they be dependent upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics findings and that we say and do today exactly what we have said for at least 6 years in my time here; namely, that we are going to compete at comparable salaries for employees in the Federal Establishment with those in the private establishment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been some conversation about revenue, the revenue particularly in the Post Office Department.

I want to advise this House that we proceed as much and as often as we can with the postal rate recommendations of President Nixon. I want you to know that I am there but on occasion I do not get a second member. When I do not have a second member at committee hearings, I adjourn the hearing. Now, when there are two people at the hearing, we shall proceed and we will have a Revenue Act. This is a message to the Postmaster General as well as to my colleagues here. All we have to have is two people at postal rate hearings and we will

proceed and we will clean it up rapidly and then we will proceed to a mark-up of the bill, depending upon the question of a quorum in that subcommittee.

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

Mr. OLSEN. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Perhaps the gentleman would agree with me that what he should do is recommit this bill back to the committee and cooperate with the gentleman so that his Rate Subcommittee will move a rate package that will at least partially defray the cost of this bill.

If that was the gentleman's suggestion, I would be glad to join him in that sort of maneuver.

Mr. OLSEN. That is a very rank suggestion, because we have had meetings now since June on this question of revenue and there is not any enthusiasm on your side of the aisle for that revenue increase. When you get some enthusiasm over there, we will continue to meet and we will pass a bill. But you have got to get some enthusiasm generated on your side of the aisle.

Mr. DERWINSKI. We have had enthusiasm.

Mr. OLSEN. It has not reflected itself in the attendance at the hearings.

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman will permit me to compliment him on one other point he made, the gentleman pointed out the need for comparability with private enterprise. We are trying to do this with the postal corporation concept. We have been heartbroken that we have not been able to reach this wonderful goal in the House committee.

If the gentleman would have cooperated we could have had that enacted a long time ago.

Mr. OLSEN. I think that through Postmaster General Blount's proposed corporation it would defeat the best interest of the employees in the manner of pay for the postal employees. Over the years there has always been opposition to an increase in pay and improvements in working conditions of the postal employees. It is only because the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has voted for the employees that we have as good Post Office Department as we have right now.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to comment that to the extent that there is generated enthusiasm on the other side of the aisle for a postal rate increase, you will have to offset that in terms of this one Member.

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

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have asked the gentleman to yield for one polite observation.

Mr. OLSEN. Certainly.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I wish to help the gentleman clear up today's RECORD. I hope the gentleman was not inferring when he said that no officials of the Post

Office Department had ever been interested in this matter, that he was not casting aspersions at outstanding men such as former Postmaster Generals O'Brien, Gronouski, and others who have served in that capacity?

Mr. OLSEN. No; I included them. They opposed all improvements, too. It was only the committee and the Congress of the United States that came to the rescue of the postal employees and the others by way of across-the-board increases for them and the classified employees of this Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in somewhat of a dilemma over this bill because I do not wish to vote against any salary bill for Government employees. Yet, I do not think, in its present form, this is a good bill.

We have a recommendation against the bill from the Bureau of the Budget, from the Post Office Department, from the Civil Service Commission, and I have discussed the matter with the president of one of our big unions, and he feels that Government employees, other than postal workers are being discriminated against in this bill, as I do. And yet I hate to oppose any salary bill as far as Government employees are concerned. Therefore, it does constitute a dilemma.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman from Virginia that not very long ago I spoke to the head of the American Federation of Government Employees, and he told me that I could quote him as saying that he is not supporting and does not advocate a single amendment to Mr. UDALL's bill.

Mr. SCOTT. It is my understanding that you are talking about John Griner, and that John Griner told you he favored the postal employees getting a pay increase, but not the classified workers; is that right?

Mr. OLSEN. I am telling you just exactly what he said to me. He said he was not opposing and was not proposing a single amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Obviously he is not proposing any amendment, he is not a Member of this body, he does not have any authority to propose amendments.

Mr. OLSEN. Let me put it in the absolute context in which he gave it to me: He wanted me to know that he did not ask anybody to put in an amendment, and that he was not lobbying for an amendment, and that he was not in any way going to lobby for the support of an amendment to Mr. UDALL's bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes the establishment of a Salary Commission. Under the bill the Salary Commission reports to the Congress not later than February 1, 1970. It could be that its report would be submitted as early as January 1, and its recommendations as to salary adjustments become effective as of the first of the year, or earlier. Adjustments can be made retroactive

if the Commission in its discretion decides to do this. And they become effective unless vetoed by one or the other of the bodies of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we do not work that fast, especially on the odd years, when we are attempting to organize the Congress. It is my recollection that this year the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did not hold any meetings, prior to February 20 when an organizational meeting was held.

If the same situation should exist 2 years from now, and a report be submitted as of the middle of January, we would not have met by the time that the 30 days provided in the bill within which we could veto the proposal.

Now, any raises that might be authorized under this bill, any raises that the Commission might recommend, would not be budgeted, because the budget is prepared prior to the beginning of the calendar year.

We are talking about more than 2 million civilian Federal employees. We know that the law provides that the military shall have pay increases when the civilian employees are increased. We have 3.4 million military employees. So we are talking about adjustment of salaries of 5.4 million people without any amount being budgeted, and this would be done each year.

It seems to me that this Congress over the years has delegated too many functions to the executive branch of Government. It seems to me that we should retain our authority over the budget and over the appropriation process, to permit a commission to establish salaries that effect 5.4 million employees, civilian employees as provided in this bill, and military personnel because of other legislative acts without the Congress acting upon it just appears to me to be unwise.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for increases in pay for postal workers over and above what might be recommended effective the first of each year for all Government employees.

Let us just look back for a minute at the postal workers. Actually, they have not done badly.

They received a 6-percent pay increase on October 1, 1967; a 5-percent increase on July 1, 1968; a 4.7-percent increase on July 1 of this year. Under the bill, they would receive a two-step increase on October 1 of this year. It would be retroactive back until October 1. They would receive any increase provided by the Commission as of January 1, 1970, and accelerated within-grade raise as of July 1, 1970. In other words, the time for the step-within-grade raise would be reduced from 1 to 3 years, to 26 weeks or half a year or to 52 weeks or 1 full year.

Mr. Chairman, I am considering two amendments to this bill.

One amendment would be to provide that the report of the Commission shall be recommendations only and not binding upon the Congress and would not have the force of law until the recommendations went through the regular legislative process.

I think it is a fine thing to have a com-

mission which will advise the Congress, but I do not want to see the Congress delegate its authority over Government salaries, over the budget and over the appropriations. This is a legitimate function of the Congress which I feel should be retained. In my opinion it is in the interest of the people of the country. I believe it is in the interest of the Government employees for them to be able to come to us, their Congressmen, to present us their views and then have us be responsible to them and to the people who sent us here to the Congress to represent them.

The second amendment which I am hesitant to offer would delete the provisions for postal pay raises. I feel that all Government employees should be treated in the same manner.

I had considered offering an amendment to give the same increase provided for postal workers to the classified workers, to medical personnel in the Veterans' Administration and Foreign Service employees. But this would not be fiscally responsible. It would involve too much money going out of the Treasury and could not be justified to the public. If it is not fair to give it to all Government employees—additional pay increases—then in my opinion it is not fair to give these extra increases to the postal workers.

I shall speak briefly when the amendments are offered, but gentlemen let us be fair to all Government employees and fair to the taxpayers when we are considering this legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 89th Congress, I was privileged to be in the vanguard of the fight to bring full comparability to our loyal Federal workers across the country. The Federal Salary Act of 1967, which projected the principle of comparability for a limited period into the future and provided for automatic pay adjustments in 1968 and 1969, was a direct result of that early effort to bring Federal employees' salaries in line with private industry pay rates.

Experience has clearly demonstrated, however, that comparability is not a static goal, which, once achieved, may be forgotten. Whether we accept the fact or not, ours is a dynamic and growing economy. This means that the workers in private industry will share, along with management, the increased fruits of their labors as time lapses. To keep our Federal employees abreast of their counterparts in the private sector, we must institute a program whereby full comparability will be a continuing objective.

H.R. 13000 provides for just such a program. Through an 11-member Federal Employee Salary Commission, Federal employees who come under the four statutory pay schedules, general, postal, foreign service, and physicians, dentists and nurses hired by the Veterans' Administration, would have their pay rates adjusted as necessary under a perma-

nent method. The Commission would be empowered to make salary comparisons, determine salary schedules and submit them to Congress. A proposed salary adjustment plan would be submitted to Congress on February 1 of each year, and the House and Senate would have 30 days in which to reject or revise it. If Congress does not act, the plan would become effective without further action after the 30-day period expires.

The proposed Commission would be composed of representatives from the executive branch and from Federal employee organizations. In the event of disagreement over any Commission decision on the adjustment of the rates of Federal employees' pay, a seven member Board of Arbitration, made up of two House Members and two Senate Members and representatives from the executive branch and employee organizations, would review the disputed decision. The decision of this arbitration board would be final and binding.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering is also designed, in a sense, to accomplish comparability within the Federal service. It would provide for the acceleration of step increases for postal workers. If the Post Office Department is to meet the increasingly heavy demands placed upon it, something must be done, and soon, to halt the alarming separation rate that has plagued the Department. Although the reasons for the 1967-68 separation rate of 45 percent for postal workers may be many and varied, the low level of pay and the discouraging system of advancement probably is the principal reason for the high turn-over rate. It now takes a postal worker 12 steps and over 21 years before he finally reaches the top pay level for his grade. After he gets there, the postal worker has little to make him happy, for the Bureau of Labor Statistics will tell him that he is earning about \$1,900 less than the minimum standard for a moderate standard of living.

H.R. 13000 would permit a postal employee to move up to the top of the pay schedule in 8 years. It would also provide a pay increase, effective October 1, 1969, by advancing every postal worker below grade PFS-12 two steps. Higher level employees—PFS-12 and above—will be given earned step advancement on July 1, 1970, as their first step in the acceleration program.

It is for this equity, if none other, which H.R. 13000 will accomplish that this bill deserves our support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation. I associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) in that I, too, regret that we seem to have discriminated somewhat in this legislation insofar as the classified employees are concerned. But I do not begrudge the additional pay raise that is being granted for the postal employees. In fact, they need help. They are most deserving, and I commend them, and particularly their efficient organizations for the effective work they

have done in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress, in order for us to perform the work that we have been able to do so far.

I do hope, however, that in due course we can perfect this legislation, particularly when this Commission meets, as soon as it meets, in order to correct the inequities which already exist in the classified schedule, particularly those in the lower grades, 1, 2, and 3, that did not receive a proper increase the last two times around.

Mr. Chairman, the main objection to this legislation—in fact, the only real objection to the legislation—is that of cost.

Of course we have some objection so far as the distribution of the benefits, but the real problem concerning the legislation is the cost itself. The cost of government obviously is of concern to all of us—or it should be of concern. The dangers to our economy are real. We do not need to be reminded of the problems of inflation, high interest rates, tight money, and high taxes. We have been debating those problems for many months.

But, Mr. Chairman, the legislation we have before us is not the type of legislation that created these problems. This bill is a result of these economic problems. In fact, the problems of inflation and high cost of living have necessitated the legislation which we have before us.

Mr. Chairman, we can liken ourselves to the managers of any business, and we are managers of a big business. The Government is the biggest business we have. We are playing the role of personnel managers, and we have the responsibility and the problem of competing with other businesses, or private industry, insofar as employees are concerned and of obtaining efficiency and adequate qualifications in employees. We cannot compete properly with low wages. Any successful businessman can tell us that. We have to compete for the efficient and more qualified employees, and we cannot do it at bargain-basement prices for those employees.

The Congress has recognized this many years ago. We have stated it in legislation many years ago. In fact, in 1967 in the pay act of that year, we directed the executive branch to come up with pay scales that would be comparable with those in private industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we want to cut costs, and I think all of us recognize that is a problem of Government, the way to do it is to cut personnel, to cut out the agency, or reduce the number of Government programs, or do not create the new agency and new programs to start with. Every time we vote for a new program, we cause new employees to be hired, we cause new costs to be involved. If we want to economize after creating those programs, after we vote for new agencies, we cannot then do it by holding down the proper wages and salaries of the employees, by paying so-called sweatshop wages. To me, Mr. Chairman, this would be simply pennywise and pound foolish.

We have had this same argument over and over again every time a pay raise proposal has come up. We have had our colleagues in all sincerity saying that we cannot afford the increase, that we

should vote down the bill, or that we should cut it down. This has happened several times during my years as a Member of this body. Yet I wonder what would have happened if the wishes of the opponents of such legislation in the past had prevailed. I think there is no question but that we would have had real chaos so far as the personnel structure of our Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, if we can help many people in this country who are unemployed, and many of whom are not willing to work, then, certainly, we can afford decent wages for the employees of our Government who are willing to get out of bed and go to work in the morning.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is deplorable that in our postal service we would permit a person after working 21 years to receive a salary that is \$1,864 less than what is considered a minimum standard of living. According to the committee report, a father of a family of four after 21 years of service could not afford a new suit of clothes once every 4 years. An employee after 4 years of service would receive only \$111 more than what is considered a low standard of living.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the American people are willing to pay a proper wage and salary for employees. They can well afford it. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from Illinois that insofar as postal salaries, the users of the postal service should be willing to pay. I would hope the committee will report out a bill sufficient to raise the rates so as to pay for the cost of this pay increase. If we want to economize and we want to cut Federal costs, I suggest we do so in many other places, but not in the standard of living and the living conditions of our Federal employees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, again the House must consider legislation, part of which I find fully justified, meaning the increase in pay for Federal workers, but part of which I strongly oppose, such as establishing a Commission to adjust salaries of certain Federal employees on the basis of comparability with private industry.

Mr. Chairman, I think previous speakers have fully justified the need for a pay increase in line with the cost of living and in line with comparable industry salaries, so I will not address my remarks to this.

On the other hand, as I did on a previous occasion in 1967, I must express my strong opposition to having Congress abrogate its constitutional responsibilities on Federal pay rates.

In 1967 I voted to recommit the bill because of the Commission to set congressional salaries, and in due course what I feared would happen did indeed occur. Members received a substantial pay increase without going on record as to how they voted, which would have been the proper way to have acted.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when an amendment is offered to strike the Commission portion of the bill, I shall sup-

port the move. However, if such an amendment does not prevail, I shall support any move to recommit the bill to induce the committee to come back without such a provision for a salary commission.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the President of the United States will approve of this legislation with such a commission included in it. In no uncertain terms he has indicated his opposition.

As I say I will vote for recommitment, but if that motion does not prevail, I will vote for final passage of the bill as necessary to sustain the livelihood of our Federal workers, but I shall remain opposed to the proposed Commission. In addition, Mr. Chairman, if the President vetoes the bill on this one provision, I shall vote to sustain his veto.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. SCOTT).

I believe it is extremely unfortunate that the other classified Federal employees are not included in this pay raise. I hope that, if an amendment is not carried today to effect that result, Congress will promptly correct this inequity.

I share the concern expressed about inflation. I agree also that Government spending is one of the chief causes of inflation. But it seems to me to be grossly unfair that Federal employees be called upon time after time to bear the brunt of inflation without relief while no one else does.

I am a staunch advocate of reduced Government spending, but I believe it is unfair for Federal workers to be called upon to make sacrifices when no other segment of the economy is.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill and a member of the subcommittee headed by Mr. UDALL. I support H.R. 13000 because I consider it a major milestone in civil service legislation.

Just a few weeks ago, this body overwhelmingly approved the civil service retirement bill, H.R. 9825—of which I was also a cosponsor—to assure a decent retirement income to career civil servants. After telling these Government workers that we think they are valuable, dedicated, and deserving of these retirement provisions which will assure them a decent income after retiring, it would be sadly ironic if we were now to turn around and reject H.R. 13000, in effect, saying we do not think they are deserving of assurances of a decent wage during their period of active service to the Government.

I support all of the provisions of the bill before us, including the immediate pay raise to most postal workers; reduction of the period postal workers must wait for within-grade increases, permitting them to receive maximum pay in their grade in 8 years instead of 21; premium pay for certain employees for Sunday, night, holiday, and overtime hours; \$10 a day allowance for employees commuting to remote worksites;

and an allowance to Corps of Engineers employees who are prevented from carrying on their operations by circumstances beyond their control.

However, I am particularly proud of the features of this bill which provide for a permanent method of pay adjustment which will assure all Government employees a fair and just wage, in line with their counterparts in private industry and taking into consideration inflationary trends.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Compensation, I have had an opportunity to hear firsthand the details of numerous arguments in favor of the annual review and adjustment of pay rates for Federal employees, as well as alternative recommendations for the implementation of such a program. The results of the subcommittee's assessments and those of the full committee of these recommendations are in the bill before you.

Briefly, an established Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration would perform the functions relating to the establishment of pay comparability which are now performed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The Salary Commission, whose members will be designated by the administration and employee organizations, would be responsible for prescribing the scope of the comparability survey to be conducted annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and on the basis of that survey, would recommend exact rates of pay for each of the several salary schedules.

The Board of Arbitration, comprised of Members of Congress, representatives from employee organizations, and the Civil Service Commission, with a member of the American Arbitration Association as chairman, would review the Commission's recommendations as well as any disagreeing views, and make the final decision on the rates of pay to be recommended for the particular year involved.

The rates recommended by the Commission and the Board would be reported to the Congress, and will go into effect automatically in January of each year unless vetoed by the Congress.

On behalf of all U.S. Government employees, I urge your favorable vote on H.R. 13000.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and the floor manager of this bill. He did a very outstanding job. He explained in detail and with much clarity the most important parts of this bill. Anything I might say in addition thereto would be superfluous.

This legislation will, once and for all, provide the method by which Federal employees will receive salaries comparable to salaries in private industry; thereby satisfying the promised pay poli-

icy of 1962 and 1967 of equal pay for equal work.

Although the policy was set in the Pay Act of 1962, it was not until the Landmark Act of 1967 that a precedent was set for a system to establish true comparability.

However, it was apparent from the testimony presented to the committee during hearings this year that three major problems existed under the 1967 method of ascertaining private industry salaries. The time lag between the time that the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey was taken and the reflection in salary was approximately an 18-month lag. The second complaint was bias that was built into the survey by the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of Labor Statistics by not properly comparing equal positions in the Federal Government with those in the private sector. Finally, one of the greatest inequities that has ever plagued a Federal employee is the inability of the postal employee—letter carriers and clerks—to advance in his profession.

Mr. Chairman, the Pay Act of 1967 was a major triumph, and I believe with H.R. 13000 we can remedy the shortcomings of the 1967 act.

H.R. 13000 provides a permanent means for the automatic annual adjustments of the rates of pay of Federal employees under the general schedule, the postal field service schedule, the Foreign Service schedules, and the schedules for physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Veterans' Administration.

A Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration is created to perform the functions relating to the establishment of pay comparability which now are performed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The Commission will have members designated by the administration and employee organizations. The Board will be made up of Members of Congress and representatives from employee organizations, the Civil Service Commission, and the Chairman, who will be selected from among the membership of the American Arbitration Association.

The Commission shall be responsible for prescribing the scope of the comparability survey to be conducted annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and on the basis of that survey, will recommend exact rates of pay for each of the several salary schedules.

Any member of the Commission representing employee organizations, who disagrees with the rates recommended by the Commission, may ask that the matter be sent to the Board of Arbitration. The Board of Arbitration is responsible for making the final decision on the rates of pay to be recommended for the particular year involved.

The rates recommended by the Board or the Commission will be reported to the Congress and will go into effect automatically unless vetoed by the Congress. The rates will go into effect in January of each year.

A report on the proposed rates of pay is to be submitted annually to the Congress by February 1, but shall become effective in January each year unless

Congress, within 30 days after such rates are submitted, vetoes the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, the postal employee has suffered gross inequities. It is important to remember that opportunities for advancement for the majority of the postal workers are extremely limited. Practically all letter carriers that remain in the postal service retire as letter carriers. Shocking as it may seem, the same letter carrier must serve a 21-year apprenticeship before he can be paid the top salary. I challenge anyone to show me an employee who has as limited a chance for advancement and also cannot receive top pay for his trade or profession in at least an 8-year period.

We must remedy this serious problem before it is too late. I cannot but help think that one of the major reasons for the shortcomings in the Post Office Department today is the lack of employee morale and harmony. It is vital for an employee to know that he has an opportunity to advance in position or at least to the top of his position in order for him to accept and initiate responsibilities.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a letter carrier, PFS-5, level 4, earns \$111 a year more than the standard set for a low standard of living. Unless we provide a system for these employees to establish self-esteem and pride, we will never solve the problems of employee morale and turnover.

Mr. Chairman, section 4 of H.R. 13000 will reduce the within-grade waiting time for advancement of postal employees, steps 2 through 7, for 52 calendar weeks to 26 calendar weeks. The period for employees in steps 8 and above is reduced from 156 calendar weeks to 52 calendar weeks. This provision will become effective on July 1, 1970.

Section 5 of the bill would grant postal employees in levels 1 through 11 an advancement of two steps, effective the first pay period of this month. This would help make up for the inadequate pay raise of 4 percent that postal employees received in July, while other Federal employees received a much larger percentage. Ironically, the postal employee raise was not as much as the cost-of-living increase this year—is this reasonable or fair?

Mr. Chairman, with all candor, we must compensate our loyal Federal employees in a manner that is responsive to their needs and comparable with salaries in private industry.

I, therefore, cannot be overzealous when I say this legislation is immediately needed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and call the attention of the Members to our minority views.

Since those views were prepared some time ago, I took the occasion, over the weekend, to review them. Everyone of us has a pride of authorship.

Just to be objective, however, I glanced over the report itself, written by the majority, and I found those views quite

revealing. As a matter of fact, the deeper I probed through the report the more I was convinced our minority position was correct.

There are some interesting statements I should like to point out.

For example, the very basic purpose of the bill should cause us to stop and think. We are told in the very opening paragraph of the purpose of the bill, that this sets up a permanent method of adjusting the pay of Federal employees.

What we are really saying is—this is one of the key issues—we are taking from any Chief Executive, regardless of his political party, the control over wage scales of Federal employees.

I wonder how many corporate presidents find themselves in the position where they would have no control whatsoever over the pay scales in their companies.

All through the report the majority keep referring to "adjusting" pay scales.

The real wording that should have been used is "raising pay scales."

Adjusting is merely a diplomatic word. Can you imagine the situation, the furor, in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if this Commission which is to be created, and the arbitration board between them produce a recommendation that the pay scales should be adjusted downward? At that point you would have an eruption that would make Mount Vesuvius look like a piker. I mention this because it is merely a fact of life.

Also, Mr. Chairman, having worked long and hard and struggled as a minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have often advocated that what we should do especially in the Post Office Department but also in any other department or agency is for some formula to be determined on a regional basis, taking into account the regional variation in the cost of living. It may be true—and it is true—that the Post Office employees in New York City, Washington, and in the Chicago area, which I represent, suffer adversely in comparison to people in similar positions in private industry. However, this is not necessarily true in most of the rural and sparsely populated areas of the country. In fact, in many of the small towns the postmaster and the one or two post office employees are among the upper-middle-class citizens in terms of income. Yet there is no practical adjustment in any phase of the Federal pay scale in order to allow for the cost-of-living difference in high-cost areas such as Chicago, New York, and other cities.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to compliment the gentlemen for once again, as he did in 1967, supporting our proposal for area pay differentials for postal employees. The gentleman will recall with his support we did pass such a provision in the pay bill of 1967. We lost that provision of the bill in the other body with the explanation that the authority was already in the law to

provide pay differentials for high-cost-of-living areas and that the administration, if it chose to do so, could exercise this authority, thereby relieving employees in districts such as the gentleman and I represent, in relatively high wage areas. I wonder if the gentleman will indicate to us what the current administration's attitude is toward using the power it has under the law now to afford relief to employees in big cities such as Chicago, Detroit, and New York.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In answer to the gentleman's question, I cannot speak for the Postmaster General or the administration as to whether or not their interpretation of the situation is the same as the gentleman from Michigan provides. However, it is accurate to point out, I believe, that the Postmaster General, the overworked, frustrated man he is, has been so preoccupied in trying to produce his version of postal reform that perhaps this potential adjustment has not been properly called to his attention. I think we should appoint ourselves as a committee of two to call on him shortly and see if we cannot make this adjustment. It might be a good argument to stop this bill in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I thank the gentleman for that observation. I would be very happy to join with him in his suggestion that we appoint ourselves as a committee of two to do this and suggest that if we were successful as a committee in getting the Postmaster General to take a position on this issue, we would be establishing a new first for this administration.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think this administration has taken a lot of positions. The only problem this administration really suffers from is that its unusual diplomatic and governmental concepts are not completely appreciated by the majority which controls the Congress. After all, it is a frustrating thing that we all go through. I know myself, serving on this committee for 7 years, and rarely on the prevailing side. Everybody cannot take the easy road to popularity.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am being distracted from my main point, which is that H.R. 13000 is hardly the finest bill ever produced by our committee. I hope in the process of attempting to amend it we can do something to it. I must add that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and I are not too optimistic as to that possibility. In fact, in our minority views we stated it was so defective it could not be amended. I think that is a statement everyone would admit is quite honest and forthright. However, I feel we will test the people handling the bill with some amendments. Perhaps a few of them will suddenly strike them as being worthy of some attention.

I do not think you could improve this bill to the extent to make it passable. I also have no illusions though as to what the final vote would be.

Mr. Chairman, one other point that I think has to be made and that is the tendency of members of the legislative branch to indulge in inconsistencies ever so often. We hear this big hue and cry about surrendering our prerogatives to the Executive and we also hear the same

complaint about the Executive surrendering its powers to the legislative and vice versa.

In this bill we ask both the Executive and the legislative to give up control over Federal salaries, wages, and further adjustments to this Board. And, even though the Board would have some relationship to political reality, it is really a double abdication of authority. In other words, the Congress is willing to surrender and the administration would be forced to surrender and I cannot help but wonder what success, if any, this bill would have had in the case had the occupant of the White House had the initials H. H. H. I have a sneaking suspicion that this bill would not have been subject to hearings and I have a sneaking suspicion that a rate change which has been held captive in the Rate Subcommittee but which should have been cleared by this time—there would have been an entirely different picture.

I want to emphasize that I would not think of casting any political aspersions upon the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. I regret the cynicism of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. It is unbecoming. It is unlike him. He knows as well as I know the fact is that every administration and every Postmaster General, Democrat or Republican, has voted against enacting pay raises for postal employees. The budget considerations have always prevented them from being for comparability.

I was called down to the White House 2 years ago because I helped draft the 1967 pay bill and was chastised and castigated at some length and, in effect, accused of budget busting. I suggest that if the same thing had been true this year and if the President's initials were H. H. H., I still would have been chastised and castigated again. I do not think the President has any business in fixing the policy. I think the Congress ought to fix the policy and that is what this bill does.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In recognition of the gentleman's tremendous ability and the logic which he usually shows, it seems that we should heed the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and take into consideration the huge numbers of Federal employees in the Federal bureaucracy—

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. We have this growing bureaucracy. Perhaps if we had an administration undertaking a bipartisan attempt here in the Congress in its treatment of Federal employees, the power and troublemaking activities of most of the departments and agencies could be phased down in size and the savings which would be made available as a result of that action spread in a more equitable manner to those Federal employees who remain on the job and who do an effective job. I would suggest this to the Members as a whole but perhaps overall

to that very enlightened group called the Democratic Study Group, because I think at this point they should rally behind the question of treating employees more equitably by accepting the principle of fewer employees who would do a good job and we could get more done and they could be more adequately compensated, although that almost sounds like utopia.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13000 and commend the chairman of the committee and the sponsor of the bill for bringing forth this long-needed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the 87th Congress when Public Law 87-793 was enacted. That law was designed to provide Federal salaries comparable to salaries in private enterprise, but we have not provided salaries in keeping with the intent of that law. The bill before us today is a step in that direction but it falls short of the goal.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I say that the intent of this bill, I believe was enacted in our bill of 1962 but much to my regret has never been implemented. I sincerely hope upon passage of this bill that finally our Federal employees may receive some measure of proper compensation for their dedication and work.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, it is high time that we bring order to the Federal payrolls. The Federal Salary Act of 1967 started us on the road to permanently and adequately systematizing the adjustment of salaries for Federal employees. This set the precedent by having the Executive adjust the salaries of those Federal employees in four categories: General schedule, postal field service schedules, Foreign Service schedules, and the schedules relating to many in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. Congress would review his adjustments and maintain overall control.

H.R. 13000 would give permanence to adjusting Federal salaries, by establishing a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration.

This bill has many ramifications, but one of the most important is that we will no longer have to use so much valuable time here in Congress bickering over payroll adjustments. This would mainly be the job of the Federal Employee Salary Commission. The Congress would then vote within 30 days to reject or revise their proposal. No longer would there have to be time-consuming hearings, granting of rules from the Rules Committee and a host of other procedural matters here in Congress. This time would be spent working in other needed areas.

H.R. 13000 would assure annual review and adjustments of the pay rates for Federal employees. The Commission and Board of Arbitration would better insure that there will be comparable pay between and among the various pay systems.

This bill will also give an equitable wage to the postal workers of America. Postal employees should receive fair pay and benefits. Today their income is still below the national standard. We have a post office system that is in trouble be-

cause of backlog and overwork. If we expect to upgrade it and keep it efficient we must give incentives for qualified men to join its ranks and remain on the job for a long period of time. H.R. 13000 would permit an employee to move up to top pay in 8 years, compared with the present schedule of 12 steps over 21 years. This would be comparable to the steps in other industries and Federal employee classifications.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill because I believe it is a sound move to permanently establish a commission to deal with the problem of Federal salaries. I also feel we must grant the postal workers their just due.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I urge and hope that the House will accept and approve this bill before us—H.R. 13000—which is principally designed to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system and establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration. The measure also provides for an equitable comparability pay rate increase for postal employees, and attempts to modernize and tune-in with our current economy an in-step promotion system that now requires a minimum of 21 years' service in order to reach the highest bracket of salary grade.

As all Members of the House know, the Federal Salary Act of 1967 provided that the President would adjust salaries in 1968 and 1969 so that all Federal employees would have full comparability with private industry pay rates by July 1969. This act also projected automatic adjustments of Federal employees' salaries over a 2-year period, so that meanwhile the Congress would have the opportunity of exploring avenues and means by which it could retain final supervision and authority, but avoid the occurrence of repeatedly long and drawn-out involvements in an annual review and determination of the question of raising the pay of Federal employees.

After 2 years of intensive study, hearings and consultations, with all parties concerned, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has found that there is widespread agreement for some method that will allow and arrange for an annual review and adjustment of Federal employee pay rates.

Based on all the evidence and authoritative testimony placed before it, the committee further found and has recommended that the best way to set up this annual review and adjustment of pay rates would be to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission, composed of executive branch and employee representatives, with the opportunity for arbitration if conflicts develop. It is recognized, in this measure, that Congress should participate in this area of arbitration and, therefore, it is provided that Members of the House and Senate will sit on the proposed Board of Arbitration.

Mr. Chairman, in this turbulent period in our domestic history, it is obviously vitally important to provide reasonable encouragement for the maintenance of a high morale, for continued loyalty and efficiency, among our Federal employees.

This measure is primarily intended to reassure these employees that the coun-

try, the Congress, and the executive department of the Government are interested and concerned in their objectives of obtaining fair pay and fair treatment in accord with comparable standards of our American free enterprise system.

I again urge the adoption of this bill because I believe it is a prudent investment in the national interest, and represents a most earnest congressional effort, based on long and careful study, toward strengthening the integrity of the most essential part, the human part, of our Federal Government structure.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support, H.R. 13000, the Pay Comparability Act of 1969. This legislation establishes a permanent method of bringing the pay of Federal employees up to a level comparable with that of private enterprise. It eliminates the longstanding inequity requiring postal employees to serve 21 years before reaching maximum pay for their work. In addition, 740,000 postal workers would get a badly needed emergency 5.4 percent cost-of-living rise in salary.

The reason for my support of this legislation is that any legislation which we enact for the purpose of raising Federal employees' salaries is based on reports which are outdated by the time we complete the legislative process. This problem is met by H.R. 13000 through the establishment of a permanent method of adjusting the pay of Federal employees who are under the general schedule, the postal field schedules, the Foreign Services schedules and the professional medical schedules.

Congress will play a vital role in the adjustment of these salaries because we will have a representation on the Federal Salary Commission and because the Commission will report directly to Congress. Through this Commission, congressional representatives will work closely with representatives of the executive branch and, of course, with representatives of employee organizations.

The Commission will conduct and maintain a current salary survey. This procedure will eliminate, or at least minimize, the comparability gap. And, because the Commission will be dealing directly with salary figures immediately affecting the relationship of Federal to private salaries, a more accurate comparability will be developed.

I have become aware of the inequities existent in the present Federal salary system. None of us in Congress should have missed the point being made this year by the postal unions that the 4.1-percent pay raise effective for postal employees July 1, was a pittance in relation to the services performed and the cost of living experienced by postal employees.

We cannot pass the issue off on the basis that no similar service is performed in the private sector and therefore comparability is impossible. The union representatives outlined, in hearings held this summer, the need for a meaningful change in the postal salary system.

Under the provisions of H.R. 13000, the time in service necessary for postal employees to reach the top level of a grade will be cut by 13 years. The present system has discouraged qualified people from coming into the postal service and

has encouraged an alarming rate of employee turnover. No system can operate effectively when its employee separation rate is approximately 45 percent, as it was in 1967-68.

Because the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969 is drafted for the purposes of creating a permanent method of salary adjustment for Federal employees; of creating new incentives in the postal recruitment and retention programs through a new instep promotion plan; of enabling the full-fledged postal employee to soon enjoy the fruits of this legislation through special two-step advancements this year; and of increasing the ability of the postal employee to maintain his family at a reasonable standard of living, I urge all Members to strive to enact this necessary and meaningful legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has before it today a bill—the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969—which affects a very important segment of our Nation's population, the many thousands of Federal and postal employees. I do not believe that there is any Member of Congress who is not aware of the vital importance of the fine work contributed by these employees or of the necessity to provide equitable and adequate compensation for this work. Because of my own longstanding concern about providing adequate compensation, I have already joined the introduction of two bills in this Congress toward this end. The Postal Service Act of 1969, in addition to implementing the administration's proposed creation of a separate self-supporting postal system, gives postal employees the important right to bargain collectively directly with management over wages and working conditions. The civil service retirement bill—H.R. 9825—which has now been passed by both Houses of Congress, provides both a liberalization in retirement benefits and an improvement in the financing of the retirement system.

I have also fully endorsed the principle of comparability and it had been my intention to support the legislation now being considered as a further step towards comparability. After careful study of the Federal Salary Comparability Act, however, I have come to the conclusion that its passage by the Congress at this time would not be in the best interests of the Nation or even of those directly affected by the bill.

First, in my judgment the Federal Salary Comparability Act faces a certain Presidential veto, with the result that postal and other Federal employees would receive no benefit at all from its passage by the Congress. In his letter of this date to House minority leader, Congressman GERALD R. FORD, the President indicates that—

In its present form H.R. 13000 would add approximately \$4.3 billion a year to federal expenditures. It would balloon expenditures in the remainder of this fiscal year by \$1.5 billion.

The President pointed out that expenditure increases of this magnitude will nullify many of the steps which have recently been taken to stabilize the econ-

omy and seriously undercut the vital national effort to contain inflation. He indicates, furthermore, that the passage of H.R. 13000 would bring about additional deep cuts in Federal services which have already been greatly reduced because of expenditure ceilings passed by this very body. According to the President, this would require a reduction in postal services and in the number of postal and other Federal employees.

Second, upon reflection I believe that placing Federal salary determinations in the hands of a Federal Employee Salary Commission would prove to be an unwise step—both for Federal employees and for our country. I opposed this system of salary determination for Members of Congress and believe that it presents the same drawbacks when applied to any Federal employees. The collective bargaining procedure which is proposed in the Postal Service Act of 1969 presents, in my judgment, a more equitable and more responsible method of arriving at wage and salary decisions.

Third, there are serious questions in my mind with respect to the way in which this legislation was handled by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Not only did the committee refuse—on October 8—to even consider the administration's postal reform legislation, but it did not see fit to provide Postmaster General Blount the extra time he requested of the committee to give H.R. 13000 his complete study. He was not even given the opportunity to testify on the measure before final committee action. As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee earlier in my congressional tenure, I did not participate in any such treatment of a Democratic Postmaster General and oppose it now in the case of the present Republican Postmaster General.

Many believe, furthermore, that if this bill is passed there will be no remaining impetus toward the comprehensive postal reform which is so desperately needed. Under the present postal system many postal employees never have a real chance for advancement and the postal service itself has become increasingly inefficient. I firmly believe, therefore, that immediate and comprehensive reform in the postal system is mandatory.

Finally, it is no secret among Members of Congress that there are other Federal employees who consider this bill to be inequitable toward them in that it provides greater increases for postal clerks and letter carriers than for other Federal employees in comparable positions.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I must regrettably oppose this legislation at this time. This decision has been a painful one, and one which I have reached only after much soul searching. I remain completely determined, however, to work through postal reform and other legislation to achieve full comparability for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13000. Historically it is a fact that postal employees have always received too little too late. With regularity, my office receives the justified complaints of postal workers and their fam-

ilies about inadequate salaries and the spiraling cost of living. My mail these days is full of statements from postal employees who remind us that because of inflation, the 4.1-percent increase they received in July of this year gives them less purchasing power than they had a year ago.

H.R. 13000 will not correct the admitted inadequacies of the postal pay schedules, but it certainly will help in resolving the perennial problem of what Congress is to do about the pay of these workers. I am impressed by the section of H.R. 13000 which establishes a Federal Wage Commission and I am glad to know that the unions which represent the workers will have a voice on that Commission.

Congress has on several occasions considered legislation to raise salaries of postal and other Federal workers to a level comparable with wages being paid in the private sector. Because of budgetary restrictions, our intent has never been carried out.

In my opinion, postal workers should not have to carry the Nation's economy on their shoulders as well as the tremendous mail volume for which they are responsible.

It is most discouraging for the Government workers who reside in my congressional district to note the tremendous gains made by their neighbors and those to whom they deliver the mail, and then to be denied a justified increase in their wages.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support H.R. 13000 and in so doing I agree that wage adjustments of Government employees should be automatic and not be delayed by the redtape which accompanies passage of a new law each year.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, President Nixon has clearly and specifically indicated that he will veto the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969 as reported out that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Any veto of this desirable, needed legislation for postal employees must necessarily invite a comparison with similar legislation passed by Congress in 1967. At that time, the Post Office and Civil Service Commission, of which I was a proud member, voted rate increases to fully cover the salary increases specified in the bill. This was responsible action that permitted President Johnson to sign that bill into law. Yet, 2 years later the committee has completely failed in its responsibility to increase postal revenues to cover necessary postal pay increases. This failure to act is clearly responsible for the President's projected veto and in my view has done substantial disservice to this Nation's dedicated postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote to recommit this bill so the committee will face its responsibility and come up with a postal revenue package to guarantee the President's support of this needed comparability legislation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot support H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969.

No one disagrees with the fact that we must have competent, dedicated employees if the Federal Government is to

function smoothly and efficiently, and we must be able to offer adequate compensation if we expect to attract the caliber of personnel we need. There is no question in my mind that we have the finest merit system and Government employees of any nation in the world.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have serious reservations regarding the passage of H.R. 13000. The approval of this legislation will add \$4.3 billion a year to Federal expenditures—\$1.5 billion during fiscal year 1970. In view of our fiscal condition and the inflationary period we are experiencing at the present time, I believe it is very unwise to add this burden to our fiscal troubles.

The legislation under consideration is, I believe, discriminatory—it discriminates against classified employees, Foreign Service employees, and physicians, dentists, and nurses in the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration. It excludes these employees from the October two-step increase granted postal field service personnel.

Mr. Chairman, this measure destroys the authority and responsibility of the President in Federal employees' pay determinations. If the bill is enacted, the Chief Executive of our Government would be powerless to deal with this important executive function. In addition, it places the Congress in a subordinate role in governing the tremendous expenditures required for Federal salaries. Even though the Gross amendment relating to positive congressional action has been approved, the concept of delegating the responsibility for setting salaries to a commission is, I believe, contrary to the wishes of the American people. This role has traditionally been retained by the Congress, and it should continue to exercise this function.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support of fair and equitable salaries for Federal employees, but I do not believe that H.R. 13000 is the answer to this problem. I, therefore, must vote against the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, had the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service seen fit to bring in a simple and reasonable increase in pay for postal workers, not encumbered by other provisions, I should have been happy to give such a measure sympathetic consideration consonant with essential budgetary considerations.

The committee did not do this. It brought in a bill largely depriving the Congress of its legitimate jurisdiction over Federal salaries, and turning this authority over to a Federal commission. It provided further for virtually an automatic appeal from every decision of the Salary Board to a Board of Arbitration. The power of the President in the matter of setting Federal wage rates was largely abolished. The adoption of the Gross amendment improved this situation, but did not remove these objections to the bill; nor can we have any assurance that this amendment will be left in the bill after action by the Senate.

In addition to all the foregoing, the bill discriminates in favor of postal employees as against other Federal employees, and also discriminates, as I

understand it, within the postal service itself.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the bill, according to the President of the United States, will very seriously and adversely affect the Federal budget by adding a cost of some \$4.3 billion a year, and \$1.5 billion for the remainder of the current fiscal year alone, to our Federal expenditures. This, according to the President, will result in a decrease of Federal services and Federal employment, and will further have a serious inflationary impact. The money to pay for these increases will, as always, increase the already heavy burdens of all our taxpayers; and, to add to the irresponsibility of this measure, no effort is made in the bill to secure any part of these funds by any sort of postal rate increase.

I am informed that, because of these considerations, the President will, in all probability, veto this measure if it is passed by the Congress. The bill was opposed not only by the President, but also by the Bureau of the Budget, the Postmaster General, and the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

For all the foregoing reasons I felt, regretfully, compelled, as a responsible legislator, to vote against H.R. 13000.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee substitute amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Sections 5301 and 5302 of title 5, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 5301. Policy

"(a) It is the policy of Congress that rates of pay for employees within the purview of this section be based on the principles that—

"(1) there be equal pay under each pay system for substantially equal work;

"(2) pay distinctions be maintained in keeping with work distinctions; and

"(3) rates of pay be comparable, on a national basis, with private enterprise rates of pay for the same levels of work.

"(b) Rates of pay shall be adjusted annually, in accordance with the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section and the procedures prescribed by section 5302 of this title, for those employees subject to—

"(1) section 5332 of this title, relating to employees under the General Schedule;

"(2) part III of title 39, relating to employees in the postal field service;

"(3) sections 867 and 870 of title 22, relating to officers, staff officers, and employees in the Foreign Service of the United States; and

"(4) section 4107 of title 38, relating to physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration.

"§ 5302. Federal Employee Salary Commission; Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration

"(a) There is established, as a permanent agency of the Government, a Federal Em-

ployee Salary Commission, referred to as the "Commission".

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of 8 members and 3 associate members, as follows:

"(1) the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission or, in his absence, his designee, who shall be Chairman;

"(2) 1 designated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget;

"(3) 1 designated by the Secretary of Defense;

"(4) 1 designated by the Postmaster General;

"(5) 1 designated by the organization of employees having the largest number of members in the General Schedule;

"(6) 2, one designated by each of the 2 employee organizations having the largest number of members in the postal field service;

"(7) 1 designated by an employee organization, other than an organization designating a member pursuant to paragraph (5) or (6) of this subsection, selected each year by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on a rotating basis after consultation with representatives of such employee organizations as the Chairman determines appropriate; and

"(8) 3 associate members, one each designated by employee organizations, other than organizations designating members pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of this subsection, selected each year by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on a rotating basis after consultation with representatives of such employee organizations as the Chairman determines appropriate.

A member of the Commission has—

"(A) 1 vote, if designated under paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (7) of this subsection;

"(B) one-half vote, if designated under paragraph (6) of this subsection; or

"(C) 1 vote to be cast only to break a tie vote of the Commission, if serving under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Each associate member of the Commission is entitled to attend all meetings of, consult with, and be heard by, the Commission, on all matters, but does not have a vote.

"(c) The Commission shall, in accordance with the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title, after consultation with representatives of such agencies and employee organizations as it determines appropriate—

"(1) prescribe, and revise from time to time as it deems appropriate, a comparability pay survey—

"(A) which will develop valid comparisons of (i) the rates of pay for employees within the purview of section 5301(b) of this title and (ii) the rates of pay for the same levels of work in private industry; and

"(B) which shall be conducted annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor;

"(2) prepare annually a comparative statement of the rates of pay for such employees and the rates of pay for the same levels of work in private industry as disclosed by the comparability pay survey;

"(3) determine and prescribe, on the basis of information and data disclosed by the annual comparability pay survey, the exact national rates of pay for such employees which are necessary to effect the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title;

"(4) review, annually, the comparability of the rates of pay and step increase policies within and between the various pay systems for such employees, taking into consideration such matters as the Commission determines have affected or may affect the comparability, including, but not limited to—

"(A) within-grade rates of pay employees are receiving due to differing length of service requirements for step increases, step in-

crease without regard to length of service, or different number of within-grade steps;

"(B) different rates of pay under the various pay systems for the same level of work;

"(C) pay distinction not being maintained in keeping with work distinction, the degree of responsibility placed, the scope and variety of tasks involved, or the extent of decisionmaking authority required; and

"(D) premium pay policies; and

"(5) except as provided in subsection (e) and subsection (g) of this section, prepare and submit annually to the Congress a report setting forth—

"(A) the comparison of rates of pay prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection;

"(B) the exact national rates of pay for such employees prescribed by the Commission in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection; and

"(C) recommendations for legislation as may be necessary to achieve the comparability policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title or to achieve comparability within and between pay systems for employees within the purview of section 5301(b) of this title.

"(d) (1) In the exercise of the authority and the performance of the duties vested in and imposed upon the Commission by this section, the Commission—

"(A) shall seek the views, in such manner as the Commission may provide, of such employee organizations as the Commission considers appropriate; and

"(B) give thorough consideration to those views.

"(2) All decisions of the Commission shall be by a majority vote. The votes shall be recorded. A record shall be maintained of the views, assenting or dissenting, of the members of the Commission. The record of votes and views shall be available for public inspection and copying pursuant to section 552 of this title.

"(e) If a member of the Commission determines, and advises the Commission, that the rates of pay applicable to the appropriate pay system, as the rates are prescribed by the Commission, are not in conformity with the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title, the Commission shall submit, not later than February 1 following that determination, the rates of pay to the Board established by subsection (f) of this section for consideration by the Board.

"(f) (1) There is established, as a permanent agency of the Government, a Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration, referred to as the 'Board', which shall be composed of 7 members as follows:

"(A) 2 Members of the United States Senate designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate, each from a different political party;

"(B) 2 Members of the United States House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House, each from a different political party;

"(C) 1 designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission;

"(D) 1, who may serve not more than 2 consecutive years, designated by a majority vote of the presidents of the four employee organizations which have designated members currently serving on the Commission under paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (b) of this section with each president of the employee organization under paragraph (5) or (7) having one vote and each president of the organizations under paragraph (6) having one-half vote; and

"(E) 1 designated by a majority of the members of the Board referred to in paragraphs (A) to (D), inclusive, of this subsection from the membership of the American Arbitration Association, who shall be Chairman of the Board.

"(2) The Board shall consider the rates of pay submitted to it by the Commission pursuant to subsection (e) of this section

and determine whether or not the rates of pay conform with the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title. If the Board determines that the rates of pay do not so conform, the Board shall prepare the rates of pay as will conform with that policy. The Board shall transmit to the Commission not later than the 30th day following the date the Board received the rates of pay submitted to it by the Commission, a report setting forth—

"(A) the decision of the Board with respect to the rates of pay submitted by the Commission;

"(B) the reasons for the decision of the Board; and

"(C) such rates of pay as the Board shall have determined to be necessary to conform with the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title.

The decision of the Board, and such rates of pay as it may prepare in accordance with this paragraph, shall be final and conclusive.

"(g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Commission shall submit to the Congress the first report pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (c) of this section, based on the 1969 national survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical pay, not later than February 1, 1970, and subsequent reports pursuant to such paragraph (5) not later than February 1 of each year thereafter.

"(2) In the case of the submission of rates of pay by the Commission to the Board pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, the Commission, immediately upon receipt of the final and conclusive decision of the Board, shall submit to the Congress the decision of the Board and such rates of pay as the Board shall have determined to be necessary to conform with the policy set forth in section 5301(a) of this title.

"(h) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, all or part (as the case may be) of the rates of pay submitted to the Congress as provided in subsection (e) (5) or subsection (g) of this section become effective at the beginning of the first pay period that begins on or after the first day of the year in which the rates of pay are submitted; but only to the extent that, within 30 days after the rates of pay are submitted to the Congress—

"(A) there has not been enacted into a law a statute establishing rates of pay other than those proposed by all or part of such recommendations,

"(B) neither House of Congress has passed a resolution specifically disapproving all or part of the recommendations, or

"(C) both.

"(2) Any part of the recommendations, in accordance with express provisions of the recommendations, may be made operative on a date earlier than the date on which the recommendations otherwise are to take effect.

"(3) (A) The rates of pay of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys whose annual salaries are fixed pursuant to section 548 of title 28 shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the first day of the year in which increases become effective pursuant to this section, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided pursuant to this section for corresponding rates of pay.

"(B) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees of an Executive agency and of the government of the District of Columbia whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased pursuant to this section are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the first day of the year in which increases become effective pursuant to this section, by amounts not to exceed the increases pro-

vided pursuant to this section for corresponding rates of pay in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(C) This section does not authorize any increase in the rates of pay of employees whose rates of pay are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

"(D) This section does not impair any authority pursuant to which rates of pay may be fixed by administrative action.

"(4) Retroactive pay shall be paid by reason of this section only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the armed forces) or the government of the District of Columbia on the day immediately following the close of the 30-day period specified in subsection (h) (1) of this section, except that such retroactive pay shall be paid—

"(A) to an employee who retired, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, and ending on the day immediately following the close of the 30-day period specified in subsection (h) (1) of this section, for services rendered during that period, and

"(B) in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of this title, relating to settlement of accounts, for services rendered, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, and ending on the day immediately following the close of the 30-day period specified in subsection (h) (1) of this section, by an employee who died during that period.

Such retroactive pay shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title, relating to civil service retirement, and any other retirement law or retirement system, in the case of any such retired or deceased employee.

"(5) For the purposes of paragraph (4) of this section, service in the Armed Forces, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, includes the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of the individual to a position in or under the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia.

"(i) Each member and each associate member of the Commission and each member of the Board is entitled to travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703(b) of this title. Each such member or associate member who is not a Member of Congress or an employee is entitled to pay at a rate equal to the per diem equivalent of the maximum rate of basic pay of the General Schedule for each day he is engaged in the performance of services for the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, except that the member from the American Arbitration Association may be paid the usual fees prescribed by that association.

"(j) (1) Without regard to the provisions of this title governing appointments in the competitive service and of chapter 51 of this title and subchapter III of this chapter, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates—

"(A) the Commission and the Board each may appoint an Executive Director and fix his basic pay at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of this title; and

"(B) with the approval of the Commission or the Board, as appropriate, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the basic pay (at respective rates not in excess of the maximum rate of the General Schedule) of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission or of the Board, as applicable, and may ob-

tain services of experts or consultants in accordance with section 3109 of this title, but at rates for individuals not to exceed that of General Schedule 18.

"(2) Upon the request of the Commission or of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment of any branch of the Government of the United States may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Commission or the Board, as appropriate, in carrying out its functions.

"(k) The Commission and the Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

"(l) The Administrator of the General Services shall provide administrative support services for the Commission and the Board on a reimbursable basis.

"(m) The rates of pay that take effect under this section shall modify, supersede, or render inapplicable, as the case may be, to the extent inconsistent therewith—

"(1) all provisions of law enacted prior to the effective date or dates of all or part (as the case may be) of such rates (other than any provision of law enacted in the 30-day period specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (h) of this section with respect to such rates); and

"(2) any prior recommendations or adjustments which took effect under this section or prior provisions of law.

"(n) The rates of pay that take effect under this section shall be printed in—

"(1) the Statutes at Large in the same volume as public laws;

"(2) the Federal Register; and

"(3) the Code of Federal Regulations.

"(o) Any increase in rates of pay that takes effect under this section is not an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of this title or section 3552 of title 39.

"(p) Any rate of pay that takes effect under this section shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of such rate of pay, under conversion rules prescribed by the President or by such agency as the President may designate.

"(q) The rates of pay of personnel subject to sections 210 and 213 (except subsections (d) and (e)) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 633, 635; Public Law 90-206), and any minimum or maximum rate, limitation, or allowance applicable to any such personnel, shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the first day of the year in which increases become effective pursuant to this section, by amounts which are equal, insofar as practicable and with such exceptions as may be necessary to provide for appropriate relationships between positions, to the amounts of the adjustments made pursuant to this section, by the following authorities—

"(1) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with respect to the judicial branch of the Government; and

"(2) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to individuals employed by the county committees established under section 590h (b) of title 16.

Such adjustments shall be made in such manner as the appropriate authority concerned deems advisable and shall have the force and effect of statute."

Sec. 3. The table of contents of subchapter 1 of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"5302. Annual reports on pay comparability," and inserting in lieu thereof—

"5302. Federal Employee Salary Commission; Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration."

Sec. 4. Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule and each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"(A) to steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of 26 calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"(B) to steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of 52 calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting period specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases.

"(3) An employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule who returns to a position he formerly occupied at a lower level may, at his request, have his waiting periods adjusted, at the time of his return to the lower level, as if his service had been continuous in the lower level."

Sec. 5. (a) Each employee in levels 1 through 11 of the Postal Field Service Schedule and each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule—

(1) who is in a step below the 2 top steps of his level shall be advanced 2 steps; or

(2) who is in either of the 2 top steps of his level shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to his rate of basic compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this subsection plus the amount of 2 step increases of his level.

Changes in levels or steps which would otherwise occur on the effective date of this subsection without regard to the enactment of this subsection shall be deemed to have occurred prior to adjustments under this subsection. Each such employee who receives an adjustment under this subsection shall commence a new full waiting period, for further step increase purposes under section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1970, and service by such an employee on or after the effective date of this section and prior to the beginning of such pay period in July 1970 shall not be credited for such step increase purposes.

(b) For the purposes of the initial application of section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, as amended by section 4 of this Act, credit for satisfactory service performed by an employee in levels 12 or above of the Postal Field Service Schedule since his last step increase prior to the effective date of section 4 of this Act, shall be granted in an amount not in excess of the amount of service required for a one step increase applicable to the step category of the employee.

(c) The Postmaster General shall advance each employee in level 12 or above of the Postal Field Service Schedule—

(1) who was in level 12 or above on the effective date of this section and who did not receive a two-step increase pursuant to this section;

(2) who is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in the same post office (A) who received a two-step increase pursuant to this section and (B) who is promoted to the same level on or after the effective date of this section; and

(3) who is in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee described in clauses (A) and (B) of subparagraph (2) of this subsection.

Such advancement by the Postmaster General shall be to the highest step which is held by any such junior employee. Any increase under the provisions of this subsection is not an equivalent increase within the meaning of section 3552 of title 39, United

States Code. Credit earned prior to advancement under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained for step increase purposes under such section 3552.

Sec. 6. Section 5545(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) an employee in a position in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, and which requires substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime duty with the employee generally being responsible for recognizing, without supervision, circumstances which require him to remain on duty, shall receive premium pay for this duty on an annual basis instead of premium pay provided by other provisions of this subchapter, except for regularly scheduled overtime, night, and Sunday duty, and for holiday duty. Premium pay under this paragraph is determined as an appropriate percentage, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 25 per centum, of such part of the rate of basic pay for the position as does not exceed the minimum rate of basic pay for GS-10, by taking into consideration the frequency and duration of irregular unscheduled overtime duty required in the position."

Sec. 7. (a) Section 5942 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5942. Allowance based on duty at remote worksites

"Notwithstanding section 5536 of this title, an employee of an Executive department or independent establishment who is assigned to duty, except temporary duty, at a site so remote from the nearest established communities or suitable places of residence as to require an appreciable amount of expense, hardship, and inconvenience on the part of the employee in commuting to and from his residence and such worksite is entitled, in addition to pay otherwise due him, to an allowance of not to exceed \$10 a day. The allowance shall be paid under regulations prescribed by the President establishing the rates at which the allowance will be paid and defining and designating those sites, areas, and groups of positions to which the rates apply."

(b) Notwithstanding section 5536 of title 5, United States Code, and the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, and until the effective date of regulations prescribed by the President under such amendment—

(1) allowances may be paid to employees under section 5942 of title 5, United States Code, and the regulations prescribed by the President under such section, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section; and

(2) such regulations may be amended or revoked in accordance with such section 5942 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(c) The table of contents of subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"5942. Allowance based on duty on California offshore islands or at Nevada Test Site."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"5942. Allowance based on duty at remote worksites."

Sec. 8 (a) Subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5947. Quarters, subsistence, and allowances for employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations

"(a) An employee of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations may be furnished quarters or subsistence, or both, on vessels, without charge, when the furnishing of the quarters or subsistence, or both, is deter-

mined to be equitable to the employee concerned, and necessary in the public interest, in connection with such operations.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 5536 of this title, an employee entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) of this section while on a vessel, may be paid, in place of these benefits, an allowance for quarters or subsistence, or both, when—

"(1) adverse weather conditions or similar circumstances beyond the control of the employee or the Corps of Engineers prevent transportation of the employee from shore to the vessel; or

"(2) quarters or subsistence, or both, are not available on the vessel while it is undergoing repairs.

"(c) The quarters or subsistence, or both, or allowance in place thereof, may be furnished or paid only under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding—

"5947. Quarters subsistence, and allowances for employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations."

Immediately below—

"5946. Membership fees; expenses of attendance at meetings; limitations."

(c) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations", approved May 13, 1955 (69 Stat. 48; Public Law 35, Eighty-fourth Congress) is repealed.

Sec. 9 (a) This section, the first section, and sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1969.

(c) Section 4 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1970.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD in full and be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 38 strike out all of subsection (q), beginning with line 15 down through line 11 on page 39, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(q) (1) The rates of pay of personnel subject to sections 210 and 214 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 633, 635; Public Law 90-206), relating to Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees and to certain employees of the Legislative Branch of the Government, respectively, and any minimum or maximum rate, limitation, or allowance applicable to any such personnel, shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section by amounts which are identical, insofar as practicable, to the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay for employees

subject to the General Schedule, by the following authorities—

"(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to individuals employed by the county committees established under section 590h(b) of title 16;

"(B) the Financial Clerk of the Senate, with respect to the United States Senate;

"(C) the Finance Clerk of the House of Representatives, with respect to the United States House of Representatives; and

"(D) the Architect of the Capitol, with respect to the office of the Architect of the Capitol.

The provisions of this section shall not be construed to allow adjustments in the rates of pay of the following officers of the United States House of Representatives: Parliamentarian, Chaplain, Clerk, Minority Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Minority Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Minority Doorkeeper, Postmaster, Minority Postmaster.

"(2) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees in and under the Judicial Branch of the Government, whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise adjusted under this section may be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay. The limitations fixed by law with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of my amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple amendment which I believe will arouse no great controversy.

In the 1967 act we provided a system by which comparability raises were given to the Federal classified employees, the postal employees, and so on. We also had a section which permitted and required that the employees of the legislative branch be given the same proportionate increases once other determinations were made.

In the bill the committee reported, because of some confusion, and because of some additional study on the mechanics that I had wanted to make, there was no such provision. This is a simple amendment which will require the disbursing officer and financial clerk in the House and Senate to determine what adjustments have been made in the classified pay of the Federal executive departments, and then take the same adjustments for the employees in the legislative branch.

This would mean that if a \$10,000 clerk downtown received a 3-percent increase on some January, then a \$10,000 staff employee or committee employee in the

Congress would receive a 3-percent increase. It also includes in the machinery two types of employees in the Federal branch, law clerks of circuit and district judges, and secretaries who were omitted from the regular machinery in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any great opposition to the amendment, and I would hope that it would be agreed to.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and in line of clarification might I ask the gentleman—as the author of the bill—one further question pertaining to page 24, lines 22 through 25, where it says in effect that the rates of pay shall be adjusted annually, and then it refers to the physicians, dentists, and nurses, in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration.

Is there any particular reason why these particular categories of talented and scarcely trained personnel were picked out in the Veterans' Administration specifically, rather than in any other, for example, the dentist and physicians in the Public Health Service?

Mr. UDALL. The dentists, physicians, and so forth in other departments are covered in the classified service; they are in the classified salary system. The Veterans' Administration has a separate salary system for these particular people, and we simply bracketed them into the automatic machinery so that a nurse or dentist or physician in the Veterans' Administration would get the same increase as a nurse or a doctor or dentist in the Public Health Service, who are already included.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, do I understand then that the intent, insofar as the Commission is concerned, and the various boards of appeal, or arbitration, that are set up in this bill, is so that there will be some equalization of pay for those of like talents, and equal quality of skills, who are throughout the entire Government by this proposal?

Mr. UDALL. This is basically the intent of this proposal. We have had some incidents where we have had some nurses and nurses' assistants, as I am sure the gentleman is aware of, in one branch of the Government who are getting less than the same comparable people in other branches.

Mr. HALL. Carrying the colloquy one step further, there has actually been proselyting between the various branches of the Government because of inequities so far as this particular area is concerned, but the ones singled out here have apparently been the leaders in income and have experienced those activities, and as to their amount of income to date, and I wondered if it would work in the reverse, or if the others would be brought up to those even though they are covered by other pay acts?

Mr. UDALL. The intention is to equalize them, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 32, beginning with line 14, strike out all of line 14 and all that follows down through the end of line 7 on page 33 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) (1) The rates of pay submitted to the Congress as provided in subsection (c) (4) or subsection (g) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the adoption by both Houses of Congress (within the 60 day period following the date on which the rates of pay are submitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate), by the yeas and nays of a concurrent resolution stating in effect that the Senate and House of Representatives approve such rates of pay."

"(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in the computation of the 60 day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die. The rates of pay submitted to the Congress shall be delivered to both Houses of the Congress on the same day and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House of Representatives is not in session and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session."

On page 33, line 12, strike out "first day of the year" and insert in lieu thereof "date on";

On page 33, line 22, strike out "first day of the year in" and insert in lieu thereof "date on";

On page 38, line 21, strike out "first day of the year in" and insert in lieu thereof "date on".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment that I have offered, may I say it conforms with the policy expressed by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) in the hearings before his compensation subcommittee.

The purpose of this amendment is to require that Congress take affirmative action, not negative action, in connection with the approval of pay increases recommended to it by the so-called Federal Employee Salary Commission.

The Congress should not under any circumstances avoid its responsibility in this matter, as it did in connection with increasing the salaries of Members earlier this year. We were led then to believe that we would be able to vote on that issue in an orderly manner, but it certainly did not work out that way.

As the Members of the House well know, the executive, congressional, and judicial pay bill went into effect early this year while the House of Representatives was conveniently on vacation. My proposal would require that both Houses of Congress, by a yea-and-nay vote, shall approve a concurrent resolution within 60 days after the Commission report is received and before pay increases for Federal employees could possibly become effective.

My amendment further provides that there will be no retroactive pay increases as provided for in the present language of the bill, H.R. 13000.

There is precedent for the amendment I am proposing. A similar provision is contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, title 19, section 1981, where the procedure I suggested in my amendment is used in connection with the imposition of duties or other import restrictions.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion, if a provision such as he is now proposing in this bill had been included in the bill covering pay for the executive branch, the judiciary, and Congress, it would be unlikely that we would have received the pay raise that we got this year?

Mr. GROSS. No, that is not my understanding. Certainly, I would have liked to have seen a vote on it, and tried in every possible way to get it. The responsibility of Members of the House, the presumed responsibility, dictated that there be a vote on that pay increase. But there was no vote, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Then do I clearly interpret your position as being that you do not intend by the amendment you are offering to make it less likely that there will be an annual increase in pay comparable or commensurate with increases in the cost of living and other factors, that would be the case under the bill offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall)?

Mr. GROSS. I cannot say what position the House will take. I doubt very much that had House Members voted on a rollcall vote they would have passed the congressional pay increase earlier this year. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Then I gather that you do believe there is at least a strong possibility that Federal employees chances of an annual raise would be at least in jeopardy if your amendment is passed, to a greater extent than the provision of the Udall bill; and with that in mind, I ask the gentleman if he really believes this House could in good conscience pass a salary commission bill that treated the employees of the Federal Government less generously than we have treated ourselves?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what the House would do. I should like to see a test. I want to see a yea-and-nay vote on pay increases and all of them. That is what my amendment provides, that the House be compelled to vote on pay-increase legislation.

Let me say to the gentleman that looking down the road 18 months hence, this legislation, we are told, will very likely cost \$2.5 billion exclusive of the military pay increase, which is semi-automatic, being based upon the passage of pay-increase legislation for other Federal employees. The House has the obligation to the citizens of this country, the taxpayers of this country, to vote on all pay-increase legislation.

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

(On request of Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS

was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The point that I am trying to examine the gentleman in the well about—and I fully appreciate the good faith of his amendment—I want to say that I agree with you, and I would have been very happy to vote on the issue of pay, and that we needed it. I feel it is fully justified, and I went on record publicly. I would be most happy to do that in this Chamber. I think wherever possible we should vote.

The point I am trying to raise with the gentleman, however, is the fact that we have established a salary procedure for the top-pay executives in the Government, for the judiciary, and for the legislative, and what the gentleman's amendment would now do would be to set a double standard. We would have a different approach, perhaps less advantageous for the general employees of the Government than that which we have provided for ourselves, and this does not seem to me to be consistent with fair play, that we treat ourselves in any way better than other employees in the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. With the influential help of the gentleman from Michigan—and he can be a very helpful influence in the committee—I will be glad to offer legislation in the committee to provide for a mandatory vote on any further increases in pay for the executive, legislative or judicial branches of Government.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I will give that my sympathetic consideration.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to commend the gentleman for presenting to the House a most important amendment to this legislation. The provision of the bill that your amendment seeks to amend is the one that gives most of us great trouble. That is the question whether or not the pay raises are going to be automatic unless Congress vetoes the recommendation of the Salary Commission, or whether Congress is going to face up to what many of us think is our responsibility and affirmatively vote for the raises as recommended by a commission. That is what the gentleman's amendment does. It affords us an opportunity to go on record at this point that if we want to increase the salaries of the employees as the Commission finds they are entitled to be increased, we would then vote to do that. I commend the gentleman for this opportunity to vote on that issue.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his concurrence in and help with this amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. I urge Members of the House to give very serious consideration to the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Iowa. If the amendment is adopted, I am sure passage of the bill, at least by the House, will be assured.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman but I hope it will not assure passage of the bill for many other of its provisions are totally unacceptable.

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

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

Mr. MacGREGOR. I rise to commend the gentleman from Iowa. His amendment obviously has great merit, and I would be pleased to support it. I should like to say to the gentleman who questioned the gentleman from Iowa a moment ago about the double standard that obviously, if the House were to adopt this amendment now offered by the gentleman from Iowa on this legislation, we would subsequently adopt the same amendment with respect to a Commission's recommendations for congressional, legislative, executive or judicial pay raises.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. If we put it in this bill, as we should, then we certainly ought to put it on the other legislation. I will offer legislation to that end.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I would be pleased to support the gentleman in that legislation. I join with him.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I was pleased to read in the hearings on this legislation the statement of Mr. UDALL in connection with providing for affirmative congressional action on pay increases when he said:

This would insure that there would be an actual vote on these new pay schedules developed through the machinery I am talking about.

However, the language of the bill, H.R. 13000, does not conform to his statement.

It occurs to me that if we are going to enact permanent law on this subject, we should remove any question as to whether the Congress has acted affirmatively with respect to pay increases for Federal employees. To do otherwise, as provided for in the present language of the bill, merely leaves us in a position of having to take the blame for any action of the Salary Commission without an opportunity to exercise any affirmative action with respect to its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I told the gentleman from Iowa frankly and I told the members of the Rules Committee that I had no really strong feelings on the amendment. I am inclined to oppose it. I do not think we should adopt the amendment, but I do not think it would destroy what we are trying to do.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us make very clear what is involved before we vote on it. We are trying to set up a semiautomatic procedure in which Congress does not have to hassle every year about pay raises. We are not giving up the policy-making. The Congress sets the policy in

this bill. The bill tells a group of mechanics and bookkeepers every January to go out and check comparability of wages and bring in a proposal, which is then laid before the Congress, and it lays there for 30 days, and, if we do not veto it, it takes effect.

What happens is that every year in January or February we will have a chance to vote and say, "we love the Federal employees." I cannot imagine one of these things being voted down when a bipartisan group of labor and management has studied and said these things are necessary. I cannot imagine Congress voting it down. So we will be simply going through an act every year to say we love the Federal employees.

Now, as to the amendment—the main reason the labor unions are against it is that it brings in delays. The recommendation will be made in January or February, and if there is arbitration it lays there until March of each year, and if there is further delay, it will be May, and then it may be voted upon. So this will leave the budget and the pay situation in doubt between January 1 and May 1. For these reasons, I believe it would be unwise to adopt the amendment, but I did tell the gentleman from Iowa it was not vital. If the Congress wants to do this and waste the time each year confirming that our policy has been carried out, then let us do it, but we still have a chance to veto it. The mechanics of the bill permit Congress to take up the bill and vote against it, if Congress wishes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment writes out the retroactivity provision.

Mr. UDALL. Then this is an even stronger reason to oppose the amendment, and the employee unions would be even more bitterly opposed. I did not understand that feature.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is the lag we have of 15 months. We are behind in comparability now. We have tried to shorten that time, and it will still be more than 5 months behind. Each January we will catch it up to the previous August, but now the gentleman's amendment is going to make the lag even greater.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying we should tailor whether we vote on a bill, any bill, in accordance with whether the bankers' association, the bar association, or any other group wants us to vote? Is this the way the gentleman is suggesting the House should proceed on other legislation?

Mr. UDALL. No. What I am saying is that we ought to vote on important things. There are \$5 billion worth of Wage Board adjustments made each year. We do not fix these things, because we have set down the policy and we have told the group of technicians and bookkeepers to check on the pay for a carpenter and find out the situation in the particular area and pay that, and we do not vote each year on that.

Mr. GROSS. But we could participate in it if we wanted to do so.

Mr. UDALL. Of course we could. I am simply suggesting it is not all that important to saddle Congress with taking one afternoon or one day each year to vote on, and we do have a chance to vote if some outrage has been perpetrated.

Mr. GROSS. I have not reached the point where a \$2.5 billion bill is inconsequential from the standpoint of my vote.

Mr. UDALL. Of course, we have not. But if the policy is fixed by the Congress, it can be carried out by the technicians.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, was not one of the major contentions of Postmaster General Blount for postal reform through setting up a Corporation this argument, that without a rate board outside Congress there is a time lag and a lack of control in wages in the postal system?

Mr. UDALL. Indeed. One of the purposes of the Postal Corporation is to get our hands out of the pot, to let us stop stirring the stew, and to have wages fixed in a different method than by having Congress fix them.

Mr. WHITE. So by the committee amendment we still have oversight over the wages, yet the Rate Commission speeds up and streamlines the process?

Mr. UDALL. Absolutely. 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 49, noes 45.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. UDALL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to. AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: On page 24, line 12, strike out "adjusted" and insert in lieu thereof "reviewed"; and

On page 28, lines 14 and 15, strike out "except as provided in subsection (e) and subsection (g) of this section,"; and

On page 29, beginning with line 17, strike out all of line 17 and all that follows down through the end of line 19 on page 35 and redesignate the succeeding subsections accordingly; and

Delete each reference to the Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration and members of such Board in the remaining text of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I did not anticipate the action of the Committee just taken in adopting the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). Indeed I supported his amendment, but thereafter considered for a moment whether mine should be offered in view of the action of the Committee in adopting the Gross amend-

ment. On comparison of the two amendments, however, it is still considered worthwhile for the Committee to consider and adopt this amendment.

Essentially, what it does is it provides that the Commission shall be advisory only and that the report which it makes will have to be acted upon by the House. The Gross amendment adopted by the Committee would require a rollcall vote. The amendment now before you, however, would place the Salary Commission in an advisory role. It also eliminates the arbitration board. If the Salary Commission is going to be advisory only and if the Congress will have to act, as the Committee has just said it should, I see no purpose in having a board of arbitration. A Board of Arbitration to which any member of the Salary Commission can appeal if he is dissatisfied with the decision rendered by the Salary Commission is something that is not necessary in view of the adoption of the Gross amendment.

It seems to me we should ask ourselves a number of questions in the consideration of this legislation.

First, Mr. Chairman, we should ask ourselves do we want the President and the Congress to control the budgetary and the appropriation process, or do we want a commission to determine this. It seems reasonable to me to retain these processes within the control of the Congress and the President. It seems reasonable that when the President submits his budget to the Congress it should include salary adjustments for Government employees to be made during the fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we might ask ourselves to whom the Government employee should turn. Should he turn to a commission for the adjustment of his salary or should he contact his Congressman as he has in the past?

What will we say to the employees or their representative if they come to us? Will we say, "Talk it over with the Commission"? Will we be bound by what the Commissioner reports, or will we treat him in the same manner as all of our other constituents at the time we consider pay adjustments?

Mr. Chairman, if we look at page 32 of the bill we can see that the findings of the Commission go into effect within 30 days after submission to the Congress. If, ultimately, the Gross amendment does not become the law—and I hope that it does become law—but in the event the other body or a conference between the two bodies strikes it out, I feel this amendment will be good insurance to take two bites at similar proposals. My amendment would make the Salary Commission advisory only. I think we show our concern for the Government employee when we say to him that the Congress will retain jurisdiction over the salaries of Government employees.

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

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

Mr. LATTI. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he proposes to give the Commission only review powers. Is that correct?

Mr. SCOTT. I would knock out the Commission being able to determine the salary of a Government employee. My amendment would change the word "adjusted" on page 24 to "review." In other words, it would not adjust the salaries. The Commission would review the salaries and make its recommendation to the Congress.

If the Gross amendment does become law it would take away a lot of the thrust of my amendment. I think, however, the two are consistent. My amendment would abolish the Arbitration Board. The Arbitration Board is a review board that is set up in the bill. First, the Commission determines the salary and this would be a recommendation only. Then we would have the Board of Review. The Congress under my amendment would do that rather than a Board of Arbitration. I see no need for a Board of Arbitration in view of the adoption of the Gross amendment, or if this amendment is adopted. My amendment would remove the Board of Arbitration but not the Salary Commission. In other words, we have two separate instrumentalities contained in this bill.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with what the gentleman is attempting to do. I do not think that as Members of Congress we ought to let any board or any commission do the job that we are sent here to do. I opposed the Salary Commission created to set salaries for Members of Congress. In my opinion this bill attempts to do the same thing for postal and other Federal employees. I think it is proper and fitting that we increase the salaries of postal and Federal employees but not to set up a commission to do it for us. This is our function as a legislative body—we should not delegate it.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me say that I believe this Congress and this House over the years has abdicated a large measure of its responsibility. I think it is time that we reversed that trend and did the things that the people have sent us here to the Congress to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I make two points against the amendment. As a matter of fact I should have raised a point of order to the amendment although I did not, because it really does some of the things or undoes some of the things that were covered in the Gross amendment and as a result thereof it is my opinion that we would have a confused hodgepodge if both were approved.

Mr. Chairman, I am really appalled that a distinguished Member who represents as many Federal employees as does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) would offer this amendment, because it guts the entire work of the committee in salary fixing and the entirely

new system of fixing pay which this bill sets up and establishes would be ruined, vetoed and rendered totally ineffective.

Mr. Chairman, all this bill provides for is salary-fixing machinery and provides for study machinery. We have had study machinery since 1962, and under that system the Federal employees got further and further and further behind in Virginia until in 1967 we passed an act that set up some timetables and comparability guidelines that brought Federal employees up to full comparability.

If you want to ruin the postal and classified employees and put us right back in the committee and begin all over again and knock out the Federal salary fixing, just approve this amendment, because this is what it does.

If there is any Federal employee or any Federal employee organization that is in favor of this kind of amendment I cannot imagine who it would be.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. UDALL. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying, when he talks about the amendment gutting the bill, and as being against the interests of the Federal workers, is the gentleman asking this body to believe that the Bureau of the Budget, that the Post Office Department, that the Civil Service Commission, that the Department of the Army, all of whom have representatives on the Commission, are more interested in the welfare of the individual employee than this body is? I do not believe that these agencies are more interested in the welfare of Government employees than their elected representatives.

Mr. UDALL. No; I am not saying that. What I am saying is that the Federal employee was 2 years, 3 years, or even 4 years behind in comparability. I have heard the gentleman say how terrible this is. The reason that situation existed was because we had no machinery for regular, annual, periodic adjustments in pay. We had some study machinery that the gentleman says we should have now. But this bill would establish the automatic machinery whereby it will make sure that we can carry out the policies that we determine we believe in. If we were to continue with the study machinery as suggested, and this study were completed next January, the way this Congress works there would not be a raise until many months later. It would be maybe August or September before we would get around to coming up with a pay bill based upon that study so again that would be a year or two behind. That is what this bill is trying to avoid.

Mr. SCOTT. You are saying that the Commission would be more effective than this Congress, and I would submit that that is quite an indictment of the Congress, and the representatives of the employees and the people.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise too often to speak on the floor of this House. As the Members know, I am a relatively new Member. However, I must rise on a matter so vital and on which I am intimately acquainted.

Before I arrived here as a Member of the Congress I served for many, many years as a policeman, but prior to that I served as a postal employee for some 5 years. I personally regard my departure from that postal system as an escape. I regard it in this fashion facetiously, but the fact of the matter is that it is a proper characterization of my departure; it was an escape from a medieval system and a medieval approach to salaries.

Be assured the Commission, with executive powers, is necessary. The advisory nature of this amendment would emasculate the very purpose of such machinery which is so necessary to overcome omissions over the decades where Congress has not done its job, and that is the fact of the matter. Congress has failed to do its job and discharge its moral responsibilities to the Federal employees, and also to the neglected employees of the postal system of our Nation. That is why we find ourselves confronted with the most abysmal postal service and where we find ourselves confronted with a situation where postal employees are required in some areas of the country to engage in other endeavors in order to maintain a living wage.

Gentlemen, we have seen the unrest, we have seen the activities on the part of the postal employees of this Nation, and they are responsible people, they are dedicated, they are loyal Americans, but they are charged with the responsibility of fiscally maintaining our postal service. We only have to look across the Atlantic Ocean to Italy, where not too many months ago we found a postal strike in existence that tied up that nation before they obtained their benefits. Should we in the Congress be responsible for driving the postal employees of America to that same end in order to ultimately obtain the required benefits?

You and I know that if we permit these inadequacies to approach crisis proportions in this country then we are responsible for any similar job action. It is irresponsibility on our part to drive the employees to that point. Let us discharge our duties and our responsibilities here today by defeating this amendment—and fulfill our moral commitment to the postal as well as Federal employees.

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

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

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

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

Mr. Chairman, I know of the great contributions that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has made to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Serv-

ice, but I am sure he is mistaken in presenting this amendment.

As the chairman of the full committee, I have sat on many of the hearings, and have listened attentively to the proceedings. I have always thought that we should bridge the gap of comparability within the period of about 3 or 4 months.

I think it was explained by our able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) when he said that if we delete that one provision from the bill and abolish the Arbitration Board, we will be more than 15 months away from comparability. So I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCOTT), there were—ayes 27, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNGATE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNGATE: On page 46, insert a new section 9 immediately following line 13, and renumber section 9 as section 10, as follows:

"Sec. 9. (a) Any person paid from a clerk hire allowance of the House of Representatives who travels to a Congressional district in a State other than the State of the member by which he is employed for the purpose of influencing in any manner the outcome of a Congressional election, including any future Congressional election, shall be paid for only one-half the pay period during which the Clerk of the House is informed of the activities as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) Any person paid from a clerk hire allowance who engages in activities described in subsection (a) of this section shall report such activities to the Clerk of the House no later than five days following the commencement of such activities.

"(c) If full pay for the pay period during which the Clerk of the House is informed of activities prohibited by subsection (a) of this section has been received by a person reporting as required by subsection (b) of this section, the Clerk of the House shall withhold one-half of said person's pay for the following pay period.

"(d) Any person paid from a clerk hire allowance failing to comply with subsection (b) of this section shall forfeit all right to any pay from the House of Representatives for a period of six months.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the employing member of a person paid from a clerk hire allowance who engages in activities prohibited by subsection (a) of this section to report the activity to the Clerk of the House if the activity is not reported as required by subsection (b) of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) in support of his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill that is being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I can hardly imagine anything more germane

than this amendment relating to Federal employees pay in this bill having to do with the payment of Federal employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair would like to point out that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) that was adopted, goes to the point of clerk hire in the House and also in the Senate. The bill having been opened up on that subject by the adoption of that amendment, and since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) also addresses itself to the matter of clerk hire in the House, the Chair holds that the amendment is germane and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. It is designed to prohibit campaigning by congressional staff paid from a clerk-hire allowance for candidates in congressional elections held out of the State of their employer's district. The amendment will accomplish this goal by penalizing those staffers in violation of the provision 2 weeks of pay, and in those instances where a staffer fails to report his activities, 6 months of pay.

Mr. Chairman, as President Nixon told those of us who were here yesterday.

The spirit of party grows more evident weekly in the National Capital . . . the call to partisan combat has grown more compelling.

I have in my hand the following letter dated August 27, 1969, which reads as follows:

DEAR BULL ELEPHANT—

I presume that refers to those in the cow districts—

Our Congressional Campaign Committee chairman, Bob Wilson, has asked me to head up our reactivated R.S.V.P. program (Republicans Speak on Vital Problems), concentrating our efforts in Democratic-held districts.

Last year it was constructive Republican alternative programs—I am not sure what we should make of that. Continuing:

We plan to send out three-member teams of Republican Congressmen into these districts on successive week ends between September 26 and November 8.

To make these visits a success, we need a number of topflight advance men to precede the panels into these districts, conferring with local party leaders, setting up the agenda for the visits, arranging for press conferences, et cetera. And that's where you come in.

If you can arrange it with your boss to get away from your office for a total of about 8-10 days during this period (the first 4-5 days coming several weeks in advance of the panel's departure and the second 3-4 days immediately preceding the group's departure), we can use you. Ideally, we're looking for administrative and/or press aides with the maturity and experience to deal with party leaders at the state and local level and with the news media in these areas.

The Congressional Committee will pick up the tab on all your expenses, of course.

I interject here that this amendment would afford a further opportunity to pay their salaries as well.

Because this will be a sizable undertaking, involving planning, logistics and timing, we

are trying to line up experienced advance men as soon as possible—and would appreciate it very much if you would advise me of your availability to advance one or more of the panels.

Now, it is no secret that the Republicans need all the help they can get in running for elective office, Mr. Chairman. But taking staff members, paid with tax dollars, to pursue the interests of the taxpayers in their employing Congressman's district, and sending them to campaign for candidates for elective office in completely unrelated districts is not justifiable.

For example, why should the taxpayers meet the salary of a staff member employed by a California Congressman while that California staff member is working in a South Carolina political campaign?

Mr. Chairman, we knew the Republicans were hard up for ideas, but we never knew they were hardup for money.

It may be argued that the amendment is not needed because of the sensational lack of success the Republicans have had in recent special congressional elections. But, Mr. Chairman, this may simply be part of the "southern strategy," which involves losing congressional races in Montana, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, those not engaging in this practice would not be affected. I am sure the Members would agree with me that any who are engaging in this practice should be stopped.

I therefore urge adoption of this amendment, and a vote to support it is a vote to save tax dollars.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman's amendment apply also to employees of the Doorkeeper's office, the office of the Clerk of the House, and other such offices who are paid by taxpayers generally?

Mr. HUNGATE. This amendment is limited, as I think the Clerk read.

Mr. KYL. I do not disagree with the gentleman's amendment at all. Would the gentleman join with me sometime and try to get a similar amendment to control those other offices?

Mr. HUNGATE. I have tried to adopt a policy of giving conscientious consideration to all amendments offered. I will do the same for any amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment as drafted has a broad brush effect which the author of the amendment does not intend. I happen to represent a district in metropolitan Washington and there are probably more employees of Members of Congress residing in my district than in any other district.

The result of the amendment as written would deny the individuals living in this district an opportunity to work for me or for my opponent in a political campaign. I do not think that this is the intention of the author of the amendment.

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

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman misconstrued the amendment. The employee actually can work any place in the same State, but the employee simply cannot go out into any other State in a political campaign. There is no harm in working for a Congressman.

Mr. HOGAN. But the employee who might be a legal resident of Missouri might live in Prince George's County, in my district, and might like to work for me or my opponent in a campaign. As I see it, the gentleman's amendment would preclude him from doing that.

Mr. HUNGATE. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I believe he refers to something they do on their own time. I think with respect to the time they are paid for by the Government, for 3 or 4 days or 4 or 5 days out of State of the employing Member, that would be above and beyond donated time one may expect. I suppose they could take vacation time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri would not do any great harm, but it opens up a Pandora's box. I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. HOGAN. I thank my colleague from Maryland.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long), who engaged in the previous colloquy, hit the nail on the head when he said an amendment such as this would open up a Pandora's box. Consider in part for a moment what this proposed amendment does—and I know the gentleman from Missouri offers it with good intentions.

First of all, for example, the amendment prohibits under any circumstances a member of my staff, but not a member of a Senate staff, or a member of a committee staff, from going into a congressional district in any congressional district other than my home State, or in the instance of one of the gentleman's employees, in the gentleman's home State—unless at a sacrifice or penalty: It costs the employee one-half of his pay for that pay period.

I think it is probably unconstitutional. If he does not report to the Clerk of the House, as this amendment requires, he will lose 6 months' pay.

Consider some of the circumstances wherein every franchised and free American ought to have the privilege of doing what he wants to do politically. Every other Federal employee we are talking about giving raises to today has that privilege. Suppose a man is on a legitimate vacation, one that has been scheduled for months. He ought to have the privilege of doing what he wants to do on that vacation. He at least ought to be able to use that off-duty time to engage in politics.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman would recognize the Hatch Act does prohibit some activities for Federal employees that other people may engage in?

Mr. WAGGONNER. It absolutely does not when they are not on duty. They can engage in partisan politics when they are off duty.

Mr. HUNGATE. But the gentleman will agree there is a Hatch Act which affects Federal employees and not other employees.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Yes. But what the gentleman proposes here is far in excess of what the Hatch Act imposes on other Federal employees. Consider this. Consider the announcement just made by the Department of Defense the other day about the ability of the military to participate while off duty in elections. Suppose my administrative assistant is not a resident of the State of Louisiana, for example, but he is a resident of the State of Virginia, and he lives in the State of Virginia.

Are you going to tell me that in his authorized period of vacation he cannot participate in a congressional election in the State of Virginia? This amendment says he cannot.

If it is right for the Members of the House, why are we not going to put the same restriction on Senate elections or on presidential elections, just for an example?

This opens a can of worms nobody in this House wants to fool with.

Mr. Chairman, we are all engaged in the game of politics and we might as well recognize it. Let us not try to restrain people to this extent. It does not make sense. Vote this amendment down. It is totally unworkable.

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

I should like to express two or three thoughts to the Members.

One is, the committee did not study this amendment. It takes no position as a committee on it.

My own view is that the Republican campaign committee had a rather ill-conceived program to send out staff people, who are paid some pretty handsome salaries, to go out for several days at a time into the congressional districts of our own colleagues.

I had the honor of one of them from a colleague of our own State (a Member of this body) sending out paid staff people into my hometown to tell my voters perhaps they were making a mistake keeping me in the Congress.

This would not be outlawed under the amendment. The amendment would permit this practice to continue. It would permit Members to send AA's all over the State. It would simply say I could not send my staff people into Louisiana or into Michigan or into some other State to campaign.

I recognize the practicalities. We are all in politics. It is hard to draw the line between what staff people do in politics and out of politics.

I would hope that the practice of this kind, that gave rise to this amendment, would be given a pretty hard look by the members of the other party. Two can play this game. It is a very poor policy to have the taxpayers pay their money for this. I pay my share of taxes, and I resent paying to have a man go 2,000 miles to another State to help defeat a Member of the House.

I am going to vote against the amendment. As I say, the committee has not taken a stand on this.

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

This is a fascinating amendment. It really ought to intrigue all Members of the House. It is not as one sided as it might appear.

May I say in passing, I have the greatest of respect for the gentleman from Missouri, who offered the amendment. I remember the day when, with great courage, he marched into the well of the House and took on the entire Press Gallery, which few of us would have the courage to do. It is not surprising he will today take on the entire House membership with such a proposal.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I would say the gentleman is paying tribute to my courage but certainly not to my judgment. I appreciate his comments.

I do mean this to apply equally to both sides of the aisle. I recognize what the gentleman says. On this side of the aisle I am sure he can recognize it more easily than I can.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I want to commend the gentleman for his judgment. I do not believe his judgment is any worse in offering this amendment today than it was when he took on the press.

I do wish to point out that we just have to appreciate what goes on in reality. We do not suppose for a minute, when Senator KENNEDY traveled about the country, that staff has not been involved. I even have a sneaking suspicion that some of the more brilliant statements issued by the Democratic Study Group are the work of staff people, just as their other activities obviously are the work of staff people.

I would think, if we want to prohibit staff people from any participation in politics at all, we had better shake up this entire operation of ours. Even the press releases that will be flowing into the galleries all night long this day are politically prepared by staff people, going far beyond the district of an individual Member.

This is not really too bad an amendment. I would not mind supporting it on the ground it would confuse this bill and make it less acceptable further down the line.

I believe, in all reality, the political facts of life being what they are, this amendment would not help Democrats and would not help Republicans. It would just upset the present rules of the game.

If the gentleman from Missouri gets clearance from the leaders on that side

I will have a few amendments to try to clean up his amendment, but really I think we ought to appreciate the unusual significance of this imaginative amendment.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman that it would not be helpful to Democrats or Republicans, but I submit it might help taxpayers.

Mr. DERWINSKI. By gosh, if I thought we would do anything to help taxpayers, I would rally to the cause. But just think of the damage we are doing to the taxpayers with this bill to which the gentleman is offering an amendment. If we postponed the entire bill, we might be doing the taxpayers a real favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUNGATE) there were—ayes 48, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

COMMUNICATION FROM NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent Mr. MORTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago there was handed to me by a messenger from the White House a letter from the Premier of North Vietnam, Pham Van Dong. The letter was sent from Hanoi in Vietnamese to Paris and transmitted from Paris to the United States, 1317 Greenwich mean time, October 14, 1969. It says:

DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS: Up until now the U.S. progressive people have struggled against the war of aggression against Vietnam. This fall large sectors of the U.S. people, encouraged and supported by many peace- and justice-loving American personages, are also launching a broad and powerful offensive throughout the United States to demand that the Nixon Administration put an end to the Vietnam aggressive war and immediately bring all American troops home.

Your struggle eloquently reflects the U.S. People's legitimate and urgent demand, which is to save U.S. honor and to prevent their sons and brothers from dying uselessly in Vietnam. This is also a very appropriate and timely answer to the attitude of the U.S. authorities who are still obdurately intensifying and prolonging the Vietnam aggressive war in defiance of protests by U.Y. and World Public opinion.

The Vietnamese and world people fully approve of and enthusiastically acclaim your just struggle.

The Vietnamese people demand that the U.S. Government withdraw completely and unconditionally U.S. troops and those of other foreign countries in the American camp from Vietnam, thus allowing the Vietnamese people to decide their own destiny by themselves.

The Vietnamese people deeply cherish peace, but it must be peace in independence and freedom. As long as the U.S. Government does not end its aggression against Vietnam, the Vietnamese people will persevere in their struggle to defend their fundamental national rights. Our people's patriotic struggle is precisely the struggle for peace and justice that you are carrying out.

We are firmly confident that, with the solidarity and bravery of the people's of our two countries and with the approval and support of peace-loving people in the world, the struggle of the Vietnamese people and U.S. progressive people against U.S. aggression will certainly be crowned with total victory.

May your fall offensive succeed splendidly. Affectionately yours,

PHAM VAN DONG,
Premier of the DRV Government.

Mr. Chairman, all of us in this House have vigorously supported the right of dissent. We have supported the right of people to express themselves in assembly. I think we had better in this case—in the so-called moratorium—be very careful that we do not fall into a trap which has been set here so cleverly by the Communist leader of North Vietnam.

We had better think a long time if we use this moratorium for any other purpose than to rededicate ourselves to the support of the President of the United States and the national policy of this country which he so eloquently and so magnificently has articulated.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, as a preface to these few words, I would relate that I was one of those who felt at the time we got involved in Vietnam, and so stated, that it was a mistake to involve American troops in a land war in Asia. That has been an American military maxim since the 19th century. However, that is water under the bridge. We did become so involved. We are there. Our country is at war, and we ought not forget it.

With that out of the way, I will proceed to the point of my remarks today.

Mr. Chairman, many words will be spoken today and tomorrow in fawning support of our North Vietnamese and Vietcong enemy. This may even cause some wonder whether patriotism is dead in America. I say it is not. I shall give just one example; I know there are countless others.

Five years ago we had a page on the floor of this House from Conroe, Tex. Many of you will remember him, Jimmie Edwards. I have known Jimmie since he was 10 years old. He would rather these remarks not be made, but because of the current pro-Vietcong demonstrations, I believe I should speak, and he will forgive me.

After service as our page, he returned to Conroe to complete his high school education. He then enrolled in college, making excellent grades. But his country was in trouble—it was at war in Vietnam. As a university student, the draft was not pressing him; he was 20 years old, a junior in the university. But his country needed him; he heard the call. He was eligible for officer training, but turned it down to voluntarily enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps as a private.

He felt the need for fighting men, and that the need was current, and in Vietnam. Last February he enlisted; on August 5 he arrived in Vietnam as a Marine private; on August 6 he celebrated his 21st birthday at An Hoa, 27 miles southwest of Da Nang.

During the ensuing days, Jimmie participated with valor in the military action. On one occasion he prevented the death or capture of himself and his bud-

dies by an enemy officer who had approached to within 10 feet of where they were resting from exhaustion. The enemy had already raised his gun to shoot when Jimmie shot faster. Jimmie was not afraid to do his duty for his country.

Then, on August 19, Jimmie and several other marines were hit by enemy rockets. I understand all were killed, save Jimmie and one other. Jimmie lost both legs, and received other wounds. He is now in the U.S. Naval Hospital, Oakland, Calif. Corporal Edwards has been awarded the Bronze Star with valor, for his service rendered during his 2 weeks in Vietnam.

Jimmie is not discouraged. He is a man. He does not feel sorry for himself. He will walk again, and will feel that he is still on his own two feet, even if they will be artificial. Jimmie would return to Vietnam, if the Marine Corps should feel he could serve.

Jimmie hopes to be home for Christmas, and perhaps walking. Knowing him, I believe he will. And when he is able, I want him to visit us in Washington in order that those of you who knew him as a page may renew your acquaintance with a real square, a patriotic young American.

And I believe Jimmie would join with me in recommending a poem, author unknown to me, to those who are in sympathy with the demonstrations favoring the Vietnamese Communists:

No man wins when freedom fails—
Good men rot in filthy jails;
And those who cry, Appear! Appear!
Are hung by those they tried to please.

Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks the article by Joe Parsley concerning Cpl. Jimmie Edwards, which appeared in the August 27 issue of the Conroe, Tex., Courier:

JIMMIE C. EDWARDS WILL WALK WITH
COURAGE, WISDOM, GLORY
(By Joe Parsley)

Jimmie C. Edwards III is a square.

He's the kind of square that makes the hackles on the back of your neck stand at attention . . . the kind that makes the tears well up in your eyes and shout to your maker, "Thank God he's a square . . . just give us more like him."

Jimmie is the kind who wears his heart on his shirt sleeve rather than buried from other people in his chest. He feels. He knows others feel, and he pours forth compassion for their feelings.

Jimmy knows obligation for the many blessings which have come his way. He knows a better world is possible, and he was willing to take a chance to find that better world for all of us.

So he went forth when he didn't have to. With all the love, help and influence of this nation's capital at his disposal, he set it aside and volunteered at the very bottom as a U.S. Marine.

His reasons? Jimmie had a number of them, and all of them were good. They were based on sound logic. They were based on love of his country. They were based on his country's needs. All of them boiled down to patriotism.

The principal who knew this young man so well through high school said yesterday, "Jimmie undoubtedly was the most patriotic youngster I've ever known." Everything he added after that sounded insignificant.

Jimmie went into the Marines as a lowly buck private about the middle of last Feb-

ruary. He left a promising career as an attorney while a junior student at the University of Maryland to volunteer as a Marine. There was no pressure on him.

He underwent basic training at Parris Island, then on to Camp LeJeune before his transfer to Vietnam.

"I'm a grunt," he wrote mom and dad, Mr. and Mrs. Jimmie C. Edwards Jr. of Conroe. "That's the lowest thing there is. But I love it."

Jimmie was offered officer training school three times. He shook his humble head from side to side each time. "I know where the need is, and I want to be there."

Yep. Jimmie is a square. So square in fact that in April of 1964 he was appointed as a Page in the U.S. Congress by Rept. John Dowdy. By June he had worked his way up to the envied post as assistant overseer in that famous lawmaking body. And in early July he was elevated to the position of Overseer of other Pages.

Jimmie was so square that admiring Congressmen insisted he serve them during the Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City, N.J. starting August 24, 1964.

He served them well. This slip of a lad numbered among his close friends the men whose faces and names we read about daily as shapers of history and our destiny. To them, Jimmie was "something special" because you see, Jimmie is a square.

The lad was happy and delighted with his pre-law course at the University of Maryland. It was aiming him in the direction he wanted to travel. Toward law, toward politics.

As a student, Jimmie also held a good job by Presidential sanction in the U.S. Post Office in this nation's capital. And not only did he carry his full college course after working from 4 a.m. to 9 a.m., he also worked weekends at a stable. He was quite a horseman on the side, and held many trophies which commemorated his equestrian accomplishments.

But this was not enough for Jimmie. He was a square. And as a square his soul burned with an obligation which he felt was "now."

That need was in Vietnam. He was so very close, both logically and emotionally with this nation's need in that faraway country. The full life around him seemed hollow, so long as that need existed.

We're sure he fought the demands of that command within him. That's only human nature. But some commands are so strong you can't ignore them.

You must set aside the fears, hopes and desires of parents and other loved ones. Obligations must be fulfilled.

So Jimmie volunteered. There was no other course. After training, this square reached Vietnam on August 5. He was sent immediately to An Hoa, which is 27 miles southwest of Da Nang, and arrived there on August 6, his 21st birthday.

"It was a helova celebration," he wrote. His outpost went under siege that same day.

The rocket blasts which scream warnings at you were almost continuous. And the mortar barrages which slip upon you silently terrorized the group. But Jimmie lucked out until August 19 . . . two short weeks after his arrival.

Then it happened.

The rocket was almost a direct hit. It knocked this square's legs out from under him. Shrapnel wounded his hands, tore at one ear and penetrated his lungs.

He and one buddy were the only survivors of 10 or 12 in his bunker.

His buddy was left blind, one-armed and without legs.

All this time a terrifying premonition had been haunting both Mr. and Mrs. Edwards here in Conroe. "I know something's wrong," they told friends before the Marine sergeant reached their home on August 21.

"I knew what he had come for before we reached his car," Jimmie's father said. "I

only wanted to know the truth at that moment, and I insisted on it.

"And he told me that Jimmie was wounded critically. He also told me he would face a series of serious operations, that he had been evacuated to the Philippines for further treatment and would be sent on to where the best medical services would be available for his particular needs."

The parents have talked to their son by phone in a conversation which required the ultimate in self-control. You can imagine how they treasure that conversation.

"When our son walks again," his parents said, "it won't be on his own feet. But he will walk with courage, and wisdom, and glory . . ."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABERNETHY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Strike out section 2 and section 3 in their entirety and remember the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORROW). I think it is very unfortunate that this "talk-in" has been scheduled in the House for today or for any other day. The same applies to the demonstrations that have been scheduled to take place over the country tomorrow. I cannot help but feel, in fact, I know, that such will do nothing more than strengthen the dedication of North Vietnam to continue this war. It will prolong the war and result in the killing of more American sons. I hope that what has been planned here for tonight will be called off. It cannot help our cause but will give a big lift to North Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I intervene and offer amendments to legislation that does not come from my own committees. But this is an amendment that I could not let go by.

If there is anything that this Congress has been criticized severely for it was the enactment of the Congressional, Executive and Judicial Pay Commission which was included in the last pay bill that came before this body.

I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that if a poll had been taken of the people of this Nation when that provision was included in the bill a few years ago, it would have been overwhelmingly disapproved. It was very unpopular. It was regarded by the people of the Nation as a means of ducking our responsibility in passing upon our salaries as well as the salaries of the Cabinet and of the judicial branch. And, indeed, I regarded same as just that—a duck, a dodge, an unwillingness to face up to our responsibility.

I realize that the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), considerably improved the situation insofar as this Commission is concerned. It requires that the Commission report come back to the Congress and that the Congress may approve or disapprove that which has been recommended by the Commission. May I also point out that this Commission is stacked to begin with. Its makeup will be such that the employees will almost have complete control of determining their own salaries. If we are to have a com-

mission then certainly it should be unbiased.

Leaving the Commission in the bill even as amended by the Gross amendment—which I concede is an improvement—exempts the committees of the Congress from making their own studies and from taking testimony and denies the Congress the right to amend the Commission's recommendations. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this Commission is a mistake. And do not forget it, the people will let you know about it.

Striking the Commission from the bill will not hurt it. The employees who are intended to be helped by the bill will still be helped. The bill will still retain the present language contained in sections 5301 and 5302 of title V of the United States Code under which the policy of pay comparability is established, and under which annual reports on pay comparability are submitted by the President. The amendment will retain in the bill the sections dealing with the two-step advancement for postal employees in the first eleven levels, the accelerated advancement for postal employees, remote worksite allowances and subsistence and allowances for the Corps of Engineer floating plant operations.

All the amendment does is just get rid of the Commission. Let us take it out and continue to face up to our responsibility.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment essentially strikes out all the operative parts of the bill. The bill is designed to have an automatic salary fixing method by next January. If this amendment is adopted it means there will be no pay increase in January. It would wipe out a year's hard work by the committee, and it violates the aims and hopes of every employee organization, including the postal employees and the classified employees.

If you want to improve the postal service, then support the committee in the fine work it has done in producing this bill and vote the amendment down.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 46, line 19, strike out "October 1, 1969" and insert in lieu thereof "the date of enactment of this Act".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is so brief that I do not believe it will be necessary for me to use the 5 minutes.

All this amendment does is to postpone the effective date of this act from October 1, 1969, until the date of enactment. This applies to the October 1 two-step pay increase that would be granted to post office employees only.

The reason for offering this is quite practical. We are now in the third week of October. We have no idea how rapidly or how slowly the other body may pick

up this measure. Certainly, it is not the intention, I do not think, of even the most militant supporters of this bill to find a situation where it may not be processed until next February or March and then have a 5- or 6-month retroactive pay increase. That is not really a sound procedure. At the time October 1 was selected, we were working on the bill in committee at the end of July and early August and I do not at this point see how we could in a rational manner maintain the October 1 date.

In the interest of injecting more rationality into this proposal, I offer my amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last July the postal employees received an increase of about 4 percent. The classified employees received a pay increase of some 9 percent. A great flurry occurred and many of us promised some emergency action. The action we designed in committee was expressed by the two-step increase which would give them some relief.

As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) pointed out, the pay of the postal worker in the Washington metropolitan area is now more than \$1,000 below what the BLS statistics indicate it takes to provide a low standard of living for a family of four. But the gentleman from Illinois' amendment would delay this even further.

I strongly urge that this amendment be defeated. It is unfair and inequitable.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Just for the sake of the record, I would point out that under the leadership of the gentleman from Arizona, the postal employees received a pay increase in the first two steps under the 1967 Salary Act in excess of the classified employees. The third-step figure was really a basic adjustment to cover the pay of classified employees for extra increase that the postal employees received earlier. I do not believe they are being discriminated against.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have hesitated all afternoon to refer to this matter, but I just cannot in good conscience refrain from doing so now.

I do not know whether these figures have been brought out or not, but I think in fairness and in justice they should be. I refer to the additional cost to the taxpayers of this country of this bill—and they are the only source that we have for getting the revenues for this bill.

Now like everybody in this House, I love my postman. I like his vote. I like his good will and I like the organization as such. But when I am faced with the fact that we are now paying \$42 billion for salaries of Federal employees, and I hasten to add that \$16 billion of that is for the military—\$26 billion of that is for Federal employees, civilian employees. I think it is time to consider the impact on our fiscal affairs and particularly on the inflationary situation. When this bill was up before my committee, I called the director of the Bureau of the Budget and asked him if he could give me the figures

about what this bill would add to the existing cost. Here is his reply.

The cost of the pay increase for 1969—\$3.3 billion.

The cost of the pay increase for last year, July 1968—\$1,800,000,000.

The cost of the bill H.R. 13000 for fiscal 1970 is \$1,539,000,000—the increase—and for fiscal 1971, \$4,351,000,000, or a total of \$5,910,000,000. That is the increased cost of this legislation for the next 2 years. Now add to that an anticipated deficit of \$1.5 billion and you have a grand total of some \$7.5 billion.

We talk about inflation. The greatest enemy that this country faces today, I want to repeat, is inflation. It is greater than communism. It is greater than the trouble we have in Vietnam. It threatens the Republic itself.

What are we going to do about it? We are either going to destroy the economy of this country through inflation, or we are going to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to repeat the statement, but the 1939 dollar today has purchasing power of less than 39 cents. How long can you continue that? When inflation finally deals its death blow, then the wheels of industry stop. Everything stops—the postal employees, the Federal employees, Members of Congress—everybody. And everything stops. Chaos ensues.

I know it is not adding to any popularity that I might have, if any, in this body, nor in the galleries, nor at home to make this speech over and over again. But I still repeat that we are either going to apply the brakes somewhere—and I do not want to apply them here any more than I do anywhere else. We will be driven to wage and price controls. I wanted to apply the brakes back there when we raised our salaries through some kind of—I do not want to use the word "gimmick" but the provision in that bill, that is, in this bill that did not permit a vote on the increase. We made ourselves vulnerable to every group in the country when we did that, and we are making ourselves more vulnerable now.

I apologize to my colleagues in the House for going over this again and again, but I just could not sit here without at least permitting those who are not familiar with this situation to know what we are doing here.

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

A short time ago a gentleman from New York, a relatively new Member, said he was a former postal employee, and the Congress had neglected to do much for the postal employees. I must challenge him on that statement and point out to him that from 1955 through October of 1967 there have been 10 postal employee pay raises that this Congress has enacted and have become law. The last one was a three-phase increase.

In addition, there have been many fringe benefits that have come out of our committee. One of the most attractive for Federal employees has been the health benefits plan, and I could name dozens of others.

We cannot do this job all at once. Maybe the raises should be higher than

they have been in the past, but we were careful to write a bill that would pass and become law. We have made a great deal of progress, however, particularly under the leadership of our friend Jimmie Morrison, who was a great champion of the postal workers—the greatest champion they ever had and would have become chairman of the committee, but he was defeated.

I might say, sitting here and listening, I have heard a great deal of talk about the raises for the postal employees and not enough on the fact that we also have a large number of classified employees. As a matter of fact, approximately only about one out of every four employees is a postal worker, and the vast majority of Federal employees are classified people, and they are not at all satisfied with this bill.

The president of the classified employees' union, that is, the American Federation of Government Employees, John Griner, is not at all satisfied with this bill, because it does not treat the classified employees he represents on an equal footing.

I might say there had been some bidding between the various Government employee unions to be members of the executive committee of the parent AFL-CIO, and the two largest postal unions were fighting for that appointment. But in the last few days, Mr. John Griner was elected to that post. It is the fastest growing union and represents at least three out of every four Government employees. They are not satisfied with this bill. I think this should be brought to the attention of the House. Regardless of how some of the Members vote, those are some facts the Members should know.

I will reiterate that we have worked long and hard in drawing up these pay bills. I voted for all of them in the 13 years I have been here. I helped write them. Jimmie Morrison and I and a couple of other Members and clerks and staff wrote many of these bills in the Congressional Hotel at night over dinner or at a breakfast meeting in the morning. We worked and sold other members of the committee. We got the necessary votes lined up to get these bills passed.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman for information. There have been many statements about this particular bill being discriminatory against other Federal employees. Could the gentleman be more specific and tell me just how this bill is going to be discriminating against classified employees and others?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the author of the bill and Members of that subcommittee probably could better answer that than I, but I do know Mr. Griner, the President of the AFGE, and his associates do feel that definitely it is discriminatory against the classified people. That is about as much as I can say.

Mr. MYERS. But this is only a general and broad statement. Is the gentleman not able to be more specific then?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, other than a general statement that the bill does discriminate against the classified workers.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the request of the gentleman from Indiana for information, this bill provides within-grade increases for postal workers effective on the first of October and also provides a step increase for postal workers next July. No such provision is made for classified workers or any other Government employees, so the postal workers get increases over and above any raises provided in the annual reports of the Salary Commission established by the bill.

Mr. MYERS. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding the postal workers have not been raised previously when other workers have been. Is this true?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is just the opposite.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in responding to the gentleman from Nebraska, I congratulate the gentleman for having voted for the postal increases over the years. My observation, however, remains steadfast. Congress has failed to discharge its obligation to the postal employees of the Nation. I would like to point out those increases have been many, but they have been small.

It is a perfect illustration of too little and too late, that is perfectly demonstrated by instances where postal employees in the city and State of New York have applied for and have been eligible for and have received welfare payments in order to eke out a meager existence, and provide for their loved ones.

The point is raised that an increase of this type, the passage of this bill, would contribute to inflation. My good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, cites it as the primary problem of the day. I could not agree with him more.

However, what is even more important is the continued existence of employees and their families and providing them with a decent salary.

We talk about efficiency in the postal service. There is an exodus that is frightening—losing our most experienced personnel. The future holds no promise, except that we pass this bill and provide economic stability, economic motivation for remaining in the postal service.

What the real problem has been over the years is that there are regional differences, regional variances in motivation. In some areas postal employees have the support of their Congressmen because the economics of the area mandates it. In other areas the postal employee has enjoyed a superior position. As a result of this dichotomy, this division in the Nation, Congress failed to respond properly. It responded, but failed to respond properly.

This is an occasion when Congress can respond and perform a service for the Nation and to postal employees as

well as the other deserving Federal employees.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

I would ask the gentleman to explain the operation of the Wage Board and tell how many employees are governed by Wage Board salary controls on an annual basis, and describe that with relation to his bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, there are 740,000 Federal workers, paid by the United States whose pay is fixed by the Wage Board system.

These are regional boards which are designed to have representation from management and labor. They are based upon a congressional policy that is a hundred years old, formed back in the 1860's.

The congressional policy is that a carpenter, a sheet metal worker, or a plumber who is a Federal employee ought to make the same hourly wage as a carpenter, sheet metal worker, or a plumber in private enterprise. So these boards meet and determine what is the prevailing wage for that particular skill in that area.

These decisions never come to Congress. Over \$4 billion will be paid out this year under the Federal Wage Board system.

This bill now before us has a Federal Salary Commission for the remaining Federal workers which is designed to have labor representation on it. This is one of the complaints they have had—that they have never been consulted on the mechanics of making pay comparable. It has management representatives from the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the Postmaster General, and the Civil Service Commission. They sit down and determine what figures are necessary, what pay scales are necessary, to carry out this great congressional policy of comparability.

So they are very analogous. They work in the same way. There is no delegation here that is not in the Wage Board system. In fact, under the bill here they would have to come back to the Congress, and we would have an opportunity to veto, something we do not have under the Wage Board system.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman.

I believe every Member ought to get this clear. This is not something new. This started under President Lincoln. That is how long ago it was that the Wage Board policy was established, that carpenters be paid the same working for the Federal Establishment as they would be paid in private enterprise.

We want to do that sort of thing with all the rest of the Federal employees, so that we do not have to climb this hill ever year, or worse, to climb it every 4 years when the increase would be so much higher. We would like it to happen once every year, so that it would be much more manageable than at the less frequent time. We want it handled using the mechanics of the statistics coming out of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I certainly will.

Mr. GROSS. Many, many things have been blamed upon Abraham Lincoln. Is the gentleman going to blame the Wage Board on him, too?

Mr. OLSEN. The program commenced under his administration.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true one Member of Congress tinkered with the Wage Board last year and he is no longer among us here in the Congress?

Mr. OLSEN. I have not any knowledge of that at all. There were a number of Members of Congress who were beaten at the polls and some who died since the last wage bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto cease in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM NORTH VIETNAM

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

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctant to interrupt a discussion of this bill, but I did want to call the attention of the membership to a UPI news item. It has a time of 4:10 p.m., which confirms the fact that an open letter has been sent by North Vietnam Premier Pham Van Dong to the American people. It also shows that this moratorium has been enthusiastically endorsed by the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam, Madam Binh. Let me read the account from Paris.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman, of course.

Mr. UDALL. I have promised a number of Members who have problems to try to complete this bill as expeditiously as possible. I did not expect when the same subject was broached earlier and the entire communication was read by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland that it would again be introduced here. There are some who are going to have a discussion of this matter later tonight. I am very fond of the gentleman from New Jersey and I am reluctant to object—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much appreciate the gentleman's kind comments. However, I have apologized for speaking out of order, and I did receive unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. UDALL. I did not hear the gentleman's request.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And I can yield no longer, because the gentleman is taking up my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman did receive unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, this is the article. North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong, whose regime is banking on U.S. public pressure to force Washington into accepting Hanoi's negotiating demands, acclaimed the Vietnam moratorium day in an open letter today to the American people:

The Viet Cong's Foreign Minister Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, in a separate statement, also hailed the moratorium scheduled for Wednesday and renewed standing communist accusations that Washington is bent on prolonging the war.

Madame Binh, in her statement, cheered the day of protest and issued a new call for the total and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam and the toppling of the Saigon regime.

The news item then continues, and I quote:

"Your struggle is a noble reflection of the legitimate and urgent demands of the American people, which is to safeguard the honor of the U.S. and save its children and brothers from a useless death in Vietnam," Dong said to antiwar demonstrators.

He praised the moratorium as a "worthy rebuff to the obstinate attitude of the U.S. administration in intensifying and prolonging the war in Vietnam, ignoring the protest of public opinion in the U.S. and in the entire world."

The Premier's letter, apparently prepared in advance of his current trip to Moscow, was sent from Hanoi and released in Paris by the North Vietnamese delegation to the Vietnam Peace Conference.

"The people of Vietnam and the people of the world wholeheartedly approved and acclaim the just struggle" of American war protesters, Dong said.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 46, after line 22, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. Section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 642; Public Law 90-206), which established the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 216 of such Act (81 Stat. 638; Public Law 90-206) is amended by striking out 'and subject to the operation of section 225 of this title'.

"(c) Section 220(a)(1) of such Act (81 Stat. 639; Public Law 90-206) is amended by striking out '224 (a) and (b), and 225' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and 224 (a) and (b)'.

"(d) Section 220(b)(1) of such Act (81 Stat. 639; Public Law 90-206) is amended by striking out '219, and 225' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and 219'."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois seeks to amend section 225 of Public Law 90-206. This was the 1967 Salary Act. That Salary Act created a 4-year Commission to make recommendations on legislative, congressional, judicial, and executive salaries. This is an amendment to that act and would abolish that Commission.

There is nothing in this bill now pending before us, the present bill dealing with the Salary Act of 1967, or with the section to which the amendment refers—and the pending bill was very carefully designed so it would not affect that law in any respect whatever—and I suggest that the amendment is not germane and insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona is correct when he points out that this amendment would repeal the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. But we had anticipated the point of order and in response to the point of order made by the gentleman from Arizona I cite section 2935, volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives:

The rule on germaneness does not necessarily require that an amendment offered as a separate section be germane to the preceding section of the bill or to any other particular section of the bill, but it is sufficient that it is germane to the subject matter of the bill as a whole.

Earlier in this discussion there was a colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Arizona in which I understood him to acknowledge the fact that this bill before us was certainly locked into the 1967 Federal Salary Act.

This section I would strike by this amendment was in the 1967 Salary Act.

Further, Mr. Chairman, another point in favor of the precedent is that in the ruling in the first session, 66th Congress by Chairman Simeon D. Fess a point of order was made that an amendment was not germane to the section of the bill which it was proposed to follow. The Chairman ruled as follows:

The Chair stated in the preceding ruling that the rule governing germaneness of amendments required that amendments be not only germane to the bill but to the section under consideration. This amendment is offered as a new section and stands not in the same relationship as if it were an amendment to the section. * * * It is not a part of the preceding section and does not need to be germane to it, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

And, since I offered an amendment to the Federal Salary Act of 1967, the provisions of this bill clearly relate to this act and this proposed legislation addresses itself to the matter of Federal employees pay, employees of the House of Representatives, and so forth. I believe that my amendment falls within this context.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is germane and that the point of order be overruled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the gentleman from Arizona himself admitted earlier in the debate this afternoon that the pending bill dovetails into the Legislative, Judicial, and Executive Pay Act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) does seek to establish a new section of the pending bill.

The Chair will point out, however, that the purposes of the bill under consideration are to set up a permanent method of adjusting the pay of Federal employees who are paid under one of the four statutory pay schedules—general schedule, postal field service schedules, Foreign Service schedules, and the schedules relating to physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and the elimination of the long-standing inequity in relation to the pay schedule of postal employees.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) repeals section 225 of the Federal Pay Schedule Act relating to the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. That Commission determines salary of Senators, Members of the House, Cabinet officers, Justices, and judges. This particular bill deals with the setting up of a commission that has to do with the regulation of salaries for employees, and does not relate to the Commission established by section 225 of Public Law 90-206.

For these reasons the Chair rules that this amendment is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: on page 46 after line 22 insert:

"SPECIAL SALARY RATE RANGES FOR POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 10 (a) Section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof ", except positions in the postal field service which are unique to the service".

"(b) That part of the text of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading "SALARY STEPS AND PROMOTIONS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority

"(a) When the President finds that the pay rates in private enterprise for one or

more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the rates of basic compensation of those positions in the postal field service which are unique to that service as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified employees for such positions, he may establish for such positions in the areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more levels and may make corresponding increases in other step rates of the pay range for each such level. A minimum rate so established may not exceed the maximum rate prescribed by statute for the level. Increases above the maximum rate may be made only to the extent that the minimum rate is increased to an amount greater than the fourth step of the level. For the purposes of this section, the word "level" includes occupational groups and subdivisions of levels and occupational groups.

"(b) Within the limitations of subsection (a) of this section, rates of basic compensation established under that subsection may be revised from time to time by the President.

"(c) An increase in rate of basic compensation established under this section is not an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 3552 of this title.

"(d) The rate of basic compensation established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President.

"(e) All actions, revisions, and adjustments under this section have the force and effect of statute.

"(f) The President may authorize the Postmaster General to exercise the authority conferred on the President by this section."

"(c) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting

"3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority."

immediately below

"3560. Salary protection."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD in full and be considered as open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not have to use the full 5 minutes. Since I have offered one amendment that was actually lost in a discussion on Vietnam, and the second amendment which did not stand the test of germaneness, I get to feeling like the Chicago Cubs when they faced the New York Mets this season: I am not too optimistic as to what will happen on my third swing.

However, this amendment would establish a special rate range for postal field service employees. This would permit the Postmaster General to establish in high cost of living areas in large metropolitan centers, an adjustment, an increase in salary to cover the obvious adverse impact of a higher cost of living. It would help to stop the wholesale turnover of personnel in our large metropolitan area post offices.

This would have the effect of giving the Post Office Department long-needed flexibility in personnel handling. It would provide a practical means of inducing and keeping skilled personnel in the large city post offices, and would not discriminate against other post offices across the country, because it would in a positive way take care of the areas where the need is obvious.

It has been discussed sympathetically but without an approving vote in our committee. But I would hope that with the extreme attention the Committee of the Whole is showing this afternoon that this amendment would receive the support which it merits, because it is in the interest of the postal field service employees, and in the interest of the Post Office Department, and it is in the interest of the many users of the Post Office all over America. I would hope to receive favorable support for this amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I oppose this amendment because it would simply establish an authority that the President already has, the authority to increase starting rates where recruitment is difficult.

The President has now delegated this to the Civil Service Commission. There has been no evidence before our committee that he wants this additional authority or that the Postmaster General wants it; or that it would be used.

This kind of authority has existed for many years and has never been used. I would hope that the amendment would be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time now to discuss one other thing because apparently we have reached the end of the amending process.

The only amendment which carried today from the other side was one offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) which was carried on a teller voter of 65 to 51.

It is my intention to ask for a separate vote on that amendment. It needs not necessarily be a separate vote by the yeas and nays if it is the will of the House to do otherwise. But upon further reflection on that amendment, I think it is sufficiently dangerous, unwise, and violates the basic things we are trying to do in this bill that I would urge the members of the committee, when we go back into the House, to defeat this amendment either on a division or by tellers or by a rollcall vote if need be.

Let me tell you why. The Federal employees, that most of you are familiar with, and they have been in your office, the great majority have been told that you support their position on this bill—they were always extremely reluctant to give up the right to come to Congress and have the Congress fix their pay.

Finally, this year, after the experience with the semiautomatic 1968-69 pay raise, the union said: "All right, we will give up coming to Congress. We made an arrangement that they considered satisfactory."

But one of the things they got, one of the crucial things in return for giving up the right to have Congress fix their pay, was that once and for all we would end

this lag. There is probably not a Member of this Chamber who has not made a speech on how terrible it is to have this lag. We did shorten this lag in the committee down to about 5 or 4 months. That is the shortest we can get it because it takes time to process this survey.

The thing about the Gross amendment which I really did not fully realize at the time he offered it is that it would destroy the premise on which the unions are willing to try this other way and to give up the right to have the Congress have a pay battle every year. We can now be sure that in addition to the minimum 5-month lag that we now have another 5-month lag added to so that under the Gross amendment they will permanently be about 10 or 12 months behind the times in fixing Federal pay.

As I say, I think this is crucial to the employee union. I think the names of those who really favor that much lag on a permanent basis ought to be spread upon the record. I will ask for a separate vote when the Committee rises and goes back into the House.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. GROSS. I really did not know that reluctant dragons grew so tall in Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to indicate what the motion to recommit will be.

It will be a straight motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), a motion to send the bill back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for more comprehensive and consideration than it got in the past, and I would hope for some improved language and substance.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this bill ought to be recommitted for several reasons. First, as the gentleman from Arizona indicated, in this legislation Congress is giving up one of the prerogatives it has, which is the setting of salary schedules for Government employees.

Over the years, I have heard speeches from that side of the aisle and I have heard speeches from this side of the aisle that we should keep these prerogatives and the responsibilities we have and not give any of them up. Furthermore, we ought to get back some that we have previously given up.

It seems to me that this legislation goes in just the opposite direction.

Second, this legislation in effect makes the future role of the President meaningless in any pay-increase legislation involving Federal employees.

Third, it seems to me that, as you read the bill, there are obvious discriminations between Federal Civil Service employees and Post Office Department employees.

I heard the figure quoted that 75 percent of the total employees of the Federal Government who will not get a pay increase out of this bill will be discriminated against, while the postal em-

ployees, who constitute roughly 25 percent, will be the beneficiary of pay-increase legislation by this act.

This discrimination I do not think can be justified. Furthermore, it is alleged that the bill discriminates within the postal employees themselves.

So when you add up that total package, it seems to me that this bill, because it is inequitable and discriminatory, ought to go back to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter from the President of the United States, which I think adds another reason why this bill ought to be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

DEAR JERRY: I must frankly advise that our critically important national effort to contain inflation is bound to be seriously undercut if the federal employee pay bill now before the House were to become law.

In its present form H.R. 13000 would add approximately \$4.3 billion a year to federal expenditures. It would balloon expenditures in the remainder of this fiscal year by \$1.5 billion.

Spending increases of this magnitude cannot avoid nullifying many of the steps we have recently taken to stabilize the economy.

Less than three months ago, the Congress reflected the nation's determination to control inflation by imposing an expenditure ceiling on the current fiscal year. I gave a commitment at that time to restrict expenditures for this fiscal year to \$192.9 billion. In keeping with this limitation I am cutting federal expenditures for this year by an additional \$3.5 billion. But if H.R. 13000 should become law, additional deep cuts in federal services would have to be made.

The increase which the Post Office Department alone must absorb, for example, would require cut-backs in a variety of services. They would include the elimination of Saturday deliveries and window service for rural, city and suburban areas alike.

Since our total expenditures must be limited, a new round of heavy pay increases for federal employees would be in effect a mandate to reduce, abruptly, the number of federal employees.

The national interest clearly requires reconsideration of H.R. 13000 because of its inflationary impact. Furthermore, it would grant disproportionate benefits to postal employees. These increases should be reexamined in light of another major legislative proposal now before Congress. Improvements in the condition of the postal worker are long overdue, but they ought to be secured through total reform of the present outmoded, inefficient and costly postal system.

The postal reform I have urged provides for the setting of wage levels for postal employees through collective bargaining. Any major increase in postal worker benefits should be secured through this process, or as part of legislation establishing a government-owned postal corporation which will have the means of operating, ultimately, on a self-sustaining basis.

I solicit your personal leadership in urging the House to recognize that, however appealing H.R. 13000 may appear politically at this moment, the consequences of its enactment would surely generate strong resentments throughout the public far outweighing presently anticipated political gains.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Chairman, obviously from the content of this letter, this legislation as it presently is written is unacceptable. I strongly urge, therefore, that the Members of this body support a straight mo-

tion to recommit so that this legislation can go back to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service for reconsideration.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the distinguished minority leader on the motion to recommit. Let me quickly make two or three points.

Let us make it very clear that a vote for the motion to recommit is a motion to kill this bill—it is a vote to make sure there is no pay raise in this session of Congress, and I think it is a breaking of faith at least on the part of those who have told the Federal employees that the Members are with them.

There were over 200 Members—the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN) can confirm this—a majority of the House who introduced the bills H.R. 10000 and H.R. 11000 earlier this year. If Members think this bill is a budget buster, they ought to go out and pull out those bills they introduced and see what they would have done to the budget. They provided substantially more, and more quickly.

Those Members who promised the Federal employees they were for those bills or for this bill had better take a good look at the motion to recommit. I am one of those who worked with the Members by and large on postal reform, but, as we have done for so long, we cannot ask postal employees to wait for justice until next year.

It is like the old quip. Someone says "How is your health?" The response is, "Compared to what?" Now on this \$4 or \$5 billion expenditure the minority leader talks about, I would ask, "Compared to what?" In the official report of the administration on pay this year—and we had a hard time getting any report out of them—when it finally came out, the administration agreed we ought to have a pay raise on a comparability formula not in January, but in July of 1970, and another one in January of 1971. This bill provides two pay raises, one in January 1970, and one in January 1971. What the President proposes is two pay raises—one in July 1970 and one in January 1971. So we are arguing about 6 months.

Let me tell the Members the cost of this bill is an additional \$4 billion, and the cost of the President's proposal which he sent up to us is about \$3.5 billion or \$3.9 billion, but just spread out in a little different fashion.

One other thing. If indeed the administration is saying, when they pull the \$4 billion or \$5 billion estimates out of the air, that this is what it will cost, then what we are saying is—if an impartial commission is put together, Mr. Chairman, if we are saying that this commission is going to find it takes \$4 billion to bring employees up to comparability, then we ought to hang our heads in shame, because we have been cheating the employees out of \$4 billion. We are saying the burden of fighting inflation ought to be on the Federal employee, and not on the banker, not on the steelworker, and not on the carpenter. But we are saying, if we are going to fight inflation, the people who are going to have

to fight it again will be the Federal employees.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion to recommit will be soundly defeated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona, my dear friend, said a motion to recommit would be a vote to kill the bill. I have heard that phrase used for many years. The only reason that it would be killed is if the gentleman and his subcommittee and the full committee failed to have another go-round on this bill, so if a motion to recommit is carried, and the gentleman does not hold additional hearings, then, of course, the bill would be dead. I would be hopeful the gentleman would hold additional hearings.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. Is the gentleman for the motion to recommit?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes, I am for the motion to recommit.

Mr. UDALL. I am shocked, because the gentleman is one of the sponsors of H.R. 13000.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That was before it was changed from the way it was to what we have before us today.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. There is one point which has to be clarified, if the gentleman from Arizona will bear with me, since he may wish to make a retort.

Earlier in the year, when Members were flooded with mail against H.R. 13000, it was not quite the bill presented to us today. If Members will read the minority views the gentleman from Iowa and I prepared, they will note that the bill appeared before our full committee and was sent back to the subcommittee, and was reported back without any real study by that group. At the time it was passed by the full committee, there were few Members who had the opportunity to study it.

Furthermore, even the Postmaster General did not have an opportunity to testify on such a far-reaching measure.

So this bill in its handling as well as in its content has many dubious factors.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say this: Although I was a cosponsor of the original bill, the one we have today is not the same bill. It only has the same number.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This bill was ordered by the full committee to be sent back to the subcommittee for further study. It never went back to the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13000) to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 576, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Gross amendment, which begins on page 32, line 14.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment to the committee amendment? If not, the Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, beginning with line 14, strike out all of line 14 and all that follows down through the end of line 7 on page 33 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) (1) The rates of pay submitted to the Congress as provided in subsection (c) (4) or subsection (g) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the adoption of both Houses of Congress (within the 60 day period following the date on which the rates of pay are submitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate), by the yeas and nays of a concurrent resolution stating in effect that the Senate and House of Representatives approve such rates of pay."

"(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in the computation of the 60 day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die. The rates of pay submitted to the Congress shall be delivered to both Houses of the Congress on the same day and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House of Representatives is not in session and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session."

And, on page 33, line 12, strike out "first day of the year in" and insert in lieu thereof "date on";

And, on page 33, line 22, strike out "first day of the year in" and insert in lieu thereof "date on";

And, on page 38, line 21, strike out "first day of the year in" and insert in lieu thereof "date on".

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 169, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—191

Abbutt	Fish	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Flowers	Passman
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Foreman	Pettis
Andrews, Ala.	Fountain	Pickle
Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	Pirnie
N. Dak.	Fuqua	Poage
Ashbrook	Gallfanakis	Poff
Baring	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Beall, Md.	Gross	Railsback
Belcher	Grover	Randall
Bell, Calif.	Gubser	Rarick
Bennett	Hagan	Reid, Ill.
Betts	Hall	Reifel
Bevill	Hammer-	Rhodes
Blackburn	schmidt	Riegle
Blanton	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
Bow	Harsha	Robison
Bray	Harvey	Rogers, Fla.
Brinkley	Hébert	Roth
Broomfield	Henderson	Roudebush
Brotzman	Hull	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Jarman	Satterfield
Buchanan	Johnson, Pa.	Schadeberg
Burke, Fla.	Jonas	Scherle
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Schneebell
Bush	Jones, Tenn.	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Scott
Cabell	King	Sebelius
Caffery	Kleppe	Shriver
Carter	Kuykendall	Sikes
Casey	Kyl	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Landgrebe	Smith, Calif.
Chappell	Landrum	Springer
Clancy	Langen	Stafford
Clausen,	Latta	Stanton
Don H.	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del.	Long, La.	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Lukens	Stephens
Colmer	McClary	Stratton
Conable	McClure	Taft
Corbett	McCulloch	Talcott
Coughlin	McDonald,	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	McEwen	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	MacGregor	Utt
Daniel, Va.	Mahon	Vander Jagt
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Waggonner
Davis, Wis.	Mann	Watkins
Dellenback	Marsh	Watson
Denney	Mathias	Weicker
Dennis	Mayne	Whitehurst
Derwinski	Meskill	Whitten
Dickinson	Michel	Widnall
Dorn	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Dowdy	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Downing	Mize	Winn
Duncan	Mizell	Wyatt
Dwyer	Montgomery	Wydler
Edwards, Ala.	Morton	Wylie
Erlenborn	Mosher	Wyman
Esch	Myers	Zion
Evins, Tenn.	Nichols	Zwach

NAYS—169

Addabbo	Culver	Halpern
Albert	Daniels, N.J.	Hamilton
Alexander	de la Garza	Hanley
Anderson,	Delaney	Hanna
Calif.	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Anderson,	Diggs	Harrington
Tenn.	Donohue	Hathaway
Annunzio	Dulski	Hawkins
Ashley	Edwards, La.	Heckler, W. Va.
Barrett	Eilberg	Heckler, Mass.
Biaggi	Evans, Colo.	Helstoski
Biester	Feighan	Hicks
Blatnik	Flood	Hogan
Boggs	Foley	Horton
Boland	Ford,	Howard
Bolling	William D.	Hungate
Brademas	Fraser	Jacobs
Brasco	Friedel	Johnson, Calif.
Brock	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Tenn.	Karth
Burke, Mass.	Gallagher	Kastenmeier
Burlison, Mo.	Garmatz	Kazen
Button	Gaydos	Kee
Byrne, Pa.	Giamo	Kluczynski
Carey	Gibbons	Koch
Celler	Gilbert	Leggett
Clark	Gonzalez	Long, Md.
Clay	Gray	Lowenstein
Conte	Green, Pa.	McCarthy
Conyers	Griffiths	McDade
Corman	Gude	McFall

Macdonald, Pepper
 Mass. Perkins
 Madden Philbin
 Matsunaga Pike
 Melcher Podell
 Mikva Preyer, N.C.
 Miller, Calif. Price, Ill.
 Mills Pryor, Ark.
 Minish Pucinski
 Mink Purcell
 Mollohan Quillen
 Monagan Rees
 Moorhead Reid, N.Y.
 Morgan Reuss
 Morse Rogers, Colo.
 Moss Rooney, N.Y.
 Murphy, Ill. Rosenthal
 Murphy, N.Y. Rostenkowski
 Natcher Ryan
 Nedzi St Germain
 Nix St. Onge
 Obey Scheuer
 O'Hara Shipley
 Olsen Sisk
 O'Neill, Mass. Slack
 Ottinger Smith, Iowa
 Patten Snyder

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 13000, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for further study.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 81, nays 281, answered "present" 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—81

NOT VOTING—71
 Adams Eshleman
 Arends Fallon
 Aspinall Farbstein
 Ayres Fascell
 Berry Findley
 Bingham Fisher
 Brooks Flynt
 Brown, Calif. Frey
 Burton, Calif. Gettys
 Burton, Utah Goldwater
 Cahill Green, Oreg.
 Camp Griffin
 Cederberg Haley
 Chisholm Hastings
 Cohelan Hays
 Collier Hollifield
 Collins Hosmer
 Daddario Hunt
 Dawson Kirwan
 Devine Kyros
 Dingell Lipscomb
 Eckhardt Lloyd
 Edmondson Lujan
 Edwards, Calif. McCloskey

Abbitt Fish
 Abernethy Ford, Gerald R.
 Anderson, Ill. Frelinghuysen
 Andrews, Ala. Goodling
 Ashbrook Gross
 Beall, Md. Hall
 Betts Hammer-
 Blackburn schmidt
 Bow Hansen, Idaho
 Bray Hutchinson
 Brown, Ohio Jarman
 Buchanan Jonas
 Burlison, Tex. Keith
 Bush Kleppe
 Byrnes, Wis. Kuykendall
 Chappell Kyl
 Colmer Landgrebe
 Conable Langen
 Cowger Latta
 Cramer McClure
 Cunningham Mahon
 Daniel, Va. Mann
 Davis, Wis. Marsh
 Dennis Mayne
 Derwinski Michel
 Dickinson Montgomery
 Edwards, Ala. Morton
 Erlenborn Mosher

NAYS—281

So the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hunt.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. McKneally.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lloyd.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Martin.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Haley with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Fallon with Mrs. May.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Camp.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Quie.
 Mr. Meeds with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. McMullen with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Wold.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. JONES of Alabama changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Dwyer
 Edwards, La.
 Ellberg
 Esch
 Eshleman
 Evans, Colo.
 Ewins, Tenn.
 Feighan
 Flood
 Flowers
 Foley
 Ford
 William D.
 Foreman
 Fountain
 Fraser
 Friedel
 Fulton, Pa.
 Fulton, Tenn.
 Fuqua
 Galifianakis
 Gallagher
 Garmatz
 Gaydos
 Gialmo
 Gibbons
 Gilbert
 Goldwater
 Gonzalez
 Gray
 Green, Pa.
 Griffiths
 Grover
 Gubser
 Gude
 Hagan
 Halpern
 Hamilton
 Hanley
 Hanna
 Hansen, Wash.
 Harrington
 Harsha
 Harvey
 Hathaway
 Hawkins
 Hébert
 Hechler, W. Va.
 Heckler, Mass.
 Helstoski
 Henderson
 Hicks
 Hogan
 Horton
 Howard
 Hull
 Hungate
 Ichord
 Jacobs
 Johnson, Calif.
 Johnson, Pa.
 Jones, Ala.
 Jones, N.C.
 Jones, Tenn.
 Karth
 Kastenmeier
 Kazen
 Kee
 King
 Kluczynski
 Koch
 Landrum
 Leggett
 Lennon
 Long, La.
 Long, Md.
 Lowenstein
 Lukens
 McCarthy
 McClory
 McCulloch
 McDade
 McDonald,
 Mich.
 McEwen
 McFall
 Macdonald,
 Mass.
 MacGregor
 Madden
 Mathias
 Matsunaga
 Melcher
 Meskill
 Mikva
 Miller, Calif.
 Miller, Ohio
 Mills
 Minish
 Mink
 Minshall
 Mize
 Mizell
 Mollohan
 Monagan
 Moorhead
 Morgan
 Morse
 Moss
 Murphy, Ill.
 Murphy, N.Y.
 Myers
 Natcher
 Nedzi
 Nichols
 Nix
 Obey
 O'Hara
 Olsen
 O'Neal, Ga.
 O'Neill, Mass.
 Ottinger
 Passman
 Patten
 Pepper
 Perkins
 Pettis
 Philbin
 Pickle
 Pike
 Pirnie
 Poage
 Podell
 Preyer, N.C.
 Price, Ill.
 Pryor, Ark.
 Pucinski
 Purcell
 Quillen
 Rallsback
 Randall
 Rees
 Reid, Ill.
 Reid, N.Y.
 Reifel
 Reuss
 Riegle
 Roberts
 Rogers, Colo.
 Lowenstein
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rooney, N.Y.
 Rosenthal
 Rostenkowski
 Ryan
 St Germain
 St. Onge
 Sandman
 Scheuer
 Schwengel
 Shipley
 Shriver
 Sikes
 Sisk
 Slack
 Smith, Iowa
 Smith, N.Y.
 Snyder
 Stafford
 Staggers
 Stephens
 Stokes
 Stratton
 Stubblefield
 Stuckey
 Sullivan
 Symington
 Taft
 Teague, Calif.
 Teague, Tex.
 Thompson, Ga.
 Thompson, N.J.
 Tiernan
 Udall
 Ullman
 Utt
 Van Deerlin
 Vander Jagt
 Vanik
 Vigorito
 Waggonner
 Waldie
 Wampler
 Watkins
 Watson
 Watts
 Welcker
 Whalen
 White
 Whitehurst
 Widmull
 Wiggins
 Williams
 Wilson,
 Charles H.
 Winn
 Wolf
 Wright
 Wyatt
 Wyder
 Wylie
 Wyman
 Yates
 Yatron
 Young
 Zablocki
 Zion
 Zwach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mailliard

NOT VOTING—68

Adams
 Arends
 Aspinall
 Ayres
 Berry
 Bingham
 Brooks
 Brown, Calif.
 Burton, Calif.
 Burton, Utah
 Cahill
 Camp
 Cederberg
 Chisholm
 Cohelan
 Collier
 Collins
 Daddario
 Davis, Ga.
 Dawson
 Devine
 Dingell
 Eckhardt
 Edmondson
 Edwards, Calif.
 Fallon
 Farbstein
 Fascell
 Findley
 Fisher
 Flynt
 Frey
 Gettys
 Green, Oreg.
 Griffin
 Haley
 Hastings
 Hays
 Hollifield
 Hosmer
 Saylor
 Steed
 Powell
 Quie
 Rivers
 Rodino
 Rooney, Pa.
 Roybal
 Saylor
 Steed
 Taylor
 Tunney
 Whalley
 Wold
 McCloskey
 McKneally
 McMillan
 Martin
 May
 Meeds
 Nelsen
 O'Konski
 Patman
 Pollock
 Powell
 Quie
 Rivers
 Rodino
 Rooney, Pa.
 Roybal
 Saylor
 Steed
 Taylor
 Tunney
 Whalley
 Wold

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Adair
 Addabbo
 Albert
 Alexander
 Anderson,
 Calif.
 Anderson,
 Tenn.
 Andrews,
 N. Dak.
 Annunzio
 Ashley
 Baring
 Barrett
 Belcher
 Bell, Calif.
 Bennett
 Bevil
 Biaggi
 Blester
 Blanton
 Blatnik
 Boggs
 Boland
 Bolling
 Brademas
 Brasco
 Brinkley
 Brock
 Broomfield
 Brotzman
 Brown, Mich.
 Broyhill, N.C.
 Broyhill, Va.
 Burke, Fla.
 Burke, Mass.
 Burlison, Mo.
 Button
 Byrne, Pa.
 Cabell
 Caffery
 Carey
 Carter
 Casey
 Casey
 Celler
 Chamberlain
 Clancy
 Clark
 Clausen,
 Don H.
 Clawson, Del
 Clay
 Cleveland
 Conte
 Conyers
 Corbett
 Corman
 Coughlin
 Culver
 Daniels, N.J.
 de la Garza
 Delaney
 Dellenback
 Denney
 Dent
 Diggs
 Donohue
 Dorn
 Dowdy
 Downing
 Dulski
 Duncan

The Clerk announced the following pairs

On this vote:

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Hunt against.
Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. McKneally against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Pollock against.
Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Cahill against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Lloyd.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Fallon with Mrs. May.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Adams with O'Konski.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Cobelan with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. MIZE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 311, nays 51, answered "present" 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—311

Adair	Brasco	Conyers
Addabbo	Brinkley	Corbett
Albert	Brock	Corman
Alexander	Broomfield	Coughlin
Anderson, Calif.	Brotzman	Culver
Anderson, Tenn.	Brown, Mich.	Daniel, Va.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Broyhill, N.C.	Daniels, N.J.
Annuzio	Broyhill, Va.	de la Garza
Ashley	Burke, Fla.	Delaney
Baring	Burke, Mass.	Dellenback
Barrett	Burlison, Mo.	Denney
Beall, Md.	Bush	Dent
Belcher	Button	Diggs
Bell, Calif.	Byrne, Pa.	Donohue
Bennett	Cabell	Dorn
Betts	Caffery	Dowdy
Bevill	Carey	Downing
Biaggi	Carter	Dulski
Bieber	Casey	Duncan
Blackburn	Celler	Dwyer
Blanton	Chamberlain	Edwards, Ala.
Blatnik	Chappell	Edwards, La.
Boggs	Clancy	Ellberg
Boland	Clark	Esch
Bolling	Clausen	Eshleman
Bow	Don H.	Evans, Colo.
Brademas	Clawson, Del.	Evins, Tenn.
	Clay	Feighan
	Cleveland	Fish
	Conte	Flood

Flowers	McClary	Rooney, Pa.
Foley	McClure	Rosenthal
Ford,	McCulloch	Rostenkowski
William D.	McDade	Roudebush
Foreman	McDonald,	Ruppe
Fountain	Mich.	Ruth
Fraser	McEwen	Ryan
Friedel	McFall	St Germain
Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,	St. Onge
Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.	Sandman
Fuqua	MacGregor	Satterfield
Galifianakis	Madden	Schadeberg
Gallagher	Mailliard	Scheuer
Garmatz	Mann	Schwengel
Gaydos	Mathias	Scott
Gialmo	Matsunaga	Shipley
Gibbons	Melcher	Shriver
Gilbert	Meskill	Sikes
Goldwater	Mikva	Sisk
Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.	Skubitz
Gray	Miller, Ohio	Slack
Green, Pa.	Mills	Smith, Iowa
Griffiths	Minish	Smith, N.Y.
Grover	Mink	Snyder
Gubser	Minshall	Stafford
Gude	Mize	Staggers
Hagan	Mizell	Stanton
Halpern	Mollohan	Stephens
Hamilton	Monagan	Stokes
Hammer-	Moorhead	Stratton
schmidt	Morgan	Stubblefield
Hanley	Morse	Stuckey
Hanna	Mosher	Sullivan
Hansen, Idaho	Moss	Symington
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.	Talcott
Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Harsha	Myers	Teague, Tex.
Harvey	Natcher	Thompson, Ga.
Hathaway	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Nichols	Thorn
Hébert	Nix	Udall
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Byrne	Ullman
Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara	Utt
Helstoski	Olsen	Van Deerlin
Henderson	O'Neal, Ga.	Vander Jagt
Hicks	O'Neill, Mass.	Vanik
Hogan	Ottinger	Vigorito
Horton	Passman	Waggonner
Howard	Patten	Waldie
Hull	Pelly	Wampler
Hungate	Pepper	Watkins
Hutchinson	Pertkis	Watson
Ichord	Pettis	Watts
Jacobs	Philbin	Weicker
Johnson, Calif.	Pike	Whalen
Johnson, Pa.	Pirnie	White
Jones, Ala.	Podell	Whitehurst
Jones, N.C.	Preyer, N.C.	Widnall
Jones, Tenn.	Price, Ill.	Wiggins
Karh	Price, Tex.	Williams
Kastenmeier	Pryor, Ark.	Wilson,
Kazen	Pucinski	Charles H.
Kee	Purcell	Winn
King	Quillen	Wolf
Kluczynski	Railsback	Wright
Koch	Randall	Wyatt
Kyl	Rees	Wyder
Landrum	Reid, Ill.	Wylie
Langen	Reid, N.Y.	Wyman
Latta	Reifel	Yates
Leggett	Reuss	Yatron
Lennon	Riegle	Young
Long, La.	Roberts	Zablocki
Long, Md.	Robison	Zion
Lowenstein	Rogers, Colo.	Zwach
Lukens	Rogers, Fla.	
McCarthy	Rooney, N.Y.	

NAYS—51

Abbott	Dickinson	Pickle
Abernethy	Erlenborn	Poff
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Rarick
Andrews, Ala.	Frelinghuysen	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Gross	Roth
Bray	Hall	Scherle
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Schneebeli
Buchanan	Jonas	Sebelli
Burleson, Tex.	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Springer
Conlmer	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	Landgrebe	Steiger, Wis.
Cowger	Mahon	Taft
Cramer	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	Mayne	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Dennis	Montgomery	
Derwinski	Morton	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Poage

NOT VOTING—68

Adams	Bingham	Cahill
Arends	Brooks	Camp
Aspinall	Brown, Calif.	Cederberg
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Chisholm
Berry	Burton, Utah	Cobelan

Collier	Goodling	May
Collins	Green, Ore.	Meeds
Daddario	Griffin	Nelsen
Davis, Ga.	Haley	O'Konski
Dawson	Hastings	Patman
Devine	Hays	Pollock
Dingell	Hollifield	Powell
Eckhardt	Hosmer	Quile
Edmondson	Hunt	Rivers
Edwards, Calif.	Kirwan	Rodino
Fallon	Kyros	Roybal
Farbstein	Lipscomb	Saylor
Fascell	Lloyd	Steed
Findley	Lujan	Taylor
Fisher	McCloskey	Tunney
Flynt	McKneally	Whalley
Frey	McMillan	Wold
Gettys	Martin	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Martin against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Arends against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Lloyd.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. May.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Adams with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Cobelan with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT). If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay" in accordance with my convictions. Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 13000, and include extraneous matter during debate on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGRESSMENT OF H.R. 13000

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk, in the en-

grossment of the bill, be authorized and directed to make such changes in section numbers, cross-references, and other technical and conforming corrections as may be required to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) entitled "An act to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BAYH, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DOLE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 12, 1969, and ending October 18, 1969, as "National Industrial Hygiene Week."

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 12, 1969, and ending October 18, 1969, as "National Industrial Hygiene Week" and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 150

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the need to preserve the Nation's primary natural resource—its employed population—and in recognition of those individuals and organizations seeking to protect and improve the health of the Nation's work force through the coordinated scientific measures, technological and engineering controls which characterize industrial hygiene, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning October 12, 1969, and ending October 18, 1969, as "National Industrial Hygiene Week," and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THREE O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING—VIETNAM

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am also one of those who requested 1 hour on special orders today to express my disapproval of our present Vietnam policy. I also am in support of the October 15 moratorium. I want to stress that I do not hold any brief that my views will offer much contribution to this problem, or that the President will pay much attention to my views. But I do think that I should have the right to express them. Perhaps a measure of that right and, if you will, a measure of the esteem with which my colleagues hold me is that I am assigned time to deliver my remarks for 3 o'clock this morning, if all goes well, to express my views to those who might be present. Those views probably are not significant and I think tremendously important. But it would be tremendously significant and I think tremendously important if I were denied the right to deliver those views to this particular body, and the dissemination of those views to the public through this forum.

I would expect that deprivation of this right of those who desire to express our views would be interpreted by many as indicating a belief and a fear that criticism of administration policy cannot be tolerated in the greatest legislative body of the land.

I am particularly puzzled by a seeming inconsistency in the remarks of many relative to the impact of my views, and those who possess similar views, on Hanoi's leaders. Our President has told us he will not be persuaded "in the slightest" by our expressions on October 15. Am I to believe that Hanoi's leaders will be more responsive to my views than will my own President? I doubt it. But then I doubt that the President was accurate when he said he would not be influenced by American opinion. He will be—he should be—and he must be.

Mr. Speaker, vituperation and excesses in emotion that callously designate Americans who are desperately tired of the Vietnam tragedy as "Hanoi sympathizers" detract greatly from this debate. I venture to say that those who today have so intemperately maligned their colleagues and their fellow Americans are simply and sorrowfully unaware of the depth of their constituency's anger and dismay with Vietnam.

I would suggest that on October 16

they review the activities of October 15 and I am certain they, along with our President, will have been the witness to the peculiar magnificence of a free government and to the ability of a free citizenry to express disapproval with its leader's policies.

Their efforts to castigate manifestation of that disapproval with vague accusations of lack of patriotism or loyalty have only served to intensify those efforts and have only served to display their own insensitivities to the procedures by which a free people make their will known to their Representatives and to their President.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS AND THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, unemployment in our Nation has risen to 4 percent. This is the largest rise in unemployment in 9 years. The Nixon administration, in the words of Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy, believes that unemployment will go even higher. What amazes me is that they apparently believe that an increasing unemployment rate is good—that it is "economic progress."

I would remind Mr. Nixon that these statistics represent people unemployed and I would call such a policy heartless.

During the presidential campaign, President Nixon frequently alluded to a "forgotten American." I might ask: Who is this mystical person? Is he the one who is taking the brunt of the administration's so-called economic progress? Is he the guy who was just laid off? Or perhaps he is the person who will be hit the hardest by the administration's proposed policy on taxes?

Is the "forgotten American"—the person with a small fixed income who is being affected most by inflation or the one taking it on the chin from excessively high interest rates?

Perhaps he is the person who knows that the administration's proposed increase in social security benefits is too little and too late?

If this is the "forgotten American," then it appears to me that the administration's policy forecloses, without question, opportunity for those who need it the most. Yes, the "forgotten American" appears to have been really forgotten only 9 months after he was induced to vote for the man who said he was going to remember the "forgotten American."

Does the administration realize the effects of this so-called "economic progress" on the individual as well as the Nation? There are approximately 3.2 million Americans who are out of work. It is going to be extremely difficult to convince these "forgotten Americans" that such a policy could be labeled by anyone as "economic progress." If a man cannot get a job, if he has been laid off, if he is underemployed, he is not going to be pleased with Secretary Kennedy's assertion that a 4-percent rate of unemployment is "acceptable." Surely it

is not "progress" when nearly 3.2 million people are jobless.

Does the administration realize the effects of this heartless scheme on the wives and children of the jobless?

Does the administration realize the effects of this negative policy on the business and industry that are forced to curtail production?

Does the administration realize the effects it will have on the community? If a man does not have an income he is certainly an economic burden to the community. The gas station owner, the grocer, the local banker, the farmer, the people who deal in services—all are affected by unemployment. All must agree that a real economic progress does not go hand in hand with unemployment.

Does the administration realize the effects that this economic downturn will have on the local and State government? When men are unemployed, welfare rolls are increased. It seems to me that it is "economic progress" when we have more people employed and less people dependent on welfare checks.

If an intolerable level of unemployment, together with continuing high prices and interest rates, is "acceptable," then I do not believe the "forgotten American" can stand much more of this kind of "economic progress."

PUTTING KOREA'S PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS IN PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks our popular press has been critical of the events which have surrounded South Korea's President Park's bid for a third term. It has been charged that the ruling Democratic-Republican Party flaunted democratic processes in clearing the way for a national referendum on the provision to amend the Constitution to allow a candidate to seek a third term. It has been implied that President Park's quest for the third term is animated by a drive for personal power and standing. I think it is well that we who know Korea, its leaders and its problems, pause to address ourselves to these indictments before the referendum on October 17. It was for this reason that I requested this time. I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to contribute their comments on this issue.

It would be unthinkable for us to endeavor to influence the outcome of the national referendum. This is an issue for the people of the Republic of Korea. However, as Korea's longtime friend and ally it is both appropriate and necessary that those in our Government endeavor to understand what is happening in Korea and why it is happening. The understanding of which I speak is, in my judgment, best born of an analysis of the history of other similarly situated nations. What is Korea's current condition? The Republic of Korea has, at best, a tenuous political, economic, and defense posture. On the political front, we note that the Republic has existed less

than a decade. The country and its people have little experience in self-government and no tradition of strong democratic institutions. In addition, the country has not existed long enough to develop a large number of individuals experienced in the art and science of governance. The old nostrum that "you can beat somebody with nobody" is clearly applicable to the current situation. Even those who contend that President Park should not be allowed to succeed himself are hard pressed to suggest a suitable alternative.

Korea has undergone an economic transformation in the last 20 years. It is experiencing an enviable rate of economic growth. The man on the street is well fed, and well clothed. All this economic progress has been achieved in scarcely a score of years. The glowing record of recent progress and the rapid rate of growth should not obscure the fundamental fact that Korea's economy is still in its infancy. The nation is plagued by problems endemic to developing countries. There is a glaring shortage of development capital; skilled management and technical expertise remain a scarce commodity; agricultural self-sufficiency is problematic; the infrastructure essential to true nationhood is still developing, and the gulf between rich and poor is still vast. These facts are neutral. They state a simple truth; Korea—for all its progress—is only nearing its economic "takeoff" point. It is just now approaching the point at which it can truly say it can meet its internal needs and enter the world market as an effective competitor.

The security of the Republic of Korea is a source of constant concern. Forty miles from the capital of Seoul, the armies of North and South Korea face each other. Rarely does a day pass when there is not an act of hostility at the demilitarized zone or an attempt by the North to infiltrate by the sea. This situation has required that the country remain constantly mobilized. Korea has one of the largest standing armies in the world. Per capita, it and its adversary in the north probably have more men under arms than any other country in the world. Truly it can be said that Korea's political, economic, and defense situation is highly volatile.

A pragmatic perspective of Korea's presidential politics must encompass an analysis of history. The parallels between the Korea of today and the United States of 1940 are inescapable. In 1940 our Nation was teetering on the brink of war and we were just emerging from a depression which had shaken our economy to its very roots. At that juncture, the American people were faced with deciding whether to shatter a 150-year tradition and allow President Roosevelt to seek a third term. A review of the popular press reveals that the central issue which concerns Koreans today was much the same as that in the minds of Americans during the dark days of 1940. There was, in the United States of 1940, a grave concern over the consequences of any change in national leadership. The New Republic of July 22, 1940, said:

The conflict (in the world) is one of ideas, of economic power, of resolution and elan . . .

It is a question of being ready for drastic changes and supreme effort, of fertilizing the imagination and intelligence with a deep seated cause and a destiny.

This article and many others appearing during the year 1940 suggested that only President Roosevelt could supply the leadership needed.

In the twoscore years since the Second World War, we have witnessed a number of Western democracies maintain a single national figure as their leader. The West Germans saw in Conrad Adenauer the leader they needed to rebuild their broken nation. For this reason, they perpetuated his control for several years. The British turned to Winston Churchill—who dominated their political scene for virtually 2 decades—to provide the charisma required to restore England to the glory of old. "Le Grande Charles" became a legend in his own time while serving as the President or popularly elected "king" of France. In short, the people of four advanced Western Nations have, in the span of our recollection, chosen to put their trust in a single man to lead them in times of tension and travail. In each of these nations the decision to perpetuate the leadership of a single man was subjected to sharp criticism. The Saturday Evening Post of October 26, 1940, castigated the events preceding Roosevelt's nomination for a third term in an article entitled "How to Rig an Election." It said America was adopting a "demautocratic process."

Much has been written about the midnight session of Korea's National Assembly which cleared the way for the popular vote on a third term. I very much doubt whether the maneuvering which has led to Korea's referendum on the third term was any more carefully contrived and efficiently orchestrated than the nomination of F. D. R. to a third term. One need only recall the reports of Thomas G. Garry, whipping the delegates into a fever pitch of support for Roosevelt with ringing cries of "We Want Roosevelt" which redounded through the hall as Garry shouted into a clandestine public address system.

One final point should be considered. What are President Park's motives? What does he stand to gain from a third term? Nothing, I would suggest. Most Koreans and outsiders seem to agree that the President of the Republic of Korea has constructed a superlative record. Surely any man would be proud to rest on such laurels. President Park must risk his fine record in seeking a third term. He has already subjected himself to sharp criticism from former supporters who oppose him not for any personal reasons, but because they object to the President seeking a third term. He faces a long and hotly contested campaign which, if successful, will require 4 more years of agonizingly hard work. I see in this little opportunity for personal engrandizement.

We trust it is clear to all that American policy, expressed and exercised, is to provide people with the freedom of choice. That choice is now being exercised. It still remains true that conditions in Korea and the position of our

interests in the country dictate that a strong leader should emerge from the choice, a leader the whole nation can unite behind. We look for and hope for such a result. We believe that that will be the choice of Korea's people.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Vietnam dominates the news concerning U.S. policy in the Far East, we tend to overlook what is going on in another most important frontier of freedom, South Korea. Here we have a friendly country which is strong politically, economically, and militarily but one which has a most serious problem in the constant threat of aggression from Communist North Korea.

In many respects, there is a parallel between the wars in Korea and Vietnam—both were touched off by naked Communist aggression and in both instances Communist victory would have been assured had it not been for support of South Korea and South Vietnam by the United States, with both men and materiel.

Today South Korea is strong enough militarily to protect itself, with some continuing help from the United States. I look forward eagerly to the day when South Vietnam will be in a position to do the same.

It was my privilege to visit South Korea earlier this year, along with several of my House colleagues, at the invitation of the South Korean Parliament. I was enormously impressed not only by the physical and economic growth which was apparent everywhere but also by the spirit of the people and their obvious friendship toward the United States.

Despite all of this evident progress, South Korea has not only challenging economic problems which must be met but also some political problems still to be resolved.

It will probably take considerable time to see Korea reflect the qualities of democratic government as they exist in the more advanced nations. The experience of our own Nation would indicate that when national survival is at stake, progress in the development of democratic institutions is retarded. In fact, Korea is still under quasi-war conditions and the achievement of self-sustaining readiness in national defense and economy is so paramount that progress in the other aspects of social development must, of necessity, be slow.

It is in our own best interests not to meddle in the internal affairs of other nations. South Korea is proud of the progress made in building its institutions and we should be constructive in our criticism, lest this brave little nation and strong ally shrink from the common cause which binds us.

The people of South Korea have come a long way in their search for freedom, economic advancement, and security. I wish them continuing success in fully achieving all of these important goals.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from California for his remarks regarding the present political situation in South Korea. I was fortunate to be a part of the delegation

headed by the distinguished majority leader that visited Korea earlier this year. I was extremely impressed by the growth and development of the economy and political system of South Korea.

On April 1, I addressed the House and said:

I am overjoyed to report to the Congress that our aid to the Republic of Korea is one of the most worthwhile investments ever made. From the ruins of the Korean war, the people and Government of Korea have developed a strong, diversified and progressive economy. For the 5-year period, 1962 to 1967, the per capita gross national product has increased 7 percent each year. Agriculture production increased 25 percent in the 5-year period 1962 to 1967. The Central Government's domestic revenues increased 49 percent each year from 1964 to 1966, and what is definitely significant for our consideration is that the share of the Government budget supported by the U.S. aid program declined from 35.3 percent in 1964 to 11.8 percent in 1968.

The dedication of the freedom-loving people of South Korea and the industriousness and integrity of its leaders are responsible for its tremendous growth. It is because of the amazing sacrifices made by the people of Korea in order to insure their freedom that I take the time to address myself to the question of the proposed Korean constitutional amendment. There can be no question about the great role that President Chung Hee Park has played in the development and stability of the Republic of Korea. He has inspired his countrymen, encouraged them and led them to make the great gains they have. His personal example of austerity and simplicity have done as much to produce a similar reaction in the people of Korea as have his great leadership and inspired economic programs.

The people of South Korea on October 20 will decide in a referendum whether or not to amend the Constitution of their Government so that President Park may be allowed to seek a third term. I think this is a very commendable course of action. Whether or not one is a supporter of President Park's, and I admit that I am, it is extremely admirable that the people and the Government of South Korea, operating as a free and democratic nation, seek only the constitutional and democratic method to change their laws. For those who view this action as an attempt to impose any kind of personal leadership, I say this is obviously false. We, ourselves, have chosen the path of constitutional amendments throughout our history, and the supporters of President Park have chosen the same method. It cannot be denied President Park's leadership has been greatly responsible for the growth, stability, and continued independence of South Korea. He and his supporters hope that he may be allowed to seek a third term so that his leadership might continue and help South Korea continue to develop into the 1970's.

Whether this referendum passes or fails, the people and Government of South Korea can only be commended for seeking this democratic method and constitutional form for expressing their views and their wishes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the

free nation of South Korea will soon choose a new President. The current head of state, President Park, is seeking an unprecedented third term of office.

I think that it would be appropriate for us to pause and recognize the manner in which democracy has thrived and strengthened in South Korea. Perhaps there is no finer example of a working, living democracy than an election: a peaceful regeneration of leadership in which the people choose their governors.

There is no doubt that free men everywhere wish South Korea well in its current election. This nation, under inspired leadership, has become a fountain of freedom in a perilous Asia. The brave people of South Korea live each day under the threat of outside aggression—but there is no faltering of purpose, no destruction of morale.

I had the privilege to serve as a member of the congressional delegation which visited Korea last year. What I saw on that trip convinced me that we have a true ally, a true friend, and a true partner in progress in the nation of South Korea.

Certainly, those Americans and Koreans alike who sacrificed so much for the freedom of South Korea did not make their sacrifices in vain.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that others desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following my own remarks on putting Korea's presidential politics in pragmatic perspective.

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

There was no objection.

DISCUSSION OF THE TRAGIC VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to take part in the discussion of the tragic Vietnam war which will continue through the coming night and had obtained unanimous consent for an hour's special order.

Yesterday, however, I received an urgent appeal from the students at Hamilton and Kirkland Colleges in my home State of New York that I attend and speak at a meeting they are holding this evening. They were particularly anxious to obtain a speaker from the Congress and had been unable to do so. I agreed to go because I consider the student meetings to be central to the whole Vietnam moratorium idea. I have also agreed to speak at other student meetings tomorrow in New York State. Accordingly I will not be on the floor this evening or tomorrow.

I think it highly appropriate that those Members who wish to do so take the opportunity this evening to express in a dramatic way the depth of their feelings in the matter. For this purpose, the House should remain in session.

Apparently, an effort will be made to choke off this discussion by motions to adjourn, in spite of the fact that a series of 1-hour special orders have been agreed to. Not only would this be in violation of the traditions of the House, but it would be an affront to the basic principle that duly elected Members of this body are entitled to be heard when they seek to speak within the rules and customs of the House.

Of course there are members who disagree with the views of those who have arranged for special orders. May I respectfully suggest that they come and debate the issues on the floor during the course of the evening, instead of trying to muzzle their colleagues. Those who have obtained the special orders have indicated they will be glad to yield to those who disagree, as well as to those who hold the same or similar views.

Allow me to turn now briefly to the substance of the matter.

In the present situation, with the Saigon regime able and anxious to veto any steps toward a reasonable political settlement, the United States has no alternative but to withdraw troops from Vietnam as fast as possible, consistent with the safety of our troops, the need for obtaining the release of our prisoners of war and the provision of asylum for those Vietnamese who would be endangered by our disengagement.

Along with Senator MCGOVERN and other Senators and various Members of Congress I have introduced a resolution calling upon the President to take such action. The text of that resolution follows:

Whereas the war in Vietnam has resulted in the loss of more than forty thousand American lives, in some two hundred and fifty thousand American casualties, in the depletion of American resources to the extent of over \$100,000,000,000 and in inestimable destruction of Vietnamese life and property; and

Whereas the war stands today as the greatest single obstacle to efforts to focus the country's financial, human and spiritual resources upon urgent domestic needs; and

Whereas spokesmen for the present administration have recognized that military victory cannot be achieved in Vietnam and have specifically defined United States policy to exclude that unattainable goal; and

Whereas the painful history of United States involvement in Vietnam exposes the futility of external attempts to create and sustain a viable, indigenous government, particularly when its leaders resist political and social reforms aimed at inspiring popular confidence and support; and

Whereas the leaders of South Vietnam have indicated, by action and deed, that their ambitions conflict with the interests of the United States in a prompt settlement of the conflict, and that they are unlikely to adopt a negotiating posture which might end the war so long as they are assured of all the United States support they need to prosecute it; and

Whereas the dominant result of policies relating the level of American presence to the capability or willingness of the South Vietnamese to fight the war themselves can only be the continued daily loss of life and limb by American servicemen, with no foreseeable conclusion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States, that all United States forces should now be

withdrawn from Vietnam, the pace of the withdrawal to be limited only by steps to insure the safety of our forces, the mutual release of prisoners of war, and the provision of safety, through arrangement for amnesty or asylum in friendly countries, for those Vietnamese who might be endangered by our disengagement.

In addition, there are other steps which our Government should take immediately.

First, every effort should be made to bring the killing to an end immediately by means of a standstill cease-fire along the lines recently proposed by Cyrus Vance. Such a cease-fire could be inaugurated by us and continue as long as observed by the other side.

Second, in the hope of persuading the Saigon Government to move in the direction that would make a peaceful settlement possible, we should also press much more vigorously than we have in the past for a broadening of the Thieu-Ky government so as to have a representative regime in South Vietnam capable of negotiating a peaceful settlement through elections or otherwise. To this end, Ambassador Bunker should be replaced and a tough spokesman like Averell Harriman sent out to Saigon to make clear to Messrs. Thieu and Ky in no uncertain terms that American boys are not going to go on dying to keep them in power.

From the actions of the Nixon administration as well as those of the Thieu-Ky regime, I see no hope that either a cease-fire or a basic broadening of the Saigon regime will take place. If this estimate proves to be unduly pessimistic and a basic change in the situation in South Vietnam occurs, then the timetable for U.S. withdrawal could be reexamined.

Let no one say that for the United States to withdraw its troops now is in any sense a sellout. In the past almost 5 years we have done more to protect South Vietnam than anyone could have expected, especially since our obligation to do so was, to say the least, unclear. If after all this time and effort, after all the lives lost and bodies mangled, after the extensive training to Vietnamese forces and after the enormous amounts of materiel that we have given them and will give them, the Republic of South Vietnam would collapse upon the departure of American troops, then I say we have been engaged in propping up a shell of a regime with no strength of its own and should recognize the task as not only hopeless but useless.

ADMINISTRATION'S TIGHT MONEY POLICY SPELLING DISASTER FOR PHILADELPHIA SCHOOLCHILDREN

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, we are all too well aware that this country is witnessing the highest interest rates since the Civil War. In every sector of the financial market interest rates have reached historic high levels. The administration's attempt to deal with inflation by tight money and high interest rates

has all but destroyed the housing industry this year. Mortgage credit is unavailable, builders are laying off their workers, and families cannot buy homes. We are all too well aware of the effects of tight money on the home building industry, but in another area we are just beginning to see what effects this severe economic prescription by the administration has affected the country.

In my city of Philadelphia in 1966 the city began an ambitious program to get rid of 65 schools which were built before 1907 and were terrible firetraps. This program is going to cost the city half a billion dollars. Twenty-three of these old schools were replaced but the attempt to complete the rest of these needed new schools was halted because of high interest rates. So we have 42 old schools in Philadelphia attended by 30,000 boys and girls who are trying to learn in firetraps. I might add that Philadelphia's problem in replacing their schools is typical of most of our cities problems today. In order to build these schools the citizens of Philadelphia voted for floating bonds to finance the program.

In May of this year the city tried to float \$30 million of the already authorized bonds, some with a maturity of 25 years, but the city received no bids. Bankers refused to purchase the bonds because under State law the city could not pay more than 6 percent interest on them and in effect Philadelphia was left out in the cold. A second attempt was made to float a bond issue by reducing the amount from \$30 million to \$17.5 million. Again the bankers, who had just raised the prime interest rate, refused to purchase this issue. The kind-hearted bankers then stated that they would lend to Philadelphia, on a short-term basis, funds totaling \$27.5 million at the prime rate which was 8½ percent.

The price of high interest rates is too great for this Nation and States and cities to bear and until the administration realizes this our cities and States are going to be unable to finance the needs of their citizens. Yet the administration can afford to waste \$600 million on supersonic aircraft that will never fly over the continental United States and billions of dollars on an ABM system which the experts tell us will not protect the United States from foreign missiles. Our priorities simply need to be restructured.

Mr. Speaker, I include the story appearing in the New York Times, October 12, 1969, following my remarks:

MONEY WOES OF U.S. CITIES MAY SLACKEN

(By John H. Allan)

Philadelphia has 42 firetrap slum schools it would like to tear down and replace, but finding the money has been tough this year. Now, however, the tangle of financing difficulties confronting the city—and many other local governments as well—may become less snarled.

In Philadelphia, the school system is antiquated and half the schools are overcrowded. In 1966 the city embarked on an ambitious half-billion-dollar program to get rid of 65 schools, built before 1907, that aren't fire-resistant.

Twenty-three of these old schools were replaced but the program this year slowed down because of financing difficulties. There are still 42 old schools in the city, and 30,000 pupils attend classes in these hazardous buildings.

Besides this, four junior high schools and four senior high schools operate on double shifts. Some 25,000 students go to class either from 7:30 A.M. until noon or from 12:30 P.M. until 5 P.M.

PROBLEMS TYPICAL

Philadelphia's problems are typical of those of many municipalities. High interest rates, caused by the Government's anti-inflationary tight money policy and by fear Congress would end the traditional tax-exempt status of municipal bonds, have seriously damaged the local government bond market. Last week each of these problems took a turn for the better.

To eliminate substandard conditions, Philadelphia school officials wanted to move ahead with their capital improvement program. Last May, however, the city's taxpayers voted down a \$90-million bond authorization, largely because they were sick and tired of local property tax increases. In addition, some citizens objected to a school desegregation plan and some thought the bond issue would pay for too many "frills" such as swimming pools.

SALE ATTEMPTED

Later in May, Philadelphia tried to sell \$30-million of already authorized bonds, some with a maturity as long as 25 years, but it received no bids. Bankers shied away from the bonds because Pennsylvania law then would not permit paying interest higher than 6 per cent, and the curb, in effect, priced Philadelphia out of the market. Other cities were able to pay more.

The city cut the length of maturity of its bond issue and reduced it to \$17.5-million, from \$30-million. Unfortunately, however, major commercial banks raised their basic lending rates just before the issue was to be sold, and so banks did not bid even for the smaller amount.

The school district was able to get short-term loans totaling \$27.5-million, but it needs long-term funds.

Last Tuesday, the Pennsylvania Legislature raised the interest rate ceiling for local government bonds to 7 per cent for one year. The action, together with the change in the bond market last week, likely will enable the city to sell a \$60-million bond issue now scheduled Oct. 21.

Furthermore, the city has a \$65-million bond authorization up for approval on Election Day, Nov. 4, and the outlook for its passing is brighter. If it passes, the city will be able to keep its building program moving ahead next year.

"It's been a long, tough road," J. William Jones, director of information of the Philadelphia School District, remarked last week as he reviewed the year.

When Mr. Jones was driving from work last Thursday, he heard the news that the Senate Finance Committee had moved to maintain the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. The news pleased him, he acknowledges.

If Congress votes down the House-passed proposals to change the traditional tax-exempt status of state and city bonds and if the Federal Government succeeds in its program to stifle inflation, the municipal bond market could be restored to better health.

Last week there were indications that both these developments could take place. It was still far too early to make such a forecast on both points with any real conviction, but bond market dealers and investors appeared to be toying with the idea a little more seriously, at least.

PANEL VOTES ON DELETION

On Thursday, the Senate Finance Committee tentatively voted to delete from the House-passed tax reform bill all provisions aimed at taxing the interest from state and local government bonds, Senator Albert Gore disclosed. The panel's action was nearly unanimous, the Tennessee Democrat said.

Earlier in the week, victory in the battle

against inflation seemed more plausible after the Labor Department reported that unemployment had jumped half a percentage point in September—its biggest increase since 1960.

The bond market accepted the statistic as impressive evidence that the tight monetary policy instituted back in December finally is beginning to get results.

Bond prices rose and interest rates declined throughout the money and capital markets and the trend was evident in the municipal bond market even though the supply of new issues for sale was the largest since May. Normally, a large volume of offerings tends to push prices down and interest rates up.

INDEX MOVES DOWNWARD

The Bond Buyer yield index, the most commonly used gauge of tax-exempt bond interest rates, moved down to 6.14 per cent last week from 6.19 per cent a week earlier. In view of the \$780-million of notes and bonds offered for sale, investment bankers found the slight decline in the index impressive.

Nevertheless, few finance men in Wall Street were willing to predict any runaway rise in municipal bond prices over the weeks just ahead.

For one thing, they are concerned that the House-passed version of the tax-reform bill may prevail when the Senate and House attempt to reconcile their differences in conference committee.

For another, investment bankers are well aware that some \$2.5-billion of bond offerings have been delayed while the House worked out its version of the bill to reform taxes.

This heavy volume of disrupted financing was also caused partly by the Federal Reserve System's program to restrict credit conditions.

If rates decline, these blocked sales will be brought back to the market and that will tend to keep interest rates from declining as much as they otherwise would.

If the bond market is being restored to its former vigor, it isn't happening too soon. Last week alone, local governments from coast to coast continued to have their plans to build all sorts of new facilities blocked by the failure to sell bonds.

FRESNO CITY PLANS SALES

Fresno City, Calif., failed to sell \$1.3-million of school bonds.

Hondo, Texas, could not sell \$1.2-million of bonds Wednesday and will continue to conduct classes in a noisy auditorium to solve its overcrowded conditions.

Columbia, Mo., wanted \$200,000 for its fire department and \$4,575,000 for water and power facilities. Riverview, Mich., wanted \$4,115,000 for a new community center. Carroll County needed \$2.2-million for sanitary district facilities. Santa Clara, Calif., \$1.35-million for sewers.

For these cities, all the arguments about taxing the rich who have avoided taxes appear academic. Because of Congressional proposals and inflation, these local governments have found it difficult to provide the facilities their citizens want.

It was the fact of disrupted financing plans that drove so many local government financial officials to Washington to protest the House-passed bill.

PROPOSAL HELD "REGRESSIVE"

Arthur Levitt, New York State's Controller, labeled "regressive" the proposal to tax investors in municipal bonds, and he said it would increase the borrowing costs in the state by \$100-million a year.

"I cannot believe that the Federal Government's added revenue from the minimum income tax and the allocation of deductions combined would amount to anything more than a fraction of the total increase in state and local interest costs," the New York official stated.

Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of California, a state kept out of the bond market because

rates generally exceed its 5 percent, has spoken out against the tax-reform bill. New Jersey Treasurer John Kervick found the House-passed bill "destructive."

William E. Simon, a partner of Salmon Brothers & Hutzler and chairman of the municipal securities committee of the Investment Bankers Association, presented the case against the bill for the men who underwrite municipal bonds.

After the decision of the Senate Finance Committee was announced Thursday, the Investment Bankers Association applauded the panel's action.

A spokesman for the association warned, however, that unless the Senate and, ultimately, the Senate-House conference committee act quickly to uphold the Senate Finance Committee's action "market conditions for municipal bonds will not improve sufficiently in the near future to permit states and municipalities to procure vitally needed funds."

In his testimony, Mr. Simon calculated that the issuance of taxable municipal bonds would push up the interest rates across the board by three-quarters of a percentage point.

The increased borrowing costs for states and cities would go up 1 percentage point, Mr. Simon predicted.

"This means an increased financing cost of at least \$150-million per year, all of which hard-pressed states and municipalities will be forced to raise from taxpayers already groaning under the burden of state, local and Federal taxation," he said.

The Treasury has estimated that the municipal bond changes in the House-passed bill would produce \$45-million in revenue.

Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics at Barnard College and member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, criticized the Tax Reform Act of 1969 as "seriously counterproductive" in its over-all economic impact.

Speaking of its effect on tax-exempt bonds, Dr. Saulnier declared: "One is impressed again and again that what we have here is a massive example of throwing the baby out with the bathwater—in this case a whole family of babies, with a few cups of bathwater."

As William F. Staats, economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, warned in an article in the September issue of his bank's Business Review, "the reform package may not achieve desired objectives and may, in fact, have perverse impacts."

A CONSTITUENT'S VIEWS TOWARD AN HONORABLE SOLUTION TO THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

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

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the publicity that is being given to the "moratorium" which seeks an unconditional surrender in Vietnam, I have obtained consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter I have received from a constituent. I believe it reflects the sentiments of the majority of our citizens who do not seek to cripple our efforts to find an honorable solution to the Vietnam conflict:

RICHMOND, VA.,
September, 22, 1969.

Hon. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On August 22 of this year my 21-year old brother was killed in action in Viet Nam.

Since he didn't get back to express his wishes in such matters, I am writing for him and for myself, since our feelings are the same.

He didn't like the Army, especially since he had just married and finished business school, and it prevented him from being with his wife and earning a good living.

However, he felt strongly that he owed his country two years, and he believed that our presence in Viet Nam is just.

If he were here, he would have two requests; so, I will make them for him.

Please do your best to see that the 33,000 men who have given their lives there didn't do so in vain. When my little girl, who loved her uncle very much, reads in history 15 years from now about the war, let there be a good reason for these men's deaths, let it have been a good cause, let them win.

Also don't let these draft dodgers who have left the country back in without receiving their due punishment, for they would be making a mockery of every man who has served this country in this or any other war.

We are a strong people and can do without this scum.

I realize you are only one man, but I know you will do what you can. Thank you for your time.

Very truly yours,

C. D. TAYLOR.

OCTOBER 15 MORATORIUM—BACKGROUND FOR AMERICAN REVOLUTION

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has publicly announced that he has a duty to all of the American people, including the fighting men serving their country in Vietnam, and that he will not be intimidated by the rabble rousing tactics of loudmouths.

When public policy is made by mobs in the streets, anarchy prevails. Neither the President nor any other public official can countenance anarchy.

Continuation of the "moratorium," since it can have no effect on the public policy of the United States, must be for another purpose. For this reason it becomes more and more important to determine who are the true planners of tomorrow's proposed disloyalty. The current Don Bell report has performed a great public service in collecting, not from secret sources, but from public documents, the true story and the real names of the leaders—including identified Communists.

If these people are promoting peace it must be the Communist definition of peace—worldwide surrender to Communist tyranny.

I, for one, will not remain silent and allow my silence to be construed as condonation of betrayal.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of this information, I include the Don Bell report and a news clipping which follows:

[From Don Bell Reports, Oct. 10, 1969]

VIETNAM WAR—BACKGROUND FOR AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(It often happens, too, both in courts and in cabinets, that there are two things going on together—a main plot and an underplot—and he that understands only one of them will, in all probability, be the dupe of both.—From Colton's "Lacon," published in 1820.)

(The following, which appeared in the Oct. 15th issue of "Newsweek," may have

been overlooked, or its significance underestimated. We therefore quote at length from the article.)

MOBILIZING FOR "M-DAY"

The atmosphere on the eighth floor of 1029 Vermont Avenue, a nondescript office building less than half a mile from the White House, was frenetic—phones jangling, staffers scurrying from room to room, Very Important Persons drifting in and out. Surrounded by the paraphernalia of protest (mounds of antiwar literature, bumper stickers, "Work for Peace" buttons), Marge Sklenkar, a 22-year-old political skirmisher who earned her stripes in the McCarthy-for-President campaign, placed long distance calls to former comrades-in-arms across the country. Long past midnight, another ex-McCarthy organizer spoke quietly into the telephone: "Hello, Reverend Brown? I'm Helen Shreves, the Western area organizer for the Vietnam Moratorium Committee." Then, scarcely giving Reverend Brown a chance to respond, she launched into her low-keyed pitch—a search for support for a nationwide demonstration on Oct. 15 designed to pressure President Nixon into immediate unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Originally, Oct. 15 was to have been a campus-oriented protest involving a moratorium on normal academic activities. But it has quickly spread beyond the campus. And, if everything goes according to the evolving plans, the combination of scheduled events could well turn into the broadest and most spectacular antiwar protest in American history.

As of last week, at least, the protest was clearly gathering steam and speed, especially in the Northeast and on the West Coast. The big names of the antiwar Establishment (Harvard's John Kenneth Galbraith, MIT's Noam Chomsky, University of Chicago and CONY's Hans Morganthau) were rallying round—and more business and professional groups were being recruited with each passing day. "At first I thought it would flop," said David Mixner, one of the moratorium leaders. "I thought people were beyond this. But now I see it's going to be very successful. People have just had it with the war and they are willing to try just one more reasonable thing to stop it."

By the middle of next week—"M-Day"—the organizers of the event expect students on 1,000 campuses to turn out for the day-long protest. The demonstrations promise to be more or less standard antiwar fare—teach-ins in school auditoriums, fasts in school cafeterias, mass meetings in local football stadiums. Where the demonstrations spill off campuses, they will take on more dramatic overtones: massive afternoon rallies on the Boston Common and in New York's Bryant Park; a mock funeral cortege through downtown Milwaukee at mid-day; candlelight memorial services in small New England towns; a subdued vigil in front of the state capitol in Denver, Colo., during which the names of every one of the servicemen from Colorado killed in Vietnam will be read.

The idea of a nationwide moratorium originated in Massachusetts where a peace group called "Mass. Pax", headed by envelope maker Jerome Grossman, began casting around for ways to revitalize the antiwar movement. In short order, the idea reached Sam Brown, a one-time Harvard divinity student and the former chief student organizer for the McCarthy campaign. Brown in turn called in David Hawk of the National Student Association, one of the original students in the McCarthy entourage. In mid-June, Brown and Hawk opened a small office in Washington and quickly set to work laying the groundwork for the Oct. 15 moratorium.

Since then, the pace has picked up considerably. The original shoestring operation has spread across the entire eighth floor, and

the handful of organizers has mushroomed into a general staff of 31 full-time workers and a network of some 7,500 adult organizers from coast to coast. Their efforts have produced a flood of contributions—from \$5 and \$10 bills to checks as high as \$1,000. "We're seeing one of the benefits of the McCarthy campaign," explained Mixner, himself a veteran of the McCarthy movement. "You call four people in Iowa, and you don't have to tell them what to do. They know how to organize, get up literature, deal with the press, rent halls. They know how to handle it."

The Oct. 15 moratorium, however, is only the beginning. Brown and company plan to escalate their war on war with a two-day moratorium in November and a three-day demonstration in December. A more radical group, committed to the October protest, the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, is organizing a massive march in Washington to augment the November moratorium effort. Even with all this activity, the antiwar movement is concerned about maintaining its movement. But Adam Walinsky, a former legislative assistant to Robert Kennedy and the New York coordinator for the Oct. 15 moratorium, vows that the protestors will not be appeased by announcements from the White House of additional troops withdrawals. "Doses of sugar candy are not what the moratorium is about," Walinsky said last week. "This is everybody's war. We are all in it and we will have to work to stop it."

(End of article in Oct. 13 *Newsweek*.)

In reading the preceding article, one gets the general impression that this is a more or less respectable assemblage of "doves" who are doing nothing more dramatic than invoking and acting upon the First Amendment "right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Hence, *Newsweek* lists only those who might be classified as "respectable" leaders of this movement.

Newsweek refers to an activist group which it says is cooperating with the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, a group calling itself *The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Viet Nam*. The name being a mouthful even for a pseudo-intellectual, it is generally shortened to *New Mobe*.

What *Newsweek* does not tell us is that *New Mobe* occupies the same offices as the VMC (Vietnam Moratorium Committee). The two organizations, one of them "respectable" and the other Maoishly militant; use the same telephone number, the same staff, hand out the same literature.

While the steering committee of the VCM is composed of McCarthyites, the *New Mobe* steering committee includes such people as:

Arnold Johnson, public relations director for the U.S. Communist Party;

Irving Sarnoff, a 5th Amendment Communist;

Sylvia Kushner, an activist in her own right and for many years the wife of Sam Kushner, Los Angeles editor of the *People's World* and at one time a member of the Communist Party's National Committee.

Otto Nathan, another 5th Amendment Communist;

Dave Dellinger, now being tried in a federal court in Chicago on grounds of violating the U.S. anti-riot law during the 1968 Democratic National Convention.

Rennie Davis, also being tried in Chicago on charges same as above;

Fred Halstead, an avowed Trotskyite;

Robert Greenblatt, who went to Paris in 1968 bearing a letter of introduction from Tom Hayden to North Vietnamese Col. Lao who is a dignitary at the so-called Paris Peace Conference. In the letter Greenblatt was hailed as a trusted worker, the letter ending with this wish for Col. Lao: "Good fortune! Victory!"

Commenting on this bedfellowship, *Human Events* of Oct. 11, reports:

"While the VMC itself is not Communist-controlled, it nevertheless is working hand-in-glove with 'New Mobe', whose steering committee is rife with Communists and pro-Communists. . . . the ironically named David Hawk, a leader in the VMC, appears on the steering committee of 'New Mobe.'

"VMC leader Sam Brown, moreover, holds vigorous anti-American sentiments. . . . Yet, despite the ideology of the protest leaders, despite the fact that 'New Mobe' and its affiliates are making common cause with the Communists and the Viet Cong, the leadership in the Democratic party has elected to join the 'peace movement'. . . . In brief, the Democratic party which sent American boys to die in Viet Nam to prevent South Viet Nam from being taken over by the Communists, would now join the Communist-endorsed and infiltrated peace movement to achieve a Communist objective: the Communist conquest of South Viet Nam caused by a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. troops."

(What *Human Events* neglected to mention is the fact that the Democrats are no more guilty than the Republicans in this respect: the liberal Democrats—not the Democratic Party as such—are promoting this Moratorium. By the same token, the Republican Party's liberal Ripon Society is also backing the moratorium. If *Human Events* wants to accuse the pot, it should also mention the kettle, else its readers may be brainwashed into believing that all Democrats are Red, that all Republicans are White, and that some of the latter are also true Blue.)

MAIN PLOT AND UNDERPLOT

Three target dates are established:

Oct. 15—one day of protest;

Nov. 15—two days of demonstration;

Dec. 15—three days of antiwar activity.

Since we are writing before the events, it would be foolhardy to predict what may happen when 1,000 campuses are being used as virtual battlefields. But we should like to repeat the quotation with which we began this letter:

"It often happens, too, both in courts and in cabinets, that there are two things going on together—a main plot and an underplot—and he that understands only one of them will, in all probability, be the dupe of both."

In this instance, the main plot is to get us out of the Vietnamese war. There is but little doubt that almost every American is sick and tired of this foreign struggle, and is eager to end the Vietnamese involvement as soon as possible, and with honor if that is still possible. No longer are the facts hidden from the Average American: (1) It was wrong for us ever to enter this war by Presidential Proclamation, and without clear and unmistakable declaration of a state of war by the Congress of the United States; (2) It was wrong, once having entered the war, not to have fought and won it in a matter of weeks or months, not years; (3) It was wrong to adopt a no-win policy for economic reasons; (4) It was wrong to permit the war to become a political football; (5) It was wrong for many other reasons, not the least of which having to do with the killing and maiming of over a million American men for no purpose consistent with the best interest of the country or of its citizens.

Every patriotic American will agree with James Madison, who wrote in 1795:

"Of all the enemies to public liberty war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies: from these proceed debts and taxes: and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under domination of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the Executive is extended; its influence in dealing out offices, honors, and emoluments is multiplied; and all the means

of seducing the minds, are added to those of subduing the force of the people. . . . (There is also an) inequality of fortunes, and the opportunities of fraud, growing out of a state of war, and . . . degeneracy of manners and of morals. . . . No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.

"The Constitution expressly and exclusively vests in the Legislature the power of declaring a state of war . . . the power of raising armies . . . the power of creating offices. A delegation of such powers (to the President) will strike, not only at the fabric of our Constitution, but at the foundation of well organized and well checked governments. The separation of the power of declaring war from that of conducting it, is wisely contrived to exclude the danger of its being declared for the sake of its being conducted. The separation of the power of raising armies from the power of commanding them, is intended to prevent the raising of the armies for the sake of commanding them. The separation of the power of creating offices from that of filling them, is an essential guard against the temptation to create offices for the sake of gratifying favorites or multiplying dependents."

Liberals and present day politicians would not subscribe to James Madison's reasons for dreading war, but they, too, are against the Vietnamese war, for different reasons. So: almost everybody wants to get the war ended and get the boys home.

But—to use the Vietnam antiwar sentiment to stir up an American Revolution is the most abominable political trick ever perpetrated upon the American people!

Because ending the war is a popular cause, glib and sentimental people who seldom look beneath the surface before leaping, will be out in full force to support the protests, demonstrations, and activities of Oct. 15, Nov. 15, and Dec. 15. And leading and directing them will be communists and socialists, nihilists and Trotskyites, anarchists and revolutionaries of every hue.

By appealing first to the campuses, the *New Mobe* enlisted a bewildering assortment of student and youth protest organizations who await but an invitation or an excuse to go into their acts of destruction and spoliation. To name just a few, there are the Third World Liberation Front, the Progressive Labor Movement, the New Left Forum, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, Students for a Democratic Society, Young Socialist Alliance, Young People's Socialist League, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Technocrats, SLATE, Advance, the Trotskyites Social Workers, the Black Panthers and other black militant groups, and dozens of others.

These protests don't just happen. As *Newsweek* indicates in the article quoted at the beginning of this letter, there is careful planning, the gathering of a staff of expert agitators to direct the movement, appeals for money to finance the operations, and always there is the underplot with aims entirely different from the stated objective; which in this case is to end the Vietnam war—while the underplot promotes anarchy, revolution, destruction of society and the eventual creation of a Socialist Dictatorship.

Listen to the radical Saul Alinsky, as he teaches the first crop of *Robert F. Kennedy Fellows*, a newly formed group of young activists, specially selected and specially financed with Kennedy Foundation money: "In the world as it is, man moves on the basis of self-interest and not on the basis of mythical ideals. Those come later as justification. Try to organize people around things, not issues; around their self-interests, not around what is right or wrong. People do the right things for the wrong reasons. So one of the things an organizer tries to do is look for the wrong reasons. . . . Never once have I approached a priest or minister or rabbi on the basis of Judaic-Christian

principle because to do so would be to go outside their experience. As for businessmen, I could persuade a capitalist on Friday to bankroll a revolution on Saturday that will bring him a profit on Sunday, even though he will be executed on Monday. Even though he will be executed, he can't pass up that Sunday profit. . . . Reconciliation is when you get power and the other guy gets reconciled to it." (Quotation from an article appearing in the *Washington Post* of Sept. 22, 1969).

This is what these organizers of protests are taught to think of, and do to, the glib but warm hearted and well meaning people who contribute money and time to such protest movements as the antiwar rallies. "For there is no faithfulness in their mouth; their inward part is very wickedness; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongues" (Psalm 5:9). They "are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness" (Matthew 23:27).

Because we all detest the Vietnamese war, it seems good and patriotic to join in an antiwar movement. But, before lending yourself to any mass movement, look beneath the surface. The road to hell still is paved with good intentions, and hell is filled with those who believed a lie.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Oct. 12, 1969]

FOUR MORATORIUM LEADERS ARE HEADQUARTERED HERE

There are four major leaders of Wednesday's Vietnam Moratorium activities headquartered here. The four are:

Sam Brown, a Harvard University fellow. Brown had been one of the principal organizers of college students and other young people for Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., in last year's presidential campaign. Brown, 26, was born at Council Bluffs, Iowa; attended the University of Redlands, Rutgers University and Harvard Divinity School. He was a Kennedy fellow at Harvard.

David Hawk, 26, born in Allentown, Pa., attended Cornell University and Union Theological Seminary in New York City. Hawk worked in the college student movement for McCarthy, and was active in the antidraft programs of the National Student Association. He currently is awaiting trial in Scranton, Pa., for refusing induction into the Army.

Marge Sklenar, 23, was born in Milwaukee, studied government and history at Mundelein College, Chicago. She also worked in the McCarthy campaign, and has taught second grade in a Chicago school.

David Mixner, 24, a native of Bridgeton, N.J., attended the University of Maryland and Arizona State University. He has been a union organizer, and handled McCarthy campaigns in Georgia and Texas.

The Moratorium Committee has its headquarters in eighth floor offices of a building at 1029 Vermont Ave., NW.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT STANDS ON WEAK BUDGET CRUTCH IN CUBAN MIG SITUATION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since a Cuban Mig fighter plane penetrated American airspace and landed at an Air Force base last week, the military has been using the budget as a crutch to explain away the fact that the Southeastern part of this Nation is obviously vulnerable to attack or invasion.

But once again, it appears that this crutch is a weak one at best. Even this excuse is another example of penny wise and pound foolish philosophy which has pumped the Defense Department budget to \$80 billion, yet which leaves me wondering just how effective our defenses really are.

The Pentagon told me yesterday that it costs approximately \$1.9 million per year to fly and maintain an EC-121 aircraft which was used as an air picket in the Straits of Florida. This includes, I was told, personnel, spare parts, and every other phase of the operation of this plane. That means that the three planes used on picket patrol cost a total of \$5.7 million. I do not think that is too great a price to pay to insure the security of Florida and the Southeastern United States.

There are many areas I feel are less important than the actual defense of this Nation. If a Cuban plane can fly undetected into an Air Force base, then the defense of this Nation is not very complete. Indeed, it casts a shadow on the entire defense system of this Nation.

There is a second point which should be made here. We have heard over and over again—starting years ago when a crop duster flew from Cuba to Florida undetected—that radar is unable to pick up low-flying aircraft.

This is only partially true. Existing radar cannot do the job, as witnessed by the Cuban Mig situation. But industry has a radar system which can, if installed in Key West for example, pick up a Mig-sized plane or missile, from the runway in Havana when it takes off.

The Navy is now conducting tests on this system, but the Air Force cut its funds which were earmarked for this project.

I have been told that the installation of such a radar system at Key West would cost about \$3 million.

Written reports say that, indeed, there were two Mig's headed for Florida and that one turned back. The Pentagon said this morning they do not know of a second Mig. But, of course, they did not know about the first Mig until it landed. I have urged that the House Armed Services Committee will investigate this matter in the immediate future, at which time I hope this question mark will also be resolved.

At this time, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald and the Pompano Beach Sun-Sentinel which points out the concern of south Florida citizens in this matter:

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE—BUT NO WATCH ON CUBA?

To support the mightiest defense system the world has ever known taxpayers of the United States will be asked this fiscal year for \$76.6 billion, a sum which is 40 per cent of the whole federal budget.

For all of this might and all of this money, however, the defense establishment appears unable to man the only frontier where an avowed enemy—if only a feeble one—sits close at hand.

On Aug. 21 Defense Secretary Melvin Laird announced that spendings for Air Force training and other flights not connected with Southeast Asia would be reduced by a sum later estimated at from \$35 million

to \$50 million. The cuts took effect last Friday.

On Sunday the Air Force ceased its 24-hour picket patrol of the Florida Straits opposite Cuba, grounding two of three surveillance planes and sending a third on nine-hour random missions.

That same day a Russian-made MIG jet fighter with Cuban markings skimmed over the water from Cuba and asked to be allowed to land at Homestead Air Force base. We are told the pilot claimed political refuge.

On that day President Nixon's Air Force One was parked on the Homestead strip and the President himself was in temporary residence only a few miles away.

The Cuban plane was not identified by radar or otherwise until it was within seconds from Homestead AFB.

We cannot believe, as some have suggested, that this event was contrived to persuade the taxpayer he was treating the military establishment with untoward stinginess.

If deliberate economy was the excuse for failing to man the battlements, however, it is even stupider than a staged act of poverty. Had the pilot of the Cuban plane intended something other than defection the country could have been at war Sunday afternoon.

Perhaps this hypothesis is farfetched, but it has not escaped the minds of concerned Floridians and many Americans elsewhere. Ground radar cannot "see" beyond the horizons. Picket planes can detect any movement near the surface. Since every military pilot knows that extreme low altitude can escape ground radar, higher altitude surveillance is mandatory to any coastal system of defense.

We suppose that the picket planes are back on patrol—belatedly. Pearl Harbor, too, has been restored.

Who is responsible for this bureaucratic folly? We trust that Congress will find out. He, or they, ought to be drummed out of the Air Force.

THE NEED TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN HIS EFFORT TO ACHIEVE PEACE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's demonstrations in protest against the war will no doubt continue to receive ample coverage in the news media. And, no doubt, many superlatives will be used in describing the goings-on, such as, "the largest" or "most effective" or "most far-reaching"—in the typical fashion of the modern-day journalism.

But what worries me is that despite President Nixon's disclaimer that he will be unswayed by street demonstrations, the press and other news media will interpret every action he takes toward peace in Vietnam as a response to this moratorium. Already such indications are being given. They are saying that the withdrawal of troops was a "token" effort to stave off protest demonstrations; that cancellation of the draft for November and December and reinstatement of the Johnson-removed, end-of-year graduate student deferment were mere numerical ploys tossed to the college-age protester; that the announcement of a changed status for General Hershey and a meeting with top Vietnamese war advisers were last ditch efforts to take

the steam out of the moratorium tomorrow. The press never once mentioned that maybe these actions were in fulfillment of President Nixon's pledge to end the war as fast as possible. The press just has not given the President credit for any initiative in his efforts to find a just peace.

And now the White House has announced that the President will address the Nation on November 3 to discuss the state of the war in Vietnam at that time. No doubt, whatever he says then, will be construed as a response to the moratorium of October 15 and an effort to forestall the planned March on Washington scheduled for November.

What is the matter with some of our people today? Have we lost faith in the American principle to give credit where credit is due? Or is it just that it is more fashionable to criticize the President than to congratulate him.

As I have said before, I firmly believe the President is making every effort to bring this terrible war to a swift and honorable conclusion. I hope that all Americans will realize the need to support this effort.

THE ENEMY WITHIN

(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, whether we like it or not, the United States is at war with Vietnam, declared or undeclared. We have half a million troops there fighting for their lives, being attacked by a Communist enemy, mortared, sapped, mined, booby trapped, poisoned. It is a serious business.

President Nixon did not send these men to fight in Vietnam. He wants to get them out of there. But he knows that they cannot be withdrawn without a commitment from the enemy not to attack while American forces grow ever smaller. Lacking such a commitment, God save the last 100,000 Americans left in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, here in the relative safety of the United States, those who should know better, including some who are in a position of public elected office, seek further domestic unrest by supporting the so-called Vietnam moratorium protest tomorrow, which, of course, merely encourages the enemy to believe that if they wait long enough the Americans will withdraw without a commitment.

Mr. Speaker, such activity when America is at war is not mere dissent. It is awfully close to subversion. It certainly is aiding the enemy in time of war. It is contemptible, whether the actor is a yippee from Haight-Asbury or a Member of the Congress of the United States.

The record should show now, today, before tomorrow, what is going on here. Dissent is one thing. Undermining the President of the United States while he is attempting negotiations with an enemy government with whom the United States is at war is quite another.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants this war. No one in his right mind wants Americans to continue to die in Vietnam. We

all want out of there. The Commander in Chief is trying his level best to obtain the necessary commitments from a determined and attacking enemy to get us out of this tragic situation. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot simply withdraw—lock, stock, and barrel—when you are under attack or you invite slaughter. Those who urge a precipitous course of wholesale retreat would take Americans down that road.

Such action should be recognized nationwide for what it is—outright political expediency tainted with timidity and outrageously harmful to our country. If this be the portent of leadership in tomorrow's United States, then our legacy from America's Revolutionary heroes has been lost indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it has been lost. I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans support President Nixon in his efforts to resolve the Vietnam impasse honorably and I am convinced that they deplore tomorrow's exercise in infamy masquerading as dissent that is, in fact, inspired and directed by the enemy within.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR OF THE UNITED STATES TO COINCIDE WITH THE CALENDAR YEAR

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on October 7 I introduced legislation to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year. After my statement our colleagues, Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. Bow and I engaged in a colloquy during which we agreed on the need for some improvements in the current procedures for handling authorizations and appropriations bills.

Because of the interest expressed to me by other colleagues I sent a letter to the entire membership asking for cosponsors and I am happy to report that 27 Members have responded indicating their desire to support this approach and I, therefore, offer this proposal again in conjunction with these cosponsors. In addition I expect to contact all 50 Governors as well as mayors of some of our larger cities asking for their comments and views regarding this proposal.

At this point in my remarks I would like to insert a statement by Secretary of the Navy, Samuel L. Southard, written in 1825. The situation he describes in that long-ago era certainly applies now and his words could have been written today:

STATEMENT BY SAMUEL L. SOUTHARD

One of the most serious inconveniences under which the Department labors in the administration of the concerns of the navy, is the time at which the appropriation bills are passed by Congress. They are passed, in the short session, late in February, a.d., in the long session, generally in May, so that, during a period of from one-fourth to a third of the year, the Department is left without funds previously appropriated, and must, of necessity, permit expenditures not yet legally authorized. Another evil results: It is the will of Congress often to change

the wording and character of the appropriation, and, after the bill is passed, it is a month or six weeks before the instructions under the new appropriation can be given to and acted upon by the agents. It consequently follows, that for nearly one-half of the year, the Department acts in perfect ignorance of the law under which it is bound to act. Expenditures are made, under one form, when they ought to have been made under another. The law is, necessarily, not complied with, because it is passed after the act is performed. Infinite confusion is created in settling the accounts, and it is impossible for any talent or any industry ever to have them rendered and settled, in that plain and simple manner in which they ought always to be exhibited if any efficient control is to be had by Congress or the Department, over that branch of the service. The accounting officers do all that capacity and labor can accomplish, but they cannot settle an account according to the forms of a law not yet in existence; nor can they, every year, alter the items, open new books, meet the errors resulting from this cause, in accounts transmitted from a distance, and yet settle the accounts of the year within the year.

VARIOUS CONTROLS OF DANGEROUS AND ADDICTIVE DRUGS

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, we are currently studying various controls of dangerous and addictive drugs. No one kind of control is going to achieve our purpose. First, we must mount a realistic education program for all segments of the population. It is important that this educational material include the realization that there are psychological causes of addiction and that in very many cases, drug use is symptomatic of deeper psychological problems.

New laws must be extremely tough on the commercial seller, but must give consideration to the fact that there are varying degrees of guilt below that category of purveyor.

The public must offer treatment of addicts through private efforts and government expenditures. Larger government spending can be justified. In the Nation's Capital, there were 46 percent more robberies the first 6 months of 1969 than there were last year in the same period. A study of D.C. jail inmates shows that nearly one-half of the prisoners are addicts. If the estimated 10,000 addicts in the area must each steal at least \$50 a day to support their habit, it is easy to explain the increased robberies. It can also be said that this total expenditure for drugs exceeds the entire District of Columbia budget. We cannot equate these costs dollar for dollar, but the figures do represent not only dollar figures but also social costs, danger to victims, and human misery.

Narcotics control is a most important part of general crime control, from street crime to organized syndicates. Smaller cities across the Nation note increasing "on the street" solicitation for prostitution, caused in large part by need for funds to buy drugs. Narcotics are part and parcel of many organized crime syndicates.

It may be necessary to give addicts a choice of penalty or treatment. Present

treatment facilities range from none to inadequate. We need much more research on treatment methods. Widely heralded methadone is certainly not a panacea for drug ills.

So far as I am personally concerned, case histories indicate clearly that we must stop excusing the use of certain nonaddictive drugs as harmless. Almost without exception, the heroin users I have had a chance to study started on the so-called harmless drugs, and in many cases they continued to use them as supplements to the addictive drugs.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support to President Nixon in his efforts to bring about an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam. No one wants to see this war ended more than I do yet I cannot agree with those who advocate a "Peace at any Price" policy.

Although the news media is playing up the antiwar demonstration planned for tomorrow, I firmly believe that the vast majority of the Members of Congress and citizens of this great Nation support the President as I do. A small percentage of the Members of Congress will make speeches tomorrow, a small number of congressional staff members will hold their vigil and a small percentage of the people of our country will demonstrate in their own way. They will receive the attention of the news media. The rest of us who constitute an overwhelming majority in this country, will go about our daily business and will be the forgotten Americans.

While there is no organized effort to show support for the administration, I would hope that each community and each individual might, in his own way, express to President Nixon and to our fighting men in Vietnam, his true feelings. This could be done in a very small way such as turning on car lights, as someone has suggested, or displaying the American flag or just simply stopping for a moment during the day and saying a little prayer for our servicemen and for those who must make these important decisions.

My own hometown of Sylacauga, Ala., has declared tomorrow Patriotism Day. No special program has been planned but flags will be displayed and each individual will acknowledge the day in his own way.

Mr. Speaker, my further sentiments concerning tomorrow's antiwar demonstration is contained in an article by David Lawrence which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

SURRENDER DEMANDS

WASHINGTON.—For the first time in American history, some members of Congress as well as a number of protesting groups are demanding that the United States run up the white flag and yield to the enemy in Vietnam after many American lives have been sacrificed for a great principle—to repel aggression and aid weaker nations to determine their own destiny.

No public-opinion poll has directly asked the question whether the American people favor surrender. The customary queries have been whether the war is being handled properly or if it should be brought to an end, without reference to how this could be achieved. The issue has not been clearly put to the people. If it were, undoubtedly Americans would reject any humiliating policy amounting to "peace at any price."

NO CONDITIONS

Resolutions are being offered in Congress and are being supported by various organizations which plan "demonstrations" in many cities on October 15 to insist that the United States make peace at once. Not a single one of these proposals requires as a condition any reciprocal action to be taken by the North Vietnamese. In Paris this week, both North Vietnam and the Viet Cong have deliberately ignored peace efforts made by the United States, and are offering no concessions whatsoever.

The forthcoming "protest day" in the United States—next Wednesday—is being hailed by the Communists as a sign that the American people are willing to surrender. Seventeen senators and 47 House members are supporting the projected "demonstrations."

The chief American delegate at Paris, Henry Cabot Lodge, has been pleading in vain for talks that would accomplish constructive purposes, but the opposing delegations at the Paris conference have been turning a deaf ear. The negotiators of the North Vietnamese government instead are placing great hopes on the signs of American opposition to the war. One of the Hanoi representatives says that support is snowballing in the United States in behalf of the Communists.

Almost every week some members of the Senate and the House call for a more and more rapid pullout of American forces by President Nixon, but not one of them imposes any condition on the enemy to take the action necessary to assure peace in South Vietnam. Timetables are being specified by senators for the withdrawal of the American troops, yet no stipulation is made that the enemy must also remove its military forces from South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, there is much talk about a "coalition government" being set up which could replace the present government in South Vietnam and make it easy for North Vietnam to move in and assume command. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird recently stated President Nixon's policy as follows:

"We hold firmly to a single objective for Vietnam: Permitting the people of South Vietnam freely to determine their own destiny. We want peace as speedily as possible, but we cannot acquiesce to a peace that denies self-determination to the South Vietnamese."

The advocates of peace at any cost would, in effect, allow the South Vietnamese government to be destroyed. Yet it has mobilized a large army, and what some members of Congress seem to be asking is that this force surrender to the enemy.

DIFFERENT WORDING

A Gallup poll recently showed 52 per cent approval when the question concerned "the way President Nixon is handling the situation in Vietnam." One wonders how much bigger the percentage would be if an answer were obtained on the following question:

"Do you want the United States to surrender in Vietnam, and thereby ignore the sacrifices that have been made by tens of thousands of troops of the United States and our allies who have been killed or wounded in an effort to protect the right of peoples to select their own form of government?"

All the so-called "antiwar" statements being made inside and outside the Congress

are unquestionably encouraging the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong to prolong the war. If this fact, which has been stated by high authorities, were to be reiterated and made plain to the American people, they would surely not support any resolution in Congress that could mean surrender. For to do so would tell the Soviets and the Red Chinese that America would no longer help countries to resist aggression whether in Asia, Europe or Latin America.

AN HONORABLE SOLUTION TO THE WAR

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sadness, rather than one of anger, that I view the plans of some Members of the House of Representatives to keep the House in session through this night and up until the time of tomorrow's session. I certainly would not deny the right of any Member of this House to speak about a subject with which I may violently disagree, for the simple reason that this would prevent meaningful dialog in the House Chamber and would censor the legislative process that keeps the people back home informed about matters that concern them. While I would not judge the motives of the Members who are staging the all-night session, it appears to me that what is unsaid, will have far more importance and long range effect than what will be said. There is no valid reason for keeping the House in session for 22 hours after the business of the day in order to support the national strike that is taking place tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these Members in keeping the House open throughout the night will have the effect, whether intentional or not, of making it look like this legislative body is in support of attempts being made through the national strike to label the war "Nixon's War," and making it appear that we as a body favor the Communist demand that we unilaterally withdraw our troops immediately. For us to lend such support will be to take a position without regard for the safety of the American men presently in Vietnam, without regard for the blood bath that will surely follow the creation of a power vacuum on the battle field resulting from unrealistic withdrawal procedures, and without providing necessary protection of the citizens of South Vietnam.

Our President is taking the most realistic and practical approach to this war at his disposal. His actions reflect the will of the majority of the American people to de-Americanize the war. The President cannot in good conscience allow himself to be affected by the demonstrations planned for tomorrow or to allow Government policy to be made in the streets by those who bear none of the responsibilities of the alternative they choose. I therefore submit that the Congressional support for the demonstrations set for tomorrow will be to support the proposition that those persons with the loudest voices and with the best slogans will be able to determine public policy.

This is not in keeping with the legitimate processes of the democratic republic. It is anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, argument is made that to deny any person to speak on the floor of the House concerning the Vietnam war would be to deny him the right to express his views on this situation. I submit however, that these Members of Congress have been making their statements about Vietnam with freedom every day for the past number of years and I see no indication that they will not be allowed to continue to do so in the years ahead.

I support the President in his attempts to bring about an honorable and lasting solution to the war without surrender to the enemy.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, of course my topic is the same as that of many others who have spoken here and that is the subject of Vietnam. I want to make this observation.

Many of the people who are participating in the demonstration tomorrow are well intentioned. But I equally suspect that many of them are not well intentioned but that their purpose is to undermine the very security of the United States by forcing us into an impossible position in our international relations.

But I ask those who are participating to keep in mind, it is not the intention behind our actions but it is how our actions are accepted that is important. The leaders in Hanoi have made it very clear that this demonstration is being interpreted by them as support for a Communist victory in Southeast Asia.

Look for a moment at the position of the leaders in Hanoi. Their armies have not won a major battle in 3 years. Their venerated leader, Ho Chi Minh is no longer available to them to give inspiration to the people in North Vietnam, or to many sympathizers in South Vietnam. Their chief suppliers of weapons, the Chinese and the Russians, have seen fit to engage in actual combat on their adjoining borders. General Giap has admitted the loss of over 500,000 of their finest troops.

Indeed it would be a very dismal picture that presents itself for the leaders of North Vietnam. There is only one source of hope for the Communist leaders and that is the continuing demand in the United States for an immediate and complete withdrawal of American forces. Those who are participating in the demonstration tomorrow are giving the North Vietnamese the only source of hope still available to them and that is the prayer that American determination in Vietnam will collapse.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not stand for such a withdrawal—I stand behind my President and I stand behind my country. Let the leaders in North Vietnam not be misled by the noise of the few but let them be aware of the steel and strength in the hearts of the many.

OCTOBER 15 STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the demonstrations of October 15 demanding a "peace moratorium" is another one of these steps that lends heart to the enemy and undercuts the President's efforts in seeking a meaningful, honorable end to the Vietnam war. I would hope those well-meaning persons involved would seriously consider what they are doing to hurt our chances for peace, prolong the war and actually lose more American lives.

Nobody wants the war ended more than I do—or more than most Members of Congress. Students have no monopoly on a love for peace. Many of the so-called older generation have been through a war and know its horrors. But this does not mean we favor complete surrender, which seems to be the line many of the students are taking. America never has run up the white flag in the face of defeat. Neither do we sympathize with the cause of the North Vietnamese aggressors which many of the students seem to, and finally, neither do we advocate the betrayal of our allies.

As President Nixon so ably stated:

On October 15, many are simply saying: "I am for peace." I ardently join with all Americans in working toward that goal . . . but the road is not easy. It is not simple. There is no problem to which I have given more of my time and thought. For nine months, we have worked every day for a just end to a conflict which has been building for more than eight years. We have drastically altered the policies we inherited. We are on the road to peace. The policies we are now following reflect our own best judgment, based on exhaustive study of all the available evidence, of how to achieve that goal. To abandon that policy merely because of a public demonstration would therefore be an act of gross irresponsibility on my part.

Whether we wholeheartedly agree with it or not, there is a new direction in the war in Vietnam. Consider carefully the facts:

In 1960, at the end of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, there were only 793 Americans in South Vietnam, and in an advisory capacity only.

In 1963, when Johnson took over from the Kennedy administration, there were over 25,000 Americans in Vietnam, driving tanks, flying planes, and actively engaged in the conduct of the war.

In January 1969—8 long years later—when the Nixon administration assumed the reins of Government, there were 549,500 Americans doing the fighting in the mud and swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

Now, after less than 9 months in office, Nixon has initiated a program of turning this war over to the South Vietnamese themselves—helping them to help themselves, to defend their own country and fight their own battles—and the American troop level has been reduced to approximately 511,000, is reducing every day, and should be down to 484,000 by December 15.

The President has very substantially

reduced the number of our men who are directly exposed to the possibility of enemy casualty and that's why our casualty rates are dropping—in fact, we have comparatively few troops now exposed to enemy fire, and there will likely be only very few so subjected by the end of the year. However, the United States will probably need to maintain some support forces and Air Force strength there for some time yet.

Basically, there are three primary options in Vietnam:

First. Continue the endless-winless, vacillating conflict as during the previous 8 years,

Second. Utilize our air and other military superiority to win this war promptly, or

Third. Turn the war over to the South Vietnamese to do their own fighting and proceed with an orderly withdrawal of our troops as rapidly as possible.

While the second alternative has been my first choice and recommendation, I will support any honest effort to end this costly, deathly, destructive conflict, and I will continue to work with the Nixon administration toward such a goal. Rather than continued dissension and protest, our countrymen need to demonstrate bipartisan determination and resolve to support our national administration in seeking an honorable end to this war.

VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which would express the sense of the House that because of the unequivocal statement of the President of the United States a military victory is neither possible nor sought in Vietnam, it becomes incumbent upon us as a government to act to bring about disengagement at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, so long as doubt remained as to whether this Nation would seek an end to its engagement in Vietnam through negotiations or through a dominance of military power, it was appropriate to continue to build and utilize military forces of the United States. However, the decision of the President requires the Vietnamization of the war at the earliest possible moment. Obviously this cannot be fully accomplished with the presence of major American military units in the country. Accordingly, the resolution I have introduced would express that sense of the House. I include it herewith:

H. CON. RES. 581

Resolved, The House of Representatives of the United States takes cognizance that:

(1) It is the duty of the House of Representatives to give expression to its concerns and to so inform the Public and the President. In view of the continuing war in Vietnam, the exercise of such responsibility is the highest form of service to be performed.

(2) The war in Vietnam was caused by no one man and no one party, but it is the responsibility of all men and both parties to bring the war to an end. In the past five

years, some forty thousand American soldiers have died. Since the beginning of this year, more than eight thousand American fighting men have been killed. In light of the thousands of lives being lost, there can be no moratorium on discussion and no halt to the necessity for leadership in terminating further American participation in the combat.

(3) The President has taken a step in the right direction by his announced withdrawal of sixty thousand American troops. But this is only a small beginning to what must be done to extricate the United States from this war. At the present rate of withdrawal, American troops will be engaged in Vietnam for the next eight to ten years. The policy of the United States can no longer wait upon the pleasure of either Saigon or Hanoi.

(4) The future of South Vietnam must be shaped by the will of the South Vietnamese. The continued presence of United States military forces can only postpone the political accommodations essential to ending the conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That in the sense of the House of Representatives that, having furnished South Vietnam with an American shield for the past five years to allow for the development of its political and military capacities, the time has arrived for the people of South Vietnam to take charge of their own destiny; and be it further

Resolved, That this can be accomplished only through a more rapid withdrawal of American troops, and a commitment by the United States to fully disengage from South Vietnam, pending such reasonable interval as may be necessary to provide adequate provisions for the orderly and secure withdrawal of American troops and those who may wish to leave with them.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep concern of my colleagues about the tragedy of Vietnam. It is fair to say, I believe, that there is not one Member of this distinguished body who feels otherwise. We all have been sincerely troubled by the duration, the cost, and the thousands of lives which have been poured into that frustrating conflict.

Without a doubt, that same deep feeling is shared by millions of our fellow countrymen. Each of us has a right and an obligation to express our concern in responsible and realistic ways and to offer constructive alternatives.

It goes without saying that those planning and participating in this national demonstration of concern about the war have an obligation to assure their activities are peaceful, relevant, and restrained.

They also have an obligation, I believe, to make their objectives crystal clear and their alternatives to present policy fully understood.

I do not believe they have succeeded in this latter undertaking.

Leaders of the national protest contend their effort is not directed at President Nixon but at extracting us from Vietnam. They say that 1968 demonstrated to them they must oppose not personalities but policies.

If that is true, then frankly, I am con-

fused about the objectives of the demonstration.

As one who has been deeply concerned for a long time about our policies in Southeast Asia, I have been much more encouraged by the policies of President Nixon than by those of the previous administration.

There are fundamental differences in these policies, but they are differences which are easily obscured or forgotten.

In contrast to the previous administration, which committed 550,000 combat troops to Vietnam, President Nixon has ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield.

President Nixon has not continued to escalate the war but has offered withdrawal of U.S. and allied troops over a 12-month period.

More than 60,000 U.S. troops are already home or on their way.

He has proposed free elections organized by joint commissions under international supervision.

He has declared that we will retain no military bases in Vietnam.

He has offered to negotiate supervised cease-fires under international supervision to facilitate the process of mutual withdrawal.

He has made clear that we would settle for de facto removal of North Vietnamese troops from the South.

He has said publicly—and persuaded the Government of South Vietnam to do likewise—that we are both prepared to accept the outcome of free elections, regardless of what that outcome is.

He has announced his willingness to discuss the 10-point program of the other side along with plans put forward by the other parties to the conflict.

He has halted the bombing of North Vietnam and he has reduced the level of offensive combat operations.

In short, the President has offered to bargain on any point except the right of the people of South Vietnam to self-determination.

He has virtually taken over many of the policies of those who demonstrated so vigorously last year against President Johnson. To that extent, many of those who protest this week will be demonstrating against their own policies.

More important than pronouncements and even unilateral actions, in my view, is the growing array of undisputed evidence that these policies are having the practical effect of scaling down the war.

There can be no disputing that American troops are coming home—more than 60,000 of them by December.

It is a fact that the level of fighting has fallen off and that American, South Vietnamese, and North Vietnamese casualties are occurring at the lowest rates in years.

The enemy has lowered the level of its combat troops in South Vietnam by 25,000 to 35,000.

And, infiltration from the North to the South is down by two-thirds this year as compared to last year.

These are important facts which no fair-minded person can ignore in a care-

ful and calm review of the situation. They are the most encouraging signs I have witnessed in many years.

What then do the critics of the President's policy propose as a more constructive alternative? They have not spelled out their positions clearly.

It may be they are recommending immediate and unilateral withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam—for that is the only alternative that the President has resisted.

Yet, I feel certain there are many in this body and across the Nation participating in the current demonstrations against the war who would not—or at least who have not in the past—endorsed this drastic step.

There are, I am sure, very few Members of the minority party who would support such a precipitous change of course.

And, as David Broder of the Washington Post reminded us today, the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago last fall specifically said the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender, or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

Mr. Broder went on to make some interesting observations about that policy statement which bear on this discussion. He said:

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they would explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull-out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent troops in. Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

We are, I believe, in a very critical period concerning the war. The decisions the President will make during the next few months—and only he can make them—will go a long way toward determining the value of our 6-year investment in Vietnam and the course of our future policy in Southeast Asia.

But it is clear also that we are in a critical period of domestic turmoil concerning Vietnam—approaching national hysteria, caused perhaps partly by the first signs of a change in policy in 6 years.

So, we must pick our way very carefully through this crucial time keeping in mind the long range as well as the short range results of our actions. We must strive to rely wherever possible on the guideposts of sober judgment and experience.

Some of that valuable guidance, I believe, was contained in a speech last Saturday by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont, who embodies the standards I just mentioned.

Although he has long been a critic of the war, Senator AIKEN called on the Nation to give President Nixon more time to work out an orderly withdrawal of American troops.

He said:

We cannot achieve instant gratification through a precipitate withdrawal of our troops. The President needs time and, I for one, will do my best to see that he gets it.

Senator AIKEN, a student of war and a man who long ago established his desire for peace, clearly believes President

Nixon has changed our policy in Vietnam and is on the right course.

We heard similar counsel from former Vice President Humphrey.

He said:

We have only one President at a time. One of the worst things we could do is undermine the President. I think the President is proceeding along the right path.

The practical, commonsense logic in those simple statements is perfectly clear to me. We have only one President at a time and I do not believe in tying his hands in negotiating an honorable settlement.

Statements and resolutions which seek to set a time limit on such things as troop withdrawals or which would impose other artificial restraints on the President certainly do not recognize these basic considerations.

In my view, they are really just disguised arguments in favor of immediate and unilateral U.S. withdrawal. Setting the deadline a year or 6 months in advance does little to change that fact.

Whatever the target date, it is obvious to the opposition they need only to bide their time and the effect will be the same. If this is what the sponsors of such resolutions really mean, why postpone the inevitable disaster for 6 months or a year? Why waste another American life or spend another American dollar? Why not face the chaos that must follow such a policy today?

I do not pretend to understand the motives or the complex logic of those advocating this position.

I am clear in my own mind, however, that this approach makes no sense in terms of well-considered, long-range American policy.

Much more reasonable, I believe, is a very brief resolution cosponsored by a bipartisan group of 113 House Members, myself among them. It states very simply:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date.

The true, bipartisan nature of this resolution is illustrated by looking at its sponsors among the Michigan congressional delegation; in addition to myself and fellow Republican EDWARD HUTCHINSON, there are three members of the other party, Representatives JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., and MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

Writing in the Washington Star last Sunday columnist Carl T. Rowan made this interesting and I believe accurate assessment of the President's efforts in Vietnam:

President Nixon has taken a more conciliatory stand on the Vietnam war than almost any American would have dreamed a year ago.

Any fair-minded observer must admit that it is Nixon who has made the concession to peace and that it is the Communists who have remained obdurate—except for a possible silent decision in Hanoi to let the scale of fighting subside.

Anyone with any knowledge of the situa-

tion knows that Mr. Nixon is right when he says that the flamboyant American protests that are coming up soon will only encourage North Vietnam to remain stubborn and hopeful of total American capitulation.

The President is clearly the only man who can negotiate the meaningful and lasting settlement of this tragic war which we all so earnestly seek. My prayers, my hopes, and my support are with him in that difficult endeavor.

MORATORIUM

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear as we study the facts as they have been presented to us with respect to the war in Vietnam that we sent our men there on an impossible mission. We have never decided either formally or informally to give our men what they needed to have any reasonable chance of success.

And we as a body apparently never thought this conflict was important enough to declare war, although the Constitution of the United States says if we are to go to war, that we, as a body, ought to convene and make that decision. However, we have not seen fit to do so.

Mr. Speaker, should we now stand up and tell others how they ought to behave after we have ignored our own constitutional responsibility. We have heard many statements here today but I have not heard any stand up and say that they think the Congress was wrong in sitting on the fence for 8 long years without making such a decision. And we continue to sit on the fence today.

Mr. Speaker, this has been the longest war in our history, a war which is an undeclared conflict. We have lost 40,000 men. We have expended \$110 billion. We have knocked all of our other national priorities out of whack. We have experienced higher and higher taxes, higher interest rates, and inflation as a result of this tragic war in Vietnam. We talk about it but what action have we taken as a body—what formal action?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which was passed in 1964. However, I do not think anyone would argue that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was meant to authorize the massive U.S. commitment that occurred in Vietnam. This conflict spiraled out of control, and we here in the Congress share the responsibility for failing to face up to this issue long ago.

So I think it is proper and responsible for students and for other concerned citizens to pause for a time tomorrow to reflect upon how it is that this country could drift into a war without it being declared by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am going to appear on three college campuses to discuss the questions of how this war came about, how we might wind it up, and what the lessons are for the future. I hope to insure that the discussion I participate in will be rationale and thoughtful and nonviolent. But I think these are the kinds of a question that the country

has every reason to consider at this point—particularly when we in the Congress still appear to have little stomach for facing up to the war.

DEBATE OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there have been some questions raised as to whether those of us who propose to speak here tonight on Vietnam will be able to do so. It is stated that an effort will be made to adjourn the House before the time for special orders. Some on the minority side have indicated their support for such an effort, and I should like to call the attention of those Members who question our right to debate to a statement made in another body on January 5, 1951, by the distinguished and eminent Senator from Ohio, the late Robert A. Taft. This is what the Senator said:

During recent years the theory has developed that there shall be no criticism of the foreign policy of the Administration, that any such criticism is an attack on the unity of the nation, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that it sabotages any idea of a bipartisan foreign policy for the national benefit. I venture to state that this proposition is a fallacy and a very dangerous fallacy threatening the very existence of the nation.

Then he goes on to say—

As I see it, Members of Congress, and particularly Members of the Senate, have a constitutional obligation to re-examine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States. If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of the country, but even its future existence.

The right, the responsibility for free debate in this House, is well stated by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those who are thinking of adjourning the House before the debate begins will think again and let those of us who want to debate the foreign policy of the United States do so tonight.

CUTBACK IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly disturbed to read that this administration's actions may force the cutback of numerous research programs involved in fighting against and finding cures for heart disease, cancer, diabetes, and lung disease.

To use the words of the Washington Post, the planned administration cuts, if applied, "will practically wipe out the chronic disease control program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

This is a sad situation, to say the least. We can fund chemical warfare research, studies for more missiles and more tanks, but we cannot find money to fight disease.

The five programs to be eliminated, according to HEW, are those in heart disease and stroke, cancer, arthritis and diabetes, neurologic and sensory diseases—such as Parkinson's disease and multiple sclerosis—and respiratory disease—such as pulmonary emphysema.

Even more disturbing is that these planned cutbacks, required because of the administration's order to cut \$3.5 billion from the budget, come on top of news that the National Institutes of Health is forced to cut funds for new medical research grants by some 10 percent and grant renewals by 5 percent. I can fully understand why medical colleges and hospitals are upset. I share their concern.

To quote Newsweek magazine of September 22:

To be against medical research these days seems akin to opposing motherhood or the (American) flag. But that is the position the Nixon administration apparently put itself last week when the U.S. National Institutes of Health said it might have to close down 19 of its 93 clinical research centers across the U.S.

To the senior citizen with arthritis or to the young boy or girl with multiple sclerosis, it is difficult to tell them that they have second priority after a new nuclear aircraft carrier or a supersonic airplane. This Congress should make up its mind as to which is most important. We have a responsibility to our Nation's citizens first and foremost.

DISSENT CARRIES A RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) is timely.

The letter from Pham Van Dong wishing the "fall offensive" success is disturbing.

I believe strongly in the constitutionally granted right to dissent and protest. I cannot support any effort to subvert the right of free people to freely express their views.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must also share the view expressed by Mr. MORTON on the need for caution.

I say this having stated my opposition to both a moratorium on debate regarding Vietnam and one aimed at breaking the President of the United States.

Expressions of dissent do not take place in isolation. An expression in the United States no longer sways the audience solely at the right. Modern communications today carry a message across the country and around the world.

Thus dissent carries a heavy responsibility lest it be misunderstood or misrepresented. Our process of self-analysis by which we arrive at a reasoned judgment has apparently been misread by the Premier of North Vietnam.

This tragic turn of events has placed upon all who wish for peace the heavy burden of making sure their expressions are not calculated to inhibit the search

for peace by the one man who can bring peace, President Nixon.

As David Broder of the Washington Post wrote this morning:

In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

Tonight, tomorrow, and in the future these words are worth heeding and remembering.

BE THE FIRST ON YOUR BLOCK TO KILL OR MAIM ANOTHER HUMAN BEING

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is now fairly common knowledge that certain industries operate in a totally irresponsible manner constantly. The well-being of the public seems meaningless to them as they pollute, profiteer, and pour dangerous products into the hands of millions of consumers.

Our auto insurance industry is a coast-to-coast scandal. Drug companies spend \$2 on advertising for every Government-given dollar they lay out for research. Papermaking operations vie with steel mills for the title of worst polluters. Yet the unquestioned champion of cumulative corporate irresponsibility has to be our auto industry. A damning indictment is being created as more facts come to light.

Automobiles are not only constructed to become obsolete in ever-shorter periods of use, but are deliberately built in such a manner as to crumple at the slightest impact. Collisions at speeds as low as 5 miles per hour have been proven to cause extensive damage. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety conducted tests which reveal this and more. Striking at a speed only equal to that of a man walking caused damage ranging from \$134 to \$200. At 10 miles per hour damage varied from \$485 to \$814. Bumpers which are mainly decorative and sheet metal a person can bend with their hands are major causes of such phenomena. Impact-absorbing devices seem to be as foreign to Detroit as safety and economy.

Billions of dollars in repair costs result and are passed on to the driving public. Most damage results from such low-speed contacts. Of the overall dollar insurance losses 39 percent emanate from claims of \$200 or less; 64 percent from claims of \$400 or less. Technology is immediately at hand to rectify this appalling situation. Yet, all America's drivers continue to receive are millions of chromeplated, overpowered, gas-gulping coffins on wheels.

Which brings us to the next item of our indictment, in the form of a flood of so-called muscle cars. Masses of horsepower on light chassis, these motorized missiles are responsible for 56 percent more accident losses than standard cars. Insurance rates on them are about to rise 50 percent, a sure indication of

their deadline. Why must we be menaced by such overpowered bullets, possessing horsepower far exceeding normal requirements? Listen to their names, which callously appeal to the most violent, repressed human instincts—Mustang Mach I, Cougar Eliminator, Road Runner, Tempest, Cyclone, Charger, and others.

Named after violent storms, projectiles and vicious animals, they puff the egos of any person, especially younger ones, who, once behind the wheel of such a cannonball on wheels, feel free to use our roads and streets as horsepower proving grounds.

Thousands of Americans are being crushed and maimed by these blasting monsters. A lightly constructed body on oversized wheels and a massive engine makes no sense. Demands for style above engineering have produced an ever-lower auto silhouette, but at a terrible price. Instead of weight placement up front, where power is concentrated, it is centered mainly at the rear of autos, with disastrous results. The entire package, from name, build, useless chrome appendages, and ads pitched at a minimal mentality, add up to one message.

Be a racing driver. Hold your own Indianapolis 500 race. See how fast you can go. Floor that pedal. Be the first one on your block to murder or maim another human being. Wow. Does anyone not wonder whether it makes sense to pour these juggernauts onto our highways?

As if this were not enough, we have the looming shadow of air pollution, more than half of which is caused by internal combustion engines. Antipollution devices exist which are increasingly effective. Where are they? Ask the manufacturers. Make them install such controls. Not if the Justice Department has anything to say about it. It refused to take these companies to court after evidence had been accumulated showing they may have conspired to suppress development and installation of such devices. Surely, a thorough airing of the issue would have benefited the public.

So there we have it up to now. Remember a few of these gems when next the automakers shed crocodile tears over foreign imports. When cars are made deliberately flimsy, dangerous, and pollution-prone, can the driving public be blamed? When they are uneconomical to operate and dangerous to drive, can there be any consumer faith in specious advertising claims? We are choking on these monsters, as a despairing effort to travel in any urban area will prove. Yet there is not a scintilla of responsibility of awareness of this situation on the part of the manufacturers. All they can do effectively is raise prices, which all of them did quite recently. Give a passing thought to these arguments next time one of those little whizz-bangs zips past you, crunches your heap, or leaves you behind in a cloud of zesty fumes.

What is good for Detroit is beginning to be bad for America. America cannot change too much further to accommodate Detroit. We simply cannot absorb further impacts of this sort indefinitely.

In closing, I offer the following figures.

Last year 55,200 Americans died on our highways; 2 million Americans were injured. Why?

VIETNAM SOLUTION—BIPARTISAN SELLOUT

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the debate over the so-called moratorium, I have taken note of two significant facts, which I believe it well to call to the attention of the House once again.

First, there seems to be absolutely no disagreement between the President and the peaceniks over the question of American withdrawal from Vietnam. The disagreement seems to be only whether such retreat should be a hasty abandonment of our allies, as a result of leftist pressure, or a more sedate retreat after a semblance of face-saving negotiation. The decision to forgo victory seems to have been made.

American prisoners held by Hanoi have been abandoned. Korea taught us that there is no way to recover prisoners short of victory.

Second, the raucous voices of a tiny minority, totally without regard for the consequence of their activities, are the only ones who have been heard. Even in this House, those who have announced their intention to conduct an all-night session number less than 10 percent of the membership. The voices of the great majority of Americans, who are loyal and patriotic citizens, have not been heard. The voices of our fightingmen overseas, whose blood will pay for any delay won by the peaceniks, have not been heard. The voices of Americans who are captives of the enemy cannot be heard.

This evening's newspapers carry interesting comments, truly relevant to the debate over the so-called moratorium.

In order that our colleagues—and through the activities of this House this evening, the American people—may observe the thinking of these other Americans, I call them to the attention of all Members.

A story from Saigon describes "politicians who sound like Hanoi radio" and "well-meaning but awfully uninformed students" and "ivory tower doves would not dirty their hands over here." These are the views of Americans engaged in combat with the enemy.

Twelve letters to the editor in tonight's Star show the temper of the Washington people. Their vote is 11 to 1 against the show of disloyalty, which they recognize for what it is. The one favorable letter plainly indicates the confused passion of its writer and his aim to obtain other people's money for his favorite projects, regardless of the cost to decent citizens.

A wire service story quotes Hanoi radio, the North Vietnam Communist newspaper, and the Vietcong leader in Paris—all effusively praising the anti-war activities of their allies in the United States.

The same newspaper carries an inter-

view with responsible field commanders, indicating that the enemy is beaten in Vietnam—that victory on the battlefield is in sight. But in Washington the serviceman's enemies seek to mobilize public opinion for surrender.

Mr. Speaker, I include these news clipping as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1969]

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

SIR: We have some things in common with tomorrow's protesters. We agree that the war in Vietnam is tragic and unfortunate. But all wars are. We, also, would like to "get out of Vietnam," but we'd like them out, too.

We'll "protest" tomorrow, but ours will be less noticeable and press coverage will be sparse—no banners, no speeches, no marches or sit-ins—we'll be too busy with the responsibilities of life. Those of us that are students will go to school and study hard; the workers will be on their jobs putting in a good day's work and the housewives will perform their chores—all of us with a bit more enthusiasm tomorrow.

Tomorrow isn't our day—ours is coming next month at the polls, and in the November following that will be upon us sooner than the _____, _____, and _____ might realize.

WILLIAM J. HOF.

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: I suggest to the peace demonstrators that on their National Day of Meditation they mediate on the following:

The North Vietnamese have killed over thirty-five thousand Americans and the peace demonstrators are responsible for needless thousands killed by encouraging the enemy to prolong this war instead of entering into meaningful negotiations.

Isn't it time the peace demonstrators refocused their demands and insisted that the North Vietnamese stop fighting and insist that the North Vietnamese withdraw from South Vietnam (as we do) so this war will end?

HARVEY L. HUSTON.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

SIR: Since most of the people who demonstrate tomorrow will be flying the colors or flags of the Viet Cong and, yes, the Communists, could you please suggest to all the quiet Americans who love their country and their President, no matter what their politics, that they fly the American flag wherever they can.

MRS. R. C. BACON.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.

SIR: So tomorrow is the day set for university students and some lawmakers to demonstrate their opposition to our continued involvement in the Vietnam war. The noted Senator from New York says that the nation will be impressed, I promise you that I, for one, will not be impressed. How is it possible for our nation to put a man on the moon one year and the next year quit the fight for freedom in Asia. Are we a nation of cowards? Do the children of the heroes of World War II really believe that the nation will stand for such a dishonorable peace?

MRS. WM. ROSNER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

SIR: For the uninformed, who are throwing themselves so enthusiastically into the so-called Vietnam Moratorium, I feel only pity—pity that anyone could be so uninformed. For the political prostitutes, such as _____ and _____, I feel nothing but contempt.

JOHN S. PERILLOUX.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

SIR: The proper name for the demonstration tomorrow is "Support Aggression Day."

L. COGGESHALL.

ADELPHI, MD.

SIR: Sen. _____ has made a fine suggestion for all patriotic Americans. Demonstrate

in favor of our armed forces (and against Hanoi).

Drive with your headlights on all day tomorrow.

CARLTON C. HOLMES.

SILVER CREEK, N.Y.

SIR: To keep the "Vietnam Moratorium" as much as possible fair and square, I think the marchers should carry as many signs and make as many speeches denouncing the Communist aggression that already existed in Vietnam prior to our going to the aid of the South Vietnamese as they will against our intervention.

Since a march is to be made on the White House, I believe the march, in all fairness, should go a stone's throw farther and demonstrate before the Soviet embassy with placards denouncing the refusal of the Russians to try to influence their brothers, the Viet Cong, from further aggression in the South of Vietnam. Can't these stupid marchers, past and present, realize that we wouldn't have gone to Vietnam in the first place if the Viet Cong hadn't started the war?

S. V. S.

SIR: There is a wide agreement that Vietnam is a mess. Indeed the belief that war is always a mess is not a recent discovery. Most people want an acceptable out and no one more than the President of the United States. He is under enormous pressure to solve the number one problem. The protest marchers only add pounds to the tons of this pressure.

The marchers do little constructive for the United States except provide the kicks of excitement and help fill in news space and TV time. They are, however, worth several divisions of troops marching for Hanoi. The image of a violently divided people, coupled with well-meaning U.S. troop withdrawals, must convince the Communists that time is on their side. They therefore sit at the Paris poker table with a pat hand while the killing goes on, waiting for us to toss in our cards.

G. W. HALLGREN.

SIR: Should wanting peace with all your heart make you lose your head attempting to gain it?

Crosby Noyes, in the Oct. 9 Star made clear the awful burden the peacemongers are placing on our soldiers and our country.

It is incredible that responsible people can truly believe that bringing our troops home immediately will bring peace to anyone, ourselves included. Or, are the congressmen, governors, mayors, etc., who support tomorrow's protest playing politics in its worst form?

M. L.

SIR: Those who dissent, including congressmen, claim they oppose the war. Sincerely, do you know of anyone who doesn't? We may even safely include our President and those three who preceded him. The sixty-four-dollar question is: Do they oppose it with meaningful effect? The sad fact, which is at the root of this trouble, is that they actually oppose, above every other consideration, existing policy with reference to the conduct of the war; for all practical purposes it must be ended their way, and no other will do.

Even if this were the most immoral war ever, by compromising the situation, they forfeit the right to sit in judgment on any question of morality and must bear their rather heavy share of responsibility in this situation. Their hands are not clean.

P. J. LEVINGTON.

SIR: Tomorrow's march is more than a march by those who participate. It reflects also the desires of the silent Americans, those that have lost a son, a husband or a loved one in a conflict which should not be.

It is more than a march against war; it is a march against poverty, disease, and ignorance. The march is for those that face death in the poverty areas of America as well as those that face death on a battlefield.

This march seeks solutions for today's problems, solutions which build a bright future for those that have a future, and open a door for those that seek, in faith and works, the future.

In a time of national disillusionment concerning the illicit Vietnam war and living conditions of 30 million Americans, this is a much needed march. Let us hope this message is heard.

JAMES M. WOLF.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1969]

HANOI HAILS WAR MORATORIUM, SEES PRESSURE PUT ON NIXON

SAIGON.—Radio Hanoi today hailed the Vietnam Moratorium protests in the United States and said it had put the Nixon administration in "a very difficult and confused situation."

The broadcast said the demonstrations show that the Communist fight in Vietnam was "for peace, justice and the right cause."

"The present autumn struggle wave of the American people is putting the Nixon administration into a very difficult and confused situation," the broadcast said. "It has uncovered all of the bluffing and treacherous methods of the Nixon administration on the Vietnam question."

"We believe solidly that the autumn struggle wave of the American people will bring magnificent successes."

SAME THEME SOUNDED

A Hanoi broadcast yesterday sounded the same theme.

The broadcast heard in Saigon quoted Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, chairman of the Vietnam Committee for Unity with the American people, as saying:

"The Vietnamese people heartily welcomes and entirely supports the October wave of struggle."

"The whole world is standing on your side and acting in coordination with you."

(The Associated Press quoted North Vietnam's Communist party newspaper Nhan Dan as saying that "the struggle of the American people extends so deep that it is supported even by senators and congressmen in Nixon's own party.")

Viet Cong agents meanwhile infiltrated Saigon's central market today and passed out leaflets urging the South Vietnamese to hold anti-war demonstrations to coincide with the Moratorium in the United States tomorrow.

CEASE-FIRE URGED

Police sources said the leaflets called for a cease-fire and a coalition government to include the Viet Cong.

The government sent soldiers in full combat gear to the central market and to smaller markets in the Cholon section with orders to use "strong measures" against citizens who try to demonstrate.

In Paris, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, head of the Viet Cong's provisional revolutionary government delegation to the Paris peace talks, addressed an open letter to American youth planning to take part in the Moratorium.

She denounced what she called "contradictions between the words and the acts" of President Nixon and repeated her delegation's demands for a rapid and total withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces and for the formation of a coalition government in Saigon.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1969]

GENERALS SEE REDS SLIPPING

(By Ott Kelly)

The Vietnam war is "gradually winding down"—not because the enemy wants it that way but because he has no other choice, the American general responsible for areas around Saigon says.

"He is just being screwed into the ground and he doesn't seem to be able to do anything about it," Lt. Gen. Julian Ewell, a commander of the II Field Force, said yesterday at the annual meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army.

"The enemy is thrashing around, trying to find some initiative, no matter how small," Ewell said. "We are not only beating his brains out but pulling the rug out from under him at the same time."

CHANGED ON READING PRESS

Ewell is home on leave from Vietnam and he came home with his mind made up that he would not get trapped into the optimistic comments on the war that hang over the heads of so many other political and military leaders.

"But when, after reading some of the informed comments from the press, I decided I might as well say it like I see it," he said.

"The coalescing of a real favorable trend is very recent," he said. "It wasn't until June and July that pacification took a real spurt. It was not until after the Communists made a real effort (in late July and early August) and fell on their kazoos that we sensed their deterioration."

"It was not until September and October that we saw how bad off they were."

The panel discussion featured, besides Ewell, three other men long associated with the Army's role in Vietnam: Lt. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, until recently commander of American forces in the northern areas of South Vietnam and now deputy chief of staff of the Army; Maj. Gen. George S. Eckhardt, former commander of U.S. forces in the Mekong Delta and now commandant of the Army War College; and George Jacobson, assistant to Gen. Creighton W. Abrams for pacification in South Vietnam.

JACOBSON BACKS VIEW

Ewell's optimistic assessment of the situation in Vietnam was reinforced by Jacobson.

"The Viet Cong has not only given up trying to win the war militarily but they have given up trying to win it ideologically as well," he said.

In trying to convert the peasants to their viewpoint, he said, the Communists are using "sheer terror."

A careful kind of American withdrawal from Vietnam is now possible, the four men agreed, because of the military success achieved there in the last four years.

In a sense, their message was directed to those who plan to demonstrate against the American involvement in the war tomorrow.

"Our progress is so substantial as to make possible the first steps in the withdrawal," Stilwell said in opening the panel discussion. Later, he added:

"In 1965, all the trends were wrong. Today, as far as the eye can see, all the trends are right. Nothing can reverse these trends except precipitate action that destroys the government of South Vietnam."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 14, 1969]

HAVEN'T SHED A NOSEBLEED—"OTHER WAR" IN THE UNITED STATES RILES GI'S

(By Don Tate)

SAIGON, October 14.—As tomorrow's war "moratorium" will demonstrate, there are two Vietnam wars—the one Americans fight in Vietnam, and the one Americans fight in the U.S. Observers here say the decisive battlegrounds is in the U.S.

They point out that short of a highly successful Communist offensive, which is extremely unlikely, or a dramatic allied strategy change, such as renewed bombing of North Vietnam, the killing war in South Vietnam is apt to rock along in its fight-lull-fight rhythm much as it has been, at least until many more U.S. troops are withdrawn.

Meanwhile, the war to win American pub-

lic opinion and, particularly, the mind of Richard M. Nixon, is waxing hotter. What happens in the U.S. will determine what happens here. As the President warns Americans not to buckle and run, protesters prepare to hit the streets, many of them demanding immediate, unilateral withdrawal of all American troops. That translates here as "bugout."

GI DISDAIN "BUGOUT"

It is difficult to find an American soldier here who wants to leave Vietnam that way, or as one GI puts it, "with our tails dragging." It is difficult to find one—even among those most disgusted with the war—who wishes simply to abandon the South Vietnamese to a Communist bloodbath.

It is difficult to find one who thinks the value of the American word would be worth a dime anywhere in the world if they did, or that a humiliating U.S. defeat by a blustering Communist midget would do anybody but the Communists any good.

These consequences are apparent to most Americans here, and they are not acceptable. It is largely a matter of national backbone. Most express hope that President Nixon sticks to seek a reasonable solution to the war.

There are, of course, many critics of war here. They charge that a number of war critics in the U.S. are using the same tactics Hanoi has shown—the more you give them the more they demand, and they both demand total, immediate and unconditional everything.

In the two wars—one group of Americans is convinced of the rightness and necessity of bringing this bitter war to a conclusion by presenting a united front to Hanoi, the other protesting group is more or less convinced the only way out of Vietnam is to get out fast regardless of consequences.

MYSTERY IN VIETNAM

There is often the feeling here that the war is only a secondary feature to the show of exposed nerves going on in the U.S. What the war has done to the U.S. is the biggest mystery of all here.

"It seems like any American who ever wanted to protest anything has found his cause in the Vietnam war", one veteran analyst contends, "and yet 95 per cent of them have suffered little direct personal hardship because of the war."

"You hear so much of the war-weary American, and how exhausted he is by the war. Yet this exhaustion of the mightiest power on earth is a relative thing. It hasn't been bombed, or invaded, or lived under the Communists a single day. It's manpower loss has been a drop in the bucket compared to that of either North or South Vietnam, and its suffering has been a thousand times less. Many Americans would hardly know the war was going on if it wasn't for newspapers and TV. Suppose Americans had to face what the South Vietnamese people have yet to face? America's exhaustion is a self-induced state of mind, composed mostly of confusion."

One ranked American, with invested years and effort in Vietnam, condemned some of the ranting protesters as the "most confused of all."

WEARY OF "POPPING OFF"

"Soldiers do the dying," he said, "and these others do the popping off. I'm tired of hearing these so-sure people who haven't shed a nosebleed in this war scream pig this and obscene that and run around protesting for the hell of it."

"I'm tired of hearing what politicians who sound like Hanoi radio demand, what well-meaning but awfully uninformed students demand, what ivory-tower doves who wouldn't dirty their hands over here demand. I'm weary of hearing how much Sen. (J. William) Fulbright, D., Ark. wants out. We all want out. We all protest the war. We

all want peace. But not by saying: 'Here Hanoi, take 17 million people. We'll pretend we were never involved. We quit.'"

Many here feel that some of the protesters would do well to focus their moral wrath less on President Nixon and more on the Communists.

It is the Communists, they stress, who are killing Americans. It is the Communists who butchered, as a matter of policy, the civilians of Hue and so many other places, and it is the Communists who will murder methodically thousands more Vietnamese if the U.S. totally, immediately and unconditionally abandons them, as many protesters advocate.

To Americans who have put in their time here, it is not good enough to dismiss blandly such realities with an: "Oh, well, it is up to the Vietnamese to work out their own problems."

Many here, eyewitnesses to the war, have become anti-war in the truest sense, but they have also become resolutely anti-bugout.

THE DOVE GAME: BAD NEWS FOR PEACE

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Evening Star published October 9 came to my attention and I thought it appropriate to put it in the RECORD and comment on it on this eve of the so-called moratorium exercise.

The Star correctly points out that the flood of resolutions setting deadlines for withdrawals, and specifying certain conditions for the Government of South Vietnam add up to an almost hysterical clamor. This is surely not a good or favorable stance for the leader of the free world to take. I agree with the Star's concluding paragraph and point it out to my colleagues as a matter of urgency. I am as desirous of peace with honor as anyone in this Hall. Creating a panic or crisis atmosphere is no way to win this goal. The editorial follows:

THE DOVE GAME

There's a new fad these days up on Capitol Hill. It's a game in which the contestants seek to out-dove one another by issuing directives to the President on how and when to get out of Vietnam.

Everybody's doing it. Senator Goodell was first on the bandwagon with his bill that would cut off funds for troops in Vietnam as of December 1, 1970. Then along came Senators Church and Hatfield with a "sense of the Senate" resolution calling for "a more rapid withdrawal of American troops" and a solemn pledge that the United States will "fully disengage." Senator McGovern, meanwhile, was whipping up his own resolution telling the President to get a move on. And there was an entry by Senators Hughes and Eagleton calling for an end of all commitments to the present Saigon government unless Thieu and Ky institute major reforms—specified by the senators—within 60 days.

The evident motive behind these separate proposals—the desire to score political Brownie points—is not intrinsically wrong. The senators have read the polls, studied their mail and decided that the public wants an end to the war. Proposals demanding total disengagement at some unspecified early date are certainly within the area of responsible action.

But taken together with the Goodell strategy of forcing evacuation by economic strangulation, and coupled with the puppet-master philosophy implicit in the Hughes-

Eagleton proposal, the proliferation of resolutions takes on a different coloration.

The impression that comes through is that of a country verging on panic, looking for some way—any way—to get out of Vietnam and to dissolve the partnerships that exist with other nations of Southeast Asia. That is a dangerous impression to create. It is harmful to the delicate process of disengagement that is now under way. It is dangerous to the American troops that must remain until the withdrawal is complete. It is dangerous to the future of Southeast Asia. And it compounds existing dangers of future involvement of the United States in that troubled area of the globe.

OCTOBER 15 PEACE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 15, will be a big day for some, but to me it will be a day of shame.

I am sorry that we have in this country leaders who can be swayed by breezes of sentiment toward a path that can only lead to a weakening of the U.S. position in world affairs.

There is no easy way out of Vietnam. We did not get into Vietnam in a well-planned, orderly fashion. President Nixon has had only 8 months to try to unwind what took 8 years to tangle into a mess beyond description.

May I say here that I am for peace. I know from personal experience the hell and fury of war. No one wants peace more than I. No one wants peace more than President Nixon, who, for 24 hours a day, must face this great international problem.

I am not, however, for giving aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear. I am not for pulling the rug out from under the thousands of young Americans who have been sent to Vietnam on order of their country.

It is my opinion that the actions such as those planned for tomorrow are created by the stupidity of political opportunists, and the confusion created by the ignorance of amateur theorists. The cost of such actions in the past, and tomorrow, can only be measured in the lives and bodies of American men.

It is also my opinion that the war in Vietnam would have been over long ago had not such groups for the past 2 or 3 years urged Hanoi to hang on.

President Nixon did not send us into Vietnam, but he is sincerely trying to get us out. He is trying all approaches, and he is making progress. Since he has been in office American troops have come home for the first time. More will come home before the end of this year. Casualty totals are down, and hopefully will continue downward.

No matter what the approach the administration uses to end the Vietnam conflict, the results are going to be weakened by such protests as the October 15 peace moratorium, the November march on Washington, and the November and December moratoriums.

Those who support the protest set for tomorrow seem to ignore the obvious—they are playing into the hands of the enemy. It is Hanoi, not Washington, who

will benefit tomorrow. It is Hanoi, not Washington, who will gain prestige, and, most of all, bargaining power at the Paris peace talks. The moratorium will be a valued addition to the North Vietnamese propaganda arsenal.

I urge students to go to classes and to study tomorrow, instead of giving aid and comfort to the enemy—taxpayers are working hard to help pay for their educations. We have schools and colleges for the express purpose of educating our youth. Campuses were not established as political entities.

I urge teachers and professors to stand before their classes tomorrow as brave, patriotic Americans and to teach as usual. We are paying them for teaching, not demonstrating and rioting.

I think it should be recorded that those who are participating are toward the left in our society and do not represent mainstream America.

The moratorium was called by a newly organized Vietnam Coordinating Committee which was formed, I am told, by workers in the presidential campaigns of Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

Although they claim the militant groups are not the leaders, and that this will be a peaceful occasion, militants will be there, and who knows what the results? The protests may by no means remain low-keyed.

Furthermore, the October 15 protest has the endorsement of such militants as the baby doctor, Dr. Benjamin Spock, who no doubt may be seeing some of his "babies" in action and perhaps will nudge them along if they do not follow "the book." Spock too, is working on plans for the November 14 "march against death" for Washington.

Senator MCCARTHY also said he would take part actively, and I understand that Senator MCGOVERN will be the main speaker at one of the rallies.

Who started the plans for tomorrow? Dave Hawk, a national coordinator of the Moratorium Committee, credits its beginning to Jerry Grossman, a businessman member of the Massachusetts Peace Action Council who was active in Senator MCCARTHY's 1968 campaign.

Hawk has said:

We are introducing the war as the focal issue. Our total purpose in being is to end the war. We are demonstrating that the sentiment is already there. This will be the most sustained and evolved movement in history.

No doubt the antiwar demonstrations in Chicago last week will carry over into tomorrow's gatherings. Organized by the Revolutionary Youth Movement, the Chicago plans did not call for quiet and nonviolence. Mark Rudd now heads the Revolutionary Youth Movement which he formed after a split in the militant Students for a Democratic Society—SDS. "Bring the war home" has been their theme.

These protestors claim they want to convince President Nixon that the majority of Americans want to end the war. I have news for them. All Americans want the war to end.

But, all Americans do not want us to turn our backs on a commitment and run out on responsibility.

We are loyal people and we are brave

when it comes to protecting freedom and our Nation from threats.

Another theme of the new groups who will protest tomorrow is that they are not necessarily antiadministration, nor anti-Nixon, nor antiestablishment. Their actions, however, speak louder than their words. If they wanted to be helpful and if they really wanted peace, they would do nothing to hinder the progress we are now making.

I am convinced that President Nixon will not be intimidated by these politically misguided leftists, just as he maintains the dignity of his office in confrontations with pacifists and militants who try pressure measures through arousing public sentiment.

The antiwar protests will not influence this Vietnam policy.

They will not end the war. They will not create peace. They will serve only to hinder and harm. Nothing the protestors say and do, however, will cause our President to sacrifice abroad what he considers to be the best interest of the United States. He will not let threats and blackmail overrule reason and patriotism. He has all the facts about Vietnam, and he knows the score there and here.

Since the President is trying very hard to end the war, and since he is the only person in the United States with the power to do so, it really seems ridiculous for these groups to attack him. They are, in a sense, trying to destroy the one channel to their goal—if their goal is really peace.

The Moratorium Committee's expressed purpose is "to maximize pressure to end the war by encouraging a broad cross section of Americans to work against the war."

If I were a student, I would walk into my class tomorrow with pride in America. I would not be counted as a protestor. As a Congressman I will be here on the floor of the House of Representatives doing what the people of the Second District of Tennessee elected me to do—represent them—not demonstrate.

Statesmanship speaks for itself, perhaps more in this matter than in other situations.

There are times when we must think of America above all else—above party, above personal gain, and personal ambition. I think Senator MIKE MANSFIELD illustrated this a few days ago on a national television interview. Having seen the battlefields of Vietnam, as I have, he said:

I think the President is doing everything he can, according to the best advice he can get, to get out of Vietnam. It is not a partisan issue. It is something we must all try to work toward a solution of and I am hopeful that it can be accomplished in the not too distant future, though I am not too encouraged by the events up to this time.

Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, voicing praise for President Nixon's peace efforts, said he "is proceeding along the right path" and "has made some progress" toward peace. He also said:

We only have one President at a time, and I think the worst thing we can do is try to undermine the efforts of the President.

The organizers of the moratorium claim that President Nixon has taken enough time to settle the war. They say they have waited long enough and have decided to strike up the old antiwar demonstrations once again. The truth of the matter is that they have been planning for October 15 since spring. They organized a staff who has been raising funds and organizing campuses throughout the country for months.

Now there are those among us who would have the United States announce a definite timetable for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. That would merely be telling Hanoi to just wait a little while and we will be completely out of there and it will be yours to conquer and to keep. It would give Hanoi little reason to make concessions. It would be necessary only for Hanoi's delegation in Paris to sit out the interval until the deadline.

Why would Hanoi want to cooperate in peace talks if they knew we would be gone from Vietnam in 12 or x number of months. They would need only to wait us out and take South Vietnam by default.

As you know, Secretary of State Rogers said this weekend that the President does have "a schedule" for troop withdrawals which "may vary" with events and that he "contemplates the complete removal of the troops in Vietnam," but "he does not plan to announce it to the enemy."

Secretary Rogers mentioned that while the President "has carried out his promise to deescalate" the war, "the dissent in the country seems to be accelerating" even though "we have made every concession that it has been suggested we make in the past 9 months."

In editorial comment the Wall Street Journal gave these words well worth repeating:

The Administration's evident course obviously is no happy one, but it looks a little better when you also look clearly at the alternatives. It makes more sense if you understand there is no magic combination of levers, that there is no easy way out, that this war is indeed a tragedy in the full sense of that word.

During the Johnson administration, the President had my backing on his handling of the Vietnam war. Certainly there were times when I disagreed with some minor functions, but he had my full loyalty and support when it came to supporting our boys who were carrying out the fight in Vietnam.

My feeling is that the President has far more facts and far more influence than the average politician who comes up with a new solution each week.

The Vietnam war brought President Johnson many hardships, and some say, caused his retirement from the Presidency. Neither his escalation of the war nor his final attempts to deescalate brought appreciable results.

If we compare his first 8 months—without harassment—with these first 8 months of the Nixon administration we find a great contrast to the war activity.

During the 8 months between December 1964 and July 1965 the Johnson administration began the bombing of North Vietnam, raised the authorized troop levels in Vietnam five-fold from

23,000 to 125,000, and gave the fateful go ahead to our military commanders to send American ground troops into combat. President Nixon during his first 8 months, has again reassessed the Vietnam situation and he has started bringing boys home and de-Americanizing the war.

Because I feel a great threat will ensue if we are committed to a definite timetable for troop withdrawal, I have joined other colleagues in a resolution that supports President Nixon's withdrawal program. We believe that the substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President should be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date.

The President has told us:

I do not want an American boy to be in Vietnam for one day longer than is necessary for our national interest.

While Vietnam is the big issue that overrides all others, its accompanying revolt by the new left and by the militant groups may be as dangerous a threat to our society as the war is to freedom in Asia.

For this reason, again I say that I do not condone any activity that leads us into the hands of the enemy, directly or indirectly. I realize that there will be those among tomorrow's gatherings who are sincere, though perhaps a little misguided; others just following the action, running to the sound of a noisy gang, whether it is Chicago, a California campus, or Washington, D.C.; and still others who are dangerous, hard-core militants.

The public needs to know the tactics by which militant groups can turn a nonviolent gathering into chaos and destruction. SDS, the Black Panthers, and other militants have been holding top secret strategy meetings to plan more violence. The extremists, black and white, have the common goal of destroying American society by violence.

Operating these new left groups is expensive and the money comes from many sources, mostly contributions because the organizations do not bring in any great amounts in membership dues. One example of operational costs is the \$80,000 a year necessary to run the SDS national office.

Wealthy individuals and tax exempt foundations sometimes give substantially to the new left. Student fees at some colleges go to help the new left when the students elect as their campus leaders new left activists.

These contributors are certainly not helping peace. They are making payments on the destruction of America. They should be classed with the demonstrators and rioters. I do not condone them, and I fear that they do not have respect for our great country. They are contributing to the disrespect shown by many youth, and thus many young people go in search of the new left as though they are following a new pied piper.

The administration needs our support on Vietnam now more than ever. I think Secretary of Defense Laird expressed this

very well when he told the AFL-CIO meeting in Atlantic City last week:

Make no mistake about it. To carry out his policy the President needs the support of a united people. The young Americans in Vietnam need that support. Hanoi's strategy is clear: the leaders in Hanoi expect to achieve victory by waiting for us to abandon the conflict as a result of anti-war protest in this country.

From their experience with the French and from their reading of events in the United States last year, they are encouraged to believe that they can get all they want if they merely wait long enough. The President will not bow to acts and utterances by these Americans who seek to pressure him in capitulation on Hanoi's terms. Those acts and utterances serve only to encourage the enemy to keep on fighting in South Vietnam and to keep on stalling in Paris.

Thus, it is alarming to see leaders of prominence in this Chamber, from campuses, in business, and other fields supporting the moratorium tomorrow. I feel that they are misguided in this approach. There is room for many opinions in this society without causing disruptiveness that could weaken this Nation.

When American boys are asked to give their lives we owe them our complete support, whether or not we believe in the reason for their being in a conflict.

I want to be counted among those who urged the students to remain in class and boycott the boycott. I want to be counted among those who encouraged the workers to attend to their jobs as usual. I want to be counted among those who stood faithfully behind their country, behind their President, and, most of all, behind their soldiers. My prayer and my hope are for peace. I support President Nixon in his dedication to peace with honor.

You will not find my family and me giving encouragement to the enemy and discouragement to our fighting men. This is something that all should not forget tomorrow.

ADDRESSES CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last month we held the seventh annual meeting of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society. As the founder and president, it fell my lot to develop with our staff and executive committee a program for this meeting.

As you know, the Capitol Historical Society has become a working component of Capitol Hill, providing both Congress and the public with a variety of services that help us better understand the history of our country. Anticipating an attendance of approximately 200 Washington leaders at the meeting, I endeavored to build a constructive program, and, from the remarks later, it appears we were successful.

The principal speaker was Dr. James Robertson, Jr., professor of history at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blacksburg, Va. Also on the program were Senator MARK HATFIELD and Congressman JAKE PICKLE.

In brief remarks, Mr. PICKLE spun a delightful historical yarn about a colorful piece of Texas' turbulent history. He recounted with authority and eloquence the 2-day, bloodless Texas Archive War of 1842. In this story he illustrates brilliantly how some of the little known historical items are often the most interesting and very significant. Although few people know of the Texas Archive War, this was perhaps the single most important factor in choosing the location for the capital of Texas therefor should be better known by Texans as well as by all Americans. I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

TEXAS ARCHIVE WAR OF 1842

(Speech of Congressman J. J. PICKLE)

Let me add my welcome to each of you. I like this group . . . we are here to talk about the Capitol, not about politics. We are here to talk about history, not to try to make it. It is a refreshing exchange for each of us.

History is the records-keeping of little instances that later prove to have bigger-than-life meanings. For example, everytime I gaze across the street at the Library of Congress or the National Archives—and everytime I take a group of my constituents through the Nation's Capitol and pass by the statue of Sam Houston, who was President of the Republic of Texas, I cannot help but remember one of the better stories that illustrates how the history of Texas and the history of the nation are intertwined.

Let me tell you about it briefly. . . in 1842, we had one of the most unusual wars of all time. . . it is called the Texas Archive War. Texas has had many unusual internal wars with unusual names. . . most were caused by money or politics. We had the Fence Cutters War, the Hoodoo War and the Jaybird-Woodpecker War, to name a few. But the most unusual of all was the Archive War. This historical skirmish was limited to a period of two days, twenty miles and included some one hundred men and one very important woman. This war was one of the most significant factors in making Austin the Capital of Texas.

This was during the time of Sam Houston's second term as President. For reasons known only to himself and to his ego, he wanted to move the Capitol 168 miles south and east to Houston, which was named after him. Sam Houston was one of our state's greatest leaders and I certainly don't want to take anything from him . . . but in 1842 there were people in Austin who thought him to be a scoundrel and a scawag . . . some even called him a Republican, although not to his face.

Austin had been chosen the capital as an expansionist move . . . at that time Austin was on the very edge of the frontier and the city was vulnerable to attacks from Indians and the Mexican Army. But a capital in the interior of the state would force growth in that direction.

But when Sam Houston was elected to his second term with $\frac{3}{4}$ of the votes, he took this to be an endorsement, even a mandate, of his expressed desire to move the capital and the archives to safer quarters—like to his namesake city. Houston tried several times to get the Texas Congress to pass a proposal to move the Capital and the archives. But Texas congressmen exhibited their stubborn streak—today, we call it independence—and refused to budge. Only an emergency would give Houston the power to make that move.

He got his wish, a state of emergency was declared when the Mexican Army staged a brief attack on nearby San Antonio. Houston decided to make the move. But Sam Houston had been repeatedly warned by the people of Austin that he would have a fight on his hands if he tried to move the Archives.

A man named John Welch wrote Houston a pretty mean letter laced with the rawhide expressions of the times. He told Houston—quote—"You sed you never was going to move it . . . now Sam, you told a damn lie." He even called Houston a "damn old drunk Cherokee" and promised to back Austin's claim to the Archives with guns and men.

But Houston wouldn't be scared off. He sent secret orders and three wagons, and about 30 men were dispatched to Austin to get the Archives. They nearly had the job completed before the brave citizens of Austin knew what they were up to.

A Texas version of Carrie Nation caught the troopers red-handed. She spread the alarm in a hurry—like a one-man wrecking crew, Mrs. Angelina Eberly mustered up some stout-hearted men with rifles. On Congress Avenue, she spied a Howitzer that was always loaded in case of Indians. The cannon was conveniently aimed at the Land Office Building. Without a by-your-leave, Mrs. Eberly sized up the situation and took charge . . . as some women tend to do. She grabbed a torch and jammed it to the powder charge setting off the cannon and sending grape shot all over everywhere. Her intention was good, but fortunately her aim was bad . . . she didn't hit any people, but she did manage to hit the broad side of the Land Office Building. In the confusion and gun smoke, Houston's troopers rode off with the Archives and their wagons.

The good people of Austin were quick to the saddle and gave chase. For extra measure, they took Mrs. Eberly's cannon along. Next morning, the raiders woke up in the midst of a blue norther—and they were looking down the throat of the cannon again. But this time a keen-eyed frontiersman was taking aim. After a short parley, Houston's men wisely agreed to haul the Archives back to Austin where they have been ever since.

Rumor has it that the ladies of Austin prepared a covered dish dinner that night and invited Houston's raiders . . . the meal was so good and the music so fine that the hard feelings melted away and everybody left happy.

I want to emphasize that Sam Houston was one of our greatest leaders and all-time heroes. I am one of his admirers. Houston just made a judgment error in going up against the people of Austin.

Thus ended a bloodless war . . . the Archives are still in Austin, and Austin is still the Capital of Texas . . . and if they ever try again to move it, I know where the cannon is and how to use it. And I hope my aim is about as good as Mrs. Eberly's.

Most of all, I have a greater appreciation now of the Texas Archives, and of our national Archives, because of stories like this one about the Texas Archive War of 1842.

C. Y. STEPHENS AUDITORIUM AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an event has taken place in my State which has fired the imagination of Iowans and gained the admiration and acclaim of citizens throughout a widespread area of the Nation.

In what has been described in the Los Angeles Times as "the cultural coup of the year"—"Vaudeville Isn't Dead—It's Going to College," by Fredd Wayne, June 22, 1969—Iowa State University attracted the Nation's oldest and finest orchestra, the world-renowned New York Philharmonic, to Ames, Iowa, to perform

a festival of concerts inaugurating the C. Y. Stephens Auditorium in the Iowa State Center.

It was the first time in the philharmonic's 127-year history that the orchestra consented to perform such a series of concerts outside New York City.

The unique festival has attracted nationwide attention, but no more than has the magnificent building in which the orchestra performed.

The Stephens auditorium, first of four buildings in the Iowa State Center, is an architectural masterpiece constructed at a cost of nearly \$5 million by alumni and friends of Iowa State University and given to the State of Iowa for the cultural enrichment of all Iowans. It is especially noteworthy that no appropriated funds, State or Federal, are involved in the project.

The late C. Y. Stephens—for whom the auditorium is named—was an Iowa State University graduate and a prominent dairy industrialist here in the capital city. Mr. Stephens provided an initial gift of more than \$1 million toward the auditorium's cost and, with the support of thousands of additional contributors, made the center dream a reality.

The qualities of the building were in part responsible for attracting the philharmonic to a site which, just a few years earlier, had been a cornfield. The auditorium was the subject of a film report on the "Today" show—Friday, September 12, 1969—on the NBC television network and a representative of the New York Times was on hand to record the philharmonic's appearance.

Critics were unanimous in their praise of the building. Among them were the following:

It is safe to predict that the auditorium will become a rallying point for people from every corner of the state. (Nick Baldwin, Des Moines Register, September 12, 1969.)

It seemed fitting that the nation's premiere orchestra was on stage to dedicate Iowa's premiere auditorium named for the late C. Y. Stephens. It was a first-class night and both the musicians and the building lived up to advance billing. Doug Looney, Omaha World-Herald, September 11, 1969.)

The hall itself was as interesting to the opening night audience as anything going on in it. It is an impressively bold and uncluttered architectural statement on the outside, and the interior, despite its size, establishes a rather surprisingly intimate atmosphere. (John Haskins, Kansas City Star, September 14, 1969.)

I also know that I was captivated by the building, the manner in which it was related to its environment, the feast it furnished my eye and the wonderful sound it provided my ear. (Lew Reeve, Minneapolis Tribune, September 15, 1969.)

The Iowa Board of Regents, in a departure from tradition, passed a resolution unanimously commending Iowa State University, President Emeritus James H. Hilton—who first had the center dream—Mr. and Mrs. C. Y. Stephens and the friends and alumni of Iowa State for their imagination and perseverance in providing such a showplace for the performing arts for the benefit of all Iowans.

Even those closest to the situation cannot foretell the full impact of the Stephens auditorium upon the quality of life of the countless persons who will be in-

spired, entertained, and informed within its walls.

Already recognized as one of the finest buildings of its kind, the Stephens auditorium, in the wake of its historic introduction to the public, has been christened the cultural center for the State of Iowa and perhaps for a far broader area of the Midwest.

Yet the auditorium is but the first of the center buildings. A 14,000-seat coliseum is now under construction and is scheduled for completion a year from next spring. Efforts are now being made to attract funds for a continuing education building which will serve more than 50,000 persons per year through short courses and conferences alone. A small, experimental theater will complete the Iowa State Center complex.

It is with great pride, and in the name of my State and its citizens, that I make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this recognition of a significant event in the history of Iowa and Iowa State University and the addition to our Nation's culture of an asset whose value is immeasurable.

MUST READING FOR PLANNERS IN GOVERNMENT: HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS' ANALYSIS OF BASIC FINANCIAL POLICY AND CURRENT ERRORS IN THOUGHT REGARDING INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri recently addressed the National Tax Association at its annual meeting in Boston, October 1.

The members of that association were privileged to hear an analysis by one of the finest and most experienced economic thinkers in the country today.

The address he gave, which I include following these remarks, is must reading for the top policy makers in our Government.

I am sending a copy to the President and to others in key policymaking roles in the administration.

Tom Curtis is one of the outstanding public servants in America today. He was a leader for congressional reform during his many years as a Member of the House. He was, of course, second-ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee. He brought to that position great knowledge, experience, and dedication. Outside Congress he continues to contribute the weight of his scholarship for the benefit of his country.

I believe the writings and career of Tom Curtis are now, and will come to be regarded generally as, a profound textbook on the intricacies of the modern industrial democracy.

Here is a fragment from the address to illustrate the currency of his thinking and its importance to us:

The economy is slowed down and inflated because of a shortage of skills. This doesn't seem to deter either the economists of the administration who are now out of power or the economists who have come into power

with the new administration from telling the people and the Congress that the price of solving inflation lies in slowing the economy down and accepting a higher rate of unemployment, and that the level of federal spending, not the quality of it, is the governor.

This blind attitude keeps us from zeroing in on expenditure policy and expenditure discipline, and from really going all out to treat unemployment as frictional, structural and, I would add, thinking of the American Negro, institutional. There are more jobs going begging than there are unemployed. . . .

This address is full of thought-provoking, meaty, succinct observations and recommendations.

Tom Curtis is sorely missed in the House these days. I consider it a privilege to bring at least this much of his thought before us by inserting the following address in the RECORD:

BEYOND OUR ABILITY TO CONTROL: GOVERNMENT AS MASTER, NOT SERVANT?

(By Hon. Thomas B. Curtis)

One important dimension to determine the relative size of government in respect to other institutions and to the total society is expenditure. Governmental expenditures may be financed by tax revenues, by borrowing, by selling capital assets, by user fees, by corvee, and by inflation. I note in Webster's international dictionary after defining corvee as "unpaid or but partially paid labor exacted by public authority," it is stated "Corvee was formerly exacted in various countries, but is now largely abolished." The studies of the President's Commission to develop a voluntary armed force following up on Milton Friedman's and others' studies reveal that corvee is very much a factor today in the United States, measured in the billions of dollars in the federal government's utilization of manpower for national defense.

It may be assumed that borrowing money to finance governmental expenditures is merely deferred taxation. However, this is an assumption that needs examination. The federal public debt in the United States has become a basic and essential part of our monetary system. The Federal Reserve System uses its Open Market Committee for purchasing government securities as its primary mechanism for increasing the amount of money and credit extant in the society. It is the roll over or refinancing of the federal debt which enables this mechanism to operate. I have speculated as to what range the ratio of total federal debt to gross national product should be in order to permit monetary policy to be effective and non-inflationary, and have come up with a guess of about 15% to 20%.

The ratio of debt to Gross National Product is around 45% which represents a continual decline from the peak of 140% in 1946 at the end of World War II. Most of that decline in that ratio is the result of inflation, a form of taxation which I shall discuss later. The British use consols, government debt securities with no maturity date, which illustrates the point I am making that some portion of the federal debt is not deferred taxation, but a form of capitalization.

Selling off governmental capital assets to finance current governmental expenditures has become an important factor recently in federal financing as the Congress has sought to use the Federal Debt Ceiling legislation as a cumbersome technique for controlling governmental expenditures.

NO U.S. CAPITAL BUDGET

Federal governmental accounting does not include a capital budget. Nor is there a federal balance sheet listing and giving the market values of the federal government's capital assets. The Government Operations

Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has, over the period of the last decade, attempted to maintain such a balance sheet. However, items tend to be entered with their acquisition costs with no amortization. Real estate is entered with periodical revisions to reflect market values. Military installations and equipment are entered as capital assets, when surely most of these items should be treated as current expenditures.

On the other hand, expenditures for capital assets such as public works are treated no differently than current expenditures, even items like defense highways, which are financed by earmarked taxes. Revolving funds, which total in the billions, are largely outside the federal budget. Governmental guarantees and commercial paper owned by the government as a result of its many financing and loan guarantee programs are likewise mostly out of the budget. But so are the contingent governmental liabilities resulting from the guarantees.

In recent years, the Federal Government budgetary officials have talked in terms of "uncontrollable" expenditures, meaning primarily expenditures resulting from open-end programs established by law to which the Federal Government is committed. Of course, the laws can be changed and so these expenditures are controllable. Whether they will be controlled depends upon the very executive officials and the people's representatives in the Congress, who use the term "uncontrollable" to avoid discussion.

For the purpose of this paper, however, which seeks to examine the relationship of government to the total society—is it master or servant—these expenditures which are presently committed on the books, in an expansionary fashion usually, are an important aspect in measuring the size and scope of government.

I shall illustrate the importance of this item by a brief discussion of the OASDI social security program. Annual expenditures from this program now run around \$30 billion a year, and the projections show a steady annual increase of many billions of dollars. Theoretically, this is a pay as you go program, where the revenues derived from the earmarked payroll taxes cover the annual expenditures. The trust fund of around \$25 billion is merely a contingent fund to protect against fluctuations. Increasingly, the contingent fund is a less ratio of the annual payout. The earnings from the contingent fund are not calculated in the actuarial computations to determine long range solvency. For contrast, if the Social Security Program was set up on the same actuarial assumptions as those required by our federal tax laws for the private pension plans, primarily the assumption that earnings from the trust funds will provide a large part of the revenues to pay the benefits, over \$350 billion in the Social Security trust fund would be required. For further contrast, the private pension plans have over \$120 billion in their trust funds covering the contractual retirement benefits of 30 million people as opposed to \$25 billion in the Social Security trust fund covering the non-contractual but politically committed benefits of about 120 million.

The assumptions which make the Social Security System actuarially sound are that the Congress will continue to impose the social security tax, and its rate, that the labor force will continue to increase in size, and that the average wage will continue to increase in dollar amount to approximate the dollar limit in the statutory wage base. To a large degree the Social Security System has benefitted from post World War II inflation in that it effectively increased wage scales and so raised the average wage base for the payroll tax. Of course, benefits have been increased to keep step with inflation and increased living standards in the society. So, periodically, the Congress has increased both the payroll tax rates and the wage base.

The point I am seeking to make is that such commitments into the future to finance present government programs must be measured if we are to realize the full extent of government expenditures in present day society. The expectations of the citizens, though not enforceable in the courts, are enforceable through the Congress. Social Security is the largest item of this sort, but the civil service retirement system is another such item; and although it is set up on actuarial assumptions comparable to private pension plans, not those of the Social Security System, it is woefully underfunded. The Veteran's benefit programs are likewise commitments passed on to the future taxpayers, and there are many other commitments to finance current benefits out of future revenues.

CAPITAL BUDGET IMPERATIVE

It is imperative that we develop a capital budget for the Federal Government. State and local governments, to a large degree, have capital budgets. Most capital improvements of state and local governments are financed through bonds and debt, not current revenues. Furthermore, a relationship is maintained in local and state governments between debt and capital assets. In fact, very little financing of current programs can be or is done through debt and bonds at these levels of government.

It is interesting to note that of the five institutions or groups in our society, federal government, state government, local government, private businesses and families, only the Federal Government has a minus ratio of capital assets to debt. The next poorest in debt/asset ratio, although a healthy plan, is state governments; the next, local governments; the next, private businesses, and the healthiest of them all are the American families. Their assets amount to \$2.4 trillion compared to \$500 billion debt, leaving a net wealth of about \$1.9 trillion.

The failure to maintain an inventory of federal governmental wealth is part of the failure to maintain the development statistics on national wealth. What wealth statistics had been developed were largely abandoned in the 1920s and we have now gone through five decades without paying much attention to our lack of wealth statistics. And yet, one of the great factors in the emergence of the American corporation in economic and social importance has been its development of cost accounting. The development, if you please, of the science of distinguishing current expenditures from capital expenditures.

This leads me to restate one of my favorite definitions. A nonprofit organization is one with a poor accounting system.

Without proper cost accounting, it is difficult to have sound expenditure policies, as well as proper expenditure discipline. When a charitable organization like a hospital runs out of money or depletes a capital asset, it engages in a capital fund drive. When government—a non profit organization—runs out of money or depletes a capital asset, it increases its taxes, or, if it is the Federal Government, it inflates the dollar. The former technique, a capital gifts campaign, is a little more healthy than the latter because it still relies on voluntary giving; increasing the taxes relies only on the majority wanting to give, thus binding the minority; frequently, if not always, it is the majority which pays less and binds the minority which pays more.

NEW STATISTICS

One of the reasons for the downgrading of governmental and social wealth statistics has been the important development of statistics measuring economic activity. Certainly, the amount of economic activity going on is the more important economic factor to be concerned with. Furthermore, the amount of economic activity reflects to some

degree the amount of wealth and capital available in the society. But when economists measure economic growth by looking to the incremental differences in the gross national product series instead of developing wealth statistics, they are dangerously oversimplifying the economic picture.

During periods of war, economic activity rises quite markedly and shows up in increased figures of gross national product. However, the increased economic activity can well be, if not usually is, eating up capital assets rather than augmenting them. Furthermore, a major economic mistake can show up in increased gross national product, such as Russia's heavy investment in hydroelectric dams under Stalin, instead of utilizing coal burning steam generators as Khrushchev did, but end up depleting, not increasing, wealth. Cutting off a ten mile curve will reduce the amount of future economic activity as does any productivity increase. This will distort the picture of economic growth if measured in terms of GNP apart from wealth statistics.

It is dangerous to measure a nation's wealth after a war to its wealth before a war in GNP statistics on the assumption that the economic process produced this result, not the defeat of the enemy and the taking over of its wealth and markets.

The process of measuring economic growth in terms of GNP with a disregard to a capital inventory has had a deleterious impact on federal governmental expenditure policies and expenditure discipline. Indeed, it is undermining our political institutions.

If increased economic activity is the goal, rather than what the economic activity is producing, then what difference does it make what the money is to be spent for, as long as it is spent?

Coupled with the overemphasis of GNP statistics and the neglect of maintaining and developing wealth statistics has been the wide acceptance of the theory of the Phillips curve. The assumption that the Phillips curve reveals a true economic law has also contributed greatly to minimizing expenditures policy and expenditure discipline as a major factor in establishing federal fiscal policy.

The Phillips curve relates economic activity to unemployment, which is quite accurate. Indeed, one test of economic activity is the amount of employment. However, certain economists go on in extrapolating from the Phillips curve to equate economic activity with economic growth, which may or may not be accurate. The extrapolation goes on to equate economic activity with total expenditure in the society. It equates total spending with total purchasing power, of which the federal government through direct spending, financed with a disregard of whether by current taxes or increased debt or through monetary policy, maintains the total purchasing power. The Phillips curve theorists disregard, among other things, the factor of "discretionary purchasing" power which is now being measured statistically and is an increasingly important factor in an economy, like ours, based upon plenty, not scarcity.

The net result of the various assumptions in the Phillips curve, many of them important variables, some certainly questionable, is the final assumption that inflation and unemployment interact. If we want less inflation, we can have it only at a sacrifice of higher unemployment. If we want full employment, we must accept a modicum of inflation. The federal politician, always seeking excuses for voting to increase spending has absorbed this like a sponge.

The fact is we have heated up the economy to a point where we have serious inflation and equally, if not more serious, high interest rates, more serious because we know little about the economic consequences of interest rates, which are now the highest in our history. Yet we still have pockets of

very high unemployment. The economy is slowed down and inflated because of a shortage of skills. This doesn't seem to deter either the economists of the administration who are now out of power or the economists who have come into power with the new administration from telling the people and the Congress that the price of solving inflation lies in slowing the economy down and accepting a higher rate of unemployment, and that the level of federal spending, not the quality of it, is the governor.

MORE JOBS THAN JOBLESS

This blind attitude keeps us from zeroing in on expenditure policy and expenditure discipline, and from really going all out to treat unemployment as frictional, structural and, I would add, thinking of the American Negro, institutional. There are more jobs going begging than there are unemployed. But the unemployed do not have the skills to fill these jobs, nor are they the ones necessarily to be trained in these skills. The process of treating frictional and structural unemployment is a bit more complicated. People with good jobs are probably the ones who should be trained for the jobs in demand requiring higher skills, which if they will do, then leaves their jobs available for those below them on the ladder of skills who can then be trained. Somewhere along the ladder of skills, the unemployed are trained and fitted in.

If we have rapid technological advancement, and we have been having it, we will have concomitantly an increased rate of obsolescence, not just of equipment and buildings, but of skills. I add buildings because our IRS and Treasury authorities haven't caught up with the times to realize that today, buildings, so many of them being single purpose, can become just as obsolete and sometimes as rapidly as a piece of equipment. No one in the IRS or Treasury or the Council of Economic Advisors or wherever in government tax policy is set seems willing to recognize that skills are likewise made obsolete by rapid technological advancement, and that our tax laws that relate to expenditures for education and training are 50 years out of date, and are one of the greatest impediments to economic growth and sound money in our society.

Today a man must be retrained three or four times from 19 to 68, the years he is in the work force, if he is to maintain a marketable skill. Our tax laws work against this phenomena. Those who relate inflation to unemployment distract our attention from frictional and structural unemployment and the proper tax reforms and programs needed to eliminate it.

If we had been in the business of maintaining capital budgets and understanding a nation's wealth as we should have been, we would by now realize that the knowledge and skills of the people are the greater part of the nation's wealth, and the tangible wealth—the equipment, the buildings, even the so-called natural resources are the lesser part. We haven't even kept up our statistics to measure the nation's tangible wealth, let alone get into the business of measuring this more important component. This wealth is called intangible only because you cannot touch it, and because it is not real and powerful.

AUTOMATION MAKES JOBS

The new economists are now interjecting another red herring to bolster the misinterpretation extant in respect to GNP and the Phillips curve, and to keep the attention diverted from federal expenditure policy. The new myth being promulgated is that renders certain people economically unusable, and that as time goes on this will be increasingly the case. Therefore, government, the master not the servant, will provide for their livelihood. All objective studies made on this matter reveal just the opposite

to the case. Automation, instead of rendering certain people economically unusable through its concomitant feature, specialization, is rendering people who were unusable because of physical handicaps or whatever, economically usable. Automation creates many more jobs than it destroys, better jobs in the sense that they require more brains and less brawn; better paying jobs, in that automation (marketplace automation, that is, subject to expenditure discipline) is synonymous with productivity increase.

Furthermore, rapid technological growth places added emphasis on initial training and retraining. The new economist, fighting against these cold facts, has raised another bugaboo, namely, that we will have so much leisure time we will not know what to do with ourselves. Much of this leisure time is not leisure time. It is study time, retooling time and re-creating time. Just as we have found that the 8-hour day, the 5-day week improves labor efficiency, so we are finding that the 11-month year will do the same. And so, I argue, will we find the 7-year sabbatical will increase human efficiency. Furthermore, the average age of entering the labor force is now over 19 years 6 months, and is continuing to increase. It was just a few years ago that we changed our BLS statistics to measure the labor force by raising the age of entry from 14 to 16. We are still out of date. On the other end of the life span, the average age of retirement continues to move down from 70 to 65, and we are witnessing an increased efficient use of older employees through the use of their knowledge and skills, part time and out of the chain of command.

It is fortunate that the federal government remains highly inefficient; that is, in one sense. Its very inefficiency keeps it from moving into the private sector more than it presently has. Government in our society, measured in dollars expended, takes up about $\frac{1}{3}$ of our endeavors, the private sector $\frac{2}{3}$. If we can reestablish expenditure policy and expenditure discipline at the federal level, we can cut the ratios back to $\frac{1}{4}$ government $\frac{3}{4}$ private, and in doing so we will increase our wealth and productivity immeasurably. We can also start on a 20-year program of systematically reducing our federal income tax rates. These reductions in rates will cut costs and increase efficiency in the private sector. When the tax rates are sufficiently low, then and only then can we have comprehensive tax reform.

We are not yet at a state where the government is other than a servant, although some of the new economists, in anticipation, speak of it as a partner. But if we continue this foolish approach of ignoring wealth, capital, and cost accounting and continue to neglect expenditure policy and expenditure discipline, the servant can well become the master—a master of a scarce pantry. There is historical significance in the many instances where the major domo became the sovereign. The Stuarts of Scotland were once royal stewards, not kings.

SECRETARY STANS ON FOREIGN TRADE

(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, Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans has marshaled the resources of his Department to promote U.S. exports. Calling the effort to help businessmen maximize their export opportunities "our Department's No. 1 job," the Secretary has worked at home and gone abroad to promote a more favorable balance of trade.

Mr. Stans recently delivered an ex-

cellent speech before the International Trade Club of Chicago on the occasion of its 50th anniversary dinner. His comments summarize the commitment of the Nixon team to an era of more profitable trade.

Because an improved export position is a major goal of this administration, and because of the universal interest in the topic, I wish to call attention to the address Secretary Stans made on October 1 in Chicago:

ADDRESS BY HON. MAURICE H. STANS, U.S. SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CLUB OF CHICAGO, OCTOBER 1, 1969

I am twice honored tonight.

First, I have the honor to bring you a message from the President of the United States.

"To the members of the International Trade Club of Chicago: It gives me great pleasure to extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of your Club's golden anniversary. You have helped to make Illinois our leading export state. You have helped to create new jobs for our growing work force and the additional profit required for technological research and industrial progress. Most important you have demonstrated a commitment to trade expansion that has helped to strengthen the free world economy and enriched the lives of people on every continent. But your greatest opportunity for service lies ahead as we lift our sights toward a national export goal of \$50 billion by 1973. Under the dynamic leadership of men like yourselves, we not only can reach it, we can exceed it. And I pledge your government's assistance in every way. Let us lift our sights in the greatest export drive in history.

"RICHARD NIXON."

My second honor is to be your speaker on this notable occasion. Anyone would be proud to be asked to join in celebrating this distinguished Club's 50th anniversary. But because Chicago was my home for so many years, I am especially pleased to be here, and to be with so many of my oldest and best friends. I thank you for your gracious invitation.

TRIBUTE TO PAST

One of our pleasures tonight is to pay tribute to the past. We honor the men of vision and daring and faith who built this area into one of the world's greatest international trade headquarters.

When this Club was formed a half century ago, Chicago was the capital of a landlocked heartland. Today it is a thriving port on the shipping lanes of the world, with direct access to markets on every continent.

Your Club was a prime mover in this historic achievement. And I am proud to say that among those who joined in making this possible was one of the greatest Americans of all time and whom I had the honor to serve, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. His far-sighted leadership in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway is a legacy of progress that challenges us all.

President Nixon has called on us tonight to respond to that challenge when he says that we must "lift our sights in the greatest export drive in history."

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

But let me assure you that this will not be simply another exercise in which government's main role is to exhort you businessmen to get out there and export. You've been hearing that tired line for about eight years, like a stuck needle on a phonograph record.

We are going to ask you to work harder at it, but you will note that President Nixon pledges government's full assistance. And you are going to get it. The President himself is

personally involved in developing this aid, and we at the Commerce Department have the responsibility for following through on the plans. It is our Department's number one job.

THE PROBLEM

The reason it has priority over everything else is the sudden critical nature of the problem. Let me outline it briefly.

Through the 1960's we sailed blithely along with a trade surplus of \$5 billion or more annually. And then suddenly in 1968, the roof caved in. There was a tremendous surge in imports of about 24 percent, while exports were rising only about 10 percent. On the balance of payments basis the trade surplus dropped to the lowest point in ten years, to about \$600 million.

It will not be much better this year, in 1969. It will not be much better in 1970. It will not be much better by 1973—unless we find new ways to stimulate exports and to reduce overseas barriers to our exports.

I am confident we can do it. Some countries export up to 30 and 35 percent of their Gross National Product. We export only 4 percent of ours. If we could raise this, as the GNP increased, to only $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent, we would have solved almost all our problems.

OBSTACLES

But success will not come easy. There are formidable obstacles, especially overseas. But we are working to dismantle them. The main purpose of my recent trips to Europe and the Far East was to begin this work.

In Europe, you exporters must contend with a rising wall of what the trade specialists call nontariff barriers. These include:

Border taxes—while exporters from those countries receive tax rebates.

Limitation or exclusion from participation in procurement by government entities.

Protectionist aspects of the Common Market agricultural policy.

Artificial technical restrictions placed on imports.

European subsidies which take away American markets in third countries.

For the first time in history, we are mounting a full-scale attack on these open and covert restrictions, which threaten to wipe out the gains of the Kennedy Round of tariff reductions.

OPEN TABLE

On my trips abroad I proposed the Open Table Policy, under which all nontariff barriers would be brought into the open, measured, probed, diagnosed and dealt with on a reciprocal basis.

We in the United States have some restrictions of this kind, but we are convinced that those of other nations are of much greater significance than ours. Our proposal for frank discussions of them has met a favorable response in both Europe and the Far East. We have already exchanged lists of such barriers with Japan, and discussions on them will go forward in the coming weeks.

EXPORT CREDIT

A second part of our program of assistance to exporters is in the credit area.

You have been losing sales abroad for lack of adequate credit facilities. This has to stop. We have in this Nation the greatest accumulation of capital in the world, the greatest system of credit, the greatest money markets. Why we haven't been using our financial muscle to make our exporters competitive in this field is beyond me.

So we are going to do it. We're going to do it through the Export-Import Bank, whose principal job is to spur exports. The new head of Ex-Im Bank, Henry Kearns, is the most dynamic leader this institution has ever had, and he is going to see to it that you exporters meet the competition everywhere.

We're going to say to other nations of the

world, "From now on we are going to be competitive with you on any financing terms you offer. You can name the terms. We will meet them."

And that will be that. You exporters are not going to be at a disadvantage in this area any longer.

COMMERCIAL REPRESENTATION ABROAD

A third part of our assistance program will be to strengthen our overseas commercial representation. In the field of government, our commercial attaches around the world are the eyes and ears of you exporters. Their job is to provide you with intelligence and leads on sales opportunities.

These men work in the Foreign Service, which comes under the State Department, and we are cooperating with State on upgrading their services. In this matter, we need guidance from you exporters on how these commercial representatives can be most helpful. We need from you specific examples of where our services are deficient, and how you would like to see them improved.

If you have suggestions in this area, please let me hear from you. Your comments will receive the most careful attention.

PROMOTION ACTIVITIES

Fourth in our program is to strengthen the whole array of our export promotion activities. We are stepping up the number of our commercial exhibitions in major foreign markets. We are working with the National Export Expansion Council in targeting industries which offer the greatest export potential. We are sponsoring a new and highly effective program of industry-government trade missions abroad. We are increasing our Joint Export Association program to help develop foreign markets for groups of small and medium-sized firms. And we are strengthening our field offices throughout the Nation, and stepping up their export activities.

EXPORT DOCUMENTATION

Fifth, we have streamlined export documentation procedures.

Some of the paperwork in exports had its origins back in the 19th Century. Nobody ever bothered to do much about it.

This Administration has slashed it to the bone. We've made several changes that greatly simplify the whole documentation process and will sharply cut the delays involved in a major share of U.S. export shipments. This will bring substantial benefits to business and government alike in time, money and efficiency. And it will free you to put more effort into the real business at hand—increasing exports, increasing profits, increasing jobs.

MERCHANT MARINE

Sixth, we are going to rebuild the American merchant marine.

President Nixon and this entire Administration recognize the importance of American shipping to our foreign trade. A highly productive U.S.-flag fleet guarantees us access to foreign sources of raw materials and to markets for our manufactured goods. This assures you exporters and importers that there will be ships available to carry cargoes at reasonable rates on reasonable schedules.

Today, many of our ships are aging derelicts left over from World War II. We are going to replace them with high-speed, containerized, highly productive ships with quick turn around time. We need them for our national security.

To do it we must have a workable, sensible government maritime program. I hope we can announce this program in the next few weeks.

We also must use the vast research and development capabilities of this Nation. During the summer we held an intensive, three-week meeting on the subject that included representatives of industry, government, science and engineering. They went over every

possibility that could help modernize the fleet. And in the end they came up with a five-year research and development program that will help us achieve the goal we all seek: the rebirth of a strong, productive, healthy American merchant marine.

INFLATION

And finally, we are attacking a home-grown thorn tree that is one of the toughest barriers you exporters face. It is one whose wild seed was planted more than four years ago and which has grown right to the sky. I'm talking about inflation, which makes your products less competitive in the world market.

Today the leaves on the thorn tree of inflation tell us it's October 1. They are dry. They are beginning to turn. And sometime in the not too distant future, they're going to shrivel and drop off.

I'm confident of this because President Nixon has had the courage to attack the roots of this wild plant, instead of just hacking at the branches. He has joined prudent fiscal policies with the Federal Reserve Board's policy of monetary restraint. Together they are restoring order and balance to economic growth. This not only will assure our continued domestic prosperity, it will help clear the way for you exporters to get our fair share of the burgeoning world market.

So these are the obstacles, the barriers, the hurdles. Your government is working day and night to lower or eliminate them altogether.

FREER TRADE

The Nixon Administration, I can assure you, has an unswerving commitment to freer trade. We want to widen the markets for the goods produced by working people everywhere. We want to share the growing markets of the U.S. with our trading partners, and we ask them to let us share in their growing markets.

In this way, we develop a climate of mutual cooperation that fosters the growth of trade, not the growth of protectionism.

Our idea of mutuality of interest in the growing export market turns on freeing up competitive forces through reduction of nontariff barriers and artificial export subsidies.

But the Nixon Administration's approach to problems is pragmatic and not doctrinaire. And there is one special problem that requires exceptional treatment. I refer to the growing flood of imports into our country of wool and man-made fiber textiles and apparel products.

TEXTILES

We are the only open and free market for these products in the world. We want to share this market with our trading partners. But we have asked them to voluntarily limit their exports of these products so that our own textile industry, as well as theirs, can continue to flourish. Under our proposal, there would be no cutback in foreign jobs, no closings of foreign textile plants. In fact, their exports of these products to the U.S. would continue to grow at an orderly rate.

Our proposed solution is eminently fair and reasonable, and I am confident that it will be adopted by our trading partners.

CONCLUSION

So tonight, we celebrate the past. We mark 50 years of outstanding achievement by a great organization.

We also aim toward the future. We look forward to the invigorating challenges ahead, determined to build on the past.

But in a larger sense, we celebrate the spirit of man. We celebrate the spirit of cooperation in him, the one essential for peace and progress on earth.

That's what international trade is—the highest tangible expression of cooperation among men of every nationality, every race, every creed. Every day it affirms the faith, the trust, the unity and the interdependence of men everywhere.

Tonight, on another celestial body a quarter of a million miles in space, there is a plaque which reads, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Here on earth, in this hall and on every continent, there are the international traders whose daily work expresses that same high purpose: "We came in peace for all mankind."

Let us resolve to strengthen this spirit of brotherhood and cooperation which your organization has so nobly advanced through trade. That is our real challenge. Let us go forward in confidence to meet it.

THE FRATERNITY CRISIS

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have taken the floor on a number of occasions in defense of the fraternities and sororities of our colleges and universities, most often during those times when the harassment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare becomes intolerable. This will be another of those occasions, but I will be brief.

Two items have come to my attention which I think are worthy of the time it will take to read them and I shall insert them here in the RECORD.

The first is an article which appeared in Banta's Greek Exchange, written by Mr. William Zerman, and the other is a column by the distinguished writer, Mr. Jenkin Loyd Jones, which appeared in the Washington Star on September 13.

I urge those who share my concern over the crisis that is today threatening the very existence of fraternities and sororities to pay heed to these two timely and appropriate articles, as follows:

FRATERNALLY YOURS

(By William S. Zerman)

There is evidence that the unit rule which is used by many fraternities for electing men to membership is under attack by some segments of college and university communities because the unit rule, which has been used by many fraternities for years, is thought to be "discriminatory."

Some of the ammunition for this attitude has come about because of a misinterpretation of correspondence from one or more officials of the Health, Education and Welfare Department of our Federal Government. As the months go on, it is certain that this will be clarified because of meetings which are currently being held with members of Congress who developed the Civil Rights and Aid to Education Laws.

Some college presidents feel that the Compliance Provisions of H.E.W. are a form of blackmail. This has been told to me off the record by college administrators. They feel that Federal funds will be withheld if H.E.W. personnel are not satisfied that there is no racial discrimination in any campus organization.

Colgate has gone so far as to require that its fraternities reduce the voting requirement to around 50 per cent of the undergraduate members of each chapter. There is strong feeling within the Colgate community that this is the only democratic way to operate a fraternity system. On the other hand, there is honest and sincere concern that because of the nature of fraternity, a 50 per cent vote will soon tear apart the fraternal aspects of the fraternity chapters.

I fall into this latter category. We must not confuse "discrimination" with our voting

system. Even with the unit rule, all members of each undergraduate chapter are not compatible. By reducing the vote to around 50 per cent, it seems to me that we will develop greater incompatibility and therefore, in direct ratio, less fraternity.

I have discussed the matter of "recognition" in another column. It was suggested that there may well be good reason to follow the University of Texas plan which provides that the fraternity system there is not recognized by the University. The interference by Colgate University into the private affairs of fraternity strengthens my feeling that we should return to making fraternity our business, rather than everyone else's business. And, we can do this by operating on some campuses without recognition. There are few administrators of the 600 colleges and universities on whose campuses fraternities are located which concern themselves to the extent that Colgate has.

As one of the regents of a Big Ten University said recently, "Fraternities should be allowed to determine their own membership practices in convention at which time the undergraduates have the predominant vote." If our conventions vote to allow each chapter to determine its own method of election to membership, then there should not be interference from any segment of the college or university. If at a convention, the fraternity votes to maintain a standard election procedure for all chapters, the college or university authorities have some responsibility for supporting that fraternity's democratic process if it wishes to maintain a general fraternity system. There is far too little understanding on the part of university authorities of the democratic process our fraternity system has in determining its policies. If the college or university interferes with this due process, then it will weaken the fraternity system. Perhaps this is what some people want. If it is, then the fraternity system should either work to change the thinking of those responsible or remove the fraternity system from that particular campus.

I know of no general fraternity whose membership does not consist of all races, creeds, and colors. Social change in our society will continue to be reflected within the membership of each of the general fraternities. I am highly suspicious that there is more involved than a concern for "discrimination." It is time for fraternity members to stand up and be counted. When we see copies of the letters which Health, Education and Welfare personnel have written to over 250 colleges and universities, we will be able to determine for certain if this correspondence has encouraged colleges and universities to become concerned with fraternity voting structure. Those letters we have seen imply that there has been H.E.W. pressure implied to modify fraternity voting procedures.

Institutions which are demanding that voting requirements be watered down to a majority vote will find themselves without general fraternities, if the fraternities themselves are interested in maintaining solid fraternity relationships within their chapters. A majority of college and university administrators see the fraternity system today as an important adjunct to the campus scene. More than one university president has told me that the fraternity system is most important to him and his Student Personnel Deans, as they carry out their responsibilities. If there is an attack on the fraternity voting system on your campus and the excuse is communication from Health, Education, and Welfare, I suggest that you contact those Congressmen who were responsible for developing the Civil Rights and Aid to Education Laws so that there will not continue to be misunderstanding as to the intent of Congress in developing laws which specifically have excluded any Federal employee from meddling with fraternity membership requirements. If you feel that an attempt to

modify your voting requirements is going to hurt your fraternity system, then I suggest that you move toward operating in that campus community without college or university recognition. At the same time, you should make it known that the fraternity system will continue to be a part of the goals and objectives of your college or university.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 13, 1969]

ANARCHY AN ABHORRED VACUUM

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

On August 27 the board of directors of the national college fraternity, Phi Gamma Delta, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Whereas, this fraternity views with strong disapproval the tendency of some colleges and universities to acquiesce in a general lowering of standards of conduct among their students; and

"Whereas, the affirmative action of some college and university administrators in approving the use of intoxicants on the campus, abolishing curfew time for women students, permitting visitation by members of the opposite sex in sleeping rooms and condoning the use of narcotics results in the destruction of morals; and

"Whereas, some of these same administrators have allowed anarchy to prevail on the campus to the irreparable loss and damage to the college or university and the majority of the students;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that this fraternity calls upon these administrations to recognize that morals are not out of date, but that they are basic standards of human conduct, divinely inspired to promote the dignity of man and the sanctity of the family relationship."

Square? Sure. Thirty years ago who would have thought college fraternities would be looked upon as square?

But that was before the age of swinging professors and militants bearing guns. It was before the idea that the administration should serve as servants to ad hoc committees and the theory that pot and casual sex were extensions of the Bill of Rights. In contrast to this high trapeze work, the average college fraternity swings low.

The Phi Gamma Delta directors have put their fingers on a truth. A college that succumbs to the bullying of the loud, the violent and the ignorant gets out of the education business. And the majority of students, who came not to confront the "pigs" but to learn a lot of pretty complicated stuff in a very short time, are robbed of the promise of the catalog.

The college that is bluffed out of laying down reasonable rules of conduct peddles the idea that at the animal level of behavior there is happiness, fulfillment and a flowering of the personality. If so, the court of Caligula was the golden age of Rome and the alleys of the Ginza represent the acme of Japanese civilization.

You've got to have rules—even if you are bent on revolution.

For most interesting is the discovery by the New Left, itself, that anarchy doesn't work.

The September issue of Ramparts magazine, the voice of what is hopefully described as a Third World (something about communism with complete humanity), carries an article about this summer's riotous convention of the Students for a Democratic Society at the Chicago Coliseum.

The writer, Paul Glusman, a Berkeley SDS activist, sadly described the three days of splits, secessions, excommunications and walkouts.

According to Glusman, the Progressive Labor Party had been infiltrating the SDS and planned to seize the convention. Alarmed,

the SDS National Office formed something called the Revolutionary Youth Movement to give PL battle.

At the Chicago affair, PL sympathizers kept drowning out SDS speakers by chanting "Mao, Mao, Hao Tse-tung!" Whereupon RYM shouters bawled "Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh, Dare to Struggle, Dare to Win!"

This intelligent debate ended only after SDS threw out PL by resolution, but then marched huffily away, leaving PL in possession of the hall.

Criticizing the SDS for lacking discipline and often behaving merely "as a debating society," Glusman expressed worry that PL might drain away many SDS members because it offered the iron regimentation of the old Communist parties.

It is worth noting that the archons of Phi Gamma Delta and Mr. Glusman of SDS, although they have utterly conflicting aims, seem to agree on one fundamental thing: Chaos is a temporary condition that must destroy itself.

Man abhors confusion. He can take it only for a little while. Either our colleges are going to have to show the guts to teach school in the face of patent sabotage and lay down some reasonable value judgments for the guidance of the young, or a confused and rudderless generation will look around for its new Hitler.

Anarchy is just for today.

THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM IS VERY DANGEROUS BUSINESS

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I issued a statement from my office with regard to the so-called moratorium scheduled for tomorrow. In that statement I criticized the proposed moratorium as an example of trying to influence public policy by street demonstrations rather than by reasoned argument and following the legal parliamentary process. I pointed out that this kind of approach toward influencing public policy was all too reminiscent of the approach of the Nazis in the 1930's.

The same point was made in a thoughtful column that appeared this morning in the Washington Post by David S. Broder. Mr. Broder also points out—and it is a point that has been largely overlooked in all the recent discussions on this proposed moratorium—that the Vietnam course which President Nixon is now pursuing, and which they are attacking with their moratorium demonstrations, is the very same program for Vietnam advocated in the minority platform plank in the Democratic National Convention last summer. Those behind the moratorium fought for that plank last year; now they are trying to destroy the President for carrying out their own proposal. One wonders just what's going on.

The Broder column follows:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 14, 1969]

ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The larger the plans for Wednesday's Vietnam moratorium, the more the central message and tactic of the demonstration have been obscured. If the event is to be gauged properly, it is important to uncover its original premises from the debris

of cliches and endorsements in which they have lately been buried.

A number of men active in the moratorium have taken time to point out what they consider the errors of the argument in this column last week that it is a plan for "the breaking of the President." With sincerity and conviction, they have asserted that, far from breaking the President, they are out to save him, by persuading him to make the peace the nation craves and, incidentally, to save the political system by keeping the antiwar movement out of the hands of the radicals and in control of those with a commitment to peaceful forms of protest.

Their conversations and correspondence have helped to define three questions which might be borne in mind by those planning to participate in the moratorium.

First, what is the target of this protest? Sam Brown, the able spokesman for the moratorium, says it is not an anti-Nixon move because "we learned in 1968 that what we must oppose are not personalities but policies."

But if the Nixon administration is following the very policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, as I believe, then their moratorium is mobilizing public opinion against its own policy recommendation to the President. The minority plank at the Democratic convention, endorsed by all the leading doves, called for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. This has been done. It recommended a reduction in offensive operations in South Vietnam. The President has ordered this and it is in effect.

It asked for "a phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time" of all foreign troops. The Nixon administration has begun pulling Americans out of Vietnam without waiting for North Vietnam to agree to mutual withdrawals, as the doves thought necessary.

Finally, it recommended that the United States use the leverage of troop withdrawals to "encourage" the Saigon government "to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front" looking toward "a broadly representative government" but recognizing that "the specific shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese."

If this is not precisely the policy of the current administration, as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State, then words have lost their meaning. And if the moratorium sponsors want to argue—as some have—that the President is lying about his purpose, their suspicions must be weighed against the facts of reduced fighting, reduced troop levels and reduced casualties, which his policies have brought about.

Second, what is the alternative they recommend? It has been described in moratorium publicity as everything from a negotiated settlement to immediate, total American withdrawal from Vietnam, but Brown said Sunday on "Face the Nation" that it is the latter that the moratorium has "consistently" demanded.

If that is the case, then the elected officials, clergymen and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium can properly be asked if this is the program they endorse. Many of these sponsors were involved in the fight for the minority plank at the Chicago convention which specifically said the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they could explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent the troops in. Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

Third, and most important, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representative democracy or does it substitute the rule of the street?

The sponsors say the name "moratorium," rather than "strike," was chosen to emphasize that the protest is to be peaceful and noncoercive. It is a nice distinction. The noncoercive feature may be almost invisible to the thousands of students whose colleges will shut down Wednesday. If the moratorium continues, as planned, for two days in November, three days in December, and so on, it will more and more come to resemble the general strike so familiar to European politics.

And if it succeeds in its aim, what is to prevent other majorities or sizable minorities in the country from using the same technique to force their views on agencies of the government? The moratorium sponsors say Vietnam is an extraordinary issue, but they must know it is not the only issue which agitates millions of people.

One wonders what the moratorium sponsors would say if Billy Graham were to ask all the parents who want prayers restored to public schools to withdraw their children from school for one additional day each month until the Supreme Court reverses its school-prayer decision.

Suppose pro-prayer teachers agreed to meet the pupils in private homes on moratorium days to discuss "the overriding significance of religion in human life." Would the Vietnam moratorium sponsors cheer? What would they say if landlords and real estate men opposed to integrated housing declared a moratorium until Congress repeals the open-housing law?

My view, just to be clear, is not that the Vietnamese moratorium is un-American, illegitimate, meanly partisan or personally vindictive in its motivation. My view is that it is an ill-timed, misdirected protest, vague in its purpose and quite conceivably dangerous in its precedent.

As was said last week, its immediate result may be the breaking of the President. In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

HOUSING START DECLINE AND HISTORIC IMPORT LEVELS THREATEN CERAMIC TILE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, all of us have become increasingly concerned as the full impact of anti-inflation measures, such as monetary and credit restraints, have been felt by the housing industry and its suppliers. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney underscored this concern when he expressed fear recently that new construction might fall below 1 million units in 1969—down from a rate of nearly 1.9 million units early this year.

The vulnerability of the housing industry to such restraints was acknowledged by Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., when he appeared recently before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to comment on the report of the Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates. He said:

At the outset, it should be recognized that monetary and credit restraints inevitably have their largest effects on sectors of the economy most dependent on credit financing. Housing is particularly susceptible.

Over the longer run, housing will be best served by a mix of fiscal and monetary policies which, as the Commission states, makes "greater use of fiscal policy as a stabilizing force, so that monetary policy is freer to maintain an even flow of credit at reasonable rates of interest that American families can afford." To permit changes in the fiscal-monetary policy mix when needed, there is much to be said for procedures that would lead to greater flexibility in setting Federal tax rates as is recommended by the Commission.

President Nixon's recently announced 75-percent cut in Federal construction was also an acknowledgment of the seriousness of this problem. His proposal, according to news reports, was designed to effect a shift in funds to the housing market, which has been artificially depressed because of the insufficient availability of long-term credit.

Mr. Martin has also recognized "that special public measures may at times be required to aid housing without sacrificing the overall objections of public economic policy."

Appropriate steps are clearly needed to assist the beleaguered ceramic tile industry, for the shift in private resources away from housing toward more lucrative investments has deprived this industry of its principal market—new residential construction.

Comprised mostly of small individual firms, this industry has suffered not only from the shortage of available mortgage funds and other forms of long-term credit, but the nature of the competition it encounters from a rising tide of foreign imports. These importers have captured over one-third of the U.S. market, primarily through various predatory practices which would result in prosecution under our statutes if engaged in by domestic firms. A few examples of these practices include marketing through giant international cartels—a practice which is proving especially useful to the British—price fixing, unlawful territorial restrictions, and improper use of standard grade labels.

It is essential to note that the shift in distribution of private resources referred to by Chairman Martin has also resulted in a shift in the type of housing units being built. Last year for the first time in history, apartment units represented more than 50 percent of residential construction and it is in this market that foreign-made tile finds its most receptive market.

In order to offset the adverse effects of these monetary restrictions on this industry, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in sponsoring a concurrent resolution designed to express the sense of Congress that the executive branch should take steps under its existing powers to negotiate voluntary quota arrangements with foreign countries to effect such reductions in imports as may be necessary to protect the ceramic tile industry, and others, until such time as free market conditions are restored.

Mr. Speaker, if the economists are correct in their forecasts, the current situ-

ation is a temporary one. There will be an urgent need for housing, particularly if we are going to meet the national housing goal of 26 million housing units over the next decade. America will need strong and viable industries if we are to have adequate sources of supply to meet our housing goals. This concurrent resolution is designed as a step in that direction:

WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR OHIO

1. Ohio's ceramic tile companies employed 1677 workers in 1968.
2. Their total payroll was \$9,677,000.
3. These companies' total sales were \$21,342,000.
4. This meant a total economic benefit to Ohio of \$53,355,000. (Derived by assuming an income multiplier of 2.5.)
5. Ohio's ceramic tile companies could have contributed significantly more to the State's economy. Because of import competition, these companies used only 74 percent of their capacity.
6. At full capacity, therefore, they could have had a total economic benefit to the state of over \$60,000,000.
7. The average age of Ohio tile companies is 67 years. This is a traditional and well-established industry in Ohio.

BERNARD P. "DICK" CASEY HONORED BY CITY OF BOSTON

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress the recently conferred honor on Bernard P. "Dick" Casey of Dorchester, Mass. Dick, who is loved by everyone who knows him, was honored by the city of Boston in dedication ceremonies renaming the Town Field at Fields Corner, "Dick Casey Field."

Dick, as everyone in Boston knows, is the Red Sox's No. 1 fan. Having been an expert baseball player in his own right as a youth, Dick has worked among youngsters in the Dorchester area of Boston promoting athletics.

Dick is presently attending the world series games between the Baltimore Orioles and the New York Mets. Being an avid American league fan, I know Dick is having mixed emotions on this series. However, he is very likely rooting part of the time for Baltimore while at the same time he greatly admires the underdog Mets.

Mr. Speaker, Dick Casey, Congressman "TIP" O'NEILL, JR., Congressman "EDDIE" BOLAND, and I worked together in the Massachusetts State Legislature for several years, and since that time my admiration for Dick Casey continues to grow. Bernard P. "Dick" Casey is truly deserving of this salute from the city of Boston.

At this point I include a statement by the distinguished Speaker of the House:

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER McCORMACK

Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. Speaker, Bernard P. (Dick) Casey is one of the most prominent authors in Massachusetts, a dear friend of mine whose dedicated life of constructiveness has been an inspiration to countless of thousands to follow and particularly to the youth Dick Casey is "one of God's noblemen."

It was a pleasure for me to be present when the Town Field at Field's Corner, a famous athletic field in Boston, was dedicated in his honor which honor he richly deserved. There were thousands of persons present to show their friendship and esteem for "Dick" Casey.

The wonderful life of "Dick" Casey will always inspire others to lead a better life.

I am proud of my friendship with "Dick" Casey. I am so happy the Town Field at Field Corner in Boston has been named in his honor.

At this point I include a statement by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

STATEMENT BY MR. BOLAND

Bernard P. "Dick" Casey of Dorchester, Mass., celebrated in the Boston area as one of the Red Sox' most ardent fans, has received a signal honor from the City of Boston.

The city has renamed the Town Field at Fields Corner, "Dick Casey Field." An outstanding baseball player in his youth, Dick promoted athletics and athletic leagues among youngsters in the Dorchester area after his own playing career ended. His lifelong interest in baseball—and his many contributions to the sport—make highly appropriate the honor bestowed on him by the City of Boston.

Dick opened his playing career more than a half century ago, serving as first baseman for the Neponset Wanderers of the Dorchester Catholic League. He later played semi-pro baseball for St. Ann's of Dorchester, Boston Navy Yard, Greater Boston Twi League, Chelsea Millstreams and Moncton, New Brunswick, of the old Canadian League. The famous Dick Casey Club he formed in the Boston Park League 45 years ago won the league championship 11 times within 14 seasons.

A charter member and director of the Bosox Club, Dick is generally recognized as the Red Sox' number one fan.

Congressmen "Tip" O'Neill, Jimmy Burke and I served together in the Massachusetts Legislature with Dick. A four term member of the Legislature and Sergeant-At-Arms for the Massachusetts Democratic Party at national conventions for forty years, Dick has made significant political contributions to his state and nation as well as to the sport he loves. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him.

I submit for the RECORD tributes that appeared in the Boston papers.

[From the Dorchester (Mass.) Argus Citizen]

TO RENAME TOWN FIELD TONIGHT FOR "DICK" CASEY—DEDICATION RITES START AT 7 P.M.

The City of Boston will honor Bernard P. (Dick) Casey of Dorchester by renaming the Town Field at Fields Corner "Dick Casey Field". The dedication ceremonies will take place tonight (Thursday evening) August 28, at 7 p.m. at the ball park.

Dick Casey has been a resident of the Neponset section of Dorchester for seventy-five years. He served four terms in the Massachusetts Legislature and is retired from the New England Telephone Company with thirty-seven years service. Dick served on the staff of Maurice J. Tobin while Tobin was Mayor, Governor and Secretary of Labor. He has served for forty years as the Sergeant-At-Arms for the Massachusetts Democratic Party at the National Conventions.

Dick is best known for his life-long interest and participation in baseball. His own career began in 1911 playing first base for the Neponset Wanderers of the Dorchester Catholic League at this same Town Field. One of his teammates at the time was John W. McCormack, Speaker of The House of Representatives, and they have remained life-long friends.

During his many years in semi-pro ball, Dick has played for St. Ann's of Dorchester, Boston Navy Yard * * *.

Years later, he formed the Dick Casey Club and joined the Boston Park League in 1934, winning the championship eleven times in fourteen years. His influence on Park League baseball helped make it the best known semi-pro league in the country.

He has been a Red Sox fan since starting as an usher in Fenway Park in 1915 and is a charter member and director of the Bosox Club. He has been a familiar figure at Red Sox training camps and world series for over thirty years.

It is indeed appropriate that the City of Boston salute Bernard P. (Dick) Casey in this manner.

A ball game between the Wolf Club and the Craven Club will follow the ceremonies.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler]

CITY TO HONOR "DICK" CASEY

(By Jim Morse)

Off the cuff: Bernard P. "Dick" Casey of Dorchester will be honored by the City of Boston Thursday night when the town field at Field's Corner will be renamed "Dick Casey Field." Casey, a resident of the Neponset section of Dorchester for 75 years, served four terms in the Massachusetts Legislature and is retired from the New England Telephone Co. with 37 years' service.

He served on the staff of Maurice J. Tobin while Tobin was mayor, governor, and Secretary of Labor. And for 40 years he has served as the sergeant-at-arms for the Massachusetts Democratic Party at the national conventions. Dick is perhaps best known for his lifelong interest and participation in baseball. He's been a Red Sox fan since starting as an usher at Fenway Park in 1915 and is a charter member and director of the Bosox Club.

ILLEGAL TRAFFIC IN DRUGS AND NARCOTICS

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days much has been written and said about Operation Intercept—one phase of our Government's war on the illegal traffic of drugs and narcotics.

Emotions ran high. There was widespread dissatisfaction on both sides of the Mexican border, not with the intent of the operation but with the manner in which it was implemented.

Everyone agreed that the dope problem should be stopped because it is like a cancer—eating at the very heart of our society—our young people. But here the unanimity ended. Even within the administration for example, there were those who had different opinions as to the harm done by and penalties for the use of marihuana.

Operation Intercept also caused concern to many, because it was not merely an internal or purely domestic endeavor, but by the very nature of its implementation a foreign country was involved. Our good neighbors to the south were involved—the Government and the people of Mexico with whom we have had the highest level of relations and for whom vast numbers of our people have great admiration and respect. That is why many of us were concerned, that what had been built by so many would be severely damaged by a few.

We can now use hindsight and see that our concern was natural, but that the friendship, the good will and understanding for which so many of us had worked diligently for so long was indeed a monument to that mutual respect and admiration between our two peoples. This good will was stronger than any minor disagreement, or misunderstanding. This, I am satisfied, is what prompted our two Governments to initiate talks and reach an agreement on a joint effort to combat the dope menace.

It was the desire and hope of our two peoples that our Governments join hands in this endeavor. That they did should be a tribute to the spirit of solidarity which exists between our two peoples and which should exist between our two Governments.

So now we have a joint effort known as Operation Cooperation, and we have the task of repairing what damage might have been done. We must return our border country back to its normal way of life. We must return to an unarmed frontier where we live in brotherhood and friendship. We must return now because of Operation Intercept, more conscious of our responsibilities to deal with the illegal dope traffic, joining our efforts to rid our countries of this menace to our youth.

We have done this with our problems in the past. I am satisfied we can do so again. Together the people of Mexico and the people of the United States can continue to be an example to the world of how we can live, work, and play together, as brothers and as friends.

Let us not look backward, let us continue on the road we have traveled now for many, many years—the road of mutual respect and trust, of friendship and understanding, of love and admiration.

We have come too far to stop now. Our history demands we continue.

PRESIDENT NIXON DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL WHO SEEK VIETNAM PEACE

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Vietnam war moratorium has gained nationwide attention. Many Members of this body are giving support to the students and others who are staging demonstrations, vigils, and other activities urging an end to the war—now.

Many, who are participating in the moratorium, have given little thought to the consequences of unilateral withdrawal—and a unilateral cease-fire.

Several Members of this House and of the other body have gained widespread publicity in behalf of plans for ending the war in Vietnam. One plan would set a precise timetable for troop withdrawal. Other proposals call for immediate withdrawal and for a unilateral cease-fire. These also have attracted nationwide attention. However, the only person capable of action is the President of the United States who as Commander in Chief is entrusted with the decisionmak-

ing authority regarding our Armed Forces.

Together with more than 100 other Members of the House of Representatives I have cosponsored a resolution in support of the President's decision to reduce our ground combat forces in Vietnam and in behalf of withdrawing our remaining forces at the earliest practicable date.

It seemed to me that the President's decisions to withdraw troops, to Vietnamize the war, and to suspend the draft calls for November and December are consistent with a policy to restore peace at the earliest possible date. Also, the President's request for unified support in behalf of his efforts appeared to be reasonable and proper, and I do not intend to try to outdo the President with regard to a subject for which he has the principal responsibility.

In recent weeks I have been reminded of the President's inaugural speech delivered just 9 months ago when he said:

I shall consecrate my Office, my energies and all the wisdom I can summon to the cause of peace among nations.

This language was voluntarily added by the President to his constitutional oath and I am confident that he meant it as he said it.

It is in this spirit that I am regarding the various public expressions and demonstrations in behalf of peace in Vietnam—and in this spirit I will continue to regard all public action as being in support of, and not in derogation of, our Chief Executive's moves for peace.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, at 4 p.m. tomorrow, in 2247 of the Rayburn Building, I will have a statement for the press on the subject of congressional reorganization and will also conduct a press conference on the subcommittee's work to date and its plans for the future.

THE ROAD TO PEACE: BRING OUR BOYS HOME NOW

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the expression: "Hell no, we won't go." We are familiar with it because we have heard it shouted by students throughout the country. We are familiar with it because we are aware that it is the wish of a large number of young people confronted with the draft and the specter of serving in Vietnam. We are familiar with it because we are all aware of the horror of war shown daily on our television sets, the horror that is Vietnam. But for all their shouting and for all their wishing these youngsters for the most part do go. They go into the Army or the Navy or the Air Force or the Marines, and they are taught to fight and to kill and, if the present rate of troop withdrawals continues, they will probably be sent to

Vietnam. And just as likely, many them will not return. But I know that I do not have to remind you of these facts. I am sure that they are on your minds daily.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for almost 7 years. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I have toured Vietnam to observe our operations there firsthand. I am against continuation of the war and American military involvement in Vietnam. I am against the present draft system that messes up the lives of our youngsters so needlessly. I am against token troop withdrawals aimed at placating our youth at home without seriously reducing the levels of hostilities of our troops overseas. I am against supporting a corrupt, dictatorial government which does not have the support of its people with the lives and blood of American boys. Simply put, I am for peace; peace as soon as possible.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT in the book "The Arrogance of Power" stated that we are well on our way to becoming a traditional great power—an imperial nation if you will—engaged in the exercise of power for its own sake, exercising it to the limit of our capacity and beyond, filling every vacuum and extending the American presence to the farthest reaches of the earth. As with the great empires of the past, as the power grows, it is becoming an end in itself—governed, it would seem, by its own mystique—power without philosophy or purpose. Without philosophy or purpose, is not that how many people in the older generation describe the youth of today? Maybe they cannot see the forest for the trees?

I originally supported our involvement in Vietnam. At that time I accepted the premise that U.S. assistance was needed to prevent a centrally directed Communist conspiracy aimed at subjugating an unwilling people. I accepted the premise that the security and welfare of the United States would best be served by our involvement there. I accepted the premise that the people, not only the leaders, but the people of South Vietnam wanted our help. Today, I must reject all these premises and by rejecting them I must do all within my power to see the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam as quickly as possible.

President Nixon, speaking about de-Americanizing the war when he was Candidate Nixon, said that it was a new kind of war which, and I quote: "Is not primarily a military struggle in the conventional sense. It is primarily a political struggle, with the enemy conducting military operations to achieve political and psychological objectives. It is a war for people, not for territory. The real measure of progress is not the body count of enemy killed, but the number of South Vietnamese won to the building and defense of their own country—this kind of war can actually be waged more effectively with fewer men at less cost." That was Candidate Nixon talking. More effectively—fewer men—less cost.

Query: token troop withdrawals? I hope not. I hope the President is sincere in his efforts to bring about a halt to this

tragic war. Our original reasons for involvement have proven to be incorrect. We are not dealing with a worldwide centrally directed Communist conspiracy. We are dealing with a South Vietnamese Communist national uprising aided and abetted by Vietnamese in the north. The two Communist giants that pose threats to the United States are literally engaged in an undeclared border war with each other. The Soviet Union is having trouble keeping its own backyard in order—witness the uprising in Czechoslovakia, the Rumanian rejection of Russian communism, and the grumblings among other Eastern European captive nations.

Red China is just ending a period of a bloody counterrevolutionary attempt that was squelched by Mao Tse-tung and his Red Guards. It appears, however, that thousands and thousands of Chinese lost their lives in this purge of the Chinese Communist Party. In addition, it is now a well-known fact that the Vietnamese, both North and South, hate and fear the Chinese. Hanoi has shrewdly played off Moscow against Peking and has thereby kept its independence. A national brand of communism has been accepted by the United States with Yugoslavia being the prime example. We should allow the South Vietnamese to freely choose any form of government that they truly desire to live under. After all, were we not originally fighting to allow them to have the opportunity to determine their own destiny? The presence of about 500,000 U.S. troops certainly does not give them much of a chance to do that.

Some advocates of slow withdrawal will claim that in order to insure free elections, we must build up the South Vietnamese Army and not pull out before that or else there would be a large-scale blood bath. I consider it true that we now have a large-scale blood bath, but it is not only South Vietnamese blood, nor Vietcong blood, nor North Vietnamese blood, but also American blood. It is the blood of our friends, of our children, of our relatives. Fifty thousand Americans have now died in Vietnam. What does it take to classify a war as a blood bath? War is a blood bath.

Theodore Draper, historian and author of "Abuse of Power" stated, quote:

In the new worship of power, we are squandering our power by using too much too frequently and too maladroitly. All great powers which have overestimated, overindulged and overextended their power have come to grief. Whatever one may think about the present military imperatives, we cannot go on falling politically and "succeeding" militarily without ultimately inviting disaster beyond anything yet known to mankind.

Scary words are they not? But these are scary times and the United States is threatened with disaster.

Where are we going? What are we doing to ourselves? We pollute our air, destroy our streams, endanger our bodies, and threaten our minds. We expound high ideals and principles, but when viewing reality, we see hypocrisy and selfishness all about us and the credibility gap has become the credibility gorge when it concerns communication between the generations.

According to a report recently issued by the Ninth Strategy for Peace Conference held at Airlie House in Warrenton, Va., the dominant characteristic of world politics is the rapidity with which fundamental and qualitative changes occur due to the impact of technology, expanding population, the widening disparity between poor and wealthy states, the weakened allegiance of postwar blocs, the corresponding multiplicity of power centers, the emergent nationalism of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the resort to subnuclear revolutionary conflict, the proliferation of statehood, and the varied perspectives of national leadership between the generation now in power and the people of the next. Or in other words, as Bob Dylan put it "for the times they are a changin'."

I say it is time to change our role in Vietnam. Our men over there have fought valiantly for this country. Make no mistake about that. The United States has never had better trained nor better led men in our entire history. Our officers are not only dedicated and brave, they are also exceptionally well-educated and informed men to whom our country owes a great debt. Most were called to go and went reluctantly but they all went in the service of the United States and let us never forget that.

But times have changed. The people of South Vietnam will never be able to determine their own destiny as long as we remain in their land. Why should their army get ready and fight when they know U.S. boys will fight and die for them? Why should they fight for a corrupt government which is, whether we like to admit it or not, a puppet of our own Government? Why should they fight, when they feel they have nothing to fight for? And why should we send our young men to that far-off land when we recognize that the realities of the situation have changed, and we can avoid further death and destruction without endangering U.S. security interests by withdrawing now? These are questions that I have asked myself over and over again. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have studied many reports and papers dealing with the war. I have questioned generals and admirals. I have argued and debated with both Senators and Congressmen. I have listened to hawks and doves and visited the cities, villages, and towns of Vietnam. And after a long, soul-searching analysis, I have concluded that we should work to meet an established deadline to withdraw all our forces from South Vietnam. That deadline, I feel, should be December 31, 1970. We can do it; we should do it; we must do it.

The price of this war is truly incalculable. American deaths total over 50,000 men but this figure is deceiving. Due to fantastic medical advances, lives of U.S. troops are being saved that would have been lost during the Korean war or World War II. But many of those saved are no longer whole men. Many have lost arms, and legs, and eyes. Others have lost more, their minds. How many G.I.'s are now going to spend the rest of their lives in veterans hospitals, existing as vegetables, oblivious to all that goes on about them, needing constant

medical attention? I tried to find out how many, but even, as you all know only too well, Members of Congress cannot get all the information they need at times.

The price of the war is not calculable in terms of the inflation that it has spurred. It is not calculable in terms of the frustration of our own poor who see a military budget of \$70 billion per year and a poverty program for 14 million Americans, of less than a tenth of that. That is right, about 14 million Americans fall below the present poverty level. Education funds and student financial loan programs are slashed due to financial priorities that feed our military machine. Health activities such as cancer studies are curtailed due to the quote scarcity unquote of funds. I do not find it strange that many of the youth today are disillusioned with our Government.

I do not find it strange that high school and college students are raising their voices in protest against a war that seems lost, against a draft system that is unfair, against a society that seems to have placed emphasis on the wrong areas. No, I can understand it because I feel the same way too and I am not alone in my views. More and more Members of the Congress are raising their voices in dissent and protest, possibly not as dramatically as some students on campus, but nevertheless with conviction and sincerity.

I, personally, am introducing legislation that would abolish the present Selective Service System and replace it with a lottery method with age 19 being the year of eligibility. I am proposing legislation that would forbid the use of draftees in combat zones without the express authorization of the Congress. This is in line with the grants of power contained in section 8 of article I of the Constitution and will avoid the United States rushing into wars without it first receiving the consideration of the elected representatives of the people.

I want U.S. troop withdrawals by the end of next year. I feel that it is the only way to convince the South Vietnamese that they cannot indefinitely use American men to do what it is their duty to do. That knowledge hopefully will force them to shape up and meet their responsibilities. We have lived up to our commitments. We have paid a terrible price. It is now time to bring our boys home.

Nobody in their right mind defends war. Vietnam has seen nothing but war for almost 30 years—30 years—it's incredible. How many have died? Half a million? A million? I believe the loss of one life that could be avoided is one too many. I promise to you, as I have promised to my wife and to my sons, to work in the best interest of our country. And the best interests of our country now demand that we make the fastest possible withdrawal of our men from Vietnam.

Today we gather as free Americans to represent our constituents, to show that our Government can be responsive to the will of its people. We want peace and we want it now. Let none of us rest until we achieve it. Let us bring our men home.

ENDING THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is time to speak out again to end the war in Vietnam.

The new President has had 9½ months now to unveil his promised plan to end the war. In that time, more than 4,000 Americans, 19,000 South Vietnamese and 81,000 North Vietnamese have been killed in the war. And still the end is nowhere nearer in sight.

It is, indeed, time to speak out again, and past time to end the war. I, therefore, wholeheartedly support this day of moratorium and exhort every citizen, every business, every civic group, every political leader, to put maximum pressure on the administration to stop the war and stop it now.

Look at the damage this war has caused America.

We have now lost 44,798 American lives and left 227,754 Americans wounded. Our casualties have exceeded those of World War I and will soon exceed those on both sides of the Civil War, making this the second costliest war in U.S. history, second only to World War II.

Look at the damage we have wreaked on South Vietnam, with 93,738 killed, 271,102 wounded and 1,212,000 stranded as refugees in their own country, huddled miserably in makeshift camps, barely sustained in life. What other country in the world is ever going to want to be so generously "saved" by the United States?

Look at the damage to our national prestige. There is not a major country of the world that supports us, including most of our staunchest allies.

Look at the drain of our resources—some \$110 billions now siphoned from programs desperately needed at home and abroad. The economic impact in this country alone is staggering. Our Government is spending, for every man, woman, and child, more than \$142 per year on this war. For every \$100 of our Federal tax dollars, only \$1.26 is spent on protecting our environment, \$1.84 for housing and community development, \$4.04 for education, \$8.63 for health, but \$52.96 for the Defense Department, of which \$19.50 goes directly for the war in Vietnam.

To use yet another yardstick, we spend \$82 million a day on direct Vietnam war expenses. The entire model cities program for 140 urban areas could be sustained for a full year on what we spend in 8 days on the war. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's annual budget represents 3 days' military activities in Vietnam. And our entire Federal investment in air pollution abatement is only \$78 million a year, less than 1 day's Vietnam costs. A more distorted set of national priorities could hardly be imagined.

Look at what this war has done to our most precious resource, our youth. It has undermined their confidence in America. It has embittered thousands of them. For the great majority who have not succumbed to the extremes of militancy

or hedonism, it has spelled disillusionment, disgust, and disinterest.

Let us put the matter clearly. There is no way to convince our young people that this is not an absurd war—for it is absurd. There is no way to argue for patience in the face of continuing senseless destruction—for it is senseless.

Truly, a nation that has lost its youth, has lost its future.

We must stop the war before this ill fate besets us.

Let us look at our proclaimed original goals in this war. Have we discouraged the Communists from similar wars of national liberation? Quite the contrary; we have demonstrated clearly our inability to deal with them.

Have we saved South Vietnam for freedom and self-determination? Hardly. Conservative estimates indicate that there are at least 20,000 non-Communist political prisoners jailed by the Thieu regime, including student leaders, newspaper editors, Buddhist priests, and political opponents. Generals Thieu and Ky and their military-dominated regime can hardly be called the voice of freedom in South Vietnam.

These are the two goals we have proclaimed as our justification for being in Vietnam, and they have been shattered.

We fight on, apparently for fear of stopping, to save face after such a large expenditure of our most precious resources, and to save the face and hides of the military junta in Vietnam.

I submit that these new objectives are not worth the loss of a single American life. Continuing the war can only amount to throwing more lives away in a senseless cause and throwing good money after bad.

We had no business taking over the war in Vietnam. We have no business now in perpetuating our error.

How, then, do we extricate ourselves from this most tragic error in our history?

Not, I think, by the Nixon approach of limited pullouts and so-called "Vietnamization" of the war. I regard that as a formula for continuing our participation in the war indefinitely, not as a formula for extrication. What it means in truth is a prolonged U.S. commitment to supply the South Vietnamese with arms and to support them with perhaps a quarter of a million troops and airpower in the hope that the South Vietnamese with this help can win militarily where we failed. The goal here would seem to be to perpetuate the Thieu-Ky regime, though at minimum loss of U.S. lives. This, in turn, would seem to be predicated on a notion put forward continually by our military that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are close to the end of their rope, demoralized, desperate.

There is no evidence, however, that this is the true state of events. The Vietcong and North Vietnamese have been fighting now for 18 years, and their aggressiveness and determination seems if anything greater. On the other hand, the South Vietnamese seem even less interested in or capable of pursuing the battle. Just look at their ineffectiveness with a million and a half men under arms as against 135,000 Vietcong and about 90,000 North Vietnamese troops now in the

south. And consider the continued corruption that pervades their activities.

Most important of all, I believe that the basic premise of this Nixon approach is wrong. I do not think the Thieu-Ky regime is worth fighting to save—I do not believe they represent principles we should be defending.

We simply have to learn, starting in Vietnam, that we cannot determine the future of other nations. It is not our proper role to intervene in the internal struggles of other countries around the globe, nor are we capable of doing so. If the South Vietnamese Government is not strong enough to command the support of its people, to cause them to wage an effective battle against the North, then the South Vietnamese Government does not merit our support. It will lose despite our efforts. It may be replaced by a government we like less, but it is not for us to try to determine that result.

The fact is, however, that we have intervened massively in South Vietnam. We have caused vast destruction throughout Vietnam. We have caused thousands of South Vietnamese to become crippled, homeless, and dependent upon us. We have laid down the gauntlet to China, albeit falsely I think, that we would prove in Vietnam that we can stop wars of liberation, and we have successfully prevented North Vietnam from overrunning the South militarily. We have not been defeated militarily in South Vietnam any more than have the Vietcong and North Vietnamese.

These considerations rather than any motive of promoting Generals Thieu and Ky argue for settlement rather than abandonment. If we define our goals properly, I think we can achieve them.

Our goal in South Vietnam should be to withdraw completely in as short as possible a time, leaving a mutually agreed upon temporary international structure to supervise the withdrawal of all foreign troops and to assure the safety and self-determination of the South Vietnamese along the lines set forth in the 1954 Geneva Accords.

Settlement means accepting the conditions that actually exist in South Vietnam, not trying to get in the settlement gains not actually achieved on the battlefield as we have continually been trying to do.

This necessarily involves acceptance of coalition government. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong, still controlling about half the South Vietnamese population and two thirds of its territory, cannot be expected to accept in settlement an arrangement that does not give them an accurate share of the power they actually control. To talk otherwise is to negate settlement, for more simply has not been won.

I believe we could settle the war tomorrow on these principles. The North Vietnamese have so proclaimed. It is certainly at least worth putting them to the test of their declarations. It is worth taking this risk for peace after taking so many greater risks of war.

I thus reject the proposal for unilateral withdrawal put forward by Senator GOODALL—because it would be tantamount to assuring the murder of thousands of South Vietnamese for

whom we have assumed responsibility, because it would invite future adventurism, and because it would hand too clear a victory to the hawks in the Communist world. I think the Senator's proposal is well-intentioned but unrealistic.

I think, instead, that we should try for a realistic settlement in Paris offering complete mutual withdrawal, an internationally supervised coalition government to arrange South Vietnamese elections, eventual elections throughout Vietnam for reunification, and an immediate stand-still cease-fire while these arrangements are being made.

Anticipating the possibility that no such formal settlement may be possible, as was the opinion of such architects of our Vietnam policies as Dean Rusk, who thought the war would just fade away, we should match the North Vietnamese battlefield lull with our own, withdrawing our troops in proportion to their withdrawal, and receding to a posture of defending U.S. positions and South Vietnamese centers of population rather than seeking out combat. I would also try a unilateral cease-fire to test the willingness of the enemy to respond to it. I would do everything within our power to promote mutual scaling down of the war rather than maintaining it.

The end is within our reach if only we have the wisdom and strength to act on realities, admit our mistakes, and move on to constructive efforts to rebuild in Southeast Asia and in the world.

The last thing we should do is remain silent as the war continues, as the President has demanded.

Can anyone really believe at this stage of the war that we will achieve a better settlement by continuing the fighting for another 60 days, or 90 days, or any other period?

That has been the unsuccessful line for far too long—that we are just about to turn the corner—if only the critics would be silent.

Indeed, the new President has adopted the rhetoric of his predecessor toward criticism. Those who were branded "nervous Nellies" are now called "neo-isolationists." Where Lyndon Johnson exhorted his critics not to "tuck tail and run," Richard Nixon urges us not to "cut and run" or "buckle under."

The military tells us for the thousandth time not to respond to the enemy lull as a sign of peace but as a sign of weakness.

The President and even some prominent Democrats now call on us to refrain from criticism under the banner of national unity.

Let us be united in ending the war, not in its continuation.

Let us be united in peace, not in bloodshed.

And let us speak out to achieve this unity

MILITARY JUSTICE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, has dropped the charges against the Green

Berets. But, it is not so easy for the people of this country, while relieved that the Green Berets will not be made scapegoats for possible interservice rivalry, to dismiss their questions about what happened. Why the abrupt conclusion of the case? Why the clemency in this instance, but not for the Presidio offenders? Indeed, even the *Pueblo* crew had to undergo more questioning and public scrutiny.

Most important, however, are the questions that have been raised about military justice in Vietnam. There was the initial killing of Chu Yen Thai Khac; the severe pretrial confinement of the arrested Green Berets; the delay in the appointment of defense attorneys; the lack of information in the Pentagon during the months of July and August and then the subsequent withholding of information; and the promise of a closed trial by field officers—secret trials are reminiscent of medieval star chamber proceedings rather than our American way of public trial by jury. Is this the nature of military justice in Vietnam?

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) has introduced a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Investigating Committee on Justice in Vietnam. The committee's examination would extend beyond the case of the Green Berets; it would include a complete investigation of that judicial system affecting many young Americans and yet for so long free from public, and even congressional, review. I agree with my colleague that such an investigation is needed; and perhaps, in view of the recent article in *Life* magazine describing some most severe and unacceptable treatment given to prisoners in our stateside stockades, perhaps this examination should be extended to include all operations of military justice. It is my hope that this Congress will hasten in approving such a study for we have allowed the Military Establishment's treatment of its soldiers to operate under cover—under the guise of "security"—for too long.

I am introducing for the RECORD a column which appeared in the October 13, 1969, issue of the *Nation* entitled, "The Green Beret Scandal." This piece underlines the need for the investigating committee proposed by Mr. BINGHAM, as follows:

THE GREEN BERET SCANDAL

When Mendel Rivers announced in the House of Representatives that the Army's murder case against eight men of the Special Forces (Green Berets) had been dropped, some members rose and cheered. They might better have wept. No doubt the damage to the Army, the Green Berets and the Central Intelligence Agency was less than if military justice had been allowed to take its course, but all three came out with grievous injury to their reputations, already considerably debased by the inherent vice of the Vietnamese War.

The Green Berets' image has been tarnished, although the returning officers will no doubt be greeted as heroes in John Wayne quarters. However irrelevant considerations of morality in war may be in the eyes of the Green Beret officer corps and many civilians, some Americans retain the quaint notion that there is a difference between killing in combat and in gangster fashion. Indeed, Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, in announcing the conclusion of the proceedings, reiterated that "the acts which were

charged, but not proved, represent a fundamental violation of Army regulations, orders and principles." His wording could be construed as implying that such violations had in fact occurred but that the manner and circumstances precluded a successful prosecution.

In the issue of September 8 *The Nation* said editorially that it was most unlikely that any of the Green Berets would be court-martialed or, if tried, that they could be convicted. The crucial question was why, assuming they were guilty as charged, they should be punished for the murder of an obscure South Vietnamese alleged to be a double agent. Why this sudden squeamishness? To be sure, a case could be made out against the accused on the basis of the Nuremberg principle of individual responsibility, but in organizations like the Green Berets this is hardly more applicable than it was in the Nazi SS.

The background for the scandal seems to be that the CIA, the Green Berets and the Army headquarters in Vietnam have been at one another's throats. Once the charge of murder was in the open, the CIA even took the unprecedented step of trying to exculpate itself by holding a press conference at which it presented its side of the story, naturally on a no-ascertainment basis. Accusations and counter-accusations flew all over the place, presenting a picture of the participants which belied the traditional patriotic portrait of the military as honest, disciplined guardians of the national security.

As just one sidelight, William Beecher wrote in *The New York Times* (September 28) that on June 21 Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, commander of all American forces in Vietnam, was in touch with Col. Robert B. Rheault, commander of the Green Berets in the area where the alleged double agent disappeared. The General asked for a status report on the case and reportedly was told that the man was on a dangerous mission, when supposedly he had been killed the day previously. Beecher continues, "Why he (Colonel Rheault) said that remains a mystery to this day." Still without the protective "it is alleged," "it is said," etc., Beecher writes that Sgt. Alvin L. Smith, Jr., told his story of the killing to the CIA a few days later (in other accounts Smith is said to have been in fear of his life at the hands of his comrades in the Green Berets) "causing, among other things, General Abrams to become furious at being lied to and to order a no-holds-barred investigation."

The lawyers for the accused then proceeded to try the case in the newspapers and in Congress, and the scandal mounted. After first denying, for two days, that the President had approved the decision of the director of the CIA not to permit its personnel to testify—because of "national security" of course—the White House finally admitted that Mr. Nixon had endorsed, if indeed he had not ordered, the CIA refusal. The affair thus takes its place as an inglorious episode in an inglorious war.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, treason against the United States shall consist of—giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

Today I received an invitation to encourage our enemies. No matter how sincere the motives of those who support this encouragement of our enemies, I shall give them no aid or comfort.

I have just replied to the above mentioned invitation.

My letter follows:

OCTOBER 14, 1969.

Miss KATHERINE L. CAMP,
President, Women's International League for
Peace and Freedom, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MISS CAMP: Your multityped letter addressed to all Members of Congress was just received, along with the miniature flag-draped casket, which you described as being "a symbol of mourning for America's dead in Vietnam." You then stated: "If our nation's leaders truly mourned these dead, they could not continue to pile up the grim body-count week by week in a futile effort to impose political objectives by military means."

I don't want to join with you in trying to measure the sincerity of other people. I am not going to charge anybody with insincerity, but I must suggest that it seems to me that the most charitable appraisal that I can give of those who would have the United States pull out and abjectedly run for home is that their judgment as to how they can help American fighting men is unrealistic. I think that all Americans would like to avoid any further loss of life, but some of us who are old enough to have observed previous wars (I was an enlisted man in World War I) feel that the most certain way to assure continued loss of American life is to run from Vietnam. Certainly, such ill-conceived invitations to the North Vietnamese to hold on as is going to be conducted in the Capitol Building tonight can have no other effect than to encourage these people to keep shooting American boys, and certainly, the withdrawal from Vietnam is but an open invitation to the Communists to conduct the same kind of ruthless and brutal attack in the Philippines, in Taiwan, in Korea, and Japan that they have conducted in South Vietnam.

I realize that there are those who say that "this is none of our business—let them torture and kill these people of distant lands just as they have tortured and killed hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians in South Vietnam." There are those who say they don't like the government of South Vietnam—that it is not truly democratic. Just what is so desirable about the government of North Vietnam? How truly democratic is it? As a matter of fact, can you remember in what election the rulers of North Vietnam were selected? Or for that matter, how much democracy is there in Mainland China?

I am not trying to pass judgment on anybody's government. But I have been amazed that so many American citizens would find the moat in the eye of our allies and overlook the beam in the eye of our enemies. But the really important question seems to me to be: Would these people have us fight when the "war of liberation" is carried to the State of Hawaii, or would they have us wait until they land in San Francisco Bay?

As far as I am concerned, I am extremely anxious to bring this war to a prompt ending and to prevent as many future wars as possible. I know of no way of doing this except to show the enemy that it is not profitable to him to keep "picking off" American boys. I know of no reason why Hanoi should be given greater consideration than was Berlin. I believe most everybody will agree that the Germans fought a more nearly civilized war than have the North Vietnamese. But we were able to put a stop to the slaughter in Europe only by destroying the German capital, and I think it saved many American lives to do it. Why not put a stop to this war just as quickly and effectively? In short, the way to end any war is to win it. I have no apologies to offer for the brutality of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. They are indeed a crude and brutal people. I have no criticism to offer of our allies, the South Vietnamese. They are no more perfect than we are, but I know of no reason for magnifying their shortcomings and glossing over the brutality of those from the North. It has been the

North Vietnamese and their Viet Cong allies who have been killing American boys—not the South Vietnamese.

I am not going to be a party to conducting any kind of treasonable or seditious gatherings either in the United States Capitol or elsewhere. I don't believe that those who do are serving their country or protecting the lives of our young men—but they are clearly giving aid and comfort to our enemies.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

COLUMBUS DAY

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress fulfilled the hopes of millions of Italian Americans by making Columbus Day a Federal holiday, effective in 1971. This entirely worthy objective was achieved by enactment of the statute known as the National Monday Holiday Act, which provides that the second Monday in October of each year, beginning the year after next, will be observed as a Federal legal, public, holiday. In the meantime, many of the States celebrate Columbus Day as a legal holiday, and we in Congress pause to pay appropriate tribute to the great discoverer of our Western Hemisphere and to praise the achievements of his countrymen, the Italian Americans in our midst.

We have shown the high regard in which we hold the contributions to the United States of Italian Americans by reforming the immigration system by which Italian immigrants to these shores are admitted to the land of their hearts' desire, the Nation for whom their countrymen who preceded them here have done so much for so long. Prior to the new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, less than 6,000 persons could be admitted to the United States from Italy each year under the infamous national origins quota system. Since President Johnson signed the new Immigration Act at an unprecedented ceremony at the Statue of Liberty, more than a hundred thousand have been welcomed from Italy. Under today's immigration system, 20,000 Italians, who yearn to become Italian Americans, can be admitted each year.

Of all the famous Italians whose deeds have made an imperishable record in the hearts and minds of men and women through the ages, it is Columbus whose fame will last forever. Perhaps his achievement in sailing into the trackless Atlantic is more meaningful for us today than it was for previous generations, because we face the vastness of outer space beyond the moon in the same way that Columbus faced the expanse of the uncharted ocean.

Even the varied ethnic pattern of the future United States was foreshadowed in Columbus' voyages. Here was an Italian who used Spanish ships and Portuguese charts in achieving the most spectacular and important geographical discovery in the history of this planet. Despite all obstacles and hazards, despite primitive navigational aids, he found land and successfully returned to Spain.

Columbus Day is the right time to note

the achievements of Italian Americans. In their early days in this country, Italian Americans performed backbreaking toil in heavy industry and in construction. Yet Italian Americans, in remarkably few years from the period of their early migration here in large numbers, during difficult times and under severe handicaps, have come to take their place in the leadership of our free American society. During the past half century, Italian Americans have been holders of public office as judges, mayors, executive branch appointees, and Members of Congress. We all know how strong the Italian-American contribution has been in music and the other arts; it is the contribution most often described in paying tribute to Italian-American culture.

An Italian, Christopher Columbus, discovered America, and Italian Americans now help lead it and preserve its freedom.

THOUGHTS OF THE VERY YOUNG

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for many of us older people to realize how much the very young of the younger generation understand about our world and our problems.

I had the thrilling experience recently of spending an evening with an eminent Boston lawyer and devoted friend, Mr. Jerome Medalle, and his family at their lovely home in a suburb of Boston. At dinner the subject of the war and some of our disturbances upon the campuses and in the streets arose in conversation.

The father told me about a poem that his 11-year-old son, David, had written about these subjects. I asked to see the poem, and David read it to me. I thought it surprisingly good and perceptive, revealing an understanding about the war and the riots I did not realize an 11-year-old young man had.

I asked the father to send it to me so I could put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues and those who read the RECORD might share the appreciation that I have of it.

Here is what David wrote:

I WANT TO BE FREE
(By David Medalle)

Riots, riots, riots,
Inflation, wars,
Fighting on campuses—
What is this place turning into?

Can things continue like this?
Heck, no.
They can't!
The world's turning in a mass of violence.

I want to get away from this land.
I can't endure this.
I can't, I can't, I can't!
I've got to get away from this damn place.

I want to live with peace
See the beautiful flowers stand up straight
forever.
May this world be a world of peace—
And only peace.

David's poem reminded me of a line from Longfellow's "My Lost Youth":

A boy's will is the wind's will, and the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.

And, too, Isaiah 11: 6:

And the little child shall lead them.

It may be that many of our youth, unscared by tragedy and unscarred by frustration, have what Carlyle said Mirabeau had—"an eye which enabled him to see."

It could be that we would profit from talking less to youth and listening more to what it has to say.

GRAVES OF RICE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a rather touching and beautiful tribute to those gallant men who have given their lives in Vietnam was penned by a very distinguished and able friend of mine, Gene Griener, of Virginia Gardens, Fla. I insert the poem, "Graves of Rice" in the body of the RECORD following these remarks:

GRAVES OF RICE

(By Gene Griener)

A green beret was worn with pride and rode upon a young man's head; then telegraph clacked in the night the words they read—your son is dead.

New boots had waded deep in mud and through minefields where old boots lay on those faced down in graves of rice where mourners could not stop to pray.

Dogtags and chain reflect the sun, no tarnish to obscure the name, the number and the grade stamped there upon these tags someone would claim.

A Bible marked with prints and sweat, it rode inside a soldier's shirt 'til sniper's aim cut short the span that poured out in the Viet Nam dirt.

MOTION TO ADJOURN OFFERED BY MR. STUCKEY

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 210, answered "present" 1, not voting 121 as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—99

Abbutt	Downing	King
Abernethy	Edwards, Ala.	Kyl
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, La.	Landgrebe
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Landrum
Belcher	Flowers	Langen
Bevill	Foreman	Lennon
Blanton	Fountain	Long, La.
Bow	Fulton, Pa.	Mahon
Brinkley	Fuqua	Meskill
Broyhill, N.C.	Gibbons	Miller, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.	Gross	Mizell
Buchanan	Gubser	Montgomery
Burleson, Tex.	Hagan	Nichols
Burton, Utah	Hall	O'Neal, Ga.
Casey	Hansen, Idaho	Passman
Clancy	Harsha	Poage
Clark	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Colmer	Henderson	Quillen
Corbett	Hogan	Rarick
Cramer	Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.
Daniel, Va.	Ichord	Reifel
Denny	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Dennis	Jones, Ala.	Roudebush
Dickinson	Jones, N.C.	Ruth
Dorn	Jones, Tenn.	Sandman
Dowdy	Kee	Satterfield

Schadeberg	Stubblefield	Watson
Scherle	Stuckey	Whitehurst
Scott	Teague, Tex.	Whitten
Sikes	Thompson, Ga.	Williams
Snyder	Utt	Wyllie
Steiger, Ariz.	Waggonner	Wyman
Stratton	Watkins	Young

NAYS—210

Addabbo	Friedel	Nedzi
Albert	Galifianakis	Obey
Alexander	Gallagher	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Gaydos	Olsen
Anderson, Ill.	Giamo	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Gilbert	Ottinger
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gonzalez	Patten
Annunzio	Gray	Pepper
Beall, Md.	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Bell, Calif.	Gude	Pettis
Bennett	Halpern	Philbin
Betts	Hamilton	Pickle
Biaggi	Hammer-schmidt	Pike
Blester	Hanna	Podell
Blackburn	Hansen, Wash.	Poff
Boggs	Harvey	Preyer, N.C.
Boland	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Pryor, Ark.
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Pucinski
Bray	Helstoski	Purcell
Brock	Hicks	Randall
Broomfield	Horton	Reid, N.Y.
Brotzman	Howard	Reuss
Brown, Mich.	Hungate	Rhodes
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Robison
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Burke, Mass.	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.	Karth	Rooney, N.Y.
Bush	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Button	Kazen	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Keith	Roth
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Ruppe
Caffery	Kluczynski	Ryan
Carter	Koch	St Germain
Chamberlain	Latta	St. Onge
Clausen, Don H.	Leggett	Scheuer
Clawson, Del	Lowenstein	Schwengel
Clay	Lukens	Shipley
Cleveland	McCarthy	Sisk
Conable	McClary	Slack
Conte	McClure	Smith, Calif.
Coryners	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Corman	McDonald, Mich.	Smith, N.Y.
Coughlin	McEwen	Stafford
Cowger	McFall	Staggers
Culver	Macdonald, Mass.	Stanton
Daniels, N.J.	MacGregor	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Madden	Stokes
de la Garza	Maillard	Symington
Delaney	Marsh	Talcott
Dellenback	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Matsunaga	Thomson, Wis.
Donohue	Mayne	Tiernan
Dulski	Melcher	Udall
Duncan	Michel	Ullman
Eilberg	Mikva	Van Deerlin
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Esch	Mills	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Vigorito
Feighan	Mink	Waldie
Fish	Minshall	Wampler
Flood	Moorhead	Watts
Foley	Morgan	Welcker
Ford, Gerald R.	Morse	White
Ford, William D.	Morton	Widnall
Fraser	Moss	Wilson
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H.
	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolff
	Myers	Wright
	Natcher	Wyatt
		Wydler
		Yates
		Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Grover

NOT VOTING—121

Adair	Cederberg	Edwards, Calif.
Adams	Celler	Evins, Tenn.
Arends	Chappell	Fallon
Ashley	Chisholm	Farbstein
Aspinall	Cohelan	Fascell
Ayres	Collier	Findley
Baring	Collins	Fisher
Barrett	Cunningham	Flynt
Berry	Daddario	Frey
Bingham	Davis, Ga.	Fulton, Tenn.
Blatnik	Dawson	Garmatz
Bolling	Dent	Gettys
Brooks	Derwinski	Goldwater
Brown, Calif.	Devine	Goodling
Burton, Calif.	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Cabell	Dwyer	Griffin
Cahill	Eckhardt	Griffiths
Camp	Edmondson	Haley

Hanley	May	Schneebell
Harrington	Meeds	Sebelius
Hastings	Mize	Shriver
Hawkins	Mollohan	Skubitz
Hays	Monagan	Springer
Hollifield	Mosher	Steed
Hosmer	Nelsen	Stephens
Hull	Nix	Sullivan
Hunt	O'Konski	Taft
Jarman	Patman	Taylor
Kirwan	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Kuykendall	Pirnie	Tunney
Kyros	Pollock	Whalen
Lipscomb	Powell	Whalley
Lloyd	Quie	Wiggins
Long, Md.	Rallsback	Wilson, Bob
Lujan	Rees	Winn
McCloskey	Riegle	Wold
McCulloch	Rivers	Yatron
McKneally	Rodino	Zion
McMillan	Rostenkowski	Zwach
Mann	Roybal	
Martin	Saylor	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected. Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GROVER changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

VIETNAM

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I voted for this debate, because I believe it is important for Members of this House to have a chance to discuss the alternatives to Vietnam, but I made this point, and I serve notice, and I reserve the right to make a point of order of no quorum at any point if debate is denied us and if there is no opportunity to ask questions and make this a meaningful discussion. So if this is to turn into a one-sided monolog on Vietnam, then I shall, of course, exercise my right.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana as to how broad the unanimous-consent request is: Does the request include the right to include extraneous material?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the tradition.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman as to what affect this unanimous consent, if it is granted, will have upon the length of the session tonight. It has been announced in the newspapers that the gentleman from Indiana and others participating in these discussions intend to hold the House in session until noon tomorrow. Will this have any effect upon the length of the session?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman the only effect it might have would be to shorten it. Some

people might opt to revise and extend their remarks.

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Indiana includes all Members of the House desiring to participate in the subject matter the gentleman will discuss. It is not limited to those Members of the House who have asked for special orders.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has answered that it might limit the time we will stay in session. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I might observe it never was intended on the part of those who asked for special orders this evening to extend the debate into the legislative business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, "I may not agree with a word you say, but I shall defend to death your right to say it."—Voltaire.

In the 1956 election, Governor Stevenson, speaking at an eastern university or trying to speak at an eastern university, was shouted down by the crowd repeatedly. Each time he began to address the crowd, he was shouted down again. After 10 minutes of this, Governor Stevenson said:

Will you please be quiet?

For some reason the crowd was quiet. Then Governor Stevenson said:

"Thirty years ago this year when I visited as a tourist in the Soviet Union, the most distinct impression I received was that those who wished to speak in disagreement with the government were not permitted to do so. Good night.

And he left.

Disagreement with the Government policy on war would not be tolerated in the Soviet Union. It would not be tolerated in Hanoi. Indeed, it would clearly not be tolerated in Saigon.

I stood in this well not 2 weeks ago and expressed my opprobrium and shame over the action of the House in limiting debate to 45 seconds on a very important question involving expenditures of billions of taxpayers' dollars in this country.

I stand here tonight as proud now as I was ashamed then.

I think there is a message in what happened in this last rollcall vote, a message to all those in our society who say that we can no longer operate within the system to bring about change.

I am talking about the people during the 1968 campaign, whether I agreed or disagreed with the point of view they claimed to hold, who stood in crowds and shouted like Fascists so that the speaker, regardless of whether he was George Wallace, President Nixon, or Vice President Humphrey, was not given the opportunity to speak.

I would say of those people, there are kindred souls in this Chamber who do not understand or seem not to under-

stand the basic and essential qualities of a democracy without which it will fall apart and die.

But I would say to my young friends from one end of this country to the other that on this night this House for the record and for history has said that people who do not believe in democracy are not in a majority in this Chamber.

"It is sometimes easier to die for your country than to tell her the truth"—Lord Chesterton.

If this country ever goes to war it should be because we have to, not just because we have a chance to—me.

In 1956 President Eisenhower, a man who knew war, refused to take this country into war in Hungary and the John Birch Society said that he was aiding the Communists and aiding the enemy. I suppose in a sense the Communists were grateful that the United States did not intervene in that clear act of overt aggression across international borders. Maybe the Soviet Union applauded the nonintervention of the United States in the case of Czechoslovakia.

But I hope that history will record that always only a minority of our citizens would ascribe sympathy with totalitarian principles of government or with foreign dictatorships simply because a President of the United States would hold with John Quincy Adams that America does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the vindicator of her people, of her own people.

I realize that those of us who for years now have objected, as unnecessary, to our involvement in the Vietnam war do not speak for all the people of the United States, and 4 or 5 years ago when we began we spoke for far fewer than we speak for tonight. Tonight, according to the latest Gallup poll, we speak for 58 percent of the American people, and only 36 percent of the American people speak up against our position.

Nor do any of the Members I know of who are participating in this discussion, and who hold the general view that I hold, favor stirring resentment or hatred for our President. We have had too much hatred in this country, hatred based on childishness that does not tolerate the other fellow's right to an honest point of view.

President Nixon is my President.

President Nixon, I believe, is sincere in his views about the Vietnam war. President Nixon has changed his mind about the war in Vietnam. President Nixon was sincere in his views about the Vietnam war, and no one has heard me say any less of President Johnson than that I had an honest disagreement with him. I respected him for his point of view as I respect President Nixon for his point of view tonight; and as I applaud President Nixon and President Johnson for moving closer to a point of view which I believe is commonsense and practical for our country. I do not want this country ever to make decisions based on the mobs in the streets as such, but I think it only right that the President of the United States and all of the Members of the Congress at least consider the orderly parishioners in churches, the people who are in orderly assemblage about the

country in schools and other public and private places. In considering those people, the policies on Vietnam, my dear friends, have changed and changed radically.

My honorable and learned friend has truly said that the present is a new era in the war. The honorable Secretary of State feels the justice of the remark; for by traveling back to the commencement of the war, and referring to all the topics and arguments which he has so often and so successfully urged to the House, and by which he has drawn them on to the support of his measures, he is forced to acknowledge that, at the end of a 7-year conflict we are come but to a new era in the war, at which he thinks it necessary only to press all his former arguments to induce us to persevere. All the topics which have so often misled us—all the reasoning which has so invariably failed—all the lofty predictions which have so constantly been falsified by events—all the hopes which have amused the sanguine, and all the assurances of the distress and weakness of the enemy which have satisfied the unthinking, are again enumerated and advanced as arguments for our continuing the war. What, at the end of 7 years of the most burdensome and the most calamitous struggle that this country was ever engaged in, are we again to be amused with notions of finance and calculations of the exhausted resources of the enemy as a ground of confidence and of hope? Gracious God. Were we not told, 5 years ago, that North Vietnam was not only on the brink, but that she was actually in the gulf of bankruptcy? Were we not told, as an unanswerable argument, that she could not hold out another campaign—that nothing but peace could save her—that she wanted only time to recruit her exhausted finances—that to grant her repose was to grant her the means of again molesting this country, and that we had nothing to do but persevere for a short time in order to save ourselves forever from the consequences of her ambition and her communism? After having gone on from year to year upon assurances like these, and after having seen the repeated refutations of every prediction, are we again to be seriously told that we have the same prospect of success on the same identical grounds? And without any other argument or security, are we invited, at this new era of the war, to carry it on upon principles which, if adopted, may make it eternal?

Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. Charles James Fox said that on February 3, 1800, with reference to the war between England and France. I changed only two words in it.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman for the spirit in which he has opened the debate. I think he has shown clearly that the Congress of the United States is now prepared to discuss the war in Vietnam thoughtfully, prudently, and carefully.

I think tonight's debate and tomor-

row's moratorium are an expression of the nonviolent and deeply felt yearnings of the American people from all walks of life to secure an end to the war.

The moratorium which we are observing tomorrow is an effort to take anti-war sentiment out of the hands of the radicals who seek destructive political aims rather than an end to the war. There can be no moratorium on dissent in a democracy—to do otherwise is to betray our tradition of the free exchange of ideas.

Any policy that does not enjoy broad and deep support and the participation of Americans as a matter of conviction will be neither viable at home nor respected abroad.

So I would say that the argument that Americans will quicken the end of the war by remaining silent is just not true. Silence, I think, will only confirm the fact that there is nothing imperative about concluding a peace.

We will have peace only when we make clear privately in negotiations that there will be a definite date for all U.S. troops to be withdrawn and when we make clear the character of a peace settlement to Saigon, Hanoi, and the NLF.

We applaud the President's determination to withdraw American troops, but we feel that a new and compelling priority must be given to the pursuit of peace. Our country, I think, is always strengthened by responsible public dialog that bespeaks the national will. We are saying we have had enough of death and destruction. We want the war in Vietnam ended and we want no more Vietnams.

Once, it seemed, General Thieu was prepared to say that American forces could be withdrawn by 1970, leaving the South Vietnamese Army to fight what is surely its war. But now General Thieu has changed his mind and indicates that he does not foresee the time when we can leave the South Vietnamese to themselves, even with American military equipment and, perhaps, even American air and artillery support.

I quote President Thieu when he said recently:

The replacement of troops is not a one-year problem. It is a problem that will take years and years.

But I ask my colleagues tonight, are we prepared to wait? I say we are not.

The fact is that our war in Vietnam has not enhanced our national security but weakened our national foundations.

Since the Vietnam war began in earnest 4 years ago, our society has been subject to strains that have virtually torn it apart. Yet the resources—monetary, intellectual, spiritual—that should have gone to head off those strains have, in fact, gone elsewhere. Look at what has happened to us:

First, the campaign to end poverty has ground to a virtual halt.

Second, our inequitable and undemocratic draft system has become an unconscionable burden to us all and a source of justifiable discontent to young men of all backgrounds. In fact, we have drafted over 20,000 more men this year than last. The Executive and the Congress still pass the buck and fail to act.

General Hershey's removal was about a decade overdue—but it will not reform the draft.

Third, inflation has ravaged our economy, sparing no American, and hurting those most who are in direct need. Tax reform and tax equity still languish in the Congress.

Fourth, our educational system from grade school to graduate school has fallen progressively behind, with 400,000 classrooms unbuilt and 2 million teachers untrained, and more and more children functionally illiterate;

Fifth, our air and water have become more polluted;

Sixth, our cities are in crisis, and we can only watch them decay until we come forth with a new national commitment and dollars to match; and

Seventh, our preoccupation with Vietnam has led to serious neglect of our relations with Africa and Latin America.

We have experienced social discord greater than at any time in our history—traceable, perhaps, not directly to the war in Vietnam, but surely to the general crisis in faith in the justice, morality, and responsiveness of the American social system.

We need to end the arms race and begin by stopping construction of the ABM system and the testing of the MIRV. We need mutual agreement with the Soviets at the SALT talks subject to verification. We have got to end racism and assure equal opportunity to all. In short, we must redirect our national priorities, to assure a rational, progressive society.

We will never get peace, in my judgment, if we allow General Thieu a veto, permit him to call the tune. We will never have peace if we allow a government of uncertain legitimacy to persuade us to pledge its perpetuation until time immemorial.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a few days ago that President Thieu said in Saigon:

I do not have any further peace initiatives in mind.

He further dismissed the concept of a standstill cease-fire as unrealistic. He pledged never to cede so much as a hamlet to the Vietcong, and he promised he would make no further concessions in the Paris talks.

He reportedly stated, according to the New York Times, that in his view it will be 20 to 30 years before the Vietnamese Communists modify their brand of politics into a form acceptable to the South Vietnamese Government.

But I would ask my colleagues to consider that we used to be told that we had sent our Armed Forces to protect the right of the South Vietnamese people to choose their own government. And, to be sure, after a long series of military coups, there was an election in South Vietnam.

Of course, some Vietnamese were allowed neither to vote nor to run.

And, of course, no one who favored a coalition government was allowed to run.

And, of course, the newspapers were censored and the opposition was harassed.

And the system for electing the National Assembly was rigged to favor the

rich, absentee landowners, whose exploitation was at the very heart of the revolution.

And, despite all of this, the government of General Thieu received only a third of the vote—which was enough to get him into power and enable him to throw his remaining serious opponents and dissenters into jail where they remain today.

And that is the free government that our Armed Forces are defending in South Vietnam.

I think that what must be negotiated is the character of the postwar settlement and not just the token or phased withdrawal of troops. One of the first requirements for the success of such negotiations is that our Government insist that Saigon change its constitution and agree to participate in the kind of election machinery essential to a totally free election.

I believe that we will have peace, therefore; only when the NLF and leaders in Saigon and Hanoi and Washington recognize the futility of continuing the war. Peace will only come when we take firm steps to indicate that we will get out of Vietnam on a date certain; and that we are prepared to negotiate a cease-fire in place, the release of all prisoners of war, and amnesty for all peoples.

Lastly, I would mention to the Members of the House that I was in Paris during the period of the negotiations of 1954, and I well remember the actions of Mendes-France before he assumed the responsibilities of premier. And he made it abundantly plain that he would take office only if he could end the war within 30 days. And he lived up to that promise. And the same arguments that are now being raised were raised then.

I think we can end the war faster than we are doing.

Finally, I would say that to take certain of these actions is to recognize that a settlement is possible, and that a negotiated end to the war will raise America's stature in the world, not lower it, as the French learned in Algeria.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I will yield just briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Indiana have both spoken eloquently on dissent. We had an example and a good taste of this dissent in Chicago over the weekend. There was a brilliant young lawyer, Richard Elrod, who is today fighting for his life with a broken neck, broken by one of these hoodlums who came to Chicago to exercise dissent. What assurances do we have that these hoodlums who are churning up young people all over this country to exercise dissent that there is not going to be more of this kind of violence? And what do my two colleagues recommend in the wake of this kind of violence, which is not dissent, but outright anarchy?

Mr. JACOBS. I might say to my colleague from Illinois that I know of no man in this House who advocates that kind of senseless violence.

As far as the assurances are concerned, I can give the gentleman no more assurances than he could give me that certain speeches against civil rights would not lead to violence by Klansmen.

That is the problem with political debate. The conservatives are sometimes embarrassed by the far right. The liberals are sometimes embarrassed by the far left. Neither reasonable view—liberal or conservative—should be blamed for the antics or violence of extremists.

I would say that the honest and dispassionate expression of one's viewpoints should not be called a cause for violence in this country.

I will recall for the gentleman the words of Kipling:

And sure keeps their honor clean
The learned court believes,
They never gave a piece of plate
To murderers or thieves.

They never told a ramping crowd
To card a woman's hide,
They never marked a man for death,
What fault of theirs he died?

They only said "intimidate",
And talked and went their way.
By God, the boys who did the work
Were better men than they.

No person that I know participating in this special order tonight is going to say "intimidate." We speak from a spirit not of hate, but of understanding and reasonable discussion. If violence is drawn from that, then the Christian faith will have to go out of business.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I believe the gentleman knows that I hold no brief for those who would limit the very basic right of free debate in this House, for I was one of those who joined with the gentleman a week ago when we spoke out against those who would limit debate on the military procurement bill. And yet, as I said earlier today when I addressed the House, I have been troubled—and deeply troubled—by all the discussion that has surrounded the so-called Vietnam moratorium in that it seems to me that those who have endorsed this moratorium—and let me parenthetically add that the gentleman now in the well knows that I hold him in high regard and great esteem and great affection, and I make no charge of disloyalty or anything else against the gentleman or anyone else in this body who may participate in this debate tonight.

I was just as shocked as you were by some of the comments that were made in the House, I think, on yesterday charging Members with being "emissaries of Hanoi" and I will have no part of that kind of comment this evening. But what troubles me deeply is, much as I applaud the right of debate and of free discussion, and I hold these rights as precious as I know the gentleman now in the well does—but what troubles me deeply is that those who embrace this moratorium apparently also support the objective of this Vietnam moratorium, which as I understand it, is the absolute

unconditional immediate withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, and that this could conceivably be done as I understood in 3 weeks or 30 days. I base this conclusion on a call which my office made to the office here in Washington of the moratorium committee where we spoke to a Mr. Mixner. To me that kind of pellmell retreat to the beaches could result, if not in the annihilation of our own forces could certainly result in the slaughter perhaps of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians in South Vietnam. There were 900,000, I am told, who fled to South Vietnam from North Vietnam way back in 1954 and 1955 because they did not want to live under a Communist government.

I just cannot believe that the gentleman, great libertarian that he is, could countenance the objective of this moratorium to make an unconditional withdrawal of our troops regardless of what the National Liberation Front do and regardless of what the North Vietnamese do—that we should pellmell make a rush for the beaches, it seems to me, not only from the standpoint of what that would do in Vietnam itself, but the incalculable harm that this might do to the American psyche itself. We ought to pause before we adopt such advice.

I was at the White House this morning and I listened to the President of the United States and I am as convinced in my heart tonight as I ever was that his yearning for peace is not exceeded by anyone in this Chamber and he believes that a patient process of Vietnamization and a patient process of trying to negotiate an honorable settlement is the real way to lasting peace in this situation.

I simply cannot believe that the gentleman now in the well and others who support this particular moratorium really believe in the objective that some have stated, namely that we should within 30 days or within a relatively brief time literally rush to the beaches and leave the South Vietnamese people to whatever fate may befall them.

Mr. JACOBS. I would respond by first saying, as the gentleman well knows, that there is no Member of this House whom I hold higher in my esteem than the gentleman from Illinois who so far as I am concerned is one of the most thoroughly honest men, both intellectually and otherwise, I have ever known in public life.

In response to the gentleman's question, I have here a photocopy of a page from a newspaper dated December 28, 1950. It is a wire photo of a sign that was placed by the 1st Marine Division, when we withdrew from Hangnam after the Chinese field armies came across the Yaloo River late in 1950.

The poster was put up by the Marines and it reads: "We don't want the damn place anyway."

Now before the gentleman raises his ire at the simplicity of this, let me say that I acknowledge, and I think most people who share my view of the war acknowledge that the matter is not so simple in Vietnam.

My own judgment is that the resettling of hostages in Vietnam, hostages who undoubtedly would be subject to brutalization and death were they left

to the national process of the revolutionary aspect of that country—a process followed in a majority of countries in the world in changing governments, and I would say these hostages in Vietnam should be resettled. I would say that our Government has an obligation to see that they are protected and resettled in a safe place and get assistance from us.

They depended on our involvement in Vietnam, an involvement few Americans now would say was fortunate and necessary.

I would suspect that the cost to us of such a program would be about that of a day or two of the war itself. I would suggest, on the other hand, to those who say, "Let's win and get out," and that kind of thing, or even, "Let's fight a search-and-destroy war," whatever it may be, and then get out is a little like building a dam across the river with the intention of tearing it down right away. When you withdraw, the realities of war politics, inside that unhappy land—which, I might say, we have been able to make no happier with our own sacrifice of life and treasure over the last several years—those realities will exist all over again as they did before we went there.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. With this comment I shall desist from further interrupting this presentation. I have no desire to do that. I have no desire to put words into the gentleman's mouth. But it seems to me he has in effect answered the question I have put. I do not think you can resettle a million or maybe as many as three million refugees from South Vietnam within a period of 30 or 60 days, which is really what is contemplated by those who recommend an immediate, unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam. I think the gentleman is more sensible than that.

All I am pleading tonight is that we give the President of the United States the time that I think he needs to carry out a policy of withdrawal—and not pursuing a policy of military victory. The gentleman spoke of winning in Vietnam. The President has made it abundantly clear that he is not seeking a military solution to the agony of Vietnam. What he is asking for, what he is literally pleading with the country for, is the time to carry out the kind of reasonable policy which will accommodate the wishes of the gentleman in the well and myself.

Mr. JACOBS. I say to my friend from Illinois that probably on occasions I have not been sensible enough to agree with him—maybe vice versa—but obviously there has to be some kind of negotiation. Obviously there will be some kind of negotiation.

I just want to take a moment now to address myself directly to the moratorium. People all over this country—organizers, followers, participants, and I understand there is some question about just who is participating and who is not, or who is approving and who is not—to my moratorium friends, let me

say this: Don't blow it. You have done well already. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that my fellow Hoosier, the Director of Selective Service, has been dismissed on the eve of the Vietnam war moratorium.

I consider it hardly a coincidence that this new leadership we have heard about to end the war, Ellsworth Bunker in Saigon and Henry Cabot Lodge in Paris, have been called home suddenly on the eve of the Vietnam moratorium.

Let me take you back 5 years ago tonight, when it was the official policy of the U.S. Government that we would negotiate with no one. As I remember the quote, "All those folks up there have to do is stop bothering those folks down there"—ignoring the fact that the people who were running the government down there were some of the folks from up there. The majority of the South Vietnamese-Saigon government are North Vietnamese.

Four years ago those of us who suggested an internationally supervised election were hooted down because, why, you can not have an election with the Communists. After all, no Communist ever won an election. Perhaps in Italy, in a town; perhaps in India, in some town. And, of course President Eisenhower said Ho Chi Minh would win one in Vietnam. But if you entertained the idea of an election you were a traitor to your country. And I am not referring to my friend from Illinois, nor am I referring to the vast majority of this House when I make that reference. But according to some sources, you were a traitor to your country if you favored negotiation in 1964, if you favored the elections in 1965, and, my friends, 4 months ago you were a traitor to your country if you objected to Hamburger Hill.

I have not heard anything about Hamburger Hill lately. I have not heard anything about killing 300 or 400 American kids; dying for the privilege of playing king of the hill and marching down the hill again and giving the real estate back.

The fact is that the American public is given not only the right to elect the Government, but also to let that Government hear from them now and then after it puts the Government into office. And the American people have been heard from. The policy has changed from unconditional surrender to negotiations, to elections, to the General Gavin enclave theory which tonight is saving lives—and I congratulate President Nixon for being man enough to stand up and change his position. I do not ridicule him for it. I think nothing is more honorable than to do that very thing.

As Mayor LaGuardia said once: "When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to respond in kind to some people who spoke in the well and slandered Members of this body yesterday and today. My father long ago advised me against that. He said, "It is like wrestling with a hog. You both get dirty, but he is more used to it." So we are not going to get into that kind of exchange.

I want, however, to read a statement that was made by a man whom I disagree with sometimes and with whom I have

agreed at other times. He is generally known in the country as a conservative. It was made more than a year ago—almost 2 years ago, as a matter of fact. I will read just a portion of it, and this is a quotation from the "Paul Harvey News":

Yet, absurd as this posture is, in a Presidential election year I hear nobody offering the voters a real, honest-to-Uncle Sam alternative. The alternatives to our present pussy-footing are all out—or get out. And nobody seems to want to recommend either.

I know something of the fear which the politicians face, I've faced some of it myself in recent weeks.

When I began to document the case for withdrawal I received white feathers in the mail.

Further, it is uncomfortable and embarrassing to find myself in bed with some peace-at-any-price people whom I do not respect. But most personally hurtful is the fact that there are many sincere Americans patriots left over from an earlier era who still pledge their allegiance, "My Country, may she always be right, but—right or wrong—my country!"

They would blindly follow a blind leader if he carried our flag. And I love those people. I admire and respect them. I'm proud for a lifetime to have been one of them.

But after an agonizing reappraisal I am convinced that being either hawk or dove is preferable to the chicken-policy which presently sends American sons into worthless jungles to fight today's war with lesser weapons than the last one.

No, My Country is right in so many ways that she is worth fighting for. But in this now-win war my country is wrong—and it's time somebody says so. The question is not "whether" we will get out of Vietnam; of course we will, eventually.

Either we will bomb our way out and have to rebuild the nation . . . Or we will force a compromise cease-fire and have to continue to occupy the country, as in Korea . . .

Or we will, like the British and French, become totally exhausted and get thrown out . . .

Or there is one other alternative: We can quit this war and come home now. Let's consider the increasingly convincing case for coming home now. The government we left behind in Korea is a military dictatorship. How is this better than a communist military dictatorship? Is it really worth the lives of American sons and further devaluation of the American dollar in order to provide the Vietnamese with a military dictatorship? Nations, aborning, cannot be spared the pain of labor. We outsiders can pace the waiting room floor and bite our nails and pray—but democracy must "deliver" itself, when the time is right. When the time is right!

Maybe the time is not yet right.

Realistically, we must consider the mathematics of this kind of intervention. America's six percent of the world's mothers cannot possibly produce enough boy babies to police the planet. Presently, remember, we have commitments with forty other nations almost identical to the agreement which got us involved in this untenable situation in Vietnam.

Russia and Red China could prefer nothing more than for the United States to continue to debilitate and bankrupt itself in a multiplicity of stalemate wars. And the effect of these winless wars is devastating on our own people. The hypocrisy of opposing communism in Vietnam and tolerating it 90 miles from Florida is diluting traditional American allegiance, demoralizing our young.

We're told, "We have to fight them over there or we'll have to fight them over here."

They are over here—and we are not fighting them . . . over here!

And other nations see comparable hypocrisy in our eagerness to tame the world's jungles when we can't even make our own streets safe. The idea of pulling out is not without precedent. We "pulled out" of the Bay of Pigs. The French "pulled out" after DienBienPhu. And both they and we survived. And those who fear Moscow rule of all Asia might note that neither Moscow nor Peking has been able to "rule" even little Castro.

I am aware that American politicians are unanimously unwilling to recommend withdrawal. They are fearful President Johnson might pull a rabbit out of the hat between now and November.

Yet without some alternative to present policy on this most vital issue, there is no point in another election.

To those who fear a strategic retreat would cost us "face", let's remember that the United States has had no "face" in Asia in twenty years. And the places where we have meddled most we have the least "face."

On the contrary, think about this—for us to withdraw now could be sold to the world as a magnanimously noble, humanitarian gesture. Here this great and powerful United States—having the awesome weapons which could cremate all our adversaries—declines to do so. Instead we will allow Asians to choose their own form of government. Some say the result would be a bloodbath. The Vietnamese are now getting a bloodbath.

Meanwhile we would continue to keep any powers which menace us at arms length with our weapons of decision.

Some protest that to leave Vietnam would mean thirty thousand American sons have died for nothing.

On the contrary, if their sacrifice has been the finger-down-the-throat which has triggered the final regurgitation in our nation. Then it will be they who, at long last, taught us to mind our own business. And so saved countless lives.

Again, remember, eventually we will withdraw from trying to feed, finance, fortify, protect and police the whole planet. Eventually we will have no choice.

Every nation in history which has over-extended itself has eventually gone broke and been forced to pull back, just to survive. Why wait for that? Why not now revert to leading the world—by example—as we once did.

Instead of waiting until we are bankrupt, let us revert to self-concern . . . on purpose. Before we are drained of our blood and our sweat and our tears and our gold.

Why not, instead, husband our resources—make ourselves what we once were—strong and solvent—an oasis of arts and sciences and physical well-being.

So honorable, so admirable, so desirable . . . that the world will then, again, have something better than a red star to steer by.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman please yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I appreciate it. I would stipulate my great good will for the gentleman in order to overcome time consumed by the exchange of rhetoric.

I would only ask the gentleman, in pursuit of the same line of questioning the gentleman from Illinois attempted to get an answer to, what is it that you—not the Moratorium Committee; not the other 19 Members, whoever it is, who are going to testify here tonight—what is it you hope to achieve? What change of policy? What specific change of policy would you like to see accomplished? How do you hope to accomplish it by the eloquence which you have displayed here

and the historical exactitude which you have been able to expose before us?

I would like it as specific as possible. I recognize that is difficult because I do not want any rhetoric. I would like specific suggestions.

What would you do differently from what the President is doing now?

Mr. JACOBS. The Vietnam moratorium, as I said to my colleague, has already brought about substantial changes in policies, which I applaud.

The dismissal of a draft chief who is—

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. JACOBS. Now, I am answering the question. That is part of the Vietnam policy, who goes there and who gets killed. That is part of it, and I am responding in connection with how I would change the Vietnam policy. That is one thing.

The second thing is that the enclave theory has been given birth in the past several days. That means no more Hamburger Hills, the unnecessary spilling of American blood. That change is coming about, I think, not only because somebody decided on a moratorium idea but because that is the will of the American people.

Most Americans do not want to be protecting a dictatorship against another dictatorship somewhere far off and waste our kids' lives doing so.

So far as withdrawal is concerned, I am talking about an immediate cease-fire. Yes, I am talking about the enclave theory and pulling back into defensive positions instead of search and destroy. Search and destroy, indeed. A war of attrition. That is a change that has not been made fully according to the news cables coming out of Vietnam. I hope this expression of the American people will fully achieve that.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. A cease-fire. Is that what the gentleman is after? An immediate cease-fire?

Mr. JACOBS. A cease-fire so far as attacking with search and destroy missions is concerned; yes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. With no quid pro quo?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know what the gentleman means by "quid pro quo." If I were the father of an 18-year-old kid who would not have to march up Hamburger Hill, that is quid pro quo enough for me. I am talking about coming into the enclaves. I am not talking about yielding without any condition as we did at Lang Nam. I am talking about relocating the hostages. I am talking about negotiations whereby every one of the prisoners of war who are Americans and who are held by the other side will be repatriated and accounted for. I am confident that it can be brought about in the framework of negotiations of a withdrawal. You see, the concept is not "to bug out," it is to but out.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is absolutely right, because this administration moved very close to a cease-fire. The use

of the term "protective reaction" differs from that of "maximum pressure" which they used. I for one hoped that the President might have proclaimed a cease-fire and called it a protective reaction cease-fire, but he has proclaimed it at the United Nations and told nations of the world that it is our choice. Why does not Hanoi do likewise? I think the administration missed a bet in that regard.

Mr. JACOBS. Let me say to the gentleman specifically that I advocate the so-called enclave theory. I would not withdraw our troops from Vietnam without taking the hostages out. I may say to my friend from Illinois that the 1- and 3-million figure was given to by a stooge of the Saigon dictatorship in the so-called National Assembly. Realistically that figure is all wrong. It is much too high. Perhaps the correct figure is closer to 30,000.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will concede the fact that that figure is frankly pulled out of the air, but I want to thank the gentleman from the bottom of my heart for making it abundantly clear that he does not support objectives of some supporting the Vietnam moratorium who are calling for an immediate unilateral withdrawal without any reaction or anything being done by the Vietcong or North Vietnam. I think that the gentleman has made a real contribution.

Mr. JACOBS. Let me make clear what reaction I am demanding from them. They say "How do you get out of Vietnam?" The answer is "By boat." But I do not want the boat to leave without all of the Americans and the hostages. And some of those Americans are brutally languishing. I want to make it clear I have utter contempt for the dictatorship of North Vietnam and for the dictatorship of South Vietnam. I am talking about those Americans, some of whom are languishing and being subjected to a special kind of torture that Americans have never been subjected to in the past; namely, isolation from one another in prison camps. I am talking about bringing them home with us.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. That is another thing I can agree with and I can support my friend. I think the administration is moving precisely in the direction you want it to move in.

Mr. JACOBS. If the gentleman agrees with me, he is showing a sensible disposition.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman tell us how his statements and the statements of others to be made here tonight or the moratorium effort tomorrow is going to have one beneficial impact in getting North Vietnam, Hanoi, to free the hundreds or thousands of American prisoners now held by them as brutally as he admits they are being treated?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not admit it. I charged it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Tell us now

how this effort is going to be helpful in achieving that result.

Mr. JACOBS. That is very simple. If we stop demanding as a condition of our withdrawal the propping up of a dictatorship in South Vietnam I think we can get those prisoners back forthwith.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman is living completely in a fool's paradise, because there is not a scintilla of evidence that the more concessions we make that we will get anything from them. We have stopped the bombing, we did this and we did that hoping the enemy would make a concession but yet there is not a scintilla of evidence that they would cooperate in any manner in the prisoner-of-war effort, that they would withdraw their forces from South Vietnam. They have done nothing in return for what we have given and the United States for a year has shown its good faith in both a military and diplomatic policy.

If you will explain how we will be able to get the American prisoners back from the Hanoi regime, it would be very helpful.

Does the gentleman from Indiana believe that unilateral withdrawal of American forces would be helpful in getting American prisoners of war back from the Communist regime?

Mr. JACOBS. I just said repatriation of American prisoners should be a condition to withdrawal. Of course, there are the abrasions on the skin of the body. But the disease is deep. The essential issue is this. Do we insist, as President Nixon did in the 1960 presidential debate—do we insist on propping up the dictators in Saigon as a condition of withdrawal?

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The President has agreed to free elections, supervised as the gentleman says he advocated in the past. However, I do not remember him making any such speech in the past in which he advocated that course of action.

Mr. JACOBS. I might say to the gentleman that this is the first special order the gentleman in the well has taken since he has been a Member of Congress for nearly 5 years. I did not expect to cause all of this trouble on my first voyage.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The President has agreed to free elections and I understand the government of Saigon which the gentleman condemns so freely has also fully agreed to free elections supervised by an international organization.

Mr. JACOBS. Does the gentleman define the government of Saigon as a democracy?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think it is a far greater democracy than what you have in North Vietnam.

Mr. JACOBS. It is not a democracy. Close only counts in horseshoes. And neither the Hanoi nor the Saigon regime comes close to being democratic.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me make one further observation: How are you through the efforts you are making and

the efforts of others going to help get the thousands of American prisoners of war back to the United States?

Mr. JACOBS. I will just repeat it for the gentleman one more time.

I am saying that, if we discard as a condition for our withdrawal the propping up of the dictatorship in Saigon, then the issue of the prisoner exchange is one which either will or will not work. I repeat we have not tried it. So you cannot say it will not work.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have heard the same wishful thinking before—and there was no result—no action toward peace.

Mr. JACOBS. No, you have not. We have never yet announced we would mind our own business and let all the Vietnamese settle theirs.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Perhaps the gentleman did not, but others have alleged that, if we stopped the bombing of North Vietnam, all would be well.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman is not being relevant.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I see no evidence whatsoever that, if we give something, we get anything in return. Certainly, I think we ought to have some assurance that the American prisoners of war are going to be returned before we give anything in the future.

Mr. JACOBS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman: we do not leave without all our kids that are being held by Hanoi and the Vietcong. How can I make it any plainer? But in 1953 President Eisenhower discarded two of our conditions for a Korean truce—and we got it. We now should forget about further propping up of the Saigon dictatorship and look to our own interests there; namely, getting back our kids who are prisoners and taking out the hostages to whom we have developed an obligation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR) makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman from Minnesota does insist upon his point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That is very plain.

The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and 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. 222]

Abbutt	Arends	Bevill
Adair	Ashley	Bingham
Adams	Aspinall	Blatnik
Alexander	Ayres	Bolling
Anderson,	Barling	Brooks
Tenn.	Barrett	Brown, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Berry	Burke, Fla.
Anunzio	Betts	Burton, Calif.

Byrne, Pa.	Hanna	Patman
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Pelly
Caffery	Harrington	Pickle
Cahill	Harsha	Pike
Camp	Hastings	Pollock
Cederberg	Hathaway	Powell
Celler	Hawkins	Preyer, N.C.
Chappell	Hays	Quile
Chisholm	Hébert	Rarick
Clark	Hollfield	Rees
Cohelan	Hosmer	Reifel
Coillier	Hull	Riegler
Collins	Hunt	Rivers
Colmer	Hutchinson	Roberts
Corbett	Jarman	Rodino
Coughlin	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Cunningham	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, Pa.
Daddario	Kirwan	Roybal
Daniel, Va.	Kuykendall	Sandman
Davis, Ga.	Kyros	Satterfield
Dawson	Landgrebe	Saylor
Dent	Landrum	Schneebell
Devine	Latta	Shibley
Diggs	Lennon	Sikes
Dingell	Lipscomb	Skubitz
Downing	Lloyd	Springer
Dulski	Long, La.	Stafford
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Stanton
Eckhardt	Lowenstein	Steed
Edmondson	Lujan	Stephens
Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Esch	McCulloch	Stuckey
Evins, Tenn.	McKneally	Sullivan
Fallon	McMillan	Taft
Farbstien	Macdonald	Taylor
Fascell	Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Findley	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Fish	Martin	Thomson, Wis.
Fisher	Mathias	Thunney
Flynt	May	Ullman
Frelinghuysen	Meeds	Utt
Frey	Melcher	Vigorito
Fulton, Tenn.	Michel	Waggonner
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Watson
Gettys	Miller, Ohio	Whalen
Gialmo	Mills	Whalley
Gibbons	Mize	Whitehurst
Goldwater	Mollohan	Widnall
Goodling	Monagan	Wiggins
Green, Oreg.	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Griffin	Mosher	Wold
Griffiths	Moss	Wright
Gubser	Murphy, N.Y.	Wylie
Haley	Nichols	Young
Halpern	Nix	Zion
Hammer-	O'Konski	Zwach
schmidt	O'Neal, Ga.	
Hanley	Ottinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 238 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) is recognized for the 9 remaining minutes of his time.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of debate.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I have previously indicated by joining in a resolution with over 100 Members of this body, I support the President in his announced intention to make substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces at the earliest practicable date.

When former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford said we should withdraw 100,000 troops by the end of this year and the remainder by the end of 1970, the President then indicated he would hope to better that timetable. I wish to make it clear that I support him in this effort.

I would like to make it equally clear that I disagree with those who might

attempt to dictate to the President a specific date on which all troops should be withdrawn. And, Mr. Speaker, I would be equally emphatic in support of the rights of those who disagree to be heard.

In my judgment we have had some of the finest debate on this matter during my entire service in the House and I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman in the well for presenting a high level discussion of one of the most important problems now facing our country. For those who ask what good can come of this discussion, it seems to answer itself, that a great deal can come through the discussion of an issue such as this, one which is a most important problem facing the American people. I have been disappointed and saddened by the somewhat inflammatory attacks on my colleagues who are endeavoring to stimulate debate on an issue of vital importance to our country, in the highest traditions of Henry Clay, Fiorello La Guardia, and George Norris.

After all, I think the great Philippine patriot, José Rizal, said it best:

Blind obedience is not piety. Thoughtful reflection is not arrogance. Ignorance is ignorance and not patriotic honor.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I respect the gentleman's eloquence.

I was in Indochina when the 1 million people voted with their feet to move south, and I simply want to stand to challenge his statement about this being such a dictatorship. His own colleague, the late Senator Kennedy, the gentleman from New York, and others witnessed the holding of free elections in South Vietnam despite the attempts of intimidation and at times murder, violence, mutilation, kidnaping—you name it—to stop them, over 80 percent of the people of that nation voted. And that is a higher percentage than ever voted in this free Nation in any national election.

I think it is tragic that the continual statements are made that there have not been free elections. I think it is tragic that the implication is made that the present administration of that nation has not evidenced and stated its willingness to have free elections—and that has been supported by the President of this Nation, President Nixon.

The gentleman has misled this House if that is the kind of implication he wishes to leave.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is certainly entitled to his opinion.

Perhaps the gentleman would like to know why 80 percent voted. The thing was their food ration cards were punched when they voted, and if you did not vote you did not eat after that.

That has been documented by the American press.

There are varying views in the American press, and they have agreed at least on that.

Now, let me just go on and quote from Boss Tweed. Boss Tweed said:

I don't care who does the electing, so long as I can do the nominating.

And perhaps you remember a man named Big Minh. Not a Communist nor a neutralist—they were not allowed to vote or run either in that free election in Vietnam—but he was not permitted to run. And then a fellow who did run in the election was put in jail because he came out for ending the war. The point is that you know the election was rigged, as it clearly was, by denying the right not only to the neutralists and Communists which we now say we favor participating in the elections, but also denying to this fellow Big Minh the right to run because they thought he might win.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I will yield to the gentleman again, but my time is just about finished.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I respect the gentleman's opinion, although I disagree with it.

I would refer the gentleman to the mayor of Chicago, who has a similar reputation.

Mr. JACOBS. On that I will have to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to congratulate our colleague in the well. At the outset of this discussion I had announced that I would exercise my parliamentary rights, and I am sure other Members would, if this were not a regular debate. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana for the manner in which he has conducted this first hour. There is no question in my mind that if we continue in this way the rest of the evening there will be some real value and real knowledge exchanged on this subject, and will prove when we are all through that we are really not very far apart in trying to find a solution.

Mr. JACOBS. Let me close. I probably have about 2 minutes remaining, but I just want to say this: First of all, to the foreign governments that no doubt will be reading of this debate. We are a nation of free men, and politics does end at the water's edge in abiding our lawful decisions. But in discussing the making of those decisions we do a lot of fussing, and that is why we are a free people.

When the decision is made we abide by the laws that are passed by the Congress, and we abide by the policy, but we have every right to continue to try to change it. That is the American tradition.

For the future, dear friends, let us remember what has happened too often in the past. A politician makes a brave speech, and a lad lies dead. How easy it is to be heroic on the House floor. But that means being a hero on somebody else's time. When the call for war is made by a Member of Congress in the future, let that Member decide if he would be content to give his own life in such a war. And the next time we have a chance to go to war, let us decide if the giving of American lives would not be better reserved for the defense of our

country than for the defense of some dictatorship far removed from the security of this land we love. Let us bear in mind that there are two concepts of saving face.

In the hospital at Houston there are scores of American soldiers. One of them is from my district and I spoke to his wife this very afternoon. His face was burned. Sixty-five percent of his body was burned. I want to leave you with this thought.

Which kind of face, really after all, if we really, really believe in priorities—which kind of face really most needs saving? The face of a mistaken policy or the face of that American boy who either will or will not come under rocket attack a year hence.

Consider the difference between diplomats' tophats and soldiers' helmets. At noon, the tophats go to lunch; the helmets go to eternity.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks we have seen growing public interest in the administration's efforts to end the Vietnam war. We have seen legitimate and constructive discussion, by the young as well as the old, by the "outs" as well as the "ins." In the current debate the Vietnam Moratorium Committee has played a particularly active part in encouraging discussion of the U.S. role in Vietnam. I think this debate is healthy. I agree with Congressman ROGERS MORTON that this kind of responsible discussion is a good thing for our country. However, I want to ask a few hard questions this morning because I have been disappointed by the public discussion to date—and I hope that we can make tomorrow's day of debate more constructive by trying to focus on realistic alternatives, which I sometimes feel have been forgotten in the atmosphere of excitement that has been growing over the past few weeks.

First of all I wonder—and I specifically want to ask those Senators and Congressmen who have endorsed the moratorium tomorrow—if an adequate distinction has been made between the objective of the moratorium and the means that are being used to achieve that objective. The means that are to be used—public discussions, peaceful marches, and organized campaigns to encourage American citizens to express their feelings about the war and the direction of U.S. policy—are all in the best traditions of American freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. It would be a travesty on American history if any political leader suggested that U.S. citizens did not have this right or ought not to exercise it. I would only add that I firmly and sincerely hope that this day of debate will be a peaceful one, for if is not, irreparable harm may be done to these most precious of our freedoms.

So, I say that the means are legitimate, but I have grave questions about the stated goal of the moratorium leaders. And I further suspect that the many statements of support or opposition by public figures in the past few days, may have done more to confuse than to clarify that goal in the public mind. Yesterday I asked the moratorium organizers

for a formal statement of their objectives. Mr. David Mixner, one of the committee leaders, gave this reply:

We want to show that it is politically possible, and desirable, to support complete, immediate and unilateral withdrawal. We want out now, and this is not contingent on anything that Hanoi or the Viet Cong might do.

Do Senators MUSKIE, KENNEDY, McGOVERN, and others who have endorsed the moratorium also support this objective? If not, then in the interest of more responsible debate on a question of critical importance to the Nation, I would ask them to make clear just where they do stand—not only on the general question of public discussion of the issues—in which I fully agree with them—but also on the specific question of immediate and unilateral withdrawal as a goal of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Second, I would like to make clear again, in case some have forgotten already, that the announced policy of the Nixon administration is to end the Vietnam war as quickly and honorably as possible. There is broad agreement on this policy—much broader, I submit, than on the moratorium objective of immediate, unilateral withdrawal. It is clear that this war has become the concern of all Americans. I think an overwhelming majority of our people wants this war brought to an early and honorable end. That is one reason Richard Nixon was elected President in November, because he recognized that widespread feeling throughout the Nation. I hope that tomorrow Americans will remember that the President has already taken important steps to reduce our own role in the fighting, to encourage the South Vietnamese to shoulder more of their own burden, and to bring about a reduced level of hostilities in Vietnam at the same time that he is actively seeking an early end to the war in Paris.

Finally, I ask myself, and I would like the American people to ask themselves, whether the atmosphere of excitement and emotional commitment that has prevailed in the past few days and will reach its peak tomorrow, is the kind of atmosphere in which major decisions affecting a critical national policy should be made. I do not say this policy should not be reviewed. I do not suggest that important decisions should not be made—decisions which may affect the size and scope and schedule of our commitment in South Vietnam. I only suggest that a time of high excitement and emotional response is not the time when grave national decisions ought to be made. These important decisions ought to be made carefully and quietly, after serious reflection, in an atmosphere of studied deliberation. Let us express ourselves as a people—or more accurately, let us express ourselves as groups of people. But let us do it carefully, responsibly, peacefully, as befits a democratic nation which understands that great questions of war and peace are solved neither by sloganeering, nor by public posturing, nor even by dramatic days of debate and dissent.

I do not ask, and I do not think the President asks, for the kind of strict unity behind a person or policy that

would silence dissent or imply that it is un-American. The right to disagree, and to disagree publicly along with others of the same persuasion, is one of our most precious freedoms. I hope and believe that what we will see tomorrow will be a positive, peaceful reaffirmation of that right. But let us also remember that the cause of peace is not served simply by strident voices rising in concert. As the Washington Post recently observed:

A loud shout to stop the war, however heartfelt, is not a strategy.

Mr. Speaker, the President too seeks peace and disengagement, but in his judgment immediate and unilateral withdrawal does not seem the best way to achieve that goal. He has chosen instead the twin course of Vietnamization and negotiation, an honorable moderate course which I believe will serve the interests of both our countries and the interests of peace. This morning the House Republican conference passed a resolution supporting the President in these efforts. I think these efforts should win the support of almost all of us, Democrats as well as Republicans, in the Congress and in the country at large.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium which is designed to display in a peaceful and nonviolent way the overwhelming concern by a large segment of our country over our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Who, for instance, would like to see the war in Vietnam ended? JAMES J. HOWARD would. Richard M. Nixon would. Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey would. So would Senator HUGH SCOTT and Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN.

Few, if any Americans, want to see this tragic war continued. So to equate anti-Vietnam war with anti-Americanism is wrong.

We could argue for days, possibly for years, over whether we should have gotten involved in Vietnam in the first place. But that is not the issue—like it or not, we are there, and deeply committed now.

The real issue is just how can we disengage ourselves from this war which not only causes death and human suffering in Southeast Asia but eats up so much of our national budget that it also is responsible for death and human suffering here at home.

There are those on the extreme of one political spectrum who feel we should "win" the war in Vietnam, even if it means the use of nuclear weapons. We could then majestically preside over scorched pieces of earth.

At the other extreme there are those who would leave Vietnam today, without making any plans to assure safety for the many persons who might be killed as a result of mass retaliation by the North Vietnamese.

No political party can be blamed for the war, nor can any one President.

Tomorrow, when we join together in a massive show of concern over our plight in Vietnam, I feel it will show that the overwhelming majority of Americans want the war ended as soon as possible, even though there are differing views on how to attain that goal.

Quite possibly there will be some inci-

dents tomorrow by a very small and highly irresponsible minority who might burn an American flag, shout foul language, or break the laws. Those of us supporting the moratorium deplore those tactics. Actions such as this are not only reprehensible but hurt the cause of the moratorium.

These people are as irresponsible as the very small and highly irresponsible minority on the other side who would cause injury to anyone protesting the war in a peaceful and law-abiding way.

The question is not if we shall get out of Vietnam. It is when we shall get out of Vietnam. I support any responsible and realistic effort to end the war in Vietnam at the earliest possible date.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has written searchingly about the torment that he experienced in confronting six crises. He now faces his seventh and greatest crisis, in his confrontation with the Vietnam war.

This crisis will not be his last. How he faces it may give us some forecast of how he will meet his next crisis, be it sharp recession, racial conflict, or uncontrolled inflation.

During the campaign preceding his election, the President stated that the office of the Presidency should be a "place of moral leadership." A President, he said, "cannot stand aside from crisis; he cannot ignore division; he cannot simply paper over disunity." Yet, now that an issue has reached the point of crisis—now that public disaffection with the endless war in Vietnam builds higher and higher—his reaction is to do just that which he should not do. He has stood aside; he has ignored division; he has glossed over disunity. He has remained passive, plugged his ears, and retreated into himself. He has shrugged off the burden of taking action. He has given the warning that he will under no circumstances be affected whatever by public protests over the war. He has closed his mind to the rising concern of millions of Americans who want to speed the Vietnamization of the war, and to stop the slaughter of young soldiers. Our soldiers fight today, not to gain a military end, but only to underscore a point at the conference table, only to give bloody substance to the statement that we are tough, we mean business. The list of the dead grows longer, as the President asks us to table the whole issue, and avoid public discussion for 60 days. Is that when the time arrives for the next meeting, when the issue of Vietnam will again be taken up?

It will take something more positive to affirm the President's moral leadership and to demonstrate his control over the situation. He does not affirm his moral leadership by saying fretfully that he will not be affected by public protests over the war. He does not demonstrate his control over the situation when he states coldly that he is not going to be the first President to preside over an American defeat, even if he loses the support of 95 percent of the people in the country.

This kind of emotional reflex is deeply disturbing to me. It shows, I think, that the President has drifted far from a realistic awareness of what is going on in

this country and in Vietnam. Is it correct to call planned withdrawal "capitulation"? I believe that planned withdrawals demonstrate true moral leadership, not surrender. American boys have fought to protect the liberty of the South Vietnamese, and they have protected it bravely. We simply are saying that they have protected it long enough, that they have done their job and done it well, and now they are going to start coming home.

Without the pressure of planned withdrawals, what is to give the Thieu-Ky government the incentive to become more broadly representative of their people? What hope is there for an end to censorship and for freedom of opinion in South Vietnam, as long as we serve as a palace guard for the party in power? We are not capitulating by pulling our forces back. Our involvement in Vietnam will continue as we work to rebuild the country we have torn apart. We will have achieved victory when this task is done.

It seems clear to me that only a policy of planned withdrawals will accomplish the Vietnamization of the war. As long as we are there, conducting the burden of the fighting, the South Vietnamese Government will not do what is necessary to win the loyalty of their people, and to mobilize for their own defense. Planned withdrawals are the one sure way to stimulate the South Vietnamese to take action.

Such a policy does not hand victory to the leaders in Hanoi. It represents a clear peace initiative which will put pressure on North Vietnam to show their good faith in reaching a cease-fire agreement, and ending the fighting between north and south. I believe that our experience has shown that bombing the north has increased their will to fight, and has not brought us closer to peace. Now let us try a peaceful offensive.

Last month I called upon all Americans to express their feeling about the war by participating in a vigil of silence on October 15, the day of the Vietnam moratorium. I repeat that call to all Americans whose consciences are troubled over the endlessness of this war, to interrupt their usual routine for a while on October 15, and maintain a period of silence, in churches, parks, or stadiums, and in public processions. If places of public gathering which are filled during weekends for sport or worship were filled next Wednesday for a massive vigil of silence, then the message that the time for talk is over and the time for action is at hand will be communicated with greater force than any speaker, however eloquent, can voice.

If surrounded by silent disapproval, perhaps the President will listen to the promptings of his own conscience. He has shown us the quality of that conscience, in expressing the hope that all American troops could be withdrawn from Vietnam by the end of 1970. As things now stand, that timetable is not going to be met.

If the President does not face the need to act now, where will he be when the next crisis comes along? Will he be in San Clemente, or Key Biscayne? Or will he be in the White House, at the seat of responsibility? Will he preside, or will he

lead? These are the questions which will become more and more critical in the crises ahead.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express a community of feeling with good Americans all over this land who are observing the moratorium in protest against the continuation of the war in Vietnam.

What they do is in the grand tradition of America. We are not a people who keep our deep feelings to ourselves. We are enjoined by our Constitution and by our heritage to stand up and be heard. I commend all those who are participating in the moratorium ceremonies today.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President was mistaken in asking the country to maintain an additional 60 days of silence on the subject of the Vietnam war. A respite in criticism is not going to persuade the enemy that we love this fight any more. I am afraid only that it will give our leaders the impression that we, as a people, have become indifferent to the killing. The popular expression being made throughout our country today will not make the negotiation of a peace settlement more difficult; it will, on the contrary, reaffirm to our leaders that we can stand no more of war.

Let us make no mistake: We are not going to extricate ourselves by trying to salvage an unpopular, undemocratic, and reactionary regime in Saigon. We will get out when we acknowledge that we had no business interfering in the first place. If General Thieu wants to keep fighting, that is his prerogative. It is not our responsibility to keep him in power.

Whatever the President's strategy for getting out of Vietnam may be, I cannot agree with it. For it is, at best, a long-term strategy, and each day that he pursues it, more young Americans give away their lives. If the President has a strategy, it must be to get us out quickly. We are already some 40,000 lives too late. I cannot countenance a strategy that will cost another life in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I hail the courageous young people who avail themselves of the democratic process to marshal the sentiments of this Nation. They have, in the splendid instrument of the moratorium, made clear to the President and to the world that the American people want peace—and they want it now.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last year many of us here were engaged in a peoples' movement. With our leaders Robert Kennedy and GENE McCARTHY we challenged the President. We turned the primary elections into national referendums on the illegal and immoral war in Vietnam. We pointed out that time was running out on America's mounting stockpile of unsolved domestic problems and unfulfilled promises.

The year 1968 had its sorrows and failures; yet, it had its hopes and satisfactions. We campaigned from the snows of New Hampshire to the farms and cities of Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Nebraska. We walked the streets of our sister State, Oregon. We rang doorbells in every part of our own great California.

We found the people of this country yearning for a world without war and for a fair and equitable society at home—we found them willing to support politi-

cal leaders who pledged to move our country in these new directions.

At the Chicago convention assassination had removed the candidacy of Robert Kennedy. And GENE McCARTHY, despite the evidence of the primaries, was swamped by party regulars, unconcerned with the great issues, but holding in their hands the machinery of nomination.

We lost at Chicago, but at the convention we kept faith with the people by providing the only real debate on Vietnam and the arms race.

Today, just a year later, the polls tell us that a great majority of the American people support the anti-Vietnam peace resolution voted down by party hawks in Chicago.

I suppose that it is our respect for fair play that has given this administration 9 months to get its bearings and to begin the fulfillment of its campaign pledges.

Mr. Nixon was entitled to a fair amount of time to execute his promise of an early termination of American military involvement in Vietnam.

Today, this nationwide day of moratorium, is the time for summing up. In every part of the country Americans are taking time out to examine what the President and Congress have done to end the war and to redirect money and energy to the solutions of urgent domestic and international problems. What do they see on this day of reflection and analysis?

Since Mr. Nixon's inauguration more than 9,500 Americans have died in Vietnam, more than 60,000 have been wounded, and \$21 billion of American taxpayers' money have been spent directly on the prosecution of the war.

We do not know how many hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese have been killed or wounded. We do know that 4 million people have become refugees in South Vietnam and that the destruction in the country is enormous. We know that there are 2½ million holes, 45 feet in diameter and 30 feet deep caused by B-52's alone.

We know that the Thieu-Ky government is a military dictatorship, propped up by U.S. power, despised by most Vietnamese and notoriously corrupt.

The hard evidence is that the heralded policy of "turning the war over to the Vietnamese" is a slogan being used to conceal our staying in, not to facilitate our getting out.

Last week General Wheeler said that we will be in Vietnam for "quite a while." And from the White House came a steady stream of comments from President Nixon to the effect that he is determined not to be the first President to lose a war. He publicly has referred to Vietnam as "our finest hour." We are uneasily reinforced in our belief that our goal in Paris is a permanent division of Vietnam, as in Korea, half theirs—half ours.

So there has been no real change in policy, simply new management of the old L. B. J. assumptions. We are following the same strategy that has produced our earlier years of sorrow.

On this historic day of moratorium I suggest that we again tell Mr. Nixon and Congress that it is time we leave Vietnam—now that it has been 8 years and 4 months, \$100 billion, 46,000 Americans

dead, and 252,000 Americans wounded. If, after all this, the Government of South Vietnam is not prepared to stand on its own feet in its own country, then indeed it is time that we leave.

As President Kennedy said on September 2, 1963:

In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . the people of Vietnam.

I firmly believe that the Vietnam war must end if we are to begin to solve our domestic problems. But not for a moment do I adopt the simplistic notion that Vietnam is everything.

We have a deeply troubled domestic society. Some of the energy generated by the moratorium must lead the fight against racism in our country. We must bring to full citizenship the 20 million black Americans, the 5 million brown Americans, and the poor of all races and creeds.

Of all our problems here at home, the most immediate and pressing, the one that threatens to tear our society asunder, is the plight of the minority Americans.

The slums are a reality, as are idleness and poverty, lack of education, and dilapidated housing. We are in the midst of what is rapidly becoming the most terrible and urgent domestic crisis to face this Nation since the Civil War.

The consequences of racism reach into every home, bringing the sure knowledge that failure to deal with this problem could make irrelevant our success with other problems.

It is a white problem more than a black or brown one, because we are in charge. We, the whites run the country, and it is up to white America to accept the challenge—to face this difficult problem with imagination and dedication, wisdom, and courage. And, yes, with love. This is something we are learning from the young—that the hatred in this country must be rooted out and replaced by love.

On this subject I can offer a personal guarantee: The love we extend will be returned in abundance. This is something I learned in being the Congressman for many thousands of black and brown Americans.

There is another issue today, the conflict between the young and old. And we will not have a bridging of this generation gap—and peace and trust between the old and young—until the draft is gone.

Do not reform the draft—get rid of it. A volunteer army is the American system. A volunteer army was promised by presidential candidate Nixon. He must be called upon to produce.

I suggest that it is vital to remember that business, students, college professors, and city councilmen cannot stop the Vietnam war, or reduce the fantastic military budget. Nor can lawyers, State legislators, or newspapers create a new foreign policy, one that diligently and skillfully seeks accommodation and conciliation among nations, and world disarmament.

As Prof. George Wald said:

We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war; nothing,

material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating.

Only the President and Congress can get rid of nuclear weapons—or control their proliferation—through international agreements whereby no nation's security is imperiled.

And only the President and Congress can end the Vietnam war, end the draft, and provide the money and programs to bring our brown and black brothers up to equal citizenship.

This seems to me to be the most important understanding that can grow out of the moratorium. For the first time I am convinced that our movement is large and powerful enough to cause change in Washington, D.C.

On September 30, a special election was held in Massachusetts' Sixth Congressional District. The seat was left vacant by the death of William Bates, No. 1 Republican on the Armed Services Committee and a hawk on the war. It had been a Republican seat for 159 years.

Thirty-three-year-old MICHAEL HARRINGTON won the election over the State Senator William Saltonstall, HARRINGTON was the antiwar, anti-ABM candidate. People such as those involved in the moratorium staffed his campaign as volunteers.

The same thing happened on April 1 in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin, the seat Secretary of Defense Laird had held for 17 years. Here, too, the antiwar, anti-ABM Democratic candidate, DAVID R. OBEY, won over his Vietnam-Pentagon supporting opponent.

Twelve days ago in the House of Representatives, 93 Members voted against the deployment of the ABM, 270 voted for it. On August 6, 51 Senators voted for ABM, 49 against. Even so, many of us are not being properly represented.

Regardless of what a Congressman or Senator says during the campaign, the evidence is plain in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He cannot claim he is against the Vietnam war if he votes for special Vietnam appropriations. He is no friend of the Mexican American if he does not sponsor legislation to include farmworkers in the Wagner Act. He is for the draft if he has not introduced a draft reform bill.

Yes, it is all there, and they should be forced to run on their record. And you should defeat them if they are wrong on the issues. In the last analysis it is the constituency that votes through their Representative. Representative government can work. The trouble is that only occasionally is it tried. The decisive moments in history are never repeated. The absent are always wrong.

Men love their country when they have the kind of country that inspires respect and love. And what kind is that?

It is a country that is free and unafraid; that listens to the unhappy and discontented; that then proceeds to learn the causes of the discontent in order to end those causes.

And finally, I would hope that the moratorium will mark the beginning of a new foreign policy for the world's most influential and powerful nation—the United States.

The time has come to admit that man-

kind stands visibly nearer to annihilation than ever before in history. The arms race accelerates. The cold war goes on. There is a chilling absence of improvement in the structure of world politics. Today, world war could be ignited by a reckless decision in any of a dozen capitals.

Let the moratorium signal America's moral commitment to a unified world civilization. Let your generation insist that the politicians subscribe to this global unity.

John F. Kennedy told us the torch had been passed to a new generation. Today, I join him in passing that torch to you. In a few short years those of you who are under 30 will make up the majority, not the minority, in this Nation. Some fear you. I am not one of them. You bring me hope, hope for a world far better than my generation has been able to create.

I join with you in the goals so necessary for the survival of this Nation and all mankind: An end to the Vietnam war; an end to racism; a new beginning for this Nation and for the world, a beginning of peace and justice for all. And you, we, can accomplish this. Let us do it.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there are many views on moratorium day, which is to be observed tomorrow in a variety of ways by some of our citizens. We are hearing different views expressed here today.

Let me state mine very frankly. I cannot feel that it is in the national interest, either from the standpoint of achieving aims and objectives in South Vietnam or of supporting American foreign policy elsewhere in the world. I believe there is a national commitment to our fellow Americans who serve in the Armed Forces in this troubled area of the world. A part of this commitment, I think, is making it clear to them that this Nation is firmly behind its fightingmen.

I believe there is a danger that the moratorium, regardless of how well intentioned or how sincere the views of those who participate in it, will be misinterpreted in Hanoi as an indication of American weakness and thereby will diminish our chances to negotiate an honorable settlement, secure a stable peace for that area and prevent a far wider war.

I have stated previously—publicly—that I support President Nixon's efforts to obtain that kind of resolution of the war in Southeast Asia. I think it is in the national interest to demonstrate our support for the President and his policy to conclude the Vietnam war in keeping with our national interest, in order to insure that the great sacrifices that have been made by Americans shall not be in vain.

I am concerned that a demonstration of this type will weaken our position in negotiations to conclude the war at a time when our position needs to be strengthened.

I believe demonstrations of this type run the risk of encouraging our foes to prolong military action and consequently create the even graver risk of hurting rather than helping those American servicemen who serve this Nation in this troubled area of the world.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to participate in the special order he has for this evening to address the House so that I can express my feelings on the Vietnam war and participate in the moratorium observance which begins officially at midnight.

War has been a part of this Nation for the last 30 years. First there was the Second World War, then the Korean conflict, and now the Vietnam war. Some have said that war has been so much with this Nation that its citizens would not know how to live in peace. I believe that the American people would like to find out how it would be to live in peace. They believe that we have been in Vietnam far too long and they feel that the time is long past when this Nation should face squarely up to the issue of whether we want continued war or peace.

We have never faced up to the reality that the Vietnam war is not a peace-keeping operation. It is not an operation designed to protect our friends only. It has taken a tremendous toll on the moral fiber of the Nation. I believe that the time has come for the Nation to face this fact and for the President to end the war and end it quickly.

We all have hoped that the Paris peace talks would bring peace. Each time the negotiators meet the Nation pauses and new hope springs that maybe this week the logjam will be broken and we will start down the road to peace in Vietnam. And, each week the hopes and dreams of the world are shattered by the negative results of the talks.

If we need to Vietnamize the war to get out, I say let us get on with it. The time for pious platitudes and good sounding campaign oratory is past. Now is the time for action. President Nixon is losing his opportunity for a fresh peace offensive. I do not say we should pull out unilaterally and abandon Paris. I say stay in Paris, Vietnamize the war faster, and bring our American boys home soon. I encourage President Nixon to explore private talks and unexplored avenues or do anything else he sees fit. I do caution him against repeating the old errors and ask him to remember that old solutions accomplish nothing. It is time for the Vietnam war to become a tarnished page in American history. There is no need to prolong the agony. I urge the President to act now to end the war.

To date, 39,000 Americans have lost their lives in Vietnam. About 1,350 families do not know whether husbands or fathers are alive or dead because the North Vietnamese have refused to observe the common courtesy of releasing the names and physical condition of the prisoners they hold.

Frustration is creeping into the makeup of the Nation. I believe this development must be arrested before it invades the whole fiber of our national being. We must withdraw our forces before any more Americans are maimed or killed. We need no more new graves and grieving widows.

When President Nixon was elected he promised the people of this Nation that he would extricate us from this war. He

did not promise us peace now, next week, next month, or even next year. But, he did promise us peace. I see no movement in this direction at the present time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to all demonstrations.

I believe that many well-meaning people, with a desire for peace, have been misled by the organizers of these demonstrations.

These demonstrations often lead to riots, violence, and destruction of property, and infringe on the rights of the majority of our citizens.

There has never been anything accomplished by demonstrations.

We have only seen demonstrations lead to violence and destruction.

I feel that these organizers are in effect the "tool of Hanoi" and are making meaningful peace negotiations impossible.

The Hanoi government is making effective use of these demonstrations by trying to show that the people of the United States do not support the President.

I strongly believe that it is time for the citizens of the United States to give their wholehearted support to the President in his efforts to bring an honorable peace to the Vietnam war.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have just voted tonight against the motion to adjourn. It is possible that some attempt will be made to place me under the influence of Hanoi as a result thereof. Therefore, just a couple of observations would appear in order.

First, though the 91st Congress has now been in session for over 9 months, tonight is the first time we have had a motion to adjourn, preceding, and for the purpose of preventing, special order speeches. If no previous attempts have been made to cut off special orders, why should an exception be made simply because the Members seek to discuss the Vietnam involvement?

Second, the House of Representatives is a deliberative body. It does not make sense to this Member that the national lawmaking Chamber be denied deliberation of the one overriding issue which persists in this Nation today.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the agony in Vietnam continues. There is no military victory even remotely in sight. In Paris, all negotiations are at a complete standstill. The President's negotiators have frittered away even the minimal good will and progress left them as a legacy by Mr. Harriman. Democratization of the Thieu-Ky regime is a fruitless pursuit. Vietnamization of the conflict returns no tangible dividends in terms of American withdrawal or military progress.

Here at home the running sores of American social problems are turning into cancers which will destroy our society unless they receive swift, meaningful attention. The gap in understanding between generations grows into an abyss. Dissent grows here, matched in its universality only by war weariness and disillusionment. Only the flow of American corpses back home remains constant.

Yet there does not seem to be the slightest comprehension on the part of

President Nixon and the administration he leads of these accumulating factors. At his last press conference, he stated he expects strong antiwar protests and "under no circumstances will I be affected by it." The latest poll shows six out of every 10 Americans believe our country made a mistake in getting involved in that civil war. We have the President's answer, which discounts protest before it takes place.

Troop cuts have been taken. When first announced, there were more men on the way than were slated for withdrawal. President Nixon has drafted as many men in 10 months of 1969 as President Johnson drafted in all of 1968. So his draft cancellation for the last 2 months of 1969 becomes mere statistical sleight of hand. The words emanating from his administration are a grotesque echo of yesterday's meaningless rhetoric. President Nixon told the American people he had a secret plan to end American involvement in Vietnam. It has not been forthcoming. It does not exist. It will not emerge. Claims that it is real are as hollow as a jug.

This sums up the situation in toto. Therefore, we must exercise the only remaining option left to us as citizens of a free society where dissent is allowed those who wish to protest and alter avowed policies of their Government. I support the national protest slated for this Wednesday in the hope it will reveal to the administration how fervently the overwhelming majority of Americans oppose our further participation in this unjust war.

Mr. Speaker, as of September 27, by the Pentagon's own figures, 45,352 Americans have died in Vietnam, 9,161 of these young men have perished during President Nixon's tenure. For each dead American, there is at least another who will never be whole again. They will be among us for many, many years to come, without arms, legs, and eyes; broken in so many physical and mental ways as to defy belief and discourage observation. We cannot countenance any further sacrifice of such kind.

We hear talk of glory, honor, and patriotism. Hollow phrases to graveyards, hospitals, and grieving families. Our dead are from every corner of our land and each national and ethnic group. Would that every patriotic orator could look into their faces. Would that every person who so blithely speaks of more conflict could gaze into the eyes of those who have sacrificed all they had. Their dreams. Their hopes. Their futures. Their lives. How many of them would have continued to be true realizers of our national dream? What do words of glory, honor, and patriotism mean to them now?

Do we not wonder what they all were like? How many had been musical? Or athletic? Or bookworms? Or terribly mechanical in that mysterious way we who are not wonder at? How many ever had a chance to enjoy or savor life? Most of them are terribly young. How much can one crowd into 19, 20, or 21 years of life, even with the best opportunities? What chance did they ever have? What does their sacrifice mean? Who sits on Hamburger Hill now? Why did they have to

die? For the intrinsic value of Hamburger Hill or the Ashau Valley? For the corrupt Saigon government? For glory? Is there such a thing? What meaning does it have for those who perish attaining it?

Old men send young men off to die. Only strong backs and straight shoulders, clear eyes and young legs. After bands play, flowers wither and cheers die, what is left? Only filth, grime, pain, fear, horror, grief, and futility of conflict. Then the silence of a grave and the calm of a cemetery. Only grief of parents, sobs of sweethearts and wives, and cries of an orphan which will never know its father again. Ask them about honor.

What is martial music or GI benefits to mourners? Tell the grave markers of unity and perseverance. See how quickly and unanimoously they respond. Listen to their eloquence and cheering of the flag. Hear their patriotic shouts.

Do we not all wonder what we are doing to the next generation? Do we not pause and ask what these young men are like? Which possessed an infectious laugh? Who had been most compassionate? Who was shy or readiest to aid a neighbor? Who had been a mother's sole support, a loving son, a steady worker or a hail fellow well met? How many mechanics, doctors, plumbers, and pharmacists were there among them, had they lived?

Who among them had adored children or known a woman's love? How had they died? In a soaring moment of valor? In terror? Above all, why did they have to die in such a place and in such a manner? What has their sacrifice accomplished for their goals, country, and loved ones?

Who shall give us our answer? Generals who promise victory which never comes? Politicians who promise peace which they will not move toward? Professional patriots who have never heard a shot fired? Military contractors whose profits mount in blood-soaked piles? Potential despots who would stifle dissent? Draft boards which do not represent the youngsters they constantly feed into the mouths of the insatiable cannon?

To all young Americans who have perished, death followed a step behind, then overtook and claimed them. Fear was a visitor whose stay was unending. Hope was a glimmer never realized. And up to now, it has been all for nothing. Nothing at all.

Mr. Speaker, we should weep for our country and for these youngsters. For all those they leave behind. For churches they helped build which they shall never worship in. For families they will never start. For parents who will never see beloved faces. For sweethearts who will always live with an empty place in their hearts. For projects never built. Hot-roads unfinished. Educations ended. Promises unfulfilled. Our country loses along with their families. Our national spirit is wounded when each perishes.

And I say it is enough. Absolutely enough. We have not carved out this Republic, complete with ideals and promise, to send the flower of our youth to Vietnam any longer to perish for an Asian despotism whose jails bulge with

non-Communist opponents of its autocratic rule. Calling them a freely elected government is like accusing Walter Ulbricht of being the prima ballerina of the Bolshoi Ballet.

The names and faces of those who have already been killed and maimed for ages will haunt our Nation. If we do not call a halt to this inexorable attrition, tomorrow's burden of guilt will be that much heavier and intolerable to bear.

It is time we began to act as a mature society ready to acknowledge policy errors and accept political realities. Losses of almost any kind are acceptable in a noble, just or self-preserving cause. The war in Vietnam does not fit into any of these categories. Is not a realization of futility better than a continuation of murder?

Mars is a jealous god. He consumes lives and wealth in ever-vaster quantities. Dreams, ethics, and futures are drawn into his maw. The further sacrifice of our seed corn is the very antithesis of America. Even though we have failed those already dead, let us not do so to others whose lives may be spared by our further actions. Let us at least learn something from their demise and our loss. Let us hold our ideals more precious than our prejudices—our dreams as more valuable than our hates—our ideals more priceless than our faults—our capacity for compassion and doing the difficult but correct thing above our selfishness and desire to harm others. Let us end this ghastly involvement, turning ourselves to urgent domestic tasks requiring so much from each of us. We can do no less because these youngsters gave so much at our behest. They have not, in the end, died for Vietnam, as much as they have perished for all of us—for America's soul and her future.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have stayed until past 10 o'clock and have heard nothing new.

Certain perspective is required when any proposition is being deliberated—in the House or elsewhere.

Some perspective is given to the anti-war discussion by an exchange of letters between a local university student and the President.

President Nixon has clearly set forth the responsibilities of the President, or any other representative official, in making decisions. Every American ought to understand the decisionmaking process of the President—especially in the context of the excruciating issue of ending hostilities in Vietnam. I include at this point copies of both letters:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

DEAR MR. DICKS: In reply to your comments about my press conference remark that "under no circumstances will I be affected whatever" by the demonstrations planned for October 15, I would suggest that there are several points you should bear in mind.

First, there is a clear distinction between public opinion and public demonstrations. To listen to public opinion is one thing; to be swayed by public demonstrations is another. A demonstration—in whatever cause—is an organized expression of one particular set of opinions, which may or may not be

shared by the majority of the people. If a President—any President—allowed his course to be set by those who demonstrate, he would betray the trust of all the rest. Whatever the issue, to allow government policy to be made in the streets would destroy the democratic process. It would give the decision, not to the majority, and not to those with the strongest arguments, but to those with the loudest voices. It would reduce statecraft to slogans. It would invite anarchy. It would allow every group to test its strength not at the ballot box but through confrontation in the streets.

The planned demonstrations will tell us that a great many Americans are deeply concerned about the war; that some of these consider U.S. participation immoral; that many want U.S. troops withdrawn immediately and unconditionally. But all of us in the Administration are already well aware of this sentiment. We are already well aware that it is widespread—indeed, that no matter how many people might participate, there would be many more who share their concern.

Therefore, there is nothing new we can learn from the demonstrations. The question is whether, in the absence of any new evidence or any new arguments, we should be turned aside from a carefully considered course. The policies we are now following reflect our own best judgment, based on exhaustive study of all the available evidence, of how to achieve that goal. To abandon that policy merely because of a public demonstration would therefore be an act of gross irresponsibility on my part.

One further point: I respect the right of each American to express his own opinion. I recognize that many feel a moral obligation to express their opinions in the most conspicuous way possible, and therefore consider such expression to be their responsibility. I respect that. However, my responsibility is different. I must consider the consequences of each proposed course of action—short-term and long-term, domestic and world-wide, direct and indirect. Others can say of Vietnam, "Get out now;" when asked how, they can give the simple, flip answer: "By sea." They can ignore the consequences. But as I consider those consequences, in both human and international terms, I can only conclude that history would rightly condemn a President who took such a course.

One of the first acts of my Administration was to review, exhaustively and comprehensively, every aspect of the nation's policies in Vietnam. We have drastically altered the policies we inherited. We are on the road to peace. That road is not easy. It is not simple. But I am convinced it is the right one. There is no problem to which I have given more of my time and thought. For nine months, we have worked every day for a just end to a conflict which has been building for more than eight years.

On October 15th, I understand, many will simply be saying: "I am for peace." I ardently join with all Americans in working toward that goal.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think that your statement at your recent press conference that "under no circumstances" will you be affected by the impending anti-war protests, in connection with the "Viet Nam Moratorium," is ill-considered to say the least. It has been my impression that it is not unwise for the President of the United States to take note of the will of the people; after all, these people elected you, you are their President, and your office bears cer-

tain obligations. Might I respectfully suggest that the President reconsider his pre-judgment.

Yours sincerely,

RANDY J. DICKS.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today is one of national observance, a day on which thousands of Americans have shown through their individual and collective action their concern about the tragedy in which we are involved. There is no announcement in the Presidential papers published daily about this observance. You will not find a notice of this day in the world almanac listing our national holidays. You will not find a section in your daily paper saying that the banks will be closed or that the public buildings will be closed on this day. October 15, 1969, is not a recognized holiday.

October 15, 1969, is all the more important, however, because it is spontaneous. What started out in the minds of a small group as a college and university based moratorium has become a nationwide movement involving not only students but businessmen, teachers, lawyers, Vietnam veterans—Americans from every walk of life. The day has evolved not through the mailing of thousands of envelopes, not through the spending of large sums of money for television advertising, nor through the organizational structures that are the normal vehicles for important announcements. Observance of October 15, 1969, has come through word of mouth and through a sense of anticipation. It is the sense of anticipation perhaps more than any other factor that has evoked the massive involvement in this observance.

This sense of anticipation has its roots in a period of crisis that was perhaps unequaled in more than 100 years of our history. In the fall of 1967 and the early spring of 1968 our Nation experienced tension not known since the days preceding the Civil War. Millions of Americans harbored a sense of frustration and tension concerning the war in Vietnam that found no release. Although President Johnson spoke—and spoke again—of his earnest desire to bring the war in Vietnam to a close, his very actions seemed to many Americans to belie his words.

Contrary to the beliefs of some, Americans have few opportunities to express their wishes concerning their Government. Once every 4 years we pick the truly national leader—the President of our country. And by practice this period has become 8 years. True, we tend to read special elections and the congressional elections as indications of the national mood but they cannot be truly representative. The year 1968 would not offer the opportunity for a truly representative election. The incumbent would be reelected to another 4 years according to the rules of the game. But the rules of the game could not prevail in that period of great national crisis.

The seriousness of the situation in Vietnam in the fall of 1967 and the early spring of 1968 is easy to gloss over now. But friend split from friend and hawk attacked dove and dove criticized hawk with a bitterness that has not been ex-

perienced in recent time. When Senator EUGENE McCARTHY entered the race for the Presidency he did so not on the basis that he was a candidate seriously believing that the incumbent President could be beaten in the party primaries and the convention but rather as a candidate who would insure that the issue of Vietnam would be debated. Senator McCARTHY met a deep-seated need in the American people—an opportunity to demonstrate their concern about the course the United States was taking in Vietnam. And the depth of this need was evidenced in the months that followed.

The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy entered the lists in the spring of 1968 and the tempo of the debate over Vietnam increased. Although Washington prides itself on its ability to know what will happen before it happens, few of the experts predicted that President Johnson would take himself out of the race. But he did—and did so with the purpose of being able to more effectively work toward peace in Vietnam. His action served in many senses as a safety valve for the American public. Almost with a collective sigh America exhaled. The election of 1968 now offered an opportunity for change—meaningful change.

I believe the case of President Lyndon B. Johnson is tragic in a classic sense. He was most interested in and most concerned about such domestic issues as poverty, education, housing, medical care, the threats of air and water pollution, and the danger to our entire environment. He did great work to lead the way in meaningful action on all these fronts. But the incredible tragedy of Vietnam, which he inherited more than he created, turned to bitter ashes all his great hopes for progress and renewal here at home.

Although the positions attributed to Vice President Humphrey have often been misinterpreted, many Americans believed that he was too inextricably wound up with the policies of President Johnson to chart a new course in Vietnam—to hold to a course of action reflecting the United States' best interests. Presidential nominee Richard Nixon offered a plan for withdrawal from Vietnam. It was not a detailed, explicit plan, but it was a plan. This plan was a significant factor in the 1968 election.

President Nixon was elected in November 1968, undoubtedly with the help of the votes of independent and some Democratic voters. The 1968 election gave the public an opportunity to choose—to choose a course of action on Vietnam. The choice was made and President Nixon came to office with a mandate—a mandate that called for winding down the war in Vietnam.

One of the practices that has acquired the status of a tradition in the United States is to give the newly elected President a period of grace—to give him an opportunity to take over the reins of Government and to place his imprint on our policies. We do not expect our Presidents to modify or change overnight the positions taken during the previous 4 or 8 years. We expect the new Cabinet officers as well as the Chief Executive to

devote part of this initial period to mastering the details of their job. Our Presidents are not blamed or praised for the actions of their predecessors but rather make their own imprint on the scroll of time.

But, it is now almost 1 year since Americans had the opportunity to show their concern about Vietnam. It is only 3 weeks to the first anniversary of our trek to the voting booth. But this year there is no vote—no place to register our approval or our concern or other judgment about the course of events during the past year. True, we do read in the paper that the latest Gallup poll shows that 58 percent of all Americans think that we made a mistake to have gone into Vietnam—that another 32 percent think we should have—and 10 percent do not know. But the Gallup poll has limitations. It does not show the depth of conviction with which Americans hold these opinions. It does not show the deep affection that a number of Americans have for Vietnamese that they have fought beside or helped to reap better crops. It does not show the bravery of the many Americans who have shed their blood for Vietnam, whether by choice or by sanction. No poll can reflect these differences of opinion. Yet in these troubled times, polls are not adequate indicators of public opinion.

What is public opinion, after all? Is it the sum of the views of the elected officials of one or the other body of Congress? Is it the editorials appearing in 10 or 15 major newspapers? Is it the voice of a particular columnist or of a particular broadcaster? If one could know for sure what public opinion was at any particular time, our lives might be infinitely simpler, although somewhat sterile.

I must say here that public opinion concerning Vietnam is felt with an intensity that we rarely see. Opinions about Vietnam are not lightly held. This intensity finds form in a search for participatory democracy—something more tangible than an acceptance of the actions of the representatives that we elect. Some Americans who I have talked to feel that they must demonstrate their very real and terrible sense of conscience about Vietnam. In what is almost a religious act, they must perform an act of conscience. For those of us who only live the war through the television tube—who do not expend the adrenalin, the sweat, and the toil that may cleanse the spirit, the burden is a heavy one. It is a burden that is not thrown off in conversations with our friends or an occasional letter to Washington. And so the pressure mounts to express—to somehow bear testimony to a people in a foreign land who are subjected year in, year out, to the ravages of war, and most importantly to those of our younger generations who either carry the burden in Vietnam or face a future that will take them there.

This pressure to bear testimony, to make an observance of conscience, has found its opportunity. It has focused on October 15, 1969, as the day when Americans wish to be counted. The total will not be recorded in the voting booths. It will be recorded in hundreds of

gatherings in churches, in places of business, in the car lights that are left on, in the talks at colleges and schools throughout the Nation, in all the ways that individuals choose to make their concern known.

This day of observance will not—cannot—be ignored. The shift in opinion in the Congress, the statements of support from such eminent Americans as Richard Cardinal Cushing and Gov. Averell Harriman all indicate that this day has already had an effect. The question at this point, of course, is, What kind of effect?

I believe that October 15, 1969, will serve as a watershed in our history if it serves to reinforce the promise made to Americans on November 5, 1968, a promise to bring our involvement in Vietnam to a rapid conclusion; it will be useful if it removes some of the illusions on the part of both the public and our national leaders as to how we can disengage in Vietnam; it will be useful if it strengthens the hand of President Nixon in his search for an end to this chapter in American history.

I watched at close hand what the war in Vietnam did to Lyndon Johnson, how it turned his hair white, eventually drove him from the White House as most of the dreams for America went up in smoke. I do not wish this on any man. We only have one President at a time and I believe we must do all we can to help the President. Let us not have a repeat of 1968. I do not think the Nation could stand it.

Former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, a clearheaded and courageous statesman, wrote recently in an article:

When I asked for a presentation of the military plan for attaining victory in Vietnam, I was told that there was no plan for victory in the historic American sense . . . The President had forbidden our forces to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia, for to do so would spread the war, politically and geographically, with no discernible advantage . . . After days of analysis . . . I could not find out when the war was going to end; I could not find out the manner in which it was going to end . . . And so, after these exhausting days, I was convinced that the military course we were pursuing was not only endless, but hopeless.

As a design for further action, Secretary Clifford concluded that our goal should be to stop sending additional troops to Vietnam and to begin a gradual disengagement.

What has happened since Secretary Clifford came to this conclusion in the spring of 1968? A new President has taken office and a new Secretary of Defense has been chosen. The tragic toll of American, South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese dead has continued to mount. Each week with minor variations we learn that 115 or 94 or 152 American boys have lost their lives. We are told that the U.S. Army has pulled out of the delta south of Saigon and that the South Vietnamese Army has taken over the job of maintaining order there. We learn that 60,000 troops are to be pulled out before the end of the year.

I believe that President Nixon is committed to disengagement in Vietnam. And I believe that Americans have the

fortitude to back up President Nixon in the complicated and perhaps painful actions that must be taken to achieve this goal. There can be no illusion about the disengagement in Vietnam, it will take place and it will recognize the political realities of the situation.

We must seek disengagement on the basis of control as it exists, not how we would prefer it to exist.

What we must search for at the conference table is not kind words but some agreement concerning the future based on the realities of power as it exists in South Vietnam.

A sudden withdrawal of U.S. troops would bring more chaos and death than an orderly withdrawal that places additional responsibilities on the South Vietnamese. An act of will must be made, then, to withdraw American troops on a timely schedule. And in my opinion this is more on the order of 100,000 ground troops as Secretary Clifford and Ambassador Harriman have recommended than 60,000 now planned to be withdrawn this year.

I also believe that we can negotiate a cease-fire now. There have been sufficient signs of North Vietnamese inactivity to warrant a cease-fire. We should not seek some nebulous promise or some unachievable goal; we should mold the course of events with the material in hand. The limited engagement policy announced by Secretary Laird last week is a useful first step in this direction; its very success argues for further action. I urge President Nixon to use his statesmanship to seek out and announce a cease-fire in the immediate future.

I have not mentioned a date by which I believe all American troops should be out of Vietnam. Just as we are unable to fix the precise date on which we became involved in Vietnam, I believe that we cannot fix the precise date on which we will be out. There must be an end to our involvement in the near future, particularly for the ground troops who have been bearing the brunt of the fighting. And there will be an end to the need for our support troops, an end that we hope will follow the ability of a South Vietnamese Army to perform these functions.

The end to American involvement in Vietnam will come and it will come in the near future.

One comment that should be added. The conduct and the decisions that are made concerning Vietnam are not a matter for partisan politics. Our foreign and military policy in this instance concerns the lives and fortunes of every American. There should be every opportunity for genuine expressions of opinion. There is no room for Democrat or Republican in this debate. But, in taking my place among those who wish to be counted on this October 15, 1969, I do so as a concerned American, as the Representative of 500,000 Americans acting as my conscience dictates. I do not do so as a Democrat. From this day, President Nixon can draw the support and the expression of will for positive action. There could be no better observance.

Vietnam may well be the worst debacle in American history. The story of our involvement in that troubled peninsula

since World War II is marred by mistakes. We should never have supported the French effort to reestablish their colonial empire after the war when colonialism was taking its place with feudalism as a regrettable vestige of the past.

One could go on and on. But that is past history. Now we must pursue the basic course of disengagement that has been charted. My chief difference with it is that we must put on some steam and move faster so that we can turn at the earliest moment to the urgent, unfinished business of America here at home.

Many public officials made mistakes and I confess to my share.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, why are there no gold stars in the windows of American homes during the Vietnam war as there were during World War II? In 1943 and 1944, did any American woman, mourning a son's death in the war, refuse to allow military honors to be paid at his funeral, or scorn to accept the flag from his coffin? Did any bereaved mother carry picket signs demanding that the troops be brought home from Italy, or chain herself to a young man outside an induction center?

These things are common now. Has our society changed so much? Have American women changed so profoundly? These questions, perhaps, honestly trouble some persons. They may wonder if they see our country in decline, in decay, because such things are going on. That is nonsense. Our country is not decaying. American mothers are as able as they ever were to make the greatest sacrifice a woman can make, to consent to the death of a son, in a just and necessary war.

But not in an unnecessary war into which we stumbled, or were led by shortsighted men. We have been locked into the war by stubborn, proud leaders who could not admit that they were wrong. We have been systematically lied to for years about the nature of the war and the prospects of ending it. We know now what we have been doing, despite the lies. We have been pouring out the lives of our sons and wasting the spirit and the resources of our Nation to support a corrupt and dictatorial government whose citizens would reject it in a moment if it were not protected by a wall of American arms. This is not a just and necessary war we are fighting.

If it had ended sooner, if we had won it quickly, these and other unpleasant truths about the war might never have become known to most of the American people. But it has gone on too long, and the truth has come out. Now the Nation demands that the war be ended. But President Nixon talks of an honorable conclusion. He says that he will not be the first President to preside over an American defeat. He says he will not be affected by the demands being voiced this week, in an unprecedented and historic outpouring of public opinion, that the war be ended. We who have hoped—and I believe all of us here, and most Americans have hoped it—hoped that the new President would find a way to repudiate the mistakes of the past and put a merciful end to this shameful episode

in our Nation's history, have been disappointed. We are disappointed daily at every fresh proof that nothing has been changed.

The President talks of withdrawal, and the Secretary of Defense talks of Vietnamization of the war. Members of this House have been to Vietnam since that talk began, and came back to report that they were cruelly disappointed to learn that this talk is deception. The so-called withdrawals are tokens; Vietnamization is a fraud and it is all a device to prolong the war.

A few Members of this body have called those of us who oppose the war traitors, or virtually that—"doing the work of agents of the enemy" was one phrase given public currency this week. In the minority caucus, I have read, there was an attempt to censure some Members who have decided to stand behind this week's moratorium. Government employees have been refused permission to hold moratorium programs where they work. There is clearly a plan to try to discredit any effective opposition to the war by labeling it disloyal and un-American.

What is more un-American than to subvert the Constitution of the United States? Have not the men, in elected office and in appointive offices, in uniform and in civilian clothing, who have taken this Nation into an undeclared war, committed the most un-American action possible? They have flouted the Constitution they swore to uphold, by making war without the declaration of Congress. Has not Congress, by failing to insist that it, as the representative body speaking for the people of this Nation—in whom the ultimate authority to decide for or against war rests—has it not also failed to uphold the Constitution?

And now some of the leaders of our Nation, on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue say they will not listen to the voice of the people. They say they are right. The majority of the country, who demand that the war be ended now, are wrong—they are misled, it is even said, by traitors. But I say such arrogance must be punished, as it certainly will be in the long run, and this subversion of the basic tenets of our free Government must end.

Why do our leaders not listen? Is it possible that they do not see the consequences of their refusal to heed the deep, profound, bitter opposition to this war—and, increasingly, to Government itself—that their policies have caused? Those of us who have been on the campuses, where much of the opposition was born and where it is still strongest, have had an opportunity to learn how deep the difficulties are that our Nation is in. I have been on 25 campuses in the last 9 months. I have had young people asking me "is this war really worth the number of lives that are being snuffed out. What kind of country can engage in this kind of madness, and try to force us to take part in it, with persecution and prison sentences?"

The division between the old and the young starts at that point. From it flow many of the other struggles and crises

that our Nation is undergoing—the intense, serious questioning that is taking place of all the values of our society.

Our country must be protected when it is necessary to protect it. Citizens must be willing, in an extremity, to give their lives for their country. But must they give their lives in a cause they do not understand, and which many of their disillusioned elders do not understand? If this continues, where will it lead us? The war has torn the seams of this country, North and South, East and West. The young people on the campuses are not afraid to protest. They owe nothing to any group that has a special interest in the prolongation of the war. They want to see their Nation become one again. They realize that without their voices speaking for many who dare not cry out, for all kinds of reasons, the war could go on a long time. And they realize that the war is causing the deterioration of the values on which this country is founded—government by the majority, for instance—government by the consent of the governed.

Americans will not be given to die in a war they do not understand or believe in. They will not be fooled any longer into supporting it. Groups everywhere in the Nation this week are saying, each in its way, that they are tired of the war—student groups, women's liberation groups, academic groups, religious groups, black groups, a great cross section of America. All are saying that the war must stop now.

Let us not be afraid of being slandered for acting and speaking in this just cause. Let us regard, with the little respect he deserves, anyone, however high his office, who uses such a contemptible device to hide the fact that he does not dare discuss the facts. Let us continue what we have begun now, and not relax for a moment the pressure on those leaders who will, if we falter, continue to use every subterfuge to pretend that they are seeking peace while they continue to wage this immoral and unpopular war.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of discussion has taken place in recent weeks concerning the student moratorium and the rightful place of their petition and dissent. There are those angry voices which charge the dissent an unpatriotic alinement which benefits our enemies. There are also those who seek to substitute the basic reasonableness and propriety of the dissent with passionate policies of disorder.

Dissent is a proper and necessary instrument of democracy. It is not to be obstructed or destroyed. It is a useful weapon in the arsenal of democracy. Dissent, however, is separate and distinct from disorder. Dissent is usefully applied to change policy. Disorder is applied to destroy all policy. Disorder can be created by those for or against dissent who compound their position with unreasonable passion.

The fact that dissent can be effectively expressed in this country does not weaken America. The freedom for dissent—on the contrary—tells the people of the world, friend and foe alike, that our Nation reacts to the opinion of its

people—that the American people are the power behind and beyond government policy; that official American policies are dependent on a continuation of public support.

The opposition in this country to the Vietnam war has gained momentum at every turn. It has been claimed that the protest to the war affects the President's capacity to negotiate a peace. The dissent to the continuation of the war does not detract from the President's capacity to negotiate a peace—but realistically it does advance the timetable and provides a deep sense of urgency for positive action. If the dimension of the public protest should continue to grow at present rates—the President's capacity to most favorably negotiate diminishes with each passing day. Time is of the essence. An American proposal for a cease-fire and for peace would attract better terms today than is likely next year or the year after that.

The American people have exhausted their patience with the cruel demands of a war which they cannot relate to the security of America. There is no desire to give American lives or spend American dollars in a crusade for prestige or the preservation of privilege, particularly in a foreign country. The American people will never again align their strength and their blood in the defense of privilege. This impatience is apparent on domestic priorities of the Nation as it is in foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 9 months we have waited for the President of the United States to act to redeem his campaign pledge, to terminate this savage conflict. Our fear is that delay is not on the side of peace.

Today, the war continues relentlessly to wreak incalculable destruction on Vietnamese society, to claim the lives of our finest American men, and to infect our Republic and distort our purposes as a great nation.

What is needed is decisive action.

The token withdrawal of troops by the President is a calculation that the old policies might somehow work in the present situation even though they have proven disastrous in the past. The policy of the past is the policy of failure. It is a substitute for action. It is an effort to buy time, which can only be purchased at the unacceptable cost of the lives of more innocent people.

The "Vietnamization" of the war was supposedly begun with the much-heralded Midway announcement that 25,000 troops would be withdrawn by the end of August. This withdrawal more resembled a rotation in many of its aspects than a genuine pullback. In fact, there were 5,000 more troops in Vietnam on June 8, when the President made his announcement, than on the day before his inauguration. For several weeks in June and July the number of American troops in Vietnam was actually increasing.

The President inflated his intentions. He "hoped" for 100,000 this year. He said he would like to beat former Secretary Clifford's plan of withdrawing all combat troops by the end of 1970. Saigon officials stated publicly that 75,000 or more men would be gone this year.

Instead there was the indecisive first 25,000. Then came the delay and the postponement of the next withdrawal. In September we heard of another withdrawal of 35,000 by December 15, with Vice President Ky breaking the news early and using different figures. Whatever the figures, there seems no hope for 100,000 by the end of 1969.

This is the measure that President Nixon calls a "significant step." This is the number that Ambassador Lodge refers to as a "formidable force." Can we really believe that the President has gone as far as he possibly can go?

The troop withdrawals to date are militarily insignificant and politically motivated.

At the present rate, assuming no interruptions, the process of withdrawing all American troops will take 4½ years. That is, Americans will still be in Vietnam at the beginning of 1974. If the war continues, who can estimate how many more casualties, how much more anguish, will result? Who wants to be responsible for this senseless suffering?

We are now cautioned by the administration that "Vietnamization" means transferring responsibility to the Vietnamese in noncombat areas as well, such as economy, government, and police. The State Department recently admitted that South Vietnam never made a formal request for U.S. troops in the first place. The administration now seems to confess that there has been no independent government in South Vietnam apart from our mission in Saigon. In narrating the story of Vietnam over the years, our Government has included a generous amount of fiction.

"Vietnamization" appears destined to travel the same confused route as "self-determination." It can justify any policy at all, or as in this case, the policy of indecision. In the final analysis, "Vietnamization" should mean disengagement for America.

An immediate reduction in the level of fighting or an immediate cease-fire should be the essential priority, while we carry out other measures toward peace. I advocated in early 1968 the withdrawal of American forces to protected, defensible enclaves. We must end the ill-conceived strategy of maximum pressure through search and destroy. Events since 1968 prove that the consolidation of defensible positions still offers the best way of minimizing casualties. Such a disposition of our troops might form the basis for the achievement of local or larger cease-fires, either by mutual example or by prior agreement.

It is time to end the useless effort, based on years of illusion and false hope, to expand our military and political control beyond the areas now occupied.

We have supported a procession of dictators in South Vietnam. The Thieu regime, a government of despots and cronies, has failed consistently to initiate the kinds of reforms—economic, social, and political—that might make it worthy of the support of its own people and more than the mockery that it now is to the noble sacrifices of our people.

The recent cabinet formation by Premier Khiem was a bitter disappointment

to many of the other non-Communist elements in South Vietnam who remain unrepresented in the present government. There is strong evidence that the government of President Thieu does not want a cease-fire and new elections. It has repeatedly sabotaged the efforts of the United States to seek an end to our involvement. It does not want American withdrawals and will accept them only to the extent necessary to achieve a permanent American presence. The government does not enjoy wide support; it does not allow full and free political participation; individual rights are not guaranteed; and there is no freedom of the press. It is a government that punishes even talk about a coalition solution. It is a government of suppression rather than free expression of the popular will.

For us to continue to insist on the preservation of the present Thieu government as an unnegotiable condition of peace in Vietnam is dangerous and unwise, in addition to being wrong. Thieu should be put on notice that if he will not alter his policies, then he must defend by himself his unrepresentative government against those of his countrymen in the south who oppose him.

American forces continue to bear by far the major burden of the fighting in South Vietnam, even with the troop withdrawals in progress. What is needed are greater withdrawals and a firm timetable. Such a definite blueprint might be sufficient incentive to the present Saigon government to take the steps necessary to make it viable, democratic, and stable. The United States should encourage the formation of a new coalition of political forces, while adhering to a fixed schedule of withdrawals, some aspects of which might be contingent on progress in negotiations between the different Vietnamese sides toward forming a new governing structure.

The American people have said clearly, as indicated so powerfully by the events of 1968, that they want the troops home and home soon. Rhetoric, palliatives, and pleas for unity to the contrary, the public will not accept the indefinite retention of our forces in Vietnam in the decade of the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, these are the simultaneous goals, then, that this Nation should pursue diligently from this moment with regard to Vietnam: First, seek a reduction in the violence by the defensive arrangement of our troops in order to consolidate our present positions; second, demonstrate unequivocally to the Thieu government our patent dissatisfaction with the undemocratic practices of his regime, his refusal to consider a coalition government, and his undercutting of American peace efforts; third, draw up a clear schedule of troop withdrawals, spaced over the coming months, in order to insure the early withdrawal of all American military personnel from South Vietnam; and fourth, announce a plan for selective cease-fire by region or by military unit directed toward total cease-fire.

If we take these measures, the burden will pass, for all the world to see, to the

enemy to negotiate constructively. Only a hard process of bargaining between the Vietnamese can produce the "self-determination" what we want for South Vietnam.

If free elections are the solution on which all the South Vietnamese agree, then the elections must be genuinely free—with the organization of those elections under the control of no one political faction.

All political elements, including the other non-Communists and the Vietcong, want the right to participate in the inevitable reorganization of the political life of South Vietnam. There is considerable reason to believe that all parties, free of outside influences, might be able to do so in a peaceful atmosphere without the bloodshed of war.

We have never proposed to offer the Vietnamese any less for the future. We are not able to offer them any more.

President Nixon promised the Nation a plan for ending the war in Vietnam. At this late hour, he indicated only that he "plans" to end the war. We have been promised this before.

President Nixon must understand that the dissent and debate on Vietnam is not a matter of personality—it is a matter of grave national policy in which every citizen has a stake and a voice.

I pledge my full support to any and every effort directed toward a speedy conclusion of this savage war at this late hour, words must be replaced by deeds and action.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the deep issue that we must discuss on this day set aside as a moratorium is not just to discuss whether to support or reject a particular Presidential policy. We are here to discuss the movement of this Nation out of Vietnam and into the future. We should not fall into the trap of spending all of our time discussing the date when all troops should or should not be removed or the things that should be said day by day in Paris. These discussions are important but on this day which we have set aside to stop our normal activities and look at ourselves, we should discuss not only the tactics of what we do to stop the war in Vietnam, but also what is the lesson for the future from that conflict and what America should do with its resources as we try to move out of this war and into an uncertain peace.

With this as background, I want to state that I am making every effort I can to persuade the President to continue the long journey out of Vietnam. This October 15 Moratorium Day must demonstrate to the President that the Nation believes the "old days" are over. We must have a new view of America's relationship to the undeveloped, revolutionary portion of the world. We must change the draft laws we have fastened on America's young since the beginning of World War II, and we must carefully decide as a nation which things in our Nation require our attention first. We cannot ignore any of our pressing problems entirely, but the amounts of time, money and intellect we spend on each one must be determined by the severity of the problem it poses to us as a people. This, of course, is generally discussed by the word "priorities," but I find that too

often we bandy this word about and it loses a real meaning because it papers over a real discussion of the fundamental problems which must be solved.

THE GENERATION GAP

For example, we have a generation gap not only between young and old in the Nation, but also in Congress. Many of our leaders are the age of my father. This gap reflects itself in the programs which we pass. A man who came to Congress in the 1920's, 1930's, or 1940's looks at military preparedness from the disasters of the 1930's and 1940's when America in isolation ignored its security. This is emotional and the beat of new drums is not heard. He therefore is always afraid he has not done enough and will succumb to the argument that every new military program is a "must."

There is a gap between the old domestic programs such as agricultural subsidies and the new needs, such as food for the poor. This gap is not being closed. The gap in helping the poor in a high employment, affluent society means we are still using programs of unemployment compensation and welfare designed to help the victims of the 1930 depression. We have not given true meaning and incentive to the youth of an affluent society, but used old slogans.

THE MORATORIUM

Those of us in Government who have moved throughout the country this day to support the moratorium have stressed that this should be a day of nonviolent dissent to a continuation of old policies and prayer for those who have died or been injured in Vietnam. I cannot understand those who panic at the thought of this day or believe that it is injurious to America. We memorialize our past war dead and discuss our country's policies on Independence Day, Memorial Day, and Veterans Day. On this date, we should do no less than memorialize our dead in Vietnam, let those who are presently facing the awful peril of war know that we are concerned about them, and voice our beliefs about America's future.

To say that we must promptly end this war and start bringing our troops home from Vietnam is from a sense of protecting our men since every day we remain unnecessarily in Vietnam we expose more and more Americans to the perils of war. It also reflects our belief that an era of overemphasized military response to political problems should end.

The necessity for this day in our democracy is to be certain that those in charge of our democracy know full well the feelings of the American people on this war. Unfortunately our elective process and often the attitudes of our elected representatives lag behind the feelings of the country. The peaceful assembly and organized dissent have always been America's way of correcting this lag by bringing the issue to the attention of those in charge of our Government. The elective process follows if the dissent is correct and the people are aware. The recent example of the election of MICHAEL HARRINGTON to Congress on a program of changing policies in Vietnam shows this. The American people are changing their fundamental position and we cannot face losing more

American men unnecessarily while waiting for the elective process to reflect this mood. We want those who lead the executive and legislative branches to act now.

THE DEMAND FOR CONFORMITY

The request of the President for a moratorium on criticism comes 8 months after an election in which the major issue was peace in Vietnam in spite of the efforts of leaders in both parties to avoid the issue. The President indicated he had a plan for ending the war. We hope and pray he does, and if so he should tell us. The cry for silence has a deadly familiar ring to the statements of President Johnson during the last 4 years of his administration. Many of us responded to those requests of President Johnson in 1965, 1966, and 1967. We pleaded for change in 1967 and 1968. In 1969 we have waited on President Nixon to be certain that the policies of the past do not continue through inertia of the past. We do not demand the impossible and we hope on this day the point will be made that we support his action in starting an orderly withdrawal of troops, in proposing changes in the draft law and the removal of General Hershey as head of the Selective Service System.

We are dismayed, however, when we hear the President say that there may not be future withdrawals or that we will remain in Vietnam for an indefinite period of time or that our future actions will depend on the reaction of Hanoi.

THE NEGOTIATIONS

I am convinced that the North Vietnamese in Hanoi and Paris are looking to the ability of the indigenous people in South Vietnam to maintain themselves as the test of whether to negotiate. The North Vietnamese know they will remain in the region of North and South Vietnam indefinitely because it is their home. They know the South Vietnamese must remain in this same region indefinitely because it is their home. They know the Americans will not remain indefinitely and therefore arguments about 60 more days or 1 year or 2 years are not the factor that make successful negotiations in Paris possible or impossible. A negotiated peace will only exist if the South Vietnamese are capable of dealing with the North Vietnamese and both sides know it. This we have tried to produce.

WE HAVE MET OUR COMMITMENT

We have met our commitment to the South Vietnamese and won our part of the war. We have given the South Vietnamese people 15 years to develop a nation. We have tried many different programs and have provided an immense protective military shield for the present government for 3 years. Even President Thieu does not ask that we accomplish any more militarily other than an orderly transfer of military functions to the Saigon government. The South Vietnamese Government will either survive or it will not. As of now we should begin a methodical, orderly withdrawal of our troops so the South Vietnamese can run their nation.

It may be necessary to provide protective enclaves for a limited period for those who believe the Saigon regime will

not survive, which will also be necessary to provide protected disembarkation areas for our troops as they withdraw. It may also be necessary to negotiate treaties with the surrounding countries for those Vietnamese who do not wish to remain in South Vietnam once we are gone. We should be willing to support and aid such endeavors. During this process the prime factor should be protection of our troops as they move out of the jungle and back into the staging areas from which they originally moved in 1965. It may also be necessary to provide special advisory forces and certain types of assistance to the South Vietnamese as we are moving out.

WE LEAVE AS WE CAME IN

As you can see, I am proposing that we move out of Vietnam just as we moved in and that we finally leave the nation, hopefully better than we found it when we took over from the French in 1954. The ultimate destiny of this country then will remain in the hands of its people.

A NEW ERA

From all of this I find that we have reached the end of an era that started in the middle 1950's and continued into the decade of the 1960's. First was "brinkmanship," a policy of hard, nuclear confrontation with the Communist world. Then we tried a policy of flexible military response in the 1960's which was to be coupled with social and political action. Unfortunately, our system overemphasized the military response but now we have learned what we can and cannot do in conducting military operations in a very distant place against strongly motivated indigenous forces. A new era opens and I pray on this day of commitment that we have not turned the whole new generation of Americans away from living in all of this world and into neoisolationism. If America were to withdraw completely into itself and refuse to recognize that two-thirds of the world is poor, ill-housed and undernourished we would have a tragedy of immense proportions. The fact that we cannot militarily rule the nonaligned portions of the world should not prevent us from seeing that we can be a great influence for them in many other ways. I hope that the new generation, which all of you represent so well, will have a sense of dedication as strong as that which we brought into American politics with John Kennedy in 1960. We are struggling to survive in government and build a bridge into the control of government for you. Mistakes have been made. I do not on this day look back and accuse. I would rather look forward with hope.

I want to end on a positive note. I think if we make this movement succeed the President will join with us, and together we will move this country out of Vietnam. When that has happened we can start down the long road of the future with a new type of America where the poor are no longer left out, the affluent no longer apathetic, the young no longer frustrated, and the minorities no longer isolated. Then the journey which we started in 1960 which has been so often interrupted will begin again and America will fulfill its destiny as a nation and

bring some measure of peace and prosperity to this world, not because of its military might, but because it deserves to lead.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress and Representatives of the American people, we are concerned with the termination of the war in Vietnam as soon as possible. I am of the firm belief that the majority of the American people are in favor of withdrawing American participation and bringing to an end this unhappy chapter in our history. The voice of this majority must be heard if we are to accelerate the pace toward peace.

Tomorrow, October 15, the American people will give voice to this sentiment through peaceful assembly and nonviolent action to show that the attainment of peace is the most immediate and important national goal. I believe that a clear commitment to that goal will hasten the development of a new U.S. policy which will bring peace to Vietnam.

We must work to find some means of terminating the war which will reflect the urgent desire of our people. Those who are deeply concerned and are attempting to change the U.S. policy are doing so through a visible protest, one that will reverberate throughout our Nation. Insofar as it is peaceful, lawful, and nonviolent, I believe that it is an important and constructive undertaking and I commend the action being taken in this respect.

Although these demonstrations reflect the attitude of the American public toward the war, the President has repeated the statement that they will not change his policies on the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1969, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Melvin Laird, regarding the President's announcement of the withdrawal of 40,000 additional troops from Vietnam. I have also written to President Nixon on this same subject.

In my letter, I expressed my concern about the withdrawal of troops and yet this withdrawal was accompanied by sending additional men into the fighting area. I was concerned because my constituents could not understand why their sons were still being sent to Vietnam when there was supposed to be a massive troop withdrawal.

My letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1969.

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: President Nixon's announcement of the withdrawal of 40,000 additional troops from South Vietnam is a significant demonstration of America's desire for peace and an end to the long and bloody conflict in Vietnam. But, the fighting continues, the peace talks stall, and the Saigon regime remains unwilling or presumably incapable of assuming the full combat burden of their own war.

Although there appears no prospect of a cease-fire taking place in Vietnam, I feel we should firmly work in this direction. I believe the American public ought to know more about the actual withdrawal of X numbers of troops, while we continue to send X numbers over to the same area. What can I tell my constituents whose sons are still being deployed every day to the combat area when

they ask why their sons must now go to Vietnam when the Administration announces the withdrawal of 25,000 and 40,000 troops, and, yet continues to send troops back to that area? I cannot answer my constituents' questions until I am able to tell them the U.S. withdrawal is more than just newspaper headlines.

What, therefore, is the total figure on the real withdrawal subtracted from the figures of those assigned to the combat area since the announcement of 25,000 withdrawn, for instance?

In terms of troop withdrawals and draft quotas, can you define and clarify the policy on: a) troop withdrawal; b) continued draft quotas; and, c) eventual total withdrawal? How does this relate to the Paris peace talks and the U.S. position in Vietnam today?

Your replies will enable me to give my constituents the answers to their questions which they are seeking.

I am sure, Mr. Secretary, that we share the same concern about peace and about the need to assure a fit world for our future generation, but only a broad and bold new policy towards peace will attain this end.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY HELSTOSKI,
Member of Congress.

On October 3, 1969, I received a reply from the Assistant Secretary of Defense which, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1969.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: This is in reply to your letter of September 19, 1969, to Secretary Laird concerning the redeployment of US troops in Vietnam.

It is President Nixon's responsibility, in consultation with President Thieu, to decide the timing and magnitude of United States troop redeployments from Vietnam. Previously President Nixon has mentioned three criteria with regard to troop replacement: progress in the training and equipping of the South Vietnamese forces and their ability to handle their own defense; the level of enemy activity in South Vietnam; and progress in the Paris peace talks.

Recently it was decided that the RVNAF had improved sufficiently to undertake a greater burden in the conduct of the war. The increasing capabilities of the RVNAF resulting from equipment modernization and other improvement programs, and the military situation in South Vietnam, made it possible to justify the reduction of the US troop strength in Vietnam to a force level of 484,000 by December 15, 1969.

As of January 31, 1969, shortly after President Nixon's inauguration, there were approximately 542,000 troops in Vietnam. As of May 31, 1969, prior to the redeployment of any US troops, there were approximately 540,000 troops in Vietnam. As of August 31, 1969, after the initial redeployment of 25,000 US troops, there were about 510,000 US troops in Vietnam. On September 16, 1969, President Nixon announced that the US troop strength in Vietnam would be reduced to a force level of 484,000 by December 15, 1969.

There are no personnel being sent to Vietnam to replace the US troops in units which redeployed as directed by the President. There still is a requirement, however, to provide replacement personnel for those units remaining in Vietnam. This number will fluctuate to a degree each month based on several factors. For example, it usually increases considerably during the summer months when there historically has been a high turnover of personnel. During the first six months of 1969, approximately 45,000 men per month arrived in Vietnam, and an

equal number departed in conjunction with normal rotation and replacement requirements.

As announced by President Nixon at his press conference on September 19, 1969, the troop withdrawals from Vietnam, as well as other manpower reductions, have made possible a reduction in previously planned draft calls by 50,000 in the period October-December 1969. It has been, and will continue to be our policy to keep the draft calls at the lowest number necessary to meet approved strength objectives.

Current United States strategy has been designed to accomplish our objectives in South Vietnam. In brief, these include the following: to obtain a just, durable peace; to assure that the people of South Vietnam are able to determine their future course free from the coercion of invasion and terrorism; to help the South Vietnamese people build democratic political institutions and a viable economy; and to make credible the commitments of the United States, including our commitment under the SEATO Treaty.

After carefully studying and weighing the various alternatives, President Nixon decided that the best strategy for achieving our objectives was through the diplomatic negotiations that are now in progress in Paris. The President places the highest priority on ending the war as quickly as possible provided that the solution does not involve an abandonment of the South Vietnamese people. At his direction all policies in connection with the war are under continuous review and you can be assured that every reasonable step will be taken.

I hope this information will be useful to you.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. DOOLIN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

I have also received a reply from the White House dated October 8, 1969. I wish to point out that the reply from the Deputy Assistant to the President, Mr. William E. Timmons, is identical to that of the Defense Department, yes, exactly word for word.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the draft calls for the summer of 1969 reached an unprecedented high as indicated in these figures:

	1968	1969
July.....	15,000	22,300
August.....	18,300	29,500
September.....	12,200	29,000
Subtotal.....	45,500	80,800
October.....	13,800	29,000
November.....	10,000	29,000
December.....	17,500	29,000
Subtotal.....	41,300	29,000
Total.....	86,800	109,800

It is clear that the draft calls for November and December were inflated so that claim for a 50,000 reduction in the draft could be made.

Mr. Speaker, we know the cost of this war is tremendous. It takes away the funds that are so badly needed on our home front to provide for the termination of poverty, to provide for adequate education, to provide for adequate housing, to alleviate the financial burdens of our senior citizens.

Almost a decade ago public attention was called to a danger in America that too much power to affect national decisions was accumulating in the hands of the "military-industrial complex," which

extends outside Government. It has become something of a cliché since that the war is important to our Military Establishment so that it can maintain its manpower and the size of its arsenal, and so that it can test the newer weapons under conditions of "realistic" testing. Likewise for defense industries: Clearly it is to their advantage that large contracts keep coming their way so that profits can be maintained and their corporate structures nourished on the steady flow of congressional appropriations.

There is a growing risk, however, of an imbalance of power, created by this war and maintained by its continuance, within Government itself. One does not need to invoke the hallowed principles of the Constitution, with its emphasis on "balance of powers" to clarify this point. It is just a matter of commonsense that the war has always been, and becomes increasingly, an administration war. And this does not mean an administration of this or that partisan persuasion: It is merely administrations of the "executive first" party. Nothing is clearer these days, as the 1960's come to an end, than that the present administration which is Republican has nothing new to add to the war policy it inherited from the previous administration which was Democratic. Their so-called differences of party are absolutely lost under their identity of administrative mentality. When a Senator comes out publicly with the remark that Capitol Hill ought not debate the war since neither war nor peace negotiations can be waged "in the Halls of Congress," we have only an instance of Capitol Hill abdicating its responsibility to affect administration policy in such crucial questions. Again it is pointless to wave the Constitution: Those who give overemphasis to the Constitution and remind the public that it is Congress which has the power to declare war are probably too unrealistic in this day and age—just as are those who make high-conscientious pronouncements about how the court is not empowered to make, but only to interpret, the law. But again commonsense is enough to guide the way: When an organization as complex and gigantic as the Government newsmen refer to glibly as "Washington" is faced with an issue as bone-shattering serious as that of the current war in Asia, it is no time for one-third of that organization to plead its incompetence to think clearly or its inability to make its thoughts known to the world.

Much of the point I am trying to make can be expressed in a concentrated form by using certain public figures as symbols, and discussing it in those terms. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT is not a Senator merely, he is a cause. He is the cause of the right of free men everywhere to self-determination. This means, of course, in this case not the sloganized thing the administration(s) plead for here and there and everywhere on the planet, but the concrete thing we have a crying need for right here within Washington. I mean, of course, the right of Capitol Hill to self-determination when it comes to this impossible war. FULBRIGHT is a more important symbol of course in that it has

been exactly his vigorous and tireless opposition to the administration policies there which has been his ground for campaigning against the administration first, or Pentagon first party. What could be plainer in making the point that this is no partisan matter at stake than the fact that this courageous man's time in office extends back into the decade-old era when "military-industrial complex" was a new concept put forth by a Republican President — and presumably taken note of by his then Vice President—through a pair of regimes with Democratic administration, and now in not another Republican regime, and has stoutly held onto his position that, Tonkin or no Tonkin, Capitol Hill has a legitimate role in shaping Washington's policy in Southeast Asia? The still more sensitive issue of whether Capitol Hill is permitted to be informed, fully informed, about the political and military situation is one this courageous man did not shrink from raising, and giving the larger public some exposure to.

Among the things the Founding Fathers seem not to have had a clear image of is the Pentagon, 1969-70. It was enough of an uphill battle for FULBRIGHT when there was a Secretary of Defense who believed that war was too important a matter to entrust to the generals. Now, with the Pentagon presenting a united front to the rest of Washington under the present Defense Secretary, the political hill is still more difficult to fight one's way up. There seems to be no issue presently—from ABM to the Asian land war—on which a Secretary of Defense would look any different in uniform than in civilian clothes. When an administration, whether Republican or Democratic does not matter, finds it advisable to join the ranks of this kind of Pentagon, and when Capitol Hill neither makes drastic cuts in its war appropriation, there seems to be no limit to the imbalance of powers that can be created.

But the most serious and pernicious thing of all is the righteous politico-military standing at attention by the President and those of his followers who will "fall in" for him and pronouncing that "at this present time" or "for the next x days" any expressions of dissent from the war policy is damaging to our fight against the enemy, one place or another. I believe that this is an old trick; to focus attention on either Saigon or Paris when it would be most uncomfortable to have it focused on Washington; that is, on his own administration and its own war policy. Another ex-Vice President has just—October 10—lent his voice to the chorus of "my administration, right or wrong" songsters: He said he disapproved of the moratorium since the lull in war casualties may be the sign of something. Yes, they may; so may the inside information which some seem to have available to them; so might the light at the end of the tunnel which General Westmoreland saw some time ago—and with eyes probably better trained than others for such things. It is too late to trade on maybe's and mightbe's, and the stakes are too high anyway. Money we can "probably" afford to waste, whether on Boeing or Saigon; American lives we cannot. And anyway it is vitally

important to the internal health of Washington that the voices of criticism not be squelched at this time, especially not those voices from Capitol Hill.

This is, of course, what the present set of speakers, here in the House tonight, want to say just by their desire to speak. There is symbolism in these speeches, and important symbolism. We are insisting that Congress be heard, that its judgment, based on what evidence is made available to it, must be at least counted in to the process of decision about this war and U.S. disengagement from it. Not only must the war be, as the Pentagon now puts out, Vietnamized—the American part of it must be congressionalized. Which is not, of course, to say that the whole burden of the deciding will be instantly shifted over to our halls and our shoulders—but only that we have a right to self-determination, and our voices in defense of that right will be heard no matter what efforts are made to squelch them. It is a commonplace by now that this Nation must get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible; what we are here to insist on tonight is both that commonplace and also the urgent principle that the Congress and the ones they represent, be heard on this vital issue.

The vast amount of funds that were, and are still being, spent on this unpopular war can be recouped in time. But what are we going to do about the dead and wounded in this conflict, which should not have found us involved to the extent which we are?

These lives can never be restored. They have been taken at a time when each one of them could have added to the economic well-being of his own community. This, in turn, would add immensely to the betterment of all America.

My own State of New Jersey suffered 170 casualties in the period of January 1, 1969—June 30, 1969. These men were taken away from their families, their jobs, their communities. Each of them gave their life needlessly.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the names of these 170 young men who were returned to New Jersey, only to be greeted by tears and heartbreak—I extend sincere condolences to their families.

The names follow:

NEW JERSEY

DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION

Army

Andujar, Charles Manuel, Newark.
 Atkinson, Franklin G., Jr., Hurfville.
 Baker, George Arthur, Little Ferry.
 Barnes, Alfred, Montclair.
 Bastian, Michael Francis, Sewell.
 Bell, William Brent, Essex Fells.
 Biddle, Joseph Leonard, Berlin.
 Blesantz, Howard Stanley, Newton.
 Bonine, Thomas Marvin, Glen Ridge.
 Boyce, James Franklin, Plainfield.
 Brenner, Richard Irving, Teaneck.
 Brunn, Richard Conrad, Westfield.
 Callahan, Michael Patrick, Wildwood Crest.
 Callan, George Allan, Pennsville.
 Cama, Dennis Rocco, Hazlet.
 Carlough, George Gerald, Pompton Lakes.
 Cerrato, Nicholas Frank, Paterson.
 Christie, Donald, Hazlet.
 Coll, Dennis Joseph, Springfield.
 Cyran, Richard Edward, Clifton.
 D'Adamo, Albert L., Jr., Wanamassa.
 Daley, Gerald Charles, Uniondale.
 Danchetz, Lester, Rahway.

Davis, Charles Henry, Camden.
 Deltman, Edward, Clifton.
 Derbyshire, James Wilbert, Bridgeton.
 Eggenberger, William Gary, Lyndhurst.
 Fanning, Edward Charles, Hazlet.
 Farawell, George Thomas, Linden.
 Flaherty, Paul James, Gloucester City.
 Folger, John Vincent, Bayonne.
 Foulks, Charles, Jr., Browns Mills.
 Francisco, James Leonard, Laurence Harbor.
 Francisco, William, Jr., Summit.
 Ga Nun, Paul Huntington, Asbury Park.
 Gaines, James, Jr., Jersey City.
 Grover, Thomas Roy, Trenton.
 Hanlon, James Paul, Irvington.
 Hinson, Alvin Crawford, Westville.
 Iasello, Dennis Anthony, Newark.
 Jackson, William, Bayonne.
 Johnson, Guy Frederick, Chatham.
 Johnson, Ralph Edward, East Orange.
 Joynes, Frank Dennis, Jr., Newark.
 Klantecki, Edward Matthew, Fanwood.
 Kulbatski, Francis Kenneth, Jersey City.
 Laird, Jerry Proctor, Allentown.
 Lang, James L., Neptune.
 Lawson, Birden Jerome, Newark.
 Lewis, Benjamin F., Jr., Ft. Dix.
 Lopez, Jose Lius, Passaic.
 Lyons, George Michael, Jersey City.
 Madden, Francis Bernard, Jr., Newark.
 Mahurter, Lawrence William, Fair Lawn.
 Markovich, Douglas Joseph, Madison.
 Marshall, Willie Junior, Newark.
 McCallum, Peter John, Jr., Passaic.
 McCants, Joseph, Jr., Trenton.
 Mendez, John William, Maywood.
 Miller, Robert Theodore, Westfield.
 Mills, Karl William, Paramus.
 Moon, Theodore Edward, Jr., South Orange.
 Moore, Leon David, Summit.
 Moran, Vincent, Iselin.
 Morgan, Jerry, Jr., Long Branch.
 Morris, Robert John, Collingswood.
 Myers, Thomas Wayne, Middlesex.
 Nelson, Paul Vincent, Belleville.
 Nofford, Clarence, Newark.
 O'Shaughnessy, James John, Closter.
 Oliphant, Joseph B., Jr., Ventnor City.
 Palma, Gerard Vincent, Hammonton.
 Peterson, John B., Jr., Dover.
 Price, John William, Westfield.
 Pryor, William Jackie, Paterson.
 Rasmussen, Peter Terence, Paramus.
 Reed, Stanley Majure, Teaneck.
 Rivera, Euclides, Irvington.
 Robinson, Robert James, Plainfield.
 Romero, Ricardo Ibrahim, Jersey City.
 Ross, Roger Alan, Morristown.
 Smith, Joseph John, Bogota.
 Spence, Roger James, Roselle Park.
 Tufts, Robert Bruce, Morristown.
 Tully, Walter Busill, Jr., Madison.
 Van Houten, Nelson Omar, Paterson.
 Van Winkle, Harold J., Jr., Paterson.
 Walters, Michael Arthur, Gloucester City.
 Warnett, Ronald Leonard, Linden.
 Washington, Albert B., Jr., Asbury Park.
 West, John Hayden, North Bergen.
 Wickline, Donald Lee, Jr., Lake Hiawatha.
 Wilkins, Bobby Ray, Newark.
 Zycck, Fred Joseph, Flemington.

Air Force

Alexander, Calvin Eugene, Newark.
 Baumann, Ludwig, Plainfield.
 Dinan, David Thomas, III, Nutley.
 McCollum, James Patrick, Pleasantville.
 Rios, Noel Luis, Newark.

Marine Corps

Arribi, Donald, Cliffside Park.
 Barton, James John, Jamesburg.
 Beaumont, Herbert Michael, Trenton.
 Benn, William Paul, Lakewood.
 Blevins, Thomas Lee, Jr., Middletown.
 Bowen, Larry Hansen, Penns Grove.
 Burke, William Gregory, Saddle River.
 Burr, Stewart Samuel, Passaic.
 Byrne, John Patrick, Sayreville.
 Carlton, Randall Mark, Harrington Park.
 Christiansen, Bernhard M., Willingboro.

Crane, Dennis, Spotswood.
 Davis, Richard Wayne, Vineland.
 De Lorenzo, Ronald, Trenton.
 Desimone, Alfred, Jersey City.
 Giordano, Daniel J., III, Hi Nella.
 Grassia, Joseph, Jr., Paterson.
 Green, Otis, Bridgeton.
 Hayes, Michael, John, Jr., Bound Brook.
 Hoffmann, Thomas Martin, Palmyra.
 Jarmolinski, Chester, Jr., Jersey City.
 Kurtz, Charles John, Absecon.
 Lamanna, John Michael, Fair Lawn.
 Lunapiena, Nathan Charles, Hoboken.
 Melnyk, Mikolaw, Linden.
 Mokuau, Kenneth William Jr., Wenonah.
 Newton, Barrie Myron, Cherry Hill.
 O'Shea, William II, Newark.
 Presley, Avey, Elizabeth.
 Quarles, Wayne Robert, Camden.
 Romaine, Thomas Gilbert, Saddle Brook.
 Ryan, William Cornelius Jr., Bogota.
 Sargent, Gordon Leroy Jr, Newark.
 Satterfield, William Hurlie, Orange.
 Sellitto, Michael Joseph, Towaco.
 Sincavage, Richard, Elizabeth.
 Tulp, Guyler Nell, Clifton.
 Watson, Marvin Lerol, Woodstown.
 Williams, Fred Thomas, Paterson.
 Winters, John, Clark.

Navy

Bauer, Alfred, Keansburg.
 Gillies, Robert Knell, Mantua.
 McFadyen, Bruce Searith, Montclair.
 Melady, Richard Raphael, Dumont.
 Menter, Jerome, Englewood.
 Pawlowski, Edward Wesley, Union.
 Pearce, Henry-Ellwood II, Stanhope.
 Russell, Peter Fransson, Wharton.

DEATHS RESULTING FROM OTHER CAUSES

Army

Colasurdo, Joseph Peter, Edison.
 Coppedge, Lawrence, Montclair.
 Engedal, John, Matawan.
 Harbienko, Andrew, Elizabeth.
 Haver, Dale Harry, Whitehouse.
 Hoffmann, Robert James, Ridgefield Park.
 Johnson, Lester, Jr., Hightstown.
 Kalivas, John Angelo, Vineland.
 Melendez, Rafael, Hammonton.
 Newman, Thomas McKnett, Saddle River.
 Parmerter, Michael James, Midland Park.
 Pierson, Robert Emmett, Chatham.
 Russell, Wayne Howard, Rutherford.
 Tipton, John Edward, Pennsauken.
 Wemple, Earl Scott, Netcong.
 Wilson, Elroy, Jersey City.
 Zicchino, Darrow Frederick, Carlstadt.

Marine Corps

Cancelliere, Frank Anthony, Belleville.
 Leary, John Dennis, Collingswood.
 Nichols, Daniel Clement, Westfield.
 Snyder, Thomas Wayne, Millville.

Navy

Franke, William Thomas, Williamstown.
 White, William George, Union City.

Mr. Speaker, the heartbreaks and sorrows which befall a family who has lost a dear one in this uncalled for and immoral conflict can best be expressed in the letter of Mrs. Miles Stewart, of Georgia, to President Nixon upon the death of her son, Wayne.

The Members of this House no doubt are well acquainted with this type of letter, for many of you probably have received one from a grieving parent.

Mrs. Stewart's letter follows:

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This was my son. Now he is no more. He has died in vain (as have all the boys who died and are dying in Vietnam) unless through his death I am able to be of some influence, however small, in bringing this immoral war to an end, and

helping to prevent further useless, mass deaths.

As the Flag of the U.S. is an outward symbol of an inward feeling, I am returning the Flag presented to me at my son's funeral for this reason: I do not want a Flag which represents a country which is sacrificing her young men as this one is doing.

I cannot help comparing this situation to that of the Biblical baby Moses, ordered killed, with all the young males, by the dishonorable king. If a young man goes out to defend his country because he believes in it and what it stands for, this is his decision, but when he is forced to give his life, is this not murder? A difference between the baby Moses and the sons of American mothers is that we are allowed to give them a few more years loving care before they are so brutally taken. Who can wonder at the rebellion of our youth? What goals are they allowed to have?

From personal interviews with the men who returned, I discovered it must be a hell-hole. Do you underestimate the American people's intelligence? Personally, I am deeply humiliated over our world-wide reputation, as well as crumpled and crushed over the loss of my son. Our Flag is one of the most despised in the world, and now it is being hated at home.

I might bring out that I was the mother of five until my recent loss. They are citizens their country can be proud of. It was my thinking first to teach them to love and serve their home, then they would in turn grow up to love and serve their country. Now, mothers seek to protect their sons from their country. What do you think you are accomplishing by causing us to crumble from within? Was Khrushchev right when he said we would bury ourselves?

As you can see from Wayne's portrait, he was tall, good-looking, intelligent, with high ideals. He was studying to be an attorney and would have been an honest, good one, an asset to his country. But you have him killed. What a loss. Can you imagine the agony of packing up his youthful camping equipment, his clothes, his toothbrush? You should be ashamed. I would appreciate it very much if you would retract that "form condolence" you sent. I also request that everyone down the line do the same thing. If a person does something deliberately, as has been the taking of my son, don't you think an apology is in order? To me, every one of these letters is a further slap and insult. They will all be returned along with a copy of this letter to the rightful owners, as I want no part of such hypocrisy.

I do extend my thanks to those who were in charge of the burial of my son. They were patient, understanding, and very sympathetic, denying no request on my part so far as was in their power.

I add that I resent paying the taxes that took my son, buried him, and help continue to kill and maim our fine young men. What do you think this country will do when it must fight an all-out war, that is probably inevitable with Red China? We will be too anemic to wage a war. For a real cause, I would have been proud that I had a son to give for his country. As it now stands, the loss of my respect for my country is surpassed only by the grief over his murder.

You promised to end this war. Each day, hundreds are killed and wounded as it drags on. The American people still cling to the hope and trust that you will keep your word. We will believe you only when you do.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MILES STEWART.

My mail has brought me many comments on this conflict in Vietnam. Among the recent letters, I have received was a poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Albert Epstein, of Maywood, N.J. I feel that these few lines

have a meaning of their own and I wish to share it with my colleagues.

The poem follows:

DOES FOLLY LEAD A NATION TO THE
 HEIGHTS OF GLORY?

He sailed away on a battleship,
 The Pentagon said he should—
 But he never came back,
 He never came back.
 The President called it an honor
 To die in Vietnam—
 But his mother wept,
 And his young wife wept,
 They mourned a life they lost—
 A life so young,
 So full of hope,
 So full of the joy of living.

ALBERT EPSTEIN.

Mr. Richard J. Barnet, who is codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington and author of "Intervention and Revolution; the U.S. and the Third World" has presented a very eloquent message on the subject of Vietnam.

Entitled "President Nixon's Choices: The Way Out of Vietnam," should be read by everybody who is concerned about this war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Barnet's observations follow:

PRESIDENT NIXON'S CHOICES: THE WAY OUT
 OF VIETNAM

(By Richard J. Barnet)

After 9 months in office, the Nixon Administration has yet to adopt a strategy for ending the Vietnam War. To end it the President must make some decisions as hard as any American leader has ever faced. He must look coldly at the real choices open to the U.S. and prepare to redefine U.S. war aims in terms of political realities rather than the optimistic fantasies that so misled his predecessor. Unless he is prepared to do this soon, the momentum of war will carry him into a new round of escalation. Johnson's War will have become Nixon's War, the obsession of his Administration and a legacy for his successor.

What are Nixon's choices?

(1) *Military escalation*—The familiar one is to concentrate more military power on the enemy to induce him to accept a settlement more to our liking than what his political position in South Vietnam would warrant. To put the matter plainly, Nixon Administration officials say privately that the U.S. objective still is to prevent a coalition government in which the NLF would play any significant role, despite the fact that the communists represent the best organized political force in the country and have the allegiance of the largest single minority, if not a majority, of the population. The Nixon Administration, like the Johnson Administration, continues to define "negotiated settlement" to mean something other than the admission of the NLF to a share of power and responsibility in the Saigon government. Why the NLF should accept less has never been clear. How the U.S. hopes to arrange a settlement that denies the fundamental war aim of a movement that has been fighting for a generation without first crushing that movement is equally mysterious. Such a negotiation can take place only as a ratification of a decisive U.S. military victory. The past Tet offensive, like the one last year, is designed not to defeat the U.S.—the NLF has no illusions on that score—but to demonstrate that they are not defeated.

The Nixon Administration could replay the last year of the Johnson Administration and send in the 207,000 troops that the Johnson advisors concluded could not win the war. Or he could send in more and court the risks again of a confrontation with China, worsening relations with the Soviet Union, and a resurgence of domestic opposition in

the United States. The events of the past three months show that the U.S. escalation in B-52 raids on South Vietnam and in offensive operations in the South elicit military responses rather than political concessions. The military option is a totally unreal path to peace and American extrication. To continue the hopeless strategy because we will not face the alternatives is to betray a trust to the fighting men we send there. To continue the present cost of 15,000 to 20,000 American lives and \$30 billion, after four years of war, is a tragedy and a scandal. Even for the world's most powerful country a debilitating war without moral purpose or prospect of political victory is a recipe for self-destruction.

(2) *Mutual withdrawals.*—What about negotiated military withdrawals? The United States has begun recently the withdrawal of some 50,000 U.S. troops as the first step in a process of mutual withdrawals. Such a process would help bring about a de-escalation of the war and would therefore be useful. But this strategy cannot rescue the U.S. government from the necessity of choice. The Nixon Administration will still have to answer the fundamental political issue at the heart of the struggle: Are we willing to accept NLF participation in a coalition government? If not, then the withdrawals can be no more than token, because the Thieu government backed by the South Vietnamese Army shows no signs that it will ever be strong enough to keep the NLF from power once U.S. troops are gone.

What kind of coalition government could be arranged? Henry Kissinger has pointed out that a Thieu-Ky-NLF government is the equivalent of an SDS-KKK coalition to run the state of Georgia. Even if such a coalition could come into being, it could not last. Each faction would maintain its own private armies. Once the Americans left Ky and Thieu would have no political base from which to deal with the NLF for they have no reliable support in Vietnam outside the U.S. Embassy except for a small minority who are afraid of retaliation from the Vietcong or who profit enough from the flow of U.S. dollars to back the warrior government.

(3) *Imposed coalition.*—One possible alternative model for arranging a coalition government is the Laos settlement of 1962. An international conference, perhaps an expanded version of the Paris talks, would attempt to put together a cabinet in Saigon. Those who advocate this approach argue that the commitment to such an arrangement of the U.S. and the Soviet Union—perhaps even China—would guarantee its stability. The NLF would try to take over the crucial ministries and the United States would try to interest them in the Ministry of Tourism. Such a negotiation would solve nothing for the United States. Even if the wrangling of the rival great powers and the bitterly hostile internal forces could somehow produce agreement, the United States would be no less committed in Vietnam than it is now. It would have staked its prestige on maintaining the uneasy coalition that it helped to engineer. It is hard to believe that such an imposed coalition would survive. Thus once again the U.S. would face the dilemma whether to intervene to try to save a protege or to dishonor what would now be a clear international commitment. One lesson of the Vietnam war is that the U.S. cannot arrange political structures for other people that will serve their interests or will last. The process of political reconciliation in Vietnam will be improved and American reputation served during the formation of a coalition government if the U.S. Embassy in Saigon devotes its full attention to packing. The less American responsibility there is for the government that emerges in Vietnam and the more such coalition is the product of indigenous Vietnamese forces, the sooner the U.S. can

end its destructive involvement and the Vietnamese can begin to reconstruct their tortured country.

(4) *Encourage negotiation between broadened Saigon Government and NLF for coalition.*—In short, the United States should negotiate with North Vietnam and the NLF for mutual military withdrawals while at the same time encouraging the warring Vietnamese factions to negotiate among themselves for an interim coalition government that will hold elections. If the United States commitment in Vietnam is really self-determination for the Vietnamese people rather than loyalty to a group of discredited leaders who cannot govern without American troops, then the Nixon Administration should insist that negotiation among Vietnamese for a coalition government including the NLF begin immediately.

But what can the U.S. do to get such negotiations started? The government of Thieu, Ky, and Huong adamantly opposes any steps to broaden the present war cabinet so that it could conduct serious peace negotiations. The jails of Saigon are filled with Buddhists, neutralists, former government officials, and students who have pointed out the truth that the leaders of the Saigon government are incapable of making peace because they know that their power will not survive the war. The current NLF proposal at the Paris talks for the establishment of a "peace cabinet" in Saigon representing a broad spectrum of Vietnamese political interests is not original. Similar proposals have been made at considerable personal risk by non-communist students, monks, priests, and professionals in South Vietnam. To anyone who believes that ending the war takes priority over keeping the NLF out of the government, it is clear that the creation of some sort of peace-oriented cabinet in Saigon is an absolutely precondition to serious negotiations. If peace is to come through negotiation, at least some members of the Saigon government must want it.

This then is Nixon's dilemma. He cannot get a negotiated peace even if he is willing to accept a coalition with communist participation until Thieu and Ky bring enough moderates into the government to change its essential character, and this they will never do as long as they believe there is any alternative. Administration officials greet the suggestion that they put pressure on Saigon generals to liberalize their government with the remarkable observation that the United States does not intervene in the internal affairs of other countries! The real reason why U.S. officials have treated the Thieu government so gingerly despite its continuing efforts to sabotage the peace talks and suppress those non-communist political forces in South Vietnam who represent the most hopeful stabilizing influences in a post-war government is that the Saigon generals are essential instruments of present U.S. policy. By the standards of its predecessors, the present regime is a reasonably effective government for prosecuting the war and it is fiercely committed to the present U.S. objective of defeating the communists. As long as military strategies for ending the war take priority over political strategies, Thieu and Ky will continue to hold an effective veto over U.S. policy by threatening to collapse. Once the U.S. changes its basic objective, however, and stands ready to accept a coalition government which includes communists, the Saigon generals lose their power to wreck a settlement. The Saigon government depends on the U.S. completely for cash, gasoline, and credibility. Although the U.S. has always had the power to compel it to take less extreme positions, the exercise of that power has seemed self-defeating because pressure on the Saigon generals to make political accommodations undercuts their effectiveness as warriors. But once the military option is recognized as an expen-

sive illusion, the generals are no longer indispensable and the U.S. can begin to talk honestly to them.

If the President actually communicated his decision that he was prepared to extricate the U.S. from Vietnam even at the price of a communist South Vietnam, the Thieu government would have no choice but to move quickly towards accommodation with those elements in South Vietnam who favor a negotiated peace. One effective way to communicate that the policy change is serious would be to begin significant troop withdrawals. Another would be to protest publicly and privately the mass arrests of political prisoners (which now number about 20,000) and the suppression of political opponents who call for peace. Without such pressure, the Thieu government has no incentive to broaden the government sufficiently to make negotiation with the NLF possible. If the President grasps the truth that further escalation of the war will only bring further tragedy to the American and Vietnamese people, he should not shrink from using political power and persuasion to keep a group of self-seeking politicians from prolonging the slaughter.

What is likely to happen in Vietnam if the U.S. encouraged the formation in Saigon of a peace cabinet willing to negotiate with the NLF? The only reliable answer at this point is that we really do not know except that the war would move quickly to an end since no one would have an interest in prolonging it. The U.S. Government has always assumed that the National Liberation Front would take over the government and quickly arrange for the reunification of the country with Hanoi. A communist-dominated South Vietnam is a distinct possibility which the U.S., once having adopted the proposed strategy would be powerless to prevent. The Administration must not deceive itself or the public that it can control internal politics in South Vietnam once it takes out a substantial number of troops. There are important political groups in Saigon which see themselves as a "third force"—some Buddhists, Catholics, Cao Dai, Hoa, Hao, and Montagnards—but whether they have the strength to contain the communists depends upon what happens in Vietnamese politics in the next few months and is quite beyond U.S. influence. The sooner such groups are released from prison and harassment and can rehabilitate themselves, the sooner they can unite their forces and deal with the communists from greater strength. The NLF is under no illusion that political opposition to them will disappear once the Americans leave. They are going to have to accommodate the various factions or else continue a bloody civil war which it is in the interests of no Vietnamese to prolong.

There are some solid grounds for believing that the NLF cannot eliminate all other elements of Vietnamese society from a share in power. For one thing, strong religious factions, such as the Buddhists Struggle Movement under Thich Tri Quang, and the Cao Dai, are as anti-Communist as they are anti-United States intervention. Presumably, when the intervention ceases, and they are no longer torn between nationalism and anti-Communism, their ideological antagonism to the NLF leadership will grow stronger. The religious groups, along with other semi-autonomous factions such as the Hoa Hao, which now runs Angiang Province with virtually no interference from Saigon, are as unlikely to submit to tight NLF control as they are to Ky's. The Catholics, too, who are well organized, are a force which cannot easily be ignored by the NLF. Indeed, the NLF has demonstrated its awareness of the necessity of enlisting the cooperation of these various groups by pointedly including in its own Central Committee representatives of the Buddhists, Cao Dai and Catholics.

The Front recognizes that the two most popular issues, other than simply ending the war, are the termination of all "foreign" intervention (which to most Vietnamese means Americans, not other Vietnamese who happen to live in the North) and the granting of autonomy to those factions in the society which represents regional, religious and social interests. It may well be that they will be able to construct a monolithic Socialist Vietnam, but they know that this will not be easy and that it will take a long time. The only certainty is that the longer the war goes on and the more fragmented Vietnamese society becomes, the greater power the communists will have.

Reunification, according to repeated statements of the NLF, must be delayed a decade or more because of the profound political and economic differences that have developed in the two sections of the country as well as the historic distrust that Northerners and Southerners have had for each other. Normalization of relations between the two zones, the issue over which the Communist insurgency began in 1957, would take place much sooner.

As for foreign relations, the NLF has emphasized many times their interest in maintaining a neutrality based on good relations with the three great powers, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States. The Vietnamese communists desire postwar U.S. aid not only to help with the staggering task of reconstruction but also to symbolize a U.S. interest in their country that can be balanced off against Soviet and Chinese influence. Far more than ideology the Vietnamese value national independence. If the U.S. can play a role in helping to preserve it, and they believe that it can, they will welcome that role.

The most difficult issues raised by the proposed strategy concern the future of the United States. How can the President accept the risk of a communist takeover after the huge sacrifice the American people have been asked to make to prevent precisely that result? How can he escape "stab in the back" criticism from the military? Is there no "face-saving formula" that can vindicate the judgment of those officials who committed the national honor in Vietnam? The question can be answered on two levels, one superficial and the other profound. On the superficial level, I am convinced from my talks with the North Vietnamese and the NLF that they understand the problem that occidentals, especially powerful ones, have with face-saving. As long as the basic objectives of independence and freedom from foreign domination are met, they would go to great lengths to make extrication as easy as possible for the U.S. They have too clear a sense of their own interests to try to humiliate us. Indeed, if the Nixon Administration would revise U.S. war aims to anything more modest than the total political defeat of the NLF, they would probably make some ostentatious concessions. If they really believed that we were prepared to leave, they would probably accept some international supervision of the election or even a token U.S. base or two for a number of years.

But on a more profound level, such concessions could not conceal the fact that the U.S. failed to realize the war aims for which so much blood and treasure has been sacrificed. There is no way to mask this fact. If the war is to end in his administration, the President will have to rouse the American people from the long dream of omnipotence and all-righteousness. The President can transcend the post-Vietnam trauma as de Gaulle transcended Algeria only by talking sense to the American people. He can point out that American power and prestige are being damaged by the never-ending war, that a communist Vietnam need not be our enemy, and that America's initiative to end the war will win the gratitude and respect of

the whole world. Finally, he can articulate for the public the essential truth that a U.S. foreign policy makes sense only if it serves the interests of the American people. The health of American society in 1969 demands a diplomacy of extrication for it is this society, not the Vietnamese that must become central to our concern.

The alternative is to make this country a warrior state willing to sacrifice its youth, wealth, and the hopes of its people in a vain effort to cover up the past errors of misguided politicians and generals. Neither secret talks nor patience will deliver us from this war until our leaders give up the goal of determining the political future of South Vietnam, an objective which adds nothing to the security of either the Vietnamese people or our own. The Congress has a responsibility to the American people and particularly to those we send to their death in Vietnam to tell the President and the public the truth. Unless voices of sanity are heard in this chamber, there is no possibility for building the political climate for a realistic strategy to end the war. To take the course of statesmanship the President needs your prodding and your help now.

But the constitutional responsibility of Congress goes even beyond this. If it should turn out that the President lacks the courage to end the dishonor that this war is bringing upon the nation, then Congress itself must act. How many thousands more must die and how many billions more must be wasted before the Congress votes no to this war and withholds the money to carry it on?

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's statement of a few months ago that he hoped to get all American ground combat forces out of Vietnam before the end of next year is hardly the "commitment" or "timetable" which we like to hear. We should demand a clear disengagement from Vietnam and this, I believe, could stimulate the interest in peace negotiations of all the Vietnamese contenders—Hanoi, the Vietcong, and the Saigon government.

Discussion of the cease-fire has figured very little in the Paris negotiations so far. The National Liberation Front's 10 points are equally vague on this subject. If we could negotiate a cease-fire first, we could then take up all the other problems as separate items toward a permanent peace.

Recognizing that neither side can win a decisive military victory, both sides should cease trying to gain advantage on the battlefield to improve their bargaining positions in the negotiations. They should agree now to a standstill cease-fire.

Upon reaching an agreement to the cease-fire, both sides would conduct no further offensive actions and begin withdrawals. Free movement of trade, civilians, and unarmed military personnel would be permitted to all areas, political activity would not be restrained.

But as long as both sides follow the talk-fight strategy, the killing will continue. Pope Paul, United Nations Secretary General U Thant, and other world leaders have called many times for a standstill cease-fire in Vietnam as the way to end the killing and create a favorable atmosphere for progress toward a fair political settlement.

Experience has shown that certain unilateral actions can be helpful in advancing negotiations.

Our purpose throughout should be to

signal to the other side our determination to obtain both a peaceful and equitable settlement. The unilateral initiatives should have both of these objectives in mind.

A reduction in forces along with the cease-fire proposal would demonstrate the United States seeks a political, rather than a military solution to the war in Vietnam.

The United States should not take "no" for an answer from Hanoi, Saigon, and the National Liberation Front, but should press now at the negotiating table and before world opinion for this cease-fire package. If it is turned down, the offer should be left on the table as a standing proposal, thus providing a positive policy goal to the negotiations, around which political forces could rally, at home and abroad.

We should stress our desire for a political settlement based on free elections jointly supervised by a representative electoral commission, assuring all South Vietnamese the right to choose their own leaders. These should be scheduled at the earliest possible date following the cease-fire.

To give the South Vietnamese a stake in their own future, an extensive and basic land-reform program should immediately give title to the tenants farming the land, and provide compensation to landowners. If the United States paid the full costs of compensation, it would cost a small fraction of the present expense of the war.

In addition, we should provide for a full economic development program as a means of binding the wounds of war. Immediate refugee relief and medical aid to the victims of the war should be given the highest priority. A massive aid and economic development program should be channeled through the United Nations or other international agencies.

In these efforts we must all be joined by our community groups and organizations. A united effort can be very profitable to finding a just solution to ending this conflict.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a poem written by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, which seems to fit this occasion:

THE ARSENAL AT SPRINGFIELD

This is the Arsenal. From floor to ceiling,
Like a huge organ, rise the burnished arms;
But from their silent pipes no anthem pealing
Startles the villages with strange alarms.
Ah! what a sound will rise, how wild and dreary,
When the death-angel touches those swift keys!
What loud lament and dismal Miserere
Will mingle with their awful symphonies!
I hear even now the infinite fierce chorus,
The cries of agony, the endless groan,
Which, through the ages that have gone before us,
In long-reverberations reach our own.
On helm and harness rings the Saxon hammer,
Through Cimbric forest roars the Norseman's song,
And loud, amid the universal clamor,
O'er distant deserts sounds the Tartar gong,
I hear the Florentine, who from his palace
Wheels out his battle-bell with dreadful din,

And Aztec priests upon their teocallis
 Beat the wild war-drums made of serpent's
 skin;
 The tumult of each sacked and burning vil-
 lage;
 The shout that every prayer for mercy
 drowns;
 The soldiers' revels in the midst of pillage;
 The wail of famine in beleaguered towns;
 The bursting shell, the gateway wrenched
 asunder,
 The rattling musketry, the clashing blade;
 And ever and anon, in tones of thunder
 The diapason of the cannonade.
 Is it, O man, with such discordant noises,
 With such accursed instruments as these,
 Thou drownest Nature's sweet and kindly
 voices,
 And jarrest the celestial harmonies?
 Were half the power that fills the world with
 terror,
 Were half the wealth bestowed on camps
 and courts,
 Given to redeem the human mind from
 error,
 There were no need of arsenals or forts:
 The warrior's name would be a name ab-
 horred!
 And every nation, that should lift again
 Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
 Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain!
 Down the dark future, through long gener-
 ations,
 The echoing sounds grow fainter and then
 cease;
 And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
 I hear once more the voice of Christ say,
 "Peace!"
 Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
 The blast of War's great organ shakes the
 skies!
 But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
 The holy melodies of love arise.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, all of Amer-
 ica is watching this moratorium. I join
 it as my witness to peace.

I have every confidence that this day
 will have a profound meaning for this
 Nation.

I know that the vast majority of the
 American people want the war to end. In
 1965 our goal was a military victory. Our
 leaders could not see that a land war
 could not be won. They could not com-
 prehend that a half million soldiers
 backed by a hundred billion dollars could
 not bring this enemy to his knees. They
 would not accept the fact that this was a
 civil war of divided peoples of one na-
 tion. Slowly we turned our national pur-
 pose to that of protecting the right of
 self-determination with a declaration
 that once the fighting stopped we would
 be prepared to accept the verdict of a
 free and open election.

This is still today the posture of
 America. Despite the denials and protes-
 tations of the President and his advisers,
 we have begun a deliberate withdrawal
 of our troops. Called by any other tacti-
 cal name, it remains a staged with-
 drawal, albeit modest but nevertheless I
 believe if properly supported by the peo-
 ple of this country, it will herald the
 final act toward the end of our involve-
 ment of manpower in this tragic episode
 of our history.

President Thieu declared last week to
 his National Assembly that his country
 is prepared to accept the complete re-
 moval of American men by the end of
 December 1970. To make this withdrawal
 a byproduct of peace is the mission of
 the Paris talks. It is my hope that the
 President will call for a cease-fire, surely

not any more unthinkable than the
 bombing halt which was called by Presi-
 dent Johnson during the waning hours
 of his tenure. With a cease-fire and a
 programed withdrawal of our troops,
 there can be affirmative steps taken to
 implement our pledge for free and open
 elections monitored by agreed upon third
 parties. Two years ago the suggestion of
 talks that included the Vietcong were
 viewed by those who made our policies
 as irresponsible defeatism. Today the
 Vietcong is part of the peace negotia-
 tions in Paris. Let us not close our minds
 to the progress that we have made to
 recognize the realities of this conflict. Let
 us not by impatience and incontinence
 lose this continuing momentum for
 peace. Let us express with all our fervor
 our anxiety over this war, but never lose
 sight of the progress that has been made
 in yielding to the demands of the people
 when expressed in righteousness. Nothing
 is to be gained by defamation and
 desecration. Prod and prick the con-
 science of our leaders, and their actions
 will be sure and steady and we will at
 last have won this measured victory for
 peace and tranquility.

The President's statement that he will
 not be affected by this moratorium be-
 lies the truth. Much has already been
 affected; the stretchout of the October
 draft calls for November and December;
 the push on draft reform and Executive
 order affecting graduate students; the
 announcement of General Hershey's re-
 moval; the recall of Henry Cabot Lodge
 for new briefings for the peace confer-
 ence; President Thieu's acceptance of a
 complete withdrawal by December 1970;
 the early announcement of an additional
 40,000 troop withdrawal by Christmas.

Secretary of State Rogers went on
 television for the first time to proclaim
 that both sides are deescalating the war
 and that Mr. Nixon's policies are there-
 fore making "tremendous progress." This
 claim was immediately refuted by Sena-
 tor GOODELL of Mr. Nixon's own party,
 who candidly pointed out that token de-
 escalation of the war at the present rate
 would leave American troops still in Viet-
 nam 7 years from now.

President Thieu of South Vietnam has
 said he is willing to accept a complete
 withdrawal of American troops by De-
 cember of 1970. December of 1970 should
 be the outside limit of our participation.

We must, as a people, begin to face cer-
 tain facts regarding Vietnam. One, this
 war is one of the longest and costliest in
 our history, in terms of battlefield dead.
 We have been in Vietnam for 6 years.
 Forty thousand Americans have died.
 The monotonous promise our generals
 have repeated so often—that the "turn-
 ing point" is "just around the corner"—
 has proven false, year after year. We
 must decide to accept the reality of
 Vietnam and insist upon its immediate
 resolution.

Despite massive American aid, the
 South Vietnamese have been unable to
 win physical control of their country.
 One may rationally ask, Why? If the
 people of South Vietnam themselves sup-
 ported their Government, it seems that
 the war would have been won long ago.
 The fact that it has not been won indi-

cates that the people do not support our
 effort. The new word "Vietnamization" of
 the war is no real answer to the problem
 which the people of Vietnam must face.
 Because our men are brought home and
 the conflict is "Vietnamized" does not
 mean an end to the killing and dying. To
 contribute to a lasting peace we must
 assure the people of South Vietnam a
 government which truly reflects their
 views.

I favor an immediate cease-fire, and an
 end to the fighting on both sides. The
 President has already taken the first
 step; unilateral withdrawal on a phased
 basis. The first stage of the President's
 withdrawal was the pullout of 25,000
 men without any reciprocal action being
 sought or given by the other side. Next
 we will have an estimated 40,000 addi-
 tional troops withdrawn by the end of
 the year.

Some military planners assume that
 the situation in Vietnam can be stabilized
 by continuing slow withdrawals for 2
 years and then leave a continued Ameri-
 can commitment of about 200,000 troops.
 General Gavin's enclave theory now be-
 gins to appear to be our goal. This view
 contemplates maintaining this huge gar-
 rison in South Vietnam permanently like
 Korea. We must not allow this to occur
 again; the withdrawal should be com-
 plete and on a permanent basis.

In doing this we must press for a polit-
 ical solution to the war that will guaran-
 tee the right of the South Vietnamese
 people to self-determination through the
 ballot box. This means that we cannot
 support claims by any faction to the
 absolute right to govern. We must firmly
 declare ourselves as being for the people
 of South Vietnam and not one particular
 segment or regime.

A standstill cease-fire is an absolutely
 vital step. This would freeze control over
 the land as it now stands. An election
 could be called for all areas of South
 Vietnam with adequate supervision and
 a new government for the entire coun-
 try could be quickly installed.

At this point we should call for the
 admission of both Vietnams into the
 United Nations so that the U.N. peace-
 keeping forces could be made responsible
 for the safety of the people from further
 interventions across each other's borders.

It is futile to talk on and on about the
 mistakes of the past. What we must do
 is to look to the future and that is what
 I believe that this moratorium is sup-
 posed to do. The vilifying of our leaders
 leads to nothing. We must as well declare
 a moratorium on that. But there must
 never be a moratorium against honest
 dissent and disagreement against the
 policies of our own Government. We
 must continue by discussion and debate
 to arrive at a national policy which is
 supported by the American people.

There is no way that we can bring
 back the dead. What we can do to make
 their sacrifice a meaningful monument
 is to consecrate by our actions a re-
 dedication of our Nation's power and re-
 sources to the perfection of our way of
 life and to the determination that there
 shall never again be another Vietnam.

When we speak of what this Nation
 has lost as a result of 4 years of war, the

dead buried beneath the grass of a solemn cemetery, is of course not only absolute but the greatest loss of all. It does not seem fair to me to talk about the problems of the living in the same breath. But to mourn the dead without a vision for the future is also to abdicate our duty to fight for the precious qualities of life yet to be realized by millions in our own country. It is to these pressing priorities that we must forcefully and determinedly direct our attention.

The needs of our decaying cities and poverty areas are starkly obvious to anyone who cares to look around at what is happening in the United States. Most of these problems are due to the fact that the Vietnam war is siphoning off about \$30 billion a year that could otherwise be used for helping our people at home.

This drag on our national resources is reflected in sharp budget cuts in nearly every domestic program this year. Our spending billions of dollars in the war in Vietnam has created a gap between what is needed for education, for health and housing, mass transportation, job training and welfare, eradication of poverty, food for the hungry, and our other human needs, as compared with the funds available. Congress authorized \$11 billion more in the last fiscal year for these programs than it was able to find the money for. In the current year, we have been considering an administration budget that is \$18.5 billion less than what was authorized. In these 2 years alone, the funding deficit will be more than \$30 billion. Ironically just the same as the cost of the war in Vietnam.

The American people are beginning to realize the size of the crisis situation created by this gross misallocation of national resources. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare budget was cut this year by \$1.2 billion.

The budget request for the Office of Education was \$5 billion less than the amount which had previously been authorized by Congress. In other words, we had approved education programs at a level of \$7 billion, but our budget called for only \$2.1 billion expenditure.

I submit that we can no longer afford to allow our Nation's education needs to go unmet. The House was able to add \$1 billion to the education budget a few months ago when the bill came to the floor, but this still leaves us \$4 billion short. After our action the President issued a statement vowing not to spend the money even if Congress approves it. The American people must be alert to denounce this twisted concept of what is most urgent, and I hope that you as students concerned with our concepts of national priorities will take cognizance of whatever actions the President takes.

Last week the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development sent a report to the President expressing their deep concern over the absence of Federal initiative in the field of education. They reminded the President that while Commissioner Allen was pronouncing how every child had the "right to read," the Department he heads was being ordered to cut \$8 million of a meager \$13 million program to train teachers of reading. The Council ad-

monished the President that it was concerned by not only a reduction in funds but by an absence of direction and planning. The Council said:

In dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. When the States in the last 2 years increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% and for elementary and secondary education by 28% . . . we find that Federal government is cutting back.

The Council continued:

We sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges . . . we assert that present national conditions are deleteriously affecting the studies, the hopes, and the convictions of a wide and responsible segment of the educational community. A new and ugly cynicism and anti-intellectualism is infecting American education. Repressive measures will not arrest this trend, and may even accelerate it; positive and affirmative leadership promptly to end the war and to address forthrightly our domestic problems can do so.

Too many of our young are concerned by what they are against . . . the war, racism, poverty, corruption. . . . We feel that the growing dismay and cynicism of our youth could develop into a calamity of devastating proportions. It would be unfortunate if our political leadership were to take the position that a response to the dissatisfaction of the past—or the yearnings for a different kind of future—must await the ending of the war. . . . It is now we must plan. It is now we must act. . . . If politics is the art of the possible then our political leaders have a special opportunity to demonstrate to the young that the nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities.

So much for education. The same thing can be said for the abortive effort to wage a war against poverty. Envisioned as a \$10 billion program it now struggles for survival with only \$2 billion. Over 50 Job Corps centers were closed down in June and behind these empty buildings lie the hopes and dreams of thousands of youth shattered because we lack the needed funds. Doubtless more programs will be discontinued under this agency as our war against poverty slows down to a near halt.

And what about our environment? Our rivers and streams are increasingly being clogged by pollution. And we do not have long to reverse this trend. The Federal Government has two major programs in this field—one to set standards of clean water so that the various cities and States will have goals to shoot for, and another program to provide them with grants to construct pollution control facilities so that they can meet the standards.

As it has been working out, we have given the States and cities clean water standards but not for the funds to meet them. In fact, the Government agency in charge of the program says that \$8.2 billion is needed over the next 5 years to avert a catastrophe. Last year some 1,500 of our small cities had no waste treatment plants whatever. Currently there is a backlog of 4,600 applications by municipalities for funds under the clean water program. This year's budget request was for only \$214 million for this vital program. Concerned Members of

the House battled to approve the full \$1 billion which had been previously authorized, and while we were not entirely successful in this effort we did get the amount raised to \$600 million. This was a small victory in our fight to restore a rational sense of national priorities in the United States.

Recently information crossed my desk that the urban renewal program "pipeline" is jammed with some \$2 billion in unfunded requests from cities desperately trying to relieve urban blight. We are years behind schedule in this area even if we made these funds available now.

All across the board in our Federal programs we see retrenchment, cutback, and unfulfilled promises. Seventy-five percent of our public works projects are to be deferred. Medical and health research funds have been drastically cut. All new national parks programs have been delayed. Medicare is cut by \$65 million, housing and urban development by \$74 million, and model cities by \$75 million. This is how people are being deprived of vital programs as the war continues.

So we can agree on the monetary benefits that will come from termination of the war. Or can we? The President's military advisers have said that the Defense Department has a backlog of projects which need to be funded. If the Pentagon has its way, it will absorb all of the funds we are told that would become available once the war is ended. Our stockpile of munitions and new armaments of war will build up once again.

It will be up to us to mount a campaign to save the \$30 billion for our domestic programs. The ABM alone could cost up to \$50 billion, despite the fact that it will be obsolete before it is built. The Pentagon has begun corresponding escalation in the development of our MIRV system. Again, the American people will pay an extraordinary amount for maintaining this balance of terror. I hope you will continue to watch carefully the direction and emphasis of our national budget. Is it essential that we land on Mars before we feed our hungry and shelter our poor? Can we afford a supersonic aircraft priced at \$1 billion which is incapable of flying over land because of the sonic boom, before we have built our roads and airports on the ground?

Fortunately, the picture is not all bleak. In fact we have made significant inroads. This year's 29-day debate on the ABM was the longest military debate on record. Six Senators who voted for the ABM in 1968 switched in 1969.

Public opposition to the Pentagon policies caused Secretary of Defense Laird to initiate in August a reduction of more than \$1 billion himself in defense spending during the current fiscal year. Previously, \$1.1 billion had already been cut. And the Senate voted to cut back by another \$2 billion. And so \$4 billion have been saved.

When I think of all the programs which I would like to see funded and which could be funded with \$30 billion, the urgency of ending the war in Vietnam becomes even more pressing. We must spend our resources to feed the

hungry, to provide adequate housing and health care, to build better transportation systems so that the poor may live in suburbia as well and abandon the inner city hovels of filth and vermin, to expand the provisions of medicare, to increase the benefits of the elderly under social security to a realistic minimum which can assure them of a decent life, to expand the parks and recreational centers of our country, and to guarantee that all who seek education can have that opportunity without excessive financial burdens.

I have a dream like Dr. Martin Luther King, to build a newer world like Robert Kennedy. I seek a moratorium for peace in order that we may achieve the greatness that is this promised land. I believe that we have the capacity to create our society as a function of ethical and moral commitment. We must not therefore only pursue the single goal of the end of the war in Vietnam, but we must continue our efforts to improve the lives of our citizens.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, it was my feeling that the only way we could win the war was with maximum and prompt military pressure, including the use of all necessary troops, the bombing of strategic enemy strong-points and industrial plants, and the closing of the port of Haiphong. I supported this position in the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member.

Now, the President has adopted an apparent policy of phased withdrawal of U.S. troops and the deescalation of the war. As Commander in Chief and director of the Nation's foreign policy, he has indicated our national policy is not to win the war. He holds the most responsible position in our Government to make this decision, and it is apparently his best judgment to phase out the war by withdrawing American soldiers.

Winning a military victory to preserve the peace has always seemed to me to be the only logical course our Nation could follow; for otherwise the peace-preserving purpose of our mutual defense treaties would no longer be credible and the treaties themselves no longer instruments of peace.

However, the President has announced his phased withdrawal plan; and it certainly seems to me that a timetable at this time for ending the war by quick withdrawal is not practical. It undermines negotiations and boosts the enemy. A cease-fire is desirable, if the other side would agree, which it has not. A takeover of the war by the United Nations is acceptable, if the international body had a strong operation for peacekeeping, which at this time it does not possess.

The plan the President has suggested is one we must live with, at least at this time. This being so, I support the President and urge my colleagues to do likewise. Finally, if we do not really intend to win this war, I think we should turn the problem over to the United Nations, offering them our troops to assist their conclusion of the war.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow,

October 15, will be a big day for some, but to me it will be a day of shame.

I am sorry that we have in this country leaders who can be swayed by breezes of sentiment toward a path that can only lead to a weakening of the U.S. position in world affairs.

There is no easy way out of Vietnam. We did not get into Vietnam in a well-planned, orderly fashion. President Nixon has had only 8 months to try to unwind what took 8 years to tangle into a mess beyond description.

May I say here that I am for peace. I know from personal experience the hell and fury of war. No one wants peace more than I. No one wants peace more than President Nixon who for 24 hours a day must face this great international problem.

I am not, however, for giving aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear. I am not for pulling the rug out from under the thousands of young Americans who have been sent to Vietnam on orders of their country.

It is my opinion that the actions such as those planned for tomorrow are created by the stupidity of political opportunists, and the confusion created by the ignorance of amateur theorists. The cost of such actions in the past, and tomorrow, can only be measured in the lives and bodies of American men.

Hanoi said today:

We warmly welcome and wholeheartedly support the great struggle of the American people against the unjust aggressive war being waged against the Vietnamese by the Nixon clique.

It is also my opinion that the war in Vietnam would have been over long ago had not such groups for the past 2 or 3 years urged Hanoi to hang on by causing dissension in this country.

President Nixon did not send us into Vietnam, but he is sincerely trying to get us out. He is trying all approaches, and he is making progress. Since he has been in office American troops have come home for the first time. More will come home before the end of this year. Casualty totals are down, and hopefully will continue downward.

No matter what the approach the administration uses to end the Vietnam conflict, the results are going to be weakened by such protests as the October 15 peace moratorium, the November march on Washington, and the November and December moratoriums, or as North Vietnam referred to it as the new fall offense.

Those who support the protest set for tomorrow seem to ignore the obvious—they are playing right into the hands of the enemy. It is Hanoi, not Washington, who will benefit tomorrow. It is Hanoi, not Washington, who will gain prestige, and, most of all, bargaining power at the Paris peace talks. The moratorium will be a valued addition to the North Vietnamese propaganda arsenal.

I urge students to go to classes and to study tomorrow, instead of giving aid and comfort to the enemy—taxpayers are working hard to help pay for their educations. We have schools and colleges for the express purpose of educating our

youth. Campuses were not established as political entities.

I urge teachers and professors to stand before their classes tomorrow as brave, patriotic Americans and to teach as usual. We are paying them for teaching, not demonstrating and rioting.

I think it should be recorded that those who are participating are toward the left in our society and do not represent mainstream America.

The moratorium was called by a newly organized Vietnam coordinating committee which was formed, I am told, by workers in the presidential campaigns of Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY.

Although they claim the militant groups are not the leaders, and that this will be a peaceful occasion, militants will be there, and who knows what the results. The protests may by no means remain low keyed.

Furthermore, the October 15 protest has the endorsement of such militants as the baby doctor, Dr. Benjamin Spock, who no doubt may be seeing some of his "babies" in action and perhaps will nudge them along if they do not follow "the book." Spock, too, is working on plans for the November 14 march.

Senator McCARTHY also said he would take part actively, and I understand that Senator McGOVERN will be the main speaker at one of the rallies.

Who started the plans for tomorrow? Dave Hawk, himself a draft dodger, a national coordinator of the moratorium committee, credits its beginning to Jerry Grossman, a businessman member of the Massachusetts Peace Action Council who was active in Senator McCARTHY's 1968 campaign.

Hawk has said:

We are introducing the war as the focal issue. Our total purpose in being is to end the war. We are demonstrating that the sentiment is already there. This will be the most sustained and involved movement in history.

No doubt the antiwar demonstrations in Chicago last week will carry over into tomorrow's gatherings. Organized by the Revolutionary Youth Movement, the Chicago plans did not call for quiet and nonviolence. Mark Rudd now heads the Revolutionary Youth Movement which he formed after a split in the militant Students for a Democratic Society—SDS. "Bring the war home" has been their theme.

These protestors claim they want to convince President Nixon that the majority of Americans want to end the war. I have news for them. All Americans want the war to end.

But, all Americans do not want us to turn our backs and surrender.

We are loyal people and we are brave when it comes to protecting freedom and our Nation from threats.

Another theme of the new groups who will protest tomorrow is that they are not necessarily antiadministration, nor anti-Nixon, nor antiestablishment. Their actions, however, speak louder than their words. If they wanted to be helpful and if they really wanted peace, they would do nothing to hinder the progress we are now making.

I am convinced that President Nixon

will not be intimidated by these politically misguided leftists, just as he maintains the dignity of his office in confrontations with pacifists and militants who try pressure measures through public sentiment.

The antiwar protests will not influence this Vietnam policy.

They will not end the war. They will serve only to hinder and harm. They will not create peace. Nothing the protesters say and do, however, will cause our President to sacrifice abroad what he considers to be the best interest of the United States. He will not let threats and blackmail overrule reason and patriotism. He has all the facts about Vietnam, and he knows the score there and here.

Since the President is trying very hard to end the war, and since he is the only person in the United States with the power to do so, it really seems ridiculous for these groups to attack him. They are, in a sense, trying to destroy the one channel to their goal—if their goal is really peace.

If I were a student, I would walk into my class tomorrow with pride in America. I would not be counted as a protester. As a Congressman, I will be here on the floor of the House of Representatives doing what the people of the Second District of Tennessee elected me to do—represent them—not demonstrate.

Statesmanship speaks for itself, perhaps more in this matter than in other situations.

There are times when we must think of America above all else—above party, above personal gain and personal ambition. I think Senator MIKE MANSFIELD illustrated this a few days ago on a national television interview. Having seen the battlefields of Vietnam, as I have, he said:

I think the President is doing everything he can, according to the best advice he can get, to get out of Vietnam. It is not a partisan issue. It is something we must all try to work toward a solution of and I am hopeful that it can be accomplished in the not too distant future, though I am not too encouraged by the events up to this time.

Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, voicing praise for President Nixon's peace efforts, said he "is proceeding along the right path" and "has made some progress" toward peace. He said:

We only have one President at a time, and I think the worst thing we can do is try to undermine the efforts of the President.

The organizers of the moratorium claim that President Nixon has taken enough time to settle the war. They say they have waited long enough and have decided to strike up the old antiwar demonstrations once again. The truth of the matter is that they have been planning for October 15 since spring. They organized a staff who has been raising funds and organizing campuses throughout the country for months.

Now there are those among us who would have the United States announce a definite timetable for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. That would merely be telling Hanoi to just wait a little while and we will be completely out of there and it will be yours

to conquer and to keep. It would give Hanoi little reason to make concessions. It would be necessary only for Hanoi's delegation to Paris to sit out the interval until the deadline.

Why would Hanoi want to cooperate in peace talks if they knew we would be gone from Vietnam in 12 or a number of months. They would need only to wait us out and take South Vietnam by default.

As you know Secretary of State Rogers said this weekend that the President does have "a schedule" for troop withdrawals which "may vary" with events and that he "contemplates the complete removal of the troops in Vietnam," but "he does not plan to announce it to the enemy."

Secretary Rogers mentioned that while the President "has carried out his promise to deescalate" the war, "the dissent in the country seems to be accelerating" even though "we have made every concession that it has been suggested we make in the past 9 months."

In editorial comment the Wall Street Journal gave these words well worth repeating:

The Administration's evident course obviously is no happy one, but it looks a little better when you also look clearly at the alternatives. It makes more sense if you understand there is no magic combination of levers, that there is no easy way out, that this war is indeed a tragedy in the full sense of that word.

During the Johnson administration, the President had my backing on his handling of the Vietnam war. Certainly there were times when I disagreed with some minor functions, but he had my full loyalty and support when it came to supporting our boys who were carrying out the fight in Vietnam.

My feeling is that the President has far more facts and far more influence than the average politician who comes up with a new solution each week.

The Vietnam war brought President Johnson many hardships, and some say, caused his retirement from the Presidency. Neither his escalation of the war nor his final attempts to deescalate brought appreciable results.

If we compare his first 8 months—without harassment—with these first 8 months of the Nixon administration we find a great contrast to the war activity.

During the 8 months between December 1964 and July 1965 the Johnson administration began the bombing of North Vietnam, raised the authorized troop levels in Vietnam fivefold from 23,000 to 125,000, and gave the fateful go-ahead to our military commanders to send American ground troops into combat. President Nixon, during his first 8 months, has again reassessed the Vietnam situation and he has started bringing boys home and de-Americanizing the war.

The President has told us, "I do not want an American boy to be in Vietnam for 1 day longer than is necessary for our national interest."

While Vietnam is the big issue that overrides all others, its accompanying revolt by the new left and by the militant groups may be as dangerous a threat to our society as the war is freedom in Asia.

For this reason, again I say that I do

not condone any activity that leads us into the hands of the enemy, directly or indirectly. I realize that there will be those among tomorrow's gatherings who are sincere, though perhaps a little misguided; others just following the action, running to the sound of a noisy gang, whether it is Chicago, a California campus, or Washington, D.C.; and still others who are dangerous, hard-core militants.

The public needs to know the tactics by which militant groups can turn a non-violent gathering into chaos and destruction. SDS, the Black Panthers, and other militants have been holding top-secret strategy meetings to plan more violence. The extremists, black and white, have the common goal of destroying American society by violence.

Operating these new left groups is expensive and the money comes from many sources, mostly contributions because the organizations do not bring in any great amounts in membership dues. One example of operational costs is the \$80,000 a year necessary to run the SDS national office.

Wealthy individuals and tax-exempt foundations sometime give substantially to the new left. Student fees at some colleges go to help the new left when the students elect as their campus leaders new left activists.

These contributors are certainly not helping peace. They are making payments on the destruction of America. They should be classed with the demonstrators and rioters. I do not condone them, and I fear that they do not have respect for our great country. They are contributing to the disrespect shown by many youth, and thus many young people go in search of the new left as though they are following a new pied piper.

The administration needs our support on Vietnam now more than ever. I think Secretary of Defense Laird expressed this very well when he told the AFL-CIO meeting in Atlantic City last week:

Make no mistake about it. To carry out his policy the President needs the support of a united people. The young Americans in Vietnam need that support. Hanoi's strategy is clear: the leaders in Hanoi expect to achieve victory by waiting for us to abandon the conflict as a result of anti-war protest in this country.

From their experience with the French and from their reading of events in the United States last year, they are encouraged to believe that they can get all they want if they merely wait long enough. The President will not bow to acts and utterances by these Americans who seek to pressure him in capitulation on Hanoi's terms. Those acts and utterances serve only to encourage the enemy to keep on fighting in South Vietnam and to keep on stalling in Paris.

Thus, it is alarming to see leaders of prominence in this Chamber, from campuses, in business, and other fields supporting the moratorium tomorrow. I feel that they are misguided in this approach. There is room for many opinions in this society without causing disruptiveness that could weaken this Nation.

When American boys are asked to give their lives we owe them our complete support, whether or not we believe in the reason for their being in a conflict.

I want to be counted among those who

urged the students to remain in class and boycott the boycott. I want to be counted among those who encouraged the workers to attend to their jobs as usual. I want to be counted among those who stood faithfully behind their country, behind their President, and, most of all, behind their soldiers. My prayer and my hope is for peace. I support President Nixon in his dedication to peace with honor.

You will not find my family and me giving encouragement to the enemy and discouragement to our fighting men. This is something that all should not forget tomorrow.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in tonight's meeting. I only hope we will never have to return here for a similar chore. We are tired of talking about, and living with, war.

Yet I feel that I must speak out at this time, for there seems to have been change—but inadequate change from the policy I protested against several years ago. On Monday, the President wrote:

To listen to public opinion is one thing; to be swayed by public organized demonstrations is another.

On this point the President made the same mistake that his predecessor made—he failed utterly to comprehend that the public demonstrations and meetings, such as this one, reflect the opinions of not the isolated few who, in his own words, "invite anarchy" but rather a substantial and clear majority of the American people.

I believe that despite his unfortunate words, the President's acts indicate he does not realize that the people of the United States are fed up with this war, that the last 9 months have been a long moratorium on criticism, that the country does not need an additional 60 days of silence, and that the statement of the Harvard dean in 1967 that "this is a bum war, a bum war" is now echoed throughout the country, yes, especially by those who voted for the President last year.

Just 2 weeks ago, a Gallup poll showed that only 35 percent of the people supported the Nixon policy in Vietnam. A more recent poll shows that 57 percent of the people want a withdrawal by the end of 1970. So when the President says that paying heed to this public outcry against his policy would be "an act of gross irresponsibility" perhaps he ought to recall that in 1968 the American public removed one President from office because of this war. Perhaps he ought to ponder Santayana's dictum that:

Those who fail to learn the lessons of history will be condemned to repeat its mistakes.

In 1968 it seemed that persistent questioning of the war had finally caused the Johnson administration to reconsider and redirect its policy. The country came to think that those questions need not be asked any more, that its mandate for an end to the slaughter of American lives would be followed.

Now, 1½ years later, we see that this mandate has not been the basis of any new policy, that 7,000 more men have lost their lives, and that we clearly need

to ask once again: Why should we continue to fight this war?

To this question the present administration has said that we Americans have a moral obligation to keep our promises, to help the Vietnamese establish a viable government. So we ask the administration: How can it talk of self-determination when the weight of our intervention has made self-determination impossible? How can it say we are supporting a trustworthy government when corruption permeates every level of the Saigon regime? And finally, how can the administration support a regime that imprisons political opponents for saying what Members of this Congress have said, and what several months later Saigon says itself.

There are those who claim that, "We must stand fast so that the enemy knows that it has no choice except to negotiate." Should it not be clear that such tactics have not worked for the past 4 years?

In both 1964 and 1968 we elected Presidents who promised in no uncertain terms to disengage us from a hopeless and futile war. The national consensus was twice made clear by the electorate. We now linger painfully as we slowly draw troop by troop from the battlefield at a rate that would take us 10 years to withdraw. Let us get on with the job of bringing our men home.

The operations of withdrawal may be complex, but the answer to the question, "when should we withdraw?" is simple and brief. We should withdraw as soon as possible, consistent with the safety of our men and the lives of threatened Vietnamese nationals.

The Vietnamese people are tough and durable. If they have been able to survive the last decades of war, they should certainly be able to work to produce a viable society in peacetime. Let us help them get on with that job.

Then there is the other question: Whom is this war helping?

Today it is obvious that the Vietnamese people have suffered heartbreak. A whole generation has never known peace. It is obvious that the American economy is warped and wounded, that our leading educational institutions no longer serve primarily as centers of learning, that American ideals and American foreign policy have been discredited throughout the world. It has prevented us—both at home and abroad—from attaining goals well within our reach.

It has prevented us from cleaning our air, our rivers, and our harbors, from helping our poor, from stopping the inflation that robs our pocketbooks.

This war has been one of the greatest blunders in our country's history. Our economy, our prestige, our power—all these have been diminished by this repugnant war. But more than anything else, the war has forced us to examine ourselves as a people, it has forced us to recognize our own faults. The pertinence of the following lines by Samuel Taylor Coleridge about the British invasion of France shortly before 1800 has become obvious:

We have offended, oh! My countrymen!
We have offended very grievously,

And been most tyrannous. From east to west
A groan of accusation pierces heaven!
The wretched plead against us: Multitudes
Countless and vehement, the sons of God.
Our brethren! Like a cloud that travels on,
Steamed up from Cairo's swamps of pestilence,

Even so, my countrymen! Have we gone forth

And borne to distant tribes slavery and pangs,

And deadlier far, our vices whose deep taint
With slow perdition murders the whole man,
His body and his soul!

Hopefully today's moratorium will persuade our Government to make a determined effort to right these wrongs. For what we are likely to hear, or sense, amidst the blaring of bullhorns and the brandishing of placards, is a deep-seated yearning for a halt to the slaughter and for a more rational reordering of our priorities, a yearning shared by a broad spectrum of Americans who have come to believe that we never should have embarked on this futile, tragic effort in Vietnam and that we should wind up our role in it as swiftly as possible. Let us hope and pray that the President will listen to us and ponder the voices of Americans across the land tomorrow.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as the date of the Vietnam moratorium approaches, the call by its supporters for participation in the demonstration becomes more and more emotional. They are apparently oblivious to the steps which the President has taken to achieve a permanent peace in Vietnam and the resultant deescalation in the level of the violence without placing in jeopardy the freedom and security of the South Vietnamese people.

In this context, the fog of rhetoric surrounding the original purpose of the moratorium and the alternative, if any, it seeks to present are in need of clarification. The noted columnist, David S. Broder, in a cogent and well-written article in the Washington Post of October 14, 1969, discusses these matters. So that all the Members of the House of Representatives can have the benefit of his views, I would like to include them for the RECORD:

ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The larger the plans for Wednesday's Vietnam moratorium, the more the central message and tactic of the demonstration have been obscured. If the event is to be gauged properly, it is important to uncover its original premises from the debris of clichés and endorsements in which they have lately been buried.

A number of men active in the moratorium have taken time to point out what they consider the errors of the argument in this column last week that it is a plan for "the breaking of the President." With sincerity and conviction, they have asserted that, far from breaking the President, they are out to save him, by persuading him to make the peace the nation craves and, incidentally, to save the political system by keeping the anti-war movement out of the hands of the radicals and in control of those with a commitment to peaceful forms of protest.

Their conversations and correspondence have helped to define three questions which might be borne in mind by those planning to participate in the moratorium.

First, what is the target of this protest? Sam Brown, the able spokesman for the moratorium, says it is not an anti-Nixon move because "we learned in 1968 that what we must oppose are not personalities but policies."

But if the Nixon administration is following the very policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, as I believe, then their moratorium is mobilizing public opinion against its own policy recommendation to the President. The minority plank at the Democratic convention, endorsed by all the leading doves, called for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. This has been done. It recommended a reduction in offensive operations in South Vietnam. The President has ordered this and it is in effect.

It asked for a "phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time" of all foreign troops. The Nixon administration has begun pulling Americans out of Vietnam without waiting for North Vietnam to agree to mutual withdrawals, as the doves thought necessary.

Finally, it recommended that the United States use the leverage of troop withdrawals to "encourage" the Saigon government "to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front" looking toward "a broadly representative government" but recognizing that "the specific shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese."

If this is not precisely the policy of the current administration, as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State, then words have lost their meaning. And if the moratorium sponsors want to argue—as some have—that the President is lying about his purpose, their suspicions must be weighed against the facts of reduced fighting, reduced troop levels and reduced casualties, which his policies have brought about.

Second, what is the alternative they recommend? It has been described in moratorium publicity as everything from a negotiated settlement to immediate, total American withdrawal from Vietnam, but Brown said Sunday on "Face the Nation" that it is the latter that the moratorium has "consistently" demanded.

If that is the case, then the elected officials, clergymen and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium can properly be asked if this is the program they endorse. Many of these sponsors were involved in the fight for the minority plank at the Chicago convention which specifically said the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they could explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent the troops in. Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

Third, and most important, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representative democracy or does it substitute the rule of the street?

The sponsors say the name "moratorium," rather than "strike," was chosen to emphasize that the protest is to be peaceful and noncoercive. It is a nice distinction. The noncoercive feature may be almost invisible to the thousands of students whose colleges will shut down Wednesday. If the moratorium continues, as planned, for two days in November, three days in December, and so on, it will more and more come to resemble the general strike so familiar to European politics.

And if it succeeds in its aim, what is to prevent other majorities or sizable minorities

in the country from using the same technique to force their views on agencies of the government? The moratorium sponsors say Vietnam is an extraordinary issue, but they must know it is not the only issue which agitates millions of people.

One wonders what the moratorium sponsors would say if Billy Graham were to ask all the parents who want prayers restored to public schools to withdraw their children from school for one additional day each month until the Supreme Court reverses its school-prayer decision.

Suppose pro-prayer teachers agreed to meet the pupils in private homes on moratorium days to discuss "the overriding significance of religion in human life." Would the Vietnam moratorium sponsors cheer? What would they say if landlords and real estate men opposed to integrated housing declared a moratorium until Congress repeals the open-housing law?

My view, just to be clear, is not that the Vietnamese moratorium is un-American, illegitimate, meanly partisan or personally vindictive in its motivation. My view is that it is an ill-timed, misdirected protest, vague in its purpose and quite conceivably dangerous in its precedent.

As was said last week, its immediate result may be the breaking of the President. In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow protesters across this Nation will take part in Vietnam Moratorium Day and express their demands for the unilateral withdrawal of American troops from the Vietnam war zone. I am convinced that these demonstrators can do nothing but hurt the chances for an honorable settlement of that conflict.

Those in support of the moratorium are hindering the efforts being made by President Nixon in his program to de-Americanize the war. These protesters are willing to jeopardize the chance for peace, just when President Nixon is continuing the negotiations in Paris, just as we are anticipating the return of more than 60,000 of our fighting men home for Christmas, and at a time when the fighting has reached its lowest level in more than 2 years. Those who are endorsing this movement seem to be completely ignorant of these facts.

Instead of assisting the administration in its efforts to achieve peace, this irresponsible action leads the enemy to think that the majority of the American people do not want Communist aggression stopped. It leads them to believe that we are a severely divided nation, and that the majority of the American people want us to set a date for the total withdrawal of our troops.

The North Vietnamese Communists are in strong support of moratorium day. Just last week, according to a United Press International story, the deputy negotiator for Hanoi at the Paris peace table and the Foreign Minister for the Vietcong called on American citizens to increase their resistance to force President Nixon to accept the Communist peace proposals in Paris. This endorsement by the North Vietnamese was further confirmed today by the letter referred to by the gentleman from Maryland. These North Vietnamese have at-

tempted to bypass our negotiators at the peace table by calling on the American people to apply pressure to the President. The Communist leaders warmly applauded the so-called dissent in Washington. I can well understand why they would be in support of the Moratorium Day activities. If these demands are accepted, why should the Communists negotiate when all they have to do is hold on and fight until a specific date; and then, all would be in their control. Willingly or unwillingly, those who endorse the moratorium are playing into the hands of the Communist propagandists.

Let me remind the Members that this war is not a partisan issue. It is far too serious for that. I cannot understand how any American could believe that this course of action is in the best interest of our Nation, our fighting men, and those who have paid the ultimate price for peace while fighting under the American flag. I can only say that the people who take part in this moratorium must be prepared to shoulder the responsibility for the consequences which may result. These consequences might be severe. Encouraging the enemy to continue to fight rather than engage in meaningful negotiations would be a tremendous price to pay for a few headlines.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the debate this evening on Vietnam has been a credit to the House of Representatives and those who participated in it. For my own part, I have reserved only 15 minutes and at this stage in the debate many excellent points have already been covered. The first two speakers, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) set the high tone of the debate and I congratulate those whose excellent questions and comments made this a true debate rather than just a series of monologs.

I am also proud of those young Americans on the campuses of our Nation who have organized the moratorium which is taking place throughout the country on October 15. This moratorium will be expressed in many different ways. In the same spirit in which President Kennedy stated "we must make the world safe for diversity," there is a genuine diversity in the manner in which the moratorium is being observed.

Last evening I visited the beautiful city of Keyser, W. Va., the site of a fine college, Potomac State College. A group of about 15 or 20 war veterans met me and invited me to dinner. At dinner they told me of their plans for the October 15 moratorium on the campus of Potomac State College and in the community of Keyser.

It is very significant that the moratorium movement is being led primarily by veterans who have served in combat in Vietnam. The chairman of the moratorium is Robert Hagan of my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., who is enrolled at Potomac State College. Young Hagan spent 13 months in combat with the famed Big Red One Infantry Division in and around the Diah, Vietnam, area. He is earnestly articulate about his determination to find a quick and peaceful solution to the deepening morass of Viet-

nam. Among other Vietnam veterans who are leading the moratorium at Potomac State College are David Boothe of Fenwick, Nicholas County, W. Va., who spent 17 months in combat in Vietnam with the 1st Aviation Brigade, flying O-1 "Bird Dog" light observation planes. Then there is Jim Roberts of Elkins, W. Va., who spent 8½ months in Chua Lai, Vietnam, with the Americal Division. Among other moratorium leaders at Potomac State are Jack Thomas of Penns Grove, N.J., who spent 18 months at Nha Trang, Vietnam. Tom McCullough of New Cumberland, W. Va., Marvin Simpson of Keyser, W. Va., Jim Breithner of Ridgeley, W. Va., and Victor and Mike Joseph of Elkins, W. Va. also have served in the Armed Forces and are now leading in the campaign to end the war in Vietnam.

These veterans are a dramatic answer to those who contend that this moratorium movement is led by radicals, by draft card burners, by students who are just trying to avoid military service or combat, or by those whose aim is to foment violence and disruption.

I deplore and abhor the kind of violence which has been spawned by extreme elements, such as those who sparked the serious breaches of the peace in Chicago in the past few days. I sincerely believe that the success of the moratorium rests in the fact that this is a peaceful, responsible and meaningful expression of determination that the war must end. The movement is responsibly led, and by its peaceful and nonviolent aims and manner of development, the moratorium is focusing public attention on the greatest violence of all—the war itself.

When future historians look back on October 15, 1969, I believe they will recognize the significance and value of this nationwide movement. I respect the sincerity of the President of the United States in his devotion to peace and his professed desire to do the best he can with the situation. One cannot expect either the President or those who demand unquestioning support of his policies to acknowledge that the moratorium or this debate tonight will have any clear and perceptible effect. Yet I am confident we will see some changes. We do not ask that these changes be clearly labeled and acknowledged as retreats, advances or 180-degree turns. But in a democracy, public opinion is a powerful force. The public is frustrated with the false promises made through the years concerning Vietnam, the public is tired of those who would merely "save face" or protect an imaginary image. They are determined that the great sacrifices we have made for illusory goals are not continued and compounded without reason in the very indefinite future.

In the State of West Virginia, there have been 472 men killed by enemy combat action through July 30, 1969. In addition, there have been 77 West Virginians who have died in Vietnam as a result of nonbattle causes. West Virginia stands highest among the States of the Union in battle deaths in Vietnam in proportion to population. West Virginia has lost one serviceman per 4,000 people as contrasted with the national average of one service casualty per 5,500 people.

Our Mountain State now has 6,950 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen on duty in Vietnam, which is also higher in proportion to population than any other State. These grim figures point up once again that West Virginians are first in war and patriotism and stand second to no one when it comes to courage and bravery under fire.

And so we in West Virginia join in this effort to end the senseless and mindless carnage. We are confident that a withdrawal of our combat forces from Vietnam, coupled with measures to protect American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam, will constitute positive moves toward peace and stability throughout the world.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the United States should decide now to begin the total withdrawal of its military forces from South Vietnam. And it should decide this not because it is or is not in North Vietnam's interests; not because it is or is not in General Thieu's interests; but because it is in the U.S. interests. We set out to defend South Vietnam until it could defend itself; that Government now has over a million men under arms—four times the number of North Vietnamese and Vietcong combined. We did not agree to keep the South Vietnamese generals in power until kingdom come. We must now develop our own timetable for withdrawal—for there are American men involved, and American lives at stake, and America's future in the balance.

We can neither accept General Thieu's views on a withdrawal timetable, nor should we make our disengagement contingent on the intransigence of the North Vietnamese in Paris. The Vietnam war has brought this Nation—these United States—to the point where our own national survival as a unified people is threatened. The decision to withdraw from South Vietnam is totally the responsibility of this country because what we are talking about is the survival of this country. The United States cannot save any other country until it saves itself—no matter how many lives or how much money we divert to the task. But we can save ourselves. Nothing less than saving ourselves is at stake in the issue of American withdrawal from Vietnam.

We are running out of time in Vietnam. The light at the end of the tunnel has gone out. The corner around which victory was supposed to appear has turned into an abyss. The secret solutions and the 60-day solutions have all turned out to be no solutions at all. The only way to get out is to get out.

I believe that we must resolve to withdraw from Vietnam totally, and that we must make that resolve clear now. We must begin that total withdrawal immediately. This is not the same as "immediate withdrawal" a phrase which has been used by Vietnam hawks to convey the idea of hasty, unplanned and irresponsible termination of U.S. participation. And it is not the same as "unilateral withdrawal," which makes it sound as if we have to deliver a surrender, signed and sealed, to Hanoi before we can get out. I set no deadlines; I offer no monthly quotas. What we are talking

about here is not "bugging out," to use the President's rather inelegant phrase. We are talking about being honest with ourselves about our intentions in Vietnam.

Our withdrawal timetable must, of course, take into account the logistical and practical difficulties of moving hundreds of thousands of men and millions of tons of equipment many thousands of miles. It also should include consideration of the effect of our withdrawal on the fate of American servicemen now held in North Vietnam. Once we have truly determined, as a first principle of our national policy, that withdrawal of U.S. forces is in our national interest, this determination should be used to exact from the North Vietnamese as a precondition of that total and complete withdrawal the unconditional release of all U.S. servicemen now held in North Vietnam. It is inconceivable to me that once we have convinced ourselves that withdrawal is in our national interest, we cannot convince Hanoi that releasing our men is in their national interest. In any case, the withdrawal operation, requiring as it will phasing over a considerable period of time, will provide opportunities to apply additional pressure as the weeks go by. The important point is that having made the decision to withdraw totally, we would be able to devote more strenuous and more convincing efforts to obtaining the release of our men now held prisoner.

Thus our timetable for withdrawal should be a timetable which reflects our national interests. It should be a timetable which will give us the best balance of benefits from withdrawal. That balance should, as I have said, include consideration of how best and most quickly to reduce American deaths—of which there have already been 40,000 too many. It should include consideration of how best to insure the immediate release and return of American prisoners in the North. And because of the role which we as a Nation have played in bringing war to South Vietnam, we must consider in planning our withdrawal how best we may play a role in bringing peace to Vietnam.

To anyone who has lived through the last 2 years in America, it should not be necessary to describe the reasons for urgency in withdrawing our troops from South Vietnam. The effects of this tragic war—surely the most egregious diplomatic and military misjudgment America has made in the last century—have rent the very fabric of our Nation for almost 5 years. In Vietnam, there have been the deaths of American men, and the lives twisted or destroyed in senseless violence—lives of both Americans and Vietnamese. But this carnage, this destruction of human life occurs in every war. What has made Vietnam so unique in the American experience? What has made it different from Korea, or World War II, or the others? There are, of course, many reasons. Let me choose but a few, and discuss them under the headings of division, diversion, and disillusion.

The most obvious result of the Vietnam war has been the deep divisions which it has fostered in American

society. The war has divided fathers from sons, separated husbands from families, and tragically, isolated a government from its people. It has exacerbated existing divisions between black and white, between rich and poor, between young and old. It has driven from office a President who was elected only 4 years earlier with the most overwhelming mandate in modern political history. It has resulted in accusations of defeatism, intimations of disloyalty, criminal prosecutions for dissent. It has—in short—turned the American body politic into a seething, divided, discouraged mass of discontented citizens. It has brought us to the point where some wonder whether—if the war is not ended—popular government in America can continue to function coherently and effectively.

If the war in Vietnam has divided us, it has also diverted us. It has required close to \$30 billion a year since 1966; it has caused us to divert to military pursuits an additional 800,000 men; it has turned our attention from the urgent social and economic problems which we face here at home. Not only has the war taken the dollars which we should have devoted to poverty, hunger, and education in America. It has also contributed directly to domestic problems, like dissatisfaction with the draft—which has now become a draft revolt; like the gross distortion of our defense budget—which has now made us not only the greatest military spender on earth, but maintainer of the largest standing Armed Forces in the world; and like inflation—whose plundering of salaried and middle-income families can be traced directly to the billions which our Government has overspent for Vietnam.

Education programs are being cut; health programs are being cut; conservation and antipollution programs are being cut. And why? So that we can find the resources to continue fighting a war which involves no vital interest of the United States; so that we can say that we have brought the war to an honorable conclusion. If we continue on this ill-conceived course, we may find that we have preserved our honor, but that our troops do not have much to come home to.

Finally, and perhaps most important in terms of its effect on America's youth and on her future, our continued participation in the war in Vietnam has brought with it disillusion. Many of my colleagues in the House have asked me what is the difference in this student generation; why are they so militant about the war when their predecessors were so docile. I think I know a little of what is bothering the students today. They are, as Prof. George Wald said, a generation in search of a future, a generation which is not even sure it has a future. This generation of young people did not live through the depression and see our Nation raise itself up by its bootstraps from economic chaos and disaster. They did not see America rescue Europe from the clutches of a ruthless and incomparably evil dictator, or save East Asia from the grip of a cruel, militarist regime in Japan. To this generation of young peo-

ple America means smugness, material affluence, billions for defense and pennies to feed the hungry, the first peacetime draft in our history, the atomic bomb, a country at peace but with the largest Army in the world, the ABM; I could go on and on. To these young people America means defense, or war, or the fear of war; it means protecting ourselves against threats which are vaguely defined and vaguely substantiated. To these young Americans our Nation means something different than it meant to us before.

Senator Robert Kennedy, who had a special ability to communicate with the young, summed up what it is that has so disillusioned America's young people:

Even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to "build bridges" to this new Communist world, they see us, in the name of anti-Communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends. However the war may seem to us, they see it as one in which the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children (they do not care if accidentally) in a remote and insignificant land. We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mistakes made before many of them were born, before almost any could vote. They see us spending billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home; they see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Vietnam, but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettos of the North. And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decisions of policy; that they themselves do not, by the nature of our political system share in the power of choice on great questions that shape their lives.

This disillusion, this disbelief in the America which captured so many men's imaginations and held so many men's hopes before the cold war—this is what really bothers me most about the continuation of the war in Vietnam. Every day that we continue fighting half-a-world away, every day that more Americans die in a cause which none can defend and few can even explain, every day we make it just a little bit harder to vindicate the America that used to be. President Nixon recently called upon Americans to return to the spirit of 1776. How hollow that call must sound from an administration which continues to fight the war in Vietnam in the face of overwhelming public condemnation of that war. What meaning can democracy and self-government have when those who govern say "under no circumstances whatever will I be affected" by the will of the governed? Who was that President who only a few months ago in his inaugural address said to us:

For its part, government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways.

Can this be the same President who last week said:

Under no circumstances whatever will I be affected.

This, indeed, is something different than America meant before.

Having described what I believe the policy of this country must be on troop withdrawals from Vietnam, and having examined the reasons that this policy

is so urgent, I must turn now—rather sadly—to the position of the Nixon administration. Let me make clear at the outset that I do this not in a spirit of partisanship. The question of how the United States will liquidate its commitments in South Vietnam is too fundamental, too important a matter to be used as a means to gain partisan political advantage. I believe Democrats who attempt this do a disservice both to their party, and to the cause of peace. It ill-becomes Democrats, whose President began and so accelerated the war, to seek political advantage from a Republican President's failure to end it.

But criticism there must be if criticism is warranted; dissent there must be if dissent is needed. Entreaties to silence so that the President's secret plan can work must not be heeded. We have heard these entreaties too recently before. This is not how democracy functions, even if some leaders of my own party suggest that this is so.

What has President Nixon told us, then, about his plan for withdrawal, his plan for peace? The President has told us that the pace of American withdrawal will depend on three factors: progress at the Paris peace talks, developments on the battlefield, and the ability of the Vietnamese Armed Forces to shoulder a larger share of the burden of the war. At first glance, these may seem reasonable enough. But on reflection it becomes clear that each of these factors depends on another party. The ability of the South Vietnamese to take over the war depends, obviously enough, on the South Vietnamese. Anyone who believes that the South Vietnamese generals want to take over the fighting does not know very much about human nature or about South Vietnamese generals. About all General Thieu has said he wants to take over from the United States are atomic weapons.

The second factor in the President's formula, battlefield developments, depends almost entirely on the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. What the President means here, I take it, is that if the enemy will give us on the battlefield what we cannot get at the negotiating table—cessation of hostilities—then we will consider that as a factor in our withdrawal. I submit that this is as unrealistic as the President's first condition.

Finally, the third factor—whether progress is made at the Paris peace talks, depends not alone on the South Vietnamese generals, or the North Vietnamese, or the Vietcong—it depends on all three. Thus if we are waiting for progress at Paris as the sign to step up withdrawal of our forces, we will wait for a long time. Once again we have abandoned the initiative to the opposition and to our allies—and I am not sure which is worse. Candidate Nixon jeered because the United States had been humiliated in the *Pueblo* incident by what he called "a fifth-rate power." President Nixon, however, would base American withdrawals from South Vietnam on the will of two fifth-rate powers—and one party which is not a power: at all, at least according to the South Vietnamese Government.

If there is one point which I hope came clear in the first part of this presentation, it was that America must regain the initiative on the solving the Vietnam problem. The vacuum of leadership which makes progress in achieving peace dependent on what others do, rather than on the national interests of the United States, is a poor excuse for a policy. If this is the President's secret plan for peace, we now all know why he has kept it secret for so long. Withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam must depend on our national interest: on reducing American casualties, insuring the safety of troops during withdrawal, on obtaining release of American prisoners in North Vietnam.

Many will ask, "what more can the President do? We have stopped the bombing of the North, we have withdrawn 25,000 troops and announced the withdrawal of 35,000 more. Is not the burden of going forward on the enemy?" I believe that an answer to this question can only be given in the context of President Nixon's mandate from the American electorate and the context of America's massive commitment to that tiny land so far from our shores and so remote from our interest. President Johnson was driven from office by the war in Vietnam. Hubert Humphrey was denied the Presidency largely because he would not disavow Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam policy. Richard Nixon was elected to end the war in Vietnam. He was elected because of an overwhelming revulsion with the war and an overwhelming desire to be quit of it.

It is in light of President Nixon's overwhelming mandate to end the war, and the overwhelming commitment of American men and materiel to South Vietnam, that the President's moves thus far must be evaluated. And in this light, they are insufficient. All we have heard from the administration is Secretary Rogers saying that continued protest and dissent will harm progress at the talks. We might ask "what progress?" We have heard Secretary Laird lecturing the American people on how they ought to be satisfied with the great progress we are making in Vietnamizing the war—and not even convincing his own son. And we have heard the President of the United States say that:

Under no circumstances, will I be affected by protests against the pace of our withdrawals.

This is not a policy. This is buying time; and buying time, to use a current phrase, just will not make it.

The objective is not Vietnamizing the war; it is American disengagement. Our interest seems to be an exclusive concern as to whether Generals Thieu and Ky can continue to fight after we leave. There is no indication to me that this will guarantee our stated objective in Vietnam—self-determination for the South Vietnamese people—any more than a coalition government, or some other political accommodation. In fact, the generals have reportedly told us that even if we stay, and a coalition government is negotiated in Paris, they will overthrow it in 24 hours. Whose interest are we defending anyway?

The President's alternatives are legion, really too numerous to discuss in detail here. He could offer immediately a standstill cease-fire, which at least would put a stop to Americans killing and being killed in Vietnam. He could stop the B-52 raids over South Vietnam, as we thought he had done a few weeks ago. But this time he should stop them for longer than 36 hours. He could begin to cut down the 40,000-odd men per month which we are still sending to South Vietnam as replacements for men whose tours are over. By a ghastly quirk of history, 40,000 is the same number of men whose lives have been lost in this war. We could replace at a ratio of only 1 for 2, or 3 for 4; or we could stop sending replacements to Vietnam altogether. Simply doing this—simply stopping the flow of Americans into Vietnam—would end our participation there in less than 14 months. The point is not that any one of a combination of these is the solution; the point is that to a President who really wants to end our participation in the war, the possibilities are limitless.

And of course the most disquieting thought, the nagging doubt on which the President will not reassure us, is that we have really not yet abandoned that fleeting, ephemeral vision of military victory. The sad possibility is that the President may not have gotten the message yet, that he may still be pursuing military glory—what Abraham Lincoln called "that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood, that serpent's eye that charms to destroy."

I have said what I believe our policy on withdrawal must be—total withdrawal begun immediately and completed as quickly as it practically can be. I cosponsored a resolution to this effect in the House last week. It provided for withdrawal of American forces now, subject only to the safety of those who temporarily remain and an offer of sanctuary to South Vietnamese who desire it. Because I believe that this is not a partisan issue, I also cosponsored a resolution which commended President Nixon on his troop withdrawals to date, and expressed the sense of Congress that they were in the national interest. And finally, because I believe that the kind of concerned citizen expression represented by the Vietnam moratorium is absolutely essential, I wrote to the sponsors of the moratorium endorsing their efforts to show that protest in America may still be passionate but peaceful, vital but nonviolent, and uncompromising but not unlawful. I hope that those who have organized this peaceful expression are successful in ending American military involvement in South Vietnam, before that involvement ends in even greater disaster for America.

President Nixon recognized in his inaugural address that "the greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker." With that wise observation in mind, let our Government heed the warning of the prophet Jeremiah against healing the hurt of America only slightly, and saying "Peace, peace; when there is no peace." We should remember rather the advice of the Apostle Paul:

Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and the things whereby we can uplift one another.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the people will be heard. The people of the United States, it seems, will have to be the generating force which will lead our Government out of that immoral morass which is Vietnam. Peace, Mr. Speaker, is not the exclusive domain of Presidents and diplomats—nor can it be—for they have failed—and they are failing—to bring an end to this horrible war. A massive and nationwide movement for peace, Moratorium Day, is an attempt to change our Government's perverse policy of war. It seems once again that mass citizen criticism is the only way. We had some effect before—and many people at that time said that our efforts would not work—that it was impossible to successfully impel an incumbent President—with his incumbent policies—not to run for reelection. But this time we must do better. We must truly bring an end to our tragic war in Vietnam. Peace is our purpose. And we are resolved.

This morning I saw what, in my judgment, is a most concise and eloquent statement concerning the reasons for a Vietnam Moratorium Day. It is a statement in the Detroit Free Press by the Alliance for Labor Action—which includes the United Auto Workers International Union, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the International Chemical Workers Union. These organizations and their members join us today in our stand for peace and an end to the war in Vietnam, and in our support of "the peaceful, lawful, nonviolent community activities of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium."

Their statement reads in part, and I quote:

We take our stand with the millions of our fellow-Americans who share the view that the support of efforts to disengage America from Vietnam is an act of the highest patriotism and a distinct service to our country.

I commend to my colleagues the declaration made by these organizations and will insert the entirety into my remarks.

On this Vietnam Moratorium Day we must say to Lyndon Johnson as he sits at his ranch tonight trying to figure out where he went wrong: "You listened too late." And now President Nixon has told us, and I quote:

As far as this kind of activity is concerned . . . under no circumstances will I be affected by it.

But I wonder tonight as he sits surrounded and sheltered by ex-advertising men and personal editors of the news, whether President Nixon is listening.

The feeling of the country is clear. A Gallup poll reported October 12 that 57 percent of the Nation says they would like to see passed by Congress the resolution introduced by our colleague in the other body, Senator GOODELL, which would bring all U.S. troops home from Vietnam by the end of 1970. And even as far back as 1966, in Dearborn, Mich.—a city I know well as being traditionally conservative—the people were confronted on their ballots with a question which read:

Are you in favor of an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam so the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems?

Even then—in that conservative city—41 percent voted for withdrawal. I maintain that the people of this country want out.

Mr. Speaker, just as they said before that it could not be done, they are saying now that it should not be done. I stand here tonight incredulous that, fully 9 months after President Nixon took office on the pledge of bringing peace to Vietnam, and with only the most meager measures having been taken to end this illegal and immoral war, we who speak out and criticize the war policy are being used as the scapegoats for the failure to bring this promised peace. On this, our era's most grave and tragic issue, we cannot—and must not—remain silent. Yes, we have been told that Mr. Nixon has a plan, but that we must be patient—we must give him time. We have been told that we are undermining his efforts for peace when we, here tonight, speak of peace. Time, time, time—we have all heard that too often before. But we are still looking for the deeds to match the promises. I have searched for a meaningful pattern of change in the Government's policy. Yes, some of the names have been changed—Vietnamization, protective reaction, honorable settlement—but it is the same shameful game and its name is war—and it has not stopped. The killing and maiming go on. Nearly 10,000 of our men have died in Vietnam since President Nixon took office. The Saigon government is as corrupt, repressive and dictatorial as ever before.

The policy of Vietnamizing the ground troop fighting is not a strategy for peace with a viable political settlement. Our Government knows that. So does President Thieu. He has said:

The replacement of (American) troops is not a one-year problem, it is a problem that will take years and years.

It is a tactic that signals an indefinite continuation of our involvement in that unfortunate country, with as many as 300,000 of our support forces aiding this so-called disengagement. It is similarly, in this country, to draw a parallel, that phrases such as the newly coined "Order and justice under law" signal an indefinite continuation of police abuse and brutality and mistreatment of not only blacks but students and others who dare raise their voices in protest.

Who are we supporting in Vietnam? Last Sunday, Secretary of State Rogers, in clear contradiction to other recent statements, repeated the old Dean Rusk litany that we have a commitment to the present Government of South Vietnam, a government totally bereft of the support of the people for whom it purports to speak; a government repressive in its policy and its power. One of the many arguments that have been used to rationalize the mistake of this country's involvement was the securing of self-determination for the people of Vietnam. This, indeed, was the ironic justification used to halt the elections called for by the Geneva Agreements of 1954. To

therefore support a regime that does everything in its power to suppress the true sentiments of the people is criminal.

I have been in Vietnam. It was less than 6 months ago that, as a member of the U.S. Study Team on Religious and Political Freedom in Vietnam, I spoke with Thich Thien Minh, one of the most influential Buddhist monks in South Vietnam. He said:

My only offense is that I believe in Peace.

He has been held in military custody since February 23, sentenced to 3 years at hard labor.

We talked with Truong Dinh Dzu in his cell in Chi Hoa prison—the man who ran for President under the sign of the white dove of peace to win more votes than any candidate but President Thieu himself. Dzu was imprisoned on May 1, 1968, on charges brought by the government, and I quote, "of urging the formation of a coalition government as a step toward peace." Coupled with this is President Thieu's statement that:

My government can die because of these pacifists, but before we die, they will have to die first.

Now, our own Government is supposedly advocating a coalition government and free elections as a possible way out of Vietnam. Yet, our Government by its studied passivity has sanctioned these outrageous acts, the equivalent to putting Senator EUGENE McCARTHY in prison.

Moreover, these are not isolated incidents. We found that persons are often held in detention centers and interrogated for periods up to 2 years. There is no "due process" as we know it in the arrest, detention, interrogation, and sentencing of suspects. The favorite method of suppression used by the Thieu-Ky government is the extra-constitutional military field tribunal, a method responsible for the imprisonment and sentencing of thousands of Vietnamese, most often without the least regard for the elements of a fair hearing. Furthermore, accounts we heard by ex-prisoners verified that ingenious and brutal torture is the general procedure in detention and interrogation centers.

In Thu Duc Prison we saw 50 women, some with babies, living in a crude building 40 by 30 feet in size. We heard a fellow prisoner describe the ordeal of a woman law student, for months tortured and beaten so incessantly at an "interrogation" center that two fellow prisoners had to carry her before the military tribunal when her case came up at last. She had been arrested as a spy but it was later found to be only a case of mistaken identity.

In recent months 30 newspapers have been forced to close down for in some small way criticizing the Thieu regime. In sum, more than 30,000 South Vietnamese have been jailed as posing a threat to that military regime. The Nixon administration apparently has not recognized the relationship between the full and active political participation and protection of civil rights for all Vietnamese and the ability of that country to fashion its own stable, representative government. There has never been any

disavowal issued from the White House concerning President Thieu's proclamation of last June in which he said:

I solemnly declare that there will be no coalition government, no peace cabinet, no transitional government, not even reconciliatory government.

Mr. Speaker, continued support for the present government of Mr. Thieu and General Ky will never bring peace to Vietnam.

It is therefore intolerable for this war—and our fighting—to continue any longer. We have already determined that we are not seeking a military solution. The very least President Nixon should do is order an immediate, unilateral, stand-still cease-fire. It is absolutely indefensible not to stop the killing while we supposedly speak of peace in Paris. But the White House now tells us that we are taking such steps—that our troops are now following a tactic termed "protective reaction"—a major step in disengagement, we are told. However—in Saigon—Gen. Earle G. Wheeler insists that there has been no major change in battlefield tactics. General Wheeler said only a few days ago that the American commander in Vietnam "is following the policies he was following when I was there in July." And you will remember that it was in July that Defense Secretary Laird told us the policy was "maximum pressure." I suppose now President Nixon will beseech us to disbelieve his military men, such as General Wheeler. That was hardly what he urged us to do when we were discussing the antiballistic missile 2 weeks ago. We were implored to believe them then, just as we are now being implored to believe that President Nixon has definite and workable plans for peace.

The war in Vietnam, lamentably, has been the longest in which we have ever been involved, excepting our own Revolutionary War. It has gone on so long, and so many have said so much concerning our involvement, that it will be difficult now for some to explore those larger historical and ethical questions which are so crucial as we seek a true perspective from which to end that war.

We, in this body, must reassert our responsibility to our constituents and the Constitution; a responsibility we abdicated too long ago. We, in this body, concurred with the Senate in passing the joint Tonkin Bay resolution on August 10, 1964—a resolution which we have allowed to be interpreted as an authorization or approval of an unlimited expansion of our involvement in Vietnam. Very probably that was not the intention of many who supported it. But we allowed it to happen. Mr. Speaker, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 2, 1968, a resolution issued by the National Lawyers Guild which carefully and thoroughly examined the legal questions regarding the Tonkin Bay resolution. It shows clearly, in my judgment, that the Tonkin Bay resolution did not extend to the President of the United States the authority to wage a military action in Vietnam. But in that it was this resolution that was used fully 6 months after its passage, to justify the escalation of our armed involvement in Viet-

nam by the President of the United States, I moved to reassert our constitutional function by introducing January 3 of this year House Concurrent Resolution 44 which would terminate forthwith that supposed justification.

For there is no "justification" for our involvement there. Nor have we ever had an obliging commitment to the Government of South Vietnam. In a 1966 report, the Committee on Planning and Research of the House Republican Conference stated that the decision to use American troops in combat, and I quote: "was not forced upon the President by the SEATO Treaty or by any other obligation entered into by an earlier administration"—conference committee, supra, "The United States and the War in Vietnam," in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 17, page 23308. Furthermore, it became clear long ago that because it was written to be subordinate to the United Nations Charter we are acting in Vietnam in violation of the SEATO Treaty; that treaty and others as an obligation to fight and kill in Vietnam. Yet, we continue the conflagration on the self-deception of a commitment to a Government in South Vietnam which blatantly serves only itself.

Mr. Speaker, as regards that Government we have no further commitment; we must honor no further pledge than that which we have already given—more than 40,000 lives, approximately 250,000 casualties, and over \$150 billion in the last 15 years—for an absolutely discredited cause. We have exploded every myth, punctured every rationalization.

Mr. Speaker, we have a larger commitment. It is long past time that we honor a pledge to ourselves, a commitment of freedom for all our countrymen. It is long past time that our Government pledge itself to an unswerving commitment—both here at home and abroad—to the fulfillment and confirmation of the principles upon which this country was founded—those principles of which so many of us still can only dream.

Because of this war, everything that is needed to bring a higher quality of life to America is being cut or eliminated. There can be no more assurances that we can afford guns and butter. Because of this war, perpetrated on the American people, this country is wracked by turmoil which may leave no values sacred. Because of this war, the hypocrisy of our Government, both past and present, has become so self-evident that the resentment may soon harden into open and constant defiance of its authority.

One must only compare in dollars the national effort to bring what is claimed is "freedom" to 13 million people in South Vietnam with the magnitude of our effort for 30 million Americans who are living in poverty here at home.

One must only compare the billions of dollars spent each month in Vietnam with the pitiful amounts used to ameliorate the plight of black Americans in the ghettos found in every sizable city from coast to coast.

One must only compare the spurious legalistic arguments now being used by Federal Government for the necessity of

decelerating desegregation in the South and to explain past failures to protect civil rights workers—with the crass violations in Vietnam of our international agreements. And this says nothing of one of the most important provisions of our Constitution which gave to Congress, and to Congress alone, the power to declare war.

Until our priorities are put right, this Nation is set on a perilous course. And it is first to getting out of Vietnam that we must turn.

We all have heard the President reiterate time and again his desire for peace.

But of what type of peace is Mr. Nixon speaking? An "honorable settlement"—that euphemistic phrase which allows an unlimited variety of interpretation—but what we know to mean as a ploy to please everyone—those who want our involvement to end—and those who do not wish to admit that we have made a mistake. We must speak plainly. Any way of getting out of Vietnam is more honorable than to continue. We must stop trying to save face; the face of this, our Nation, now scarred almost beyond recognition. Is our confidence in ourselves so imperiled that we resort to even the most transparent of deceptions? It is in my view a sinister and brutal deception which protracts the killing and prevents true peace. The people of this country should be told the truth—our war in Vietnam has been wrong. I believe the people can accept it.

But it does not help that the present administration inches toward peace with such a negative approach—I must say, an almost reluctant attitude. Straight truth is not flagellation but freedom—a liberation for America from the shackling mistakes of the past. We are not being defeated in Vietnam. No one doubts our potential power. We could, of course, have dropped an atom bomb—and once again killed millions for our pride and a "victory" of sorts.

Although it is somewhat too late for the more than 40,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese who have been killed in Vietnam, we will be recognized as finally showing wisdom and restraint in the use of that power. To some it will be callous to say—but sending good lives to die for a now repudiated cause will not save those who have gone before.

Mr. Speaker, in our reluctance to face the truth, this Nation has not moved positively enough toward peace. There are steps that must be taken if we truly desire that peace which we so loudly espouse. We must withdraw as soon as logistically possible all of our troops from Vietnam. This is not only a moral act, Mr. Speaker. If we wait to commence a meaningful level of withdrawal of troops from Vietnam until, in Paris, our writing of the peace is insured, there will be little, if any, chance of ever bringing a negotiated and lasting peace. Why is this so? Are we really so naive and ethnocentric to believe that the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front will trust us? With hundreds of thousands of foreign troops secure in their land and on their border, can we honestly expect them to hurriedly agree on a political settlement.

Even if we did not learn a lesson from the Geneva Agreement of 1954, they have. We cannot gain anything for ourselves in the current negotiations. We do not belong in Vietnam. We cannot sincerely negotiate for future military bases or presently secured troop positions. We are negotiating, it would seem, only from a distorted pride. What we are protecting at the Paris talks is not some vital national interest but the fear that any peace we achieve will be called defeat. The fact that we are now in Vietnam gives us no moral right or obligation to in any way impose its future fate. We have disavowed that purpose. By supporting the Thieu-Ky regime, even in the so-called Vietnamization of the fighting, we are hindering and prolonging the founding of a stable peace.

Peace in Vietnam will come only from a settling to equilibrium of all the various political forces which make up the Vietnamese population. Thieu and Ky will certainly never allow this to happen. Nothing will be gained in Vietnam until we leave it.

There is no way to give dignity to the liquidation of our ignoble involvement there. But it will be a triumph of principles over pride, and intelligence over delusion. Our withdrawal from Vietnam will give hope to the world that we are again on the right course. And for us, it should signal new intentions—both at home—and abroad.

For, truly, we will have accomplished little if we get out of Vietnam and leave unreformed the institutions and kind of thinking which involved us there in the first place and which continue to set our military posture and foreign policy throughout the world. I agree with those who say that Vietnam is not an accident—not a "mistake." It is a very logical extension of our own present economic, social, and political institutions. If, after Vietnam, we are not successful in cutting military spending to a truly defensible level, then we will have failed. If we do not successfully challenge and reorder our current national priorities, we will not soon see real peace and tranquillity in this, our own torn land.

The signs are all around us. Moratorium Day is an important indication—but only one. The urban crisis and the race problem are still smoldering—and they have yet to command the attention of President Nixon and his administration. Black America is losing confidence in the Federal Government. And in every white, middle-class community across the Nation the people are fed up with inflation and exorbitant, wasted tax assessments. In a Harris poll, published in September by Life magazine, 78 percent of the American public believes the reason for inflation is the cost of the war in Vietnam.

The Kerner report, which was ignored by President Johnson and disbelieved by then candidate Nixon, told of the true state of the Nation—and conditions have worsened. Almost 30 million Americans, including 15 million children, are living below the poverty line. Another 16 million live in families with only slightly higher incomes. Malnutrition has actually increased over the past decade—in this the most agriculturally productive

nation in the world. The Nixon administration studies and restudies the problem of hunger while millions continue to starve. The stockpile of hard-core unemployed mounts in a nation whose gross national product continues to rise. Fully 6.5 million work full time for wages which fall below the poverty line. Nearly 6 million families live in substandard housing units. The quality—if that is a word that can be applied here—of inner city schools deteriorates even more as Federal funds prove more difficult to obtain.

The Kerner Commission has recommended creation of 2 million new jobs over the next 3 years; 6 million new and refurbished decent housing units over the next 5 years; expanded aid to disadvantaged school districts, and improved welfare assistance.

How are these needs going to be met? Last January 14, I and more than 40 of my colleagues here in this body, introduced the Full Opportunity Act—a massive and comprehensive plan calling for \$30 billion to be spent annually for the next 10 years in an all-out attack on poverty and discrimination. This legislation has provisions for full employment, minimum wage, family allowances, compensatory education, post secondary education, adequate housing, and antidiscrimination.

How is the money to be raised? I believe it can be raised—and without adding to the inflationary spiral. I believe that the money must come from savings accruing from a drastically reduced military budget. It is a budget calling for expenditures that not only prevents the attempted solutions of our crying social needs but by its very nature continues to warp the very fabric of life in America. As the poor and oppressed wait with outstretched hands and broken hearts for us to help, we continue to throw good money after bad in that dangerous and unconscionable waste known as the arms race. I have voted against every military appropriation authorized for Vietnam since I was elected to Congress. But I will now from this year on vote against every authorization for military appropriations until some sanity and humaneness is shown by those who now wield the power.

We who are here to criticize this present course—this insane military spending in support of an old, worn out, and dangerous policy and for that, we will continue to be assailed by the so-called defenders of the faith, just as we were assailed 2 weeks ago when the authorization for military procurement bill was on the floor. Many charges against us will be asserted. Frightening spectres were raised. Certainly it will be alleged again that we are indifferent to Chinese and Soviet intentions. Yes, the thermonuclear threat will be used by some in an attempt to reduce us to silent passivity. Yet, it is those among these same elements who devise or support the irrational escalations of the arms race which keep that threat alive.

When will those who constitute the military-industrial complex learn that the strength and true security of our Nation does not depend on its weapons or a pugnacious policy of defense as

much as it does on our dedication to the value of human life and the dignity of man.

I, for one, am more confident than ever that those of us who wish to bring responsibility to our foreign policy will meet with more support than ever before. For we desire to update to the 1970's that simplistic thinking of post-World War II that has so distorted our world view that we—once a source of hope to the oppressed—are now an easy target for fear and hatred worldwide. In my judgement we must terminate that double standard which in the name of anticommunism has used war to give "peace" and repression to give "freedom." From our bull-like, anti-Communist perspective we have seen red too often, and time after time repressed nationalistic, broadly based uprisings that would have overturned a truly totalitarian rule. As "defenders of the free world," we have supported Hitler's ally, Generalissimo Franco of Spain, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, Batista in Cuba, Branco of Brazil, myriad other dictators in South America and Latin America including the infamous "Papa Doc" Duvalier of Haiti. We have supported the shahs of the Middle East, Salazar of Portugal, and neither last—nor least—we continue to support by our very presence in Vietnam the repressive regime that we ourselves brought to power—that of President Thieu and General Ky. Those in this country who encourage our messianic mission to save from hell the Vietnamese they believed were being deprived of their freedom by the Communist government of Ho Chi Minh and the Vietcong are some of the same people who fail to see in this country that many Americans still do not enjoy that basic natural right. Who? Who will save us from ourselves? Those false fears of being engulfed by that dread monolithic "Red monster" have enwrapped in a powerful creed the minds and hearts of our people for so long that they are just beginning to see out into the light.

The blatancy of the deceptions of our Government in Vietnam has awakened many Americans to the larger issue of the reasons our foreign policy and the collective conscience of the Nation permitted us to become involved there at all.

More and more people recognize that peace in Vietnam, and a lasting peace for the future, requires not only a change of strategy but a change in the fundamental premises which underly our national life and our international relationships. Ending our tragic involvement in Vietnam—and bringing peace—can unite America to fight a war against racism, poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease. But such resolution will not come until we renounce the mad folly that is the weapons race and reduce military spending to a sane and realistic level. What can the concerned citizen do? Both at home and abroad, will we as a nation have the determination to turn our backs on destruction and to embrace, instead, the construction of a new order?

It is the most urgent challenge for the people and their Government.

Are you listening, Mr. President?

Let us end the Vietnam war and start building America.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today, many Americans find it necessary to remind their Government that as free men and women they have the right—indeed the obligation—to make known their grief and outrage over the continuing American prosecution of the Vietnam war.

A few weeks ago the President showed his contempt for the democratic process by saying he would totally ignore this expression of citizen protest. Confronted with the public's justifiable anger with such a statement, the President has since recalled his ambassadors for consultation, eased General Hershey out of his job, and in lieu of new policies pursues a patchwork of public relations.

Still members of his administration, as well as Members of this House have stated these moratorium activities undermine our negotiations and give hope to Hanoi. Their rhetorical counteroffensive seems to be an attempt to put the ultimate blame for the consequences of our disastrous Vietnam policy on those who have long opposed that policy.

The absence of logic or fairness in such insinuations never seem to bother those who must find scapegoats for their own folly. The folly of Vietnam is that our Government never has been nor is it now willing to admit to its own people that our policy has been a mistake.

The Nixon administration was under no obligation to justify the war of its predecessor. On the contrary, the Johnson administration was repudiated at the polls and it was said that the new President had a plan to end the war. Yet just recently, Secretary Laird reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the objective of "permitting the people of South Vietnam freely to determine their own destiny." And so the Nixon administration still pursues the elusive goal of internal stability in Vietnam despite the fact that the military situation is a standoff; the diplomatic talks are stalemated; and the corrupt and repressive regime of Thieu and Ky continues to preside over a war-torn land.

How absurd for the Nixon administration to persist with a policy that attempts to salvage national pride and international respect when the American people and people across the globe already have condemned or grown weary of such a shabby and discredited policy. How tragic that the price of such persistence by the Nixon administration is the continued loss of American lives every week in Vietnam. We cannot tolerate that kind of sacrifice for the sake of national pride. As others have said, our pride be damned.

Some say we must remain resolute until we achieve strategic success if for no other reason than to justify the loss of 40,000 American lives. How much stronger then must be the resolution and will of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong who have lost 1 million of their own. We should no longer tolerate those who think success can be determined by body count. It is both barbaric and futile.

One can only assume from the rhetoric of the Nixon administration that it does not believe the continued American involvement in Vietnam to be a mistake. This is a frightening conclusion. It un-

necessarily prolongs the withdrawal of troops because withdrawal of troops remains predicated on achieving strategic success. It unnecessarily divides the American people who are torn between the patience of patriotism and the outrage of continued sacrifice. It raises the sinister possibility that some in power are indeed interested in finding scapegoats rather than having to admit mistake.

I believe the acceptance and admission of error by our Government is an indispensable condition for a true reversal of national policy resulting in the total and immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

The American people know a tragic mistake has been made. It remains only for the Nixon administration to accept once and for all that judgment. And so today let the Government be reminded who is master and who is servant.

I am inserting extracts of letters received from constituents and others with the thought they will be of interest to my colleagues.

This is from a U.S. captain stationed in Vietnam:

DEAR SIR: Today I read in the Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes that you had been castigated for describing Ho Chi Minh as a Patriot and the Washington of his country.

I would like you to know that there are many of us in the armed forces who share your view. He has been a truly great force in bringing this part of the world into the 20th Century. He molded a nation out of the Vietnamese in the North and, though not in the way he planned it, out of the South also. While it is deplorable that he embraced the Communist cause in achieving his goal of freeing the Vietnamese from French domination it must be remembered that he was first and foremost a nationalist, and is thought of in this light by many throughout Vietnam. While this is my second tour of duty here in Vietnam I am continually surprised by the resiliency and tenacity of the individual Vietnamese. It was this that made Ho Chi Minh great and it is this that will eventually save this nation.

No attempt by other members of our Congress can wipe out or blur the accomplishments of this man. He has proven a worthy adversary and his passing will be felt in this part of Asia for years to come.

I feel proud that someone in our Congress had the guts to view him as he was and then say so. I find it difficult to believe that your speech should cause such an emotional reaction by supposedly mature and objective men. I assure you, here the reaction was different and we are a bit closer to the reality of the situation than your colleagues.

Sincerely yours,

This letter is a response from a mailing I sent out:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I concur with you one thousand percent re a ceasefire, etc. This senseless slaughter has got to stop . . . on both sides. Now! The President has let us down with his plan to end this war which Congress had not declared. His speech at Colorado Springs was worse than the one referred to here. It seems that the military (Pentagon) is now telling us what to do. We cannot afford these taxes any longer . . . taxes going down the drain for the military. We have got to cut down the Pentagon and those know-nothing Generals who cannot win the war but who are playing hell with our best Youth, while the Yippies roam the streets . . . and the Vietnamese are living high off the U.S. hog.

Our entire schedule of Foreign commitments *must* be reappraised. I am fed up with paying and paying to other countries for their defense while they sit on their cans. I am fed up with taxes at their present level; with rising rents, interest rates, and the cost of living. This country is in damned real trouble! We had better get back to Congressional rule instead of the Pentagon and the Chief Executive. We are only as strong in the world as we are at home . . . It seems we've forgotten *Us!* We are mighty sick at home!

In a broadcast interview earlier this week you said you would wear black ribbon as a sign of mourning until the war ended and American troops are returned home. It occurs to me that an even more effective way of making President Nixon aware of the sense of mourning that so many Americans have would be to start a campaign of asking Americans to send a piece of black ribbon to Mr. Nixon personally. I can visualize the White House receiving thousands of pieces of black ribbon from people all over the country. They could, of course, be sent anonymously or with a signed note.

I hope you will consider this suggestion seriously and perhaps find some way to implement it.

Sincerely yours,

This is a letter I received in May about the Vietnam war:

I firmly disagree with any of your colleagues who have any praise whatsoever for President Nixon's statement on the War in Vietnam. I am one of the far too few Americans who could not be fooled by our President's plan to end the War. Evidently too many of our voters were willing to wait for President Nixon to get into office to tell of his great secret plan. I do not believe there ever was such a plan and I don't believe there is any plan to be seen in the near future. Our newscasters and newspapers are not calling this senseless killing a War but are referring to taking a hill where many Americans have been killed as a "clash".

I thoroughly back your thoughts that if the South Vietnamese are not willing to fill the gap with their own men, they are definitely not worthy of our continuing support. I agree—the War in Vietnam must stop and the only way to stop it is by cease fire.

I only wish that my letter or my moral support could help get your resolution through. In the meantime, may I wish you the best of luck and much success in all your present and future plans.

This is part of a letter which had many subjects included in it:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Immediate action must be taken to extricate us from the insane and disastrous war in Vietnam. Face-saving is now beyond possibility, for we are the most disrespected and most hated nation in the world. All other of our national and international problems stem from and suffer from this war—the rebellion of our youngsters in and out of the universities, the lack of money to aid our decaying cities, our polluted air and waters, and the lack of more money to aged, and poor citizens. We are committing suicide.

Respectfully yours,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: This is a plea, one of thousands I hope, to you and anyone else who will listen, to do what you can to end that fruitless, sickening war in Vietnam.

When our constructive needs are so desperate here at home, how can the Congress continue to ignore these obvious needs and, instead, allocate billions for death and destruction thousands of miles away.

Why is it so important to "play the game" at the Conference Table in Paris when hun-

drreds die every week for a cause that is not even their own. At least let's make an attempt to stop the killing and destruction *first*, and *then* sit down and bicker over a solution to this mess.

For the sake of the entire human race, please end that awful war. It's tearing our beautiful country apart.

Sincerely,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Please continue your plea and efforts to bring our boys home from that slaughter in Vietnam. The people of this country are in a state of utter despair and we feel the nation is being run by those who are profiting by the war, those who have no regard for the life of the young men or for those at home who are suffering because their loved ones have been taken from them.

Sincerely,

DEAR SIR: I read that you are identifying with the people who are reading the names of Vietnam Casualties in Washington each week. Thank you. My son is one of those names. I protested by not having a military funeral—but protest doesn't seem to have any effect, does it? Keep up your stand for justice. Thank you.

This is part of a letter on several subjects which I received last June:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is only one way the sixty Congressmen who praised the President's speech will reverse their stand—and that is—when there are enough ordinary people like me who will back up their Representatives like you and Senators Fulbright, Church and McGovern on the Vietnam issue.

Sincerely,

SIR: Am with you 100% in the current drive to end the Vietnam war now. Our generation allowed it to develop along with inflation and allied ills. We should no longer allow continued deception under Mr. Nixon who pleads for more "patience." If in fact our military is running the show it should be challenged by the democratic process.

Sincerely,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: A tragic mistake has been made by this country but fortunately we are big enough to admit it. I have no sympathy for the President's statement, in effect, that he will not be the first to preside over an American defeat. That sounds very personal—not that of one pledged to do his best for the American people.

Very truly yours,

CHURCH OF THE SACRED HEARTS,
New York, N.Y., September 8, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: In view of some recent unhappy events, the below may be of some interest to you.

This priest offered a public Mass for the soul of Ho Chi Minh and for the intention that God might use his death as the instrument of a final peace for the unhappy land of Viet-Nam.

Warm personal regards.

In Christ,

Rev. JAMES J. GILHOOLEY.

DEAR SIR: It was with greatly mixed feelings that I read the excerpt from the Congressional Record of May 15, 1969, which was sent to my home from your office. Why, when you and I apparently have a complete concurrence of opinion on the Vietnam adventure, do I say "mixed" feelings?

Simple. Because I am sick of the whole —. I am sick of talk and talk and talk. I am at this point totally cynical about the entire mess. This is God's own truth: I evaluated for months on end all aspects of the war in Southeast Asia before I was able to make up my mind as to who was right and who was wrong. As I remember, it was in late 1963 when I eventually decided that I was what is popularly termed a dove regarding this geopolitical —. From that point on I did everything within my power to proselytize, to make others see the true situation regarding Vietnam, to flood the Congress with letters, etc. And what good has it done? I daresay very little. Occasionally I run into admitted hawks. And what do they talk of? Commitments. Just commitments. Also, honor. As you yourself said, "If the South Vietnamese are not willing to fill the gap with their own men then they are not worthy of our continuing support." Why can't other Americans see this as you do? And as I do? Why cannot the President see and understand this simple question? Why can't the Congress see it?

In brief, I have lost hope. I can see our commitment in that dreary land extending till 1999, possibly with upwards of over 2,000,000 American troops lodged there by that time. I can see at the same time all of young America double alienated by then, burning draft cards, storming draft centers, engaging in street fights with the Establishment, and in every way accelerating and compounding the horrid mess that exists today.

My heart is with them. I am no hippie. I am an honorably discharged veteran of the 101st Airborne Division, and am today a public school teacher. But if I were today a mere 20 or 21, and know what I know now, I would with no compunction burn my draft card and say Damn the War! And I'd echo the yells of today's knowledgeable young men who say, Hell No I Won't Go!

I have on many occasions written Senator Fulbright and begged him to get us out of this misadventure. Now, I am begging you. Do something! Please!!

Sincerely,

VIETNAM POLICY

To the EDITOR:

One fact emerges clearly from President Nixon's March 14 press conference. He was not speaking for an aroused people which, only a year ago, had forced President Johnson to abandon pursuit of victory in Vietnam, to seek a negotiated peace and to renounce renomination. He was not speaking for the youth of America nor for the inhabitants of the ghettos. He was not speaking for the moderate Republicans and Democrats in the Congress, nor reflecting the advice of our most competent scientists and scholars.

Mr. Nixon was speaking for the national security bureaucracy—for the "military-industrial complex" against whose "unwarranted influence" President Eisenhower warned in his valedictory address.

President Nixon was given a clear mandate to make peace in Vietnam, to halt the spiraling arms race and to give priority over global interventionism to the nation's long-neglected domestic needs. He himself declared that the establishment of peace in Vietnam must be the first step toward carrying out that mandate.

NEEDED FOR PEACE

Yet one is forced to conclude from his remarks on March 14 that, like his predecessor, Mr. Nixon is unable or unwilling to recognize what must be done to achieve peace.

Like Mr. Johnson, he wants to "turn over the war to the Vietnamese" as soon as possible so that American troops may be withdrawn. However, what this means is turning

over the war and the peace to a Saigon Government which—because it is corrupt, incompetent and without roots in popular support—has no desire to make peace, knowing that it cannot hope to survive any conceivable peace settlement.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that Mr. Nixon can see "no prospect for a reduction of American forces in the foreseeable future." The simple fact is that there can be no peace without a phased withdrawal of American forces and that there can be no such withdrawal so long as the United States continues to support the unrepresentative regime in Saigon.

As for Mr. Nixon's "compromise" on the Sentinel ABM system, it is no compromise at all since it leaves the camel's head in the tent. It is a shrewdly calculated move to obtain the consent of the Senate and after disregarding its clearly given advice. If the Senate succumbs, the military-industrial complex will have achieved another victory at the expense of the people.

Now is the time for the people's movement which overthrew Lyndon Johnson to wake up and go into action.

JAMES P. WARBURG.

GREENWICH, CONN., March 15, 1969.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the planned October 15 moratorium, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial by David Broder that appeared in the Washington Post today.

Mr. Broder penetratingly asks those who have or are going to lend their support to the moratorium to examine the issues and questions more deeply. First, what is the target of the protest? Is it the Vietnam policies that President Nixon is conducting? The President, as Mr. Broder points out, is more or less following the outline of the 1968 antiwar faction, that is withdrawing troops, scaling down bombing and negotiating at Paris. What does the moratorium want?

Second, what are the alternative policies proposed by the moratorium? It is apparently unilateral withdrawal as enunciated by its leader, Sam Brown. Do labor, church, and civic groups, as well as many other organizations really want this? Do they want to be criticized for a hasty exit that ignores consequences and responsibility?

Third, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representative democracy or does it substitute the rule of the streets?

I commend Mr. Broder for bringing to the attention of the public, a thoughtful appraisal of the ramifications of the moratorium committee's goals and methods and the effect that it will have on the President in attempting to negotiate an end to the war. It is reassuring to see reflective and responsible journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The larger the plans for Wednesday's Vietnam moratorium, the more the central message and tactic of the demonstration have been obscured. If the event is to be gauged properly, it is important to uncover its original premises from the debris of clichés and endorsements in which they have lately been buried.

A number of men active in the moratorium

have taken time to point out what they consider the errors of the argument in this column last week that it is a plan for "the breaking of the President." With sincerity and conviction, they have asserted that, far from breaking the President, they are out to save him, by persuading him to make the peace the nation craves and, incidentally, to save the political system by keeping the antiwar movement out of the hands of the radicals and in control of those with a commitment to peaceful forms of protests.

Their conversations and correspondence have helped to define three questions which might be borne in mind by those planning to participate in the moratorium.

First, what is the target of this protest? Sam Brown, the able spokesman for the moratorium, says it is not an anti-Nixon move because "we learned in 1968 what we must oppose are not personalities but policies."

But if the Nixon administration is following the very policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, as I believe, then their moratorium is mobilizing public opinion against its own policy recommendation to the President. The minority plank at the Democratic convention, endorsed by all the leading doves, called for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. This has been done. It recommended a reduction in offensive operations in South Vietnam. The President has ordered this and it is in effect.

It asked for "a phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time" of all foreign troops. The Nixon administration has begun pulling Americans out of Vietnam without waiting for North Vietnam to agree to mutual withdrawals, as the doves thought necessary.

Finally, it recommended that the United States use the leverage of troop withdrawals to "encourage" the Saigon government "to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front" looking toward "a broadly representative government" but recognizing that "the specific shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese."

If this is not precisely the policy of the current administration, as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State, then words have lost their meaning. And if the moratorium sponsors want to argue—as some have—that the President is lying about his purpose, their suspicions must be weighed against the facts of reduced fighting, reduced troop levels and reduced casualties, which his policies have brought about.

Second, what is the alternative they recommend? It has been described in moratorium publicity as everything from a negotiated settlement to immediate, total American withdrawal from Vietnam but Brown said Sunday on "Face the Nation" that it is the latter that the moratorium has "consistently" demanded.

If that is the case, then the elected officials, clergymen and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium can properly be asked if this is the program they endorse. Many of these sponsors were involved in the fight for the minority plank at the Chicago convention which specifically said the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they could explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent the troops in. Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

Third, and most important, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representa-

tive democracy or does it substitute the rule of the street?

The sponsors say the name "moratorium," rather than "strike," was chosen to emphasize that the protest is to be peaceful and noncoercive. It is a nice distinction. The noncoercive feature may be almost invisible to the thousands of students whose colleges will shut down Wednesday. If the moratorium continues, as planned, for two days in November, three days in December, and so on, it will more and more come to resemble the general strike so familiar to European politics.

And if it succeeds in its aim, what is to prevent other majorities or sizable minorities in the country from using the same technique to force their views on agencies of the government? The moratorium sponsors say Vietnam is an extraordinary issue, but they must know it is not the only issue which agitates millions of people.

One wonders what the moratorium sponsors would say if Billy Graham were to ask all the parents who want prayers restored to public schools to withdraw their children from school for one additional day each month until the Supreme Court reverses its school-prayer decision.

Suppose pro-prayer teachers agreed to meet the pupils in private homes on moratorium days to discuss "the overriding significance of religion in human life." Would the Vietnam moratorium sponsors cheer? What would they say if landlords and real estate men opposed to integrated housing declared a moratorium until Congress repeals the open-housing law?

My view, just to be clear, is not that the Vietnamese moratorium is un-American, illegitimate, meanly partisan or personally vindictive in its motivation. My view is that it is an ill-timed, misdirected protest, vague in its purpose and quite conceivably dangerous in its precedent.

As was said last week, its immediate result may be the breaking of the President. In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I feel a little bit like the gentleman who followed Will Rogers around out on the western trail. The gentleman from Indiana is a hard man to follow.

I do say this very sincerely—I think we are all to be commended tonight. I am proud to be a Member of the House and proud of this debate. I am hopeful that it will continue in the manner it has up to now.

I might say I will speak reasonably briefly and then try to invite as many Members with divergent views to participate.

It did occur to me to wonder why the debate has maintained such a high level—I wonder if perhaps it is due to the absence of the Brussels delegation.

I would like to review a little of the historical background of the situation in Vietnam because somehow we always get caught up in the details of the current moment. I think it is highly relevant as to how we became involved and what the choices were then.

I think you can then measure the choice available to us today.

I read to you a few words from the article by David Shoenbrun who spent considerable time during the French period in Vietnam. He wrote as follows:

Our predicament began with the judgment of John Foster Dulles—a correct judgment—that Ho Chi Minh had become so popular a national hero that he would win free elections by a big margin (80 per cent, President Eisenhower estimated in his memoirs). Every informed observer concurred. It was not the judgment that was wrong, but the conclusion Dulles drew from it. Dulles decided that we must organize an Asian equivalent to NATO, support an anti-Communist leader in South Vietnam and stall off the free elections provided by the Geneva Accords. This led to Eisenhower's letter to Ngo Dinh Diem, our selection as anti-Communist champion, offering economic aid.

Eisenhower then believed that the South Vietnamese needed only our friendly help and guidance. This policy was based on America's brilliant success in Europe, where the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO combined to provide the fruitful use of economic aid under a military shield against external aggression. The error, of course, was the assumption that a policy that had worked in industrialized, technologically advanced, white, Christian Europe could also work in rural, backward, yellow, non-Christian Asia.

We also failed to understand how the mechanism of our program of aid leads inexorably from butter to guns. We start with the simple proposition that Communism is evil and should be stopped from spreading. Therefore anti-Communists must be helped. When we give economic aid, we soon discover we must also provide technological help.

To persuade Congress and the people to give tax dollars the anti-Communists are described as fighters for freedom. When they fail to carry out our proposals for reforms, fact is hidden because more aid must now be given to prevent their collapse. The investment in aid and technical advisors becomes so great that soldiers are sent to protect it. The soldiers are shot at, so they are authorized to shoot back. The Communists strike harder to prevent the American program from shoring up the adversary. More soldiers are sent and bases are built. Once our honor and power are committed, it becomes our war. And once it becomes our war, then we devise new rules. Thus an Eisenhower who once believed that only Asians should fight an Asian war can two years later approve an American commitment greater than the commitment of the South Vietnamese themselves.

The irony, and the error, of our American entrance into Vietnam is also pointed out by our former Ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reischauer, a distinguished scholar of Asian history. He wrote:

If we had clearly favored Vietnamese nationalism over French colonialism in 1945, it seems obvious that Ho, in short order, would have established effective control over the whole of Vietnam. He probably would have set up the same sort of dictatorial, oppressive, Communist rule over all Vietnam that he actually did over the North. He would probably have encountered much the same sort of problems he did in the North, and the economic progress of Vietnam would have been slow, though, of course, not as slow as in a war-torn land.

The society and government of this unified Vietnam would probably not have been something we would have approved of, but we have not found much we could approve of in the society and government of a divided Vietnam either. Quite possibly, a uni-

fied Vietnam under Ho, spared the ravages of war, would have gone at least as far toward that evolution of a stable and reasonably just society as had the divided, war-torn land we know today. For us, however, the question is what that sort of Vietnam would have meant in international politics. I believe it would be safe to assume that it would have been a highly nationalistic Vietnam. By the same token, I believe it also would have been free of Chinese domination. The Vietnamese have instinctive fears of their great northern neighbor. While they have always admired and imitated China, for more than a millennium they have had a deep national tradition of resistance to its domination. If they had had no specific reason to fear or resent us, the chances are that their fears and resentments would have come to focus on China, whether or not it, too, were Communist.

It seems highly probable that Ho's Communist-dominated regime, if it had been allowed by us to take over all Vietnam at the end of the war, would have moved to a position with relation to China not unlike that of Tito's Yugoslavia toward the Soviet Union. Ho, like Tito, had had cordial wartime relations with us. He apparently expected our continued friendship and had more to hope for in economic aid from us than China. He and his associates were ardent nationalists and probably had deeper fears and suspicions of the Chinese than the Yugoslavs had of the Russians. While such a Vietnam might have been more circumspect and respectful toward China than Tito has been toward the Soviet Union, it would probably have been even more fiercely independent. The way in which Hanoi has sought to maintain its independence of Peking and Moscow, despite the military dependence on both, which was forced on it by the protracted war with us, suggests how strongly independent a Communist Vietnam would have been, if not pushed by these military necessities.

Would such a Communist regime in all Vietnam have been a serious menace to its neighbors or to world peace? I doubt it. A Communist take-over in all Vietnam shortly after the end of the war would probably have seemed to the rest of the world no more of a Communist triumph than the successive victories of Communists over anti-Communists that have taken place in Vietnam since 1945. It is hard to believe that a united Communist Vietnam would have had any more harmful an influence on Laos than a divided war-torn Vietnam has had. Laos and Cambodia might have fallen under Vietnamese influence, but this at least would have kept them out of Chinese control. Or, possibly, Cambodia's traditional animosity toward Vietnam would have induced it to veer further away than it has from association with the Communist nations, if South Vietnam, too, had been Communist. Thailand would probably have been less adversely affected by an entirely Communist Vietnam than it has been by the prolonged war there.

Meanwhile, a united, strongly nationalistic Vietnam, while paying lip service to Communist China, would probably have served as a far more effective dike against the southward extension of Chinese power and influence than have a North Vietnam forced into military dependence on China and an unstable South Vietnam. And this general situation in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, which would have been so much less unsatisfactory for us than what we have today, would have been achieved without any of the terrible costs that have mounted so high.

Our men in Vietnam are superbly equipped, are well-organized and are fighting valiantly, but the best they can hope to achieve is worse than what we could have had, virtually for nothing, if we had only had enough interest in Vietnam and in Asia

to study in advance the problems we faced there. If we are to avoid more national catastrophes like that in Vietnam, we must devote a great deal more attention and careful thought to our relations with the half of the world's population that lives in Asia.—Edwin O. Reischauer, *Beyond Vietnam: The United States and Asia*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1967.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York for yielding and for sharing with us the wisdom of Ambassador Reischauer, whom I respect.

I am sure the gentleman would not wish to leave the impression that the responsibility for this war goes to President Eisenhower's administration. I would remind the gentleman, as I am sure he is aware, that there were less than 700 men in Vietnam when Dwight David Eisenhower left the White House. I think the gentleman knows that the trouble started under Dulles, but I would suggest that the war started under the later administrations.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to do that, nor did I read those pages because they suggested that General Eisenhower was involved. That was a fact of American history that he was President then.

I would like to offer a comment to the very searching and penetrating question of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). The gentleman's question was: What will the Vietnam moratorium do? What will all the voices of the American people do? What effect will that have? Will that lead to any different conclusions? In effect he said: What is the President doing wrong that you would do differently?

I think the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) answered the gentleman from Illinois with considerable eloquence, but let me suggest another thought: So long as the present regime exists in Saigon, so long as we remain virtually the puppet of that regime, where they have the right of veto over actions of our military forces and the withdrawal of our forces, we can never achieve a reasonable peace, there.

The President proposes graduated steps of withdrawal at the present stages he has announced, and over a long, long period of time. I would suggest—and it is a very difficult decision—that we withdraw as expeditiously as possible, taking into account the safety of our own troops and the safety of those persons who could be refugees from such a withdrawal.

My own judgment is once we were to announce an immediate withdrawal with a monthly timetable, there would be a major change in the government in Saigon. That government cannot stay in business without being propped up by our military forces. It would fall. It does not represent the indigenous people in that area, nor does it represent all the major elements there.

If I were presumptuous enough to offer a timetable to the President, he should

immediately begin massive withdrawal of troops.

Then, other things would start to happen. For example, I would expect that any people, even the North Vietnamese, are capable of some degree of humanitarian attitudes, and our announced withdrawal would cause a substantial release of American prisoners.

I also think the safety and security of people in South Vietnam that could be endangered by a change in government could be an area for negotiations, once it became clear American forces would be withdrawn.

So the difference between my position and that of the President is that we cannot have a long-range kind of slowdown. We cannot have a withdrawal that permits the present government to stay there. For 4 years now it has seemed clear to me that we have to have a government—and call it coalition or anything else—that represented all the forces and not merely the military people who are in command there.

Until we have a change of government, a government that is in a position to negotiate a realistic and viable settlement, with all elements putting down their arms, we cannot achieve a long-range peace there.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I just want to be careful that we do not let a few comments go by without clarifying them.

The gentleman said, with substantial authority, that the Government of South Vietnam does not represent the people and depends entirely on our military forces, and so forth.

They have a legislative body. It was freely elected. I am not aware that there is any proof that the elections there were rigged. We had American observers on the scene.

I do not quite see how one could say flatly the Government there does not represent a substantial portion of the population of that country.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WOLFF. There has been talk here about the election in Vietnam. I believe Mr. Brock alluded to the fact that Senator KENNEDY had said something to the effect he felt the elections were free.

I was at the elections and was an unofficial observer at the time of the elections in Vietnam. I, too, felt that they were as free as they could be at the time. I came back and I said so.

However, subsequent events have changed my mind about the present Government of Vietnam.

Those subsequent events are, No. 1, the imprisonment of dissenters, and the imprisonment of the second candidate who ran in the elections.

No. 2 is the fact that the new Government was supposed to clean up corruption and the black market that existed in Vietnam. It has never done that.

There were other elements that have taken place since that time. Mr. Bunker

has become a satellite of Mr. Thieu. The best thing this Government could do would be to recall Mr. Bunker and have him come home so that we dictate policy and not Vietnam dictate our policy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would think, if we are helping people achieve some understanding this evening, we would at least tone down some of these statements.

The gentleman tossed out another indefensible statement, this charge about Mr. Bunker being a stool pigeon or a stooge, or whatever you called him, of the President of South Vietnam. I am not aware that Ambassador Bunker either under this administration or in his service under the previous administration has been anything but a loyal message bearer for the American President and the American Department of State.

It is so easy to go from a fact to an interesting charge. I think if you gentlemen spend not just 17 hours, as scheduled, but 77 hours, you would be repeating these empty clichés to yourselves.

For example, I would like to have one of you—any one of you; I challenge you—address himself to the subject of democracy and elections and freedom in North Vietnam. What do we ever hear from you about the people who suffer in their prisons in North Vietnam, the people who were murdered? Where are you? You are absolutely silent. You do not have an answer.

All you do is convince yourselves of a position. You are speaking to the converted. You have your press releases in the gallery. You are contributing nothing to peace. You are contributing nothing to stability in the Far East or any other place in the world, and I think this performance this evening demonstrates it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me read to the gentleman President Thieu's statement after he returned from his meeting with President Nixon, when there was a question about coalition government. This is a quote. He said:

From now on those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the Executive or the Legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the Army and the people. I will punish them in the name of the people.

Let me say this: There is not a person in this room, or anyone I know of, that is prepared to say North Vietnam is the model of democracy. To charge us with silence on that is really carrying it to an extreme, and is not relevant.

General Ridgway said a long time ago in determining whether or not the United States should intervene you decide first, is it in the national interest? Second, is it manageable? I think both of us would agree today that it was not manageable at any price that the American people would be willing to pay.

We might have a discussion as to whether it is in the national interest. In my judgment, our intervention was not in the national interest either. There was nothing vital to our interests that we could have accomplished. We could

not contain Communist China. We could not stabilize the kind of government we wanted in there. Apparently we had to accept some unhappy resolution of events.

You remember in 1945 Ho Chi Minh was our hero, too.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes. Let me finish first.

He was fighting the Japanese and had become the symbol of anticolonialism with the French. In 1954 he had the impression, based on his military victory and the armistice, that there was going to be a national election. We never would accept that possibility and instead encouraged a separate government in South Vietnam.

Let me say this: It is not a question of whether we like the North Vietnamese or the South Vietnamese. The question is what does it do to the United States. There are plenty of places I know that you would have liked to have intervened in the last year or two. I do not have to go through them. There are areas that you were deeply concerned with. But it may have been that we could not manage it. It may have been that it was not in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I say that the gentleman in the well is one of the most profound historians of the House and also one of the most effective debaters. So if I may, I would like to have the gentleman return to one point he made 4 or 5 minutes ago. That was the opposition of the President of South Vietnam to a coalition government. Since I know that the gentleman is an able historian, I know he will recollect that in the experiment of coalition governments starting at the close of World War II all of them ended in disaster for the cause of freedom, starting in China, Rumania, Hungary, and going right on down the list in Eastern Europe. There is no evidence in post-World War II history to show that there is any case of a coalition government that succeeded before there was a takeover by the Communists and then suppression. Certainly the gentleman is not recommending the tragic mistakes of World War II diplomacy be perpetrated again on the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Laos might have been an exception to that. You know our Government entered into a reasonable kind of coalition government because perhaps it was in the best interests of the United States. The one thing we have to realize is that we cannot always have it the way we want it. There are accommodations that have to be made.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to.

Mr. OTTINGER. I would like to know from the gentleman from Illinois, if he will stay with us, how he can possibly conceive of a settlement in South Vietnam without settling on the basis of the actual powers that exist in South Vietnam? If you do not give the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese a share of power

commensurate with what exactly actually exists at the present time, then you are not talking about settlement; you are talking about still pursuing an illusory military victory. The only way we will see settlement is some kind of coalition representing the actual powers that are there.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I respond to the gentleman?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman again is at least helping to bring this conversation to a basic point, which is that if we are advocating, as I see it, coalition government, it will merely postpone for 3 to 6 months the takeover in South Vietnam by the Communists. I am sure, if the gentleman does not agree with me that this will be the end result at this point, then our conversation should terminate. But we have no evidence of Communist successes in municipal and parliamentary elections in South Vietnam. All we have to go by is the official evidence.

Mr. OTTINGER. The Communists were excluded from the official elections. They gave no clue at all.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I wonder if I can yield to some other Members.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I just do not want to leave that charge.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. What would be your explanation? How would you resolve things in Southeast Asia?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would resolve the situation there quite simply by having the Congress and the American public rally behind the President and have the President be able to speak for a united nation, which is easily achieved, as it was in World War II, and advise the Communists—and this would include the people in the Kremlin—that unless the aggression from north against south is ceased within a reasonable period of time with no open end or date set, that the United States would exercise flexibility in response.

But, let me give you a few examples.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You would rule out a military deescalation but seek a military victory?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I did not say that at all. I said that he should have flexible response. The gentleman and I serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and we understand the language which is being used.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. But would you hope for a military victory?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, the gentleman is extending the statement far beyond what I said. I said that the President must have support of the public and must have flexibility. He has neither of them at the present time.

I would also like to point out that there are a number of other factors at stake far beyond South Vietnam. Reference was made to Laos. Do we have to go back to the negotiations of 1962 when the real tragedy occurred in Laos and the negotiations which were sponsored to produce a perfect solution. If the gentleman will recall, Mr. Harriman was a major factor in that procedure. But he has not been a very effective diplomat in this particular matter.

However, the point is that the only thing the Communists understand—and

again I respect the gentleman's knowledge of history and I did make reference to the Middle East and Far East, but in order for them to understand aggression, they must understand it in terms of defeat in some form or they will continue.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is it the gentleman's view that we can do this in any area of the globe?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In other words, anywhere where it occurs or where that kind of aggression occurs, we have and should use the force to resist it?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Not at all. The gentleman is again going far beyond what I said. We are talking about a situation in South Vietnam and in Southeast Asia. I made reference to the Middle East because here is an area where the Soviet Union is very principally involved in a form of aggression. I think the gentleman will concur in my observation along that line. However, I would point out that in South Vietnam that their aggression has been, in effect, supported by a good deal of activity in the United States and other countries where it has been encouraged.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not think we want to encourage that aggression, nor do I think we want our President to be without reasonable flexibility in order to show the Communists that their activities will not result in victory.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I merely say that I am convinced we will have peace in Southeast Asia, we will have peace in the Middle East only when the Communists recognize that aggression does not pay. Anything short of that is to have impossible dreams.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Does the gentleman think that is the course the President is presently on?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think the President could embark upon many more effective courses if he had the patience, the tolerance, and the support back home that he deserves.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman and commend him for his level-headed discourse. I would make a couple of points. On this historical factor to the effect that there has never been a coalition government that did not result in a Communist take-over, I would remind Members of the fact that France had a coalition government with the Communists in 1947. Fortunately, we did not go to war with France because they had a coalition government with the Communists. The French people voted the Communists out of office, and thus again became a non-Communist democracy.

More importantly, however, on the very vital point made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) earlier on the question of hostages, may I say that we who take part in this debate agree with President Nixon that it would indeed be a tragedy, one that all people would look upon with dismay, if in the aftermath of our evacuation from South Vietnam there would be a massacre. There is no doubt about that.

One might say that someone who dies as the result of a drumhead trial in the aftermath of war is no less dead than a peasant in his paddy, or a villager in his hut, who gets killed right now as a result of military action. They are both dead.

I do not say that, though. I do say that we must do everything we can to keep a blood bath from occurring. And I can think of no better way of minimizing the chances of such a blood bath than to follow the policy advocated by the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL), when he says that we must make it clear to the Saigon government that we want the jails emptied of their political opponents, that we want the exiles brought back from exile, that we want the right of newspapers to be published, that we want, in short, a broadly based government in Saigon. And the best way of getting that message through to Saigon is to make it clear that American troop withdrawals will proceed in an orderly and a steady fashion until withdrawal becomes complete.

Now, if that message gets through to Saigon, and if the Saigon government does submerge itself in a broadened government, and if in Saigon and in the villages in the next year or two—which in my mind is the proper and practical time for our troops to be completely withdrawn—if in that year or two the people of South Vietnam learn to live one with another, learn how to operate at the village level and not just as instruments of a narrow Saigon government but as something broader, I think the chances are considerable that the relaxations of tension, the experience of living together, will do a lot to minimize the chances of the kind of blood bath which is anathema to us all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his views—views which take into account that there must be a humane goal of concerning ourselves with those in South Vietnam whom we have left to a predicament of intervention.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one thing I might add before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio. I think one of the things that prevents legitimate social, economic, and political development in South Vietnam, is our very presence there. We had an incredible—almost swashbuckling ability to build major bases, major airfields, and import 500,000 more men into the economy of that society. They simply were geared to a somewhat different way of life. I would suggest that if there were an immediate intent of withdrawal that their position to rally their forces on their own, using all of their indigenous people, that they would be able to defend and govern themselves.

I also think that an accommodation can be made, and this is absolutely urgent, about the safety of American prisoners, that in return for a withdrawal it would seem to me this would be a modest price to the North. And that there unquestionably would have to be some asylum provisions made. We cannot knowingly participate in a blood bath. We cannot condone a civil action that permits that kind of thing.

So I think it is a tough decision for

the President to make. It is an easy decision to take 25,000, another 10,000, and another 35,000 troops out. It is a long, long, hard, torturous path, and my judgment is it will never succeed unless the President really puts the muscle on the Saigon government and lets them know that that kind of unrepresentative rule with political prisoners and that kind of dictatorship cannot survive.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to pursue another point with the gentleman now in the well. But I am constrained to make one observation with reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the remarks of the gentleman in the well just made and that is that we are not a presence in North Vietnam but in North Vietnam we have political prisoners. There are no free elections. There are no rival newspapers and there are no rival political parties, for that matter.

I wonder if there is any way we can resolve that problem in North Vietnam?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I know that the gentleman is asking a kind of rhetorical question and he knows the answer as well as I do.

I know there is no direct way, but I would hope that in the long development of mankind maybe people like China could be admitted to the United Nations and join that society of man.

The gentleman knows as well as I do that we have very little influence in North Vietnam or even with the other Communist-dominated countries such as the Soviet Union, but that is another story. That is not an invitation for us to be involved in what appears to me as a civil war in South Vietnam.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to explore that with the gentleman, if I may.

The gentleman now in the well is from the State of New York and I am from the Midwest.

Thirty years ago when the United States became involved in World War II, or prior to that time, your section of the country I suppose generally could be described as being interventionists, or concerned about the situation in Europe, and perhaps my section of the country could generally be described as isolationists or anxious not to get involved in that conflagration that was then sweeping Europe.

The thing that concerns me is how do we move in our involvements in the world so as to avoid such things as participation in the war in Vietnam? Do we not take any kind of direct concern with the problems of emerging nations? Do we not become directly concerned with the nations where we think we have some interest and, therefore, participate?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If I may respond to the gentleman, that, of course, is the great question of the day.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think if we could debate this tonight so long as we have the time, it might illumine some of the past actions the gentleman has made with his presentation of Mr. Schoenbrun's article to suggest at least the inference that to express ourselves in international affairs and certainly to

express ourselves by assisting emerging nations that we automatically lead to this kind of participation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me try to respond to the gentleman's question briefly. The gentleman asks the one real question that raises the issue—what kind of America are we—what kind of America do we want? I think perhaps the only way of looking at it when one begins to think of the domestic needs of our country and the problems we have. It sounds trite again when one thinks of the cities and the urban communities in terms of people—what are our responsibilities to our fellow citizens?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There were great needs in our country in the thirties.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. What are the priorities in terms of responsibility to our own citizens?

I am not one who believes we should shrink into a fortress surrounded by the Atlantic and the Pacific and that that should be the end of our role. There are measurable equations that one could use in determining that, but that cannot be answered tonight.

I would like to say just one thing that we have to learn from Vietnam that there is a limit—there is a limit on American military power and a limit on the ability of our power to do all the kinds of things we want done and impose that kind of government that is suitable to our tastes and style.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Where would that point stop? Because I think it would illuminate our relationships in the world if we knew where the divisions come between our interest and concern and the problems of other nations and the method of intervention in a military sense which the gentleman is so concerned.

It seems to me that it seems to mean that perhaps that point came after the Tonkin Gulf problem. I am interested in the gentleman's thinking on this because of the gentleman's concern about the problem because of his reference to Shoenbrun's revolutionary presentation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. One cannot really write a timetable with a diagram for intervention. So far as I am concerned, unilateral intervention of any kind anywhere is not an appropriate American tradition. If there can be an effective world force such as the U.N. forces where we can participate with other nations possibly—as we did in Korea—that might be one limited kind of intervention that I might be willing to subscribe to.

Whether one would be willing, on the other side of the coin, to accept the Dominican Republic situation or the Bay of Pigs, is another question.

This is something that I, of course, find unacceptable. I do not think that, tonight, we can define the limits of American responsibility around the world. I do believe we have a responsibility to emerging nations. I do believe we have a responsibility to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. But we do not have the right to use the massive military force as we did in Vietnam, to virtually destroy a nation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This, of course, I understand, because that occurred after the Tonkin Gulf development. But

what I am trying to find out is what the gentleman's concern is with the participation that existed prior to that time. The gentleman talked about the effort of the Eisenhower administration to send assistance to an emerging nation. Are we not supposed to do that?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would not say, "No, you are not supposed to do that." Shoenbrun makes the point that from the hand comes the arm, and from the arm comes the rest of the body. If you put a little aid in, you then send troops, technical programs, and then you protect everything with troops. My own judgment is that somewhere along the line, from 1959 on, some American President should have made the very hard decision that at that point it had gone beyond the price that we could and should afford to pay. Vietnam had grown beyond our manageable national interest. Instead we refused rather to accept the theory that many in the commercial world do, that you cannot put good money in after bad.

At some point it became an unmanageable investment and we had to forgo the investment, as unpalatable and as difficult a decision as it is to swallow. That is where we stand today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I draw somewhat of a parallel between the situation in Israel and the situation in Vietnam. I support the determination of the Israelis to remain a free people and a free nation, as I am certain the gentleman does. But would it be logical to tell the Israelis that you are going to have to take into your government a group of Arabs who have said, "We are going to drive you into the sea and we are going to annihilate you"? Is not the reaction of the Thieu Government in Vietnam one of self-preservation? They have been told by the Communists, "We are going to annihilate you." They say that during the elections anyone who advocates a coalition government—and I think the gentleman is correct—anyone who advocates a coalition government in effect we will not allow you to run.

After the election, one of the opponents was put in jail. The gentleman is correct. But is not this one of the basic laws of self-preservation, and is not an identical situation existing in Israel, where there is a Palestine Liberation Army—that may not be the correct name—that had vowed, in effect, to drive the Israelis into the sea, and would it not be suicide for the Israeli Government to take these into a coalition government just as if someone had vowed to kill me and my family and I would allow him to come into my house? Is not the action of the Thieu government understandable?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think the question is one of self-determination. Our involvement in South Vietnam, in my judgment, inhibited self-determination for the people in South Vietnam. I think it is quite clear that in Israel they had, at least within the confines of those borders as of 1968, national unity. But if the gentleman is trying to ask me to suggest that this is an area where America should think in terms of unilateral mili-

tary involvement, as we did in Vietnam, I will not do that, because I do not believe it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. There is a great deal of difference between the Israelis and the South Vietnamese. The Israelis have a determination to exist.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. There is also a difference in other respects.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I recognize that. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that South Vietnam determination is not present in the same degree.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not necessarily see that as the only difference. It is an obvious and acknowledged difference. The difference is quite clear, as far as I am concerned. In 1945 you had one nation in Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh, whether we liked him or not, was fighting on the same side we were, against the Japanese. In 1954 when the French got out of Indo-China, we went in and repeated their errors.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. France got out of Indo-China.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. We went in and bailed them out.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. But they got out. The British gave up Palestine and Israel came in. The point I am trying to make is that it is not understandable to me that any government would tell an enemy they would allow the enemy to be in the government. Free discourse is a different thing with us, being isolated as we are by 12,000 miles.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Within one country, if there are disparate groups, it may be in the interest of that country, like South Vietnam, to have a coalition government that represents all the people. In my judgment it creates a healthier government and they can create some degree of national community. I am not suggesting that we take people from other areas or some other country and invite them to form a coalition government. This is obviously an indulgence which no country can afford.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Let me say this. I think particularly some of the dissenters who have condemned and damned the Government of South Vietnam should look at it from a realistic standpoint. If we look at it from a realistic standpoint, they have their backs up to the wall. They know if their government goes down, their lives are not worth a plugged nickle.

True, what the gentleman says, they do not want the Communists to come in, and they do not want dissent. It is just as when we were a young nation and trying to seek our freedom from the British, during the Revolutionary War, a British sympathizer was hung, because that was contrary to our interest. It is contrary to the interest of the people in South Vietnam who are in power to say they will allow a coalition government. They say they will not allow a coalition government, because they want, in effect, to annihilate that government.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman knows quite well that most of the ruling people in the government in Saigon came from the North. They were not home-grown South Vietnamese.

How can the United States face itself and the world in supporting what is

obviously a dictatorial government? How can we continue to do that on the thesis of anticommunism? That seems to me to be the question.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) for their contributions to this debate which is a high-level debate.

Is the point not that in Vietnam the United States intervened in what was essentially a civil war?

Is not the point also that, if any negotiated political settlement is to be achieved, then the crucial question is whether or not the people who have been struggling for 25 years in South Vietnam—that is the indigenous Viet Cong or National Liberation Force—are to participate in a future government in South Vietnam?

It seems to me the key to a political settlement in Vietnam is, and has been for a number of years, participation of all elements in South Vietnam in a future government.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It seems that way to me, too. It seems to me until the National Liberation Front—call it what we will—becomes a part of the government and agreeable to the peace settlement and willing to lay down their arms, we can never have peace and tranquility in South Vietnam.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK).

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, virtually all of us share a sense of quiet desperation when we review the dilemma posed to us by this war. Even so we must be realistic as we appraise the options and try to seek the one that will achieve a lasting peace while maintaining the dignity of the people involved and their own right of self-determination.

The gentleman mentions an interesting point when he talks about what constitutes a nation. I think the gentleman would find it difficult to get agreement from the Montagnards that they were Vietnamese at all. So, should we include them or not?

When we are talking about coalition governments, a certain inconsistency seems to creep into the discussion. I hear time and time again the humanitarian plea for the right of self-determination, for free people to participate in their own government, but how can we achieve a coalition government without imposing that government, and if we impose it, can it ever be free? Was it achieved by free will if imposed by force?

The only kind of coalition that would be acceptable is one that did occur in France, that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned. He failed, however, to mention there was a substantial presence of American Armed Forces there following World War II.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me say this, and then the gentleman may continue. We have no right to impose any kind of government anywhere, coalition or otherwise. But right now we are imposing the

government that is in existence there. If it were not for us propping up that government with our military forces, it could not stay in business 24 hours. It does not have popular support in that country.

Mr. BROCK. All right. We may disagree on degrees of force.

I think there is obviously a disagreement among the people of South Vietnam as to whom they want to represent them. I would concede that point. We, I should point out, have that same disagreement in this country—and it is reflected in our election process every two years.

But it is so difficult to foresee how to achieve what the gentleman seeks other than the course the President himself has chosen; that is, to gradually increase the pressure for the establishment of the democratic process in that nation. One cannot do it overnight, or the nation collapses. I think everybody agrees to that. I have not heard anybody tonight advocate a 24-hour withdrawal. Such restraint, if you can call it that, has contributed to the quality of the dialogue. But is not the only kind of representative government that can ever work a free, elected government in which every indigenous person is given the right to vote, and is that not—

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BROCK. Now, has that not been proposed by President Thieu, and supported and endorsed by President Nixon, without any condition whatsoever?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You cannot realistically have that kind of government when all the opposition is in jail, when every landlord and every government official is taking 10 percent off the top throughout the country, when there has been no legitimate land reform in the country.

Really, let me say this: Our intentions are good. I have seen this in South America and all over. We talk about land reform, land reform, land reform. We have talked about it for 20 years. Nothing really ever happens. It is such a sluggish, self-serving government that we support there. This kind of government, of Thieu and Ky, is not going to abandon the prerogatives of office.

Mr. BROCK. Then the gentleman proposes that we abolish the government, which is certainly not a free act on the part of the people. And do what? We have already suggested that we will guarantee, with international supervision, free elections with all people participating, all indigenous people. What more can the American Government do?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is not too bad an idea. But it will never happen until President Nixon tells them, "We are getting out forthwith." So long as they know this is going to be a slow, gradual process, that they have 2, 3, or 5 years, they will keep themselves in office. This is not unusual. That is human nature.

Mr. BROCK. Does the gentleman honestly believe the Communists would ever tolerate an election if we said we were going to get out forthwith, when they know they have the military capacity to subdue that nation and not take any gamble?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am not aware of

any Communist regime we are supporting. I am aware of military dictatorships we support in many countries throughout the world.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. Earlier in the debate mention was made of Ambassador Bunker. It was pointed out, if the policy is to be changed, it would be important to change the Ambassador. I recall when Ambassador Bunker was here and discussed Vietnam with Members of the House 2 years ago. At that time he made it perfectly clear, so far as he was concerned, that there would be no participation in any election by the Vietcong, or the National Liberation Front.

Until it is recognized that all elements in South Vietnam have the right to participate in elections, it is foolish to talk about self-determination in that country. Ambassador Bunker is a prisoner of past policies. Until past policies are changed in South Vietnam, until the administration makes up its mind that the discredited policies of the past are no longer to be followed, it will not be possible to achieve peace.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. It seems to me, to quote the Washington Post, which is a thing I seldom do, I agree with what they say here after listening to this debate tonight:

What the hard core of the war critics want is to stop the war, now, any old way, and never mind the consequences because these couldn't be worse than going on the way we are.

Or, as the gentleman said a moment ago, we should get out forthwith. I suggest, if we do that, it simply means a Communist takeover in South Vietnam without any question in the world. That means a complete American defeat. I see no way around it.

The point I would like to suggest which I have heard here tonight is what does the gentleman think the effect of that is going to be at home here in this country, adopting that as a national policy? To accept a Communist takeover and accept an American defeat. I must say I have heard things quoted on this floor today which were surprising to me. The gentleman here has referred to a Mendes-France and said that we could quit the war just like he did. Sure he surrendered, but who ever heard of Mendes-France since, and who will ever hear of any American politician who does a thing like that?

I heard a suggestion here awhile ago from my good friend from Indiana. He quoted the example of Dienbienphu and the Bay of Pigs. They are a couple of great examples to hold up for what we ought to do today. I heard this gentleman say that Ho used to be our hero. He was never mine. I do not know whose hero he was. He was never on my ball team.

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNIS. Just a moment.

Let me go back to the good old Wash-

ington Post. Speaking again about this, here is what that liberal paper said:

To be realistic—

They are talking about this immediate withdrawal—

It is not even clear that the proposition is feasible logistically, let alone sound militarily. This, of course, leaves wholly aside the vast imponderables of which the hard core critics speak so glibly—the fate of Vietnam, the secondary effects in Southeast Asia, the impact on this country's position in the world, and quite possibly—

The thing I am talking about—most important of all, the domestic political repercussions at home.

I suggest to the gentleman that—and I am now closing—I suggest to the gentleman that moratoriums and protests may be popular at the moment, but when the American people stop and think it over they will never give support to any political party or to any politician who runs up the flag of surrender and adopts it as national policy.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I do not think this debate turns on the question of surrender. I think it is less than a salutary consideration in the high-level discussions we have had here in terms of assisting the President and expanding and multiplying the options he has to exercise in his desire to achieve a just peace. I remind the gentleman from Indiana a very potent statement was made tonight, and I believe possibly the most meaningful statement we have heard from the minority side, from the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), who stated to us that the results, after discussions he held with the President this morning, were that he could state—and I took it to be categorically—that the President has abandoned any notion of a military victory in Vietnam. Those were the words from that side. Hearing that we now begin to think in terms of what are the options available to us as representatives of the people to recommend to the President as the opinion he should express to the people on what we should do to extricate the young men of this country from a situation in a foreign land under a foreign form of government, riddled with corruption, where they are no longer pursuing a course of victory and where we have done all we possibly can to support the government for 10 years and bring about what the White House said and the Secretary of Defense said in terms of Vietnamization of the war and de-Americanization of the war. I do not know how you do this without a resolution for some level of troop involvement and financial involvement of that regime.

And, I would hope you would think of this in terms of lasting peace. We will not achieve lasting peace if we submit to all of the demands of the two governments, because they seek from us aid to stock their arsenals with which to replace their value in terms of men now deployed.

I ask this question: What is the value of the two demands? How much will we

have to contribute in the way of equipment in order to get our troops back here? I submit that this is the question that must be placed upon the demand. What is the demand?

We know that back in 1954 the demand of the South Vietnamese Government at that time was 15,000 or 20,000 American troops and a price tag of a couple of billion dollars and with that that the regime could be maintained.

Now, in 1969, with 510,000 troops over there and with the expenditure of \$30 billion a year in investment, the time has come to ask what is the price to the American people. One price which I know we will not pay is any further commitment in which we would become involved in an interminable situation of both American lives and dollars.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, just one last thought. I think the moratorium is a good thing. We have a President and not an emperor. We have a country here where we can have free discussion and free dialog. We cannot suspend discussion in this country. We cannot suspend the Constitution.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow all over the Nation—on the campuses, in the business and financial districts of our cities, in the suburbs—Americans from every walk of life will join in an outpouring of citizen concern over the tragic conflict in Vietnam. On the eve of the October 15 moratorium it is appropriate that the elected representatives of the people discuss and debate American policy in Vietnam and its consequences.

The moratorium is a peaceful effort to convince the President and the administration that they must extricate the United States from Vietnam and bring the war to a prompt end.

If the President's real attitude toward the moratorium was summed up in his September 26 press conference declaration: "Under no circumstances will I be affected by it," then there is very little hope that he understands what is happening in America.

The President's letter yesterday to a Georgetown University student, Randy J. Dicks, was an attempt to soften the press conference statement. However, it reflects the same feeling, for the President said in his letter, "There is nothing new we can learn from the demonstrations."

Then the President sought to explain participation of many citizens in the moratorium as simply an expression of "I am for peace"—a goal he ardently joins—as do all of us.

No one questions the President's desire for peace. The purpose of the moratorium is to make it clear to the administration that it is not enough to be for peace. Rather it is essential that peace be pursued relentlessly; and that the United States terminate its involvement in an undeclared war 10,000 miles from our shores.

The war in Vietnam continues to take its toll in American lives—there were approximately 520 casualties in September—and to consume more and more of our Nation's resources, while our cities disintegrate; our youth is further alienated; and our country becomes more disunited.

From the beginning of this tragic conflict I have consistently warned of the threat which the war poses to both the welfare of the American and Vietnamese people and the stability and integrity of the United States. Since 1964 the domestic needs of our people have been neglected as our Nation's resources and energies have been committed to the Americanization of the war and the constant escalation of our military role—an escalation carried on with the consent, if not the advice, of the Congress, which, despite the opposition of a few of us, has readily authorized and appropriated some \$30 billion annually to conduct the war in Vietnam.

Last March 26 in a speech on the House floor I spelled out three steps which I believed then should be taken to bring the war to an end.

First, the Congress should refuse to approve any further funding for military activities in South Vietnam.

Second, the administration should accept the participation of the National Liberation Front in the future political life of South Vietnam.

Third, the withdrawal of a significant number of U.S. troops—at least 100,000. Also, troops rotated back to the United States would not be replaced.

I suggested those steps in March. Had they been adopted, the moratorium might have been unnecessary.

Unfortunately, neither the Congress nor the administration have been willing to take the steps necessary to end the war.

Congress continues to provide the appropriation; the administration continues to support the repressive Saigon regime which has narrowed rather than broadened its base; and the withdrawal of 25,000 troops is tokenism.

It is apparent that the administration's plan is to reduce our troop level at some future time to 250,000, restrict military operations in order to keep casualties down, maintain the American presence, and attempt to shift the combat burden to the South Vietnamese. This is the Johnson strategy intended to be made more acceptable by token withdrawals, reduced casualties, and lower draft calls. It is hoped that the result will be a quieting of dissent in America.

It is dubious that such a strategy will move the Paris peace talks off dead center because it ignores the political realities in South Vietnam and denies an indigenous movement a role in the future Government of South Vietnam.

To expect that either the National Liberation Front or the North Vietnamese will agree to a settlement, which does not permit them a political role in South Vietnam after nearly 25 years of struggle on their part to achieve power, is totally unrealistic and out of keeping with the political realities of South Vietnam. We do nothing to further the evolution of democracy in South Vietnam by propping up a regime so corrupt and unrepresentative that even its proponents believe it would immediately collapse in the face of U.S. military withdrawal.

There has been no movement at Paris after 17 months and 17,000 casualties because we are not prepared to make concessions on the basic issue of the

war—who shall participate in the government of South Vietnam. As long as the administration is unwilling to negotiate on this question, it is difficult to believe there will be a negotiated settlement of the war.

General Thieu has refused to accept a compromise. But he must no longer be permitted to determine American policy, in reality having a life-or-death say over American lives.

The cost of continuing to support the Saigon generals is too high. The cost of repeating past mistakes is too high. The cost of perpetuating past policy is too high. In short, the cost of maintaining a client state in Southeast Asia is too high.

The American people who gave the President a mandate to end the war recognize that the cost of continuing it is too high—that is what the moratorium is all about.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the United States, millions of Americans are expressing their views that the war in Vietnam and American participation in it should be liquidated. I support this moratorium observance as a significant and nonviolent expression of opposition to the continuation of this war. It emphasizes the painfully apparent fact that if the war should continue much longer it will contribute further to corrosive divisions in our society.

In a word, Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is for us a quagmire and we must find new ground in both our foreign and domestic policy. The steady drain on our manpower has now reached the astonishing total of 38,887 lives nationwide, of which 3,779 KIA were from the State of California. When we add to this our own thousands who have been wounded and maimed, and the military and civilian dead of the South Vietnamese, we have a measure of the expenditures in blood. But we must add to that the incredible expenditure of billions of dollars which in large part has been diverted from the urgent domestic requirements at a crucial point in our national history. The drain of blood and treasure into engulfing muck is what Professor Reischauer says the Japanese call "doronuma"—the quagmire.

And how are we to find new and solid ground? How are we to make peace with Hanoi?

This, of course, is what today's moratorium is all about. It is an appeal to the President to get out of Vietnam as soon as possible consistent with the security of our forces. It means we should call for a cease fire in the Paris negotiations and go firmly on record before all the world that we are resolved to disengage from the conflict.

But most of all we must face realities that we have somehow avoided. When we speak of 500,000 men we think of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guardsmen. We must remember that for the most part they serve for a 13-month rotational tour. So in reality, our manpower commitment is far more than this oftquoted number.

Any way you look at it the costs of this war are unbelievable. When we consider that all of our effort has brought neither victory nor, more importantly, peace in South Vietnam and has in-

creased domestic tension and strife, the current and long-range costs of this conflict are incalculable.

The argument is made that the only obstacle to military victory has been our unwillingness or reluctance to increase the size of our military effort. There were times when we were told that with just a few more battalions we would have victory.

When I first went to Vietnam in 1962, I was told by distinguished military and diplomatic personnel that the war would be over in 2 to 3 years. Even Secretary McNamara harbored the hope that manpower levels could be reduced when basic installations were completed and secured. Even more remarkable is that such talk can still be heard today.

I have no doubt that more intensive application of our enormous power could eventually grind the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese into submission.

But at what cost?

The immediate cost of escalation in men and material is obvious. What are the consequences? Even ignoring for the moment the consideration that such a step could lead to a nuclear war engulfing far more than just Vietnam, the tragedy of escalation is that it will ultimately destroy Vietnam as a country. Certainly such a prospect cannot be seriously considered "victory" by any definition.

The futility of escalation then is one of the major realities of the Vietnamese war—and has been for some time.

The second Vietnam reality is that the war has become an American war on both the political and military fronts. We have been making fumbling efforts at doing the work of an ineffectual South Vietnamese Government and at the same time we bear the burden of the bulk of the fighting.

It is now no secret that the South Vietnamese Government is rife with corruption and incompetence and, stifled by its own bureaucracy, is unable to capture the spirit or support of the Vietnamese people.

The popular support of the South Vietnamese is as important a weapon of war in Vietnam as we have in our arsenal. The National Liberation Front has for years been acutely aware of this and has even gone so far as to initiate its own village-level program of land reform, an area of consuming interest to the people of a largely agrarian country.

Guerrilla soldiers are dependent on the support, or at least acquiescence of the people. The ability of the guerrilla in Vietnam to survive the massive military effort of the past 3 years seems indicative of the fact that he is not without that support or acquiescence.

Though they were unable to rally a mass uprising, the Vietcong during the recent Tet offensive startled both the South Vietnamese Government and American planners with the level of support they commanded.

Battalions of guerrillas moved secretly into the cities and then managed in some cases to survive for nearly a month, though our intelligence tells us they brought food and supplies sufficient for only a few days' operation.

I cannot help but feel that a large measure of the effectiveness of this of-

fensive could have been blunted by a people who gave both their respect and support to their own Government.

But when they turn to their Government, what do they find?

Vietnamese soldiers looting or selling water to homeless refugees after the Tet fighting.

A corps commander trafficking in opium, bribes, kickbacks from bars, winking at illegal exports of rice to Cambodia.

Petty officials selling driver's licenses, visas, places on military planes, and jobs with Americans.

Not all the Vietnamese officials, of course, are corrupt. There are a large number of accounts of valiant efforts by Vietnamese civil servants. In a revolutionary situation, however, a man expects dedication, unselfishness, decent service, and reasonable competence from his Government. In Vietnam, instead, he is offered only intolerable corruption.

The South Vietnamese bureaucracy is stifling. Few local civil servants will take—or are given—the initiative to act on his own. Deals, incompetence, and corruption so pervade all levels of government in Vietnam that some Cabinet ministers have been known to despair of ever seeing the implementation of their orders.

For years the Saigon government has promised the people meaningful land reform. Yet last July when I was in Vietnam with the Moss congressional subcommittee our investigation showed that very little real land redistribution to the peasants had been carried out.

It was not until 1965, after the Manila conference, that the South Vietnamese Government initiated a "crash" program to supply peasants with permanent titles to their land.

The titles finally went out in 1967—but with the local province chiefs empowered to distribute them. During our investigation last year, one American province representative told us of what happened to these titles in his area:

Land reform is just not going on. There have been about 900 land titles distributed to the province chief. He has distributed them to the district chiefs. But the people have not gotten them yet.

The man (province chief) has his own ideas about land reform. He is making his own laws down there. There is just too much power concentrated in him. He is using it.

The Vietcong land reform program, on the other hand, and I quote here from the report, "has eliminated landlord domination and reallocated lands owned by absentee landlords and the Government of South Vietnam to the landless and others who cooperate with Vietcong authorities.

"Although there is no evidence that firm titles have been given to the land, possession is stressed by the Vietcong and taxes rather than rentals are collected."

The startling aspect of this is that rather than countering the Vietcong program with its own, the South Vietnamese Government adheres to a policy of restoring land rights to the former owners whenever it seizes a Vietcong dominated area.

The Government we support as an alternative to the other side is at present not very attractive, to put it mildly.

The Saigon government must more vigorously implement programs designed to help the people and win their support. This means that land reform programs should be given new life and new purpose. This means that the Saigon government must become more conscious of the importance of providing good government services, including relief and reconstruction assistance. It means more and better attention must be paid to the people.

It means the Saigon Government must take greater measures to accommodate the views of other non-Communist politicians. It means that former candidates must not be harassed or deplorably imprisoned "for their own safety." It means that the Saigon Government must move to broaden the base of its support.

But will it?

We have tried without particular success our own program of pacification which drives at moving the Vietnamese to the side of their own government.

We have substituted our soldiers for Vietnamese in the brunt of the fighting because they frequently are found wanting in motivation.

We have tried to do with American men and equipment and money a job that the South Vietnamese should have been doing for themselves in many instances.

And what have we for it?

The size and scope of our involvement is such that today, to many Vietnamese, we have become an extension of the French, a non-Asian nation standing in the way of Vietnamese nationalism.

Unwittingly, we have corrupted the will and spirit of many South Vietnamese. They view the war increasingly as an American, not Vietnamese, war and I believe that as our involvement grows South Vietnamese involvement diminishes in direct proportion.

The final reality I offer for consideration today is the staggering cost of this war.

Thousands of lives, hundreds of thousands of destroyed dwellings, millions of refugees, and billions of dollars tell only a part of the costs.

These are the obvious costs. But the price of Vietnam must be measured in more than ledger book terms.

World opinion in many friendly quarters is against us. None of our major European allies, including Great Britain, fully endorses our policy in Vietnam and none is allied with us there.

Prices, balance of payments, taxes all bear some mark of Vietnam. And with further increases in our commitment, they will suffer all the more.

But perhaps the highest and most tragic cost is the deep internal wounds we are inflicting on our national unity, wounds that I fear will be many years in healing even were the war to end today. Our Government and our very society is challenged daily by our own people and that disaffection grows with each calendar day we remain in Vietnam.

These then are the realities of the war and they are indicative of a policy that has failed.

What we must do now is realize that what we have been doing has not worked. We must change our current course of action to one that will give rise at the

earliest possible moment to a negotiated cease-fire and free us—and the Vietnamese—from a war that is inexorably leading to the utter destruction of Vietnam and possibly even a wider Asian war.

We must find that course. It is time to realize that the answer does not lie in the relentless flow of more and more American blood and resources.

I think we must abandon the notion that victory in Vietnam is simply a matter of committing more Americans to the effort. This is a Vietnamese war. In the end, it must be fought and settled by the Vietnamese.

Among other things, our massive presence in Vietnam has relieved the sense of urgency which the South Vietnamese have felt about their future. But they must now accept the responsibility for their own fate.

In a word, I think we must begin immediately to rely more on the Vietnamese to be masters of their destiny and they must rely less on our immense military resources.

If they do not want to be governed by the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese they must fight and show the necessary spirit to avoid such a regime.

In my judgment, which is shared by many of the experts, this war will only be ended and a firm peace gained if the Vietnamese themselves develop the settlement. The United States cannot and must not carry Saigon forever. And this goes for not just Thieu or Ky but any government.

I also believe that our withdrawal from Vietnam should also be accompanied by an overall reappraisal of our role in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. It suggests to many of us who have been following events in this part of the world that we should maintain what Reischauer calls "low posture."

Mr. Speaker, there is a danger that some in our Government may have forgotten the events of the last election. If President Nixon has forgotten he should remember that the events surrounding the election made it crystal clear that most Americans do not consider South Vietnam to be one of our vital interests warranting further sacrifice of blood and treasure.

If the President really wants to bring Americans back together with a feeling of unity he will undertake to withdraw our armed services from Vietnam at the earliest practical date.

On this moratorium day we pray that the President will lead us out of this morass—this quagmire and get us back to the business of rebuilding and renewing the greatest democratic republic in recorded history—the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, October 14, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. FARBEIN, for the period after 1 o'clock p.m., October 14, for the balance of the week on account of official business. This change of plans from Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN, for October 15 and 16, on account of business out of the city.

Mr. RIVERS (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN), from October 14 to October 24, on account of attendance at NATO conference.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CAREY, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. CHISHOLM, for 60 minutes, on October 15.

Mr. REUSS, for 15 minutes, on October 15.

Mr. FARBEIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHISHOLM, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. McMILLAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING to extend his remarks immediately following the offer of House Joint Resolution 910 by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. OLSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOWDY, to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON).

Mr. GRAY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESHLEMAN), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. HICKS.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN in five instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in three instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. RYAN to extend his remarks following those of Mr. ROSENTHAL during his special order today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. RYAN) to extend his remarks following those of Mr. RYAN during the special order of Mr. ROSENTHAL, today.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1471. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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:

Abbutt	[Roll No. 223]	Bolling
Abernethy	Ashley	Bow
Adair	Aspinall	Brooks
Adams	Ayres	Brown, Calif.
Alexander	Baring	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Barrett	Burke, Fla.
Anderson,	Berry	Burton, Calif.
Tenn.	Betts	Burton, Utah
Andrews, Ala.	Bingham	Byrne, Pa.
Annunzio	Blackburn	Cabell
Arends	Blanton	Caffery
	Blatnik	

Cahill	Harsha	Pirnie
Camp	Hastings	Pollock
Cederberg	Hathaway	Powell
Cheller	Hawkins	Preyer, N.C.
Chappell	Hays	Purcell
Chisholm	Hébert	Quile
Clark	Hogan	Rallsback
Cohelan	Hollifield	Rarick
Collier	Hosmer	Rees
Collins	Hull	Reid, Ill.
Colmer	Hunt	Reid, N.Y.
Corbett	Hutchinson	Reifel
Cunningham	Jarman	Riegler
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Daniel, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Rodino
Dawson	King	Rogers, Colo.
Denney	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Dent	Kleppe	Rooney, Pa.
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Roybal
Devine	Kuykendall	Ruth
Diggs	Kyros	St Germain
Dingell	Landgrebe	Sandman
Dowdy	Landrum	Saylor
Downing	Latta	Schneebell
Dulski	Lennon	Scott
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Shipley
Eckhardt	Lloyd	Sikes
Edmondson	Long, La.	Skubitz
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Slack
Esch	Lowenstein	Smith, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	Lujan	Springer
Fallon	McClory	Stafford
Farbstein	McCloskey	Stanton
Fascell	McCulloch	Steed
Findley	McKneally	Stephens
Fish	McMillan	Stubblefield
Fisher	Macdonald,	Sullivan
Flynt	Mass.	Taft
Frelinghuysen	Mann	Taylor
Frey	Martin	Teague, Calif.
Fulton, Tenn.	Mathias	Teague, Tex.
Fuqua	May	Thompson, N.J.
Garmatz	Meeds	Thomson, Wis.
Gaydos	Melcher	Tunney
Gettys	Michel	Utt
Glaimo	Mills	Vigorito
Goldwater	Minshall	Waggonner
Goodling	Mize	Watson
Green, Oreg.	Molloy	Whalen
Griffin	Monahan	Whalley
Griffiths	Mosher	White
Gross	Moss	Whitehurst
Gubser	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Hagan	Nichols	Wildnall
Haley	Nix	Wiggins
Hall	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Halpern	O'Neal, Ga.	Wold
Hammer-	Ottinger	Wright
schmidt	Passman	Wyatt
Hanley	Patman	Yatron
Hanna	Pelly	Young
Hansen, Wash.	Pickle	Zion
Harrington	Pike	Zwach

geant at Arms, would it be possible for the House to proceed, or would the House have to stand in abeyance with no further proceedings?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the House cannot do business without a quorum.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in order to see if I have that point clearly in mind, if there were an instruction to bring in absent Members and it did not succeed during the period of time, during that period of time the House could proceed with no other business; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The House cannot proceed at all until a quorum is established.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the lack of a quorum, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, does it require a quorum to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Louisiana that it does not require a quorum.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. What is the result of the vote without a quorum present?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it in order to move that the House adjourn on the ground that a quorum is not present until the Chair has announced the nonexistence of a quorum?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that a motion to adjourn is in order any time after the conclusion of the second call if a quorum has not been established.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is on his feet and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred not to do so at this time, but in view of the fact that—

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, is not a motion to adjourn pending?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Is there not a motion to adjourn pending upon which I have asked for the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's inquiry is correct.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it does not require unanimous consent to withdraw the gentleman's motion.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and I yield to the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the gentleman from Tennessee does not have that privilege. The Chair has the privilege of recognition when the gentleman has withdrawn his motion. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer not to make this motion at this time, but in view of the parliamentary situation, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the motion to adjourn does not prevail, and a quorum is not present what is the situation then?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the House would continue to proceed under the call of the House to establish a quorum.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, does that entail another quorum call at that point?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that we would be continuing under the previous call, the call that was in existence prior to the motion to adjourn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at that point to move that the Speaker instruct the Sergeant at Arms to bring in Members who are absent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if the House fails to adjourn, a motion to that effect would be in order.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 113, nays 109, not voting 209, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—113

Andrews,	Boggs	Burleson, Tex.
N. Dak.	Bray	Bush
Ashbrook	Brinkley	Byrnes, Wis.
Belcher	Broomfield	Casey
Bell, Calif.	Brotzman	Chamberlain
Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.	Clark
Bevill	Broyhill, Va.	Clausen
Blaggt	Buchanan	Don H.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask, if I may, where the matter stands now of the call of the House which was made by the majority leader. As I understand it, there is not yet a quorum recorded at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the options open to the House at this point?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is patiently waiting to see. Regular order is the establishment of a quorum. If a quorum is not established, then a motion to adjourn would be in order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that if a quorum is not established, there are only two choices open to the House—either a motion to adjourn or a motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to produce the missing Members?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, so long as a quorum is not produced and in the event the House should instruct the Ser-

Clawson, Del
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dennis
Dickinson
Dorn
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gray
Gross
Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey
Henderson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Kees
Keith

Kyl
Langen
Long, La.
Lukens
McClure
McClure
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mizell
Montgomery
Morton
Myers
Nelsen
Pettis
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Relief
Rhodes
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rondebush

Ruth
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Schlerle
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stagers
Steiger, Ariz.
Stratton
Stuckey
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Utt
Waggoner
Watkins
Watson
Williams
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—109

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Calif.
Beall, Md.
Biester
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Button
Carey
Carter
Clay
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Coughlin
Culver
de la Garza
Dellenback
Derwinski
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallifanakis
Gallagher
Gilbert

Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gude
Hamilton
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Kazen
Kluczynski
Koch
Leggett
McCarthy
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
Madden
Matsunaga
Mikva
Minish
Mink
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.

Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Podell
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Robison
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Ruppe
Ryan
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schwengel
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Symington
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Welcker
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Yates

NOT VOTING—209

Abbutt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson,
Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.

Cabell
Cafery
Cahill
Camp
Cederberg
Celler
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Denney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson

Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington

Harsha
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hebert
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
King
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCloskey
McCulloch
McKneally
McMillan
MacDonald,
Mass.
Mann
Martin

Mathias
May
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Molohan
Monagan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nichols
Nix
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Purcell
Quile
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
St Germain
Sandman
Saylor
Schneebell
Shipley
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Vigorito
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wold
Wright
Yatron
Zwach

transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md., to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN, Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 11039 (Rept. No. 91-564). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POAGE, Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14169. A bill to amend section 402 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in order to remove certain restrictions against domestic wine under title I of such act, without amendment (Rept. No. 91-565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE, Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 934. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 to \$610 million; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4244, a bill to amend section 576 of title 5, United States Code, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, to remove the statutory ceiling on appropriations (Rept. No. 91-567). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY, Committee on Rules. House Resolution 580. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13827, a bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-568). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ABBITT, Committee on House Administration. H.R. 14195. A bill to revise the law governing contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 12781 (Rept. No. 91-570). Ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 15, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1255. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended December 31, 1968 (H. Doc. No. 91-179); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1256. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, selected rural areas of Minnesota, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1257. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1258. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS: (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLURE, and Mr. McDADÉ): H.R. 14327. A bill to restore balance in the Federal form of government in the United States; to provide both the encouragement and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI: H.R. 14328. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, provide for automatic benefit increases thereafter in the event of future increases in the cost of living, provide for future automatic increases in the earnings and contribution bases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN: H.R. 14329. A bill to prohibit hiring professional strikebreakers in interstate labor

disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14330. A bill to improve judicial machinery by providing Federal jurisdiction for certain types of class actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14331. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14332. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants and making them available to the public, by making protection available to those who breed, develop or discover them, thereby promoting progress in the useful art of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 14333. A bill to provide for orderly trade in leather gloves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 14334. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act to increase the effectiveness of the District of Columbia Bail Agency, to authorize consideration of danger to the community in setting conditions of release of persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for pretrial detention in the District of Columbia of dangerous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 14335. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons in the District of Columbia suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14336. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 14337. A bill to require that the uniform of officers and members of the uniformed police forces in the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch showing the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 14338. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14339. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct, operate, and maintain a parking facility and cafeteria for Federal employees in Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14340. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14341. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1971 and succeeding fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 14342. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14343. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14344. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 14345. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Armed Forces and the Veterans' Administration to use dairy products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 14346. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14347. A bill to liberalize the provisions of law governing the payment of increased disability compensation as the result of examination or hospitalization in a non-governmental hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 14348. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish an equitable survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14349. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14350. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ERLÉNBOHN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KING, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MANN, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 14351. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REES, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 14352. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 14353. A bill to provide for the establishment of a consumer education program designed to inform and give more adequate warning to elderly persons and others concerning the widespread existence, techniques, and dangers of home repair rackets and other forms of consumer fraud; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BURTON, of California, Mr. DABBARIO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 14354. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 951. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLÉNBOHN:

H.J. Res. 952. Joint resolution to declare a

national day of prayer and concern for American servicemen missing in action and those being held prisoners by the North Vietnamese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 953. Joint resolution to establish a joint commission of the United States, the Republic of South Vietnam and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam to study the ecological effects of chemical warfare in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.J. Res. 954. Joint resolution to create a Special Joint Congressional Committee on Oversight in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H. Con. Res. 406. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the effect of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. REES, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. MIKVA):

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution to provide that failure of executive departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government to respond within 60 days to requests from committees of Congress for reports on pending legislation shall create the conclusive presumption that such agencies favor enactment of the legislation and that enactment is consistent with the legislative program of the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. BETTS):

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the impact of the contracting housing market on the ceramic tile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Res. 581. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relative to the Vietnam war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 14355. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Derlin and Bruno Derlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 14356. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Meandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14357. A bill for the relief of Franca Zazzera; 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:

292. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Representative Town Meeting, Westport, Conn., relative to withdrawal from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

293. Also, petition of the Council of Willoughby Hills, Ohio, relative to taxation of State and local government securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.