

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 15, 1969

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

Be strong and of good courage, for it is the Lord your God who goes with you; He will not fail you nor forsake you.—Deuteronomy 31: 6.

O God, our Father, who art acquainted with all our ways and who dost love us in spite of our shortcomings, we pause in Thy presence acknowledging our dependence upon Thee and offering unto Thee once again the devotion of our hearts. Confronting problems too difficult for us to solve and face to face with fears that frustrate us, we come to Thee for wisdom to rightly interpret the signs of this troubled time, for insight to see clearly the way we should take, and for strength to do what we ought to do for the good of our Nation.

May the blessing of Thy spirit rest upon our President, our Speaker, and these men and women called to lead our country in a day like this and upon all who work with them and for them. Give to them the assurance of Thy guiding spirit and the feeling that underneath are Thine everlasting arms.

O Thou who changest not, abide with us now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1242. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1857) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. SCHWEIKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 3016. An act to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Eco-

nomic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes.

MAJ. GEN. LEWIS BLAINE HERSHEY

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure the majority of my colleagues will agree that the American people owe a debt of gratitude to Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey for his outstanding service as Director of the Selective Service System for the past 21 years. He has performed in a superior manner in fulfilling his duties as administrator of our draft system. Many men of lesser character and with less determination to perform a thankless job well would have quit long ago to lead a quiet life of retirement. But being the patriotic American he is, General Hershey stayed on the job and withstood the harsh words of abuse heaped upon his head. Through times of peace and war, he sought to administer the draft in a fair and impartial manner. I personally salute General Hershey for a job well done.

SOLUTION TO VIETNAM

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his sensible comments which we all should support.

Mr. Speaker, starting late yesterday afternoon there has been a parade of prominent individuals, including Vice President AGNEW and Governor Reagan, who have appeared before national television and news media to quote at length a letter from North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong. In great glee, this letter from a Communist liar has been quoted in an attempt to discredit loyal and patriotic American citizens expressing their free and constitutional right of dissent. This letter from the leader of a nation which has massacred innocent and helpless people and tortured American prisoners is now being used by otherwise sensible Americans to try and prove that today's moratorium is giving aid and comfort to Hanoi.

Since when can we start trusting anything the North Vietnamese leaders say? Why should so much prominence be given to such an obvious piece of Communist propaganda?

I think Americans should start trusting each other, instead of being guided by or reacting to either Hanoi or Saigon. To those who shut off debate in the House of Representatives last night, and those whose heavy-handed tactics are trying to crush meaningful and peaceful debate or dissent, I say we are highly complimented that you feel our remarks are so important or influential that you

are afraid to have them brought out in the greatest deliberative body in the world—the Congress of the United States. And to those who seem to be influenced by what is said or happens in Hanoi or Saigon, I ask: Is it not about time we stop allowing Hanoi or Saigon to dictate our policy and start acting for the United States of America by getting out of Vietnam?

VIETNAM

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, over the recent past we have been asked to support the President's policy on Vietnam. Is it not time we heard exactly what his policy is? Since the President has stated that he seeks to end this war and does not intend to pursue an elusive military victory, I feel the minimum steps that he can take to help achieve peace is to change completely the face of our representation in Vietnam and in Paris.

Mr. Lodge has indicated that he is tired of his role. I think we should take him at his word and a great leap forward on the road to peace could be the replacement of Mr. Lodge with a new perspective.

A second step would be to remove Ambassador Bunker, who has failed to represent properly American interests in dealing with the present Saigon regime. He is now a captive of President Thieu and has put this Nation in a position of satellite to Saigon instead of demanding cooperation and a departure from the intransigence they have exhibited.

Vice President Ky must also be removed from his post as Saigon's chief negotiator. Our Ambassador must prevail upon the Saigon government that one who is only interested in perpetuating himself in personal glory cannot truly represent the Vietnamese people in open negotiations.

This could be the beginning of a meaningful policy for President Nixon. And a change from the status quo is what the people of this Nation demand.

HANOI'S ADVICE TO AMERICAN WIVES

(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, Hanoi's treatment of the brave American wives who went to seek release of their sick and wounded husbands makes any red-blooded American boil. How dare Hanoi treat our men this way? How dare they dismiss the poignant pleas of American wives by suggesting they go home and demonstrate against their Government?

Talk about cruelty and heartlessness. Yet this comes as no surprise at least to those of us who recognize communism's hatred of America for the fanati-

cism that it is. There is no heart there—no God there—no compassion there—no soul there. Yet thousands of Americans demonstrate today for unilateral withdrawal from a nation that we committed ourselves to protect against Hanoi's continuing attacks. Thousands, with less cause than these brave wives, demonstrate openly against the Government of the United States while it attempts to obtain a commitment to protect men who seek no aggression but merely the right of self-determination for South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, unilateral withdrawal without a commitment from the enemy not to continue to attack our troops is suicide. It is prelude to another Dunkirk. It is dishonorable. It cuts the heart out from under our fighting men to whom we owe the security that is ours here at home.

Those in public elective office who join in such demonstrations against the U.S. Government whatever may be their motivation are giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war. They are doing Hanoi's bidding without even the provocation that Hanoi sought to force on those brave wives who today and for many days to come must be alone.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, last night I voted against every attempt to restrict my colleagues' expressions on the Vietnam war. Prior to that, I had announced to the people of my congressional district support of the concept of peaceful expression by the people of the United States on the searing issue of Vietnam. Within the bounds of our political institutions and respect for our fellow Americans, I stated that each individual had the very basic right and, in fact, obligation, to comment on Vietnam by doing his own thing on October 15.

Having taken these positions, I will now do my own thing by supporting President Richard Nixon in his actions to disengage U.S. forces from Vietnam.

I have never seen one human life saved by hysteria—either the hysteria of running away or the hysteria of bullying ahead in the opposite direction. In the job of saving 500,000 American lives, I wish to our President both the strength of God's guidance and the strength of a nation unified to support the completion of a new direction that he, and only he, started.

SEPTEMBER PARITY

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, throughout my tenure in Congress I have worked for a rural renaissance in countryside America. One way of doing this is to improve the income of the producers.

Parity figures for the month of September 1969 dropped from an average

of 75 percent in August to 74 percent in September—a drop of 1 percent. In June the average was 76 percent, up 4 percent from the January low of 72 percent. Certainly this is indicative of the serious financial crisis the farmer faces today and which affects the countryside. It is my hope, even though parity is down from the June average of 76 percent, that parity can be kept in an upward movement.

Mr. Speaker, according to my practice of inserting the farm parity from month to month, I herewith insert the recent parity for September 1969.

(In percent)

Commodity	August	September
Cotton.....	43	41
Wheat.....	43	45
Corn.....	69	67
Butterfat.....	75	75
Milk.....	83	81
Wool.....	44	43
Barley.....	58	60
Flax.....	63	60
Oats.....	56	58
Sorghum.....	69	71
Soybeans.....	69	63
Beef.....	87	83
Chicken.....	75	71
Eggs.....	70	75
Hogs.....	101	96
Lamb.....	90	88
Turkey.....	64	66
Average.....	75	74

CITIZENS OF BIRMINGHAM ELECT NEGRO COUNCILMAN

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be impressed with the fine judgment of the people of my congressional district as witnessed by the caliber of the people whom they elect to serve them. The people of the city of Birmingham yesterday reelected by a resounding margin Birmingham's first Negro city councilman who had been appointed by the other members of the council to fill the unexpired term of a member who had passed away.

Mr. Arthur Shores, a distinguished Negro of our city, ran second in a field of approximately 20 candidates and received a vote second only to that of our distinguished and beloved councilwoman, Miss Nina Miglionico.

Mr. Shores has been prominent in city life in Birmingham for four decades, striving for unity and equal rights for all citizens, white as well as black.

The road to success has not been easy for Mr. Shores.

Although he never graduated from law school, he studied law in his spare time and passed the bar exam, thereby becoming one of the first Negro lawyers in the State of Alabama.

There can be little question of Mr. Shores' qualifications for this post.

Following his graduation from Talladega College, he taught school in Jefferson County, becoming one of the first Negro high school principals in the area.

Mr. Shores left the education field to practice law and earned admission to the Alabama bar in 1937 and was later admitted to the Supreme Court bar.

His civic activities bring him in contact with virtually every phase of community life in Birmingham where he is a member of the chamber of commerce, commissioner of the Birmingham Housing Authority, chairman of the board and president of the Birmingham Chapter of the Urban League and board member of the 18th Street YMCA as well as being a member of several fraternal organizations.

I think Mr. Shores' election says something for the record of public service for this distinguished attorney of our city, but it says something too about the people of the city of which I am extremely proud.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM UNIMPRESSIVE TO SOME

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing again this morning of the performance in the House last night.

On leaving the House Chamber at 11 o'clock last night, we heard the chants on the Capitol Grounds and nearby streets: "Sieg Heil!" "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh!" and "Hell, No, We Won't Go!"

If last night's performance was so impressive, apparently little of it rubbed off on some people.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

\$22.4 BILLION LESS IN SOCIAL SECURITY FUND

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today we opened hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on social security and the President's welfare recommendations.

I want to report that an incredible thing happened. On this most important legislation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Robert Finch, had to limit his appearance before our committee to only 2 hours, during which he read a 38-page statement.

In response to questions from my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), the Secretary admitted that he had to fly to California to make two political fundraising speeches.

It is regrettable that politics should re-

ceive priority over the critical needs of the elderly who endeavor to survive on the present level of social security benefits.

And how about this: On page 34 of his statement before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Finch revealed for the first time how the Nixon administration plans to have \$22.4 billion less in the social security fund at the end of fiscal year 1973 than is provided under present law. The Secretary stated:

Under present law the cash benefit trust funds would increase from an estimated \$38.7 billion at the end of the present fiscal year to about \$75 billion at the end of fiscal 1973. Under the President's proposal the trust funds would reach \$52.6 billion at the end of fiscal year 1973.

How can the administration defend its plan to manipulate and weaken the social security fund?

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ON POLITICS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) and also to point out the incredible answers we received today from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the coterie who attended the hearing.

Can Members imagine the incredible answer that it would take over 4 months to adjust the checkwriting machines to send out an increase of social security payments? What a spurious excuse. Here they are telling the elderly of this Nation, "You will have to wait through the cold months of December, January, February, and March because the computers down there cannot be adjusted."

I pointed out to them that in 1967 and 1968 it took less than 60 days to adjust those computers to send out increased payments.

They had better come up with some better answers than they gave this morning.

It was a sorry sight to see the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare fleeing out of the committee room, rushing out apparently to the airport, to go where he is to make some political speeches on behalf of some Republican candidates in the State of California.

Can Members imagine the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare admitting that it was more important for him to be in California to make political speeches than it was for him to give testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on one of the most pressing problems of the day, the need for increases for the social security recipients?

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to rollcall vote No. 221 yesterday, business of a compelling nature kept me from the floor. As a proponent of free debate, had I been present, I would have

voted against the motion to adjourn. I ask unanimous consent that my position be recorded accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the Record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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. 225]

Adams	Findley	Morse
Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	Morton
Arends	Flynt	O'Konski
Ashley	Ford,	Ottenger
Aspinall	William D.	Patman
Belcher	Fraser	Patten
Berry	Frey	Pepper
Bingham	Gallagher	Pirnie
Boland	Gettys	Pollock
Brock	Gialmo	Powell
Brooks	Gray	Quie
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Griffin	Reid, N.Y.
Cahill	Haley	Reuss
Camp	Harrington	Riegle
Carey	Hastings	Rivers
Cederberg	Hays	Rodino
Celler	Helstoski	Roybal
Chisholm	Hosmer	Ruppe
Clark	Howard	Saylor
Clay	Kirwan	Scheuer
Cohelan	Koch	Steed
Collier	Kuykendall	Stokes
Conyers	Kyros	Stratton
Cramer	Latta	Taylor
Cunningham	Lippscomb	Teague, Calif.
Dawson	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Dennis	Lowenstein	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Lujan	Tiernen
Devine	McCarthy	Tunney
Diggs	McCloskey	Ullman
Dingell	McKneally	Whalley
Eckhardt	McMillan	Wilson,
Edmondson	Martin	Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.	Meeds	Wold
Farbstein	Mikva	Wright
Fascell	Mize	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 AND SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Thursday, October 16, and that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may have the same permission.

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

There was no objection.

DEMONSTRATIONS FOR PEACE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully request the attention of the House for just 1 minute? During the course of the early afternoon the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I understand after consultation with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ABRAHAM), the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I have decided to introduce the following resolution which I shall request unanimous consent to call up immediately following the consideration of the conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill:

H. RES. 582

Resolution relating to demonstrations for peace

Whereas responsible dissent and freedom of speech are among the most sacred traditions of the American people; and

Whereas many Americans are demonstrating their concern for peace pursuant to rights enjoyed under the Constitution of the United States, from which springs our Nation's deep commitment to peaceful debate, the essence of our free political system; and

Whereas the Premier of North Vietnam has publicly described the Vietnam Moratorium in an open letter to the American people as "their fall offensive" aimed at forcing the United States "to withdraw completely and unconditionally" from Vietnam; and

Whereas the said Premier greatly misjudges Americans, and deceives himself if he believes that those who demonstrate are doing so with a desire to assist Hanoi; and

Whereas the said Premier's letter to the American people is a blatant and insolent intrusion into the affairs of the American people by an enemy; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we support the inherent right of all Americans to responsible and peaceful dissent, but we abhor the attempt of Premier Pham Van Dong to associate those Americans who demonstrate for peace with the cause of our enemy; and be it further

Resolved, That we repudiate the Premier's letter and call upon all Americans to disassociate themselves from North Vietnam's insolent and intolerable declaration.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the distinguished majority leader has indicated, he and I intend jointly to sponsor this House resolution. I fully subscribe to the action which the gentleman from Oklahoma has indicated he will follow; namely, that at the conclusion of the consideration of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill he will seek recognition for unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution. I hope and trust that we can have unanimous support for this resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

MORATORIUM CANDLES SHOULD BE BURNED AT THE RUSSIAN EMBASSY AND NOT AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many Members read in the morning paper the ad which showed a comparison of what this Nation has done to try to bring peace to the Vietnam situation compared to what the Government of North Vietnam has done. I think it would be very enlightening for all who are participating in the moratorium to read this ad.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that tonight there is to be a march, with people going to the White House with candles to stand silently around the White House. I know of no man who wants to bring peace for this country more than the President of the United States. I do not think he needs to be reminded with candles all around the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that those who participate in the moratorium, if they truly want peace and want to be effective, march not to the White House but to the Russian Embassy. When they arrive they should stand in the street in front of the Russian Embassy with those candles lit reminding and telling the Russians to do something to bring about peace.

In view of the announcement today that Russia has agreed to send \$1 billion in additional military aid to North Vietnam, no action by those who are demonstrating for peace could be more appropriate.

EVEN A CONGRESSMAN HAS THE RIGHT TO BE WRONG

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, early this afternoon the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made some remarks about the special orders yesterday relative to the so-called Vietnam moratorium.

I believe I understood the gentleman correctly when he said that the debate went on despite the efforts from the Republicans to prevent that debate.

In reviewing what happened yesterday afternoon and evening, I see that the motion to adjourn was made, not by a Republican, but by a Democrat.

In reviewing hurriedly rollcall No. 221, which was requested by a Democrat on that motion, I find that 55 Republicans supported that motion, but also 44 Democrats voted to adjourn. It would seem to me that that was a bipartisan vote.

Now, I cannot interpret why anyone here voted any particular way on that vote, but I certainly know the reason why I did. I voted "no," and I do not want that to be construed that I had any sympathy with the efforts that were made here yesterday, but I think every Member represents constituents back home, and I believe they have a right under the rules of this House to speak for their constituency. If the 24 yesterday spoke for that constituency, I believe they had the right to speak for that constituency back home. Likewise, I

think that the constituents have the right to know what that Member is doing down here. If their constituents do not agree with their Member's comments, they will have the opportunity next year to make a change.

I voted "no" because I think every Member of Congress has the right to speak and to be wrong.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION'S REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-180)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 302(b) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, I hereby transmit the Appalachian Regional Commission's report, Acid Mine Drainage in Appalachia.

This comprehensive study was carried out by the Commission in cooperation with a special panel of experts convened by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering. I recommend it for thoughtful consideration by all interested parties.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 15, 1969.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 14, 1969.)

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Washington give us just a brief explanation of what transpired in the conference?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I shall be glad to do so.

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and

extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 12781, Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill for 1970, provides total appropriations of \$1,546,273,300. This amount is \$16,107,165 over the 1969 appropriation and \$23,181,200 below the 1970 budget estimate. The conference total is \$6,088,600 over the amount approved by the House and \$2,391,600 below the amount approved by the Senate.

House Report 91-570 on the conference describes in detail the various actions agreed to by the conferees with regard to individual projects and programs. Therefore, I will not discuss the conference actions at great length at this time. I would like to, however, mention a few of the major items that are responsible for the increase over the House-approved bill.

An increase of \$1,500,000 was agreed to for the Bureau of Indian Affairs participation in kindergartens in public schools. This amount will provide what we believe to be necessary for kindergartens for the number of months that are left in this year. As you are well aware, it is improbable that kindergarten classes will be started before January, and this amount should provide for kindergartens from January through the school year. The committees of both the House and the Senate are deeply concerned with the matter of kindergartens, but we are also deeply concerned that the money be properly spent, and that we have before us in the financing picture a complete list of the necessities in the various States, that is, what State can use the money to the best advantage? What are the basic financial structures and provisions in the States for kindergartens?

The next item is \$491,000, which will provide kitchen and dining room facilities for the Wahpeton Indian School, North Dakota.

Next, \$400,000 is provided for a jail at the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana. This money is to replace a lamentable structure, something that our Government should be ashamed of.

There is an increase of \$3 million for the helium fund for the payment of contractual obligations.

An additional \$2 million is provided for the Office of Coal Research, which includes the continuation of several very vital research programs that are ongoing for the full use of our coal resources. The increase includes \$652,000 for Project Gasoline, \$1 million from the lignite gasification project, Rapid City, S. Dak., and \$348,000 for the low ash coal project, Tacoma, Wash.

There is an additional \$200,000 in the bill for timber salvage in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama, resulting from damage caused by Hurricane Camille.

An additional \$900,000 is provided for Indian health services in a variety of categories needed desperately in various areas of our Indian lands. The conference restored a provision which the House had placed in the bill of fish disaster

funds, under Public Law 88-309, section 4(b). We would like to inform the Members of the House that this amount of money is available for disasters, and the use of that to be determined on priority of need as determined by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

There is \$700,000 for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. Since this re-

quest came too late to the House Appropriations Committee to be included in the House bill, it is included here.

Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, a conference between the two Houses involves considerable give and take. It seldom happens that the position of either body prevails in toto. It is seldom that a conference report pleases everyone. However, all of the conferees are in agreement with the report submitted today. I be-

lieve the conference report presents a reasonable conciliation of the varying actions taken by each House. We have provided funds where they are urgently needed and at the same time have reasonably observed the dictates of existing budgetary restrictions. I recommend adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point pertinent tables relating to the funds provided in this conference report:

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12781)

Item	1969 appropriation	1970 budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1969 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Bureau of Land Management.....	\$80,255,000	\$72,114,000	\$71,063,000	\$70,984,000	\$71,010,000	—\$9,245,000	—\$1,104,000	—\$53,000	+\$26,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	230,350,000	267,123,000	260,578,000	262,522,000	261,722,000	+31,372,000	—5,401,000	+1,144,000	—800,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	103,815,000	112,762,000	111,972,000	112,562,000	112,222,000	+8,407,000	—540,000	+250,000	—340,000
Office of Territories.....	44,697,000	56,533,400	56,312,000	55,533,400	55,533,400	+10,836,400	—1,000,000	—778,600
Total, public land management.....	459,117,000	508,532,400	499,925,000	501,601,400	500,487,400	+41,370,400	—8,045,000	+562,400	—1,114,000
Geological Survey.....	90,917,000	95,628,000	95,628,000	95,115,000	95,755,000	+4,838,000	+127,000	+127,000	+640,000
Bureau of Mines.....	79,249,000	82,312,000	76,429,000	80,715,000	79,310,000	+61,000	—3,002,000	+2,881,000	—1,405,000
Office of Coal Research.....	13,700,000	13,300,000	13,300,000	15,800,000	15,300,000	+1,600,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	—500,000
Office of Oil and Gas.....	866,900	1,081,900	994,000	994,000	994,000	+127,100	—87,900
Total, mineral resources.....	184,732,900	192,321,900	186,351,000	192,624,000	191,359,000	+6,626,100	—962,900	+5,008,000	—1,265,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	41,352,400	42,996,000	41,816,000	41,816,000	42,316,000	+963,600	—680,000	+500,000	+818,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	60,630,000	57,998,000	59,182,000	61,836,000	60,602,000	—28,000	+2,604,000	+1,420,000	—1,234,000
National Park Service.....	87,860,000	102,163,000	101,517,000	101,754,000	101,717,000	+13,857,000	—446,000	+200,000	—37,000
Total, fish and wildlife and parks.....	189,842,400	203,157,000	202,515,000	205,088,000	204,635,000	+14,792,600	+1,478,000	+2,120,000	—453,000
Office of Saline Water.....	25,642,835	26,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	—642,835	—1,000,000
Office of Water Resources Research.....	11,181,000	11,229,000	11,229,000	11,229,000	11,229,000	+48,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	5,683,000	5,625,800	5,530,000	5,555,800	5,530,000	—153,000	—95,800	—25,800
Office of the Secretary.....	8,755,000	10,212,400	9,912,000	9,912,700	9,912,700	+1,157,700	—299,700	+700
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....	884,954,135	957,078,500	940,462,000	951,010,900	948,153,100	+63,198,965	—8,925,400	+7,691,100	—2,857,800
Consisting of—									
Appropriations.....	858,754,135	930,878,500	919,462,000	924,810,900	924,153,100	+65,398,965	—6,725,400	+4,691,100	—657,800
Definite appropriations.....	(749,390,735)	(804,214,500)	(792,798,000)	(798,146,900)	(797,489,100)	(+48,098,365)	(—6,725,400)	(+4,691,100)	(—657,800)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(109,363,400)	(126,664,000)	(126,664,000)	(126,664,000)	(126,664,000)	(+17,300,600)
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	26,200,000	26,200,000	21,000,000	26,200,000	24,000,000	—2,200,000	—2,200,000	+3,000,000	—2,200,000
Memorandums: Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(104,793,000)	(65,028,000)	(62,028,000)	(62,028,000)	(62,028,000)	(—42,765,000)	(—3,000,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authori- zation.....	(989,747,135)	(1,022,106,500)	(1,002,490,000)	(1,013,038,900)	(1,010,181,100)	+20,433,965	—11,925,400	+7,691,100	—2,857,800
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES									
Department of Agriculture:									
Forest service:									
Definite appropriations.....	270,205,000	253,490,000	260,451,000	257,040,000	258,676,000	—11,529,000	+5,186,000	1,775,000	+1,636,000
Indefinite appropriations.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000
Total, Forest Service.....	270,985,000	254,270,000	261,231,000	257,820,000	259,456,000	—11,529,000	+5,186,000	—1,775,000	+1,636,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	157,000	148,000	148,000	148,000	148,000	—9,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:									
Health Services and Mental Health Administration:									
Indian health activities.....	112,506,000	119,581,000	117,581,000	119,566,000	118,481,000	+5,975,000	—1,100,000	+900,000	—1,085,000
Indian Claims Commission.....	619,000	800,000	800,000	850,000	850,000	+231,000	+50,000	+50,000
National Capital Planning Commission.....	1,047,000	1,248,000	922,700	1,300,000	222,700	—824,300	—1,025,300	—700,000	—77,300
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	14,500,000	16,744,000	16,000,000	15,690,000	15,790,000	+1,290,000	—954,000	—210,000	+100,000
Public Land Law Review Commission.....	944,000	922,000	922,000	922,000	922,000	—22,000
Smithsonian Institution.....	46,886,000	38,420,000	35,775,000	35,165,000	35,165,000	—11,721,000	—3,255,000	—610,000
Executive Office of the President:									
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering De- velopment.....	1,125,000	760,000	760,000	700,000	—425,000	—60,000	+700,000	—60,000
Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources.....	175,000	—175,000
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska.....	235,000	235,000	150,000	235,000	192,500	—42,500	—42,500	+42,500	—42,500
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.....	25,000	10,000	5,000	10,000	5,000	—20,000	—5,000	—5,000
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.....	225,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	+175,000	—50,000
National Council on Indian Opportunity.....	\$100,000	\$300,000	—\$100,000	—\$300,000
Total, new budget (obliga- tional) authority, related agencies.....	449,419,000	433,778,000	\$433,824,700	\$431,756,000	\$432,222,200	—17,196,800	—1,555,800	—\$1,602,500	+\$466,200

Footnotes at end of table.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 12781)—Continued

Item	1969 appropriation	1970 budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1969 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES— Continued									
Consisting of—									
Appropriations.....	437,222,000	433,778,000	433,824,700	431,756,000	432,222,200	-4,999,800	-1,555,800	-1,602,500	+466,200
Definite appropriations.....	(436,442,000)	(432,998,000)	(433,044,700)	(430,976,000)	(431,442,200)	(-4,999,800)	(-1,555,800)	(-1,602,500)	(+466,200)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)				
New contract authorization.....	12,197,000					-12,197,000			
Memorandums: Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(91,000,000)	(113,570,000)	(103,870,000)	(103,870,000)	(103,870,000)	(+12,870,000)	(-9,700,000)		
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authori- zation.....	(540,419,000)	(547,348,000)	(537,694,700)	(535,626,000)	(536,092,200)	(-4,326,800)	(-11,255,800)	(-1,602,500)	(+466,200)
Recapitulation:									
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	1,334,373,135	1,390,856,500	1,374,286,700	1,382,766,900	1,380,375,300	+46,002,165	-10,481,200	+6,088,600	-2,391,600
Consisting of—									
1. Appropriations.....	1,295,976,135	1,364,656,500	1,353,286,700	1,356,566,900	1,356,375,300	+60,399,165	-8,281,200	+3,088,600	-191,600
Definite appropriations.....	(1,185,832,735)	(1,237,212,500)	(1,225,842,700)	(1,229,122,900)	(1,228,931,300)	(+43,098,565)	(-8,281,200)	(+3,088,600)	(-191,600)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(110,143,400)	(127,444,000)	(127,444,000)	(127,444,000)	(127,444,000)	(-17,300,600)			
2. Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	26,200,000	26,200,000	21,000,000	26,200,000	24,000,000	-2,200,000	-2,200,000	+3,000,000	-2,200,000
3. New contract authorization.....	12,197,000					-12,197,000			
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(195,793,000)	(178,598,000)	(165,898,000)	(165,898,000)	(165,898,000)	(-29,895,000)	(-12,700,000)		
Grand total, new budget (obli- gational) authority and appropriations to liquidate conduct authorization.....	(1,530,166,135)	(1,569,454,500)	(1,540,184,700)	(1,548,664,900)	(1,546,273,300)	(+16,107,165)	(-23,181,200)	(+6,088,600)	(-2,391,600)

¹ In addition \$770,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation granted under "Land acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System" are transferred to and shall be available for salaries and expenses.

² Not considered by House.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

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

Do I understand that, in round figures, the conference report means we will be spending \$16 million more than were spent for the same general purposes last year and the conference increased this bill, again in round figures, \$7 million above the House figures?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It is \$6,088,600. I would like to point out to the gentleman, as I did when I appeared with the regular House bill, that this is one of the largest income-producing agencies in the United States. Our timber revenues are up. The Outer Continental Shelf lands have tremendous value. The oil shale lands of the West and Midwest have tremendous value.

This also is what I call the securing and developing and protection of America. I am proud to present this, in view of the debate that has been going on around us.

This is money for our land. This is money spent for our people. This is money that means America is going to have something for the future. I am not ashamed of the figures we have placed in here.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman, if she will yield further, that I am not opposed to spending money for good and reasonable purposes when there is the money to spend.

May I ask whether there is money in this bill for Resurrection City?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is no money in this bill for Resurrection City.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any increase

in the arts and humanities in the conference?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No. There is a reduction in the humanities item.

Mr. GROSS. Is there an increase in the arts?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is no increase in this conference report over the amount approved by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in the bill as it comes from the conference for the payment of salary increases?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No. There is no money provided here for the increased pay costs. Let me explain, and I have a statement here because I was prepared for this question.

As far as this bill is concerned, the committee has received estimates that there will be additional pay increase costs of approximately \$70 million. This is on a gross basis. It has not yet been determined how much of this increase can be absorbed by the agencies. To the extent the increase cannot be absorbed, there will, of course, be a supplemental request for the additional funds submitted during the next session of Congress.

I would like to remind the gentleman, if he will read our hearings, he will find in each instance when a department appeared before us, that department was catechized very thoroughly about their ability to absorb the costs. Our committee was very strict about requiring departments to absorb as far as possible all pay raises.

Mr. GROSS. That probably will come in a supplemental appropriation bill at a later date.

One further question. Is there any money as a result of the conference for the so-called cultural center in Washington?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is not.

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

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as I recall the House bill did provide some funds for planning for the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is correct. It provided \$110,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the report of the conference I find no reference one way or the other to that amount. Is it a correct understanding that no funds are to be provided for this planning?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Could the gentleman elucidate why no money is being made available? The wildlife refuge happens to be in my district. I can assure the gentleman that the money is needed. We need to develop a plan for a wilderness area. A delay of this kind, if no funds are available, is going to pose a serious problem.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the gentleman that the House placed the amount of money in the bill in the belief that all these natural resources of ours, particularly lands close to urban environments, are very precious and that we must do all that is possible to keep and save them. It was on that belief that the planning money was provided. Unfortunately, the other body did not agree. I believe they had a little economy move on this particular item.

I will assure the gentleman that our committee will certainly listen with great interest to the proposals in the next budget for expenditures for planning, because I agree with the gentleman that these are the areas of our country which are today of prime importance.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate her expression of concern. I should like to reiterate, I regret very much as a practical result the stand of the other body has made it impossible, presumably, to proceed with needed planning.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give a special word of commendation to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and to the other members of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. Also, a word of gratitude is in order for the House conferees on the bill, and for the very expeditious way that they met and got approval on the bill.

Whenever appropriations bills are before the House, it is only natural that most Members want to obtain meritorious projects for their own districts. These Members are closest to their district, and they know firsthand of the needs we all have back home. But at the same time, there are not always enough funds to handle every project, and this situation gives the committee the tough burden of weeding through those to be kept and those to be put on ice.

Mrs. HANSEN recognizes this responsibility, and she and her subcommittee dealt with it admirably. Each of us who are interested in conservation and wildlife preservation owe her a particular vote of thanks for coming up with this bill in such pressed times.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 14, line 17, strike out "\$95,628,000" and insert "\$95,115,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$95,755,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: On page 16, line 8, strike out "\$93,000,000" and insert "\$38,536,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$39,331,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 18, line 17, strike out "\$26,400,000" and insert "\$26,345,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$26,600,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 22, line 10, strike out "\$1,686,000" and insert "\$1,773,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,959,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 33, line 3, strike out "\$41,880,000" and insert "\$41,326,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$42,137,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 39, line 9, strike out "\$922,700" and insert "\$300,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$222,700".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 39, line 9, insert: "and in addition \$770,000 of the un-

obligated balance of the appropriation granted under 'Land Acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System' are transferred to and shall be available for salaries and expenses."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CONFERENCE REPORT COMMENTS

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, the very able chairman of our subcommittee and the gentleman from South Dakota, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for a very statesmanlike and skillful job in resolving the differences between the two bodies on this bill.

I would like to note the total involved in the conference report is approximately \$10.5 million below the budget request.

I think the funds we have provided in the field of natural resources of our country are adequate under today's circumstances.

RELATING TO DEMONSTRATIONS FOR PEACE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 582, relating to demonstrations for peace.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 582

Whereas responsible dissent and freedom of speech are among the most sacred traditions of the American people; and

Whereas many Americans are demonstrating their concern for peace pursuant to rights enjoyed under the Constitution of the United States, from which springs our nation's deep commitment to peaceful debate, the essence of our free political system; and

Whereas the Premier of North Vietnam has publicly described the Vietnam Moratorium in an open letter to the American people as "their fall offensive" aimed at forcing the United States "to withdraw completely and unconditionally" from Vietnam; and

Whereas the said Premier greatly misjudges Americans, and deceives himself if he

believes that those who demonstrate are doing so with a desire to assist Hanoi; and

Whereas the said Premier's letter to the American people is a blatant and insolent intrusion into the affairs of the American people by an enemy; therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we support the inherent right of all Americans to responsible and peaceful dissent, but we abhor the attempt of Premier Pham Van Dong to associate those Americans who demonstrate for peace with the cause of our enemy; and be it further

Resolved, That we repudiate the Premier's letter and call upon all Americans to disassociate themselves from North Vietnam's insolent and intolerable declaration.

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask three questions of the distinguished majority leader.

First of all I want to know whether or not this resolution was cleared with the White House, and if it was I then want to know whether or not—

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I did not clear it with the White House.

Mr. OLSEN. I wonder where did we get it from?

Mr. ALBERT. I brought it in after consultation, as I announced this morning, between the distinguished Speaker, the minority leader—

Mr. OLSEN. Did the minority leader bring it in?

Mr. ALBERT. The minority leader is the first one who showed it to me, and I agreed with it and agreed with him that I would cosponsor it.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, who prepared it?

Mr. OLSEN. I want to address myself to the minority leader.

Did this get cleared with the White House?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman from Montana that I was contacted by representatives of the President following the release of the letter from the Premier of North Vietnam.

Mr. OLSEN. That is the letter you read to the House last night?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is correct. That was the letter that was released by the Premier of North Vietnam to the American people.

Following that release, I was contacted by representatives of the President of the United States suggesting that perhaps it might be appropriate for the Congress, or the House or the Senate individually, to take action on a resolution of this sort.

On Tuesday afternoon I consulted with the Speaker and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was suggested that a draft of this nature be prepared. My staff did work on it, and upon its completion I presented it to the Speaker and asked the Speaker for his observations and comments. The Speaker and I discussed the draft resolution with the distinguished majority leader. Subsequently the proposal was discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Af-

fairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAMS), ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, agrees.

Mr. OLSEN. Does not the gentleman believe this would be a good thing for this Congress if the resolution went to the Committee on Foreign Affairs so that we could have a thorough discussion, and not cut off debate like we did last night?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I believe that the circumstances today are such that a resolution of this sort is highly appropriate. What it does is say that the well-intentioned, highly motivated individuals who are participating in some of these demonstrations are not to be associated with the Premier of North Vietnam.

Mr. OLSEN. Now, you know, I find myself in agreement with that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. You do?

Mr. OLSEN. But the point is here that we had our debate cut off last night on this whole question, and here again we are not going to have a discussion if this resolution passes; we are going to have only 1 hour of debate.

That is what is wrong with this unanimous consent request. If a unanimous consent request is made for a substantial period of debate on this floor that would be good for the American people. But to have just 1 hour is not good for the American people.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman raises a good question. Assuming the President did make this request, he is coming to the people's assembly in a most expedient manner. There are 435 Members of this House of Representatives and we have the closest contact with the more than 200 million people in this country.

Mr. OLSEN. So we are to pass this without discussion? Is that the point you want to make? Do you want to pass this without a discussion?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Even if the President did ask for this—what is wrong with that?

Mr. OLSEN. What is wrong is this body ought to have a discussion on this question and should not be cut off from debate like it was last night.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am rather puzzled as to why the House of Representatives even has to take up this resolution. It seems to me that this letter from the North Vietnamese Premier is such an obvious piece of Communist propaganda that is beneath the dignity of this great deliberative body to call attention to this obvious piece of Communist propaganda which we all recognize as propaganda.

Mr. OLSEN. I have one more question to ask of the distinguished majority leader and that is, as long as we are asking for unanimous consent, why could we not ask for more than an hour?

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I have no objection. The gentleman knows I will yield to him as liberally as to any Member and I will certainly yield to those who question the advisability of this resolution. I did not contemplate that more than an hour would be necessary. I had not discussed that matter with the leadership of the minority.

Mr. OLSEN. Then let us ask the leadership of the minority. Would there be, or is there any reason why we should not ask for more than an hour?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me answer that by saying that this resolution is not a question involving policy in Vietnam. This is a resolution aimed at disassociating the American people from the Premier of an enemy of the United States.

It does not involve the pros and cons of U.S. foreign policy vis-a-vis North Vietnam.

Mr. OLSEN. That is your point of view, but there are some of us who would like at least to have 3 hours on this whole issue.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if permission is granted to bring up and consider this resolution, that my time be extended by 30 minutes.

I am trying to accommodate both sides on this matter. We have several other matters of legislation to take up and I want to be fair to the gentleman and I want to be fair to the House. I dislike asking for the extra time on the resolution, but since the gentleman feels so strongly about it and since I have such high regard for the gentleman, I am doing something I have never agreed to do before, and which the gentleman knows is really not consistent with the practice of the House.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from West Virginia, reserve the right to object in connection with the unanimous consent request for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 30 minutes, making the time 1½ hours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman reserve the right to object to the last request or to the first unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Whichever of the two gives me an opportunity to proceed on a reservation, so I reserve the right to object to the second request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this whole question has been brought into such prominent attention since yesterday afternoon by the statements of the Vice President, by the statements of the Governor of a great State, and many other

prominent national leaders. Why do we in this great House of Representatives even have to consider this resolution? No one forced the issue or raised any question about the loyalty of those supporting the moratorium until this was brought out in this fashion and the statements made yesterday. I do think it is unfortunate that the House of Representatives has to pass a resolution of this nature, to beat its chest and enunciate the obvious fact: "I am loyal." Every Member of this body is a loyal American. We ought to be governed in our actions by what is good for the United States of America, instead of just reacting to what is said or done in either Hanoi or Saigon.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would also be inclined to agree that this is an overreaction, but it is here, and perhaps it is necessary. Premier Van Dong displays an abhorrent ignorance of the American democratic system. The exercise of free America today is part of an exercise of democracy by a free people, and obviously by sending this telegram the Hanoi Premier has demonstrated that he does not understand this. So perhaps it is important to put it in proper perspective. Perhaps it is important to serve notice on him that the American people are not going to be influenced. But, more importantly, it is important for him to know that he cannot use this moratorium Wednesday as a further excuse for delaying meaningful peace talks.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the comment is in order that we are not merely beating our chest and saying how patriotic we are. We are the elected Representatives of the American people. We are telling tens of thousands of people who are just as patriotic as we are, who differ from most of us, and in some cases differ from all of us, that this House believes that all Americans, in the exercise of their rights as citizens, are patriotic citizens who sincerely desire peace.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman agree that the main thrust of the resolution is to serve notice on the North Vietnamese Communists that they cannot use this exercise of democracy in America today as an excuse for further delays in the peace talks in Paris?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understood the sequence, the gentleman from Oklahoma asked for the immediate con-

sideration of the resolution, and then he added a second request, which was for an additional 30 minutes. As I understood it, there was no objection until the gentleman from Wisconsin now indicated it to the first request and, as I understand the sequence, the gentleman from Wisconsin has lost his right to object to the first request and is now only objecting to the additional 30 minutes. That is the sequence, as I recall very specifically.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the sequence is that the request for the additional 30 minutes was an amendment. The original request had not been acted upon with respect to reservations for intention to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 582, and pending that he asked unanimous consent that the time be extended 30 minutes.

Is there objection to the second request? The Chair hears none—

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be very fair. The Chair will repeat the unanimous consent request. The gentleman from Oklahoma has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 582, and pending that, has asked unanimous consent that the time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 582? Is there objection?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DOUBLE STANDARD APPLIED

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

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, most of us heard last evening a great plea for honest debate, for free and open discussion of the issues of the tragedy of Vietnam. That debate went on for 5 hours.

Now, today, we have witnessed a turn. Those who spoke so eloquently for freedom and full debate now object to the consideration of a resolution which endorses the right of dissent in this country. I think it is typical of the double standard that is applied in this country by those elements who are so critical of an honest effort of a great Nation to achieve a lasting peace.

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

Mr. BROCK. I do not yield.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, my point of personal privilege is the attack just made from the well of the House on the loyalty of so many of us and the right of free speech in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think that address is entitled to a response of 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Under the circumstances, the Chair will grant that right. The gentleman from Montana is recognized.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not bow to anybody about being loyal to this country and voting in support of all the effort that has been made in South Vietnam or anyplace else in the world on the world programs of this country.

I have voted to support all of the Presidents, including the present one, in every instance, but I want to discuss this resolution. I am for it. I am absolutely for this resolution, but I want to discuss it. I want the American people to hear the discussion and I do not want again to see the debate shut off in this House of Representatives at 17 minutes after 11 o'clock at night when there are many more who have reserved time to talk. I say that for both sides of the aisle.

This issue of Vietnam is the biggest issue facing the people of America, and it ought to be talked about right here. Everybody saw who was in the gallery last night. They were the new voice of America. The young people were here. The young people I went to see this morning at George Mason College are the new voice. They say this is the issue that ought to be discussed.

Do not be afraid if you have the most votes. I have heard the other side say that to us from that side of the aisle. Do not be afraid of discussion if you have the votes. On this you will have everybody's vote. You will have everybody's vote. Let us send it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and then let us talk about it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. 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. 226]

Adams	Dennis	Harsha
Arends	Devine	Hastings
Aspinall	Diggs	Hays
Berry	Dingell	Helstoski
Bingham	Eckhardt	Hosmer
Boland	Edmondson	Howard
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Kirwan
Brown, Calif.	Ellberg	Kuykendall
Burton, Calif.	Erlenborn	Kyros
Byrnes, Wis.	Farbstein	Latta
Cahill	Fascell	Lipscomb
Camp	Findley	Lloyd
Carey	Fisher	Lowenstein
Cederberg	Flynt	Lujan
Celler	Fraser	McCloskey
Chisholm	Frey	McKeeally
Clark	Gettys	McMillan
Cohelan	Gialimo	Martin
Collier	Gray	Meeds
Conyers	Green, Oreg.	Mikva
Corman	Griffin	Mills
Culver	Haley	Morton
Cunningham	Hanna	O'Konski
Dawson	Harrington	Ottinger

Patman
Patten
Pepper
Pollock
Powell
Quile
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Riegler
Rivers

Rodino
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
Ruppe
Saylor
Scheuer
Sisk
Steed
Stokes
Taylor
Teague, Calif.

Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Welcker
Whalley
Whitten
Wold
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COINAGE ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 574 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 574

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. 14127) to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, 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 Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 574 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14127 to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 14127 is to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to mint \$1, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and dime coins that do not contain silver.

The \$1 coins would bear the likeness of President Eisenhower.

The half dollars would continue to bear the likeness of President Kennedy.

The coins would be copper, clad with an alloy of 75 percent copper and 25 percent nickel. Of the 1½ billion half-dollars minted since 1963—both 40- and 90-percent silver—a very small percentage are actually circulating. Also, it is stated that the minting of some 300 million 40-percent silver dollar coins over a 3-year period would mean a total monetary gain of the Treasury of roughly \$160 million. By

contrast the monetary gain by producing the same number of nonsilver dollar coins would be about \$290 million. In addition, the Treasury could obtain as much as \$50 million more in revenue from the continued sale of silver to the GSA, or a total of well over \$300 million.

The bill also provides for the sale to the public by GSA of approximately 3 million rare Carson City silver dollars minted in the latter part of the 19th century that are now being held in the Treasury. Proceeds from the sale of these coins are expected to be approximately \$100 million.

Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy on the rule. There is some controversy on the bill itself. I urge adoption of House Resolution 574 in order that H.R. 14127 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has ably stated, House Resolution 574 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 14127 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purposes of the bill are:

First, minting of the current half-dollar coin but without any silver content; Second, minting of a New Eisenhower dollar coin containing no silver; and

Third, sale to the public in an equitable manner of some 3 million Carson City Mint silver dollars.

The provisions of the bill implement the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, a nonpartisan body established by the Coinage Act of 1965. The only amendment of the committee was to indicate a congressional intention that the dollar coin carry a likeness of former President Eisenhower.

Very few of the roughly 1¼ billion half-dollar coins minted since 1963 which contain silver are now in circulation; they are being hoarded. Because of this fact the committee believes that future half-dollars and the new dollar coin should be minted without any silver content, as are our current smaller coins. It believes this is the only realistic choice; the cost of minting silver-content coins requires use of Government-owned silver, a far more expensive proposition than the use of the cupronickel alloy. The monetary gain by producing the same number of nonsilver dollar coins, approximately 300,000,000 would be about \$290,000,000. Additionally, the Treasury could obtain as much as \$50,000,000 more in revenue from the continued sale of silver to the General Services Administration, or a total of well over \$325,000,000.

The committee believes this last point is very important to insure a stable silver market. Approximately 100 million ounces of surplus silver now held by the Treasury is sufficient to continue GSA sales at these current levels through 1970. This, plus the knowledge that no silver will be used in coinage operations in the future, will enable a stable market to develop.

The dollar coin, by committee amendment, will bear a likeness of former President Eisenhower.

Finally, the bill provides for the sale

of the approximately 3 million rare silver dollars now held by the Treasury. The sale, conducted by the GSA, will seek to insure that as many persons as possible will be able to purchase these coins by limiting the number of coins which a single buyer may purchase to one of each category, or a maximum of 10 coins. Proceeds of the sale will go to the Treasury and will be well above the face value.

I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the rule for the reason that it makes in order a bill to which I am unequivocally, unqualifiedly, and utterly opposed.

The bill, as I said a week or so ago, when it was before the House under a suspension of the rules and failed to muster a two-thirds majority, will complete the debasement and degradation of the metallic currency of this Nation, if it is adopted.

I wonder how long it will be before the Banking and Currency Committee brings forth a bill to provide for the use of wampum. I am beginning to lay in a supply, because I am convinced it will be the next step to legalize wampum as the medium of exchange.

The North American Indians used it, and apparently it served them well in their primitive economy.

If that does not do the job, I assume that the Banking and Currency Committee will then come forth with legislation to provide for what the Narragansett Indians called wampum peag, which is a cheaper wampum. It looks something like this which I hold in my hand, and it comes in all colors, just as does the scrap metal money that this bill would authorize.

And here is some more wampum in the form of washers and locknuts. I call that mini-wampum—mini-wampum that might well be used.

You know, a good locknut these days probably costs about a penny. I see no reason why these nice washers and locknuts could not be used for the payment of sales taxes.

How many we can get in this country to accept currency with no intrinsic value and irredeemable paper money?

Before this debate is over I want somebody to tell me what has happened to the seigniorage accruing from the minting of scrap metal quarters and dimes?

Yes, what has become of the alleged saving as represented in the cost of minting of our common use currency out of cheap metal rather than silver? Has there been a saving, or has the seigniorage gone the way of all financial flesh in this Government? Has it been spent? Where is it?

And what has happened to the great saving we are supposed to have accomplished through the discontinuance of the use of gold? I hope some of these questions will be answered here today. If we simply spent the money we saved in so-called seigniorage, we have not accomplished very much now, have we, except to destroy the intrinsic value of our

metallic currency and deceive the people of this country? Sure you can stick this scrap metal in a vending machine, but, as I have said before, you cannot make it jingle. Remember the old saying: "When I was single my money would jingle. Oh, Lord, how I wish I were single again." Yes, it used to jingle and we were proud of it. It does not any more. It lands with a dull thud.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is about time for Congress to stop and recover its senses in the matter of the currency of this country. It is being debased and debauched here at home and around the world. Now this Government is out to paper the world with paper gold. This is in the nature of a mustard plaster applied to a monetary cancer that will not be cured by issuing all of the paper gold the international bankers can devise. Eventually this country will come around full circle, back to a showdown, and you know it. Some people thought it was a nice thing to do to paper the yacht we gave Emperor Haile Selassie—and a nice air-conditioned yacht it was—to paper it with gold wallpaper. I suppose now we will paper it with paper gold issued by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. When are we going to come to our senses in this country and get back to a currency, and a monetary system that has some stability? Or are we going to go the way of wampum?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time and urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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. BARRETT. 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. 14127) to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, and for other purposes.

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. 14127, with Mr. MATSUNAGA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on October 6 we had under consideration the bill H.R. 14127 under a suspension of the

rules. On that occasion there were 205 aye to 148 nay votes, and 78 not voting.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill and it should not take much time for its consideration during general debate. There are a few who desire to speak on it and we will be as generous as we can with time on each side of the aisle with the hope, because of the strenuous day and night which the Members had in the last 24 hours, that we may conclude the debate and the bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14127 would give the Secretary of Treasury authority to mint a nonsilver cupronickel half-dollar and a nonsilver cupronickel dollar coin bearing the portrait of President Eisenhower. The bill would also direct the transfer of the last 2.9 million rare silver dollars now held in the Treasury to the GSA for sale to the public in a fair and equitable manner. The prompt enactment of this bill would both contribute to a more effective coinage system and make it possible for us to honor a great American.

The authority in the bill to mint a nonsilver half-dollar, I believe, is long overdue. Despite the fact that nearly 1½ billion half-dollars containing silver have been minted since 1963, this coin is rarely seen in circulation. For the past several years American business has been deprived of a half-dollar in adequate circulation for trading needs. As quickly as these coins have been minted, they have simply disappeared into private hoards. It is time that the Congress authorize the production of a half-dollar that will actually circulate to meet the needs of American business. The enactment of H.R. 14127 will accomplish this purpose.

H.R. 14127 also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a cupronickel dollar coin bearing the portrait of President Eisenhower. I think this would be a fitting tribute to a great American. Now there are those who assert that placing the portrait of President Eisenhower on a coin minted of silver would be an even greater tribute. I would first point out that the composition of the coin neither adds nor detracts from the status of other Presidents on our American coins. But apart from this, there are solid reasons why it would be most unwise to use all of our remaining surplus silver for minting a single coin. Let me list a few reasons why I believe a cupronickel coin, rather than one made of silver, is in the public interest.

First, a nonsilver dollar coin would mean a far greater monetary return to the Federal Government than a silver coin. The Treasury has estimated that the total seigniorage in revenue under the provisions of H.R. 14127 in the first year after enactment could exceed \$500 million. This income would reduce the Government's borrowing needs by an equivalent amount and be a strong blow against inflation.

Moreover, to use our remaining surplus silver for coinage instead of sale through open competitive bidding would mean depriving private industry of about 100 million ounces of silver in 1970. If the Treasury's remaining surplus is used for coinage, rather than sold under competitive bids, American industry will

have to greatly step up its imports to fill this gap. The resulting adverse effects on the balance of payments next year could be as much as \$150 million.

A third disadvantage for using our surplus silver for dollar coins would be the most certain higher prices for major consumer products that would result. The halting of Treasury silver sales would probably mean a sharp rise in the silver price. This would mean higher costs to millions of consumers of film and electrical products which are the principle industrial uses of silver. It should be realized that the ultimate use of silver includes virtually the entire American public.

And finally, I would point out that the provisions of H.R. 14127 have been fully endorsed by the Joint Commission on the Coinage, a nonpartisan body established by law to advise the President and the Congress on silver and coinage matters.

In summary, the enactment of H.R. 14127 is strongly in the public interest because it would give the economy the coins it needs, honor a great American, help our balance of payments, reduce the Government's borrowing needs and the public debt, and contribute to the fight against inflation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation was considered in the House under suspension of the rules and carried by a large majority, but was about 15 votes shy of the necessary two-thirds to pass it at that time.

The bill is now back before the House under a rule, and it is the same bill as before, and is one that I believe the vast majority of our committee were wholeheartedly in favor of.

Mr. Chairman, I served on the Joint Commission on the Coinage that was created several years ago. This is a bipartisan commission with membership from both the House and the Senate.

The recommendations that are embodied in this bill are the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage with an amendment added by the committee for the coinage of a new dollar coin.

On October 3 the Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably on a bill (H.R. 14127) to authorize the minting of a nonsilver cupronickel half dollar and a nonsilver cupronickel dollar coin bearing the portrait of President Eisenhower. The bill would also direct the transfer of the last 2.9 million rare silver dollars now held in the Treasury to the GSA for sale to the public in a fair and equitable manner. I am asking for your support of this bill which would both contribute to a more effective coinage and make it possible for us to honor a great American.

The authority in the bill to mint a nonsilver half dollar I believe is long overdue. Despite the fact that nearly 1½ billion half dollars containing silver have been minted since 1963, this coin is rarely seen in circulation. For the past several years the public has been deprived of a half dollar in adequate circulation for trading needs. As quickly

as these coins have been minted they have simply disappeared into private hoards. It is time that the Congress authorize the production of a half dollar that will actually circulate to meet the needs of American business. The enactment of H.R. 14127 will accomplish this purpose.

H.R. 14127 also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a cupronickel dollar coin bearing the portrait of President Eisenhower. I think this would be a fitting tribute to a great American. I realize that there are those who feel that placing the portrait of President Eisenhower on a coin minted of silver would be an even greater tribute. I would first point out that the composition of the coin neither adds nor detracts from the status of other Presidents on our other coins. But apart from this there are solid reasons why it would be most unwise to use our remaining surplus silver for minting a single coin. Let me list a few reasons why I believe a cupronickel dollar coin rather than one made of silver is in the public interest.

First, a nonsilver dollar coin would mean a far greater monetary return to the Federal Government than a silver coin. The Treasury has estimated that the total seigniorage and revenue under the provisions of H.R. 14127 in the first year after enactment could exceed \$500 million.

This income would reduce the Government's borrowing needs—and we are borrowing today at prices up to 7½ percent and 8 percent. It would reduce those needs by an equivalent amount and contribute substantially to the fight against inflation.

Moreover, the annual industrial consumption of silver of about 150 million ounces is more than three times domestic production. Consequently if the Treasury's remaining silver surplus is used for coinage rather than sold under competitive bids, American industry will have to greatly step up its imports to fill this gap. The resulting adverse effects on the balance of payments next year could be as much as \$150 million.

Third, using our surplus silver for dollar coins would almost certainly mean higher prices for major consumer products containing silver. This would mean higher costs to millions of consumers of film and electrical products which are the principle industrial uses of silver. It should be realized that the ultimate users of silver include virtually the entire American public.

I would also point out that the provisions of H.R. 14127 have been strongly endorsed by the Joint Commission on the Coinage on which I served. As you know this is a nonpartisan body established by law to advise the President and the Congress on silver and coinage matters.

This legislation is recommended by the President of the United States. The chairman of our committee and I have both received letters from the President with an endorsement and hoping for prompt action by the Congress. I urge the Members of this body to give serious consideration to what is before us. I hope that it will receive the very overwhelming vote today on the floor of the House.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield

10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over mint matters in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I support H.R. 14127 and intend to vote for it. I will have an amendment of my own which I was not able to have considered in the committee because of the effort which was being made that morning to get the bill out of committee in just a few minutes time, in order to try to have it enacted by October 14. My amendment deals only with the proof sets issued by the mint in limited numbers each year to coin hobbyists, and does not go to the main point in controversy over this legislation, which is the use of silver in our regular coins.

I will oppose any effort to retain silver in the regular half-dollar, or include silver in the composition of the proposed \$1 coin. I have heard all of the arguments on the use of silver in our regular coinage—heard them for 5 years—and do not think they are valid today.

Four years ago, when this issue was last before the House, I supported continued use of some silver in the half-dollar coin, as the Treasury had proposed, while voting to eliminate silver from the quarter and dime. I felt—in 1965—that with about a billion ounces of silver then in the Treasury's vaults, we could divert a small fraction of that amount to the coinage of a silver-clad half-dollar. And so I took the floor in 1965 to oppose a committee amendment which had been agreed to by 18 of the 33 members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would, at that time, have eliminated all silver from our coinage. But the circumstances today are far different from those of 1965.

As I said then, it was not a question of having a prestige coin. Nor was it a question of including in our coinage at least one coin that had some intrinsic value—two arguments being used again this year to support the inclusion of silver in coinage. My point in 1965 was that the coinage bill we were then considering represented a mammoth victory in the legislative process for industries in this country using large quantities of silver—a victory which would assure to those industries access at reasonable prices to hundreds upon hundreds of millions of ounces of Government-owned silver at a time when this country used four or five times as much silver for industrial processes as our own mines could produce.

The silver mining industry had enjoyed for generations a built-in captive market in the Treasury of the United States for all the silver it produced. In retrospect, it was a good thing we were forced to buy and salt away all of this unwanted metal, at what then appeared to be excessive prices, against the day—which arrived in the mid-sixties—when this unique metal was going into scarce supply, and only Treasury stocks of silver could meet the deficit between supply and demand.

But I argued, and the House agreed in 1965, that in taking away most of a

market the silver producers had enjoyed for 173 years for silver in coinage, we should demonstrate a willingness to show some concern for the silver producers who were taking a bitter defeat. I felt it only fair to contribute, on a very reduced scale, the use of some silver in just one coin denomination. We could easily afford this diversion of about 15 million ounces of silver a year from a hoard which, as I said, was at about 1 billion ounces.

In the 1965 act, we established a national commission to study this question of the continued use of silver in coinage. Its recommendation has now been made: Take all silver out of the coins.

Furthermore, instead of the billion ounces of silver we had in the Treasury in 1965, we are now down to less than one-tenth of that amount. If we continue to use 15 million ounces a year for the half-dollar, and start using 15 million or more ounces a year for the proposed \$1 coin, we could not continue minting silver-clad coins for more than 2 or 3 years, at the outside, and all sales of silver to industry would have to stop now. Of course, that is what the silver producers want to happen.

But they are no longer in the poor-mouth position they were in 4 years ago when we passed the Coinage Act. Silver prices have been freed since July 1967, from their previous effective ceiling of \$1.29-plus per fine troy ounce. The price has been fluctuating at levels far above that ever since. Even so, there has been no appreciable increase in production. For the past 10 years, we have not been able to produce enough silver in this country to meet domestic needs. It may be years before we do again, if we ever do.

Some years ago we were told in the committee that it would take a price of at least \$3 an ounce for at least 3 years to make it economic to reopen enough old mines and find enough other new sources of silver to meet domestic requirements. But our requirements by then could well be far higher than they are now. Silver is unique in many respects, particularly for use in photographic film. There is no practical substitute.

So, Mr. Chairman, with the Treasury rapidly running out of silver it is a little too late to seriously consider increasing, or even continuing the use of silver in coinage. Unlike photographic film, coinage can use other materials just as well as silver. The silver-clad coins—the Kennedy half-dollars—are not circulating and will not circulate as long as they look so much more attractive than the cupronickel coins. It is their attractiveness that makes them keepsakes, not their silver content as such.

Let us stop the nonsense of turning out hundreds of millions of coins which are not being used as coins. If we are to please the coin collectors, then let us mint a reasonable number of specimen coins and sell them at a big profit as numismatic pieces. The Treasury received \$5 a set for coins whose face value is 91 cents, in sets which cost about \$1.35, altogether, to produce. With the added \$1 coin proposed in this legislation, proof sets could sell for substantially more than

\$5 to reflect the additional coin, and if made more attractive than the regular coin.

If we are convinced we want to turn out a "pretty" coin, it should be for numismatic use only; if any silver or other precious metals are to be used in coins, they should go into display coins specially made for collectors.

That is why I intend to offer an amendment to this bill to give authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to make proof sets from metals or combinations of metals different from those required to be used in the regular coinage. If a silver wash will make the coins more attractive, that should not cost much, or take much silver. Perhaps columbium might be used. But whatever special materials are used should be only for proof coins, and only under circumstances which will assure citizens an equal opportunity to obtain at least one of these sets before multiple orders may be filled.

I am sure the Members have heard many complaints from constituents who are coin hobbyists about the impossibility of having their proof set orders filled while the dealers advertise these sets at prices two and three times the Treasury price. The system in use for distribution of these sets is outdated—demand is now far heavier than supply, but the Treasury has been unable to differentiate in many instances between dealers ordering many, many sets under different names and the individual citizen who just wants one or two.

If the Members want to clean up this situation, and please their constituents interested in coin collecting as a hobby rather than as a business, they will support my amendment when it is offered.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER).

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

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from the 12th District of New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER). She is greatly loved and respected by our committee. The gentleman has worked very hard to get her amendment through to put the likeness of a great president on the new dollar coin.

I believe the people of her district should be just as proud of her as we are here in the Congress. She always does a fine job.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, last week's debate on the pending bill revealed clearly that there is one—and only one—real issue associated with the Coinage Act of 1969. That is the question whether the proposed \$1 coin, which will bear the likeness of one of our Nation's greatest citizens, former President Eisenhower, should be minted, in whole or in part, of silver.

I believe we should meet this issue directly. As the author of the amendment, accepted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, to provide that a non-silver-bearing \$1 coin carry the image of our late President, I believe it

would be self-defeating to use silver in the minting of this coin.

It would be self-defeating because both of the purposes for which the coin would be minted would be rendered unattainable. The new \$1 coin is intended to meet a real economic need and it is intended to honor a great American. To do either or both, such a coin must circulate.

A silver-bearing Eisenhower \$1 piece would not circulate. We do not have sufficient stocks of silver to mint enough \$1 silver coins to make certain they would circulate. The intrinsic value of the silver and the sentimental value of an Eisenhower coin would guarantee the coin's disappearance from the marketplace. And it is only in the marketplace, in actual circulation, that any coin can serve an economic purpose. And it is only as a circulating coin that any coin can meaningfully serve as a memorial. A coin which does not pass through people's hands can hardly bring to people's minds the person that coin is intended to honor.

Since the proposed \$1 coin is intended to honor a great American who was also a great Republican President, I believe that the position of the present Republican administration, which is headed by the man who was President Eisenhower's Vice President, should be especially significant. Certainly, no one could accuse President Nixon of attempting to downgrade President Eisenhower. It carries great weight with me, therefore, that President Nixon, personally, and his administration are firmly committed to the minting of nonsilver \$1 coins bearing the likeness of President Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize and respect and, in fact, I share the motives of those who seek to amend the committee bill to provide for a silver-bearing Eisenhower coin. Silver would undoubtedly add to the value of such a coin. But if a higher intrinsic value is all we are looking for in an Eisenhower coin, then I suggest we would be better off to mint a commemorative medal rather than deceive ourselves that we are minting a coin intended to circulate as a part of our regular coinage.

With President Eisenhower, however, we have tried to do more than is commonly done. By proposing to place his likeness on the newest and highest value coin in our coinage system, we are proposing an honor of a special kind, an honor reserved—at any one time—to only six Americans. But the nature of this honor rests on the fact that these six coins actually circulate as a part of our coinage.

If we are serious, then, in honoring President Eisenhower and serious about meeting the demonstrated need for a one-dollar coin, we have no alternative to the cupronickel coin provided for by the bill. For a cupronickel coin will circulate, and a silver coin will not.

We should recognize, Mr. Chairman, that a silver-bearing coin would have other harmful effects:

It would deplete the Treasury's very limited reserves of silver.

It would force upward the price of silver, benefiting speculators, and increase substantially the cost of consumer prod-

ucts which contain silver, thereby adding to inflation.

It would force American industry greatly to expand its imports of silver, thereby adding to the dangerous deficit in our balance of payments.

This would be a high price to pay for the very limited prestige value attached to a silver-content dollar as opposed to a nonsilver dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that there is the widest possible agreement in the country that President Eisenhower is most deserving of this special honor. Few Americans in the history of our country have earned the love and respect of their fellow citizens to the extent that Dwight David Eisenhower earned it. His long lifetime was devoted almost entirely to the service of his country. His influence for good was felt decisively at key periods in our Nation's history, in war as well as in peace.

A new \$1 coin, therefore, would be a most fitting and timely memorial to this great man who gave so much of himself to so many others—but only if that coin circulates.

Recent experience with the silver and silver-clad Kennedy half-dollars has shown that even these coins, minted in much greater quantities than a dollar silver-bearing coin could be minted, disappear almost entirely from circulation as soon as they are minted. Since more than one and a quarter billion silver-bearing half-dollars have been coined, surely we can expect the same fate to befall a much more limited supply—an estimated 300 million—of Eisenhower dollars. The pending bill would also remove the remaining silver from the Kennedy half-dollar.

How much honor, I ask, attaches to a coin that won't circulate, a disappearing dollar? How much honor attaches to a coin which will be inflationary? How much honor attaches to a coin which will benefit speculators and hoarders rather than people in general?

President Eisenhower was a man whose devotion to the public interest always took first place. Presented with the facts, I cannot conceive that he would ever choose to be honored in silver when a different alloy would serve his country so much better.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in considering the pending bill we apply President Eisenhower's own principles, and decide this issue on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I propose to offer an amendment to this bill. It is one which I think is very appropriate.

The distinguished committee has seen fit to decide that the new dollar should be commemorative to the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and I have no quarrel with that decision. I think he was a great President and a great military leader and a great scholar. I think very appropriately, though, we should consider the amendment I will offer that

on the other side of this coin we place thereon the inscription "We came in peace for all mankind" and the official design prescribed by NASA as emblematic of the Apollo 11 flight.

Our space program started under President Eisenhower, as you will recall. That is when it began. He did not live to see the landing on the moon, but, you know, our Apollo 11 flight is very similar to Columbus' discovery of America.

We all recall how that momentous moment in history has been recorded on our silver dollars. So, why not make this a real commemorative coin, not only with President Eisenhower's likeness on one side, but let us commemorate this great feat, this great momentous feat in history which began under his administration and place on the other side a design of the Apollo 11 flight and the words that were left on the moon by those astronauts, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Committee would consider this amendment seriously and I would be very pleased if the Members would see fit to agree to it.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to encourage this afternoon the prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation would authorize the minting of non-silver-clad dollar coins, an action which has been endorsed by the Joint Commission on the Coinage, a nonpartisan body adopted by law to advise the President and the Congress on silver and coinage matters.

It has been proposed to amend the resolution to direct the production of dollar coins of a silver content. This would in my judgment be a serious mistake.

One of the main arguments against this amendment is that dollar coins of silver content would not remain in circulation. In supporting this argument, I would like to mention the half dollar, which at present is composed of 40-percent silver. Despite the minting of close to 800 million 40-percent silver halves over the past 3 years, very few of these coins are actually circulating.

The experience with the Kennedy half-dollar indicates that silver coins will not circulate freely any longer and the Joint Commission on the Coinage and the Treasury Task Force on Silver Policy has stated that there is a commercial need for a circulating dollar coin, particularly in view of the steady expansion of the vending machine industry. This need can only be met by a non-silver coin.

In addition, in view of the fact that the melting ban on silver coins has been lifted, there may be those who engage in hoarding and speculation who may expect to profit by the issuance of silver coins.

The use of our remaining silver would require a halting of surplus silver sales.

This action would very probably drive the price of silver up excessively and further stimulate the hoarding of these coins.

In conclusion, it does not seem prudent to pour our remaining silver into silver dollar coins, when these coins would never circulate in any quantity.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us today is indisputably needed. Foremost in my thinking, this legislation would bring honor to a great American, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Secondly, it would end the uncertainty of the Federal Government's silver policies. The bill would bring additional cupronickel-clad coins into the economy, representing a savings to the American taxpayer, and insure all-out circulation of these coins in the economy—"Mackie Machine Age." For our numismatists, the Government would be given the authority to sell to the public almost 3 million rare silver dollars now held in the Treasury. The sale of these silver dollars would also bring a surplus into the Treasury.

It is rare, indeed, that one piece of legislation could represent such a savings to the public, a relief to silver dealers, and an honor to a great American at the same time. I urge my colleagues to cast their votes accordingly.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13252, the Coinage Act of 1969, which would implement the recommendations of the Joint Commission on Coinage and the Treasury Department. American industry today consumes approximately 100 million ounces more silver than this country produces. Tying up silver in future coinage would require American industry to continue and increase its present level of silver imports and would thus adversely affect the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. The continued use of silver in U.S. coins would deny to the market a large quantity of silver and thus force up the price of silver. This inflation in silver prices would be contrary to Government attempts to bring our overheated economy under control. The silver-using industries would pass these price increases along to the already overburdened consumer affecting such products as photographic materials, electronic instruments, electric appliances, batteries, silverware, and medical supplies.

Equally significant is the fact that experience has shown that coins containing silver disappear and cannot serve the basic purpose for which they were intended, that is to meet the needs of commerce. The Kennedy half-dollar which contains 40-percent silver is virtually out of circulation as a medium of exchange. To permit the future production of 300 million coins containing 40 percent silver proposed (by the distinguished Congressman from Idaho) would create a coin collector's delight and indeed "bonus" years for silver speculators willing to hoard silver to realize later profits when its use in coins would discontinue.

It is evident that authorizing the Government to mint a nonsilver dollar and half dollar using the cupronickel-clad metal assures that these coins will circulate and satisfy the basic purposes of currency. Furthermore, the use of the latter materials in coins releases silver for sale to U.S. industry for use in consumer goods.

Additionally, the Government, through seigniorage, profits much more by using cupronickel-clad metals rather than silver in coins. The Government profits in minting 100 million 40-percent silver dollars would be approximately \$52 million including the costs for production of a coin containing silver. To mint the same number of coins using a cupronickel-clad material would yield a profit of \$95 million.

It has been suggested that we must use silver in a proposed dollar coin in order to indicate the esteem in which we hold our beloved former President Dwight David Eisenhower. I feel personally that no metal, however precious, could begin to equal the esteem that Americans feel for "Ike." Indeed it would seem to me that considering the undesirable economic ramifications involved in producing a silver dollar, that Ike himself would not want it that way. H.R. 13252 proposes to place President Eisenhower's image on a nonsilver dollar coin which would be used every day by ordinary men. I believe that "Ike" would consider this the greater tribute.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, the anniversary of his birth, the Nation honored the memory of the late general and former President, Dwight David Eisenhower. It is therefore fitting and proper that this House of Representatives carry through on this observance today by considering and, hopefully, approving a bill authorizing the minting of a coin bearing the likeness of this great man.

Earlier this session I joined in cosponsoring H.R. 12747. This bill, introduced by Congressman McCURE, would have authorized coinage of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower.

However, I have become convinced from a study of the experience gained with regard to the coin minted in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, that it would be impractical to insist that the coin honoring President Eisenhower have any silver content. If the Eisenhower dollar contained 40 percent silver or even lesser amounts, it is apparent that chances would be quite remote for keeping that dollar coin in circulation rather than have its supply hoarded by collectors and silver speculators. If we are to make it possible for our fellow citizens to do honor to General Eisenhower, this can best be done by minting coins which have a reasonable assurance of remaining in circulation rather than being taken out of circulation and melted for their silver content.

I therefore fully support the bill pending before the House, H.R. 14127, which

would carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage by authorizing the minting of a non-silver cupronickel dollar coin bearing the likeness of one of the great Americans of all time, our beloved "Ike" Eisenhower. The fact that this coin will not contain silver is in no way demeaning to the memory of our late President and general, but affords a practical solution of which I am sure he himself would heartily approve.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I join with those who think if you strike a coin for a distinguished American, it ought to be a coin that is distinguished—and the last remaining metal that we have in quantity enough is silver.

Once upon a time here in the Congress, I would come down in the well and talk only for the silver miners. We produce in my hometown of Butte, Mont., about 11 million ounces a year and in Idaho they produce about 25 million ounces a year. The total I think is 36 million ounces—I am just talking off the top of my head.

But I speak for more than the silver miners now. There are certainly a lot more silver miners than silversmiths and I sincerely think that for those for whom we strike a coin—for common coinage—we should do them that honor with some prestige, and 40-percent silver is probably too little.

But 40-percent silver would protect the coin.

Now people say the Kennedy half dollar is going out of circulation, and I say what is the matter with that? It is a prestigious memory of a great man and something that they love. Now what is the matter with an Eisenhower dollar, a prestigious coin, that people might save? I really believe we ought to do this.

What is more—I deplore and I have some resentment and I must confess to it—I have some resentment about the Treasury policy of selling silver. We have almost dumped the silver out of the stockpile. We have almost dumped it. Who has it been dumped to? The people who have been using the Treasury as a silver mine—and they are the silversmiths. They are not bad people, but they looked for a good deal and they got it. But I do not think we should add another mistake now to the mistake of dumping silver—I do not think we should add another mistake and deny the people of America a prestigious coin for a great American and a great President. Forty-percent silver is little enough and to discontinue a silver half-dollar would also be bad.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two points. First, I would like to follow through with the suggestions of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) about wampum. I think he very clearly made the point that money is beginning to lose its intrinsic value. But he did not go far enough.

I have in my hand a quarter, a dollar bill, and an American Express card. I do not know how the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) got the beads which he displayed. I do not think he knows enough hippies to have gotten his several sets of beads from that source. So he possibly bought them. I think probably they cost more than a quarter. But if he wanted to get something out of one of the machines around the Capitol, he jolly well better have a quarter in addition to his wampum beads. I am sure, however, that if he offered to sell the wampum beads, he would find some takers if he devised a machine to dispense merchandise for wampum beads.

The quarter has more intrinsic value than the dollar, but anybody will be glad to trade you more quarters than one for the dollar.

I have in my hand an American Express credit card.

Now, this piece of plastic I have in my hand is worth even less than the dollar, the bill, the piece of paper. But I am sure that all of you would hold this in much higher regard than the dollar bill, especially if it was one that had your name on it and you were in good standing with the American Express.

So it seems very clear that in this day and this time we do have a little more sophistication than the Indians. What we want is the Banking and Currency Committee to help us establish some kind of coinage, some system that will transfer goods and services in this society, and we are trying to do just that.

Aside and apart from that, I would suggest that we are supposed to take care of the coinage and monetary problems of this country separate and apart from trying to solve the problems of the miner, or to solve the problems of the silversmith, to solve the problems of the coin collector.

A pox on all three houses. We should manage our present silver strictly for the interest of the people. Sales and inventory should hinge on our security needs and the return on our investment in the original purchase. That is what the people expect us to do. They expect us to provide them with a coinage system that will move the goods and services of this country as efficiently and as effectively as can possibly be done, and this legislation carries out that responsibility. I suggest that we are moving even more slowly than the very economy that we are trying to serve, because it was not our committee that invented the credit card, the maxi-wampum. It was the very economy that we are trying to serve that came up with this idea, and as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and I pointed out between ourselves in a discussion while the gentleman from Iowa was making his point in relation to history, that these points are already made for the present and for the future; that is, the checkbook moves more goods than money and credit cards will soon move more than the checkbook. They indicate where we are going in terms of what the base is for our money. It is something to be looked back upon with nostalgia, in the history of coinage, in that it does not have some basic value of itself.

At one time people had very few things in which they had an opportunity to invest. Their money was one of their sources of investment, the coins containing a saving of value. But, thank goodness, this society has moved strongly enough to spread the opportunity to take part in its great economy; has moved freely enough so that people now have tremendous opportunity to invest in its true wealth. They can buy stock in General Motors. They can buy the bonds of their municipalities, or they can take their money and buy real estate. In all of these things they have some opportunity not only to have a retention of value, but a possibility of growth as well.

It seems to me that you cannot fault people if they have turned away from putting their faith in hard money which they put in a can and buried in the backyard. Americans have moved to the point where they are now engaged in sophisticated investment in equities and in trying to put whatever they have set aside into those things that promise a better return and those things that give them a stake in the real wealth of the Nation rather than in the symbols of wealth, which is all that coinage ultimately would provide.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a quick observation?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) that after all is said and done, it will take some of this scrap metal currency or irredeemable printing press money which he has displayed to eventually liquidate his "buy now, pay later" plastic credit card.

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Speaker, today in both Chambers of Congress the fate of our monetary system will be decided. The final decision is ours, and it is not a responsibility to be taken lightly. In some future economic crisis, when the strains upon our monetary system prove insurmountable, historians will search back to the time when the trouble began. They will remember passage of the Coinage Act of 1965 and the events of the past few months. But when someone asks, "When was our coin and currency finally debased?" The answer will come back: on October 15, 1969, by the U.S. Congress. If the bill before us passes in its present form, we must be prepared to accept the responsibility for what is almost certain to transpire at some future date.

I realize that it is difficult for the Members of this body to go against the recommendations of the Treasury. Presumably, they are the experts in these matters. But I personally believe that the Department has not earned the right to your allegiance, and I would like to tell you why.

Candor has not been an asset at the Treasury recently. For example, in 1966, one departmental official testified before a Senate committee to the effect that a coin shortage did not exist, nor was one expected. And yet, every single fall since then a shortage has appeared and silver coins were recirculated.

Then, when the weekly GSA sales were authorized, Treasury said these auctions would serve the purpose of stabilizing the silver economy. Yet, we know now that they permitted the metal to be sold at below-market prices, thereby preventing silver producers from pursuing needed exploration. I reiterate what I said a week ago Monday—you simply cannot dump 178 million ounces on the market at a time when consumption is less than 160 million ounces and expect stability.

The Treasury has also said that the silver sales would have to be restricted to domestic users because of the copper strike. But when that dispute had ended, the Department refused to lift the ban for over a year.

Treasury told us that through the sales, the silver would be dispersed among all segments of the economy. But now we find out that 89 percent of all purchases have gone to only 18 companies.

Regardless of whether you feel that the GSA sales were right—regardless of whether you feel they should have been restricted to American users—regardless of how you feel about silver in the first place, surely it must be obvious that Treasury has not been honest about the reasons for the actions taken. Why, then, should we follow them blindly now?

And what is it they are saying?

For one thing, they are saying that the recommendations they make are pursuant to decisions of the Coinage Commission. But the commission specifically left the content of the proposed Eisenhower dollar up to the Congress.

The Treasury is also saying that use of silver in coins will increase the balance-of-payments deficit, because users will then need to import large quantities of the metal. Statistics tell a different story. Between 1964 and 1968, this country exported 135 million ounces more than it imported. Last year alone there was an export surplus of 55 million ounces.

Now, what would the situation be with respect to a cupro-nickel coin? The most recent statistics on lead imports and exports are for 1967. At that time the United States imported 111,463 short tons of lead more than was exported. The situation with respect to copper is the same. In 1968 copper imports exceeded exports by 315,564 tons.

That would seem to end all arguments as far as the balance of payments is concerned. But let us take it one step further and see what effect the weekly sales have already had on this problem. Since the ban on foreign purchases was lifted in May, the GSA sold—through the end of September—28.5 million ounces of silver. Of this, at least 8.7 million ounces are known to have been shipped abroad. Interestingly, a Zurich, Switzerland, newspaper commented in September that the "lively demand" for silver on the London metal market was traced to Soviet buying.

Is this the way to cure our balance-of-payments problem? Of course not. The truth is that no silver shortage exists. And we have that on very good authority, the Bureau of Mines, for instance. Last December, the bureau re-

ported exports of silver exceeded imports in 1967 "as large quantities of Treasury silver stock were shipped abroad."

Then, Handy and Harman, in its year-end review for 1968 commented, "We have continually emphasized that there will be no shortage of silver for future industrial needs, and this has been confirmed by events."

And we also have it on no less an authority that the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, Mr. Paul Eggers himself.

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

Mr. McCLURE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. The important point the gentleman is making is that the Department of the Treasury and the General Services Administration have been leading us down a road that drains the silver out of our stockpile, which we should be using ourselves, and which as a matter of fact went abroad.

Mr. McCLURE. Which is going abroad and will continue to go abroad to the benefit of foreign speculators.

Mr. OLSEN. Then, when the day comes we have to buy silver—

Mr. McCLURE. We will buy it back from those very same speculators at a higher price.

Only 2 weeks ago in hearings on this bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) asked:

Is there a shortage of silver at the present time among those industries that require the use of silver?

And Mr. Eggers responded:

No, there is no shortage right now. They can get the silver they need.

Let those statements put to rest once and for all any questions of a silver shortage or a balance-of-payments problem if we put silver in the Eisenhower dollar.

Next, Treasury is saying that only a cupro-nickel coin will circulate. Well, it is true that collectors will be more attracted to a coin of intrinsic value. That merely illustrates the high esteem in which prestige coins are held. But this is not a legitimate argument, because coin collectors will tell you that it makes no difference what the proposed dollar is composed of—the very fact it is a new issue means that numismatists will grab them up in the beginning.

In this regard, it is equally unfair to point to our experience with the Kennedy half as proof that a silver coin will not circulate. As you may recall, in 1964, 1965, and early 1966, the half contained 90 percent silver. After that, the silver content was reduced to 40 percent, and just as the coin began to circulate, the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee cut the annual authorization to one-third that of previous authorizations—down to only 100 million pieces. A very good case could be made that the coin was sabotaged. Indeed, Treasury officials themselves—in testimony 2 weeks ago before the committee—said that we must have an annual minting of 300 million halves to meet the needs of the marketplace. The scarcity of the Kennedy half was not due to the fact that it

contains silver. It just is not being minted in sufficient numbers to meet the demands.

It is also worth noting a statement made by Mr. Chester Krause, editor of Numismatic News, recently. He said that a couple of years ago Canada decided to switch from a silver dollar to a cupro-nickel coin. Our neighbors to the north have not been successful in getting the new dollar to circulate because the people there have refused to accept a worthless coin.

Another argument advanced by Treasury is that a nonsilver dollar would mean a greater monetary return to the Federal Government. What they conveniently overlook is that we are now proposing the use of silver already owned by the Government, while the lead and copper needed for a cupro-nickel coin would have to be purchased.

At this week's GSA auction, silver was sold for \$1.82 an ounce. If used to mint an Eisenhower dollar, it would monetize at \$3.16 an ounce. In the Kennedy half, the figure would be \$3.38 an ounce.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCLURE. Yes; I will be happy to.

Mr. KLEPPE. First of all I want to say thank you for yielding to me.

I think the gentleman has made a number of very interesting observations on this question. I would like to ask him this question: You just indicated the dollar would monetize at \$3.16 an ounce. Can you tell what the cupronickel dollar monetizes at?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

In answer to the question of the gentleman from North Dakota, I could not tell you the precise figure, but it is roughly 5 cents.

Mr. KLEPPE. Thank you.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, you cannot escape the fact that the American people would receive twice the return—and four times the profit—on the remaining silver if it is used for coinage purposes.

Treasury has a ready answer for this, of course. They say, "Well, what good are the profits if it means the American consumer must pay more for the products he buys?" Well, once this bill has passed, regardless of the form it takes, the uncertainty will have been removed and silver prices will begin to climb. But no realistic person is suggesting that these prices are going to skyrocket out of sight. As the Government's influence lessens, the metal will seek its proper level in the market. I might note in passing that a major photographic firm has been sending you telegrams on how badly it needs the Treasury silver. This same firm, however, has received only 80,000 ounces in the past 6 months, so they hardly are dependent upon it.

It is almost embarrassing to discuss the memory of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy in the same breath with the price of silver, but that is the strategy which Treasury has laid down for this

measure. As far as these Presidents are concerned, I sincerely believe it would be a disservice to their memory if the coins bearing their likenesses were not as prestigious as the men themselves.

Mr. Cliff Minshler of Numismatic News editorialized last week on the need for a currency with the "look and feel of real money" and the "need of a nation to maintain the image of a solid currency." He wrote:

The Treasury certainly cannot argue with the value of a silver coin in accomplishing this mission, as in the recent past its officials have espoused the theory that a monetary system must contain such a coin, by virtue of its insistence that gold must be internationally maintained as a monetary rather than a commodity metal.

It must be remembered that silver remains a magic word when someone is suggesting a base for value. Its maintenance as a part of our coinage system is perhaps a vital consideration in this day of lost values in society. Just as a baby clings to its first blanket, so do Americans seek to cling to the honored traditions of their unquestioned currency of the past.

Those are fine words, indeed. The proponents of the measure before us, however, would have you believe that turning out coins of little value brings in a huge profit. The same argument is made in behalf of printing press currency. They will even try to tell you that non-silver coins constitute a blow against inflation, although Mr. Eggers admitted to the committee that it is the silver coin which is anti-inflationary. To run to a cupro-nickel coin is a confession of weakness used by other nations only in a time of economic distress.

The supposedly sophisticated economists argue that a monetary system of intrinsic worth is unnecessary. They have little faith in the ability of the ordinary people of this country to make the correct decisions, and they therefore justify a benevolent Federal authority over monetary policies. They do not trust the people to make the correct economic decisions because in their view, the people are economically ignorant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes so I can ask a couple of questions.

First of all, you mentioned the export and import of nickel. How much nickel is produced in this country? To my information, none.

Mr. McCLURE. I cannot answer your question at this moment. I do not have the figures with me, Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. WIDNALL. You cited this as an important figure to substantiate action being taken in your behalf. That is true, also, of copper, is it not?

Mr. McCLURE. We import more than we export by the net amount of the figures I have given you. The reason why I bring this up is because it has been argued we will have to import silver if we stop Treasury sales.

The reason I believe this is because I was arguing that we will have to import silver if we stop Treasury sales. And I say to you that we are exporting silver while we are importing these other metals at the present time.

Mr. WIDNALL. What is the total

amount of silver production in this country at the present time?

Mr. McCLURE. It has fluctuated.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is, as against domestic demands for silver?

Mr. McCLURE. It has fluctuated. Our mines produce at the present time in the neighborhood of 40 million ounces a year and consumption has been in the neighborhood of 140 to 160 million ounces a year.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the domestic mining interests can only produce about 20 percent of the needs in the United States?

Mr. McCLURE. At the current price level, this has been true.

Mr. WIDNALL. Would not the usage which you suggest tend to make silver more in short supply?

Mr. McCLURE. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, as any other commodity seeks a price level, so does silver, in response to supply and demand. If the Government stays out of it, you will find the price will stabilize and that the supply and demand will be equal. But as long as the Government policy depresses the price by dumping what has been designated as surplus silver, the price of silver will be depressed to such an extent where they will not produce additional supplies.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that we have put in circulation 1¼ billion Kennedy half dollars since 1966 and you cannot find one of those in commercial circulation today?

Mr. McCLURE. I would say to the gentleman that the figure that has been used and the figure which the gentleman from New Jersey used not only in his letter but in his remarks today is a misleading figure because about 1¼ billion 50-cent pieces include 90 percent silver coins which had been minted prior to 1966.

Mr. BARRETT. Ninety percent and 40 percent.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, this leads to the autocratic decision that the people shall not have coins of worth which can be held in a time of economic uncertainty.

Such reasoning justifies the philosophic inconsistency in the destruction of the last link between gold and our currency, and, at the same time, prohibition of the ownership of gold by our citizens.

It seems to me that all history shows where this course is taking us. No government in the recorded history of mankind has been able to survive philosophical bankruptcy that leads to debasement of the currency. If the American people had been able to participate in some of our basic policies in this field, by their day-to-day decisions, we would not now be fighting the problems of inflation from student loans to housing. The people would have, by their basic and instinctive reactions, dampened the fires fueled by the good intentions—but misdirected excesses—of our economic managers. But

this is heresy in the day of enlightened Government centralism which destroys individual freedom in the name of the common good.

From 1792 until 1965, this country had a tradition of minting silver coins. During this period, the purchasing power of U.S. currency was better sustained than the purchasing power of the currency of any other major nation. This was not pure coincidence. Those countries that were forced to resort entirely to token coins and paper money were the countries in which currencies showed the greatest depreciation in value. Since 1965, we have experienced the greatest period of economic uncertainty in this century, except for the depression.

If we perpetuate this economic fallacy, a day of reckoning is most surely to come upon us. The blame will not go to the Treasury Department or the Coinage Commission or either of the last two administrations. The fault will be laid to the doorstep of the U.S. Congress.

I urge you to reconsider your position on the bill before us and support the amendment to mint an Eisenhower dollar with silver in it—a coin that will more appropriately honor the man it seeks to commemorate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to make a few remarks on H.R. 14127. This is the bill that you and the ranking minority member of your distinguished committee (Mr. WIDNALL) introduced on October 1.

I had the pleasure of testifying on behalf of this bill before the distinguished Banking and Currency Committee on October 3 and here on the floor on October 6.

I am pleased that your committee acted promptly on the bill. I only wish this body had taken the same swift action last week.

I have been fighting for this measure for many years, and I think the time for its passage is long overdue.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the minting of a nonsilver half dollar and a nonsilver dollar. I have long advocated this. I would like at this time to explain why I support H.R. 14127.

On May 12 of this year, the Joint Commission on the Coinage held a very important meeting that was chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy. As you know, this bipartisan Commission has the responsibility of giving advice on silver and coinage problems to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress.

I am currently a member of it and have been since its inception several years ago. As a result of this position, I have studied the problems of silver and coinage very closely.

At this meeting, the Joint Commission on the Coinage recommended, among other things, that silver be taken out of the half dollar and that it be replaced by a nonsilver half dollar and a nonsilver \$1 coin. As a result of this recommendation, the Treasury Department urged prompt enactment of legislation to that effect.

I might add at this point, Mr. Chairman, that these recommendations were not arrived at overnight. They were the result of more than 2 years' work, during which time the silver situation was studied with a fine-tooth comb. Every aspect of the problem was looked into. No table was left unturned.

The result is the bill before us today—H.R. 14127. It has the support of the Joint Commission on the Coinage and the Treasury Department. It embodies recommendations which were reached, as I have said, after long and careful study. And, in view of the silver crisis we are facing, it represents the only sensible and realistic approach to the minting of our coinage.

I think that Secretary Kennedy's statement to the Joint Coinage Commission explains the problem very well. He said:

The first recommendation, for the minting of a nonsilver dollar, is consistent with the conclusions reached by the Commission at its meeting last December. I think the convincing argument here is that despite the minting of some 760 million 40 percent silver half dollars over the past three years, very few of these coins are actually circulating. Even if we were to continue pouring all of our remaining 150 million ounces of surplus silver into the silver half dollar, it is extremely doubtful whether the coin would circulate in any quantity. Moreover, this use of our remaining silver would require a halting of surplus silver sales which would very probably drive the price up excessively and further stimulate the hoarding of these coins. In short, the 40 percent half dollar in our past experience is simply a losing proposition.

That statement, I repeat, was made by the Secretary of the Treasury. You can readily see that it applies to the use of silver in any coin.

I might interject at this point, Mr. Chairman, something that was brought up at the banking and currency hearings. During my testimony, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) asked me how much the Federal Government had lost by minting 40-percent silver half dollars rather than clad half dollars.

I think this is a very important thing to know, and I hope my colleagues will take careful note of it.

The fact is that since 1965, we have minted 790 million 40-percent silver half dollars. It costs 22 cents to mint this coin which means the Government comes out with a 28-cent profit on each one.

It only costs 3 cents to mint a clad coin, so we get a profit of 47 cents per coin.

This means that the Government would make 19 cents more per clad coin than it does on the 40-percent silver coin. Thus, we have lost over \$150 million on the 790 million 40-percent silver half dollars minted since 1965. I repeat—over \$150 million over a 4-year period.

In addition to that, this would have released enough silver to bring in a profit of \$66 million to the Government. So we are talking about a total of some \$215 million.

The point is—and I have said this over and over again both on and off the floor of the House—we are wasting our precious supplies of silver on a coin that does not even circulate, while our do-

mestic industry desperately needs the metal.

I might also interject, Mr. Chairman, that on May 19 I introduced legislation in this area. My bill, H.R. 11404, provided for the minting of a nonsilver \$1 coin bearing the likeness of our late President, Dwight David Eisenhower. This was 1 week after the Joint Coinage Commission meeting.

Several weeks later, my colleague from Idaho (Mr. McCLEURE) and 159 cosponsors, introduced legislation calling for an Eisenhower silver dollar. I opposed this measure then, and in a speech here on the floor on July 15, I explained why I did. I still oppose this measure, and for the same reasons. That is why I am speaking today in support of H.R. 14127.

As you will recall, it was Congress that originally authorized taking silver out of our currency. Under Public Law 89-81, which passed on July 23, 1965, silver was taken out of the dime and the quarter. Unfortunately, it was not taken completely out of the half dollar. The bill as finally enacted only reduced the silver content in the half dollar from 90 percent to 40 percent.

The reason for this action by Congress was clear, and I should know. I fought hard for it, including complete removal of silver from the half dollar, which we lost on. Congress recognized that silver was much too precious and its supplies much too limited to waste on currency.

The situation has not changed. In fact, if anything, it has gotten worse. Silver is even more precious and its supplies even more limited to waste on currency today.

A few figures should put what I am saying in the proper perspective.

For example, since 1964, 276 million ounces of silver have been used in the minting of more than 1 billion half dollars. This amount of silver alone would have been enough to fill the gap between domestic production and consumption for a period of more than 2½ years.

Or to put it another way, the United States used 60 percent more silver in minting the half dollar than the rest of the entire world consumed during 1968 for this purpose.

The fact that the coin would not circulate even at the annual production rate of 300 million coins should be proof that, so long as silver is used, it will not serve as a medium of exchange.

And the mint reduced the production of the 40-percent half dollar to 100 million a year last July. Even at this reduced rate—15 million ounces of silver per year—more silver is consumed in 1 year than is consumed by the domestic photographic industry in 4 months.

In addition, U.S. industry uses about four times the amount of silver produced in this country. Specifically, we produce about 38 million ounces annually and consume about 150 million ounces in the same period.

Thus, foreign silver must be purchased to fill the gap. At 1968-69 prices, this could mean a \$155 to \$256 million per year balance-of-payments deficit. You can well imagine the impact of this deficit upon an already unfavorable balance of payments.

Mr. Chairman, simply stated, a new silver coin would not serve the purpose for which it was intended. It just would not circulate. On the other hand, the clad coins called for by your bill would circulate and would work in our economy. But there are even more reasons that Congress should act upon H.R. 14127.

For example, the Government would make more money on seigniorage by minting nonsilver coins, seigniorage, as you know, is the difference between the face value and the intrinsic value of a coin. I have already shown how this would have worked out in the case of the half dollar. I would now like to clarify this point a little more because there may be some confusion over whether the nonsilver dollar is in fact more profitable than the silver dollar.

The proponents of a 40-percent silver dollar argue that its silver would be worth \$3.16 an ounce. They arrive at this figure by saying that you would have to melt 3.16 dollars to get an ounce of silver because each coin would contain 0.316 ounce.

Now I have followed the silver situation a long time, and I have never computed the value of silver like this. For purposes of discussion, however, I will assume that we do in fact get \$3.16 an ounce.

Thus, it is argued, more money can be made doing this.

This, however, is not the case because it ignores what it costs the Government to mint coins. For example, it would cost 48 cents to mint the 40-percent silver dollar. This means the Treasury would make 52 cents per coin or \$52 million on 100 million coins.

On the other hand, it would cost 5 cents to mint a nonsilver clad dollar. This would give a seigniorage figure of 95 cents per coin or \$95 million on 100 million coins. In addition to that, it would release silver for sale to industry. In fiscal 1968, the profit to the Government from the sale of 98 million ounces was \$55 million.

This would give us a total profit of \$150 million compared to only \$52 million with a silver dollar. I think it is quite clear that the Federal Treasury comes out better with a nonsilver coin.

In addition to what I have already said, we should not overlook the fact that there are only 100 million ounces of silver left in the Treasury reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to clear up another point that critics of H.R. 14127 have raised. They maintain that higher silver prices are a prerequisite to increased new mine production. However, the Bureau of Mines reports show that production is less today than it was in 1950 when the price was \$1.29 per ounce. The fact of the matter is that while the price went up more than 100 percent since 1950, production actually declined. This certainly suggests that higher silver prices, contrary to the arguments of some, do not increase mine production.

On July 7, the Chicago Tribune editorialized about the Treasury recommendation embodied in H.R. 14127 as follows:

Mr. Kennedy's plan is sensible and timely. * * * (It) would give us half-dollars we can use, and the vending machines are starved for them. It might give us back the old cartwheel, * * * even minus its silver. It would increase the profit * * * which the mint makes on its coinage. And nobody can complain that we will be seriously hurt by the proposal * * *.

Even more interesting and somewhat ironical, are the comments of the Denver Post of May 15, the Post ran an editorial entitled "Wrong Time for Silver Oratory." Therein, they came out against the silver dollar because they felt it would not circulate. And I would remind you that Colorado is a great silver-minting State.

Before concluding, I think there is something else we should all keep in mind. The dollar coins in question would bear the likeness of our late President, Dwight David Eisenhower. I am sure that my colleagues would agree with me that this is a fitting tribute to one of our greatest leaders. It would indeed be unfortunate if we failed or even delayed to commemorate him in this manner.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I might mention the letter President Nixon sent to you. In that letter, the President urged prompt congressional action on this bill. The late President's birthday would have been October 14 and President Nixon thought it would be fitting to have an Eisenhower dollar by that time.

Although that no longer is possible, the need for prompt action remains.

Therefore, I would hope for and urge speedy action on H.R. 14127, not only because the silver situation is critical but also because it could provide an appropriate way to commemorate President Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have made my position and my support for H.R. 14127 clear. Thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts does want to point out to our colleagues the amount that the taxpayers have realized in the last year because we did have the foresight to remove silver from the quarters.

Is it not a fact that in the testimony of the Treasury their estimate of the savings to the taxpayers for the next 3 years, if this bill is passed and silver is removed from the coins, would be more than \$1 billion?

Mr. CONTE. I think the figure is fairly close.

We could have made another \$66 million by the silver that would have been released by not having a silver half-dollar. When you add that to the \$150 million more we would have made with a nonsilver coin, you get \$215 million. Then we get into the rest of the half dollars and dollars that we are going to mint. For this reason, I would say it is a very conservative figure.

Mr. REUSS. It has been said here this afternoon that actually if we take silver out of our coinage that this will debase, debase, and degrade our coinage. Is it not a fact that if we do not take silver

out of our coinage the taxpayers, who will have to pay an extra billion dollars for the next year, will be bewitched, bothered, and bewildered because of that?

Mr. CONTE. By all means. And I cannot understand for the life of me how anybody who stands up here on the floor of the House and stands for economy and a balanced budget could be against this bill. If anything, this works for the benefit of the taxpayer, and not against the taxpayer. And with respect to this emotional argument—this great emotional argument that we have been hearing concerning how tragic it would be to put the likeness of the late President Eisenhower on a nonsilver dollar—I just wonder what happened to this Congress in the past when they put the likeness of the greatest President this country has ever had, Abraham Lincoln, on the penny, the lowest denomination, made out of copper, and copper which at that time was not worth very much.

I also would point out that the likeness of another great President, George Washington, the father of this country, is on the 25-cent piece—and there is not a bit of silver in that coin.

And I would further point out that the likeness of even another great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is on the dime and there is not a bit of silver inside the dime. If we pass this legislation today, we will take the silver out of the half dollar, and I think this should be done, and now.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. How about Thomas Jefferson's likeness on the 5-cent piece?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, and Thomas Jefferson on the 5-cent piece which contains no silver. The gentleman is exactly right.

I admire the gentleman from Idaho. He is a fine Congressman, and he deserves to come back here time and time again. But he only has one motive. I do not have enough industries in my district using silver. I became interested in this subject matter because I serve on the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, where we handle the budget of the Bureau of the Mint. I saw what happened after a certain official of the past administration made a speech out in Nevada. At that time we had 1,900,000,000 ounces of silver. That is what started the run on silver. We had 300 million silver dollars, and we could not get rid of those silver dollars.

Let me tell the gentleman from Idaho what they did with those silver dollars. They were collecting dust. They were taking up space in the Treasury. So they decided to get rid of them. They put them on a train and sent them out to the west coast and they paid off Federal employees in silver dollars. Lo and behold, those silver dollars came back here to Washington. They just could not get rid of those silver dollars.

The run on silver started after that key speech that was made in Nevada. After that time, I saw what happened. And for that reason, and that reason alone, I became interested in taking sil-

ver out of the dime, quarter, and half dollar. Unfortunately, we lost the battle on the half. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and I, and some of the others here fought to take all of the silver out of all the coins. But Congress worked its will, and they left 40 percent in the half dollar.

Now I would like to make it clear for the record the reason they did not take it out of the half dollar at that time. It was because on the first proof sets of the dime, quarter, and half dollar there was a red rim around each coin. The red rim on the half dollar, however, was much more pronounced than it was on the dime and the quarter. Because this was the case, somebody said to somebody in high authority that with a campaign coming up, if they put that half dollar out, they are going to call that a red neck half dollar. It is going to work to our detriment politically.

That was the thing. If it were not for them we would have gotten all of the silver out of all the coins.

Getting back to my good friend, the gentleman from Idaho, he only has one interest. He is not worried about the consumer. He is not worried about the photographic industry or the silver users. He is not worried about the electronics industry that desperately needs this silver. He is not worried about the medical profession or the dental profession that desperately needs this silver. He is worried about one thing and one thing alone—and I am not faulting him—and that is to drive the price of silver up as high as he can for his miners. It is just simply a question of supply and demand. Use up all of this silver and the price will go up.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GAIAMO).

Mr. GAIAMO. Mr. Chairman, I think we should bear in mind what we are trying to do here today with this legislation.

I stand here in support of the committee bill. This legislation is not a new idea. This is not something which is coming before us for the first time. This is a logical, final step in the basic policy to which the U.S. Government committed itself some years ago, to get the Government out of the silver business and to get silver out of the coinage of the country.

We have almost done this. We have done it in regard to the smaller coins. We did it several years ago with regard to the Kennedy half dollar when we reduced the silver content to 40 percent. We did it again on another occasion when Congress removed the silver backing from the \$1 bill.

Now at long last we are taking the final step, which is to take the remaining silver out of the Kennedy half dollar. Why are we doing that? You know, traditions die hard. All of us who have studied American history recall the great economic, monetary, and emotional fight over free silver in the days of William Jennings Bryan at the turn of the century. We have heard for years and decades the arguments which the distinguished gentleman from Idaho has made about the importance and necessity of having silver in our coinage.

I submit that today there is no economic or monetary basis to this argument. The health of the economy of the United States does not any longer depend upon the intrinsic silver content in the coinage. What is left is partially an emotional appeal by the silver producing spokesmen, for it is one of the most emotional of all issues which has faced us in America in the last 70 years. Also it is an attempt by the silver producing interests to drive up the price of silver for the producing people, the mines and the miners.

But the fact is that the Government got out of the silver business several years ago when the Federal Treasury stopped pegging the price of silver at \$1.29 by offering it for sale at that fixed price. As a member of the Coinage Commission, I took part in that decision. The price of silver immediately went up on the free market to close to \$2 an ounce.

We are now out of this business of selling silver at a fixed and artificial price. Now we are left with this single proposition before us today; to go the remainder of the way and to take the remaining silver out of the Kennedy half dollar.

Tradition and history tell us that when you have a valuable coin and a nonvaluable coin, the nonvaluable coin drives the more valuable coin out of circulation. Certainly if you try to find the Kennedy half dollar, you will know that you cannot.

There is no need to have silver content in the coin for our usage or to stabilize our economy. Coinage is necessary for the many, many coinage, and convenience usages which the citizenry make of it, and the confidence of the citizenry in the American economy is based upon the soundness of the dollar, not the soundness of the coinage.

The other argument that is made is that you must have a prestige coin, and that we must properly honor a great American, our past President Dwight Eisenhower. People say we must have a prestige coin to honor him. I agree that we should honor President Eisenhower but I do not agree that the commemorative coin must or should have silver in it. The fact that we have had 40-percent silver in the Kennedy half dollar has cost the American taxpayer almost a quarter of a billion dollars, almost \$225 million or more in seigniorage cost and in losses in profits which the Treasury could have made from selling that silver on the open market—at much too high a price to pay for this questionable prestige concept.

Certainly when we speak of honoring great American Presidents the honor is in the love and in the affection which people have for their Presidents, and they show this in many ways. A common one is to put the honoree on postage stamps or on coins—as was said, in the case of Lincoln, on the penny, which certainly is not a valuable coin in intrinsic value, or as in the case of President Washington, President Roosevelt, or others. We will properly honor, as I believe we should, former President Eisenhower with a nonsilver dollar. But there is no lessening in our affection and esteem for our former President in the

fact that we do not put silver into this coin.

We had over 1.5 billion ounces of silver in the Treasury several years ago and we are down to 100 million ounces today. This is a startling enough fact to compel us to understand today that we have got to take this last final step in a long series of steps by the Government, starting with the removal of silver several years ago, with the elimination of the Treasury's policy of pegging the price of silver and with removing silver backing from the dollar certificate. If we do not realize that this last ultimate, logical step is only a completion of that basic Government policy, then we are reversing basic Government policy to get out of the silver business. We will not be completing what we set out to do as governmental policy of this Congress, this administration, the Coinage Commission, as well as the former Congresses. I believe this would be making a most unwise decision.

I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, on July 7, 1969, I introduced legislation that would put the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower on either the quarter or the silver dollar.

Only a handful of American Presidents have been accorded the honor of having their likeness engraved on one of our coins. These men—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Kennedy—had a strength of character and a charisma which enabled them to transcend the turmoil of partisan politics and to become great men from an historical perspective.

Dwight Eisenhower was a man of this same giant stature. Reaching the top of the military hierarchy, General Eisenhower went on to become the 34th President of the United States. His outstanding achievements in both the military and political spheres place Eisenhower in the great tradition of America's soldier-statesmen.

However, General Eisenhower was not only a distinguished statesman and a great military leader; he was also loved and respected by people everywhere with a special fondness that is bestowed on few men in public life. The nickname, "Ike," has become a household word and a term of endearment for millions of people in this country and abroad.

The first bill which I have introduced, H.R. 12614, would place the likeness of General Eisenhower on the quarter. The quarter seemed to be the most logical coin with which to honor the general. Because the Washington quarter has been in circulation for 37 years, no special legislation would be required to change the coin's design. However, I must admit that the second bill which I introduced is the one that really fires my imagination. This bill would necessitate the minting of a special Eisenhower dollar, making it the largest U.S. coin issued and in circulation at the present time.

Recently, there has been a great deal of discussion among Members of Congress concerning whether the Eisenhower dollar should contain silver. I, for one, want an Eisenhower dollar whether it contains silver or not. However, there are several compelling arguments in support of a

silver coin. First, our monetary system should have a reasonable relationship to its precious metal backing. A silver coin would insure such a relationship. Second, the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer would both receive a better return on their money if a silver coin were issued. At the present rate of \$1.88 per ounce, the Government's profit from the sale of silver through the weekly GSA sales amounts to \$46 million. This profit would be increased by an additional \$128 million if coins containing 40-percent silver were issued. Moreover, if we remove the silver from our coins and authorize the Treasury to dispose of its silver assets, we can expect the further deterioration of our already depressed silver market. Finally, it should be pointed out that the issuance of a silver Eisenhower dollar would not interfere with the silver needs of American private enterprise any more than the issuance of a cupronickel coin would interfere with our commercial copper and nickel requirements. In either case, it would be necessary to import these metals from abroad.

When "Ike" died, we did not merely note his passing; we paused to pay full honor. Ordinary and great men alike stood in a line stretching from the Capitol Rotunda to the plains of Kansas to pay tribute to the military leader who created peace and prosperity from war and controversy. I urge that this distinguished body put the likeness of this deeply loved soldier and statesman into the hands of the people who paid that tribute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the major purposes of H.R. 14127, the bill before us now, are very straightforward—to provide for dollar and half dollar coins that will circulate, and to bestow an honor on a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower. The issue has been raised that the dollar coin should contain a minor proportion of silver, that inclusion of some of this metal will do greater honor to the memory of President Eisenhower and that use of silver in the coin makes economic sense. The composition of a U.S. coin neither adds nor detracts from the honor given the person whose likeness it bears. The 1-cent piece, only one-hundredth of a dollar, a coin made mostly of copper, honors Abraham Lincoln. I do not believe that I have ever heard it said that the composition or denomination of the penny diminished the honor to Lincoln. Similarly, the Jefferson nickel, the Roosevelt dime, and Washington quarter are all nonsilver coins, and the Kennedy half dollar will be nonsilver when this bill becomes law. I can only conclude that it is the fact that these are coins of the United States that does honor to these men and it is not the metal from which the coins are minted.

There has also been a good deal of argument that putting silver into the coinage increases the monetary gain to the Government. This argument has a deceptive appeal. It states that if the silver is sold at public auction, as the Treasury does now, the Government gets about \$1.85 an ounce, but if the silver is coined, the Government receives \$3.16 an ounce. Minting 300 million 40-percent

silver-clad dollar coins over 3 years would then give the Government a monetary gain of \$160 million rather than the approximately \$50 million profit which might be gotten through selling the same silver at the GSA auctions. This is true, but it is only half the story. If cupronickel clad dollar coins are minted, it would be possible to still get the \$50 million profit at GSA silver sales and add to that \$290 million from the seigniorage from 300 million nonsilver dollar coins. The result, then, of making a 40-percent silver-clad dollar rather than a cupronickel clad coin is a sacrifice of almost \$200 million.

Forgoing this \$200 million worth of seigniorage and revenue is not the only unfortunate effect of putting silver into coinage, however. We can anticipate that many Americans will want to hold these new Eisenhower dollar coins as mementos and as collectors items. If they are made of 40-percent silver-clad material, our production will be limited by our stock of silver. Our mints will not be able to produce enough coins to satisfy the demand. On the other hand, if the Eisenhower dollar coin is made of cupronickel clad material, we have the capability over time to satisfy any demand no matter how large.

Another sound economic reason for not producing a silver-containing dollar coin is the detrimental effect this action would have on our balance of payments. U.S. business and industry consumes each year more silver by far than is produced by domestic mines. When GSA sells Treasury silver at public auction it means we import that much less silver, and there is a balance-of-payments saving, or, if as in some cases, the silver is exported, there is a balance-of-payments earning. Every ounce of silver put into the coinage is one more ounce added to our net imports of silver.

The silver put into coinage is also not available for use in the manufacture of film, batteries, tableware, and hundreds of other products which American consumers buy. The price of silver will rise if Treasury's silver goes into coins instead of being sold at public auction, and millions of consumers will have to pay higher prices for products containing silver.

But the single most important argument favoring the minting of a nonsilver dollar coin rather than a silver one is that coinage should first and foremost be designed to serve as a medium of exchange. Silver bearing coins will not circulate. This was amply demonstrated by the coin shortage of the mid-1960's and by the fact that in spite of our producing 1 1/4 billion silver half dollars since 1963, only a very small percentage of these coins have circulated. We should not fail to learn from this experience by repeating it. The commercial need for a circulating dollar coin can only be met by a nonsilver coin. This is the recommendation of the Treasury Department's Task Force on Silver, it is the recommendation of the nonpartisan Joint Commission on the Coinage, it is the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, it is the recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it is

the cupronickel clad coin that has been requested by the President. I, therefore, strongly urge that the House adopt the nonsilver dollar by voting for H.R. 14127.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14127

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

SECTION 1. Section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 (31 U.S.C. 391) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 101. The Secretary may coin and issue one dollar pieces, half dollars or 50-cent pieces, quarter dollars or 25-cent pieces, and dimes or 10-cent pieces in such quantities as he may determine to be necessary to meet national needs. Any coin minted under authority of this section shall be a clad coin the weight of whose cladding is not less than 30 per centum of the weight of the entire coin, and which meets the following additional specifications:

"(1) The dollar shall have

"(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the whole coin weighs 22.68 grams.

"(2) The half dollar shall have

"(A) a diameter of 1.205 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the whole coin weighs 11.34 grams.

"(3) The quarter dollar shall have

"(A) a diameter of 0.955 inch;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the weight of the whole coin is 5.67 grams.

"(4) The dime shall have

"(A) a diameter of 0.705 inch;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the weight of the whole coin is 2.268 grams."

SEC. 2. Half dollars as authorized under section 101(a) (1) of the Coinage Act of 1965 as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, continue to be minted until January 1, 1971.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer, as an accountable advance and at their face value, the approximately three million silver dollars now held in the Treasury to the Administrator of General Services. The Administrator is authorized to offer these coins to the public in the manner recommended by the Joint Commission on the Coinage at its meeting on May 12, 1969. The Administrator shall repay the accountable advance in the amount of that face value out of the proceeds of and at the time of the public sale of the silver dollars. Any proceeds received as a result of the public sale in excess of the face value of these coins shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Act of June 24, 1967 (Public Law 90-29; 31 U.S.C. 405a-1 note) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Out of

the proceeds of and at the time of any sale of silver transferred pursuant to this Act, the Treasury Department shall be paid \$1.292929292 for each fine troy ounce."

Sec. 5. Section 3513 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 316) is repealed.

Mr. BARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerning the procedure which will be followed in the amendments offered to this bill. I understand the gentleman's request to be that the bill will be open to amendment at any point. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. McCURE. And that any amendment to any portion of the bill will be in order under the gentleman's request?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

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

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 3, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 101 (a) The Secretary may mint and issue coins of the denominations set forth in subsection (c) in such quantities as he determines to be necessary to meet national needs.

"(b) Any coin minted under authority of this section shall be a clad coin. The cladding shall be an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel, and shall weigh not less than 30 per centum of the weight of the whole coin. The core shall be copper.

"(c) (1) The dollar shall be 1.500 inches in diameter and weigh 22.68 grams.

"(2) The half dollar shall be 1.205 inches in diameter and weigh 11.34 grams.

"(3) The quarter dollar shall be 0.955 inch in diameter and weigh 5.67 grams.

"(4) The dime shall be 0.705 inch in diameter and weigh 2.268 grams."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McCURE

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. McCURE: Page 3, line 14, strike paragraph (1) of section 101(c) and substitute the following:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101(b), the dollar shall be a clad coin the weight of whose cladding is not less than 30 per centum of the entire coin, and which meets the following additional specifications:

"(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of eight hun-

dred parts of silver and two hundred parts copper; and

"(C) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 227]

Abbitt	Fascell	Mikva
Adams	Findley	Mills
Albert	Fisher	Morgan
Arends	Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Fraser	O'Konski
Aspinall	Frey	Ottenger
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Patman
Bingham	Gettys	Pepper
Blackburn	Green, Oreg.	Pickle
Boland	Griffin	Pollock
Bray	Haley	Powell
Brooks	Harrington	Quile
Broomfield	Harsha	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hastings	Reifel
Burton, Calif.	Hays	Riegle
Button	Hébert	Rivers
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Rodino
Cahill	Hosmer	Rosenthal
Camp	Howard	Roybal
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Saylor
Cederberg	Kirwan	Scheuer
Chisholm	Koch	Sisk
Clark	Kyros	Slack
Cohelan	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Latta	Steed
Conyers	Lipscomb	Taylor
Corman	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Lowenstein	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Lujan	Tunney
Dennis	McCloskey	Van Derlin
Devine	McKneally	Waldie
Diggs	McMillan	Whalley
Dingell	Mailliard	Whitehurst
Eckhardt	Martin	Wold
Edmondson	Meeds	Wolff
Edwards, Calif.	Michel	Wright
Farbstein		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MATSUNAGA, 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. 14127, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 319 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order of no quorum was made and sustained, the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) had been reported.

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) is now recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are now at the point where we are going to make one or two of the basic decisions concerning the monetary system of this country, decisions which are so essential to the strength and stability of the fiscal situation in our country. I would like to read the last portion of the testimony which I had given before this body in general debate with respect to the basic issue which I think is involved

here. There will be a number of people who will say, as they have said before, that my interest and my concern is self-serving and that I serve only those people who within my district in Idaho are producers of silver.

I would say to the Members there are fewer than 20,000 people in Idaho involved in the production of silver, out of a total of 400,000 people in my district. Most of those people vote for the Democrats and not for me, so the reason I am supporting this is not for political purposes to enhance my strength in my district, but I think I am speaking not only for those 20,000 people, but for the 200 million American taxpayers who are now being cheated every day by decisions of this country on the sale of silver, the sale at less than monetary value of that silver.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that reason I have offered this amendment to put back into the coinage a silver coin. This bill before us comprises three things.

The first is to authorize a dollar without any silver. This amendment would reestablish a silver dollar of 40-percent silver or exactly the same composition as the Kennedy half which has been minted as authorized by the Coinage Act of 1965. This will gain for the taxpayers of this country \$3.16 an ounce for silver, which is now being sold for less than \$1.85 an ounce. It will more than double the return for the silver being sold by the Treasury, and it will be four times as much profit for the Treasury as the present sales of silver.

Let me conclude by saying only this. The supposedly sophisticated economists argue a monetary system of intrinsic worth is unnecessary. They have little faith in the ability of the people of this country to make the correct decision. They do not trust the people to make the correct economic decisions because in their view the people are economically ignorant.

This leads to the autocratic decision that the people shall not have coins of worth which can be held in a time of economic uncertainty. Such reasoning justifies the philosophic inconsistency in the destruction of the last link between gold and our currency, and at the same time prohibition of the ownership of gold by our citizens.

It seems to me all history shows where this course is taking us. No government in recorded history of mankind has been able to survive the philosophic bankruptcy that leads to debasement of the currency. If the American people had been free and able to participate in some of their basic policies in this field by their day-to-day decisions, we would not now be fighting the problems of inflation from student loans to housing.

The people would have by their basic and instinctive reactions dampened the fires fueled by the good intentions but misdirected excesses of our economic managers.

For this reason I offer this amendment and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the

gentleman from Idaho, I am advised that in the other body earlier this afternoon an amendment of similar import to that of the gentleman from Idaho, authored by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) was adopted by a vote of 40 to 21. Is that information correct?

Mr. McCURE. That is correct.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The substance of the amendment, if not the exact terminology, is identical with that offered in the other body and adopted, as offered by Senator DOMINICK?

Mr. McCURE. This is a blanket authorization to the Treasury directing them to mint a 40-percent silver dollar. The amendment in the Senate was limited to the available silver supply now held by the Treasury.

Mr. MACGREGOR. But it embodied the same silver dollar?

Mr. McCURE. The same piece in size, content, and weight.

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

Mr. McCURE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROTZMAN. First I should like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Idaho for doing something for the American people in a very vital way.

I happen to agree with what the gentleman said. This is not a parochial decision. It does not concern a very few people. If Members doubt my word, they can ask those whom they represent if they are not getting a little tired of "funny money" and if they do not want a coin of intrinsic value.

I say, in addition, if we are going to issue a commemorative coin in memory of our late departed President Eisenhower we ought to do something real. On July 10, 1969, I joined 145 other Members of this body in introducing a bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late President Eisenhower.

I had two reasons for introducing such a bill.

First, I could think of no finer tribute to a great American soldier-statesman than to memorialize him on the most prestigious of U.S. coins: the silver dollar. In expressing her pleasure that Members of Congress had chosen to honor her husband in this manner, Mrs. Eisenhower said:

As I recall he often used silver dollars as a little memento to give to children and young people who visited his office after he left the Presidency. He made a special effort to secure some minted in the year of his birth, and I still have some that he kept in his desk drawer.

If this coin is to be truly prestigious, it is imperative that it be minted with a 40-percent silver content.

There is also a second, purely economic reason for making the Eisenhower dollar a silver dollar. At the present time, the Treasury is committed to selling the Nation's nonstrategic silver reserves.

At the current price of about \$1.88 an ounce, the Treasury can expect to receive a profit of \$46 million. If, however, the silver is monetized, the Treasury will realize \$3.16 an ounce, for an additional

profit of \$128 million. It is true that non-silver coins can be minted at an even lower cost, and it may be that Congress will want to mint such coins once our present stockpiles have been depleted. However, that is a different question. The instant question is: How do we obtain the best possible return from the silver already owned by the Government.

Gentlemen, we are in a very enviable position. We can authorize by acting favorably on this amendment, a prestigious memento of President Eisenhower which is within the means of all Americans to purchase, and, at the same time, add to the profit the Treasury will receive from depletion of its silver stockpiles.

For the same reasons I had in mind when I introduced the Eisenhower silver dollar bill, I now urge a favorable vote on the amendment before the House.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Members here talk about economy and economizing and lessening inflationary conditions. It will put into the Treasury moneys that are greatly needed. It will reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by \$150 million.

As was pointed out earlier in this debate, all of the great Presidents, including the great President Lincoln, whose image is on copper, have been commemorated on coins.

Certainly this does not diminish the status of a great President. We will put these coins, all metal coins, into circulation.

The Kennedy half dollar has not been in circulation since it has been minted, with a percentage of silver. When we put silver into the coins, not only do people hoard them, but also they take them and smelt them. If we put the coins, as proposed by this bill, into circulation we feel it will do two things; it will stop people from taking the silver out of the coins by smelting, and it will provide the merchants of this country a supply of half dollars to be put into circulation.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is this amendment not just another example of a program of a silver-State Congressman, going on now for generations, to try to increase the demand for their product?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad that the gentleman brought that question up, because I believe there is a great deal of truth to the observation made by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Are you aware of the fact that when the coinage was initially established in the United States—and I am a representative from Utah, and I do not know whether that makes it a silver State or not—90 percent of the coinage was silver and it was based on the fact that there should be

an intrinsic value in a coin that was produced. This was initiated by Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. BARRETT. I greatly appreciate that.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman knows a little bit about the history of our coinage, and I am sure he knows for generations we had a full-bodied coinage every time the price of silver went up people melted down the coins, and for a long time before the Civil War we had no American silver coins. The circulation of coins consisted of Spanish coins and coins of many other countries of the world. We had to debase the coinage in order to get American money to circulate.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Professor Long, if you will keep that microphone—

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman's words should be taken down. He called me "professor."

Mr. BURTON of Utah. The intrinsic value of the coin was based on the metal. Is that not right?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Even a full-bodied coin has no fixed intrinsic value, because its value will fluctuate depending on the market price of the metal.

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

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEPHENS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. You do realize this is an administration bill. The White House wants this legislation.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. Chairman, when we took away the silver backing from the dollar, it was said that we were destroying our monetary system. When we took silver out of dimes and quarters and dropped it down in the half dollar, it was said that we were destroying our monetary system. Ever since these actions, however, I have never had anyone to whom I tendered a bill or a coin who refused to take it. Of course, the reason is our bills and coins have value based on the soundness of the United States and not on the intrinsic worth of the medium of exchange.

In the instant case I feel that the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency is to provide to the House a bill which offers the people of America a medium of exchange in denominations of half dollars and dollar coins. The duty of the House, I believe, is to decide if the committee bill would do that, and I think it does. The clear facts show that coins with silver are not providing Americans with a medium of exchange in half dollars and \$1 coins.

I repeat that we are not providing the American people with a medium of exchange in half dollars and dollars. For example, Mr. Chairman, we have minted 1½ billion Kennedy half dollars and you do not see any in circulation today.

This is the same result as would come

from not minting these denominations at all, of course, thereby we could save a lot of money. However, the public needs these denominations and we have got to issue them. So, the only logical course is that we must provide a medium of exchange in these denominations of coins and we must delete the silver contained in them in order to continue them in circulation. That is why I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not presume upon the time of the Committee by repeating these arguments on any of the other amendments, but I ask the Committee sincerely to oppose this amendment so we can provide the American people with half dollars and dollars as a medium of exchange.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. When this bill came up under a suspension of the rules it carried by 205 yeas to 148 nays and there were 78 not voting. Therefore, it carried substantially.

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

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I am not too conversant with this subject but I am curious about the argument as I understand it against putting silver into dollars and that argument is that there would be a tendency on the part of some speculators to smelt the dollars down and take the silver content out of them.

However, the question in my mind is this: What will be the intrinsic value of the dollar as now proposed and how would we put 40 percent of silver in the dollar.

Mr. STEPHENS. The amendment would put 40 percent of silver in the dollar.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, 40 percent, but in dollars and cents could the gentleman give us some idea as to what the intrinsic value would be?

Mr. STEPHENS. No; I do not know the answer, but just let me say one thing and I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for a reply.

The point is not primarily directed at any operations on the part of speculators in making money on this. My feeling is this: the American public has taken the silver coins off the market and put them in the bureau drawer. I have a few myself, I have a friend who has a standing offer to anyone who will bring him a coin with silver in it and he will purchase it from them at 10-percent profit to them. However, I am talking about the American public and its need for this as a medium of exchange—not any special group or other interest.

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

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. In answer to that question, I would point out that the intrinsic value of silver in the half varies with the market price of silver if you use that

figure or remains constant if you use Government seigniorage figures. Assuming the price of silver were \$1.80 an ounce—it is in fact about \$1.82 this week—the intrinsic value in each half is 27 cents. You arrive at that by multiplying .15 ounce, the amount in each coin, times the price per ounce.

The Government seigniorage figure, as I said, remains constant based on a price of \$1.29 per ounce. This would give you an intrinsic value of somewhere between 19 and 20 cents.

The real issue, however, is what it costs to mint these halves. It costs 22 cents to mint each one so that we make a profit of 28 cents. It would cost 48 cents to mint the proposed 40-percent silver dollar.

On the other hand, it only costs 3 cents to mint a cupronickel-clad half dollar, which means a profit of 47 cents. Likewise, it costs 5 cents to mint a cupronickel-clad dollar, which means a profit of 95 cents.

As I pointed out in great detail earlier today, this means we lost \$215 million on the 40-percent halves already minted. It also means we lose nearly \$20 million each year on these halves, without taking into account the silver that would be released for sale.

By the same token, we would lose some \$43 million a year on the dollar, and when you consider silver sales with the released silver, the figure reaches some \$100 million.

The point I would like to make again is that it is both practical and economical for the Mint to manufacture a nonsilver dollar coin. It would be entirely possible to produce this coin, of the same material now in the dime and quarter, at a level which could increase the Government's annual seigniorage revenue by as much as \$300 million. Besides, there has been an increasing demand for higher priced items and services dispensed by vending machines.

With reference to the other point about Alexander Hamilton, that was about 200 years ago. Times have changed. There was a time when people on the floor here today who are trying to dry up silver and force the consumer to pay a higher price, once pushed the Government to buy 3 billion ounces of silver above the market price.

Mr. STEPHENS. I might point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that back then Alexander Hamilton did not have a credit card.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McClure). In my remarks in the general debate, I tried to cover the points that he has raised in his speech on behalf of his amendment. I know that there are two sides to every issue, just as there are to every coin—but the other side of the coin in this issue is that the silver interests in this country already have a market for their commodity which they cannot begin to satisfy. We do not produce as much silver in this country each year as the photographic industry alone uses.

If the wheat farmers of this country had as big and readymade a market for

every ounce of their product as the silver producers do, we would not need any price support program for wheat, which would be selling at a price probably about double the parity price.

I said earlier that it was probably a good thing that the silver bloc for generations forced the Treasury of the United States, through legislation enacted by the Congress many years ago, to purchase, at a price well above the market level, all of the silver produced by American mining interests. The silver bloc forced us to accumulate vast quantities of silver for which there seemed to be no market need. They did us a great favor. I am sure they never realized at the time that they were fortifying us in the 1960's for a great shortage of silver for industrial uses. We can thank them for what, in retrospect, turns out to have been enlightened self-interest by the United States, but which at the time looked to be a very selfish raid on the U.S. Treasury.

I have heard no arguments today that people will not spend our coins if there is no silver in them. This has not deterred anyone from accepting and spending pennies, nickels, dimes, and quarters which contain no silver. They are accepted by anyone who has anything to sell. The same thing can be anticipated for the half dollars and the dollar coins minted under this legislation, if the McClure amendment is defeated. No one is going to turn down a cupronickel half dollar or a cupronickel dollar coin because there is no silver in it. These coins will be legal tender.

The only reason this amendment is being put forward—there are many arguments, but the only reason—is to speed the day when the price of silver on the market will rise. If the silver mining interest in this country need Government subsidies, let them come in here and ask for subsidies; the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will certainly listen to any arguments they have to justify subsidies to the silver mines. But you are asking all of the people of the United States, through their taxes and through the prices they pay for consumer goods, to use up in the coinage of coins which will never circulate silver which could be used for industrial purposes, in order to speed the day when supply and demand will force the price of silver to a much higher level.

If anyone thinks that the minting of a half dollar coin without silver in it will insult the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, you need only look to the committee which sponsored the legislation placing John F. Kennedy's likeness on the half dollar to see that we have almost unanimously endorsed this legislation. If anyone thinks that the minting of a dollar coin bearing the late Dwight D. Eisenhower's likeness, but without any silver in it, would be an insult to the memory of President Eisenhower, I might point out that numerous Members of Congress from the Republican side introduced legislation earlier in this session to remove George Washington's likeness from the 25-cent piece and substitute the likeness of President Eisenhower. The quarter does not contain any silver and the fact that it does

not has never been considered an insult to George Washington. We do not think that the 5-cent coin demeans President Thomas Jefferson or the 10-cent coin Franklin D. Roosevelt, and certainly no one considers the lowly copper coin bearing Lincoln's likeness as an insult to that great man.

The purpose of the coinage is to assure adequate supplies of a vital instrument of commerce, a medium of exchange. This amendment seeks to make jewelry for keepsakes out of our two largest denominations of coins—the half dollar and the dollar. This is an amendment to provide for the striking of a commemorative coin—something we have avoided doing in the Congress for many years.

In the hearings on this legislation I asked representatives of the Treasury if they felt the time had arrived when we could consider or should consider the resumption of the minting of commemorative coins. The answer was that the Treasury opposes the issuance of commemorative coins and supports instead the striking of commemorative medals. There are John F. Kennedy medals and Dwight D. Eisenhower medals available for sale to the public by the mint and they are handsome mementos of two of our great men. If anyone wants a beautiful, shiny, attractive, sculptured likeness of either of those former Presidents, they are available in medal form from the mint at a reasonable price. But in the guise of arranging for the coinage of the United States, let us not adopt an amendment intended to keep coins out of circulation instead of getting them into circulation.

When the cupronickel coins appear, I am sure many Americans will want to have one as a good luck pocketpiece—but one that they can spend if they have to. But while they are saving these pocketpieces for good luck or whatever, the Treasury can go on minting an indefinite, unlimited amount of additional coins to meet the needs of commerce. That would not be true if this coin contained silver. I oppose this amendment and ask that it be defeated.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman on the position she has taken, I join her in opposing the amendment.

I would like to point out that a coin of 40 percent silver is certainly a long way from providing what you might call intrinsic worth. It would not any more support the value of a dollar than a pillar would which was 40 percent of the height of that ceiling, would support that ceiling.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to comment on something that I believe I should call to the attention of the Committee. The statement has been made that we have

passed laws making "phony" money. When we passed earlier legislation taking out silver, it was by the Democrats. Now, this proposal is from the Republican administration. Therefore, if these similar pieces of legislation were creating "phony" money, then it will have been done by both Democrats and Republicans.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho.

I have followed closely the deliberations of the Committee on Banking and Currency on H.R. 14127, and I want to commend the committee for reaching the conclusions it reached.

First of all, I can think of no American statesman who, more than Dwight David Eisenhower, deserves to be honored in this way. The minting of an Eisenhower dollar coin is surely an appropriate tribute for this Nation to pay this man who served it so long and so well in so many different ways.

I cannot agree with those who measure the value of this tribute to the late President and general in terms of the metal content of the coin itself. Certainly, it would be nice to mint a silver Eisenhower coin, and perhaps even nicer to mint a gold dollar coin. But in the present economic context of our supply of silver, a silver coin is almost as impractical to consider as a gold one.

Last week, each of our colleagues received a very well expressed and well-reasoned letter from the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I could not find more appropriate words than his to explain the problems surrounding the silver-nonsilver issue raised by the McClure amendment:

There are solid reasons why it would be most unwise to use our remaining surplus silver for minting a single coin. Let me list a few reasons why I think a cupro-nickel dollar coin rather than one made of silver is in the public interest.

First, a nonsilver dollar coin would mean a far greater monetary return to the Federal Government than a silver coin. The Treasury has estimated that the total seigniorage and revenue under the provisions of H.R. 14127 in the first year after enactment could exceed \$500 million. This income would reduce the Government's borrowing needs by an equivalent amount and contribute substantially to the fight against inflation.

Moreover, the annual industrial consumption of silver of about 150 million ounces is more than three times domestic production. Consequently if the Treasury's remaining silver surplus is used for coinage rather than sold under competitive bids, American industry will have to greatly step up its imports to fill this gap. The resulting adverse effects on the balance of payments next year could be as much as \$150 million.

Thirdly, using our surplus silver for dollar coins would almost certainly mean higher prices for major consumer products containing silver. This would mean higher costs to millions of consumers of film and electrical products which are the principle industrial uses of silver. It should be realized that the ultimate users of silver include virtually the entire American public.

There is another compelling issue here which would defeat the logic of this amendment. The basic purpose of this legislation is to provide for the coinage of a dollar and half dollar which would serve the public for use in commerce. It is not our purpose here to mint coins that will serve mainly as collectors items.

Our experience with the silver John F. Kennedy half dollar has been that it is rarely found in circulation, but rather, it generated so much numismatic interest as to be hoarded and treasured by millions of Americans. It is wonderful for our citizens to honor great Americans in this way—to collect and save coinage which bears their image—but this cannot be the principal purpose of coining money.

A dollar coin made of silver would follow the same path as the silver half dollar. It would be a rare occasion when one could be found in a supermarket cashdrawer.

This factor alone is to me a compelling reason for minting nonsilver dollars.

One further word, Mr. Chairman. The bill now before us has had the full support of the Treasury Department and the President. I believe that our distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency has acted judiciously in reporting the bill in its present form to the floor, and I believe we should endorse their judgment by defeating this amendment, and enacting the committee language of H.R. 14127.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland, if I may, to yield to me for a question.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland would repeat the statement again about the "40-percent pillar," because I was very impressed with that.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I was just remarking—

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Would the gentleman do it again?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I was just remarking that the gentleman argued that there was not any intrinsic value—

Mr. BURTON of Utah. No; Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about what I argued about. I want to hear what the gentleman said about the "pillar."

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am simply saying that when you put 40 percent of the value of a coin in silver it cannot provide the intrinsic value of the coin because it would not hold up the value of the coin any more than a pillar which is 40 percent the height of that ceiling can hold up the ceiling.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, how did the gentleman from Maryland vote on the 40-percent silver half dollar Kennedy coin?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I beg your pardon?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. How did the gentleman vote on that?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I do not even know how I voted on it.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Well, I think that is a convenient lapse of memory.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. No; I genuinely do not remember. I do not even know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I think I know how the gentleman voted.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might try to limit the time on this amendment?

How many desire to speak on this amendment?

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that all time on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30.

That would be 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman. I think that would be sufficient time. It is 20 minutes after 5 now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is making a unanimous-consent request in that regard?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right; all time would expire on this amendment and all amendments thereto at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The request relates to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), or to all amendments?

Mr. BARRETT. To the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman make that a total of 10 minutes?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; I will be glad to make it a total of 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, 10 minutes on what?

Mr. BARRETT. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. On the McClure amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the McClure amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that at the present time the Treasury Department is producing no dollar coins. The conditions today are entirely different than they were at the time when silver was going into our coins. The fact of the matter is that today the demand for silver far exceeds the supply of silver.

Of course, silver is in demand in certain industries such as the film industry and the electronics industry and we must see that these industries obtain the silver they need.

If we are going to insist on 40 percent silver in the dollar coin, we will not have any dollar coins at all because the supply of silver will not permit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent a silver State, yet I will be against this latest effort to make all of our money out of scrap metal. Why, oh why, can we not at least memorialize a great President like General Eisenhower with a dollar that has some intrinsic value?

While I have never followed blindly the lead of the other body of the Congress—it seems to me in the matter we are considering they have taken the wisest course. I understand they recently voted by a vote of 40 to 21 to use all of the silver we have on hand to memorialize a great hero and a great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Why does the House not at least agree to such a course?

For a country that sells its silver abroad why can we not retain enough silver to honor a great man by the issuance of a prestige dollar—not a phony dollar?

If we are determined to debase and debauch our courage—let us never go so far as to mint a fake coin of scrap metal in honor of a distinguished American who deserves commemoration by the issuance of a real dollar worth something because of its silver content.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be granted to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I think we should emphasize the fact that this bill is supported by the President of the United States.

It is supported by the present administration and it is supported by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is supported by the Coinage Commission. It was supported by the former administration.

Mr. Chairman, the only objection to this legislation comes from the silver-producing States, and it has been coming from those States for well nigh on to 70 years.

But the times have changed—the times have changed. There is not sufficient silver available for our usages in this country. The needs for silver are greater now than they ever were and not for usage in coins.

Silver is needed in our industries. It is needed for our medical functions. It is needed in our space activities. Silver is needed in our electronics industry and in many other income-producing and job-producing activities.

We have seen our silver stock depleted in the Treasury from 1,500,000,000 ounces in less than 5 or 6 years to less than 100,000,000 ounces.

If you support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho, if you continue to keep silver in our coins—if you put silver in a new dollar, the Eisenhower coin, you are going to be faced ultimately with the fact that the remaining 100,000,000 ounces of silver in the hands of the Treasury will be gone. Then what

will we do—compel the Government to go out and buy silver on the open market at its inflated, high prices that it has reached since the U.S. Government stopped selling it at \$1.29 an ounce?

Are we going to be competing with other users of silver for the purpose of putting it in coins—coins which I submit will not be put in circulation—coins which will be stored and kept by collectors and others—and coins which will not serve their function—that is to have coinage in circulation for the convenience of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. RUTH).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RUTH yielded his time to Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Treasury, through their general counsel, appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency endorsing the substance of this legislation.

The White House, through its spokesman, endorsed this legislation. I have a letter from the President of the United States indicating his support for this particular bill. I strongly urge that the committee bill be approved without change.

Let me be quite frank. I think the facts are very evident to anyone who takes a close look at what the silver situation is. If this bill is approved as it is, there will be a coin with the portrait of President Eisenhower on it available for circulation. If this bill is amended as recommended by this amendment, the net effect would be that there will be no Eisenhower dollar produced for circulation. It is just that cut and dried.

If we want a coin for circulation with President Eisenhower's portrait on it, the bill as recommended by the committee should be approved and not amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) is recognized.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, this debate is a little like the story of the boy who was given a piece of pie, and on eating it said:

My, that isn't fit for anything but eatin'.

Some of my colleagues are objecting because our coins are not fit for anything but spending. What is so bad about that? It seems to me that is what a money system is all about. Why does prestige hinge on silver in the dollar? I do not think that old Abe has been hurt because his picture is on the copper penny. His memory has unfailingly been maintained as a great President and one of the world's greatest statesmen.

I suggest that we cease supporting an artificial price of silver to help the silver miners when they do not need our help any more. We have paid tremendously for having the silver States in our Union. I think we have paid them enough. I suggest that we now coin money for its real purpose, which is to move goods and services. That is what this bill does, and I urge its support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE) is recognized.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, from 1792 up until 1865 our coinage had real value. From 1792 to 1853 it was 100 percent in its value. Because of minor fluctuations in market values, it was difficult to keep the coinage in circulation. So in 1853 our Government decided to reduce it to 90 percent in order to get away from that particular problem. From that time until 1965 it had 90 percent of face value. That was its purpose. That was the aim of our coinage.

Does it not seem more than passing strange, somehow more than coincidence, that our major problem with the stability of the monetary system of this country has occurred only since we have removed the backing of gold from behind our coinage and in the intrinsic value of our coinage? Why is it that since 1965 we have had greater problems with inflation than ever before? I say this is the time to reverse that trend.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) is recognized.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy once said:

The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive and unrealistic.

The myth we face today is that there should be some place for silver in our monetary system. The reality is that we have a silver shortage. If we can accept \$10 bills, \$100 bills, \$1,000 bills, with no more intrinsic value than paper, certainly we can have fractional currency—nickels, dimes, and so forth—without so-called intrinsic value. The reality of the matter is that we do need a metallic system that will work in our telephone booths and in our vending machines and in our parking meters. That is the only reality, and the Banking and Currency Committee has recommended reality to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We debated this bill at great length today. I think we covered the waterfront, but if the gentleman from Idaho is interested in having a coin with intrinsic value, why does he choose the proposed Eisenhower dollar? As I mentioned before on the floor, that on one occasion before we had this tremendous rush on silver, the Treasury Department tried to get rid of 300 million of the silver dollars and shipped them west and paid off the Federal employees on the west coast with the silver dollars. In no time at all, the dollars were back here in the Treasury. No one wanted the silver dollars.

There are only a few States that want the dollar coins, such as Nevada, Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming—some of the Western States. They are the only ones which really want these coins of silver.

So if the gentleman is interested in a coin with intrinsic value, why not pick a coin that really circulates as a medium of exchange, like the penny, nickel, dime, quarter, or half dollar?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say there has been reference to our past history and the fact that silver was fully in our coinage for many, many years. It was accepted as a fine program, and it provided stability all the way through. But today we have two hundred million people—with vast needs in the economy. Present domestic silver production cannot supply our needs. If we were still operating today in the same way as we were operating years ago, we could go back and buy Manhattan Island for a case of whiskey.

With 40 percent silver in these coins, as provided in the amendment we would be giving a rich reward to the speculators in silver futures in the United States and also giving a rich reward to the producers of silver, giving them a handsome additional profit out of their mining of silver.

If we were to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman, the existing supply of silver held by the United States would be used up in 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McClure).

Mr. McClure. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McClure and Mr. Barrett.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 92.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLURE

Mr. McClure. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. McClure: Page 3, immediately after line 21, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the preceding, commencing January 1, 1970, the Secretary shall coin and issue no less than one hundred million silver dollar coins annually until three hundred million of these dollars have been coined. These silver dollars shall bear the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower and shall be a clad coin the weight of whose cladding is not less than 30 percent of the weight of the entire coin, and which needs the following additional specifications:

- "(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;
- "(B) a cladding of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts of copper; and
- "(C) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper."

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

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

Mr. McClure. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Barrett. Is this not the same type of amendment the gentleman now is offering on the dollar which was just

defeated as to the half dollar? The gentleman is asking for 40-percent silver in this dollar.

Mr. McClure. Mr. Chairman, I might respond to the gentleman in this manner: The amendment I have offered and which was just defeated provided for the minting of a 40-percent silver dollar without limit to the number. This amendment limits the number of such coins to be minted.

Mr. Barrett. But it would be a 40-percent silver dollar?

Mr. McClure. That is correct.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment, following the first one, which would have authorized the continuation of the minting of a 40-percent silver Kennedy half dollar.

In view of the action that this House has just taken on the teller vote, I decided that that was futile. So I am asking here to mint 40-percent silver dollars to the extent silver is now on hand in the Treasury and available for this use, to get away from the possibility that indeed the Treasury might have to go out in the market and buy some silver at a higher price, which they have recently sold at a price that is much too low. Also I might indicate to you this is almost precisely the action that passed in the other body today by a vote of 40 to 21. They have authorized the minting of silver dollars containing 40 percent silver with the likeness of Eisenhower to the extent of the silver available. I say to you that is approximately 300 million pieces. This does not disturb the provision of the bill as presented by the committee for the authorization and minting of a cupro-nickel dollar as well. The Treasury could, if they desired, at the same time that they were minting the silver Eisenhower dollar, also be minting a cupro-nickel dollar with his likeness or do it sequentially, whichever they preferred to do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think while it is very similar to the last amendment, it is limited in its effect and limited to the amount of silver that the taxpayers of this country—the taxpayers of this country today—own and which is being sold by the Treasury Department not to the benefit of the taxpayers but for the benefit of a few users of silver who desire to continue to have a depressed and artificial price of silver in the market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Barrett. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman I merely want to point out that the Members have had a long-drawn-out session last night and today. I am quite sure they are tired and I think we ought to terminate this.

I want to pay my commendations to the gentleman who is offering this amendment. It is good legislative maneuvering, but it is identically the same thing as we just defeated better than 2 to 1.

I ask for an immediate vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McClure).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McClure) there were—ayes 45, noes 73.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 5. Section 3513 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 316) and the first section of the Act of February 28, 1878 (20 Stat. 25; 31 U.S.C. 316, 458), are repealed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, following line 5, add the following new section at the end:

"Sec. 6. The dollars initially minted under authority of section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 shall bear the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower."

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mr. Casey. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Casey. Mr. Chairman, is the amendment which I have at the desk now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's amendment an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. Casey. Well, it is to add to section 6; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman is offering this as an amendment to the committee amendment, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Casey: Page 5, line 9, after "Eisenhower", strike out the period and add "on one side and on the other side thereof the inscription 'We Came in Peace for All Mankind' and the official design prescribed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as emblematic of the Apollo 11 flight."

Mr. Casey. Now, Mr. Chairman, this proposed coin would bear the likeness on one side, if the committee amendment is adopted, and I am sure it will be, of the late President Eisenhower.

Now, I have not checked a silver dollar in a good while, but my recollection is that most of them have the eagle on the other side of it. Of course, that is traditional, because the eagle is the symbol of our great country.

My amendment will not get away from that tradition, the tradition of the great American eagle.

Mr. Chairman, if you walk down the street nowadays and ask someone what happened on July 21 of this year, somebody will say, "Well, I got a new car," and someone else will say, "It was my

daughter's birthday." In fact, Mr. Chairman, their memory gets a little short.

July 21 of this year was the day on which one of the greatest accomplishments in history took place. The "Eagle" landed at Tranquillity Base. The eagle—the good old American eagle, landed on Tranquillity Base.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes that on the reverse side of this coin we place the American eagle, the symbol of the greatest accomplishment that man has ever made—reaching the moon. The space program started under President Eisenhower. So it is very symbolic and it should be on the other side of this coin.

Some will say that we are trying to make this a commemorative coin. We are going to make billions of these. They want it to be in circulation. They say that is why no silver is in it. Let us put it in circulation and keep all our people reminded of this accomplishment we have made, remind them that the American people were the first to land a man on the moon. So I urge you to support this amendment. If we can tell them to put President Eisenhower's picture on there, we can tell them to put this symbol.

If any of the Members wish to take a closer look at what I am suggesting there is a picture of one at the Democrat desk, and one at the Republican desk. It is very appropriate, and I think it would be helpful.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, there are certain requirements of law for the design of our coinage. Each coin must contain on the reverse a figure or a representation of an eagle with the inscription "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum," and a description of the value of the coin. There is no reason why the Apollo 11 eagle could not be used. The Presidential seal bearing an eagle was used on the Kennedy half dollar.

The Congress does not have to decide on the actual design, and I do not believe that we should try to specify the full design. The reverse side of the coin would be very crowded if, in addition to the various inscriptions already required by law, you put on it the additional inscriptions called for in your amendment.

Would the gentleman possibly accept an amendment to his amendment to propose that the reverse of the coin be based on the motif of the Apollo 11 flight emblem, so that the designer could have some leeway?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for the suggestion since the gentleman is so well versed in the laws that are applicable to our coinage, and I would certainly consider and appreciate her contribution because I think we should direct them in some manner, and that was the purpose of my amendment.

I will be glad to accept such an amendment if the gentleman has it drafted. I will be glad to accept it as a substitute.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I have is this suggested language as a substitute:

And on the other side thereof, a design which is emblematic of the symbolic eagle of Apollo 11 landing on the moon.

Mr. CASEY. I will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentlewoman from Missouri prepared to offer the exact language of the substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN FOR THE AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN in the form of a substitute for the Casey amendment to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 9, insert "and on the other side thereof, a design which is emblematic of the symbolic eagle of Apollo 11 landing on the moon."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not require the full 5 minutes. I believe that I have explained that this substitute does give the designer leeway in the symbol to be placed on the reverse side of the coin, if it is going to be changed.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri is this proposal to be symbolic of an eagle landing on the moon, or the astronauts landing on the moon?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The eagle.

Mr. GROSS. An eagle landing on the moon? I did not know we had any eagles that had yet reached the moon.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the design, under 31 United States Code 324 must include an eagle. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa if Eagle was not the name of the space vehicle that landed on the moon? The amendment relates to a design emblematic of the Apollo eagle—meaning the United States of America.

Mr. GROSS. The eagles they fly high in Bombay.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 63, noes 26.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), as amended by the substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prevent Members from having the opportunity to offer their amendments, but time is running and I am hopeful that we might be able to set a time to limit debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, conclude at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, conclude at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment seriously. This funny money bill ought to be defeated right now by striking the enacting clause.

Yes, apparently the House is just about to complete the job of debasing the currency of the United States, and I am unalterably opposed to this kind of business.

We have heard a lot this afternoon about the savings that have been accomplished through the business of taking silver out of quarters and dimes. Now you want to complete the job by taking the silver out of the dollar and half dollar. Where has the money gone that you claim to have saved? Has it brought a reduction in taxes for our citizens? Where has the money gone that you say you have saved?

You talk about the shortage of silver. Two or three years ago you brought in a bill that took silver, the intrinsic value, out of quarters and dimes. In that same year this country sold 44 million ounces of silver abroad.

I do not think anyone will deny that we have been selling silver abroad ever since, yet you say we do not have the silver to keep a respectable currency in this country.

What else can you do to debauch and degrade the currency of this country? What else? Some years ago this Government bought printing presses in Britain because Americans do not make them with speed enough to turn out paper money in common usage fast enough.

Earlier this afternoon I said I would expect that after the enactment of this bill, and within a short period of time, the Banking and Currency Committee, which seemingly likes to debauch and debauch our currency, would be out with a bill to legalize wampum. And there was such a thing, as I explained this afternoon, as wampum-peag, a little less valuable wampum.

Why not make the dollar out of iron? Why not use washers and locknuts, which the farmers and others could use for other purposes? They could be used for many purposes including money. Those of you who have young children

could use them in the repair of bicycles. My friend Grandpa CELLER could give them to his grandchildren as well as use them for money.

Where are you taking this country? What are you doing to the monetary system of this country? As I said earlier this afternoon, internationally we are now out to paper the world with paper gold. But gold, we are told, is evil; it is an anachronism, although everybody else in the world covets it. And so, in answer to the demands of international bankers, this Government entered into a combination with them to paper the world with paper gold. What else? What else can you do to debauch the currency and monetary system of this country?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to compliment him on his dissertation of funny money.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from North Dakota and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not want to take the time of the Members. I am certain the gentleman who just left the well is well respected and loved by every Member of the House. I want him to know that I respect him, too. But I cannot go along with this amendment. All the coins I have in my hand have stamped on them the images of Presidents from Lincoln on, and they even have Thomas Jefferson on them. This is not funny money. I think we should vote this amendment down.

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

Mr. BARRETT. In a moment. I would just say to the gentleman, if he would permit me to say this, I know too many people who would take 5-ton trucks, back them up to the source, and load this funny money onto the trucks. That is how funny this money is.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the sale of \$3 million worth of silver dollars, does it not?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. That is very wisely handled by the Treasury. The Treasury, in handling these 3 million rare dollars, will sell those for approximately \$4 million. This is doing what the gentleman is always clamoring for: It is putting money into the Treasury. It will be a great gain. There are people anxious to buy these coins and it will be a healthy return.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if silver is in such short supply, why does the Treasury not melt the dollars down and use the silver, if the silver situation is so acute with respect to silver?

Mr. BARRETT. They can get more for these rare coins than they can by melting them down. I know the gentleman and respect and admire him, and I know the gentleman will agree with me. I know he does not want to put silver half dollars into circulation and let other people melt

them down. We have put nearly 1 billion 40-percent-silver dollars into circulation since 1966 and we cannot find one of them today in any industrial area.

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

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He said there would be about \$4 million from the sale of the silver dollar coins. The figure will be much greater than that. We have 2,900,000 at the going silver price, which will be more than \$4 million. We will have an auction and they will go to the highest bidder and they will bring in much more than that.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to be corrected. They will be worth much more than \$4 million, I am sure.

Mr. CONTE. If they were all melted down, we would not get more than 2½ ounces of silver out of each of those.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The preferential motion was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: Add the following new section at the end:

"SEC. 7. Title I of the Coinage Act of 1965 is amended by adding the following new section at the end:

"Sec. 109. (a) The Secretary may mint proof coins of the denominations set forth in section 101 from such metals or alloys as he may deem appropriate.

"(b) Proof coins minted under authority of subsection (a) shall be sold in such a manner as to assure a reasonable opportunity to all interested individuals to purchase directly from the Government at least one set of such coins of each year for which they are minted."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized in support of her amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, am I not correct in assuming we have set a time limit on the bill and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, then I now ask unanimous consent that we terminate all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto at 20 minutes after 6.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I have the right to speak for 5 minutes on my amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentlewoman was recognized previously.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BARRETT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto terminate at 6:25.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple one, to take the Treasury out of the coin dealers' pocket and require the mint to distribute numismatic materials for the benefits of the rank-and-file individual coin collector—the amateur hobbyist who collects coins for pleasure rather than as a business. We all have such constituents who buy specimen coins for their collections and who are not interested in acquiring, or financially able to build, a business inventory in proof sets.

Almost every year since the great coin scramble of 1964, when investors and speculators discovered the possibility of quick profits in bags of silver coins purchased at a premium from bank tellers or bank officials having access to the supply, legitimate coin collectors interested primarily in the numismatic aspect of coins have been complaining to us about their inability to obtain the coins they want for their collections. Nearly all of the 2¼ billion Kennedy half dollars were diverted from normal channels of coin distribution to speculators and dealers. And proof sets suddenly became hot items bought and sold at high premiums.

The Bureau of the Mint turns out only about 3,000,000 proof sets a year at the San Francisco assay office. Before 1964, it was always possible to send in an order and have it filled. But in 1964 the order lists were closed so quickly that many individual collectors were frozen out. No proof sets were offered for subsequent years until 1968, by which time the Treasury decided to raise its price from \$2.10 to \$5. Even at that price, enough orders were received within a few months to account for the full year's output, and when that happened, it was discovered that dealers were getting \$12 and \$15 for them. So the following November 1, when the order books were opened at San Francisco for the 1969 sets, enough orders were received in 1 week's time to force the mint to return all subsequent orders.

A staff member of the House Banking and Currency Committee was in the San Francisco assay office on November 12 and went through many of the orders for the maximum of 20 sets each. There were hundreds of duplications—air mail special delivery orders from the same individuals. The mint filtered out as many such duplicate orders as it could find, totaling about 1,000,000 sets. It still had enough orders left to account for the entire year's production. So none of the orders received after November 8 could be filled.

Now the mint has announced that orders for 1970 sets will be accepted beginning November 1 for only five sets per order. We can look for another race by dealers intent on getting their orders in early, under a variety of names, to disguise the fact that they are all going to the same person or firm.

This is an intolerable situation for the average hobbyist. It is an Oklahoma land race to see who can get there before the

next fellow—before the dealers corner the supply.

My amendment does two things: it authorizes the Treasury to use special coatings or materials to make the proof coins more attractive than the silverless cupro-nickel coins so that they are truly artistic specimens of our coin art. But, more importantly, it specifies that each individual coin collector who wants one must be given an opportunity to obtain a set, under procedures which will prevent dealers from obtaining multiple sets until and unless each individual collector who wants one can obtain a single proof set.

The coin dealers will not like this amendment, but the individual coin collector—the amateur hobbyist—will. If only 3 million sets can be produced a year, let us make sure that 3 million different individuals who want them can get a set each, rather than have dealers obtain them by the hundreds.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment. There are no precious metals in here, and no silver.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There is no silver required. It gives the Treasury a choice of metals to use.

Mr. BARRETT. I see no objection to it. If the other side would not oppose it, I believe we could accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Is it the gentleman's intention, so that we have a legislative history, that no silver be put into these coins?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It does not specify that there be no silver.

Mr. CONTE. It says any metal. I should like to get the gentleman's idea, as the author of the legislation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We have a metal called columbium. It is a very hard, very shiny, very pretty metal.

Mr. CONTE. I am well aware of it. I should like to ask the gentleman again if it is her intention—I believe it is—not to have any silver in these coins.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right; no silver as a specified proportion. We are not asking for any silver as such, just for a pretty coin the collectors can keep. The clad coins are not that attractive or desirable. Perhaps some silver might be used as a silver wash, or something of that kind. I am not proposing use of silver.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am not from Massachusetts, and I have no manufacturers who particularly use silver. Is there some reason why these dollars, half dollars, dimes, and quarters are not made out of stainless steel?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This will be left to the judgment of the Treasury, as to which metals to use for these specimen coins—strictly numismatic materials.

Mr. GROSS. Would it not be more effective in deluding the public if these so-called coins were nice and bright and shiny at all times?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That I cannot answer for the gentleman; I am sorry.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we would have no objection to the amendment, if the gentleman from New Jersey has no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. There is a question I asked earlier. Could the committee devise for the House a report as to what has happened to the silver stockpile and the silver coins in the Treasury and in the stockpile during the last 10 years?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That does not appear in our committee report, but I am sure we can get that information, and we will.

Mr. OLSEN. We will know, then, from the report, the price for which the silver was sold?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS: Page 4, after line 2, add a new section to be known as section 2(b), as follows:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to mint 500,000 half dollars with the likeness of Sam Rayburn, for sale to the Sam Rayburn Library at full value plus die cost. Said coins to be cupro-nickel per section 101(b)."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, much as I hate to, that the gentleman's amendment is not germane.

The gentleman is talking about minting a coin and making a profit from it. The bill calls for making coins, putting them into circulation, and making no profit.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

This is a coin the same as the other coins to be minted by the mint. The fact that they are to be distributed all through the Sam Rayburn Library would certainly not affect the subject matter of the amendment. It is certainly germane. This is a coinage act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas provides for the issuance of 500,000 half-dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn.

The amendment specifies that these coins are not to be put into general circulation but are to be sold to the Sam Rayburn Library for its use. These coins would be commemorative coins intended for sale by the library at a price above

their face value, with the proceeds to be derived therefrom accruing to the library's benefit. The purpose of the bill before the committee relates to the issuance and minting of public currency and the disposal of certain previously minted coins withdrawn from circulation and now held by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Chair does not think the issuance of coins which, although they might eventually find their way into public circulation, are designed and minted primarily for a private purpose is a subject that is germane to that under consideration. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLURE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCLURE: Page 5, immediately after line 9, add the following:

"SEC. 7. Any silver held by the Treasury in excess of that needed to complete the minting and issuing of any coin under this act shall be retained for use in a commemorative coin to be issued in conjunction with the bicentennial celebration of the United States in 1976."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is exactly the same as the amendment that has been ruled on and therefore is out of order. It is also a commemorative coin.

Mr. MCCLURE. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Chairman, there is a distinction between this amendment and the one that was just offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) in that his called for the minting of a specific commemorative. This amendment is designed to prevent the disposition of the silver by the Treasury Department and to retain it for future uses of the Treasury Department which undoubtedly will be called upon in 1976 in connection with the commemoration of the bicentennial of this Nation. It does not make any sense at all, I think, for this country to dispose of all its silver and then turn around a few years from now and go into the market and buy it back at a higher price for purposes which can be anticipated at the present time. This is not to authorize the minting of the coin but to direct the Treasury with respect to the disposition of this silver at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho applies to the issuance of a commemorative coin to be issued in conjunction with the bicentennial celebration of the United States in 1976. It is not in keeping with the purpose of the bill before the committee and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate now close on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MATSUNAGA, 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. 14127) to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 574, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments 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? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. MCCLURE

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCCLURE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCCLURE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14127 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 3, immediately after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the preceding, commencing January 1, 1970, the Secretary shall coin and issue no less than one hundred million silver dollar coins annually until three hundred million of these dollars have been coined. These silver dollars shall bear the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower and shall be a clad coin the weight of whose cladding is not less than 30 per centum of the weight of the entire coin, and which meets the following additional specifications:

"(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts copper; and

"(C) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper."

And redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

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.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors,

the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 65, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—257

Adair	Foreman	Murphy, Ill.
Adams	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Friedel	Myers
Alexander	Fuqua	Natcher
Anderson,	Galifianakis	Nedzi
Calif.	Gallagher	Nelsen
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Nichols
Andrews,	Gaydos	Nix
N. Dak.	Gialmo	Obeys
Annunzio	Gibbons	O'Hara
Ayres	Gilbert	O'Neill, Mass.
Baring	Goldwater	Passman
Barrett	Gonzalez	Patten
Beall, Md.	Goodling	Pelly
Belcher	Gray	Perkins
Bell, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Bennett	Green, Pa.	Pirnie
Betts	Griffiths	Podell
Bevill	Gubser	Preyer, N.C.
Biest	Gude	Price, Ill.
Blanton	Halpern	Price, Tex.
Blatnik	Hamilton	Purcell
Boggs	Hanley	Quillen
Bolling	Hanna	Railsback
Bow	Harsha	Rees
Brademas	Harvey	Reid, Ill.
Brasco	Hathaway	Reuss
Brock	Hawkins	Robison
Broomfield	Hechler, W. Va.	Rogers, Colo.
Brotzman	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Henderson	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Hogan	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Hollifield	Ruth
Buchanan	Horton	St Germain
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	St. Onge
Burlison, Mo.	Hunt	Sandman
Burton, Utah	Hutchinson	Schadeberg
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Schneebell
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Schwengel
Cabell	Jarman	Sebelius
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Shiley
Cassey	Jones, Tenn.	Shriver
Celler	Kastenmeier	Sikes
Chamberlain	Kazen	Skubitz
Chappell	Kee	Slack
Clancy	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Kleppe	Smith, Iowa
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Snyder
Don H.	Kuykendall	Stafford
Clawson, Del.	Kyl	Staggers
Clay	Landrum	Stanton
Cleveland	Langen	Steiger, Wis.
Colmer	Leggett	Stephens
Conable	Long, Md.	Stratton
Conte	Lukens	Stubblefield
Corbett	McCarthy	Sullivan
Corman	McClary	Symington
Coughlin	McCulloch	Taft
Cowger	McDade	Teague, Tex.
Culver	McDonald,	Thompson, Ga.
Daddario	Mich.	Thomson, Wis.
Daniels, N.J.	McEwen	Tieman
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Udall
Davis, Wis.	Macdonald,	Vander Jagt
de la Garza	Mass.	Vanik
Dellenback	MacGregor	Vigorito
Denney	Madden	Waggonner
Dent	Mahon	Watkins
Derwinski	Mailliard	Watson
Dickinson	Mann	Watts
Donohue	Matsunaga	Welcker
Downing	Mayne	Whalen
Dulski	Melcher	White
Duncan	Meskill	Widnall
Dwyer	Miller, Calif.	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Mills	Williams
Ellberg	Minish	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Mink	Winn
Esch	Minshall	Wright
Eshleman	Mize	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	Mizell	Wydler
Feighan	Mollohan	Wylie
Fish	Monagan	Wyman
Flood	Moorhead	Yates
Flowers	Morse	Yatron
Ford, Gerald R.	Morton	Young
Ford,	Mosher	Zion
William D.	Moss	

NAYS—65

Abbott	Burleson, Tex.	Delaney
Abernethy	Bush	Dorn
Ashbrook	Caffery	Dowdy
Biaggi	Collins	Foley
Brinkley	Cramer	Fountain
Burke, Fla.	Daniel, Va.	Fulton, Pa.

Gross	May	Roudebush
Grover	Miller, Ohio	Satterfield
Hagan	Montgomery	Scherle
Hall	Olsen	Scott
Hammer-	O'Neal, Ga.	Sisk
schmidt	Pettis	Springer
Hansen, Idaho	Pike	Steiger, Ariz.
Hansen, Wash.	Poage	Stuckey
Hicks	Poff	Talcott
Hull	Pryor, Ark.	Teague, Calif.
Johnson, Calif.	Randall	Ullman
Landgrebe	Rarick	Utt
Lennon	Rhodes	Wampler
Long, La.	Roberts	Whitten
McClure	Rogers, Fla.	Zablocki
Marsh	Roth	Zwach

NOT VOTING—109

Albert	Farbstein	Michel
Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	Mikva
Anderson,	Findley	Morgan
Tenn.	Fisher	O'Konski
Arends	Flynt	Ottlinger
Ashley	Fraser	Patman
Aspinall	Frey	Pepper
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Pickle
Bingham	Gettys	Pollock
Blackburn	Griffin	Powell
Boland	Haley	Pucinski
Bray	Harrington	Quie
Brooks	Hastings	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Reifel
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Riegle
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Rivers
Button	Hosmer	Rodino
Cahill	Howard	Rosenthal
Camp	Jonas	Roybal
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Ryan
Chisholm	Karth	Saylor
Cohelan	King	Scheuer
Collier	Kirwan	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	Koch	Steed
Cunningham	Kyros	Stokes
Dawson	Latta	Taylor
Dennis	Lippscomb	Thompson, N.J.
Devine	Lloyd	Tunney
Diggs	Lowenstein	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Lujan	Waldie
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Walley
Edmondson	McKneally	Whitehurst
Edwards, Calif.	McMillan	Wilson
Edwards, La.	Martin	Charles H.
Evans, Colo.	Mathias	Wold
Fallon	Meeds	Wolff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Stokes with Mr. Harrington.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Lloyd.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Albert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Dennis.
 Mr. Wolff with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Jonas.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. McKneally.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Quie.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. King.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reid of New York.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Reigel.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Whitehurst.

Mr. Evans with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Wold.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. McMullan.
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. Lowenstein.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Helstoski.
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Brown with California with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Koch with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Haley with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Karth.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Fraser.
 Mr. Ryan with Van Deerlin.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Findley with Mr. Meeds.

Mr. MIZELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

COINAGE ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 158) to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, a joint resolution similar to the bill (H.R. 14127) just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SISK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 158

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 (31 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) by inserting "one-dollar pieces," after "pursuant to this section" in subsection (a);
 (2) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) in subsection (a) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively, and by inserting before redesignated paragraph (2) a new paragraph as follows:

"(1) the dollar shall have—
 "(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;
 "(B) a cladding of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts copper; and
 "(C) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper.";

(3) by inserting at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(d) The dollars initially minted under the authority of subsection (a) shall bear the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

"(e) Commencing on January 1, 1970, and until such time as the supply of silver available to the Treasury on January 1, 1970, for coinage purposes is exhausted, or December 31, 1972, whichever is earlier, the Secretary shall cause to be minted and issued dollars authorized by subsection (a) at a rate of not less than one-hundred million coins annually."

(b) Effective on January 1, 1973, or on such earlier date as the President shall by proclamation declare that the supply of silver available to the Treasury for coinage purposes is exhausted, section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The Secretary may coin and issue one-dollar pieces, half dollars or 50-cent pieces, quarter dollars or 25-cent pieces, and dimes or 10-cent pieces in such quantities as he may determine to be necessary to meet national needs. Any coin minted under authority of this section shall be a clad coin the weight of whose cladding is not less than 30 per centum of the weight of the entire coin, and which meets the following additional specifications:

"(1) The dollar shall have—

"(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the whole coin weighs 22.68 grams.

"(2) The half dollar shall have—

"(A) a diameter of 1.205 inches;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the whole coin weighs 11.34 grams.

"(3) The quarter dollar shall have—

"(A) a diameter of 0.955 inch;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the weight of the whole coin is 5.67 grams.

"(4) The dime shall have—

"(A) a diameter of 0.705 inch;

"(B) a cladding of an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel; and

"(C) a core of copper such that the weight of the whole coin is 2.268 grams."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BARRETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARRETT moves to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 158, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 14127 as passed, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 (31 U.S.C. 391) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary may mint and issue coins of the denominations set forth in subsection (c) in such quantities as he determines to be necessary to meet national needs.

"(b) Any coin minted under authority of this section shall be a clad coin. The cladding shall be an alloy of 75 per centum copper and 25 per centum nickel, and shall weigh not less than 30 per centum of the weight of the whole coin. The core shall be copper.

"(c) (1) The dollar shall be 1.500 inches in diameter and weigh 22.68 grams.

"(2) The half dollar shall be 1.205 inches in diameter and weigh 11.34 grams.

"(3) The quarter dollar shall be 0.955 inch in diameter and weigh 5.67 grams.

"(4) The dime shall be 0.705 inch in diameter and weigh 2.268 grams."

"SEC. 2. Half dollars as authorized under section 101(a)(1) of the Coinage Act of 1965 as in effect prior to the enactment of this

Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, continue to be minted until January 1, 1971.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer, as an accountable advance and at their face value, the approximately three million silver dollars now held in the Treasury to the Administrator of General Services. The Administrator is authorized to offer these coins to the public in the manner recommended by the Joint Commission on the Coinage at its meeting on May 12, 1969. The Administrator shall repay the accountable advance in the amount of that face value out of the proceeds of and at the time of the public sale of the silver dollars. Any proceeds received as a result of the public sale in excess of the face value of these coins shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Act of June 24, 1967 (Public Law 90-29; 31 U.S.C. 405a-1 note) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Out of the proceeds of and at the time of any sale of silver transferred pursuant to this Act, the Treasury Department shall be paid \$1.292929292 for each fine troy ounce.'

"SEC. 5. Section 3513 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 316) and the first section of the Act of February 28, 1878 (20 Stat. 25; 31 U.S.C. 316, 458) are repealed.

"SEC. 6. The dollars initially minted under authority of section 101 of the Coinage Act of 1965 shall bear the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower and on the other side thereof, a design which is emblematic of the symbolic eagle of Apollo 11 landing on the moon.

"SEC. 7. Title I of the Coinage Act of 1965 is amended by adding the following new section at the end:

"SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary may mint proof coins of the denominations set forth in section 101 from such metals or alloys as he may deem appropriate.

"(b) Proof coins minted under authority of subsection (a) shall be sold in such a manner as to assure a reasonable opportunity to all interested individuals to purchase directly from the Government at least one set of such coins of each year for which they are minted."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to carry out the recommendation of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14127) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE TRAGIC PLIGHT OF MISSING U.S. SERVICEMEN

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a truly tragic part of the Vietnamese war has been the refusal of the North Vietnamese to provide information on missing U.S. servicemen who presumably are held prisoner by the Communists. There are 1,350 U.S. servicemen missing in action and many of these are presumed to be prisoners of the Communist forces. Little is known about the plight of these men, their physical condition, or even whether they are living or dead. The continuing refusal of the Communist captors to divulge information is a shocking indictment of the cruel methods which they follow and their indifference to humanitarian considerations. It is a great pity that those who protest the war do not spend their time protesting Communist inhumanity.

An equally serious part of the problem is the fact that the families of these missing men in most cases know little or nothing about them. Even the fact that they are prisoners of war frequently is not confirmed, and the families can only hope that their loved ones are still alive. The Geneva Conference long ago established a program for humane treatment of prisoners of war and nearly all non-Communist nations have abided by its terms. These include an exchange of mail, inspection of camps by a neutral organization, and delivery of medical aid and food parcels to prison camps. None of these have been allowed by the Communists in Vietnam. Hanoi signed the Geneva Conference agreement in 1957 but now refuses to abide by its terms.

Efforts have been in progress for months seeking a less barbaric attitude on the prisoners-of-war problem by the Communists but these have been unavailing. Representations to the Communist delegates at the peace conference in Paris have also been rejected.

An effort is now being made to establish November 9 as a nationwide day of prayer for the prisoners. This could be a meaningful movement by Americans from the President on down and one which should have the very active support of the Nation.

MORATORIUM

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it would be foolhardy to predict on the proceedings of today, but it is clear to me that the proceedings in the House of Representatives last night must have given the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong their greatest encouragement since the stopping of the bombing of North Vietnam and the withdrawal of American troops.

The talkathon of last night was well billed and advertised and has even been reported as nothing more than an exercise of free speech or a dignified discussion of vital issues—and when one takes most of the speeches completely separate from their context, it can be seriously contended that they were a presentation

of dissenting viewpoints. Certainly I would not deny anyone the right to express his own views or to question the wisdom of Government policies, but when these views are presented in such a manner and under such staging as to encourage the enemy to believe that such presentation is evidence of a complete lack of determination on the part of the United States, it can only result in the prolongation of the war and the loss of the lives of more American boys.

Nor does the fact that we are willing to assume that those who presented these views did so in good faith, in anywise change their effect. The authorities in Hanoi were obviously duly impressed and recognized the tremendous advantage dropped in their lap. In spite of the fact that the North Vietnamese openly and officially applauded this so-called moratorium, I did not hear one speaker last night repudiate association with the enemy.

At least until the next session of the Supreme Court the Constitution of the United States still defines treason as giving aid and comfort to the enemy of the United States. Regardless of what anyone said last night, aid and comfort was given to our enemies in large measure. I turned on my car lights this morning, as I wanted it clearly understood that I intend to give the enemies of my country no aid or comfort.

U.S. FLAG EMBLEM FOR POLICE— H.R. 14337

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the turmoil and disorder of our times, it would do us well to look again to our beginnings.

The Declaration of Independence recites that men are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It then declares that it is to secure these rights that governments are instituted among men.

We would do well to recognize again that the principal, if not the sole function, of government is to secure to men their God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means to protect men from other men who would infringe on these rights—nothing more, nothing less.

We maintain Armed Forces to protect our citizens from foreign powers which would hamper their exercise of these rights. That is the function of the national Government, the Government of the United States.

The separate States maintain police departments for the protection of their citizens against those individuals who would interfere with their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In the District of Columbia and on other Federal reservations we maintain similar police.

Like our soldiers, our police are our first line of defense. Disorder and crime are curbed by the 24-hour watch which they keep. Without recognition, without thanks, usually underpaid, and subject

to criticism and insult from every quarter, these public servants put their lives on the line so that we may live ours more freely.

Some cities have recognized the role of their police officers by making an American flag shoulder patch a part of their uniform. The results have been unexpectedly good. The recognition that the local police officer protects what is best in America is promoted by his wearing of the American flag. This has resulted in increased morale in the department, better understanding by the authorities, and more cooperation and recognition by the community in general.

It has had another unexpected result. The number of assaults on police officers has diminished drastically, and the number of officers injured in line of duty has declined.

Even criminals seem to respect the flag, and possible incitement of radicals and revolutionaries by the shoulder patch seems to have been minimal.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 14337 providing for the wearing of such an emblem, the American flag, as an integral part of the uniform of the police officers on duty here in the District of Columbia—the Metropolitan Police, the Capitol Police, the White House Police, and the Park Police.

I include the text of the bill:

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the uniform of officers and members of the United States Park Police, the White House Police, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch showing the flag of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police, the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the White House Police, the Capitol Police Board in the case of the Capitol Police, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia in the case of the Metropolitan Police force shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

IS THE ADMINISTRATION EXPECTING THE GOVERNMENT TO BE THE EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT?

(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, last Tuesday I took the floor to express my concern over the dishearteningly large increase in unemployment reported for the month of September. To say that I was astonished by the cacophony of administration officials out gloating each other as thousands of Americans entered the ranks of the unemployed would be an understatement.

Of course, in all fairness, these administration people were not slapping backs because more Americans were unemployed, but rather because they viewed the half percent rise in unem-

ployment as a sign that the administration's anti-inflation policies were taking hold. Yet, I can still see before my minds eye the somber-faced press secretary telling the White House news corps that the President will not move against inflation at the expense of jobs. I really must admit it was difficult for my poor abilities to reconcile the President's chief spokesman's somber tones with the fact that most of his policy advisers were out celebrating the half percent rise.

While I might be one of the last to question the sincerity of these good officials, I most certainly have the obligation to question their good sense on this issue.

The most recent unemployment statistic taken by itself demonstrates nothing more than a lot of people became jobless during September. When added to other unemployment data published in the last few months, a trend toward a rising rate is discernible.

What is not discernible is the basis for concluding that rising unemployment signals the need to publicly demonstrate that the Administration's anti-inflation policies are taking hold. There seems to be some dispute among administration supporters and officials that this is in fact the case.

While the Bureau of Labor Statistics was making its announcement, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve was telling the House Banking and Currency Committee that he has not seen any strong indications of a slowdown. At least there was not a statistic that sufficiently impressed Mr. Martin to offer the possibility of lower interest rates in the foreseeable future. If anything, the administration seems to be telling us we can expect continued high rates both in interest and unemployment.

The day after the Bureau announcement, Prof. Milton Friedman, Chicago University economist and the President's economic adviser in the 1968 campaign, predicted recession if the present administration policies are continued. Friedman suggested that the unemployment rate would range higher than 7 percent unless the Federal Reserve eased its tight money policies. And I have already reported what Chairman Martin's views are on easing the tight money situation.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the Washington Post report of Professor Friedman's testimony before the Joint Subcommittee on Economy in Government:

FED SPARKING A RECESSION, SENATORS TOLD
(By Hobart Rowen)

Unless the Federal Reserve quickly relaxes its tight money policy, the nation faces "an unnecessarily severe recession next year," with unemployment ranging higher than 7 per cent.

That was the somber judgment offered yesterday by Prof. Milton Friedman, the noted Chicago University economist and campaign adviser last year to President Nixon.

A long-time critic of the Fed, Friedman testified before Sen. William Proxmire's subcommittee on Economy in Government, and later elaborated on his fears of a recession to reporters.

The committee also heard testimony from Brookings Institute economist Charles L.

Schultze and from Ralph Nader on the need for efficiency and new incentives to improve government operations.

Nader complained that regulatory agencies do not make compliance surveys regularly—indeed, in some cases not at all.

"Endemic non-enforcement voter time builds up a corruption of the political legal process that is difficult to overestimate," he said.

Schultze, former Budget director, cited a number of subsidies for business, industry and farm groups that he said work inefficiently, at great cost to taxpayers.

One major drawback in managing public enterprise, Schultze said, results from the Budget Bureau's failure to charge the right departments with all the costs they incur. An example that fascinated the committee is that the Defense Department is not charged with the cost of atomic warheads for its nuclear weapons.

Proxmire (D-Wis.) said he would ask Budget Director Robert P. Mayo to comment on this and other aspects of Schultze's testimony.

Unemployment rates in the vicinity of 7 per cent would be the highest since the 1958 recession, Friedman said. And he warned that the Federal Reserve "has but little time" in which to reverse its policy.

"But I see no signs that they are prepared to do so," the controversial economist told the impromptu press conference.

Friedman's assessment of the Fed's posture appeared to be borne out by public and private statements by Federal Reserve Board governors indicating that a solid majority thinks it is too early to loosen the money strings.

Over the weekend, for example, Governors Andrew F. Brimmer and William Sherrill said in separate speeches that the present level of restraint, measured by zero growth in the money supply, would have to be continued for a time.

Fed Chairman William McC. Martin told the House Banking Committee yesterday that current signs of a slow-down in the economy were only slight. In fact, he said "It's hard to see interest rates going down."

But Friedman, internationally noted as the principal exponent of the theory that monetary policy is the single most important determinant of the shape of the economy, said that signs were already present that the over-heated economy is slowing down, in response to tight money.

"There is a serious danger that the Fed is over-doing the matter," he told the Proxmire committee. He cited figures showing that the money stock—currency and checking accounts—which had been increasing by an annual rate of slightly more than 4 per cent for the first half of the year, has not been increasing at all for the past few months.

"That's a very sharp change" Friedman argued, "and it means they probably have gone too far."

His prescription for the right policy, would be a return to a 4 or 4.5 per cent rate of growth in the money supply, which he said would be compatible with the sustainable level of real growth in the economy.

The Fed was unresponsive to Friedman's argument. Nor were they changing their minds because of publication yesterday of labor force figures showing a sharp jump in the September unemployment rate to 4 per cent. Brimmer told The Washington Post that there was still "nothing to suggest" that there has been an improvement in "price behavior."

In order to squelch the last doubt that the administration is pursuing anti-inflation policies at the expense of jobs, Treasury Secretary Kennedy assured us on October 7, 1 day after the Bureau of Labor Statistics announcement, that a higher jobless rate can be expected.

Kennedy refused to be pinned down on the unemployment rate which the administration would consider unacceptable. If one cares to examine the Secretary's testimony on this issue, it would not be unfair to conclude that the administration has not put a ceiling on unemployment and little thought has been given to reverse the trend.

The Secretary's comments make me even more "up tight" when I consider them in the perspective of what administration policy is now doing to the home-building industry. Apparently the administration is either unable or unwilling to reverse the present disastrous trend in home building and finance. Will we find this same administration unable or unwilling to reverse a rising unemployment trend? Experience tells us the answer is much less than encouraging.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD the Washington Post report of Secretary Kennedy's testimony before the Joint Economic Committee:

TREASURY PREDICTS MORE JOBLESSNESS
(By Jan Nugent)

More people will be unemployed as the Administration pursues its inflation-restraining policies, Treasury Secretary David Kennedy said yesterday.

Kennedy called the September 4 per cent jobless rate "acceptable" but refused to name a maximum unemployment level that would be tolerated.

The September unemployment figure jumped sharply from 3.5 per cent the preceding month to the highest rate in nearly two years. Administration supporters hailed the boost as evidence anti-inflation tactics were working. Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey said it illustrated the Nixon administration's "cruel and mean" economic policies.

"Are we planning for a recession to reduce inflation?" Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) asked yesterday at a Joint Economic Subcommittee hearing.

"No," Kennedy replied, "we must now watch the timing to make sure that doesn't happen."

Under questioning by Rep. Martha Griffiths (D-Mich.), Kennedy acknowledged that unemployment will rise as the administration presses its anti-inflationary policies. "There's no question as you slow the economy, there will be changes in employment patterns and some increases," he said.

The real test will be to continue the present policies without pushing the country into a recession, Kennedy said. He explained that naming an unemployment figure acceptable to the administration would become "a complete embarrassment," because proper evaluation required consideration of all the indices.

The Treasury secretary said he had no "magic figure" in mind.

Kennedy also fended off Congressional suggestions for wage-price controls, presidential "jawboning," and creation of a new, comprehensive program to deal with joblessness.

Kennedy and Budget Director Robert Mayo pressed the joint committee to give the Administration "the tools it needs" to fight inflation and achieve a budget surplus: a six-month extension of the surtax at a five per cent rate beginning Jan. 1, and repeal of the investment tax credit.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), indicated both goals are in jeopardy unless the Administration gives assurances it would act "decisively and effectively" if substantial increases in unemployment result.

The Administration spokesman said they had not drafted a specific set of plans, but

named several stabilizing measures which could be invoked: restoration of federal construction; speeding up manpower programs and enactment of family assistance and unemployment insurance measures proposed earlier by the Administration.

Proxmire suggested that a "comprehensive program" to deal with sustained unemployment might help the Administration get more support in Congress for its deflationary measures, such as surtax extension.

"We are not doing recession planning at this time," Mayo explained, because economic adjustments will be "of the nature we can cope with as we move along."

Kennedy reminded the subcommittee a four per cent unemployment rate was regarded as an achievement before the Vietnam war, when jobless levels were usually higher.

Sen. Proxmire agreed that unemployment levels had been higher during other periods of American history, but warned "we can't go back to that."

Although no specific plans have been constructed for substantial employment reverses, "our reasoning would change," Mayo explained. Manpower programs could be speeded up, he suggested.

The Wisconsin Democrat also chided another Treasury official for a recent speech in which the rise in the September unemployment level was hailed as an indication the overheated economy was dropping back "to sustainable levels."

Proxmire told Assistant Treasury Murray L. Weidenbaum, who accompanied Kennedy, his remarks indicated the administration believes the present four per cent figure will be sustained for some time.

Weidenbaum said the committee should not read too much into his speech, which was intended more as an examination of economic history than a prediction of the administration's future course.

If the price for inflation control is to be rising unemployment the question must be asked who will suffer most from such a policy. Statistics suggest that the segment of the labor force which stands to suffer most from rising unemployment will be the young—particularly the non-white young.

Anyone familiar with the present social conditions in this country quickly realizes we can least afford to seriously damage this group. Yet this seems to be the tragic direction in which we are heading.

The American Enterprise Institute in an excellent analysis of unemployment concludes with this estimate of the future.

The impact of a slowdown in the economy upon the job market for young people generally under the age of 25 will be entirely different from what it has been at any time since World War II. A slower rate of job growth will dam up the unemployed at the entry level. Well-educated and experienced young workers will still be in demand. . . . But the job market will be tough for the dropout and the poorly educated.

The youngsters most affected by this development will be the fastest growing group among them, namely the nonwhites. It is not only their growing number which will prove to be a handicap; it is also their lack of education, training, and work experience. In a broader sense it is likely that young people under age 25—males and females, whites and nonwhites, will constitute the most stubborn unemployment problem in the early 1970's.

At this point I would like to include two tables which dramatically demonstrate the conclusion reported by AEI.

Table I shows the unemployment rate for April 1969—the time of the AEI publication. While the overall rate during that month shows the economy at virtually full employment the unemployment rate for young workers is more than three times that of the total.

When table II is considered we see that the nonwhite youth rate is twice the corresponding rate. When considered against the total unemployment rate the nonwhite youth rate is almost seven times as high.

TABLE I

	Civilian labor force	Unemployed	Unemployment rate (percent)
Total	79,621,000	2,542,000	3.2
Adult men	46,048,000	902,000	2.0
Adult women	27,338,000	966,000	3.5
Young workers (16 to 19 years)	6,235,000	674,000	10.8

TABLE II

	Civilian labor force	Unemployed	Unemployment rate (percent)
Men:			
White	41,518,000	743,000	1.8
Nonwhite	4,532,000	159,000	3.5
Women:			
White	23,765,000	728,000	3.1
Nonwhite	3,571,000	238,000	6.7
Young workers (16 to 19):			
White	5,565,000	536,000	9.6
Nonwhite	670,000	138,000	20.6
Total:			
White	70,848,000	2,007,000	2.8
Nonwhite	8,773,000	535,000	6.1

While the multipliers of the youth, white and non-white unemployment rate will vary from month to month when considered against the total rate there will not be a downward adjustment. If anything, the multiplying factor may increase. If it does, and unemployment continues to dramatically rise, we can expect an equally dramatic increase in the social tensions now tearing at the substance of this Nation.

There is another aspect of rising unemployment which particularly affects me as a Californian. California, the most highly populated State in the country, consistently leads the largest 10 States in its jobless rate. The last available yearly statistic shows California exceeding the national rate by 1½ percent—table III:

TABLE III.—1968

	Percent
California	5.1
Michigan	3.9
Florida	3.8
Pennsylvania	3.4
Texas	3.4
Ohio	3.4
New Jersey	3.3
New York	3.1
Illinois	2.9
Massachusetts	2.9
10 States combined	3.6
Total, United States	3.6

A large part of the California problem stems from the high percentage of unskilled, nonwhite, primarily Mexican-American population. If California will continue to lead the national rate by 1

to 2 points, rising unemployment will have its most dramatic effect on the State having the most serious problems.

At the very local level this rising unemployment trend is beginning to take form. In my congressional district there have been a number of substantial layoffs by the large aerospace manufacturers. Tight money, rising prices, and overseas competition put Garden Grove, Calif., the largest employer out of business. More than 500 people were let go early this month, and the impact on this city of over 100,000 is serious.

Predictably, the first people to be let go in my district were the ones who could least afford losing their jobs. Their chances for reabsorption back into our local economy are tenuous at best.

Rising unemployment—particularly among the young and nonwhite population—portends serious social consequences. Yet, the administration has yet to tell us how they will deal with what could be a terribly explosive period. In fact, we have yet to be told whether the administration plans on dealing with this issue at all.

Let me suggest that if no plans are currently in the works some serious thinking should immediately be given to the Government's role in absorbing this expected large number of unemployed young.

If the administration is not expecting to be the employer of last resort it better restructure its thinking. The social consequences of not preparing for the results of the present policy will be severe.

I urge the administration to begin the planning now for the Government to absorb the jobless youth before we are forced to face this issue by confrontations in the street.

DIGNITY AND RESPECT SHOWN IN DEBATE ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion on Vietnam policy last night, men in this House who disagree profoundly did so with dignity, purpose, and mutual respect. I hope those who will take part in the moratorium all across the country today will conduct themselves in the same manner.

Those who cry peace must also practice it. Those who ask for an end to violence abroad must practice nonviolence at home.

There were two lessons to be learned from last night's debate, one for our own people and one for our enemies. For our own people, the lesson was that discussion and debate are the strength—not the weakness—of a free people. For our enemies, the lesson is that while we may disagree passionately, we are still one people and will remain so. For Hanoi in particular, the lesson is this and it is an obvious one: The most significant aspect of yesterday's debate is that it could not have taken place in Hanoi.

I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle and on both

sides of this issue, because that debate did take place here in my country and in this House—a fact which reflects great credit on both this House and American democracy. I most especially want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Jacobs), who set the tone of reason which, for the most part, prevailed here last evening, when he said that his purpose was “not to stir up hatred for the President, we have too much hatred in this country already.”

I would also like to commend my Republican colleagues. As the Washington Post put it this morning:

Despite the Republican reluctance to let it happen, they soon became involved in a lively back and forth discussion that was polite and intelligent and provided the most illuminating debate the House has had on the war.

This House last night set an example of respect for conflicting opinion which I hope will be followed throughout the country today and for all days to come.

A TIME TO UNITE

(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, in all that is being said across our land today by those participating in what they call a “Moratorium Day,” there stands out the stated position that this movement is to get President Nixon to “change his position on the war in Vietnam.”

Apparently they do not know what the President's position is or they would know that there is no one who wants peace more than our President.

What has he done to achieve that peace in the last 9 months?

He has set in motion the return home of 60,000 U.S. troops from Vietnam.

He has reduced the level of fighting to the point where our casualties are their lowest in over 3 years.

He has given top priority to turning the war over to the South Vietnamese, allowing them to protect themselves as we withdraw.

He has proposed free elections, under international supervision.

He has offered to negotiate a ceasefire under international supervision.

He has declared that we will retain no military bases in South Vietnam after the war, and that we stand ready to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

He has offered to negotiate everything except the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future.

Mr. Speaker, I for one fully support this position, and I want to stand up and be counted. If Hanoi were to succeed in taking over South Vietnam by force—even after the power of the United States had been engaged—it would greatly strengthen those leaders who scorn negotiation, who advocate aggression, who minimize the risks of confrontation with the United States. It would bring peace now, but it would enormously increase the danger of a bigger war later.

So, what has Hanoi done to end this

war? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that they have done nothing.

This is not to be construed as a condemnation of free speech or a person's constitutional right of redress of grievance. But, it is a reminder that our President has, in just 9 months, gone further than any man in an attempt to end this war, and he should be commended and supported for his achievements.

Above all, it should be remembered that there is only one man in the United States who can legally negotiate peace—and that is our President. A Member of Congress cannot negotiate peace nor can a member of a demonstration.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to the President of the United States my unqualified support for the steps he has taken to date for peace and urge all those demonstrating today to look beyond partisan differences, beyond the slogans surrounding this “Moratorium Day,” beyond personal bias or other motivations, and unite behind the President's efforts for achieving peace.

LEADERSHIP IN THE EFFORT FOR PEACE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to inquire of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), who suggested the resignation of Ambassador Lodge, Ambassador Bunker, and the leadership in Saigon, if he would name the people with whom he would replace those gentlemen.

As I recall, Ambassador Lodge served in the United Nations, representing the United States under President Eisenhower. He has also been Ambassador to Vietnam, and has served both the Democratic and the Republican administrations in that role.

Ambassador Bunker has served both the previous Democratic administration and the present Republican administration in the role of Ambassador to Vietnam.

Of course, the leadership in Saigon, I assume, is a decision which ought to be made by the Vietnamese people.

I wonder if the gentleman from New York has any positive suggestions about who should replace these people, rather than negative suggestions, which he has made.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, I have.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the gentleman to state them.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman. I believe Ambassador Harriman did a very good job in Paris. He had arrived at a point in December where a great number of North Vietnamese had been withdrawn up to the 20th parallel in response to the removal talks. In addition, I understand that Mr. Lodge was precluded from engaging in similar talks for 4 months. I do believe that whatever progress was made at that time was negated, and certainly we have not moved any further from that time to today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I recall, the gentleman concluded his remarks with

the request for a change, and I am interested to know that the only change he wants is a change back to the old stalemate.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. I am very surprised by the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, that Mr. Harriman be renamed chief Paris peace negotiator for the United States. His past performance does not merit reappointment to that post. I recall that when Mr. Harriman arrived in Paris, a reporter asked him, “How long do you think it will be before a successful conclusion of the war is reached?” Ambassador Harriman said:

Well, if we get down to business, it would take about three months.

The reporters asked the North Vietnamese negotiator the same question and he replied:

I don't know, but I brought my barber along.

The unrealistic appraisal by Mr. Harriman confirms once again the traditional and historic fault of our State Department—naïveté.

THOUGHTS ON THE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today, October 15, is a day of “moratorium” for millions of Americans. Across the Nation, people from all walks of life are expressing profound concern about the U.S. involvement in the conflict in Vietnam.

The reasons for the widespread impact of this observance are as diverse and confusing as the history of the Vietnam struggle itself. Many are exercising their constitutionally protected right to assemble to petition the Government. No American—and certainly no Member of Congress—should oppose such an exercise. Many will be assembling to pray for peace and an honorable settlement—and no American should fault that motive. Many will be expressing their sorrow at the loss of over 40,000 lives and countless treasure—and all Americans should share that sorrow, today and every other day for time immemorial. The suffering, the incalculable losses in every war are beyond expression and wholly irreplaceable.

Many Americans will assemble today to express their approval of the initiatives President Nixon has undertaken—the troop reduction, the tactical deescalation, the effort for a negotiated settlement. I applaud those who share that view as they gather today.

Yesterday, October 14, the House Republican conference adopted a resolution of importance and commitment. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, the Republican conference resolution articulates the feelings of many observing this moratorium. I wish to express my heartfelt support of its message, and my appreciation to those teachers, students, workers, and members of the clergy who

are following a similar line of reason today. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 14, 1969

Whereas President Nixon has committed his Administration to an honorable settlement of the Vietnam war at the earliest possible date, and

Whereas the President has demonstrated the sincerity of that commitment both in word and deed, at the negotiating table and in the field, and

Whereas the President has moved forthrightly to increase the capacity of the South Vietnamese to handle their own responsibilities, and has initiated a policy of substantial reductions of American troops in Vietnam,

Now, therefore, we the duly elected Republican Members of the House of Representatives

Do hereby resolve, that we commend President Nixon for the actions he has taken in reversing the course of the war, and

We express our confidence in, and support of, his efforts to end the war at the earliest practicable date.

STATEMENT ON MORATORIUM

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today, we are again witnessing the exercise of one of our greatest freedoms—namely, to assemble and express ideas openly and without fear.

Certainly there could be no issue closer to the hearts of the American people than that of establishing and preserving peace.

We are by conviction and tradition a peace-loving, freedom-loving country—never satisfied with one without the other—not only for ourselves but for the other peoples of the world who share our love of peace and freedom.

Throughout this century, we have learned how increasingly difficult it is to reconcile the demands of peace with those of freedom.

It is, indeed, the very heart of the concern, frustration, and impatience we all feel toward the war in Vietnam.

Less than a year ago, the American people went to the polls as our system of government provides and in an orderly process elected a new President. Any fair observer would have to concede that since that time, the course of the conflict in South Vietnam has been significantly and decisively altered, with American soldiers returning home in increasing numbers, a reduction in the overall level of combat and the communication channels have been opened for negotiations in Paris.

The American people spoke, and changes have been made.

While we have not had as much progress as any of us would like, myself included, we have had, and let no one mistake it, very real progress.

I believe the great majority of our citizens feel that our President is doing his very best, in a most difficult and complex situation, and support his efforts. Yes, and I also believe that many who are participating in the moratorium today, no doubt, feel they are somehow strengthening the cause of peace.

Although it is difficult for me to comprehend how the moratorium will accomplish this, I am certain that it will dramatize the fact that many millions of Americans are deeply concerned about the course of the war in Vietnam and that they are yearning for a cessation of hostilities in that battle-scarred land.

While I share the frustrations of Vietnam, I have every confidence that our President is well aware of this deep and genuine concern and wants peace perhaps more than any citizen of our land for he is the one who bears the full burden, the total and unrelenting pressure that persists to aggravate us all.

Mr. Speaker, we have but one President at a time and any peace that is to be achieved must ultimately be hammered out by him. In this most difficult hour, he has my complete faith and confidence.

PRESIDENT NIXON DESERVES NATION'S SUPPORT IN SEEKING SOLUTION TO VIETNAM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be clear to all of us that the debate which we conducted here last night was a good debate, productive and informative. Many Members on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the issue, had an opportunity to voice their views.

But when one gets through analyzing the entire debate of last night, one comes to the conclusion that there is not really any better answer to resolving the problem of Vietnam than the course the administration is trying to follow for gradual, meaningful withdrawal of our troops and our orderly disengagement from the conflict.

We heard various proposals made here, and I am sure they were sincere. I have made several such proposals myself. But we recall that the gentleman from Indiana who led the debate, when asked by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) whether he was for immediate, unequivocal withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, was constrained to say, "No, I am not for that; I believe there has to be an orderly withdrawal."

When we analyze the speeches being made today all over this country, and when we get through with moratorium Wednesday, by tonight, we will find the debate has gone full cycle and has come right back to the conclusion that the constitutional responsibility for bringing this conflict to an end rests with the President, and only with the President.

Hanoi would make a tragic and fatal error if it interpreted this American exercise in democracy, with thousands of citizens today participating in this debate, as some sort of weakening of the American people in their resolve not to abandon human dignity in South Vietnam. Hanoi would err tragically if it prolongs this conflict on the erroneous belief that American dissent means we Americans are not united in a common cause of preserving freedom for our allies in South Vietnam.

I would hope that after this whole exercise is concluded and every American has had a chance to speak his views today, that tomorrow this country will rally behind the President, our Commander in Chief. Let us give this man a chance to try to work out a solution to this tragic conflict in Vietnam.

I have made a proposal that we freeze shipment of combat troops to Vietnam and as our boys are rotated home we not replace them in Vietnam. Other Members have made proposals. We all want to make some contribution to finding an answer in Vietnam and we have all been searching for a formula to get our boys home and bring peace to Vietnam.

But, in the final analysis, the Constitution vests that responsibility in the President. All of us, on both sides of the aisle, whatever our views may be, ought to now rally behind President Nixon and give this man a chance to demonstrate to Hanoi that a United America says there is going to be no peace in Hanoi until the Communists agree to give the people in South Vietnam a chance to determine their own destiny as free people.

Such unity among all Americans is the way to end this war in Vietnam.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is the tradition of the House for each Member to be permitted to revise his remarks, but I must say that I do not accept the offer of the gentleman from Illinois to do my revising for me. In fact my position needs no revising. I think the RECORD speaks for itself and there is no point in going back over it again except that I did see in the news this morning that the minority leader said I lived in a fool's paradise. I merely say to the minority leader that I do not live in a fool's paradise. That fool's paradise is inhabited by politicians who still believe it is worthwhile to sacrifice young American lives to defend a dictatorship in Vietnam which is as distant from our basic principles of government as it is from the security of our Nation. I repeat that as a condition for our withdrawal from Vietnam we should insist on the repatriation of every American kid in prison camps in Vietnam and the removal of the some 30,000 South Vietnamese hostages to whom our mistaken policy of unnecessary intervention in that war between those two dictatorships has caused us to be obligated. So you see I do advocate a policy that is different from the President's, namely, a policy that does not make some condition about propping up the Government in South Vietnam before our withdrawal. In other words, mind our own business and let them decide that question for themselves. By "them" I mean the people who live there in Vietnam. We have enough problems of our own here at home.

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I said yester-

day or last night to the gentleman in the debate in one of our exchanges that he lives in a fool's paradise. I repeat it today, because I do not think his approach to the tragic problem in Vietnam is a practical solution to the problem. Speeches will not end the war but President Nixon's action will. The President of the United States is insisting that the American prisoners of war be returned. The President of the United States is insisting that there be free elections in South Vietnam supervised by the proper authorities. They, the South Vietnamese people, must have the right to determine their own fate and I am glad to say that President Thieu agrees. I gather from what the gentleman from Indiana is saying to me and what he said yesterday that he has no different solution that is a practical answer. At least, he did not say anything concrete or specific.

Mr. JACOBS. I do have a different solution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does he have a practical answer?

Mr. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It was not an answer that was intelligible to anybody on the floor of the House.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, the gentleman may be speaking only for himself. I can explain it to the gentleman, but I cannot comprehend it for him. I would ask the gentleman this question: If the gentleman thinks it is the duty of the United States to democratize nations that are not democratic, is the gentleman in favor now of our declaring war on all of the dictatorships, the Russians, the Chinese, the Spanish—and sending armies there not to be withdrawn until “proper authorities” supervise the institution of democratic elections?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana still has 5 seconds remaining.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not want to make the point of order with the gentleman having 5 seconds left, does he?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I want my point of order to stay after the 5 seconds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has 5 seconds left.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for protecting the Members' privileges.

AWARDS BY COUNTRY MUSIC ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tonight, a nationally televised live program will originate in my home district of Nashville-Davidson County, featuring the presentation of awards by the Country Music Association.

The Kraft Music Hall, hosted by Tennessee Ernie Ford, long established as one of our foremost entertainers, will be broadcast live over NBC-TV, with the

program originating in the Grand Ole Opry House in Nashville, Tenn.

As the only Member of the House to represent in the Congress “Music City U.S.A.,” I am indeed proud of the position of leadership my constituency holds within the music industry. As a friend of country music, and one with close ties to the artists and performers in this industry, I am pleased to represent Nashville, Tenn., the undisputed capital of country and western music.

Tonight's live telecast of the Country Music Association awards will be one of the major highlights of a week-long series of celebrations.

It is also the occasion of the country music disk jockey convention, the pre-convention pro-celebrity golf tournament, and the 44th anniversary of WSM-radio's “Grand Ole Opry,” the most successful, continuous radio program in the Nation, and the real beginning and heart of our country music industry.

This year's Opry birthday and disk jockey convention will attract more than 6,000 delegates, representing all 50 States and many foreign countries, anywhere that country and western music is enjoyed and listened to, and that is everywhere.

This year's celebration marked the announcement by WSM of a major development which will mean a nationally prominent facility and a new permanent home for the Grand Ole Opry.

WSM has acquired a 400-acre site for the construction of “Opryland, U.S.A.,” a family-oriented park, including a 5,000-seat theater which will become the new home of the Grand Ole Opry, the top-of-the-ladder for every country and western singer or performer. The theater will also be available as a base for the production of major television shows, for use by symphony orchestras and other performing groups. “Opryland, U.S.A.,” a \$16 million venture, will include a complex of shops, restaurants, and other attractions, designed for family entertaining.

We are proud of our recording industry, our position as “Music City, U.S.A.,” and as the home of the Grand Ole Opry.

To each of my colleagues, I would like to extend a standing invitation to visit us in Nashville, and enjoy the outstanding entertainment and the showmanship that is available in the country music capital of the world.

As the queen of country comedy, Miss Minnie Pearl would say, “Ya'll come, we would be just so proud to see you.”

VIETNAM: CONFESSION, CRITICISM, CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENT

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time during the national student moratorium to make my comment and reanalyze our American policy in Southeast Asia. While I certainly do not support any spirited effort to stampede the President to a decision, I do believe this is an appropriate time to take some inventory of my own and American politi-

cal thought in relation to time, conditions that are present in the American economy and the order of battle in Southeast Asia.

The point I make simply adds up to a conclusion that the alternative to the Americans being pushed into the Tonkin Gulf in 1965 is not exclusively a \$40 billion per year war in 1969 and through the 70's.

First a confession.

I would remind the country first of all that on the reverse of the official U.S. Kennedy medal approved by the former President himself there is printed:

We shall pay any price, bear any burden, etc.

I myself supported the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1965 with some enthusiasm.

The students are not alone in their criticism of administration management of the war.

In the fall of 1966 Melvin Laird, as chairman of the Republican conference, issued a document, “The U.S. and the War in Vietnam.” In this partisan indictment the Republicans criticized the 300,000 U.S. troop involvement and the \$13 billion war cost. They called the war a miscalculation and stated that the Government deception was undermining Government. The summary and conclusion of the report follows:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The involvement of the United States in Vietnam after World War II began with the decision of the Truman Administration to provide economic and military aid in May 1950.¹

A fragile peace was brought to Vietnam by the Geneva Agreements of 1954, partitioning Vietnam into a Communist North and a non-Communist South. Contrary to most expectations, South Vietnam survived. Indeed, with generous aid from the United States, it achieved what the late President John F. Kennedy called a near miracle between 1954 and 1960. Secretary McNamara spoke of the history of South Vietnam in this period as a “success story.”

When President Eisenhower left office, there was no crisis in South Vietnam. There were problems, arising particularly from a renewal of sporadic guerrilla activity by the Vietcong. The dimensions of the problems then compared with the present situation can be gauged from these facts:

1. In 1960, there were fewer than 700 American military personnel stationed in South Vietnam to train South Vietnamese; today (late August 1966) 300,000 American troops are there to fight.
2. In 1960, there were 5,000–6,000 Vietcong regulars in South Vietnam; today 282,000 enemy troops are there.²
3. In 1960, no Americans had been killed in combat; as of August 20, 1966, 4,832 have

¹ The State Department has issued three useful documents on Vietnam: *A Threat to Peace* (Dept. of State Publication 7308, December 1961) referred to herein as *A Threat*; *Aggression from the North* (Dept. of State Publication 7839, February 1961) referred to herein as *Aggression Why Vietnam* (August 1965). A handy compilation of speeches and documents has been prepared by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam* (2d Revised Edition, March 1966) herein referred to as *Background*.

² Vietcong strength in 1960 extrapolated from figures given in *A Threat*, pp. 9–10. Present strength reported by Department of Defense, *New York Times*, August 10, 1966.

been killed and almost 27,000 have been wounded, taken prisoner or are missing.

4. In 1960, and in 1962, more than 80 per cent of the land area of South Vietnam was under the control of the South Vietnamese Government; today it is about 30 per cent or less.

5. In 1960, the cost of aiding South Vietnam to the United States was \$250 million—72 per cent of it economic aid; as of the spring of 1966, it was more than \$13 billion on an annual basis, of which less than 3 per cent was economic aid.³

6. In 1960, 2,000 South Vietnamese civilians were killed or kidnapped by the Viet Cong; in 1965, 14,673 were the victims of a similar fate.

7. In 1960, the physical volume of exports from South Vietnam (a good barometer of economic activity) had dropped to 46 per cent of the 1960 level of exports.

President Truman and President Eisenhower sent American military personnel to Vietnam solely as advisors. During the Kennedy Administration, American airmen began to participate in combat. In 1965, American ground forces began to fight. This commitment of American troops to combat was the decision of President Johnson. It was not forced upon him by the SEATO Treaty or by any other obligation entered into by an earlier administration. Under the Johnson Administration, American forces have begun to assume the major part of the burden of fighting the Communists in Vietnam.

The policy of the current Administration has been uncertain and subject to abrupt change. The objective of the United States in Vietnam has become clouded. By proposing the Geneva Agreements as a basis for peace and by refusing to reveal its attitude toward the proposed coalition government including Communists for South Vietnam, the Administration leaves dangerously obscure the minimum peace terms which it will insist on. Is it willing to accept in Vietnam the kind of settlement reached after World War II for the satellite states of Eastern Europe and in 1962 for Laos?

To what degree miscalculation on the part of the enemy brought about the present war, no one can be sure. Miscalculation must have been encouraged by the failure to match words with deeds throughout the Geneva negotiations of 1961-62 over Laos, by the withdrawal of support from the Diem regime, by the 1964 campaign oratory of President Johnson promising that American boys would not be sent to do the job that Asian boys should do.

The Administration has consistently held off needed military action until the situation in South Vietnam reached a state of acute deterioration. It has failed to use the economic power of the nation in the conflict.

The Administration has not told the American people the truth about the military situation in Vietnam, about the mission of

American troops, about war costs, about casualties, about peace feelers. This studied deception strikes at the vitals of the system of popular government.

The result of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam, according to leading administration spokesmen, has been a stalemate with neither victory nor a satisfactory peace in prospect. Secretary McNamara, usually the optimist, assesses the present situation in the words, "We have stopped losing the war," and David Bell, until recently AID Director, says there has not been "significant progress for the last 3 or 4 years" in establishing security and economic progress in the areas in which the Vietcong exercise some influence.

I gave President Nixon my best current advice 2 weeks ago, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose herewith an editorial from the conservative California School Boards publication indicating their impatience with your efforts to extricate us from Southeast Asia.

If you are going to determine the policies of the Presidency on the basis of the minutia of statistics in Southeast Asia, you are destined to the failures of the Johnson Administration. If you could simply set your course on extrication of American forces, and let the Joint Chiefs of Staff know that you cannot be manipulated by subjective Defense Intelligence, you will then be giving the country the leadership which we so critically need.

I know you hesitate to reduce our posture when you note the high number of enemy and friendly casualties which continue to be inflicted and also the alleged high numbers of Vietnamese who continue to arrive in the south. I have a strong feeling that enemy casualties are not nearly as high as we allege them to be and one of the reasons is the fact that the ARVN inflicted casualty statistics are admittedly high, unreliable and probably inflated many thousands every month.

In order to account for the enemy in the battlefield I believe it has been necessary for Defense Intelligence to allege very high infiltration rates to account for the presence of enemy soldiers who have, in fact, never been killed.

Howbeit, since the bombing halt last year, North Vietnamese enemy posture has reduced one-third and the enemy has totally terminated company and battalion size operations.

You should move forthwith today—the Joint Chiefs of Staff be damned—to reduce our ground posture in Vietnam from the current level in excess of 350,000 to a level of 50,000, twelve months hence. The Navy is making plans to relinquish our posture at Vung Tau next June. We could keep the balance of the Navy and Air Force in place since total battle deaths for these departments have been less than 250 men over the past year.

If you would be dramatic you could obtain the support of our city poor and college young which the country needs quite desperately. However, at your current rate of de-escalation the young people are going to erupt against you before you can complete the job unless you give positive assurance that you know what you are doing.

To be sure your recent announcements with respect to the draft will be helpful in pacifying some of the objectors; what the country needs, however, is not a piecemeal approach but a total integrated de-escalation of our war economy and peace time conversion. I know your Bureau of the Budget would appreciate a year's projection of our national fiscal policy.

I enclose for your review again one of my recent newsletters pointing up the catastrophe of the last Administration which could fall upon you.

The mish mash of military construction curtailment last week following closely on the passage of the Military Construction Bill by the House and the further passage of a woefully inadequate Housing and Urban Development Program is a confoundment of non-leadership.

I wish you every success in rising to the challenge.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

So in conclusion in perspective I think the students urging the moratorium demonstration on the war are not isolated or even way out. The President has stated he wants to get out. He has ordered a phase down to 484,000 men. The students intend to give him some mood music to reduce these figures even further. I believe my letter to the President presents a constructive program of deescalation that could be accepted. I respect my President's right to make up his own mind. I think he will soon realize that he simply cannot play international poker with American public opinion. This is one of the pitfalls of democracy but it is also a self-corrective device of American greatness.

THE LATE VINCENT DOYLE

(MR. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

MR. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues share the sorrow of losing our friend, Vincent A. Doyle, who has given years of dedicated service here on Capitol Hill. We had great respect and admiration for Vincent as an attorney for the Library of Congress and as president of the Federal Bar Association's Capitol Hill Chapter, and his absence will be a deep-felt loss to us all. Following is the notice from this morning's Washington Post:

VINCENT DOYLE DIES; FEDERAL BAR HEAD

Vincent A. Doyle, president-elect of the Federal Bar Association, died Monday after a heart attack at the Woodner Hotel, where he was staying temporarily.

He was an attorney for the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress.

A native of Brooklyn, Mr. Doyle received his bachelor of arts degree from Notre Dame University and his law degree from Boston University School of Law. He also took graduate courses at Georgetown University Law Center.

In 1949, he joined the legal staff of the copyright office of the Library of Congress and became assistant chief of the examining division three years later.

Mr. Doyle was in private law practice from 1955 to 1958, when he returned to the Library of Congress.

He was a veteran of World War II, serving as director of the Army's 16th bombardment operation training wing.

He was author of a number of papers on civil rights and constitutional law.

In 1965, Mr. Doyle was elected president of the Federal Bar Association's Capitol Hill Chapter. Later he served as treasurer and vice president of the association, and was named its president-elect on Oct. 1 of this year. He had served on the American Bar Association's special committee on presidential inability and vice presidential succession since 1964.

Mr. Doyle was a member of the National Lawyers Club, the Notre Dame Club of Washington and the Boston University Alumni Association.

³ Background, p. 289. Determining the cost of the war in Vietnam involves difficult accounting problems. In using the figure of more than \$13 billion, we rely on Secretary McNamara's estimate of May 11, 1966 that "the incremental costs of the war are on the order of \$12 billion a year at the present time," and that military aid to South Vietnam amounts to "about \$795 million in the current fiscal year." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Hearings, Foreign Assistance 1966, p. 672.) Economic aid to South Vietnam came to \$590 million in fiscal year 1966. McNamara's estimate is close to the \$13.7 billion estimate of military costs by expert accountants outside the Defense Department. (William Bowen, "The Vietnam War: A Cost Accounting," *Fortune*, April 1966.) This article predicts a cost of \$19.3 billion annually when American forces in Vietnam increase to 400,000. XIX, no. 8 (August 1966), p. 308.

He is survived by his wife, Gerdis; two sons, Denis and Christopher, both of Rockville, and two stepdaughters, Carolyn Bowles of Boston and Rebecca Hickey of Washington.

Friends may call at Joseph Gawler's Sons, 5130 Wisconsin Ave. at Harrison St. NW (Parking on premises), on Wednesday, 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 p.m. and Thursday 2 to 4 p.m. Services will be held at the Augustana Lutheran Church, New Hampshire Ave. and V St. NW, on Thursday, October 16, at 7:30 p.m. Interment Gettysburg National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa., on Friday, October 17, at 1 p.m.

AN OUTSTANDING CHARACTER FROM LOUISIANA

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, early this year a young soldier of my acquaintance wrote me to tell me of his decision to join the Army. He thought it his duty. Later in the spring I had a call from his parents, telling me he had been wounded in South Vietnam. I made every effort to discover the nature of his injuries and to have him returned home as quickly as possible, because his mother and father were understandably concerned. Once the red tape was out of the way, we found that he was blind. It was an awful blow to me personally because I have known the boy since he was a child. In fact, he was my page while I was in the Louisiana State Senate, and he lived with my wife and me. His parents have been my close friends as long as I can remember knowing them. His mother was once my legal secretary. She is a former worthy grand matron of the Eastern Star in Louisiana and is now a member of the Louisiana Board of Parole. Their son's wounds are a bitter reward to his parents, but they have not snuffed out his wonderful spirit. We hope and pray that medical science will be able to restore to him his sight.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in the October 11, 1969, issue of the *Shreveport, La., Times* a column written by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., in which he describes a visit with William H. Fullerton, Jr., of Tullos, La., at the Fort Sam Houston Medical Center in San Antonio, Tex. I think it entirely fitting, on this day when many Americans are vocally rejecting duty to country in a spasm of irrelevant protest, that we include Mr. Buckley's remarks in the *RECORD*. I commend the column to my colleagues and to the Nation:

AN OUTSTANDING CHARACTER FROM LOUISIANA

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

SAN ANTONIO.—"It helps, man," he said spiritedly, "if you tell me who you are." The nurse identified herself so that he was then able to refer to her by name. Would he care to join us for some coffee? "I never turned down free coffee in my life," and he climbed down off his bed and struggled with his bathrobe. Unsuccessfully.

The visitor sorted it out and helped him on with it. He chatted on, wanting to know the latest word on New York City politics. He extended his left hand, fastening it on the visitor's right arm, and told him to go ahead. "If we pass any pretty girls, tell me

and I'll whistle. I don't know whether there are any around here, but I wouldn't be surprised." (But there were only doctors and nurses as they strolled down the corridor, and the maimed bodies of servicemen.)

He talked on in high spirits, touching on Louisiana politics, concerning which he was expert. He majored in history at LSU and knew and obviously cherished the brawling politics of his home state. "Real upheaval now. The old Huey Long base—the white redneck and the Negroes—is breaking up, since the integration business. The governor is in deep trouble. And you know that Louisiana never votes for the winning president. Not since 1956. Earl Long was my man. I worked for his election when I was nine years old. Outstanding. He knew politics."

NEVER WRONG

"The trick is to play politics and not to get enmeshed in them. He had a way with the voters. 'The South may not always be right,' he said, 'but it is never wrong.' One governor said he hadn't run for public office in order to take a vow of poverty. Next I saw of him was a picture, alongside the president of LSU, cutting sugar cane in a chain gang."

Getting into the car confused him because it was one of those new models, the rear doors opening up to leeward, so that he began to step in facing the rear. At that, you would not know that his experience with blindness is so short. It happened on June 9. William Fullerton was a squad leader, instructed to reconnoiter on a hilltop south of Da Nang.

"We got up there all right, but the area was booby trapped. Half the platoon was hit. My squad—20 men—had 25 casualties during the preceding period, so we were under strength. I thought, God, we're going to be ambushed, and I worried because I couldn't see my gun. But the choppers were there in no time. What a sound when you hear those blades. Outstanding. Thirty minutes later I was in a hospital. Three days later in Japan. I got here the 5th of July, how's that?"

AMERICAN LOGISTICS

American logistics, the visitor admitted, was better than American foreign policy. "They ought to fight that war to win or pull every man out of there tomorrow. If I could see, I'd go back tomorrow, if we'd agree to fight to win. I didn't have to go last time. I was 1-Y. I just figured I'd go and do my Hemingway thing."

What now? "My own doctor says an operation could bring sight back to my right eye. But the people here disagree, they say the eye is too far gone. So I'm headed for Chicago. They'll discharge me there, and I'll go to the Veterans Hospital where they specialize in blind people. If they agree to operate there, fine. If not, I'd have to go and get it done privately, and that costs \$2,000. But I suppose it's worth it. I'd like to go back to LSU and take law. But I'll have to wait. They'll teach me Braille at Chicago. Maybe that way you can get to understand Louisiana law. The Constitution is the longest in the world. I started to read it once. Didn't get past the preamble."

It was time to go back. A corporal greeted him on the street outside the hospital door. "Hey, George," he returned the greeting, "what about the kidneys?" George said the doctors hadn't succeeded. "Oh, well, George, just think, you could be ugly, too." George walked off, and Fullerton leaned over, his face deeply grieved. "Awful. He has three children. But with his kidney condition, he can't live more than 15 or 20 years."

Back at the ward, he stood erect by his bed smiling and on finding the visitor's hand, shook it. "Outstanding," he said. "I've had an outstanding time."

NO MORATORIUM FOR OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, for several hundreds of thousands of young American men there will be no Vietnam moratorium today. Many of them will be marching but they will be carrying guns, rather than candles.

I speak of our American servicemen who are deployed in South Vietnam and other support stations in the Far East. They, certainly more than any other group of Americans, would welcome an early peace and a safe return to their own country and their loved ones. They, more than any other Americans know what war is because they are there.

As one of several millions of Americans who have a son, a husband or a brother fighting in Vietnam today, this war is not a distant thing for me. Along with every member of my family, I am acutely aware of Vietnam every hour of the day.

I do not propose at this time to go into the reasons for U.S. involvement in Vietnam other than to say that the original purpose was clearly to protect a helpless people from naked Communist aggression and to defend what were deemed to be vital American political and strategic interests in the Far East and the Pacific.

From the letters I receive from my only son, who is with an Army combat unit in South Vietnam, I know that he knows why he is there. He does not want to see a unilateral pullout of U.S. military forces because he is close enough to this war to know what would follow—a quick Communist takeover and the loss of everything for which he and his comrades in arms have been fighting. Perhaps he should be thinking of his own comfort and security first but I am proud of the fact that he is not.

I could not help but wonder how he and the other men of his company felt when they heard the Hanoi broadcast hailing the Vietnam moratorium protests which, it was said, would put the Nixon administration in "a very difficult and confused situation."

According to a United Press International news report in last night's *Washington Star*, another Hanoi broadcast carried this message of encouragement to the moratorium leaders:

The Vietnamese people heartily welcome and entirely support the October wave of struggle. The whole world is standing on your side and acting in coordination with you.

In quoting this propaganda piece, I do not wish to infer that the moratorium leaders are consciously serving Hanoi. I am convinced that most of them are sincere in wishing to see the war brought to an early conclusion. I share that wish most fervently, as does President Nixon, and virtually every American. For the tiny minority which may seek to use the moratorium as a cover for inciting riots—for those few who will carry enemy flags today—I have nothing but contempt.

At the same time, I question the wis-

dom of staging the peace demonstrations at a time when President Nixon has already ordered substantial withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam and is assiduously seeking to obtain from North Vietnam even the tiniest indication that the Communists are willing to undertake serious negotiations to end this long and agonizing war. It is clearly evident that the moratorium will weaken the President's hand in achieving a peaceful settlement and will, at the same time, strengthen Hanoi's resolve to continue its war of aggression against South Vietnam.

Recently I joined with a bipartisan group of 113 House Members in introducing a resolution of support for President Nixon's Vietnam policy of disengagement and troop withdrawal.

It is significant that more than one-fourth of the membership of the House, including 46 Democrats, is sponsoring the resolution. Although the sponsors have varying views on the political and military advisability of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the manner in which the war has been conducted in the past, all of us agree on these two points:

First, we believe the substantial reductions which will shortly total 60,000—are very clearly in the national interest. President Nixon acted wisely and properly in directing these reductions.

Second, we believe that President Nixon should be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw all remaining ground combat forces from Vietnam at the earliest practicable date.

The next few weeks could be critical in our negotiations with the other side. For that reason I especially deplore any words or actions here on the home front now that would help to convince the North Vietnamese that the United States is tired, weak willed and hopelessly divided. Those who are seeking to make political capital out of Vietnam are doing a grave disservice not only to themselves but to their country.

This is not Mr. Nixon's war. He did not get us into it. He is only trying to get us out. Time after time he has made it clear to the Government of North Vietnam and to its representatives at the Paris peace talks his willingness to walk the extra mile toward an honorable solution.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include in my remarks a column by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, distributed by the Los Angeles Times syndicate, and published October 5, 1969:

COLUMN BY ROSCOE AND GEOFFREY DRUMMOND

WASHINGTON.—The leaders of the Democratic Party are playing with political dynamite in trying to force President Nixon to withdraw U.S. troops from Vietnam so rapidly as to throw away all prospect of negotiating a peace. They may be the ones who get blown out of the water. That's not important. What is more important is that the United States of America would be hurt—grievously hurt—by this shortsighted, reckless, perilous undermining of what the President is doing to end the war by seeking a fair peace.

No one is suggesting that those who want peace at any price, those who want to withdraw all American forces immediately, regardless of the consequences, should still

their protests. All the President and others who are earnestly seeking disengagement and a decent peace are asking is that for a reasonable period congressional critics should stop telling Hanoi that it doesn't need to negotiate, that all it has to do is to wait and they—the congressional critics—will see that the U.S. government accepts a no-peace policy.

The Vietnamese war has never been a partisan issue, and attempting to bring it to an end with a fair peace is not a partisan issue. But leaders of the Democratic Party are now trying to make it so. Senator Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, disclosed this strategy in a candid remark to the press last week. "We will," he said, "hold Nixon responsible if he turns South Vietnam over to the Communists." But simultaneously Senator Harris and Democratic senators like Kennedy, McGovern, McCarthy, Fulbright are continuing to demand such a rapid pull-out of U.S. troops that the end result would be give the Communists control of South Vietnam. Thus, the national chairman of the Democratic Party is not only acting to make Vietnam a pay-dirt partisan issue but is also seeking to put President Nixon in such a box that no matter what he does he's bound to lose. What he's up to is now in the open. He wants to give the Democratic Party all the dividends he can by joining in the pressure on Mr. Nixon to get American troops out of Vietnam fast. But Harris does not intend that the Democratic Party should take any responsibility for an imprudent speed-up of withdrawal. He proposes that if a President gives in to the demand for imprudent speed-up he—not the advocates of speed-up—should be held to blame. In other words, Senator Harris' neat formula is to make Mr. Nixon punishable by the voters if he doesn't yield to pressures to get out quick and also if evil consequences come from yielding to such pressures.

Senators and Congressmen have special responsibility. They know that the President has the constitutional duty to conduct foreign policy and that negotiating peace is the most difficult and delicate act of foreign policy. Heckling and harrasing the President is delaying the peace, not hastening it. Have the Democrats forgotten so soon that Richard Nixon is acting to end a war which he inherited from his Democratic predecessor and which they helped to authorize? Harris and those Democrats he is rallying to put the voice of his party behind the peace-at-any-price student-faculty protests October 15 are playing with fire. It wouldn't matter, if they weren't also undermining the chances of negotiating a just peace.

THE MORATORIUM ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last evening during the debate Mr. Jacobs was going to yield to me for 15 minutes, but the dialog got to such a point that I did not have the opportunity to speak, either then or later.

Therefore, I am happy to have this opportunity now to participate in the moratorium discussion.

Mr. Speaker, this is an age of dissent. It is now commonplace for those who disagree with policies of governments to demonstrate that disagreement. It is little wonder we have had the age of dissent. There are 500,000 men in Vietnam, still 56,000 in Korea, and more than 500,000 in all sections of the world. More than

\$900 billion have been spent on war or the prevention of war. Every man has the right to dissent—for dissent makes those in power, in authority, in the establishment, and the people as a whole aware of our inequities. America will become greater and more responsive because of dissent, and this moratorium, in my belief, is good for the Nation.

I regret that the debate was cut off last evening. It was one of the finest and most meaningful dialogs that I have heard in my years in Congress.

When the question of Vietnam is discussed, there are so many things we can talk about. Actually, I think that there are only three choices in policy—and I do not want to discuss or argue why we are there or who put us there—I want to discuss the present situation.

What are the choices that we have? The first choice that we have is to revert to conducting the war the way it was being fought 2 years ago. We could go back to bombing the North and heavy search and destroy missions. This was the situation in September of 1967 when I first came out in opposition to this war. At that time 12,000 men had been killed and today 40,000 men have been killed.

The second choice is to really try to win the war militarily as we never did. We never bombed Hanoi, we never bombed the rice paddies, we never bombed the dams, we never invaded. I think all of us realize and understand that if we were to do that, we would probably cause world war III, and I do not want that, and I cannot imagine any Member of this body would want that.

There is one other choice, and if we are to be reasonable men and not want to see the war of attrition continue, which is what going back to the old policy would be, and if we do not want to bring on nuclear holocaust and the destruction of the world as we know it, which is what would happen if we were to make the second choice, then we must take the last course. And that is to get the boys out of there and to get the boys home as quickly as we possibly can. We do not want to leave troops there or a population there only to see them lose their lives in blood baths of revenge and recrimination and that consideration is part of the phrase "as soon as we possibly can."

But something must be stressed, and I am afraid it has not been stressed sufficiently so far. That is, we must do what is best for America. We all care about the world, but our considerations cannot be based on what is best for South Vietnam, what is best for North Vietnam, but only what is best for the United States. This war is tearing our Nation and destroying us as surely as it is the nation of South Vietnam. Every program that must be enacted, all the funds that must be appropriated are being ignored so that this war can be pursued. It is not in the interest of the United States. And the interest of the United States should be our only concern.

Almost 300,000 Americans, young men in the prime of life, have been killed or wounded in a war that has lasted too long, devoured our resources and divided our Nation. We cannot tolerate the loss of our youth in a morass of never-ending

conflict. I believe that the third choice is the only one that is in the interest of the United States. I want to say at this point that I approve of what the President has done. I think the President is on the right track. He said that he was going to improve on Clark Clifford's timetable. He said that he was going to bring the men home more quickly than Clifford would have. As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I am going to keep after the President to see that he fulfills this promise and brings the boys home as quickly as possible.

I realize that we might not be able to get the troops home in 3 weeks or 2 months or a year. But we must get the action started. We must have a steady, definite withdrawal of troops, for when we get the action started, it is my belief that then the North Vietnamese in their own interest will respond.

This is what the American people want. This is why the moratorium is taking place. A great many Americans are speaking out today. First, because they do not accept the first choice going back to conducting the war as it has been fought for too many years with a loss of too many lives and an expenditure of too much of our resources. Second, they do not want the second choice. They do not want to go to full-scale war, bombing, invasion and the inevitable result, a third world war. Thirdly, the people of America are speaking out today because they want their boys, they want action and they want it quickly.

I just have one further point, but it is an important one. For those who advocate war, full-scale war, with the bombing of North Vietnamese cities and dams, harbors and agriculture settlements, I can only recite history and point to the lesson taught by history.

I have no doubts that saturation bombing and an invasion of North Vietnam could bring about defeat of the North Vietnamese. However, the danger of a world war through continued escalation is real. In the summer of 1961, the late President John F. Kennedy and former Premier Khrushchev confronted each other over the Berlin crisis. The Russian head of state told the President that if our troops were not pulled out of Berlin, the Russians would invade. President Kennedy's answer was that there would be no troop cutback and a Russian invasion of Berlin would mean world war. When the President called for a troop buildup, the Russians were convinced of our sincerity and our willingness to go to war over this issue, and they did nothing.

In October 1962 a similar situation developed. When the late President John F. Kennedy learned that there were missiles in Cuba, he demanded their removal. At the first the Russians refused; but when they realized that the United States was willing to risk war by blockading Cuba in order to have the missiles removed, they complied.

The lesson from these two crises is that the Soviet Union accurately judged the determination of the United States and knew that there were certain limits to peaceful accommodation. There is now a similar situation with regard to

Vietnam. A world power can only be pushed so far before the obligations of position and the need to retain influence make it resist.

We can push the Russians and the Chinese to a certain point, but beyond that point they must resist or relinquish any influence they have and resign themselves to being second or third rate powers. I think it naive and foolhardy to assume that the United States can escalate this war and expect no retaliation or resistance.

Our Government has been told by Peking and by Moscow—by Kosygin himself—that if we invade North Vietnam they will be obliged to come to the rescue of their ally, the North Vietnamese Government. If we refuse to believe this statement we are foolhardy, because we have done the same thing when the situation has been reversed. We have been willing to risk nuclear war to protect our interests—and so would the Soviet Union.

I mention this for those who might consider the second choice. It will only bring about the third world war and an end to everything we have ever fought for and tried to do for this Nation. The American people want peace, they want their sons, they want the growth of the Nation. If this moratorium does anything to bring about the action and the policy that will end this war at an earlier date, then our leaders will be fruitful. We cannot miss the opportunity, we cannot pass up the chance to influence policy.

CERTAIN REPUBLICAN MEMBERS SUPPORT SUDDEN, MAJOR ESCALATION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM AS A MEANS OF ENDING IT

(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, the distinguished majority leader has asked me to yield to him and I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just been handed a news ticker item that struck me as being rather unusual, especially in view of the names of some of those who signed a letter addressed to the President of the United States, the letter being signed by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER), the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. ROGERS MORTON, whose national position in the Republican Party is well known, and by other Members.

Mr. Speaker, the release reads as follows, as reported:

Representative SAM STEIGER urged congressional support today for a sudden, major escalation of the war in Vietnam as a means of ending it.

He is quoted in the release as follows: "Half-hearted wars are seldom won," Steiger said in a letter addressed to President Nixon. "Tough enemies are seldom convinced by half-hearted efforts that they need to negotiate in good faith."

STEIGER said the letter had been signed by 14 other Republican Members of Congress, including national chairman Rogers C. B. Morton of Maryland. He said he is seeking other signatures on the letter, to be sent to Nixon later in this day of antiwar demonstrations.

Representative Steiger was quoted as further saying:

"We believe this dirty little war with a third-rate power can and must be brought to an honorable end if the United States is ever again to hold up its head in the family of nations."

There is an alternative to half-hearted prosecution of the war, it said, "to put it simply, a sudden major escalation of the war with one aim in mind—victory."

The letter urged immediate resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, including the river dikes which protect the North's major rice growing areas. It says South Vietnam's Rangers should be sent into the North to infiltrate and retaliate with the same guerrilla tactics employed against South Vietnam.

"We have watched with growing indignation the efforts of some in and out of Congress to dishonor our Nation by effecting a complete surrender to the Communist Government of North Vietnam."

"We are concerned Americans, who represent constituents that are fed up with half-way measures and talk of cowardly retreat, and urge you to take drastic steps either to force the North Vietnamese to negotiate in good faith or to bring about American victory."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that both parties are divided on the issue and that there are those in favor of much more aggressive action against North Vietnam, but it comes as passing strange that a distinguished member of the Republican Party would be a signatory to a letter which in my opinion runs so counter to the recommendations of the President of the United States.

THE POSITION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON THE WAR IN 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 listened to the news release with great interest. Although I find no agreement with any of the contents of the letter, I am pleased that the chairman of the Republican Party has withdrawn from his original charge that those who took a view contrary to the President and thereby presented a break in unity with the President, were actually doing a service to the enemy.

THE WAY HOME

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is fall, and suddenly, the air is filled with shouts and slogans. The quiet spring and summer have died with the fallen leaves. The rustle of frustration, ferment and protest grows louder, muted only by the angered and anguished cries of those whose marching feet stir the leaves of change.

It is fall, and there is still war, and a

draft blows cold on young America. The fall is reminiscent of past falls when there was war, and when the draft blew cold. It is reminiscent of last fall when the hope and need for change stirred the voices and votes of Americans. There is change, but it is small, and it is fall.

Let me take a page from the President's inaugural address and attempt to look beneath the shouting and the slogans to examine with a softer and more analytical voice the problem of Vietnam.

This week, hundreds of thousands, and maybe millions of Americans interrupt their daily routine to join in demonstrations against the continuation of the war in Vietnam. These demonstrations, some in the form of religious services, some in the form of marches, others involving the reading of the 40,000 American Vietnam dead will say with a loud voice, what we already know—that the American people have grown tired, frustrated, and angry over a war whose objectives are clouded at best, and whose only certainties are death and the depletion of our national resources and national spirit.

Americans should exercise their right to free and open expression and dissent. But dissent has to be responsible. The temptation to oversimplify opposition through slogans serves only to make the opposition itself less relevant and less meaningful to those who must decide the complex questions of policy.

I believe that the moratorium can claim one accomplishment. It makes crystal clear what has been clear to many of us for years—that there can be no unity of the American people behind any Vietnam policy as long as the loss of lives and the frustration of fighting a limited-objective war continue.

This does not mean that no policy other than immediate withdrawal can be a responsible policy. It merely means that no policy which depends on the united support of all the American people cannot succeed as long as the war continues.

Opposition to the Vietnam war has long since hardened beyond the point of reversal among a large segment of Americans. In fact, this opposition, hardening with each new casualty report, has spread for many into an almost broadside opposition to everything military. Quite apart from responsible and objective expressions of dissent and opposition to the war or to specific military programs, such eye- and ear-catching slogans as: "Hey, hey L. B. J., how many kids have you killed today?" "Hell no, we won't go," and "ABM is an Edsel," add nothing to meaningful debate—they merely help crystallize opposition for opposition's sake, and they turn the ears of responsible Americans away from what protesters are really trying to say.

The reading of the names of our 40,000 dead soldiers should not be a long slogan of protest.

If such readings are used to taunt the Government and the country whose people and policies these brave men died to support and defend, the readings will only profane and dishonor the names of the best of America's youth. If, on the other hand, they are read in memorium,

in an effort to drive home the fact that too many have already died in this war, such readings may well point out the grief and despair our people feel over this seemingly bottomless and endless conflict.

Yes, the moratorium and its protests solidify a fact that has become one of the realities of this war—the fact that there will be deep division in America and hardened opposition to our Government's policies as long as there is a Vietnam war.

Unfortunately, dissent at home is not all that is required to resolve this conflict. I have enough faith in our present and past administrations to believe that if complete and immediate withdrawal were easy or painless, or if it could be done without leaving a blood bath in its wake, it would have been accomplished long ago. No, opposition at home is not the only fact to be reckoned with in this struggle—it is an important fact, and one, which makes more difficult the Government's attempts to grapple with the many other hard realities that surround the Vietnam situation.

The other, and more difficult realities are to be found in Vietnam itself. The Vietnam war did not begin with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, or with massive injections of American men and hardware. War has been raging on the eastern half of the Indochina peninsula since the beginning of World War II—almost 30 years ago. North and South Vietnam have been under one foreign heel or another for centuries.

There are few, if any natural boundaries on the peninsula, and there is little in history to show any strong propensity on the part of the Vietnamese people for self-government under a free or democratic system.

At the end of World War II, the Japanese and the Vichy French relinquished their control of Vietnam to British and Chinese forces. North of the 16th parallel, an arbitrary line drawn between the allied occupation forces, the Nationalist Chinese found the Viet Minh more than willing to cooperate in the establishment of a so-called free state.

In the south, the occupying armies of France and the United Kingdom met opposition to their attempts to reestablish French authority. By December 1946, France was under attack from guerrilla forces of the Viet Minh who had used the postwar calm in the north to organize and coordinate their nationalist resistance efforts to French rule.

The French dilemma of trying to fight the Viet Minh guerrillas and trying to organize a pro-French Union government in the south was compounded in 1949 when the Communists won the war for control of China. The Viet Minh declared their adherence to the Communist ideology and received diplomatic, political, and economic assistance from the new Chinese regime.

The Chinese, in the same year also sought to extend their sphere of influence on the Korean peninsula below the 38th parallel, but met with strong resistance from the South Korean people, aided by the United Nations. Since

the truce at Panmunjom in the summer of 1953, a free and prosperous nation has grown up south of the 38th parallel, despite the continuing threat of renewed war with North Korea. But to expect that the same prospect awaits South Vietnam is to expect too much. The political, military, psychological and economic situations in Korea and South Vietnam are as different as the climates of the two Asian peninsulas.

After the fall of Dien Bien Phu in 1954, the French agreed to a truce and a negotiated settlement of the war which their modern, well-equipped army was losing to the North Vietnamese guerrillas. The Geneva Conference established the 17th parallel and its adjacent demilitarized zone as a temporary boundary between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in the north and the Republic of Vietnam in the south. Both governments were recognized by various members of the family of nations as the legal governments of their respective areas of influence.

The past 25 or 30 years is a typical slice of Vietnamese history. We must take as a reality that there can be no expectation that a free and democratic government, mirrored as an image of our own, can emerge as the government of what we now call South Vietnam. Some critics of the Vietnam war cite the corruption, the censorship, the political prisoners, and the "junta" appearance of the South Vietnamese Government as evidence of the utter failure of our involvement to guarantee freedom to the South Vietnamese people.

It might be fair to say that the South Vietnamese Government is the best we could expect to be governing a people whose families, communities, and possessions have been torn by more than two solid decades of war. We might even laud the fact that any kind of election could have been held under these circumstances. But even measured praise of the Thieu-Ky government does not mean that defense of this regime is worth 40,000 or more American lives, and more than 150 billion American tax dollars.

We must accept as realities of this conflict that the South Vietnamese are not a people of democratic fiber, yearning to be freed from the horrors of communism, and that they are not followers of Marx, Mao, and Ho Chi Minh, yearning for the Communist guerrillas to free them from oppression from Saigon and from Washington.

Politics has lost much of its relevance to this war-torn and largely agricultural people. They, like human beings everywhere, want freedom from war, from terror, and from deprivation. They will likely offer political loyalty to whichever side seems best able to deliver security, peace, and prosperity. We may criticize U.S. backing of the Thieu regime because it does not offer freedom as we know it, even though there is no question that the limited freedom below the 17th parallel exceeds that permitted by the totalitarian Hanoi regime in the north.

But how useful is it for us to compare the benefits and drawbacks of the governments of the two halves of Vietnam?

There are governments more tyrannical

nical than North Vietnam which we nonetheless claim as our allies; there are regimes more democratic and liberal than the Saigon government which we do little or nothing to support. In a worldwide context where the form of government over the South Vietnamese people is of questionable relevance to our country and our policies, what are the goals of our involvement?

Most of the wars in history indicate that participants in war are fighting in order to "win" something, or to prevent the loss of something valuable to their national defense or self-interest. What does "victory" mean for America in the context of the Vietnam war? Let us review several alternative "goals" of American involvement which may help us to determine what meaning, if any, "victory" has for us in this conflict.

First. Do we seek the defeat of the Communist regime of North Vietnam?

I think we can promptly dismiss this suggestion as the ultimate goal of American involvement. We did not seek to protect or free the people of North Vietnam from their government. We did not invade North Vietnam, nor did we really seek to destroy any but the warmaking segments of her economy in our bombing attacks—and we drew tight restrictions around even this limited goal in the early years of the war. Our stated goals in sending troops to Vietnam have been to stop infiltration and aggression from the north into the south, and to cut off military assistance to the Vietcong from Hanoi—we never stated or carried out any intention to destroy the North or to dislodge its Communist regime. Thus, the word "victory," if it has meaning, does not mean the "liberation" or defeat of North Vietnam.

Second. Do we seek to enforce our worldwide intention to "contain" communism?

The United States has pledged to countless governments around the world that we will help shore them up against Communist aggression which threatens their borders. This web of mutual defense treaties was woven around the Communist world during the era of Stalinism and monolithic communism after World War II. It can be credited, in part, for the failure of the Iron Curtain in Europe to march any further westward in the past two decades, and for the halting of communism in Korea at the 38th parallel. While this may have been our goal initially, the Vietnam experience has raised serious questions both in the United States and in world capitals, as to the applicability of a firm containment policy in the 1960's and 1970's.

The Vietnam war also tests the definition of containment. Containment, in the sense of stopping the onward march of North Korean and Chinese troops into South Korea, or stopping a march of Russians and East Germans into West Germany, is not the same as "containing" an ongoing guerrilla war within a non-Communist nation. There is a fine line separating the two forms of Communist expansion, but the difference in the political and military situations faced in fighting a guerrilla war as opposed to an invasion are very real, and very broad.

Those who hold fast to the notion that

the United States, which stands at the backbone of all of the mutual defense treaties of containment, fear that any abandonment of Vietnam would cause other free governments in that part of the world to topple like dominoes. The only trouble with this "domino" theory is that there are other Communist-assisted guerrilla efforts taking place outside Vietnam even with our massive presence in Southeast Asia. Laos, Thailand, Korea, the Philippines and other nations are threatened, and few Americans are standing up to say that America must march into each of these countries to help crush guerrilla activity.

The Vietnam war will and should cause this Nation to rethink and restructure its policies and commitments across the globe. The President and his emissaries in Paris have already indicated that containment of communism is no longer our goal in Vietnam—we have stated that if the South Vietnamese through a meaningful process of self-determination should choose even a Communist regime, this would be an acceptable political solution of the war. Thus, the term "victory" does not require successful containment of communism within North Vietnam's boundaries.

Third. Do we seek to guarantee or perpetuate the present Saigon government?

Certainly all of our military and financial efforts in this war have been expended in support of the Saigon regime, and against the National Liberation Front. The pacification program has sought to defuse hostile areas and resettle large numbers of people in areas where they will be under the secure protection of the Saigon government and its forces.

Yet, we recognize that popular support for this government is far from unanimous, and that even majority support for the government in South Vietnam is questionable. Certain areas of South Vietnam have almost completely severed any ties of loyalty to the Saigon regime. In these areas, Vietcong military power has been strongest and, thus, offers the closest thing to security and "status quo" to those who live there.

If it has been our goal to guarantee and support this government, are we committed to supporting its power over all of South Vietnam? Have we considered redrawing the boundaries of South Vietnam so as to leave out those areas most firmly under Communist influence and control? By stating that "self-determination" through truly free elections is all that we shall insist on as a political solution for South Vietnam, the President has denied that our goal in this war is to perpetuate the Thieu government.

All of the objectives discussed thus far may at one time earlier in our history of involvement in this conflict have been firm goals of American policy. The frustration, cost, and attrition of 5 years of an Americanized war have pushed all of these initial objectives into the background. We have hopefully learned that the rules of containment are not easily or effectively applied to guerrilla-civil wars in Asia.

As military victory and a final defeat

of South and North Vietnamese Communists has eluded our grasp, we have had to pragmatically reduce and quibble our initial objectives in entering this conflict. We have even softened our insistence that the Saigon Government must be assured of survival in the war's aftermath.

If those who made the initial decisions to inject massive numbers of American troops into Vietnam could foresee the quagmire, the frustration and the perpetuation of a no-win limited war, there is little question that they would have decided differently.

Our last President never lost sight of his initial goals in ordering the troops shipped to Southeast Asia—even after the prospect of reaching these goals became nil. President Nixon has seen the futility of the policies of continuing escalation, and of any false beliefs of the past that only 5,000 more troops will turn the tide. The only tide we have turned with a half-million troops is the prevention of what was in 1964 an imminent takeover of the Diem regime by the Vietcong. We turned a certain defeat into a military stalemate and, in the process, we have strengthened and liberalized the Saigon government from what it was under Diem, and we have weakened the power base of the NFL. It is highly questionable whether we have weakened at all the will and ability of Hanoi to pursue the war into future decades.

Mr. Nixon also realizes that his decisions today must be based on the realities of today, not of 5 years ago. Thus, the goals he has stated are more realistic. He has said that the United States, must, in military terms, bolster the Saigon government's power to the point where it can carry on the fighting if the Paris talks fail to provide an acceptable political solution. He has further stated that we must maintain American credibility with other nations which may be similarly threatened in the future.

Most important he has turned around policies of escalation and has begun the withdrawal of American troops.

These are more reasonable goals. But two of these objectives, I think, are out of balance with some of the realities in Vietnam. So far, we have lost 40,000 lives and spent tens of billions of dollars in South Vietnam. I seriously doubt whether we would pay this terrible price today to achieve the limited goals which we have "boiled down" over the past 5 years.

Let us take first our present insistence that we can accept nothing less than guaranteed self-determination for the people of South Vietnam. Our free and democratic Nation supports the goal of self-determination for all peoples of the world. We support it for the Chinese, for the Czechs, Hungarians, Rumanians, and other Eastern European satellite countries, and we support self-determination for every underdeveloped nation, just as we supported our own right to break British colonial ties.

The question, as I see it, is not whether we would prefer free and self-government for the South Vietnamese, but whether we are realistically in a position to do anything about it. In light of the

last 30 years of conflict and instability in Vietnam, I do not think we can expect to achieve any political solution in the near future—perhaps not even in the next decade.

The war is likely to continue years beyond our withdrawal, just as it raged for years before we arrived.

The Saigon government has seen the result of "coalition" governments which have included Communists in Eastern European countries. They will fight to the end to prevent formation of any government which includes the Vietcong. The NLF, for its part, is committed by its very existence to the overthrow of the South Vietnamese Government. They have already indicated, with Hanoi at their side, that they are willing to hold out for decades in order to achieve this goal, and to "unite" Vietnam under Communist rule.

The lines are too hardened, the Vietcong have too little to lose, and the Saigon government has too much to lose, for us to expect a political solution to this confrontation to rise up out of the peace table in Paris. A history of decades of war; war which has stiffened the back of both sides, dictates that any international guarantees of free elections, or any coalition that is formed would be tenuous and temporary at best.

While the United States should offer substantial material support for the Saigon government, and should support self-determination for the South Vietnamese, we cannot realistically insist on any kind of a political solution as a price for American withdrawal. The best hope that I have for the Paris talks, and it is a slim hope, is that negotiation can change the present stalemated war into a stalemated cease-fire, with neither side giving an inch in terms of their long-range goals of governing South Vietnam.

Thus, I believe it is a mistake for the United States to make any change in its policy or involvement conditional on achieving a political solution or on a guarantee of self-determination which would be short lived at best.

The second plank in the President's Vietnam platform to which I take exception is the fear that our withdrawal would be tantamount to presiding over a defeat, and that this would erase our credibility with other nations in the world we have pledged to assist. On the contrary, I believe we have reached the point where the continued massive presence of American troops is working against any success in Paris, and any long-run solution to the conflict in Asia.

There is no question that time is on the side of the Communists. They have no problems with divided opinion or opposition at home, and since they do not now govern South Vietnam they have very little to lose by standing pat. They can disappear beyond the borders of Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam and not come out and fight until the time is ripe. They are aware that the United States has undertaken a course of gradual withdrawal, which will leave the strengthened South Vietnamese to fight for themselves, and they have every reason to hold back, keeping up only minimal military pressure, until the withdrawal is completed and they can again

test their renewed strength against the South Vietnamese alone.

At present, from their standpoint, there is no reason for the NLF of North Vietnam to make any major concessions in Paris. They have not even seen fit to take the humane step of releasing information about American prisoners in North Vietnam. Time is on their side.

As long as American troops remain, the Vietcong can win support among those who triumphed at the defeat of France, and who despise the presence of troops of any foreign nation on Vietnamese soil. When I was in Vietnam with the Military Operations Subcommittee in the winter of 1968, it was apparent that American troops were magnets for attack, and that our very presence raised the level of hostilities.

As long as we remain in large numbers, it will be easier for the NLF to win support for their fight against foreign domination, and more difficult for our Government to maintain support for the war at home.

In this context, the question of "presiding over a defeat" and losing credibility with other nations must be viewed in a different light. It would not be a defeat for the United States if we successfully help the South Vietnamese to help themselves.

The President's major policy goal is to Vietnamize the war, to prepare and strengthen and assist the Saigon government to fight for itself. Successful completion of this difficult task, in my view, is the meaning of "victory," if indeed that word is appropriate to Vietnam. It is no defeat to leave behind in Vietnam a government which is substantially stronger and more popular than the one we found there in 1964. That government should be able to stand and fight, and hopefully to win control of the country on its own. But it is not our place to guarantee their victory either militarily or politically with continued and perhaps endless presence of U.S. forces.

We must redefine the American role in helping to bolster other free nations, limiting that definition to helping these nations to help themselves. If, upon our withdrawal, other nations lose confidence that we will shore them up with hundreds of thousands of American troops against Communist guerrilla attacks, then they should quickly lose this confidence.

I do not believe we can any longer promise to singlehandedly bolster every government to which we are bound by treaty. We can and should offer military training and equipment, in massive doses if necessary. But Asian people, allied together, should bear the brunt of attacks by other Asians. Just as Europeans should shoulder their full share of their own defense in NATO.

If this constitutes a loss of credibility for the United States, we must accept it as the result of a major policy mistake we made in Americanizing this conflict in the first place. I do not think it is a credibility loss. I think it is a necessary redefinition of the future American role in defense of the free world. I think it is a long overdue birth of true regionalism in the context of our mutual defense

treaties. These countries must lose their comfortable dependence on American manpower. They should expect American support and assistance only to the extent that they and their regional allies are willing to maintain their own strong defenses with their own manpower and our economic and equipment help.

If, in fact, our phased withdrawal from Vietnam will shake our allies around the world out of their dependency on U.S. military manpower, this will be a victory for sensible free world foreign policies—it will not be a defeat, or a permanent loss of credibility. The 40,000 dead Americans make the strength of our commitment and the credibility of our assistance very strong indeed—just as this, their tragic loss, cries out for a restructuring of our "world policeman" policies.

With the backdrop of this long and involved discussion of the complex problems we face in Vietnam, let me offer my own thoughts on what our short- and long-run policies should be.

First, I believe we have only one goal in Vietnam. We must bolster the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves without our troops on their soil. The President has placed a high priority on this goal, and has taken meaningful steps to turn more and more combat responsibility over to the Saigon government. The ARVN—Army of Vietnam—takeover of our riverine gunboats in the Mekong Delta earlier this month is indicative of this progress. I think we should take full advantage of the current lull in the fighting to greatly accelerate this process.

Pressures of domestic needs and dwindling public support for the war at home and pressures I have already mentioned in Vietnam and Paris dictate that Vietnamization or de-Americanization of this conflict must have the highest possible priority.

It should not be an open-ended process.

If the President has not already done so, he should immediately sit down privately with the South Vietnamese Government and set a firm and early date for the final phase of U.S. troop withdrawal. This date should not be announced publicly, despite pressure at home for firm and public commitments to end the war by a definite date.

A public announcement of our final withdrawal date would serve only to guarantee that withdrawal would not take place earlier, even if the South Vietnamese are prepared sooner.

Public announcement of the date would also lessen chances that the South Vietnamese could hold their own after we leave, because we will have helped Communist planning and preparations by telegraphing this vital punch. Further, public announcement would virtually guarantee that no progress will take place in Paris until after the date has passed.

The process of Vietnamization and building up South Vietnamese troops with modern equipment has been going on for about a year. It should not have to take another full year to complete. Our own casualties and priorities at home must make this Vietnamization a crash program. We should withdraw our

ground troops first, our Army and Marine units who meet the enemy face to face.

They can and should be replaced by Vietnamese units. Harder to replace are our air and naval forces, and it may be that they will have to remain in Vietnam longer than our ground troops, in order to provide firepower and air cover for the South Vietnamese that they cannot, at first, provide for themselves.

Our private agreement to withdraw by a certain, definite date must be accompanied by a commitment to help the South Vietnamese with modern and plentiful military equipment, ammunition and training, which is essential to our goal to helping them to help themselves.

We must offer continued support for their goals at the peace table in Paris, and should continue our participation there as long as they want us to, in the hope that something concrete can be achieved.

This policy, promptly executed, is the way home from Vietnam. It can end the loss of American men, the deficiency of our concentration on serious domestic and urban problems, the erosion of our national unity and national spirit, and it can and must end the dependency of our free world allies on GI Joe to bear the brunt of their battles.

One final word. The clouds which hang today over Laos look ominously like those which shadowed Vietnam 5 years ago. Reports that American advisers are there in substantial numbers are disturbing if they mean that the Vietnam experience is being recycled a few hundred miles northwest of Saigon. If we have not already learned the lesson that the nature of our military commitments must change in a worldwide context, let us learn it now before a new Vietnam is born in the wake of this tragic war.

THE MORATORIUM AND VIETNAM

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, hindsight may well confirm that our involvement in Vietnam was a result of misreading the history of the area, misjudgment of the political viability of South Vietnam, and mistaken reliance on military and intelligence advice that has been found wanting in accuracy and reliability from the very start.

It should be remembered, however, that in the early years of the struggle our Nation largely supported the proposition that small, underdeveloped nations should have an opportunity to shape their own political, social, and economic institutions, and that failure to thwart aggression in some circumstances can lead to larger, often catastrophic confrontations.

Today, more than a decade later, with no military resolution of the conflict and little progress toward a political solution, we find ourselves engaged in a searching reappraisal of the national purposes and objectives for which 40,000 Americans have died in Vietnam.

Our Nation wants peace. But will armed conflict in Asia or elsewhere be ended either by military victory or unilateral withdrawal? In my view, the consequences of either course would be far greater losses of life and a ruinous undermining of U.S. position in every part of the world.

Nor do I think the cause of peace would be promoted by assigning a date certain for a final U.S. pullout from Vietnam. Unless such withdrawal is the result of mutual negotiation, postponement to a future date only delays the consequences of immediate unilateral withdrawal.

It is quite possible to compound mistakes of the past with mistakes of the present. If it was bad judgment to get involved in Vietnam, let us not insist on equally bad judgment in the means we choose to terminate our presence there.

The Nixon administration is pursuing a policy of gradual demilitarization and troop withdrawal in an effort to persuade Hanoi of our good faith and genuine desire to end the conflict. At best this is a difficult policy to pursue because, as we have seen to date, its effect may be to encourage continued stalemate of negotiations and insistence by Hanoi on further and further compromise on the part of the United States.

I am sympathetic to the purposes of the moratorium but I think it is important that we refrain from making the administration's quest for peace more difficult than it already is. To the extent that the moratorium and other demonstrations indicate a deep-seated desire for peace, a useful purpose may be served. But to the extent that these and other activities result in reducing options available to the administration, we jeopardize the very cause we seek to serve.

In the final analysis, responsibility for mapping a strategy for peace rests with the President of the United States. We must look to him to terminate the U.S. presence in Vietnam at the earliest possible moment, not as an end in itself, but as a means of achieving conditions upon which permanent peace can be predicated.

DANGEROUS DRUG CONTROL BILL

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a comprehensive dangerous drug control bill. My measure is aimed at stopping the millions of domestically produced dangerous pills which eventually find their way into the underground markets.

Briefly, my bill will set up careful regulations for the shipment, transportation, and warehousing of dangerous drugs produced for export—particularly to Mexico. The legislation establishes a panel to recommend ways to make State laws uniform in this area. It increases the custom force by 300, provides for procedures and standards in dangerous drug inventories, and finally it authorizes a computer information system to be installed at the border to assist and aid the new Project Cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied this complex issue at some length, and have participated in hearings of the Ad Hoc Drug Smuggling Committee. I believe this Congress must act now to stop the expanding market and increasing abuse of chemical drugs. The legislation I am introducing today will provide the tools to do just that.

I include the text of my bill at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section (6) of the Narcotic Drug Import and Export Act (31 U.S.C. 182) is hereby amended by adding at the conclusion of said section the following language:

"TITLE I.—REGULATION OF DANGEROUS DRUGS SHIPMENTS

"A. All pharmaceutical wholesale houses which sell and ship narcotics and dangerous drugs (which shall include any stimulant or depressant defined as a 'narcotic or dangerous drug' by section 4731(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and by section 201(v) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act) to an ultimate destination outside of the United States, or who sell or ship narcotics and dangerous drugs to any customer(s) who claims to do business outside of the United States, must:

"(1) Furnish the United States Customs Bureau with:

"(a) the name, address and place of business of the customer(s);

"(b) the amount of narcotic or dangerous drug to be shipped, and the date upon which it is to be shipped;

"(2) Ship the narcotic or dangerous drug in bond, to a bonded warehouse;

"(3) Agree to allow United States Customs officials to be present at the time the narcotic or dangerous drug is taken from its shipping point.

"B. Any individual who purchases narcotics or dangerous drugs from a wholesale pharmaceutical house in the United States and who agrees to receive the merchandise at a point of destination outside of the United States; makes any claim to the pharmaceutical house that he plans to sell such drugs as part of a legitimate pharmaceutical wholesale or retail business outside of the United States or actually does, at any time, transport said merchandise, for any reason, outside the boundaries of the United States must agree to:

"(1) Furnish United States Customs officials with his own name, address and business location; and with the name and business location of the pharmaceutical house from which he has bought the merchandise;

"(2) Be accompanied by United States Customs officials or the designated foreign representative of United States Customs officials, at the time he receives the merchandise at its destination point;

"(3) Be accompanied by United States Customs officials at the time he crosses the International border with the merchandise actually in his possession.

"C. Both the pharmaceutical house and its customer(s) must agree to allow representatives of the United States Customs Bureau to thoroughly inspect the merchandise;

"(1) At the shipping point of such merchandise, and

"(2) At the last destination of such merchandise before it crosses the International border.

"D. The United States Customs Bureau has the power, at any point during the transaction between the pharmaceutical house and a customer, to prohibit further shipment of the merchandise and/or to confiscate such merchandise, if any official of the Cus-

toms Bureau feels that any provision of this bill is now being violated or may soon be violated.

"(1) If after such prohibition of the transaction or confiscation of the merchandise has taken place, either or both parties to the transaction may place an initial appeal with the Food and Drug Administration.

"(2) The procedure by which the Food and Drug Administration may dispose of the case, or by which any further appeal shall be taken, shall be governed by the appropriate provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"E. The enforcement staff of the Bureau of Customs shall be increased by 300 positions. These positions shall be filled by inspectors, working at:

"(1) United States ports of entry;

"(2) United States Border Patrols.

F. The non-enforcement personnel positions of the Bureau of Customs shall be increased by 25% at all Ports of Entry.

"TITLE II.—UNIFORM CONTROL ACTS

"A. The Justice Department shall establish a committee to investigate the effort to:

"(1) Achieve uniformity among the states with respect to state drug abuse control acts, and

"(2) Achieve co-ordination between state and Federal officials in investigation under and enforcement of drug abuse control acts.

"B. The committee established by the Justice Department will issue a report to the President within six months of the passage of this bill.

"TITLE III.—REGULATION OF DANGEROUS DRUG INVENTORIES

"A. Section 511 (d) (1) of PL 89-74 (record keeping of stimulant and depressant drugs) shall be amended as follows:

"(1) The last sentence of section 511(d) (1) reading: 'No separate records, nor set form or forms for any of the foregoing records, shall be required as long as records containing the required information are available, shall be deleted.'

"(2) The following paragraph shall be added to 21 U.S.C. 360: 'Records and forms relating to the individual's manufacturing, compounding, processing, selling, delivering or otherwise disposing of any depressant or stimulant drug, must either be segregated from all other records, or be so kept that either the records themselves or the information required may be identified within a reasonable time after request and reviewed or copied within a reasonable time.'

"B. All persons covered by the record-keeping requirements of section 511 of Public Law 89-74 shall be required to report the loss or theft of any depressant or stimulant drug to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within two days after discovery of the loss or theft.

"C. Section 511(a) (1) is further amended to require that an initial inventory of a depressant or stimulant drug must be prepared by persons required to maintain records by section 511(d) (1) whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by regulation designates a drug as a 'depressant or stimulant' drug pursuant to section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"TITLE IV.—MISCELLANEOUS

"A. Representatives of the United States Bureau of Customs are hereby authorized to prohibit individuals under the age of twenty-one, when unaccompanied by an adult, from crossing the international border from the United States into Mexico.

"B. It is the intent of Congress that a representative of the Customs Bureau shall not be held liable by a Federal court reviewing an action which he took under the authority given to him by this provision, if the court finds that such representative, acting with reasonable discretion, felt that allow-

ing the minor involved to cross the border unaccompanied by an adult would expose that minor to the influence of individuals engaging in the illegal sale of narcotics.

"C. The Treasury Department is authorized to allocate funds, not exceeding \$20 million, for the development of a Southwestern Border Data Processing Center. Such Center shall process and keep on file all relevant data submitted by Customs officials and local law enforcement officials, regarding individuals engaged or suspected of being engaged in some aspect of the illegal narcotics traffic between Mexico and the United States.

"(1) The Southwestern Border Data Processing Center will make its data available to officials from:

"(a) local law enforcement agencies;

"(b) the United States Customs Bureau;

"(c) the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs;

"(d) Mexican law enforcement officials.

"(2) The Central Branch of the Southwestern Border Data Processing Center shall be located in San Diego, California; auxiliary branches are to be established at other strategic points along the United States-Mexico border. The location of these branches shall be made by decision of the United States Customs Bureau."

HELP FOR HANOI

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, whatever the motivation which has produced and supported the antiwar moratorium, the net effect has been help for Hanoi, and this I realize may be furthest from the minds of some of the participants. Nevertheless, there is very strong evidence that there is a direct link between Hanoi and the moratorium itself. Even if this were not true, the antiwar protests give new life to Hanoi and further strengthens the hands of the Communist peace negotiators in Paris. The headlines in Hanoi make it very clear that they count the moratorium a credit for the cause of communism.

The President has asked for help from the American people. He has indicated that we must brace ourselves to see this conflict through. The voice of concern about the war can best be expressed in this manner. There is ample reason to believe that a show of solidarity by the American public is all that is needed to bring the war to a conclusion on terms that are acceptable to us. The Communists have been hurt very badly. They have been fighting for years, and their losses are staggering. I am convinced that it is American headlines and peace movements which have kept them going. These Communist rulers in Hanoi have interpreted to mean the U.S. public is willing to sacrifice South Vietnam to get out of the war. That is why strong support for the President's position in search of an honorable peace can convince Hanoi that they are fighting a losing cause. Despite this, the bald, hard fact is, we could lose the war as a result of antiwar crusades which have their origins in Hanoi.

Of course the American people want an end to the war. Of course the families of servicemen who are fighting there

want them home. There are even those who will insist that we should not be involved in Vietnam. The fact remains that we are there in response to a commitment against aggression and that we have expended many thousands of American lives in defense of the ideals of freedom. To abandon this cause would make a mockery of every sacrifice that has been required.

There has been a very definite scale-down in the volume of fighting, and American losses have dropped significantly. The fact should not be overlooked that South Vietnamese losses are still high. This means they are doing more and more of the fighting, and this trend is expected to continue.

It has been stated many times that it is darkest just before the dawn. The example of beleaguered Britain in World War II is very well known to all of us. There the great Churchill rallied his people in the face of almost certain defeat and led them to victory. In contrast we are on the verge of victory. To abandon our quest for a better world at this stage and to be branded as a nation which does not have the courage or the fortitude to stand by its ideals would be the worst defeat ever inflicted upon a modern world power. As unpleasant as the war is to a large segment of the American people, the alternatives are much less acceptable in their effect upon the future of our country and our country's people. The President needs our help, for he is surely striving to bring the war to an honorable conclusion. Let us not obscure the progress which is being made and give comfort to Hanoi through headlines which do not in reality bespeak the will or the sentiment of the majority of the American people.

COLORADO PROFESSOR DISSECTS VIOLENCE COMMISSION REPORT

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the report on firearms and violence issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence advocates outlawing 90 percent of the Nation's handguns. It has shocked both sportsmen and lawmakers by the lengths to which some are willing to go in order to take weapons away from law-abiding citizens. An interesting and informative critique has been prepared on the report by Dr. Charles G. Wilber, chairman and professor of the Department of Zoology, Colorado State University. Dr. Wilber looks at the violence report from the standpoint of a professional educator and an interested gun owner. His comments were published in Gun Week, a weekly publication for sportsmen which has espoused the cause of law-abiding sportsmen and weapons owners in the current controversy and which has contributed significantly to the store of public information on the subject. Dr. Wilber's critique was carried in the October 10 and October 17 issues of Gun Week, and I am pleased to submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

PROFESSOR DISSECTS COMMISSION REPORT (By Charles G. Wilber, Ph. D.)

In view of the fact that the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has made a "statement" on the relation of firearms and violence, and in view of the fact that this "statement" may be accepted uncritically, it seems important to analyze it from the factual point of view. The commission statement was published July 28, 1969. The chairman of the Commission was Dr. Milton Eisenhower, former president of the Johns Hopkins University.

This is a nefarious document because it lends itself to propaganda based on innuendo, specious argument, circular reasoning, internal contradictions, and direct mistruths. One of the first statements of the Commission with respect to firearms is contradicted later by the recommendations which the Commission published. On the first page of the commission statement it is said: "We believe this (decrease in the misuse of firearms) is possible if both the advocates and the opponents of gun control legislation will put aside their suspicions and preconceptions, accept the fact of a common danger without exaggerating its dimensions, and act for the common good." In the light of the radical and incredible recommendations which the commission later makes, one questions whether this statement was made to put at ease the very real concerns and apprehensions of millions of law-abiding American citizens.

On page one, the claim is made that "with a few scattered exceptions, hand guns are not sporting arms." This statement is obviously not in keeping with the facts of American life. The evidence which could be readily gathered from firearms dealers and from the legal users of firearms themselves will indicate to any honest investigator that the majority of hand guns are used for sporting purposes.

Individuals who use hand guns for sporting purposes tend to have more than a single hand gun in their possession. As an example, the regular competitors in national and international hand gun shooting competition will of necessity have three guns which they use in any one contest. One of these is a semi-automatic pistol; the other would be a revolver; and then there would be a third gun of a different caliber from the other two. Thus it is easy to see, if one is willing to be influenced by facts and not by preconceived ideas, that 100 participants in a hand gun sporting event could account (without stretching reality whatever) for 300 hand guns validly owned and used by these responsible individuals.

Also highly questionable is the statement made again on page one of the report to the effect that "A substantial part of the rapidly increasing gun sales, particularly hand gun sales, must be attributed to the rising fear of violence that the United States has recently experienced." This statement cannot be supported by the facts available. The Commission completely ignores the great increase in purchases of bows and arrows. Certainly one will not attribute the rapidly increasing bow and arrow sales to a rising fear of violence. It is obvious, however, to those who have some awareness of the recreation industry that the shorter work week, more money to spend, and the ever increasing need for recreation has resulted in a phenomenal and enormous growth in the sales of all kinds of sporting goods items.

HOMICIDE

It is difficult for the objective observer to ascertain where the Commission found evidence to support the statement made on page two to the effect that:

"We find that firearms, particularly hand guns, play a major role in the commission of homicide, aggravated assault, and armed robbery, and that they are being used in

greater percentages of these violent crimes." In view of the government's own figures available from the Public Health Service from the years 1910-1960, and from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, from 1961-1966, the statement made by the Commission must be labeled as an untruth.

Using the government's own figures, the trend of firearms homicide rate in the United States has been consistently dropping since 1910. The firearm homicide rate (that is the number of firearm homicides per hundred thousand people) was up to about 5 per hundred thousand in 1910. By 1940 this had dropped to 4; by 1965 this had dropped to 3 or less. If trend over a 50-year period continues we would expect that the firearm homicide rate by 1970 will be slightly over 1 per hundred thousand. The point at issue is that, as the trend of firearm homicide rate in the United States has been downward between 1910 and 1966, the ownership of firearms has trended upward, primarily as a result of increased use of firearms for sporting purposes.

In 1966 there were nearly three and a quarter million crimes in the United States. Firearms were misused in only 3.4 per cent of these crimes. This 3.4 per cent includes the so-called "gangster weapons", home-made zip guns, modified toy guns and the so-called alleged guns. The latter category involves, for example, the robbing of a store by an individual who is holding his hand in his pocket, even though there is no gun in the pocket. If the victim thinks that a gun is involved, this event is recorded as a hand gun crime.

CRIME

The available data indicate, to any honest man, that if firearms were to be completely eliminated from society by mass confiscation and so on, and that if no criminal substituted any other kind of weapon for a firearm, the United States would still have 96.6 per cent of its serious crime and 99.6 per cent of its total crime. New York State and New York City are sometimes presented as models of the kind of legislation that would prevent firearm crimes.

The facts available do not support this belief. The Joint Legislative Committee on Crime, Its Causes, Control and Effects on Society of the New York State Legislature pointed out that the use of home-made zip guns exceeded the misuse of rifles and shotguns in murders, robberies and assaults in New York State during the year 1966. One wonders what type of data the Commission used to arrive at their gratuitous statement on crime rate and gun ownership.

DEFENSE

The Commission goes on to discuss in a very strange way the problem of firearms in self defense. In an attempt to support its rather specious reasoning on firearms and self defense there is a footnote on page four (note no. 5) which states: "No data are available on how frequently robberies and burglaries are foiled by the householder's display of a gun that is not fired. Nor are data available on the use of guns by women to prevent attempted rapes; presumably this occurs extremely infrequently."

The presumption expressed reveals the bias which the writers of this report have. Moreover, the statement is not true. This footnote merely indicates that the Commission staff was either too lazy to dig out the available statistics, refused to believe them, or having seen them realized that the data would not support their preconceived notions.

Consequently, no use would be made of them. This kind of scholarly irresponsibility is hard to accept from a report issued with the approval of Dr. Milton Eisenhower. The very fact that such a questionable footnote would be used in an attempt to document

statements indicates the worthlessness of the report as a whole.

CRIME RATES

Apparently, the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has little respect or interest in the proceedings of the United States Congress. Very fine studies on firearms which have been reported in the Congressional Record were ignored by the Commission. For example, in January 30, 1968 issue of the Congressional Record, Volume 114, No. 12, there was reported a statistical study of the relationship between firearm ownership and crime rates. The study demonstrated clearly that there is no causal relationship between gun ownership and crime.

In fact the study indicated that there is a negative relationship between firearm ownership and crime rates. The statement in the Congressional Record says: "As the proportion of the population possessing firearms goes down, crime rates go up." In other words, the contention that fewer people with guns will mean less crime finds no support from the scientific data available. The negative relationship between firearm ownership and serious crime, aggravated assault, and robbery were statistically significant using widely accepted and well designed statistical procedures.

The study in the Congressional Record goes further and says that "this means that firearm ownership by the law-abiding public could be a factor in restricting the number of these criminal acts." How then, can one have any confidence in the Commission Statement on Firearms and Violence? The ordinary citizen would like to have legislation and debate based on facts and not on fiction.

HAND GUNS

On page six the Commission admits that there is no sound evidence on which to base conclusion concerning the restriction of hand guns. They say "We believe, (my emphasis) on the basis of all the evidence before us, that reducing the availability of a hand gun will reduce firearm violence." The Commission presents no evidence. This "belief" of theirs really should have no part in an objective study.

The attempt to use experience in other countries such as England and Wales as an example of what would happen in the United States is absolutely incompetent. One wonders why the example of Switzerland is not used. In that country it is mandatory for every male citizen to own a gun and to be trained in marksmanship up to a certain age. Beyond that age he no longer is forced to engage in shooting, but he may do so if he wishes.

It is difficult to evaluate a report such as this because of the misuse of data, the actual fabrication of data, and the lack of presentation of the whole truth.

One could rephrase the statement made by the Commission, and quoted above, to read: "We believe, on the basis of all the evidence before us, that reducing the availability of the automobile will reduce automobile tragedies." No one in his right mind will deny that the violence on our highways is causing infinitely more serious damage, death, suffering, expense, disruption of society, than are firearms.

ACCIDENTS

The Commission statement implies that firearms accidents "cause thousands of deaths and injuries each year." One might point out that the same must be said of bath tubs, kitchen stools, ladders, and swinging doors.

A recent study completed by the distinguished Harvard Professor of Public Health, Dr. Ross A. McFarland, clearly shows that in 19 different countries of the world (USA included), of all accidental deaths only 1.3 per cent could be attributed to firearms. Firearms were the lowest on the scale of

causes of accidental deaths; far below motor vehicles (36 per cent), falls (22 per cent), drownings (9 per cent), or poisonings (4 per cent). The reason for the Commission statement about firearm accidents is obscure; or is it meant to becloud the issue?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Special reference should be made to the recommendations of the Commission for a national firearms policy. It is important that these be examined extremely critically because they are not in accord with our national tradition or legal system in the United States. One cannot take exception to the recommendation with respect to public education. Certainly, the aim of the National Rifle Association and law-abiding owners of firearms has always been to educate the public on the responsibility of firearm ownership. This education recommendation of the Commission is extremely important. It should do much to eradicate the unfair and vicious criticisms of the National Rifle Association. Moreover, it should do much to encourage proper firearms education in our schools. We realize that there must be a driver education program in every high school. It seems incredible that we do not have a firearms education program in every high school.

The Commission recommendation on research is one which on the face of it, looks honest and forthright. But when it is examined with care it is obvious that one might question the good sense and the integrity of the Commission. On page seven under "research recommendations", the Commission says that there should be further research on relationship between firearm violence and how this violence can be reduced. Despite the dogmatic statements made earlier in this report, the Commission admits that we need much more information on the relationship between firearms and violence than we have now. The recommendations clearly indicate that the Commission, despite its manifesto earlier, is not well informed and cannot be well informed with respect to many of the matters on which it has pontificated.

Finally, the recommendation with respect to the development of a non-lethal weapon is bewildering. The Commission admits that law-abiding Americans understandably and justifiably fear for their safety under certain conditions and that under these conditions it is appropriate that they have some kind of defensive weapon. However, has it ever come to their attention (or are they blind to the fact) that the anti-gun elements in the country are also anti-law-abiding citizens? For example, in various legal jurisdictions (such as New York City) where firearms are virtually outlawed completely, any kind of defensive weapon is also outlawed from the law-abiding citizen. The recommendation with respect to the production of an effective non-lethal weapon is extremely difficult to understand. Again, it makes one wonder whether the Commission members really know what the various portions of the report really said.

Under legislation they say "We conclude that the rising tide of firearms violence in this country merits further legislative action at the present time." First of all, the statement of a rising tide of firearms violence may be open to serious question on a factual basis. Again, one suggests that the Commission did not study the history of firearms legislation in the United States very clearly or very honestly.

If the various laws already on the books with respect to firearms were enforced we would have less difficulty than we do now. It should be pointed out that the murders of various public political leaders all involved the breaking of at least half a dozen existing laws. Consequently, how this Commission can naively suggest that further laws would prevent these tragedies is not clear to the reasonable man.

The Commission has revealed its emotional involvement when it refers to the hand gun as a weapon so "infrequently a sporting arm." This statement is definitely not true. The hand gun is, in the United States, primarily a sporting arm in the hands of law-abiding citizens. It is used properly as an offensive weapon and as a weapon of protection primarily by our police forces.

One should also recall that the murder of John F. Kennedy and the murder of Martin Luther King did not involve the use of hand guns.

CONFISCATION

The recommendations of the Commission with respect to confiscation of hand guns, except those issued to police officers and the like, just do not stand up under the light of day. For example, the Report urges that serious penalties be attached to the possession of guns by unlicensed persons; we already have serious penalties attached to possession of a variety of martial firearms but the criminal still uses them.

The only ones who will be harmed by the recommendations of this Commission, with respect to hand guns, are the law-abiding citizens. The Supreme Court already has ruled that laws may not force criminals to register their hand guns because this act would be "self-incrimination." As reported in the press, the registration law in the city of Chicago specifically excludes and excuses criminals from registering their hand guns. How then can this naive Commission say that the apprehension of law-abiding citizens will reduce the rate of violent crime in the United States?

The final conclusion of the Commission makes no sense. It merely says that the reduction of gun violence in the United States will be a good thing. Every law-abiding citizen in the United States agrees on this. Hand gun and long gun enthusiasts in the United States have been begging that more severe penalties be attached to crimes committed using any type of firearm. Unfortunately, the persons who should know better do not support these moves of the gun owners. They seem to be more concerned with taking guns away from law-abiding individuals than with attacking the root of the problem which is misuse of guns by evil people.

It is most difficult to understand how a Commission of presumably honest individuals can subscribe to the details of this statement on firearms and violence. After careful examination it seems clear that the recommendations and conclusions of the Commission on Firearms and Violence are based on suppression of facts, on distortion of facts, and on the lack of factual information. Moreover, there is specious argument involved; there are statements which cannot be supported by any facts available from the various statistical agencies of our government. The statement, for example, on page two to the effect that "Other studies confirm our finding that the proportion of gun use in violence rises and falls with gun ownership" is completely contrary to what has been published in the Congressional Record itself. Repeated studies, made by objective individuals, have demonstrated that quite the contrary seems to obtain: as gun ownership by law-abiding citizens increases there is a decrease in crimes of violence involving guns.

Unfortunately, too, the Commission has used its imagination to raise great specters of fear, e.g., the comment that "A new wave of American vigilantism could result..." The report contains some underhanded phrasing; for example, it is stated that "Extremist groups, regardless of race, are remarkably alike in their attitudes towards firearms and their opposition to firearms control." This is a knavish assertion which implies that if one opposes firearms control he is not a good American and belongs to an extremist group.

Such writing is despicable and ought to be beneath the dignity of any self-respecting commission. It is obvious that the Commission itself felt the disgusting implications of this statement because in a footnote it states: "This is not to imply that all persons who oppose additional controls are extremists." Why in the world would a forthright and objective Commission write the original sentence in the first place? This particular sentence is one example of the type of argument, the type of rhetoric which is used throughout this report. It is a shameful exhibition and should wound the consciences of the authors.

The conclusion that any honest individual must come to after reading this nefarious Commission Report is that it should be totally disregarded. The Congress of the United States, itself, should investigate this matter if it feels it essential. It is important that law-abiding gun owners be involved in looking over the staff officials of the Commission. One questions the competence of these individuals to produce such a study.

It is discouraging to a law-abiding citizen to read the many statements made by a presumably respectable Commission. In the opinion of many readers of the Commission Report, the conclusion is inescapable that the members of the Commission did not read the final draft with any understanding or critical sense. They apparently accepted without any serious evaluation the prejudices, blindness, and naivete of some staff investigator.

It is hoped that responsible public officials, members of the Congress, and representatives in the various state legislatures will discount appropriately the recommendations and conclusions of this extremely slanted report. It is urgent that anyone concerned with the firearms problem read and note very carefully the internal contradictions which abound in this report. At the very beginning of the report it is clearly stated that "The vast majority of gun owners do not misuse firearms"; but the Commission then goes on to make recommendations which would penalize the "vast majority" of gun owners without doing anything to attack the root of the misuse problem and that includes lack of appropriate education which results in firearms accidents and the protection of criminals in their misuse of firearms for criminal purposes.

The Commission, moreover in the preamble points out that "Firearms generally facilitate, rather than cause, violence." Later in the report the contrary is implied.

It is important to realize that in the Commission Statement there is clear-cut evidence of the use of the "big-lie technique." That technique supposes that if something is said often enough by persons in positions of trust or power then anyone should and will believe it whether it is true or not. Hitler used the technique effectively. It is not American; it is not scientific; it is not objective.

CONCLUSION

The statement on firearms and violence issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence deserves to be scrapped as untrustworthy, irresponsible, and as an insidious attack on our Constitutional guarantees. The lack of intellectual and scholarly integrity on the part of the drafters of the statement is so apparent that four members of the Commission were impelled to refuse "to concur fully in the report of the Commission."

BELABORING THE NEBULOUS— IGNORING THE OBVIOUS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the pres-

ent administration is creating an anti-consumer record which is formidable and forbidding in its fundamental hostility to the concept of a secure economic marketplace. On all sides, outright antipathy or deliberate nonenforcement is pushing the cause of consumer justice farther and farther back.

Almost every safety law passed in the last 8 years, and there have been 43 major ones, is withering away because of no funds or lack of meaningful enforcement. They cover fire safety, radiation hazards, industrial safety, health, traffic and aviation safety, autos, tires, and flammable fabrics. Each year, 18,000 Americans die and another 20 million are injured by hazardous products, including pesticides, flammable fabrics, electrical appliances and other dangerous articles. Truth in packaging and truth in labeling lie in a neatly labeled packet with the title, "Do not open until this administration has passed from the scene." One classic example is that the FTC has assigned five people to work on packaging and labeling.

No progress whatever has been even attempted on behalf of a greater voice for consumers within the Government. No advocacy of their cause or appointments on their behalf have been forthcoming. The average American must pay an annual interest rate of at least 18 percent in credit charge accounts in every State but one. Such interest rates cannot be justified. Is there action by the administration? Not a move. Not a sound.

Medical costs are exceeded only by the constantly escalating prices of drugs. The Food and Drug Administration, previously a consumer champion, has become a puzzled prisoner of reaction. Up to 10 million citizens a year become ill from consuming contaminated food. Countless others are affected by mislabeled or defective drugs. What is the response? Permission by the Department of Agriculture to industry to add up to 15 percent in garbage chicken meat to hot dogs. Americans spend approximately \$37 million annually on cosmetics that have little or no Federal regulation. Not a word from Government. Improved consumer product information services by the Government? If the present Government has anything to say about it, such factual guides will be forthcoming the day after Armageddon.

The guaranty and warranty situation is a scandal of continental proportions. Comment from the leaders of the Government? All we hear is the wind blowing, carrying soothing words and promises.

The National Commission on Product Safety states publicly that product guarantee seals awarded to advertised products by two national magazines are misleading and literally valueless. At least 12 products advertised by one of these publications, *Good Housekeeping*, are under investigation by the FTC for possible violation of false advertising statutes.

The general picture which emerges is damning and complete. Consumerism is as foreign to the President and his administration as conservation, antipollution, full employment, and aid to educa-

tion. Instead, however, we have Mrs. Virginia Knauer, the President's special assistant on consumer affairs, who was much too busy to give more than perfunctory, general testimony before the National Commission on Product Safety. What has she belabored recently, with loud cries of indignation and outrage? Why, cynicism in advertisements. She thumps the advertising agencies, which is a bit like hitting the new born illegitimate child because of the sins of its mother.

Has the good gentle lady not been apprised of the fact that every ad agency operates on the basis of its client's orders? Companies demand and agencies comply. Advertising messages on the media are a mere reflection of corporate policies. The media sign a contract to run so many messages of a commercial nature. The good lady has wandered off into the side shows and missed the three ring spectacle in the main tent.

It is long past time for the public to be enlightened. If there is a consumer counsel representing the Government, let her speak on adulterated food, drug prices, safety, packaging, labeling, garbage, chicken in hot dogs, unsafe autos, phony seals of approval, credit and interest practices. The list continues ad infinitum, ad nauseum. Where do they stand on each of these pressing, ominous issues? What is going to be done about enforcement of laws?

The nebulous will wait. The obvious demands attention.

THE VOICE OF PROTEST IS ALSO THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been more than a few strident noises raised against the moratorium which even now is gathering enormous momentum across the face of America. It is essential that we take a close look at this happening, and see what it is doing, saying and aiming for. As a start, it led to the most meaningful exchange of opinions regarding the war on the floor of this Chamber, that I have seen or participated in since my arrival here. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) gave most eloquent voice to thoughts which have increasingly concerned the entire Nation. I am proud to have joined in endorsing such a parliamentary expression of the principle of participatory democracy. This is a peaceful gesture of protest and opinion in every form that it is taking. Those of us who have supported the moratorium have taken the greatest pains to disavow any violence or disrespect to national symbols. In no way should anyone be taken in by clumsy attempts to link extremists with legitimate protest and dissent.

I further feel that such an expression of opinion nationally and here in this House is a desperately needed, healthy and vital force. If basic representative institutions of a free people remain silent in the face of massive domestic disagreement, they contribute to loss of

faith in those same institutions by those they are supposed to represent. Our free discussion last night was an affirmation of democratic dissent rather than a gesture of support to foreign opponents.

Nationally, the people have taken their cue, in turn insuring that we shall take ours from them. Their personal acts of dissent are living reaffirmations of the grip participatory democracy has upon so many of our fellow citizens. Protest should be understood for what it is, rather than be stifled because of any fear it may arouse in the breasts of those who have minimal faith in our people and institutions. We have nothing to fear from them. We have much to learn from how they think and feel. A nation is free so long as its institutions are free, expressive, and reflective of national opinion and will. Such a phenomenon as the moratorium is the legitimate expression of a significant and growing share of that same will. I welcome and am proud to have endorsed it.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake that the overwhelming majority of Americans are squarely behind President Nixon in his efforts to get the Vietnam war ended now but on an honorable basis. This means, simply, with some type of enforceable commitment that if we withdraw the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong will not continue their aggression and slaughter of the South Vietnamese who are our friends and who have put themselves, their property, and their future on the line for the West.

President Nixon did not order a half a million Americans to Vietnam. He is doing everything he possibly can to avoid further escalation. He seeks reason in an atmosphere of Communist aggression and hatred. Americans owe such effort their loyal support. For what do they demonstrate?

Those who would undermine our President who publicly seeks commitments from an enemy that is killing Americans at this very hour, are not helping attain the objective they seek—which is to get Americans out of the combat in Vietnam. In fact they are doing the very thing the enemy wants—which is to create further discord in the United States, with less support for our position at the bargaining table in Paris.

The following editorial in today's *Washington Star* is significant:

THE MORATORIUM

The best standard for judgment on today's Vietnam Moratorium is the effect it can be expected to have on the enemy—and on the President of the United States. Some light has been shed on both points.

It is clear that this demonstration is enthusiastically welcomed in Hanoi. A Radio Hanoi broadcast yesterday said the Moratorium showed that the Communist fight in Vietnam was "for peace, justice and the right cause," and that this demonstration is "putting the Nixon administration in a very dif-

ficult and confused situation." An additional broadcast comment was that "the Vietnamese people heartily welcomes and entirely supports the October wave of struggle" in the United States.

An Associated Press report quotes the Communist 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."

There is no reason to believe that most of the Moratorium participants want or intend to give aid and comfort to the Communists. A few may, but not many. This, however, begs the question. What counts is whether the demonstration, regardless of intention, does in fact give encouragement to Hanoi and thereby presumably prolongs the war. The evidence from Hanoi is that this is precisely what the demonstrators are doing. And, whatever the disclaimers may be, mature people are supposed to be responsible for the reasonably foreseeable consequences of their conduct.

What about the effect of the Moratorium on President Nixon? Certainly it has not been helpful.

In his recent press conference the President said that "under no circumstances will I be affected whatever" by the demonstration. We think that was a proper statement. But it evoked a predictable storm of criticism to the effect that Mr. Nixon was indifferent to public opinion, and was determined to pursue the policies of Lyndon Johnson in Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon is not deaf to public opinion. Nor is he adhering to the Johnson war policies, although the latter were modified significantly before Mr. Johnson left office.

It seems to us, however, that President Nixon is letting himself be pushed into a somewhat defensive attitude by the mindless attacks being made against him. There is at least a suggestion of this in the Nixon letter to a Georgetown University student—a letter in which the President tried to clarify his press conference remark.

There is hardly a man alive who doesn't want to see this miserable war ended. Certainly Mr. Nixon would rejoice to see the end, and firmly intends to wind up the American involvement at the earliest possible date. But as President, it is his duty to strive for an honorable and responsible termination. He has taken significant steps toward this end. As President, he also has a duty to refuse to bow to pressure tactics which have no other purpose than to force him into an irresponsible and precipitate course of action.

Despite the tumult and the shouting on this Moratorium day, we think the great, silent majority of the American people want their President to stand firm for what he knows is right. We also believe they will support him if he does his duty.

INCREASING BANKING COMPETITION IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1969, I had the pleasure to introduce H.R. 13928, a bill to increase banking competition in the National Capital region and to provide for a better flow of banking funds throughout this area.

Last week the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on S. 2569 introduced by Senators SPARKMAN and BENNETT. This bill is identical to H.R. 13928, which I have introduced.

As a part of these hearings the Treas-

ury submitted its views on the proposed legislation. These views were cleared with the Bureau of the Budget. The Treasury report was a scholarly and thoughtful approach to this problem and I am today inserting this report in the RECORD to acquaint my colleagues with the views of the Treasury and the administration on this measure. I am naturally gratified that the Treasury and the administration could see fit to support legislation which I have introduced.

The report follows:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
TREASURY,

Washington, D.C., October 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 2569, "To amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956."

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 prohibits the expansion of a bank holding company into new States unless the laws of such States expressly provide for the acquisition of banks within their borders by out-of-State holding companies. No State to our knowledge has such provisions. Existing bank holding companies which own banks in more than one State antedate the 1956 Act.

The proposed legislation would relax the restrictions on multi-State bank holding companies for the Washington, D.C. area. Specifically, the bill would permit a bank holding company to own a District of Columbia bank and also other banks located in the "National Capital region" as defined in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-669, 40 U.S.C. 652(a)). The definition is as follows:

"'National Capital region' means the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in the State of Maryland, Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and all other cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties and cities."

Under the bill, a bank holding company whose principal banking subsidiaries are located in Virginia would be permitted to acquire and own banks located in the District of Columbia. Similarly, a bank holding company whose principal banking subsidiaries are located in Maryland would be permitted to acquire and own banks located in the District of Columbia. Thus, Virginia or Maryland based bank holding companies would be permitted to own banks in the District of Columbia, while bank holding companies based in the District of Columbia would be able to own banks in only those areas of Virginia or Maryland which are suburban to the Washington, D.C. area. This would permit the large Richmond and Baltimore banks to have banking affiliates in the District of Columbia.

The proposed legislation would result in great long-run economic advantages to the Washington, D.C. area by strengthening its financial institutions. It would also recognize that the District of Columbia is merely the center of a large metropolitan area, including portions of both Maryland and Virginia. This is one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the country. Its current rate of growth in terms of both employment and average individual income compares favorably with other metropolitan areas.

The District of Columbia banks have been unable to keep pace with the growth of the area because of their inability to expand into their suburbs. Their deposit growth rates

have lagged badly behind their suburban competitors. Unless there is some modification of current legal restrictions, the banks in the area will be unable adequately to meet the credit needs of the area, and the area will be deprived of banks of a size necessary to large metropolitan areas. The proposed legislation would remedy these defects in the existing situation without unnecessary impinging upon the rights of the states of Maryland and Virginia to control their own banking structures. It should be emphasized that this legislation would not permit branch banking across state lines, but any affiliates in Maryland or Virginia acquired by District of Columbia based bank holding companies would have to themselves be either national banks or banks chartered by the respective states of Maryland or Virginia. In either case, all of the branch banking restrictions of those two states would remain fully applicable and would be neither violated nor thwarted.

This is quite clear. The distinction between chain (holding company) banking and branch banking is clear in the law and has been recognized by many courts. *Camden Trust Co. v. Gidney*, 301 F. 2d 521, 524-525 (C.A. D.C.), *certiorari denied*, 369 U.S. 886; *First National Bank in Billings v. First Bank Stock Corp.*, 306 F. 2d 937 (C.A. 9). The differences between branch banking and holding company banking are many. Each bank owned by a holding company is a separate corporation with a separate capitalization and all of the attributes of a unit bank. Each bank in a holding company organization has a separate board of directors. Each such bank has a limit on the amount that it can lend to one borrower based on a percentage of the bank's individual capital and surplus. In contrast a branch banking system may lend at any one of its office up to the lending limit of the total system. Of course, a branch does not have separate shareholders. A branch may be closed at any time by resolution of the bank's board of directors without approval of either shareholders or supervisor. A holding company unit bank may be closed only by liquidation, merger, or receivership, all of which are complicated processes requiring approval of the bank's shareholders and authorization from the supervisor (12 U.S.C. §§ 181-186, 191-200, 215-215a, 1828 (c)). There are many other differences between holding company and branch banking.

It is the Department's view that S. 2569 would be of great benefit not only to the banking industry in the Washington metropolitan area, but more importantly, to the economic well-being of this rapidly growing area and to the businesses and individuals who are dependent upon this economy. We urge that S. 2569 be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL W. EGGEES,
General Counsel.

NOT NIXON'S WAR

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, not since Abraham Lincoln sat in the White House has an American President had his efforts to attain peace so seriously handicapped.

We have yesterday and today witnessed demonstrations conducted by a small but strident minority group which advocates a peace-at-any-price stance for the United States. Some so-called

patriots carry the flag of a nation which has to date been responsible for the deaths of nearly 39,000 American soldiers. At this very hour, this same nation continues to conduct active aggressive warfare against the nation of South Vietnam, and against our Armed Forces and civilians posted there. Simultaneously, a U.S. mission strives to achieve a negotiated peace in talks being conducted in Paris with that nation. And also at the same time, the President of the United States continues his stated policies of exhausting every effort to achieve a just peace for all participants in the conflict.

No one will deny that individuals have a constitutional right to peacefully assemble to voice their opinions, and no one has denied them this right as evidenced by the fact that such demonstrations are permitted. This, however, is not the point. These individuals help to delay the very peace they seek by aiming their protests at the wrong party, and they introduce a dangerous element of coercion which is foreign to our form of government.

First, their position is confused and inconsistent. Last year at the Democratic convention, the antiwar faction endorsed a platform calling for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, a reduction in U.S. offensive operations in South Vietnam, and a phased withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Vietnam. Now, a year later, President Nixon has completely stopped all bombing of North Vietnam, U.S. offensive action has dropped to its lowest level since the troop buildup began, and large troop withdrawals have already taken place and are scheduled to continue as rapidly as the South Vietnamese Army can take over the fighting.

Recently, even the formerly rigid Government of South Vietnam has made concessions to the effect that it will hold elections and allow the full participation of the National Liberation Front—NLF.

Thus, with all of the doves' peace demands being fulfilled, they have switched their attack. They now seek total and immediate U.S. withdrawal regardless of the consequences, and furthermore, they have the gall to say that they have "consistently" demanded this. These same elected officials, clergymen, and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium endorsed a plank at the Democratic convention which specifically stated that the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It seems that the gestures for peace have been singularly one sided. Therefore, I think that those who demonstrate in Washington and around the Nation should direct their protests to the enemy which intransigently fights on, apparently unwilling to compromise in any way. The Paris peace talks have been in session for a year and a half now, but the North Vietnamese have offered only a hard line position calling for unilateral withdrawal of all American troops and a total abandonment of South Vietnam to a Communist takeover. We are asked to assume that a Communist government is the majority wish of the South Vietnamese people, although the Communists

refuse to participate in a legitimate election.

But a more ominous specter casts a sinister shadow over the moratorium, independent of its particular issues. Have we arrived at the place in our national history where the leaders of our Nation should start to follow policies dictated by street demonstrations? Are we hereafter to have government by demonstration rather than by representation? The pathways of history are cluttered with the ruins of once great nations whose downfall can be traced to the point where legitimate representative government gave way to leaders who tried to accede to the mercurial whimsies of mob rule. President Nixon, I am thankful to say, announced well before Moratorium Day that his policies would not be affected by the event. Thus, moratorium leaders were well informed that their demonstrations could have no useful purpose but to lengthen the war by giving heart to the enemy.

Does the enemy take heart from such a demonstration? A letter from the Premier of North Vietnam, Pham Van Dong, congratulating his "dear American friends," gives strong evidence that this is the case.

Therefore, I think the public demonstrations are dangerous in precedent, ill-timed, and certainly misdirected. Members of Congress who support such tactics are, in my opinion, not acting in the best interests of the democratic traditions of this Nation. They know that the President has the constitutional duty to conduct foreign policy and that negotiating peace is the most difficult and delicate act of foreign policy. Heckling and harassing the President is delaying the peace, not hastening it. Have the Democrats forgotten so quickly that Mr. Nixon is trying to end a war which he inherited from his Democratic predecessor and which they helped to authorize? This is not Mr. Nixon's war.

I am pleased that President Nixon is acting in such a manner as to prevent the United States from being transformed into an unstable, mercurial country where policy is determined by massive demonstrations and protest marches.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, District of Columbia police officials report that lawlessness and violent crimes are multiplying at an alarming rate. Figures released for the month of August this year show robberies up 62.8 percent in comparison with the same month last year, and 61 percent of these are classified as armed robberies. Total robberies for August in the District totaled a startling 1,226. By simple arithmetic we can conclude that 753 times during August, or an average of once an hour, someone's life was threatened by an armed hoodlum. And now, September armed robbery figures have been announced. Washington has the dubious distinction

of having broken its own record, because August's 753 armed robberies have been surpassed by September's 821. This means that during September an armed robbery occurred on an average of 1.1 per hour, or 26.4 per day.

Shocking as these figures are, they are only a part of the total dismal picture. August statistics showed percentage increases of 49.7 in larcenies, 42.4 in burglaries, 27.7 in rapes, 20 in homicides, and 11.4 in aggravated assaults.

And speaking of homicides, as of October 6, total for the year was 206, which with 3 months still to go in 1969, means that 1968's total homicide figure of 209 is going to be easily surpassed. Although only eighth in population among U.S. cities, Washington ranks first in number of homicides.

Overall, crime in the District of Columbia for the month of August 1969 was up a total of 33 percent. The September statistics are not available yet, but based on the armed robbery figure released, the ominous trend will undoubtedly show itself to have continued.

For those of us who live in the Washington area, this news confirms the worst suspicions of those of us alert to the city around us, and I am deeply concerned. I am concerned, firstly, as any American citizen must be to realize that the streets of his Nation's Capital City are dangerous, and that muggers hide in the shadows of the great marble monuments. I am concerned as one who makes the Washington area his second home, as do all Members of Congress. One who lives here is well aware that an aura of fear descends over this city as night falls, and men and women go out in groups if they dare go out on the streets at all. To go out alone, quite frankly, is considered foolhardy and reckless, and in a lawyer's phrase, not the act of a reasonable and prudent man. Time is of the essence. Action is urgently needed now by the Congress—not tomorrow or the day after.

President Nixon has submitted a package of legislative proposals for consideration and action by the Congress. These anticrime proposals are appropriate and well designed to attack the areas of criminal activity where they are directed. I ask this Congress to act upon these proposals now in answer to the needs and demands of the American people.

A TIME FOR STATESMANSHIP

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam moratorium is attracting worldwide attention and this is an appropriate time to make a statement on the war and the demonstrations.

The act of joining in the moratorium is a matter for the individual conscience. Where any public demonstrations are peaceful and thoughtful, they fall within the ambit of our constitutional guarantees and permit our people to express their opinions. To the extent that they are violent and destructive they serve no useful purpose and should be repudiated.

We all seek to promote a swift and

honorable peace in Vietnam. We all seek to withdraw our troops as rapidly as circumstances will allow. We all seek substantial progress toward peace and American withdrawal. In my judgment, President Nixon actively pursues these objectives and has taken substantial steps to achieve them. To the extent that the proposed moratorium would embarrass or frustrate the President in his efforts, it would be a disservice to the people of this country.

The last time I spoke at any length on this question was after the Tet offensive of 1968 when I spoke of the need for a complete and total review of our policies and a redetermination of our commitments.

Subsequent to this statement, President Johnson turned the national policy in the direction of peace by ordering a cessation of bombing, by issuing a call for a peace conference and he also announced his withdrawal as a candidate for the Presidency.

Given the extent of our commitment and the degree of reliance of associated nations upon us, it seemed to me that the Johnson initiative was hopeful and that efforts to achieve an honorable military conclusion should be supported and I did support them.

When President Nixon succeeded President Johnson, he asked for time and patience in attempting to achieve our disengagement and I was willing, as the American people were willing, to accord both to him. And I should like to say that I believe that Mr. Nixon honestly wants to bring the war to an end. Surely it would be to his advantage and that of the Nation to do so.

One must concede also that the problem facing President Nixon is no less difficult than that faced by President Johnson.

The overall need to form a cooperative structure to maintain peace is as urgent as ever. The existence of hostile forces dedicated to undermining our security clearly continues. The vulnerability of millions of people to aggression and enslavement and torture without our protection remains. The difficulty of creating a viable governmental structure overnight in Vietnam has not grown any less.

We have manfully assumed the burden of helping to achieve these objectives and to solve these problems. And it is clear that we cannot simply walk away from them and our involvement with a wave of the hand. I do not agree with those who say "turn around and walk out tomorrow."

Nor do I believe that simply because we terminate this war we shall be free of conflict and the problems of aggression forever after. Merely to mention the names of Cuba, Israel, Biafra, Peru, Greece, and Yugoslavia suggests areas where difficulties affecting this country might well arise.

Having taken all these factors into account, however, it does seem to me that we are entitled to take the measure of the Nixon administration upon its progress in achieving a peaceful end to the war.

The fact is that we have gone about as far as we can go. Whether our Viet-

nam adventure might have been conducted otherwise or should not have been started at all is now academic. Whatever the causes, the significant fact is that the American support for this war has gradually been eroded and the American people want it finished. And while it continues, American boys are being killed.

For the most part our people have not been unreasonable. They have not in appreciable numbers asked for precipitate evacuation. But President Nixon should not brush off the desire for peace as inconsequential nor consider the student questioning unimportant.

It is impossible to set a legislative prescription for terminating a war. Like the conduct of foreign policy, this activity must have flexibility and the Executive must be permitted some freedom of action.

However, this by no means suggests that the patience of the people is without limit nor that support of the military effort will continue indefinitely. We must see progress and we must see it soon. This is not to limit it to 30 or to 60 days, or a year but it is to say that there must be movement and it must be apparent without delay.

This is an appropriate time for full discussion on the war commitment. It is also a time for restraint and a time for action in the general interest. It is certainly not, in my judgment, a time to substitute political ploys for statesmanship under the claims of acting in the cause of national security and serenity.

SHORTCOMINGS OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Congress received a message from President Nixon urging action on a number of his legislative proposals. I include in the RECORD at this point a statement issued by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, (Mr. ALBERT), in response to the President's message. The majority leader has very clearly pointed out the shortcomings of the President's message and has emphasized that there is far more initiative and a greater sense of urgency in the Congress than in the administration.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL ALBERT

I have read with interest the Message of the President which will be delivered to the Congress on Monday.

The President proposes to make the legislative issue of the 1970 campaign the question of who deserves greater credit for the Ninety-first Congress' record of accomplishment. This, we are willing to do.

We have moved from the beginning in a spirit of cooperation. For the first time in history, Democrats in Congress gave an incoming President a federally-financed program for transition of the government.

Many Democrats have supported the President in matters affecting the national security and the economy of our country.

Notwithstanding the failure of the President to send up a State of the Union

message; notwithstanding the tardiness of Departments and agencies in submitting legislative proposals or in commenting on bills pending before the various committees; notwithstanding repeated instances in the most important areas where Administration spokesmen have disagreed among themselves or have asked for additional time to express their views, this Congress has moved and is moving on a broad front.

Despite the President's comments, there is a greater sense of urgency in the Congress than in the Administration.

I agree with the President that our elderly Americans need increased benefits, but I believe a 10 percent increase in Social Security payments on April 1 is not only too late but too little.

I agree with the President that the Economic Opportunity Act should be extended, but where are the Republican votes to extend it without emasculating it?

I agree with the President that the legislative areas he described are important, but I cannot understand how a message which stresses urgency can ignore the crisis in education, the increasing need for conservation, and the protection of our natural resources.

I have been in the House of Representatives a long time. I have seen administrations come and go. I have served in great Congresses, productive Congresses.

The 91st Congress is still in its first session. Yet, the House of Representatives has already distinguished itself by the quality of its performance, by its ability to plow new grounds and to prepare for the future.

With electoral college reform, tax reform, new thrusts to education and water purification already through the House; with voting rights, housing, and mine safety bills ready for floor action—all done on the initiative of a Democratic Congress—with numerous other major proposals under study by the committees, the 91st Congress bids fair to be one of the really quality Congresses of the century. Of this, the American people will be the judge, and I, for one, am willing to leave the verdict in their hands.

MR. WALKER TIDIES UP

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the great pleasure of reading an editorial published by the Chicago Tribune on October 11, 1969, entitled "Mr. Walker Tidies Up." I believe it merits the attention of our colleagues because it so aptly underscores the changing mood which has accompanied the numerous riots and demonstrations taking place across our great Nation.

The editorial follows:

MR. WALKER TIDIES UP

In the wake of Wednesday night's street violence, Daniel Walker, who sired the "Walker report" on the Democratic convention riots of August, 1968, appeared in a penitential mood before a civic organization. This time he had nothing but praise for the professionalism of Chicago police in dealing with the criminal outbreak of revolutionary rabble.

These were the same police whom Mr. Walker, in his "summary" of the 1968 report, accused of responding to provocation with "unrestrained and indiscriminate police violence," amounting to what, on two occasions, "can only be called a police riot."

Within a year Mr. Walker has not only changed his tune, but he now complains that his previous comments were misread or misunderstood. Yet on Dec. 20, 1968, some three weeks after the release of his report, Walker

strongly defended the report in toto, stating that many of the younger generation mistrust "a society that teaches but does not practice the dignity of the individual."

We wonder if the young hoodlums who went on Wednesday night's insane rampage are to be regarded as exemplars of individual dignity.

If wrong in 1968, Walker conceivably could have straightened out to the extent that he is right now. But if he has indulged in the communist exercise of rehabilitation thru self-criticism, he might at long last answer some of the puzzling questions having to do with his 1968 report. The Tribune repeatedly attempted to obtain clarification from him, but he always slipped, slid, and ducked. Here are some unanswered questions:

Why did Walker volunteer a "summary" which Chief Judge William J. Campbell of federal District court characterized as "Mr. Walker's personal opinions"?

Why was Walker in such a sweat to release the report, which was only advisory, that he rushed thru the printing of 10 copies at a Chicago plant so that members of the Presidential Commission on the Causes of Crime and Violence could get a perfunctory peek at the contents? The Walker panel was responsible to the commission, but only a handful of its members saw the document in advance, and then for perhaps an hour or less.

Was this rush related to commitments to leak the report in advance to Life magazine, the television networks, and Bantam Books, which hurried a paperback edition to the printers, and E. P. Dutton & Co., which did a hard-cover quickie? A copy of the report, perhaps in manuscript, had been handed Max Frankel of the New York Times, who wrote the Bantam edition foreword and a front-page story for his newspaper for editions of the report's official date of release, Monday, Dec. 2.

What was the concern of the Times [which had been harsh in its treatment of the Chicago police department's handling of the convention riots] in seeking wide distribution of the report? Its book division manager, John G. Stewart, stated that his newspaper had arranged "to cooperate in the publication of both paperback and hard-cover editions of the report."

Why did Walker solicit the assistance of the navy department in finding a private printer in Philadelphia after the Government Printing Office refused to print the report because of its many obscenities?

Why did Grosset & Dunlap, which also rushed out a hard-cover edition, advertise "1st Official U.S. Report," when the report was neither official nor conclusive? Why did the Times similarly headline its news story "U.S. Study Scores Chicago Violence as a 'Police Riot,'" when the report was merely advisory and not an officially sanctioned government study?

If Mr. Walker is in a mood to come clean, now is his chance to explain.

ROGERS ASKS FINCH TO REORGANIZE FDA—MAKE IT LEAD AGENCY IN CONSUMER PROTECTION WITH DIRECT ACCESS TO THE SECRETARY

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the Subcommittee on Public Health held hearings into the capabilities of the Food and Drug Administration last month, numerous articles have been published indicating once again that FDA is not playing its proper role as consumer protector in the Government arena.

An internal report which sparked the

committee's look into the activities of FDA pointed out many of the shortcomings. I do not agree with all the recommendations in the report which call for legislation, for I feel much could be accomplished through administrative action.

But there presently exists a lack of communication and coordination between FDA, the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which is adding to the problems of FDA.

Before July of 1968, FDA was directly responsible to the Secretary. There was a direct line of communication and thus a direct responsibility for the work done or not done by FDA. Since FDA was, through reorganization, placed under the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, the responsibility of communication has become fogged.

I have been told that the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has taken between 75 and 100 people from FDA, severely compounding the manpower shortage which already existed in FDA.

We have seen examples of contradictory positions on various drugs and additives, indicating a lack of agreement in an agency which is responsible for warning the American public of dangerous items.

There are other reports that indicate that FDA is not getting the support, leadership, and direction it needs to become the guardian of the American consumer because of its organization position within HEW.

I am writing to the Secretary today asking that he reorganize the department so that FDA is directly responsible to the Assistant Secretary for Health with direct access to the Secretary himself.

I am also urging that the Secretary give FDA the emphasis necessary to make it the Government's lead agency in safeguarding the American public against unsafe foods, harmful pesticides, medical devices, cosmetics, unsafe or ineffective drugs for humans and animals and the other areas of consumer activity over which it has authorization, but which it has not properly exercised its responsibility.

THE MORATORIUM: THE BEST NEWS HANOI HAS HAD IN YEARS

(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, there are any number of Members in this body older than I, but I am not so young that I have forgotten Dienbienphu in Vietnam and what took place there in 1955. Nor am I so young that I cannot remember what this Nation's misguided policy did to sabotage the Republic of China during and after World War II, so that it was delivered into the hands of Ho Chi Minh's mentor and adviser, Mao Tse-tung.

If intelligent men cannot learn from these two tragedies so recent in our his-

tory, cannot profit from the monstrous errors of judgment, cannot avoid making the same pro-Communist mistakes we made then, then this Nation is, indeed, dead in a handbasket and on its way to purgatory.

During the Second World War and after, our State Department and the administration in office sold pro-West, Democratic, struggling Chinese leader Chiang Kai-shek down the river. A book could be written on the subject, and many have, but the irreducible minimum is that we turned our backs on the struggling democracy that was building in China and literally forced it into a foredoomed coalition with the Communists. The rest is history; sordid history. Within months, the Chinese Communists, well rested since they had not fought the Japanese, well stocked with guns from Russia, declared war on the democratic forces of Chiang Kai-shek and drove his government off the mainland.

It could not have been done without the efforts of the liberals in control of our State Department. It could not have been done had we not been sold a bill of goods on the home front that the Communists were not Communists at all, but agrarian reformers.

The leaders of and participants in today's so-called moratorium have learned nothing from that lesson. There is small consolation in the fact that some of these participants are misguided in their quest for peace.

After Japan surrendered to the Allies, the French returned to Vietnam where they had acted as protector prior to the war. But before they could set up government again, Ho Chi Minh, aided by Mao Tse-tung, forced the resignation of the Japanese government in Vietnam and set up his own Communist regime. The French expeditionary force fought the Communists of North Vietnam for 10 years. By the end of that time, it was obvious that the Vietcong could not win a military victory over the South Vietnamese and the French. So, they took another course. They set about undermining the morale of the French people back home in France. The hue and cry went up, unilateral withdrawal of all French troops.

Does that sound familiar?

Through the same kind of propaganda effort that is going on in this country today, the Communists were able to rob the French people of their will to fight for the freedom of the South Vietnamese, and the expeditionary force, lacking support from home, suffered defeat at Dienbienphu.

It was not a military defeat, since less than 10,000 men out of a French army of 270,000 were engaged in the battle. The South Vietnamese and the French lost because of moratoriums on the home front, criticism of the French Government's desperate effort to negotiate peace with the Vietcong, antiwar speeches and demonstrations in Paris and the same kind of protest that has been underway here in the United States for the past several years.

Result: a humiliating defeat of the French by the Vietcong.

How can anyone pretend surprise at the news from Hanoi that the Premier

has sent a message of encouragement to those promoting today's moratorium? For anyone to seriously believe that this moratorium is not the best news Hanoi has had in years, he would have to be either childish or senile, depending only on his age.

There is no man in the United States who wants peace in Vietnam more than President Nixon. There is no man in the United States working harder to achieve that peace than President Nixon. To undercut him and this country at this hour, to encourage the Vietcong to hold out is, in its simplest terms, giving aid and comfort to the enemy. At other times in this Nation's history, it would have been called such and dealt with accordingly.

Like every American, I want peace in Vietnam. I want an end to the dying. But perhaps my price is a little higher than those who have promoted this moratorium.

I want some national and international honor left for this Nation when it is over. I do not want it written across the pages of history that America pledged its word and copped out. I want some semblance of security for the entire world and there can certainly be none if the United States is driven out and humiliated.

Three years ago, in a newsletter to my constituents, I wrote this as the final paragraph:

This nation has, on many occasions, as other nations have, fought ardently for our freedom. But it may well be that, in the long roll of history, we are now writing one of our most glorious chapters on that remote soil of this tortured little nation 8,000 miles from our shores. Our stern and unswerving defense of the helpless Vietnamese, without seeking for ourselves either power, territory or treasure, is the highest tradition of all that can be good in humanity. While the flame of freedom burns in our souls, we cannot suffer it to be snuffed out in the soul of any man by Communist oppression. I believe, from the dimensions of my heart, that the cause of freedom now and in the years to come, is best served by supporting our sons on the battlefield of Vietnam. If this is patriotism, I am proud of it. For the question now comes down to this: either we serve our country and fight Communism to preserve our freedom or there will be no freedom to fight for nor any country to serve.

That was written 3½ years ago, and I would not change a word of it today. At that time I had thought, of course, that this Nation, once committed, would swiftly win the war. I could not have known that for 3 of those years we would back and fill, start and stop, and otherwise prevent our own troops from winning a war we had sent them to fight. I could not have known then that we had no intention of winning a military victory, as former President Johnson proudly announced last year.

The shame that is ahead of us is even worse if we follow the directions of the advocates of this moratorium: total and immediate surrender to the Communists and retreat to San Francisco. For, let the Record show, there can be no isolation for this country in this day of the atomic and hydrogen bomb. We either win in Vietnam or we lose in every corner of the globe.

There are three items which have appeared in the Washington Post yester-

day, October 14. The second and third columns by Joseph Alsop and Jack Anderson in today's issue.

What is being done in this country today will be looked at by historians in generations to come. I, for one, want there to be no question where I stood. I stood by my country in one of its most trying hours; I stood by my President in his search for peace. Each man who stands somewhere else can settle with his conscience in whatever fashion he can, but I do not envy him the job.

The items referred to follow:

HUE MASSACRE FORESHADOWED RESULTS OF "BUG-OUT" BY UNITED STATES

(By Joseph Alsop)

Suppose the vociferous supporters of the Vietnam moratorium get what they want. Suppose they are finally able to force what the President succinctly calls a "bug-out." Then what?

For the students who advocate a violent revolution in this country, the foregoing question has no importance, of course. They may be, indeed they are, irresponsible, self-intoxicated young fools. But they are at least more forthright than the senators and college professors and other bug-out advocates who pretend to be responsible persons, yet will not face the predictable consequences of the bug-out they are calling for so loudly.

The first consequence, as anyone can foresee, will be the cold-blooded massacre of a couple of million South Vietnamese who have put their faith and trust in the United States. If anyone doubts this, he had better study the hideous massacre of about 3,500 old men, women and children that was perpetrated by the Communists when they occupied the city of Hue for a couple of weeks.

The Hue massacre was largely irrational. The people who were killed were not government officials, or soldiers in the South Vietnamese army, or even, in the main, blood relations of such wicked "imperialist lackeys." These people were instead buried alive, or mowed down with automatic weapons, or chained together and brained with mattocks in reprisal for Hue's infuriating failure to produce the "popular uprising" the Communist leaders expected.

A few were Catholics, to be sure, and the Catholics in Hue were reportedly treated with particular brutality. There are above a million Catholics in South Vietnam today; and either they or their parents were brought down from the North by the United States in 1954, because it was correctly considered they needed a safe haven in the South.

So what of them? And what of the million South Vietnamese who are now under arms for the Saigon government? And what of the hundreds of thousands of members of the People's Self-Defense Force in the villages, who are regularly chosen as targets by the Communist assassination squads?

American intelligence has officially predicted that most of these people will be killed out of hand—the conservative predicted figure is about 1,500,000—after an American bug-out leading to a victory for Hanoi. Is that what Sen. Fulbright and Sen. Goodell really want; and if not, how do they propose to avoid it?

As to the wider political consequences of a bug-out, they are clearly and very grimly set forth in the responses to the President from his ambassadors, to whom he long ago posed the question. These consequences, too, hardly bear thinking about.

They range from the rapid collapse of the position as a Pacific great power that the United States fought two previous big wars to establish and defend, all the way to a very serious increase in the risk that the Soviets will back the Arabs, whole-hog, in perpetrating genocide against Israel. Is that

what Professor Hans Morgenthau wants? Or does he approve of genocide in South Vietnam, while opposing genocide in Israel?

Yet the worst consequences of a bug-out, as President Nixon has kept emphasizing to many people he has talked to recently, will be right here, at home in America. This is his most special, most personal reason for not wanting to be "the first American President to lose a war."

Any fool ought to be able to foresee that the first American defeat in war, followed by the grisly consequences overseas that have been described above, will be enough to poison our political life for a quarter of a century. The inquest after the alleged "loss of China" was poisonous enough. But it will come to seem temporary child's play if we quite needlessly lose the war in Vietnam.

The defeat genuinely is quite needless. So there will be a certain substance, alas, to the angry charge that all America's great efforts and sacrifices of these last years have been rendered fruitless by a "stab in the back."

Again, there has been more than a little colloquy with the enemy. So there will be raw material, alas, for those who will howl about a great conspiracy. Then, too, Hanoi's most obviously untruthful propaganda has been faithfully parroted by many Americans in the academic community, in the media and elsewhere, and this will become another topic for dire clamor.

The truth is that a great many seemingly intelligent Americans are now behaving like mindless lemmings. The danger to themselves is of course their own business. But they might at least consider the danger to all the values they pretend to cherish.

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 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 publicly 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.

U.S. REVOLUTIONARIES LINKED TO HANOI

(By Jack Anderson)

TOKYO.—For the millions at home who will demonstrate against the Vietnam war today, the intelligence files here contain some facts worth pondering.

This column has examined documentary evidence that a few rabid revolutionaries who seek to dominate the anti-war movement in the United States are receiving instructions from Hanoi. They aren't against war at all; they merely are on the enemy's side.

Indeed, their aim is to stir up new "wars of liberation," including guerrilla warfare in the streets of America, to advance the Communist cause. Their immediate instructions are to agitate in the United States for an unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam.

In retrospect, I believe it was a mistake for the U.S. to plunge into the Vietnam conflagration. This remote patch of jungle simply hasn't been worth the price in American blood and treasure.

But those who are in a big rush to write off 38,887 American war dead and \$81,407,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should consider the French experience. The French pullout of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a Communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolph Hitler.

Too hasty abandonment of South Vietnam likewise might produce another bloodbath. Yet the Hanoi-directed militants, according to intelligence documents, are striving to turn the antiwar protest into a national demand for "quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

Possibly to avoid treason charges, the American militants are not in direct touch with the Hanoi government. Most contacts, apparently, have been kept on a friend-to-friend or organization-to-organization basis.

The Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, for example, maintains an underground liaison with U.S. leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Students' Committee for the End of the Vietnam War.

On the eve of the Vietnam Moratorium, Tran Buu Kiem, the Students' Union chairman and former chief Vietcong delegate in Paris, wrote a letter to his American disciples urging "the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall struggle movement."

HANOI LETTER

The letter, dated Oct. 6, called for a prompt American pull-out from Vietnam. Kiem contended that "the replacement of a score of thousands of troops is insignificant, as compared with about half a million U.S. youths still remaining in South Vietnam."

"Your interests and those of the American people and the United States do not lie in such a drop-by-drop troop pullout, but in the quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; not in the Vietnamization or de-Americanization of the war in South Vietnam, which is unpopular and costly in human and material resources, but in ending it. . . .

"If Mr. Nixon sincerely wants to live up to his promise to end the war, a promise which

he made when he ran for office and when he took over the presidency," the Kiem letter continued, "there is no other way than to respond to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional revolutionary government by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam without imposing any conditions and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Ky-Kiem administration, leaving the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs."

"You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success in this fall struggle phase."

INTELLIGENCE REPORT

Another intelligence document, made available to this column, casts a revealing light on the North Korean role in stirring up opposition to the constitutional amendment, which will determine the future of South Korea. A national referendum will be held Friday to determine whether South Korea's bantam President Chung Hee Park can run for a third term.

"In connection with the constitutional amendment," declares the intelligence analysis, "the Pyongyang regime is trying to arouse popular views adverse to the constitutional amendment in an effort to create political chaos in the Republic of Korea. The Pyongyang regime is concentrating all efforts on its psychological warfare to encourage the recalcitrant elements in the South."

The attempt to extend President Park's rule for another term has been described, even in the Western press, as undemocratic. The truth is that the Park government has adhered scrupulously to the democratic processes.

Once the referendum is decided by popular vote on Friday, South Korea's troubles may merely be beginning. The intelligence document estimates that North Korea will intensify its efforts to subvert South Korea next year, thus "taking advantage of the possible political chaos in the ROK during the 1971 election."

CITIZEN PROTEST AGAINST MORATORIUM IN KEENE, N.H.

(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, on this day of the so-called moratorium against the conflict in Vietnam, I wish to put into the RECORD the text of an advertisement paid for by 72 concerned citizens of Keene, N.H. They are opposed to the moratorium, as I am, because they fear, as I fear, that it will encourage the foe to fight on and not negotiate.

Although the participants in the moratorium may be motivated by good intentions, their efforts are—and I believe most of them are—likely to be misread by the enemy. Hanoi is likely to see them as a sign that the American people are on the verge of panic and will do almost anything to get out of Vietnam heedless of the consequences to ourselves or to other countries.

My constituents in Keene published their advertisement yesterday in the Keene Evening Sentinel. It includes a very apt and moving excerpt from Thomas Paine's writings.

I am very pleased to bring this to the attention of the House:

We ask that you consider anew these words of Thomas Paine, then reexamine the motives; the maturity; and the stature of those

who have perpetrated and supported the treachery that culminates in this day of shame . . . the October 15th Moratorium.

"It is surprising to see how rapidly a panic will sometimes run through a country. Yet panics have their uses. Their peculiar advantage is, that they test sincerity and hypocrisy, and bring things and men to light which might otherwise have lain forever undiscovered. These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of this country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered.

Not a place upon earth might be so happy as America. Excerpts from the American Crisis, No. 1, December 23, 1776, Thomas Paine.

Contributed in the spirit of an apology to our fighting men and to our leaders that seek an honorable end to the Vietnam War by the following:

Charles R. Adams, G. V. Aldrich, George H. Barrett, Gordon W. Bemis, Jr., Malcolm G. Beverstock, Robert W. Bird, James F. Campbell, Alexis Caswell, Donald P. Chace, John E. Clark, Richard J. Colburn, Alton B. Collier, Norman H. Cotton, Vernon M. Cram, Jim Cusick, John W. Day, Carl Delaney, Manuel J. DeSouza, Jilly DiBernardo, Bruni diBicari, Kermit Davis, Sidney O. Davis, James L. Doody, and Clifford E. Emery.

Kenneth D. Fields, James F. Fletcher, M. G. Gaouette, R. W. Gardner, Ed. Govangeli, John C. Grogg, F. Guardiani, Frank Henry, James A. Ingalls, James L. Jacobs, Fred H. Johnson, T. R. Jones, Chester L. Kingsbury, Arthur H. Knight, Albert Lafountain, Walter A. Lampinen, Earle N. Lane, Raymond L. Lane, Richard L. Lane, Richard L. Larue, Norman Letourneau, Charles B. Loos, and Al. Martin.

Clyde L. Messier, John W. Miller, Len Nelson, Birger Ohman, Donald L. Ouellette, Frank C. Papenfuss, James E. Pelkey, Sr., Roy Piper, Ed. Reyor, Robert E. Riley, George Roentsch, Richard F. Rowe, William Roy, Clark Schwettman, Charles V. Smith, Stanley B. Smith, H. B. Stamm, Dean B. Talbot, Douglas H. Treat, Stanley Turner, Lloyd L. Vickers, Evan C. White, Robert L. White, and Carl L. Wilson.

You may be interested to know that in a poll taken at random Sunday among tax paying family men, 95 were against the Moratorium and only 17 for it.

MORATORIUM—MASS SENSITIVITY TRAINING

(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, last Thursday I called to the attention of the House and caused to be published in the RECORD—page 29368—the full text of a Radio Hanoi broadcast on Monday, October 6, calling for the disloyal and disgraceful so-called moratorium of today.

Yesterday, during debate on another matter, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) read to the House and caused to be published in the RECORD—page 29968—the full text of a telegram from the Premier of Communist North Vietnam, addressed to his "Dear American Friends" and encouraging the activities designed to stab our fighting men in the back. Lest anyone misunderstand its meaning, this telegram closed with the words:

May your fall offensive succeed splendidly.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this body should understand that the American people have not been fooled by the peaceniks. Within the city of Washington the huge crowds predicted turned out to be mostly a sick trickle of confused and exploited children.

Reports from my district indicate that the so-called moratorium was properly ignored. From more than 15,000 students enrolled at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, less than 300 attended a so-called prayer vigil. Three, only three, pickets showed up to parade in front of the Federal building in Baton Rouge, a city of over 150,000. At Hammond, La., the home of Southeastern Louisiana College, students went about their business of gaining an education without interruption—a normal day like any other Wednesday.

Despite the advance publicity and all of the ballyhoo, most Americans showed far more interest over the outcome of the world's series game in New York than over the Red-led general strike in support of our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the tenor of the so-called debate in this House on the subject of the moratorium has shown two things very plainly.

First, that most Members fail to understand what the whole operation is all about.

Second, that insofar as leaving Vietnam is concerned, the decision to quit and run has already been made. Our allies have already been sold out—our captive fighting men held by the enemy callously abandoned. The only disagreement is whether our retreat is to be a rout as demanded by the peaceniks to further disgrace Americans or to be disguised as a negotiated withdrawal as peddled by the administration.

Both views ignore the fate of our many anti-Communist Asian friends upon our departure from Vietnam. It is flagrantly dishonest to suggest the further evacuation of these people, many of whom are Christian and who were already evacuated by us from North Vietnam in 1954 to prevent their wholesale slaughter by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the plain truth is that if we leave Vietnam before our allies are strong enough to protect their homes from Communist aggression, these millions can expect the carnage of the Christians slaughtered at Hue during last year's Tet offensive.

What was the moratorium really all about? It was merely a training exercise, designed to condition mindless people in large numbers to blindly follow demagogues in defiance of constituted authority—the same sort of operation which resulted in tearing down the doors of the assembly chamber in Madison, Wis. It had the further purpose of conditioning decent Americans, with the aid of massive publicity, that there was nothing to prevent such disloyal disorders.

It was a dress rehearsal for next month—November 15. On that date more ambitious plans for giving aid and comfort to the enemy have already been announced—a further operation in the fall

offensive waged in Washington by the enemy. Let no public official be misled—the American people are not, nor are our fighting men in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I include clippings from today's papers, together with other clippings reflecting the views of Americans who can wear the name with honor and pride, two of our fighting men whose views we would do well to carefully consider:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 15, 1969]

THE MORATORIUM

The best standard for judgment on today's Vietnam Moratorium is the effect it can be expected to have on the enemy—and on the President of the United States. Some light has been shed on both points.

It is clear that this demonstration is enthusiastically welcomed in Hanoi. A Radio Hanoi broadcast yesterday said the Moratorium showed that the Communist fight in Vietnam was "for peace, justice and the right cause," and that this demonstration is "putting the Nixon administration in a very difficult and confused situation." An additional broadcast comment was that "the Vietnamese people heartily welcomes and entirely supports the October wave of struggle" in the United States.

An Associated Press report quotes the Communist 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."

There is no reason to believe that most of the Moratorium participants want or intend to give aid and comfort to the Communists. A few may, but not many. This, however, begs the question. What counts is whether the demonstration, regardless of intention, does in fact give encouragement to Hanoi and thereby presumably prolongs the war. The evidence from Hanoi is that this is precisely what the demonstrators are doing. And, whatever the disclaimers may be, mature people are supposed to be responsible for the reasonably foreseeable consequences of their conduct.

What about the effect of the Moratorium on President Nixon? Certainly it has not been helpful.

In his recent press conference the President said that "under no circumstances will I be affected whatever" by the demonstration. We think that was a proper statement. But it evoked a predictable storm of criticism to the effect that Mr. Nixon was indifferent to public opinion, and was determined to pursue the policies of Lyndon Johnson in Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon is not deaf to public opinion. Nor is he adhering to the Johnson war policies, although the latter were modified significantly before Mr. Johnson left office.

It seems to us, however, that President Nixon is letting himself be pushed into a somewhat defensive attitude by the mindless attacks being made against him. There is at least a suggestion of this in the Nixon letter to a Georgetown University student—a letter in which the President tried to clarify his press conference remark.

There is hardly a man alive who doesn't want to see this miserable war ended. Certainly Mr. Nixon would rejoice to see the end, and firmly intends to wind up the American involvement at the earliest possible date. But as President, it is his duty to strive for an honorable and responsible termination. He has taken significant steps toward this end. As President, he also has a duty to refuse to bow to pressure tactics which have no other purpose than to force him into an irresponsible and precipitate course of action.

Despite the tumult and the shouting on

this Moratorium day, we think the great, silent majority of the American people want their President to stand firm for what he knows is right. We also believe they will support him if he does his duty.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1969]

END THE WAR OR WE WILL

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

I've been asked to make speeches at a number of places today. I can't because I have to work. I think that everyone should refrain from working if he can; the two exceptions should be medical personnel and newsmen. If I had spoken, this is what I would have said:

The moratorium isn't a protest. It's an ultimatum by an enormous section of the population laid down to its politicians. That ultimatum says there is no time left. It says there's no more credibility gap because there's no more credibility. It's an ultimatum that says either end the war forthwith or we will stop it ourselves.

That's not what the politicians want to make of this day. A man like Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton, the Republican national chairman, would have you believe, "I'm for the moratorium as part of our right to assemble." That's not what the moratorium is about. The right to petition a government that rejects petitions before they're laid before it is a sterile right. It's using the forms of political process to frustrate their purpose. It's a con, a fancy way of saying, "You go ahead and exercise your god-given constitutional rights to be ineffectual while we go ahead and run the war."

Even before the McCarthy campaign, hope in the right of petition died. On its better days the government rejected politics with the contention that the Rostows and Kissingers knew more and knew better. They know nothing, but that's another story. On its worst and more ordinary days, the government responded by tricks and falsifications. . . . Pull out 3,000 men here, hide them under palm trees there, don't bomb this but bomb that, invent another round of fictitious secret peace talks, run and cry on U Thant's shoulder, get the Pope to hold your hand.

Now comes Sen. Fred Harris, the Democratic chairman, saying, "It's time to take the gloves off on the Vietnam war issue. It's nine months since the President took office." It was time to do that in Chicago, August 1968, when the Senator and his friends kept the Democrats a war party and drove the Clean Gene kids and a lot of other people out of electoral politics. Today he wants to be a peacenik because he has a dawning fear that the people have had it up to their geuzik with this perpetual tragedy.

Every aspect of government, all three branches, have failed but not all men in government. Former Senators Morse and Gruening are charter members of the opposition. Fulbright may have helped vote us into this war and into the set of policies which make such conflicts as inevitable as they are recurring, but he's said he was wrong, unthinking and gulled. We must accept that. This is no longer a small protest movement, and it's bad to get into the silly, purist radical bag of refusing to associate with anybody whose antiwar credentials are dated after 1964. This war has taught all of us many awful things about ourselves and our country. It's not just Sen. Fulbright who had to learn the hard way.

But if the few respectable men in high office could make such terrible mistakes, then the question is who should lead? Many speakers today will say the politicians, chastened, humbled, made honest and sensitive to the death of their constituents' sons and the voters' high taxes. Don't you believe it. Don't let them steal the movement away.

The strength of the peace movement is its leaderlessness, the way it can survive and

grow on a consensual process which is as easy to see as it's hard to describe with exactitude. Let the movement continue to be led as it has, by its adherents, by small groups of people proposing an idea and testing it by seeing who and how many will come in with them on it. That's how this moratorium was started. Six months ago a few of the former McCarthy people anticipated that whoziz was as trustworthy as his predecessor when he said he had a plan for ending the war. They judged that by October we would be ready for the moratorium. They were right. Today we put black crepe on our arms and refrain from work.

That will not be enough to end the war. We may get something out of it. Hershey's already been tossed to us, although what we're supposed to do with the old flesh trader is a puzzle. Maybe Hoover'll be given to us next, but these ancient bonbons have lost their sweetness. If we're very lucky, they'll give us some tinsily cease-fire while they sneak a secret war in Laos. The government should not be permitted to keep a single soldier in those parts, but to get them out we must do more than today.

In fact today is a preparation for more. November the 15th is already being planned as a march on Washington. Today is a day of accustoming great numbers of people to the anxiety of standing up to their government. Even in a country like ours where there are civil liberties, great strain still attaches to exercising them. We were all brought up trusting the government; it's hard to shake off the feeling that resistance to it, especially about a war, is a form of social treason. The moratorium will make people comfortable in their new roles of resistance. It will make opposition socially acceptable, perhaps even stylish.

This isn't by design but is dictated by the probable course of events. Either the war must end or the resistance must grow and take tougher forms. The fact will not be clear in most of the talks given today because they'll be given by summer-soldier politicians who will want to felicitate everyone on their orderly, good conduct; they will praise their audiences for the lawful and constitutional manner by which they express their hatred of this lousy war. That's all right. Only imbeciles prefer street brawling and law breaking to orderly political process, but that's not the point.

The point is that there would never have been a Peace Movement if it had remained law abiding in the government's eyes. The Peace Movement is where it is because people broke into draft boards and threw blood on the files or got their heads beaten standing in front of induction centers or, like Capt. Howard Levy, took a court martial and a jail sentence.

They dramatized the war's nature. They forced the rest of us to go back over the record and check to be sure there was some plausible justification for taking human lives as we were doing. They did more. When they faced their judges and pleaded innocent by virtue of Nuremberg, they reminded us that we're individually responsible for what's done in our names. Our government, our armies, our taxes, our napalm, our soldiers, our young men.

These law breakers planted in us the bad dream that there could be the Cincinnati War Crimes Trials of 1971 in which we would have to stand before the bar and plead we were good Americans. The Spocks, the Muhammad Alis, the Father Berrigans, the David Harrises, they did that to us, gave us the bad dream of the good American.

Their example shows that an action like the moratorium isn't an event in itself but the preparation and the threat of more and wider action. Even now what started out to be a sedate moratorium is inching in the direction of a general strike. It hasn't reached that point yet, but it will unless the government capitulates to its citizens.

But what's-his-face, the furtive and fugitive president who darts from TV station to armed compound, doesn't know that; he doesn't know that if he keeps it up, by spring the country may be ungovernable. He says he won't be the first American president to lose a war, when what he risks is becoming the first president to lose America.

Maybe today he will read the ultimatum correctly and understand that playtime is over. That there is no patience left for Henry Cabot Lodge, Ellsworth Bunker and more doddily about bugging out, leaving allies in the lurch or saving the State Department's occidental face. People don't care if we bug out, run out, march out, stumble out, crawl out or fade out as long as we get out *now*. They've had it, and the tumult and anger is spreading everywhere. Even the federal bureaucracy is threatening to take to the streets. It's no longer students or blacks; it's older people, businessmen, conservatives, liberals, anti-Communists, pro-Communists; it's everybody who knows that a perennial war that we have no will to win or even fight is insanity, that a democracy which carries on a war that 40 or 50 percent of the population detests risks destroying itself.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1969]

U.S. REVOLUTIONARIES LINKED TO HANOI

(By Jack Anderson)

TOKYO.—For the millions at home who will demonstrate against the Vietnam war today, the intelligence files here contain some facts worth pondering.

This column has examined documentary evidence that a few rabid revolutionaries who seek to dominate the anti-war movement in the United States are receiving instructions from Hanoi. They aren't against war at all; they merely are on the enemy's side.

Indeed, their aim is to stir up new "wars of liberation," including guerrilla warfare in the streets of America, to advance the Communist cause. Their immediate instructions are to agitate in the United States for an unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam.

In retrospect, I believe it was a mistake for the U.S. to plunge into the Vietnam conflagration. This remote patch of jungle simply hasn't been worth the price in American blood and treasure.

But those who are in a big rush to write off 38,887 American war dead and \$81,407,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should consider the French experience. The French pullout of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a Communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolph Hitler.

Too hasty abandonment of South Vietnam likewise might produce another bloodbath. Yet the Hanoi-directed militants, according to intelligence documents, are striving to turn the antiwar protest into a national demand for "quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

Possibly to avoid treason charges, the American militants are not in direct touch with the Hanoi government. Most contacts, apparently, have been kept on a friend-to-friend or organization-to-organization basis.

The Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, for example, maintains an underground liaison with U.S. leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Students' Committee for the End of the Vietnam War.

On the eve of the Vietnam Moratorium, Tran Buu Kiem, the Students' Union chairman and former chief Vietcong delegate in Paris, wrote a letter to his American disciples urging "the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall struggle movement."

HANOI LETTER

The letter, dated Oct. 6, called for a prompt American pull-out from Vietnam. Kiem contended that "the replacement of a score of thousands of troops is insignificant, as com-

pared with about half a million U.S. youths still remaining in South Vietnam.

"Your interests and those of the American people and the United States do not lie in such a drop-by-drop troop pull-out, but in the quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; not in the Vietnamization or de-Americanization of the war in South Vietnam, which is unpopular and costly in human and material resources, but in ending it."

"If Mr. Nixon sincerely wants to live up to his promise to end the war, a promise which he made when he ran for office and when he took over the presidency," the Klem letter continued, "there is no other way than to respond to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional revolutionary government by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam without imposing any conditions and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Ky-Khiem administration, leaving the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs."

"You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success in this fall struggle phase."

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader]
NEW HAMPSHIRE SOLDIER WRITES FROM SOUTH VIETNAM: "WE'RE DOING JUST WHAT THEY WANT US TO DO"

(NOTE.—The following letter was written by "Swede," a New Hampshire boy stationed in Vietnam for almost two years. For obvious reasons his identity cannot be disclosed.)

DEAR MR. LOEB, yesterday I received a few papers from you, one of them Aug. 29. In February I will have been in Vietnam for 21 months and I want to give my full support to an article on page 17 of that newspaper titled, "Let's Face Up to Vietnam." It was well written and very true.

I realize that U.S. citizens are tiring of this war and are tired of hearing about it. That is the price of a prolonged war and we elected the men who are dragging it on and on, at a great loss to the American public. As the article stated, the war should have been won in the early stages.

We are now doing just what North Vietnam wants us to do. Crumble and crawl any way we can. Troop withdrawal will strengthen the enemy's cause.

I hope the American public is not ignoring the fact that as long as the bombing of the North has been stopped the North has had freedom of movement for shipment and resupply to the South by way of the Cambodian border, etc., to the South.

They are probably planning a deadly devastating blow to the South when troop withdrawal reaches a peak. I'm astonished that our leaders are playing into their hands and have done nothing to stop it.

Surely freedom is worth the price we have already paid in lives lost. I know my friends who have died here wouldn't want to see the U.S. crawl away defeated.

If Nixon and other government officials are worrying about votes, I think if we win this war honorably and quickly they will get many more votes than if they let the killing of American troops drag on and on, as the Communists have planned all along.

The American Public may grow sick of the war and accept anything from the other side to end it. But it will be ended only for the U.S. not for Asia, and our allies who believe in our help—not for Asia.

We will either come out of this war a crawling broken nation or a strong proud nation as we have been in the past.

Also on the front page of this edition is a story of enemy retreat near Que Son Valley. The enemy had heavily entrenched bunkers here and those five men who refused to enter any further into that valley a second time were not alone. They represented their whole

company in the refusal. As a result of poor leadership Major Ramsey was released from his duty and a new commander took over the company.

When Ho died the North asked for a three day truce. The U.S. government stated they would go along with Saigon on the decision. Saigon said no truce. But my company stopped all operations for those three days and I presume that all American operations stopped for those three days. I'd like to know why the U.S. government didn't acknowledge this.

While we stopped operations, enemy movement continued as usual. When politicians finally decide to stop playing games with American lives at stake, and let the military run it, we will be victorious. If not, politics will bring our great nation to the brink of a great defeat and the greatest blunder in American history.

"SWEDE."

AN AMERICAN VETERAN WOUNDED IN VIETNAM REPLIES TO ANTI-WAR PROTESTERS

Concerning those who protest against our nation's assistance to South Vietnam no one has said it any better than Gerard T. Frey, Lt. Col., U.S.A., a casualty of the fighting, who wrote the following letter to the Philadelphia Inquirer:

"I have been a patient at Valley Forge General Hospital for over two years as a result of wounds sustained in Vietnam."

"In this, the age of 'protests,' I, a professional soldier, have some 'protests' of my own."

"I protest against cowardly draft dodgers who use their deferment not to prepare for future service but rather as an opportunity to bring riot and disorder to the campus in an attempt to deny others the use of the facilities of the college."

"I protest against those who have lost faith in our wonderful country. These are the people who know everything about their 'rights' but nothing about their responsibilities."

"I protest against those who place themselves and their precious skins above any thought of duty, honor, or country. Their God-given superiority enables them to condemn the brave Americans who do their duty in Vietnam as 'immoral' while they champion the cause of the enemy."

"I protest against those who ridicule patriotic emotion, love of country, a fierce thrill of pride at the national anthem, respect for the Flag and a determination to do our duty."

"I protest against those who condemn our country for any and everything while refusing to see any good in it. These are the ones who mutter dark threats of 'burning it down' or 'blowing it up,' while they are safe and secure because of the sacrifices of the decent Americans."

"For all those faint-hearted cowards whose service to country is limited to pious beatings on the evils of the United States, I invite them to visit a hospital filled with Vietnam wounded. Let them talk to real patriots who have risked their lives for their country. Let them discover that old virtues, the real virtues of duty, honor and country are very much alive in the people who really count, those who have risked all for their country."

"Times change but love of country and willingness to fight and die for it remain constant."

"Throughout history, cowards have always rationalized their lack of courage. The cowardly faint-hearted of today deserve the same contempt Americans have shown for them since we became a nation."

We wholeheartedly concur with Lt. Col. Frey. Not only do we concur, we salute him. We likewise salute all of our American fighting men, particularly those who have given of their blood or sacrificed their lives, on the Battlefield of Vietnam.

"No greater love hath a man than he lay down his life for his friends."

We salute also the brave and heroic people of South Vietnam who have so courageously resisted the terror and brutal aggression being waged against them by the anti-theistic forces of world communism. May God grant them the victory they are fighting so valiantly to achieve and frustrate the designs of those who through treachery and deceit would deny it to them.

The only way to end the war in Vietnam is to win it so let's get on with it!

Distributed by: Breakthrough, P.O. Box 3061, Detroit, Michigan 48231. Pro Christo, Pro Patria.

SUPPORT FOR NIXON VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican Conference, of which I am the chairman, overwhelmingly passed a resolution of support for President Nixon's Vietnam policy. I think this is a clear indication of unity behind the President as he seeks to achieve an honorable settlement of that war. The resolution takes note of President Nixon's demonstrated commitment to that end, "both in word and deed, at the negotiating table and in the field." It further points out the President's efforts to Vietnamize the war and bring American troops home.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a policy for peace behind which Americans can unite. Today we all hope and pray for a lasting and honorable peace in Southeast Asia and commend our President on his devotion to that cause.

I would like to give special recognition to the drafters of the conference resolution: the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON). I would also like to commend all conference members on their impressive display of unity behind the President. The resolution follows:

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 14, 1969

Whereas President Nixon has committed his Administration to an honorable settlement of the Vietnam war at the earliest possible date, and

Whereas the President has demonstrated the sincerity of that commitment both in word and deed, at the negotiating table and in the field, and

Whereas the President has moved forthrightly to increase the capacity of the South Vietnamese to handle their own responsibilities, and has initiated a policy of substantial reductions of American troops in Vietnam,

Now therefore we the duly elected Republican Members of the House of Representatives

Do hereby resolve: that we commend President Nixon for the actions he has taken in reversing the course of the war, and

We express our confidence in, and support of, his efforts to end the war at the earliest practicable date.

ASPECTS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the crescendo of antiwar sentiment has reached a high peak in some quarters. It encompasses the efforts of some sincere and dedicated people, but it also has attracted many who make more sound than sense, and there is a sprinkling of treasonable elements who always are quick to take advantage of any movement which can further their own cause. It is extremely disappointing that the facts about the Vietnamese war are so little known, and it is equally disturbing that the efforts of a few protestors may serve to conceal the patriotism and determination of the great majority of Americans who realize we cannot now turn tail and abandon our commitments in Vietnam.

If only the true facts could be made clear to the American people there would be a great rallying behind the President's efforts for an acceptable peace, and this I believe would bring Hanoi to terms.

Three nationally syndicated columnists have commented in detail on significant aspects of the war and of the moratorium. They are Joseph Alsop, Jack Anderson, and David Lawrence. Together they have given a very strong insight into the entire question of the progress of the war, the true motives of the Communists, and the facts about the moratorium. I insert their columns at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1969]
VIETNAMIZATION WORKING WELL BUT LIMITS
MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

(By Joseph Alsop)

At this strange juncture, President Nixon is actually being denounced for saying that he does not wish to be the first American President to lose a war. Maybe, therefore, truthfulness is tactless.

Yet the hard, on-the-spot facts in Vietnam make it a duty to tell the plain truth, which is that the President can perhaps lose the war if he handles his "Vietnamization" program in the wrong way. It is a fine program, and it is working very well indeed, so far. But it has its own clear limits, and these must be understood.

This reporter had better confess at the outset that he went to Vietnam unhappily convinced that the U.S. troop withdrawals already made, in the name of "Vietnamization", must certainly have caused heavy military setbacks. Happily, however, that pre-judgment turned out to be entirely erroneous.

No troop withdrawal, of course, can ever be a net plus until a war has been successfully ended. The now-withdrawn brigade of the 9th Infantry Division, for instance, that had been operating in Dinh Tuong province in the delta, had genuinely become superfluous in Dinh Tuong. But there were other provinces where this brigade of the 9th Infantry would surely have greatly accelerated the terrible erosion of the whole VC structure, which is now the key feature in Vietnam.

On the other hand, there is much more to be said for making the South Vietnamese feel they must carry the main burden on their own, without big brother to come to their aid at all times. And above all, the two troop withdrawals to date have not exceeded prudent limits.

If the President is not over-hasty, moreover, further very massive withdrawals of U.S. units in Vietnam will eventually become both safe and prudent. The test, in all cases,

must be whether erosion of the local VC structure has finally reached the point of no return.

But there are also two big fakes in the announced theory of "Vietnamization", as distinguished from the practice to date. To begin with, it is faking to pretend that providing M-16 rifles has given the South Vietnamese army's divisions the same fighting power as American divisions.

Even with the aid of the U.S. helicopter companies left behind after Vietnamization, the ARVN divisions have far less mobility than the better U.S. divisions. They also have only about one-quarter of the mobile artillery support; for the other three-quarters of every ARVN division's artillery is tied down in fixed positions. This tied-down artillery in fact supports the territorial forces, rather than the division's regiments and battalions. That is the first fake.

The second fake, which is much more dangerous, lies in the fact that the enemy now has 233 maneuver battalions in South Vietnam, against only 168 ARVN maneuver battalions. The numbers are about even in the delta. But in the other corps areas, accordingly, the disproportion ranges from about five-to-three all the way up to nearly two-to-one. The disproportion, therefore, means that some (though not many) U.S. units will have to stick around until Hanoi ceases its massacre of the south.

Where Hanoi has two maneuver battalions against one ARVN battalion, after all, nothing on earth will prevent an eventual breakthrough by Hanoi's battalions. And the worst of it is that the President is obviously strongly tempted to leave ARVN to fight on these terms, in precisely the provinces where the situation is now most favorable.

Some key people in the administration, reportedly including the State Department leaders, are apparently arguing, in effect, that you cannot Vietnamize without accepting some setbacks. But these people plainly are unable to envision the kind of setback they are talking about.

In the provinces in question, the VC structure has been almost wholly uprooted from the populated areas. The people are living in peace for the first time in many years, with their own elected hamlet and local governments, under the sole protection of the little RF companies and PF platoons of the territorial forces. But let big enemy units once break through into these new areas of peace; and everything that has been built up will be smashed down for good.

It will be smashed down for good because the people have put their confidence in their government and the U.S. government; if they see the territorial forces and the elected hamlet and village governments massacred before their eyes, that confidence will never be restored again. So the other test of prudent American troop withdrawals until Hanoi ceases to invade the south is whether the people who have given us their trust will still be adequately protected.

SOME PEACE DEMONSTRATORS GET ORDERS
FROM HANOI; PURPOSE IS TO STIR TROUBLE
IN U.S., NOT END WAR; AMERICAN WITH-
DRAWAL COULD BRING BLOODBATH IN VIET-
NAM

(By Jack Anderson)

TOKYO.—For the millions at home who will demonstrate against the Vietnam war today (Wednesday), the intelligence files here contain some facts worth pondering.

This column has examined documentary evidence that a few rabid revolutionaries who seek to dominate the anti-war movement in the United States are receiving instructions from Hanoi. They aren't against war at all; they merely are on the enemy's side.

Indeed, their aim is to stir up new "wars of liberation," including guerrilla warfare in the streets of America, to advance the com-

munist cause. Their immediate instructions are to agitate in the United States for an unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam.

In retrospect, I believe it was a mistake for the U.S. to plunge into the Vietnam conflagration. This remote patch of jungle simply hasn't been worth the price in American blood and treasure.

But those who are in a big rush to write off 38,887 American war dead and \$81,407,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should consider the French experience. The French pull-out of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolph Hitler.

RISK OF BLOODBATH

Too hasty abandonment of South Vietnam, likewise, might produce another bloodbath. Yet the Hanoi-directed militants, according to intelligence documents, are striving to turn the anti-war protest into a national demand for "quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

Possibly to avoid treason charges, the American militants are not in direct touch with the Hanoi government. Most contacts, apparently, have been kept on a friend-to-friend or organization-to-organization basis.

The Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, for example, maintains an underground liaison with U.S. leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Students' Committee for the End of the Vietnam War.

On the eve of the Vietnam Moratorium, Tran Buu Kiem, the Students' Union chairman and former chief Viet Cong delegate in Paris, wrote a letter to his American disciples urging "the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall struggle movement."

HANOI LETTER

The letter, dated October 6, called for a prompt American pull-out from Vietnam. Kiem contended that "the replacement of a score of thousands of troops is insignificant, as compared with about half a million U.S. youths still remaining in South Vietnam."

"Your interests and those of the American people and the United States do not lie in such a drop-by-drop troop pull-out, but in the quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; not in the Vietnamization or de-Americanization of the war in South Vietnam, which is unpopular and costly in human and material resources, but in ending it. . . .

"If Mr. Nixon sincerely wants to live up to his promise to end the war, a promise which he made when he ran for office and when he took over the presidency," the Kiem letter continued, "there is no other way than to respond to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional revolutionary government by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam without imposing any conditions and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Ky-Khiem administration, leaving the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs."

"You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success in this fall struggle phase."

Note: Ironically, most of the student radicals who are doing Hanoi's bidding in the U.S. would get worse treatment from the Hanoi police than they have received from the Chicago police. For Hanoi has ordered a crackdown on local hippies who wear long hair, tight pants and flowered shirts. Hanoi police have been ordered to shear off long hair and slit tight trousers legs on the spot. Tight "cowboy pants" have been abolished by decree. Western records, poetry and dances also are considered "counter revolutionary" and result in stern punishment. As for unauthorized demonstrations, the youthful

demonstrators not only would get their heads clubbed; they would be subject to the death penalty.

ALL WANT PEACE; AT WHAT PRICE?

(By David Lawrence)

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."

RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions are being offered in Congress and are being supported by various organizations which plan "demonstrations" in many cities on Oct. 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:

SINGLE AIM

"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.

A Gallup poll recently showed 52 per cent approval when the question concerned "the way President Nixon is handling the situation in Vietnam."

PEACE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult time for our country.

Perhaps, after so many years of involvement and frustration, we have finally arrived at the moment of truth in Vietnam.

It seems as if the point has been reached where we either stay indefinitely or disengage ourselves from a tragic experience for America and the world.

The other alternative—once thought of as possible—military victory and a reasonably speedy compromise negotiated settlement—have all but vanished.

The choice we have left is not easy.

The consequences of either course of action can be far reaching for ourselves, for the Vietnamese and for the rest of the world.

If we stay, it means the sacrifice of more American lives, the expenditure of more billions of dollars, deeper division at home and the neglect of many other national priorities, both foreign and domestic.

If we leave, the future will be largely uncertain. Some contend that South Vietnam will go Communist and that Southeast Asia will follow suit. They warn that America's commitments will be placed in doubt and we shall be left to fight a larger war somewhere else.

Others, casting aside these warnings, believe that withdrawal offers more possibilities and greater opportunities.

Because these are the alternatives, it is, indeed, a very difficult time for our country.

And all of us—regardless of our politics, our way of looking at the world or our past position on Vietnam—must, if we truly love this country, approach these choices without prejudice and without rancor for those with whom we disagree.

Motives on all sides may be good. But what we seek is a solution which will do justice to our good motivations.

Today, there is no room for those who would attempt to make this Nixon's war.

Nor is there room for those who would continue to make it Johnson's war.

There is no room for those who lash out at critics, equating patriotism with mindless unquestioning of the facts in Vietnam.

Nor is there room for those who believe that Vietnam has proven America to be sick, and dominated by military-industrial forces beyond our control.

Young and old, Democrat and Republican: All of us had better recognize the enormity of what faces us. And all of us had better act with reason and wisdom larger than ourselves.

As the moment of truth arrives, all of our preconceptions must give way to a single concern: What is the right thing

for our country and how will our decision affect the peace of the world.

It is unfortunate that these are the only alternatives.

But they are.

Virtually no one any longer believes that military victory is a possible alternative.

President Johnson ruled that out as early as March of 1968.

And President Nixon specifically so stated in May 1969 when he addressed the Nation with the following words: "We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield."

Yet, there is another alternative which still seems possible to some and that is the alternative of a compromise settlement, a negotiated peace which would salvage a non-Communist South Vietnam or a partially non-Communist South Vietnam or, at the very least, a neutralized South Vietnam.

The search for a compromise settlement has been the true issue of the past few years. It was the initial thrust of the antiadministration forces during the 1968 presidential campaign.

Then, the question was: Which candidate was flexible enough, in contrast to the inflexibility of President Johnson, to offer compromise terms sufficiently attractive to the North Vietnamese.

Proposals for a coalition government were followed by suggestions for mutual troop withdrawal. And, finally, late in the campaign, we had a total bombing halt which Vice President Humphrey endorsed as an acceptable risk for peace.

All of these suggestions, sincere and well-intentioned, were made in the hope that, by throwing another bone, we would tempt the North Vietnamese to give and take in the traditional manner of western diplomacy.

Finally, in May of 1969, determined as were his predecessor and his competitors in 1968, a new President spoke of "neutrality for South Vietnam," "acceptance of any government in South Vietnam that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves," and "reunification."

All of these proposals have spanned the course of the past few years. And, as each was proposed, there was renewed hope of a breakthrough on the diplomatic front.

Recall, if you will, the wave of hope which swept the country and the world when President Johnson announced that the enemy was prepared to negotiate in Paris.

And then recall the renewed hope when he announced the total bombing halt a year ago.

And finally, recall the optimism with which we greeted President Nixon's first major address on Vietnam last May.

Yet, today, the deadlock remains in Paris and the stalemate continues on the battlefield.

After nearly 2 years of specific concessions, the latest reports from Paris, according to Time magazine of October 17, tell of "The dispiriting sense of tedium and pessimism that envelops the talks and the American delegation."

In asking ourselves why the deadlock

remains, I think we must honestly face the possibility that North Vietnam will not negotiate seriously as long as there is dissent here in America.

A few years ago, the same argument appeared in different colors.

At that time, those in favor of ending the war cried out for negotiations. And the supporters of the war replied that, we would, in effect, be inviting the North Vietnamese to win at the conference table what they could not win on the battlefield.

Well, today we are negotiating.

And today, those same people are now saying that, in dissenting here at home, we are, in effect, inviting the North Vietnamese to win in America what they cannot win at the conference table.

Where does this downward spiral end? Where do we go next?

The fact is that there has been virtually no criticism for 9 months.

The voices which echoed through 1968 have been largely still.

Republicans, Democrats and concerned Americans everywhere have sat back, waiting for a break in Paris, hoping that a new President, untied, as he said, to the mistake of the past, would extricate us from the quicksand.

Yet, during the time we have remained silent, the North Vietnamese have remained inscrutable.

And today, because the question of Vietnam is once again raised publicly, some of our policymakers recoil from the renewed debate and warn that the only thing which will defeat us is ourselves.

They equate patriotism with mindless acquiescence and unquestioning support.

They suggest that those who are unhappy with our policy "tell it to Hanoi." But this is our country and it is our policy we are deeply concerned about. It is not inconsistent to discuss our policy while at the same time repudiating Hanoi and its methods.

The deadlock has remained at Paris, through protest and through silence, and that fact alone tells us that we must look somewhere else for the root cause of the lack of movement.

In fact, the deadlock remains because the other side continues to say what it has said for years. There is no room for a compromise, they say because this is a Vietnamese affair. It is a civil dispute. It is a matter to be settled—not by concession of an American President or the force of American arms—but by the Vietnamese themselves.

And that settlement will come when the Americans go home and stop interfering in the affairs of their country.

How simple that fact is.

And yet, how often have we overlooked it in our endless search for a formula and, indeed, in our initial rationale for entering this war.

Dean Rusk, the former Secretary of State, was fond of saying that the war will end when the North Vietnamese leave their neighbors alone. The implication was clear: America, in the role of policeman, intends to keep peace in the neighborhood.

To the other side, this is not the case.

In the eyes of the Vietnamese, the North and South are not two neighbors

who happen to live on the same block. They are residents of the same house and the American policeman is guilty of invasion of privacy.

Whether one agrees with this viewpoint or not, in fact, whether one wishes to face it or not, it is nonetheless, what the other side has been saying for years.

And today, after we cut away the agony and complexity of the past, we must come face to face with that central fact. In the eyes of the Vietnamese, the war is a civil conflict which will be settled, if at all, only by the Vietnamese.

Misunderstanding of the facts of history has led to misunderstanding here at home.

Those who took the time and made the effort to understand what was happening in Vietnam, sooner or later came to the conclusion that this is, indeed, a civil conflict.

And because they believed this, they felt that our involvement was immoral. This feeling, in turn, led to a crisis of conscience among many of our own people and often to civil disobedience, particularly by the younger generation, not merely because the younger generation had to fight the war but because the younger generation began to understand the war.

All of the debate of the past few years sprang, not from the question of whether the war was winnable or unwinnable, but from the growing conviction that the war was unjust.

On the other hand, those who did not take the time to understand the war—and its complexity is so deep that this position is understandable too—those particularly who fought other wars for America, could not see where this war was any different.

"We of an older generation fought to keep this nation free in Europe and the Pacific," they say. "We gave our lives in Korea. What makes you so special that you take it upon yourself to judge this war. Maybe you're just afraid to go and fight like we did. Maybe you're getting too soft."

Thus does the division deepen and the misunderstanding grow. The tragic flaw of recent American leadership has been its inability to understand the moral implications of Vietnam.

It is hardly surprising, then, that the average American, who depends on his leaders for enlightenment, cannot fully comprehend today the notion of an unjust war and cannot understand why we do not win and, therefore, cannot accept dissent at home.

And yet, as I said in the beginning, what is needed now is not censure and division but the calm and enlightened determination to choose one of only two alternatives which we have left: An indefinite American presence in Vietnam or the liquidation of a tragic situation.

The consequences of the first alternative are clear—more fighting, more killing, greater cost, deeper division here at home, neglect of our other priorities and all of this with little likelihood of a diplomatic settlement. The only concrete achievement would be the continued propping up of an artificial, unrepresentative, corrupt and unreformable military dictatorship in Saigon.

Our willingness in word to accept the free choice of the South Vietnamese does not correspond to our overwillingness indeed to prop up the Saigon regime and that fact alone presents an insurmountable barrier to peace.

And so, I have come to believe, with many other Americans and with many other elected officials and government servants, that the United States must simply extricate itself from Vietnam by beginning now an orderly, total, relentless and publicly announced withdrawal and disengagement.

In suggesting such a course of action, I do not believe that we can set a specific timetable. Withdrawal is not going to occur overnight. Nor is it likely to occur within the artificial limits of an arbitrary deadline.

I do believe that the orderly and systematic withdrawal must allow for adjustments, not only in Vietnam but here at home.

In Vietnam, withdrawal should be accompanied by efforts on our part to encourage the development of the many and diversified political forces within the country to take on renewed life, a life ruthlessly and thoughtlessly suppressed by Saigon, in behalf of their own future.

The key question—indeed, the realistic question—is not when the last man will leave Vietnam. It is whether or not we, as a nation, are committed to the inevitable and total withdrawal of all forces as soon as possible as a matter of policy. The chief need is to be publicly and irrevocably committed to disengagement.

There are voices which say we simply cannot withdraw, as if this were a simple decision.

It is not a simple decision.

It challenges the American people to face up to the facts and we have been notoriously unwilling to do so throughout this war.

It demands of our leaders the courage, the leadership and the persuasive powers to make such a decision acceptable to many who believe withdrawal to be unthinkable.

Such things are never easy.

They are agonizingly difficult.

But the time has come. Mr. Nixon must simply summon up the will to think the unthinkable and face the inevitable. It will be better if he does so now because sooner or later he will inevitably be forced to do so anyway.

I believe the President wants to end this war.

And I believe that his recent actions—particularly the withdrawal of 60,000 American troops—are steps in the right direction.

But the difference between his position and that of his critics is an essential difference.

On the one hand, Mr. Nixon hints at further reductions in troops during 1970.

But, on the other, he solemnly warns against a "disguised American defeat" and hopes to "Vietnamize" the war.

Those who disagree with his policies, while they support the moves he has already taken, want a commitment to complete withdrawal based on a firm Executive decision to extricate this country from Vietnam.

In reality, he reserves the option to stay indefinitely or to go back in with additional force, presumably at the point where Vietnamization does not work and at the point where the Saigon government begins to fall apart.

The Saigon government knows that.

As long as they know that the United States is not totally and publicly committed to a planned withdrawal, we can expect nothing from them except further dependence.

They have no intention of letting us go.

And, at times, it seems as if Mr. Nixon has no intention of letting them go.

Therefore, what seems at first glance to be the beginning of withdrawal is on the other side of the coin a formula for an indefinite stay.

And that is the point at which we disagree—not on the desire to end the war, not on the desire to get out, and not even on the common agreement that the Vietnamese must solve their own problems. Mr. Nixon is reluctant to commit us to a final decision. And his critics suspect that, as long as this is his policy we probably are committed to staying indefinitely.

I have not come to the decision to support a committed withdrawal without considering all of the possible dire consequences lurking in the dark recesses of the cold war mind.

Nor can I totally censure those whose beliefs are based on the assumptions of their own experience immediately after World War II.

At that time the world was in dire need of American help.

The military hardware of Stalinist communism was locking up the gates of Eastern Europe and Russia's Asian partner had just seized the most populated nation in the world.

We soon found ourselves in a bloody conflict of naked aggression in Korea, and a movement at home which saw a Communist behind every State Department file box.

I suspect that that era has passed.

But two Presidents seem to tell me differently.

And many policymakers in Washington agree with them.

They warn us sternly of the consequences if we take the unheard of step and leave Vietnam.

They point to Czechoslovakia and say: "See, the Russians have not changed." And this should rightfully cause us concern.

And, although Russia and China have come to the brink of war, we are still asked to live under the shadow of the international monolithic and single-minded Communist conspiracy.

For a moment, let us have an end to the glowering, muttering, and warning of dark consequences and let us look at the possible results of withdrawal.

Let us examine the contention that South Vietnam will go Communist.

And before we rent our garments, let us also admit that this possibility is precisely admitted by President Nixon. In saying that he would have no objection to a united Vietnam and in admitting the necessity of free election, he

is admitting the possibility of Communist victory.

But there are other possibilities and these other possibilities are just as likely to occur when we announce withdrawal.

At present, literally hundreds of non-Communist political factions in the South, the least of which is the Buddhist, are inactive due to resentment of our presence or in jail due to the repression of the Saigon regime.

Is it not just as likely that, with our steady departure, non-Communist South Vietnam will begin to exercise its own freedom within the country.

I am not sure. But, in any event, I suggest that the viability of political life in South Vietnam will be encouraged more by our departure than by our consistent propping up of the military dictatorship with our power and prestige.

And what of the million South Vietnamese in the armed forces. Like all armies, they certainly are not going to do the job as long as America is so willing to shed its blood in their place.

Perhaps, if the Saigon government is worth saving, its million men just may fight for it.

Or perhaps they might overthrow it.

Or perhaps the regime itself, no longer shielded by American military strength, may, in its desperation, grant the freedoms and give the inspiration which the nation needs.

At any rate, if the million-man army cannot do any of these things, then the question again arises whether we ever could do so or whether that million man army is worth being shielded by American soldiers.

Disregarding the other possibilities, however, opponents of withdrawal, convinced of an imminent Communist takeover, have added another dire consequence and that is the possibility of mass slaughter in the South.

We do not know if this will happen. There seems to be no evidence that it will any more than there is evidence that it will not.

America has proven itself a generous nation in the past. Provision can be made for relief, asylum, and even additional economic aid to South Vietnam. Certainly, these are legitimate accommodations to make in return for the liquidation of the war.

And what of the rest of Southeast Asia.

If one accepts the domino theory, one believes that all or most of Southeast Asia will fall into Communist hands once American troops leave South Vietnam.

And yet, one of the most compelling sections of Defense Secretary Clifford's narrative, which documents his own change in thinking, concerns the other countries of Southeast Asia.

Returning from South Vietnam in 1967, Clifford said:

It was strikingly apparent that the other troop contributing countries no longer shared our degree of concern about the war.

Thailand, he said "Was in no hurry to allocate more troops."

He continued:

The President of the Philippines advised President Johnson that he preferred we not

stop there because of possible adverse public reaction.

Australia's Prime Minister, Clifford continues, "presented a long list of reasons why Australia was already close to its maximum effort."

New Zealand "made it clear that any appreciable increase was out of the question" and the Prime Minister of Singapore, when asked to help with troops, said he "saw no possibility of that taking place because of the adverse political effect in Singapore."

Finally, Clifford looks at the situation in Southeast Asia in this way:

The security of the Pacific region will depend upon the ability of the countries there to meet the legitimate growing demands of their own people. No military strength we can bring to bear can give them internal stability or popular acceptance. In Southeast Asia, and elsewhere in the less developed regions of the world, our ability to understand and to control the basic forces that are at play is a very limited one. We can advise, we can urge, we can furnish economic aid. But American military power cannot build nations, any more than it can solve the social and economic problems that face us here at home.

And again, a few months ago, President Nixon, in his Pacific doctrine, told the Asians that America's vital interests are no longer concerned with sending massive numbers of Americans to the mainland of Asia.

As in South Vietnam itself, withdrawal opens as many possibilities as it does pitfalls for Southeast Asia. The possibility of increased economic activity, greater concentration by America itself on broad programs to improve the social and economic life of the region and the development of indigenous democratic governments—all these things are just as possible as the facile, automatic response that says, take away American troops and the inevitable answer is communism.

Such an answer is not only narrow. It is far too simplistic for a complex world. And it betrays a defeatism which ill befits American leadership. In place of our single-minded obsession with Vietnam, we could today be using our technology and resources to create a better world.

One other question about America's role in the world comes up whenever withdrawal from Vietnam is suggested. What about America's commitments. Will our word ever be heeded again. Because we show lack of faith, will not our relative role, vis-a-vis the Communists, begin to decline in world affairs.

In the first place, no nation in the history of the world has ever committed so much for so long a period in so many places throughout the world and stuck by its treaties and agreements with such tenacity. In Vietnam alone, that commitment has amounted to 40,000 dead Americans and more than \$100 billion over the course of 8 years. And all this despite the fact that there is considerable debate about the genuineness of that commitment in the first place. The question is not whether we honor our commitments because our activity has certainly been some commitment. The question is whether we alone in the world are being asked to do the impossible. Our own lead-

ers who pose this question evidently believe that the rest of the world sees us as the superhuman, transcendental force which dares not to put a ceiling on how far it is prepared to go lest the rest of the world react with utter dismay.

And yet, the rest of the world's powers can go blithely ahead doing just as they please—abandoning allies, subverting countries and waging war.

Only America is put to the impossible test. If we dare waver for a moment—regardless of the merits—then the world itself will shake with concern.

I suspect that we judge ourselves too harshly.

I believe that we demand a standard from ourselves that few others expect and that fewer others are prepared to live up to.

We are not superhuman.

We do not by ourselves control the destiny of the world.

And a change of policy in Vietnam will be greeted throughout the world more with relief than dismay anyhow.

Here at home, it is another matter.

It is said the President fears, privately, that a systematic withdrawal from Vietnam will not only cause us to lose our leadership position in the world but will, as Stewart Alsop said last week, turn the nation "angrily in upon itself."

This need not be and it should not be. It hardly does justice to us as a people. At any rate, such a situation remains a leadership problem. If the President and other leaders of our Nation choose to permit us to turn angrily upon ourselves, it may well happen. But, if they lead us out of the quagmire in Vietnam into a constructive and hopeful future, no such conclusion need be drawn.

None of these thoughts are comfortable.

And nothing is sure.

Choosing the alternative of withdrawal has its uncertainties.

But the ambiguity of present policy presents more.

I am suggesting that such a decision, articulated by enlightened leadership, opens up more possibilities for America than pitfalls.

It opens the possibility for a country united once again with this burden lifted from our minds.

It opens the possibility for greater attention to our domestic problems.

It may give us the chance to chart a new foreign policy, concerned with turning our technology and compassion to human needs and to the great problems of bringing peace and stability among all nations.

Emerson—and other distinguished American thinkers after him—have spoken about two distinct strains in the American spirit. One is the party of hope. The other is the party of despair.

I believe we have, in the recent past, been too often concerned with the inhibitions of the party of despair.

We have been generous. We have been great. Perhaps we have saved the world.

But we have also largely conducted ourselves in the world as if the most dire consequences were also the most real and immediate. And feeling this way, we have

been very reluctant to test new directions.

Today, I think it is time for all Americans not to join the partisan interests of either Republicans or Democrats but to join the party of hope.

Let us end this war in Vietnam.

And let us use that decision as a departure point for shaping a more stable and hopeful society here at home and peace around the world.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), is recognized for 60 minutes.

UNIVERSAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE SEVENTIES

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the birth of a new decade is just 3 months away; the destiny of the next 10 years depends on the choices being made right now by this Congress. In recognition of the necessity to think futuristically, the General Subcommittee on Education, of which I am chairman, has undertaken extensive hearings into the problem of "Elementary and Secondary Education Needs for the Seventies."

Therefore, I am gratified to learn that the New York Public Schools have already begun planning for the coming decade. Beginning in 1973, all high school students in New York City will be required to complete a year of vocational training in order to graduate. This means that, for the first time, a major city has recognized the urgency of guaranteeing all of our young people a marketable skill before graduation.

The New York system has also removed the stigma usually attached to vocational education by abolishing its system of five separate high school diplomas. From 1973 on, all students will receive the same diploma, attesting to their common achievement of a comprehensive high school education. We should applaud the forward thrust of these decisions and encourage every school system in the Nation to adopt an equally enlightened policy. May I call this body's attention to the following article, detailing these decisions, which appeared in the New York Times October 10, 1969:

CITY'S HIGH SCHOOLS ADOPT ONE DIPLOMA (By Gene Curran)

A single diploma instead of the five now offered in the city's public high schools will be introduced in 1973 as part of the comprehensive high school program blending academic and vocational courses.

In making the announcement yesterday, the Board of Education said that under the new plan all students would have to take a year of "practical arts," such as shop work and typing, and pass either the State Regents tests or citywide examinations in American history, world backgrounds and English to qualify for a diploma.

One of the diplomas to be abolished is the controversial general diploma now issued to students of limited academic ability. These students are not required to take the state tests.

Some parents groups, especially those in the disadvantaged areas, have complained that the general diploma carried with it a kind of stigma that prevented students from getting good jobs or entering some colleges.

Deputy Superintendent Seelig L. Lester said the new plan "would put the general study students to work."

"Where at present," he said, "they can take a little bit here and a little bit there like going to a cafeteria they will, under the new plan, be required to have a sequence of studies. It will work out better for all concerned."

Under the new plan, all students will be required to meet minimum requirements in a variety of fields, including English, social studies, science, mathematics, art appreciation, music appreciation, health teaching, physical education and practical arts.

The present system is not as comprehensive and it provides separate diplomas for academic, commercial, general, technical and vocational courses.

The single diploma will list on its reverse side a statement of regular courses completed along with any electives that were taken. It is hoped that this will aid colleges or prospective employers to evaluate better the students' talents.

The comprehensive high school, which is being introduced gradually throughout the school system as a four-year institution, is intended to replace the present academic and vocational schools and incorporate in the curriculum the courses of both.

The board is committed to a program of four years of elementary school, four years of intermediate school, and four years of high school.

"To earn a high school diploma now," the board noted, "courses in English, social studies, science and mathematics are required of all high school students, whether pursuing academic, commercial, general, technical or vocational courses of study."

"In addition, passing grades on Regents examinations in American history and world backgrounds and in English are now also required, except for students working toward a general or vocational diploma."

"The difference between existing curriculums in high schools as now constituted and those scheduled for the comprehensive schools vary with the type of school to be replaced by a comprehensive school. For example, the present academic course stresses languages; the commercial course concentrates on accounting and secretarial studies; the vocational courses include industrial and technical studies."

EDUCATION FOR WORK

Mr. Speaker, I say that the time has come to liberate vocational education from its subservient role as handmaiden to the rest of American public education. Widespread student dissatisfaction with the present-day curriculum attests to the growing meaninglessness of traditional education for the modern working world. It also points to the need for making career development the central theme of education in the seventies.

In my role as a principal author of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, I have long urged that we place highest priority in our schools on preparing young people for the realities they will face in the world of work. Therefore, I wish to present for my colleagues' consideration an excellent editorial on the critical need for support of vocational education which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, October 12, 1969:

EDUCATION FOR WORK

In its annual report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Advisory Commission on Vocational Education condemns the waste of both money and human resources by a system that fails "to educate to the level of employability nearly 25 per cent of the young men and women who turn 18 each year."

"Young men and women who cannot qualify for decent jobs distrust the society which reared them," the report states. "Dissidents speak with the voice of rebellion; campus and inner-city revolt reaches into our schools. Our nation seethes.

"Racial unrest, violence, and the unemployment of youth have their roots in inadequate education. Each year the ranks of the school dropouts increase by three-quarters of a million young men and women. They enter the job market without the skills and attitudes employers require. They and the millions of others who are underemployed—among these the students who are graduates of our high schools but who are inadequately prepared for anything—are tragic evidence of the present inadequacy of our educational system."

The report accuses the federal and state governments and local school administrations of allocating a disproportionate share of financial resources to higher education and college-preparatory programs and neglecting vocational education. This is done, it says, "in reckless disregard of the fact that for 60 per cent of our young people high school is the only transition to the world of work."

The report notes that the federal government invests \$14 in the nation's universities for every \$1 it invests in vocational education programs. The result is that the federal government spends four dollars on remedial manpower programs for every dollar it spends on preventive vocational programs. Some of the remedial programs cost \$12,000 for every man or woman placed in a job, and those who remain unemployed may cost \$4,000 a year or more in welfare support for themselves and their families.

The neglect of vocational education in Illinois conforms to the national pattern. For fiscal year 1970 the state government appropriated 230.7 million dollars for capital investment in higher education and 540 million of general revenue funds for operations. These sums include 96 million of capital funds for junior colleges and 38.3 million for their operations. Only 19.4 per cent of the total enrollment by credit hours in the junior colleges is in occupation-oriented courses. The state appropriated only \$14,879,970 for distribution to the school districts for vocational education this year.

The national commission ascribes the neglect of vocational education to the "snobbish, undemocratic" attitude that "the only good education is an education capped by four years of college." It notes that plumbers, carpenters, and electricians make more money than many school superintendents and college presidents and asserts that "only the arrogant will allow themselves to feel that one is more worthy than the other."

The commission concludes that the federal government must allocate more funds for vocational education and must challenge the state and local governments and school administrations to "throw off old habits and take a hard, fresh look at what they are doing."

THE TRIBUNE has been advocating more emphasis on vocational education for many years. Public pressure must be generated to arouse politicians from their lethargy and overcome the prejudices and complacency of school administrators. It costs more to provide shop facilities and train teachers for vocational education than the cost of college-preparatory or general education programs, but no investment will bring a higher return.

One way the federal government can help is to offer tax incentives for the cooperation of private industry, particularly in teacher-training programs. President Nixon advocated such inducements in his campaign last year. It is time for vigorous national leadership to provide opportunities for all young Americans to achieve their highest poten-

tial, which, as the advisory commission says, is not measured by the color of their collar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for October 16 through October 20, on account of official business.

Mr. REIFEL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for October 15, 16, and 20, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA, for 20 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOLDWATER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CARTER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MORTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNT, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE to extend his remarks in permanent RECORD of October 14, 1969, immediately following invocation.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. COWGER.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. PELL.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3016. An act to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1242. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

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."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. 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. 229]

Abernethy	Cunningham	Harvey
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Hastings
Anderson, Ill.	Dawson	Hawkins
Anderson,	de la Garza	Hays
Tenn.	Delaney	Hébert
Andrews, Ala.	Denney	Helstoski
Annunzio	Dennis	Hollifield
Arends	Dent	Hosmer
Ashbrook	Devine	Howard
Ashley	Diggs	Hull
Aspinall	Dingell	Hunt
Ayres	Downing	Ichord
Baring	Dwyer	Johnson, Pa.
Barrett	Eckhardt	Jonas
Beall, Md.	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Belcher	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Berry	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Tenn.
Betts	Edwards, La.	King
Bevill	Ellberg	Kirwan
Bieber	Erlenborn	Kleppe
Bingham	Evans, Colo.	Koch
Blackburn	Evins, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Blanton	Fallon	Kyl
Boland	Farbstein	Kyros
Bolling	Fascell	Landgrebe
Bow	Feighan	Landrum
Brademas	Findley	Latta
Brasco	Fisher	Leggett
Bray	Flynt	Lipscomb
Brooks	Ford, Gerald R.	Lloyd
Broomfield	Ford,	Long, Md.
Brown, Calif.	William D.	Lowenstein
Broyhill, N.C.	Foreman	Lujan
Broyhill, Va.	Fraser	Lukens
Burton, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	McCloskey
Button	Frey	McCulloch
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	McDade
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Tenn.	McDonald,
Cabell	Garmatz	Mich.
Caffery	Gaydos	McEwen
Cahill	Gettys	McKneally
Camp	Gibbons	McMillan
Carey	Goodling	Madden
Casey	Gray	Martin
Cederberg	Griffin	Mathias
Celler	Griffiths	Meeds
Chamberlain	Grover	Melcher
Chisholm	Gubser	Michel
Clancy	Haley	Mikva
Clark	Hamilton	Mills
Clay	Hammer-	Minshall
Cobelan	schmidt	Mize
Collier	Hanley	Monagan
Conable	Hanna	Moorhead
Conyers	Hansen, Idaho	Morgan
Corbett	Hansen, Wash.	Morton
Corman	Harrington	Mosher

Murphy, N.Y.	Rodino	Taylor
Nedzi	Rogers, Colo.	Teague, Calif.
Nix	Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
O'Konski	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
O'Neal, Ga.	Rosenthal	Thomson, Wis.
Ottinger	Roybal	Tiernan
Pasman	Ruppe	Tunney
Patman	Ruth	Udall
Pelly	Ryan	Utt
Pepper	St Germain	Van Deerlin
Perkins	St. Onge	Vigorito
Pickle	Sandman	Waldie
Pirnie	Saylor	Watkins
Poff	Scherle	Watts
Pollock	Scheuer	Whalley
Powell	Schneebell	Whitehurst
Preyer, N.C.	Shriver	Whitten
Price, Tex.	Sikes	Widnall
Pucinski	Slack	Williams
Quile	Smith, Calif.	Wilson
Quillen	Smith, N.Y.	Charles H.
Rees	Stafford	Wold
Reid, N.Y.	Stanton	Wolf
Reifel	Steed	Wylder
Reuss	Steiger, Ariz.	Yates
Rhodes	Stephens	Zablocki
Riegle	Stokes	Zion
Rivers	Stubblefield	
Roberts	Taft	

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sisk). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Has a quorum been arrived at?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the present time a quorum has not been established.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I then move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 16, 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:

1259. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ended September 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1260. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the cost reduction and management improvement program in selected departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Administrator of General Services (Administration), transmitting a report of claims settled by the Administration under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for fiscal year 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to improve the cost effectiveness of the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14358. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 14359. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 14360. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 14361. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 14362. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14363. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 17-percent across-the-board benefit increase with a \$100 minimum and subsequent standard-of-living increases, to increase widow's and widower's benefits, to improve benefit computation for married couples and women with 30 years' coverage, to liberalize the retirement test, to make coverage optional for beneficiaries over age 65, and to eliminate the 6-month waiting period for disability benefits in certain cases; to reduce self-employment taxes to the level of employee taxes; and to cover prescription drugs and the services of home maintenance workers under medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 14364. A bill naming the bridge under construction linking the islands of the Lake Lanier Island development in Lake Sidney Lanier, Ga., as the "Richard B. Russell Bridge"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 14365. A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives, Members of the U.S. Senate, Justices and judges of the U.S. courts, and policymaking officials of the executive branch as designated by the Civil Service Commission, but including the President, Vice President, and Cabinet Members; and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice-Presidency; and to give the House Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and the Attorney General of the United States appropriate jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 14366. 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. WOLFF:

H.R. 14367. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to require repayment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 14368. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the naturalization procedure for adopted children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14369. A bill to provide that security deposits made by tenants of any federally assisted multifamily housing shall be placed by the landlord in a separate account to draw interest for the benefit of such tenants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14370. 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. GIBBONS:

H.R. 14371. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 14372. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, certain lands situated within the Crawford urban renewal project (Va-53) in the city of Portsmouth, in exchange for certain lands situated within the proposed southside neighborhood development project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 14374. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 14375. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 955. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 1311, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 956. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself and Mr. CLANCY):

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the

adverse effects of inadequate long term financing upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the revocation of the United Nations economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H. Res. 582. Resolution relating to demonstrations for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 583. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

294. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to denying jurisdiction to the U.S. Supreme Court on *Chandler v. Tenth Judicial Council*, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 15, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whose will is our peace, take this Nation today under Thy holy care. Give us ears to hear, not the frenzied mob but the inner voice of Thy spirit. Give us eyes to see, not the world which now is, but the new world which is yet to be.

O Thou who hast granted youth to see visions and age to dream dreams, help each to understand the other. May those who are younger not resent the discipline of learning nor reject the wisdom which is brought only by experience. Save those who are older from the foolish confidence that they know it all and that wisdom perishes with them. Draw together both youth and age that, dreaming dreams and seeing visions, they may welcome those new truths which can fashion a better world. Strengthen the faith of all the people to see beyond the tentative and temporal that which is enduring and eternal. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 14, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACID MINE DRAINAGE IN APPALACHIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 302(b) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, I hereby transmit the Appalachian Regional Commission's report, Acid Mine Drainage in Appalachia.

This comprehensive study was carried out by the Commission in cooperation with a special panel of experts convened by the National Research Council of the

National Academy of Sciences—National Academy of Engineering. I recommend it for thoughtful consideration by all interested parties.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 15, 1969.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

SENATOR MANSFIELD ANSWERS QUESTIONS OF MONTANANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just returned from 3 days in Montana, during which period I met with groups of college students at the University of Montana, the Montana College of Science and Technology, Carroll College, and Eastern Montana College.

I also had the opportunity to visit the mining camps, the small ranch towns, and some of our larger cities. The questions asked by my constituents had to do with Vietnam, the moratorium, tax relief and tax reform, inflation, high interest rates, and the plight of the homebuilding and lumber industries, among other matters.

At all the institutions of higher learning which I visited, the main question was the moratorium to be held on October 15. I was asked if I was in favor of the moratorium and my answer was to quote from the Bill of Rights, the first amendment to the Constitution. That amendment reads as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I said that as far as I was concerned, this constitutional right applied to all our citizens, to those who favored a moratorium and to those who indicated that they might want to assemble in opposition to a moratorium. I emphasized the use of the word "peaceable" in the first amendment and stated that it was my hope that any assemblies or demonstrations would be conducted with dignity and decorum and would be within the law.

I stated that I did not believe in violence or license or destruction or assault upon persons because all these were contrary to the law and those who indulged themselves in such a manner should be and would be subject to law.

The question was raised as to what should be done if one did not believe in the law, and my answer was that there were many laws passed by Congress and many decisions laid down by the Supreme Court to which I was opposed and did not approve; but once a law was passed by Congress and signed by the President and once a decision was made by the Supreme Court, regardless of my personal feelings, I felt it my duty, my obligation, and my responsibility to obey that law and to accept those decisions as long as they were in existence. Otherwise, I pointed out, a democracy such as ours would disintegrate and fall.

I was queried as to my views on the situation in Vietnam. I told my fellow Montanans that it seemed to me that the President was doing all that he could do on the basis of the best advice he had available to bring about a responsible settlement. I stated further that, in my opinion, there were elements which were encouraging and which might lead toward a possible settlement.

I pointed out that in the 7-month period since last March, the total number of North Vietnamese infiltrates numbered approximately 20,000 compared with an annual rate of infiltration last year between 7,000 and 13,000 a month; I pointed out that there had been a lull in