what inspiration did we proceed into so many overseas military obligations.

Perhaps some of these military missions and obligations are vital to our interests. But we must find some way to clarify and state and classify those interests among urgent domestic priorities so that America's mothers and fathers will not have to come again in five or fifteen years to rally on the streets to bring home five hundred thousand sons from a war we never wanted and cannot understand.

Many of us here tonight can look back to 1965 and the first anti-war protests. There are many memories, and a few legends about these past five years.

But there is no false satisfaction in having been aware before others that Vietnam was wrong. There is no joy in having been right when others were still groping for the answers. And tonight there should be no sense of triumph in seeing that a majority of Americans now think that Vietnam was wrong and that we should leave.

Rather, we shall triumph only when policy is changed. We shall persevere until the last ship brings the last American boy back from Vietnam. We shall work and march and pray until we have set America right again.

And we must remind those who criticize this moratorium that we have a President, not an emperor. We have a country where we can have free discussion and dialogue.

The hour is now late. The President and the Congress hear but do not yet understand fully. Let us send still more messages. Let us start once more.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MORATORIUM

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern for the questions raised by the moratorium by offering these thoughts on the debate itself, the spirit in which we engage in it, and the ends we seek. First, as to the propriety of debating the war, I can think of no more appropriate question to discuss, given our obligations under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution. True, at the outset of this administration we were counseled to lower our voices. More recently it has been suggested that it would be better if we said nothing at all. Congress has often been accused of doing exactly that. But "when the blast of war rings in our ears," we have not only the right but a duty to find our voice. And a Congress which has expressed a desire for greater participation in the formulation of foreign policy can hardly be reluctant to discuss it. I am glad this point was quickly and properly resolved.

Second, in what spirit do we discuss this war? Not of anger and frustation, I submit, although angry and frustrated we are; certainly not of rancor or ill will toward fellow Americans in or out of policymaking positions; and not even of implacable hatred of the foe, but calmly, thoughtfully, and constructively. It is our part to voice the Nation's reason, not simply echo its agony. Reasonable we must be, although it would, I think, sharpen our perspective if we thought of ourselves as the parents of draft-age boys.

Finally, we must try to arrive at an agreed definition of what it is we seek to achieve in Vietnam, and to which any further efforts and sacrifices should be directed. "Victory," in its ordinary sense, has been abandoned by most Americans including the President, as the definition of the goal to be achieved; it has been abandoned in favor of "peace." We must admit "peace" is susceptible of as many interpretations as "victory." So we have a duty to be candid with each other about what is meant by "peace" in Vietnam.

To most, it means termination of U.S. military involvement there, and the withdrawal of American troops. Whether this would produce peace in Vietnam, is a matter of conjecture but not of primary concern to those who consider our involvement prohibitively costly in American lives, treasure, reputation, and self-respect; those who cannot view its termination as anything but preferable to its continuance for one more day. The argument is compelling. What has been won in the past 7 years? What remains to be won? It is certainly difficult to estimate how much national security or world stability have been purchased to date. It would have to be great indeed in order to justify the direct sacrifice of blood and treasure, and the indirect sacrifice of housing, education, pollution control, and economic strength to say nothing of racial and campus harmony, or the sense of gladly shared purpose which ought to animate a great nation in conflict. I incline to the view that to date more has been lost than won. Hindsight suggests the investment was ill advised. History does not reveal its alternatives. It may well be that without U.S. intervention, a Titoist regime governing all of Vietnam under Hanoi, would have emerged as a bulwark of nonaggressive neutrality between China and the rest of Indochina. Perhaps no bulwark was required, or if required, not ours to build. If all this was predictable we must acknowledge falibility in making or heeding predictions. In any event, in our own interest as our leaders saw it, we intervened. We mainipulated South Vietnamese leadership and ravaged the land. We bear a great responsibility for the war, certainly. Do we bear an equally great responsibility for the "peace" we leave behind?

If so, how to discharge that responsibility is the question before the Nation, the President, and this House. It is not an easy question as the debate last night revealed. It turns the most eager exponents of simple withdrawal into cautious military strategists. Why? Because of the demands it makes on conscience and honor. Yes, our prisoners must be returned. No, Vietnamese hostages must not be abandoned. Yes, the enslave theory, and its assumption of continued American presence has validity. Yes, Vietnamization of the war is essential, and should include pressure on the regime to pass power to a more representative body. No, in short, the men cannot come home at once. Thus, the debate quickly narrowed the gap between supporters and opponents of current policy. No support at all was offered the 30-day-wonder theory of withdrawal. Had the debate been allowed to continue we might have been able to illuminate other possible approaches, from Senator AIKEN's novel suggestion to its opposite, accelerated withdrawal coupled with the threat of selective air attacks in the north, if necessary, to insure Hanoi's cooperation both with our removal, and the eventual establishment of an indigenous, representative government in South Vietnam.

In my view the careful implementation of a deliberate and declared policy of disengagement should be encouraged, or if you will demanded, but only to the end of achieving exactly that. If more is demanded, by putting our collective shoulder to the wheels of wishful thinking, something else could be sacrificed to this tragic conflict: rational government. In due course a question of honor can become a question of order.

SENATE—*Thursday, October 16, 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 God, send peace on earth, and by Thy grace put down the pride, greed, and anger that turn man against man, and nation against nation. Speed the day when wars are ended and all men call Thee Father.

O Lord, remove from us and from all men both hate and prejudice, that Thy children may be reconciled with those whom they fear, resent, or threaten, and thereafter live in peace.

As we consecrate ourselves to Thee, make us to know that our work is Thy work. Strengthen the faculties of our minds and dispose our efforts for the welfare of all the people and the furtherance of Thy kingdom.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 452 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The resolution (S. Res. 261) to print a list of proposed amendments to the Constitution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 261

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a list of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America submitted during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, through the Ninetieth Congress, second session, as compiled by the Senate Library, under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and that one thousand five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Secretary of the Senate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 266) authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 266

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is hereby authorized to expend, from the contingent fund of the Senate, $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 57, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969.

THE COST OF CLEAN AIR

The resolution (S. Res. 267) to print "The Cost of Clean Air" as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 267

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the first report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "The Cost of Clean Air", submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 305(a), Public Law 90–148, the Air Quality Act of 1967, and that there be printed three thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF HOUSE HEARINGS ON SCIENCE AND STRATEGIES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE 1970'S

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 338) authorizing the printing as a House document of hearings on Science and Strategies for National Security in the 1970's by the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, and of additional copies thereof was considered and agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 251) authorizing additional expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Special Committee on Aging is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $30,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 76, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF COPIES OF THE EULOGIES OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 368) providing for the printing of copies of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "thousand", strike out "and thirty" and insert "three hundred".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 227) to authorize the expenditure of funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare generally and for its investigation of the problems of education of American Indians which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after "Sec. 2." strike out "Section 4 of Senate Resolution 80, agreed to February 17, 1969, is hereby amended by striking out '$72,000' where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$93,000'." and, in lieu thereof, insert "The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $8,600, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 80, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969 (as extended by Senate Resolution 226, agreed to July 29, 1969), authorizing a study of the education of American Indians."

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, $1,500 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, Senate Resolution 141, agreed to July 17, 1967, and Senate Resolution 276, agreed to May 9, 1968.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $8,600, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 80, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969 (as extended by Senate Resolution 226, agreed to July 29, 1969), authorizing a study of the education of American Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 230) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $28,800, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 40, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 18, 1969, authorizing an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws and their administration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws".

STUDY OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $4,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 42, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments".

INVESTIGATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 232) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional

rights which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $15,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 43, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights".

INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 233) to investigate criminal laws and procedures, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $25,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 44, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing an investigation of criminal laws and procedures.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for an investigation of criminal laws and procedures".

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 234) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $65,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 46, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing an investigation of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for an investigation of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act."

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 235) to study and examine the Federal judicial system, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $9,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 47, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study and examination of the Federal judicial system.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study and examination for the Federal judicial system".

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $25,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 48, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States".

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 237) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $4,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 51, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study of matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States".

STUDY OF SEPARATION OF POWERS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 238) to make a full and complete study of the separation of powers under the Constitution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 52, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of the separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study of constitutional separation of powers".

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 242) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $9,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 50, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for a study of matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees."

ENACTMENT OF A LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 262) providing for additional copies to be printed of Senate Document 39, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 2, after the word "of," strike out "S. Doc. 39," and insert "Senate Document 35,"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 262

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate, twenty thousand six hundred additional copies of Senate Document

35, Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Enactment of a Law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resoluton authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document 35, Ninetieth Congress, entitled 'Enactment of a Law'."

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 263) authorizing additional appropriation for the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $12,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 25, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations for a study of the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government."

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 264) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 27, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations for a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities".

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 265) for additional funds for the Committee on the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $2,400, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes and during the same period, specified in Senate Resolution 84, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to February 17, 1969, authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the District of Columbia for a study of matters pertaining to the District of Columbia".

THE 70TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DAR

The resolution (S. Res. 273) to authorize the printing of the 70th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 273

Resolved, That the Seventieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1967, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2264) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The resolution (S. Res. 269) to authorize the Committee on Finance to expend $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 269

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for not to exceed 20 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 20 minutes or such part thereof as he desires to utilize.

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SENATE AND THE 91ST CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, every administration needs time to alter and to adjust the permanent machinery of the Government if it is to be given new direction. The legislative requirements for these changes are usually indicated in broadbrush fashion by a new President in an address on the state of the Union.

President Nixon did not choose to give such an address at the outset, preferring to take an item-by-item approach to a legislative program. That is his prerogative; the fact is not stated in criticism. Indeed, the President may have been well-advised to choose the piecemeal path since he entered office on the heels of a succession of Congresses of intense activity. In the prior 8 years, a multiplicity of significant new laws had been entered on the statute books. In the previous administration, there had been one of the most extensive legislative outpourings in the Nation's history.

In the circumstances, the President's first priority was hardly to push for more new laws. Rather, it was to sort out this legislation—to pick and to choose—and to try to get the permanent machinery of the executive branch to operate with responsiveness to it under his leadership. In the light of this situation, the statement on the legislative program which President Nixon issued last weekend was most welcome. It was a restrained and realistic recapitulation. Its temperate tone, moreover, seems to me to have foreclosed a tendency to politically colored commentary on the work of the Congress to date. The President's appeal for cooperation rather than conflict between a Republican-controlled administration and a Democratic-controlled Congress was well taken and appropriate to the circumstances.

I respect the President's viewpoint even though I do not concur completely in his recapitulation of the situation. So that the record may be in order, I want to go over the legislative situation as it is seen from the Senate at this time. In my report on October 3, I set forth the major bills and joint resolutions on which action has been completed or which are well along in the committee process.

One such bill concerns tax relief and tax reform. This measure is designed to shape a more equitable tax structure out of the present hodgepodge or inordinate privileges and excessive rates. It is to be hoped that out of this bill will come some relief for the lower- and middle-income groups of this country. For too long those whose incomes are derived almost wholly from salaries have carried a disproportionate share of the cost of Government.

In this connection, a far-reaching set of tax reforms passed the House of Representatives a few weeks ago. The Fi-

nance Committee is now hard at work on this bill, having before it an October 31 target date for reporting to the Senate. Let me say that the position which has been taken from the outset by the Democratic policy committee and the Senate leadership, together with members of the Finance Committee has been designed neither to shilly-shally, delay, or politicize on this measure. It has been adhered to wholly for the purpose of trying to bring through the recesses of congressional procedure and into the light of day, after years of talk, a bona fide tax relief and reform bill.

As every Member of the Senate knows, success is never assured in a legislative effort of this kind until a bill passes both Houses and becomes law. It does seem to me, however, that the energetic efforts of the Senate Finance Committee, coming on top of the work of the House now provides some basis for prudent hopes. In his weekend message, moreover, the President has placed the administration squarely behind the passage of a tax relief and tax reform bill before the adjournment of this session of the Congress. The Senate leadership is appreciative of this support and I know Americans will welcome it. It is most respectfully suggested that the appropriate department of the executive branch now make clear the urgency of this tax reform and tax relief measure along with its appeals to the Senate for extension of the surtax and for investment credit changes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President (Mr. HUGHES in the chair) will the Senator yield?

Mr MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I had a meeting yesterday with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and they strongly support the statement the Senator just made. They are extremely anxious that this bill be reported, that it be a wise and responsible bill, that it provide carefully for the review needed, that the loopholes be closed, and that it be a fair and just bill.

Having this recent information, I am happy to inform the Senator that what he recommends here is also the recommendation of the administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that I am delighted by the remarks just made by the distinguished minority leader.

With respect to other specific items in the weekend message, the Congress will try to give full and deliberate consideration to each question which was raised by the President. In fact, action on many of these measures has commenced and some are well along in the legislative process.

Among the most pressing needs of the Nation, in my judgment, is a complete overhaul of the military draft. I am delighted that the President has given this matter a high priority. In the Senate, the need for changes in the draft has been a matter of concern during this session ever since last February. At that time, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) introduced his proposal for reforms. In May, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) advanced a second proposal. The administration resubmitted, in mid-August, the draft changes which had been advanced last year by the previous administration.

On the basis of these various approaches, I am hopeful that a complete reform of our draft system will be forthcoming in this Congress. In any event, the President, as he noted in his statement, is in a position to initiate draft reforms by Executive action alone. Unless there is congressional action, which I advocate, he may have no choice other than to proceed with changes on his own.

The committees of Congress which are at work on tax relief and reform are also responsible for considering the broad welfare plan which the President submitted last week in legislative form. First things should come first, however, and it seems to me very necessary that the Finance Committee complete work on tax relief and tax reform before proceeding to a major overhaul of welfare legislation. That should also come and will come in due course. It should be noted, however, that the President's welfare proposal does not lend itself to a one-two-three disposition. The press reported that the issues involved are such that even within the administration there were deep divisions on the question. More than just cursory treatment by the Congress is clearly required and it will take time to complete that work.

The President's flexibility on the question of the electoral college system is welcomed. Notwithstanding his own preference, the President lost no time in endorsing the more direct approach to presidential elections which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote a few weeks ago. I am confident that the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) has every intention of moving the measure in his Senate subcommittee as rapidly as possible.

May I say that the leadership defers to the judgment of Senator BAYH as to how this matter should be handled. The Senate knows that the Senator from Indiana has a sober approach to constitutional reform. His work on the question of presidential succession a few years ago was outstanding in every respect. He can be counted on to deal with the electoral college question in the same way. The Senator from Indiana is attuned to deep national conviction that there is a need for change in the presidential electoral system and he possesses the legislative acumen to convert that conviction into effective congressional action.

As for the postal reform measure to which the President referred, I recall that one portion of this proposal has already passed the Senate. Hearings are underway on the remainder. I am hopeful that it will be disposed of completely during this Congress.

The Senate has already passed a strong mine safety proposal. The President's endorsement of the measure in his statement, hopefully, will expedite its passage in the House of Representatives.

The President alluded to the growing crime rate as one of the Nation's most pressing needs. On this point, he has the complete agreement of the Congress and the Nation. There have already been some congressional initiatives to mobilize resources to curb crime. The attempts have been limited, to be sure, and still fall far short of need. Therefore, the President's effort to submit a program which would complement and supplement the Omnibus Crime Control Act of last year is to be commended.

In all frankness, however, I must state that, on the preventive-detention measure along with other crime control proposals now pending before the Congress, I am advised that there has not been a full response from the administration to committee requests for reports, studies and testimony. I understand that this has been the case on other legislative proposals as well. In fact, a survey of just three Senate committees with varied jurisdictions indicated that on 97 pending legislative questions, requests for the views and reports of the appropriate departments have gone without response from the executive branch. With respect to the crime measures themselves, the Congress has gone forward with hearings only to find, I understand, that the relevant Departments were not ready or able to take a position on the substance of the proposals.

While an executive agency viewpoint may not be essential on every legislative proposal, it seems to me imperative that the experience and skill of the executive agencies involved in law enforcement should be made available to the committees writing crime laws without delay and without stint. These contributions would appear to be an essential element of the background against which laws involving crimes and the courts should be designed.

I do not speak in criticism of the President. He has done all that he could personally, and as President. The insufficiency of cooperation from the departments of the executive branch is undoubtedly due in major part to the shifting of administrations. It does seem, however, that since the President has now laid stress on passage of certain items of legislation, the departments might offer more active help to the committees so that the hearings can be rescheduled and action can be taken without further delay.

It is to be hoped that the President's endorsement of the recent Senate intensification of the effort against hunger in the Nation will prompt favorable consideration of this matter. His approval of the Senate expansion of the food stamp program should help to allay any fears in the House that the Senate has moved too far and too swifty in this area.

With respect to population growth, another point raised by the President, the Senate has already authorized a special commission to study the matter. Moreover, I am certain that any specific proposals enumerated hereafter by the President will be given expeditious consideration when they are received in legislative form in the Congress. On this matter, the President's message seemed restrained enough as, indeed, a proposal should be when the Government undertakes to enter into Kinsey's realms, with advice, supplies, and equipment, not only in this Nation but throughout the world.

I would expect that with the help of the tax-writing committees the Congress will be able to enact sufficient increases in payments to social security pensioners. What with the continuing inflation, the President correctly pointed to the urgency of the need among the elderly citizens of the Nation. A government which can find billions for anti-ballistic-missile systems—ABM's—of highly disputed value and tens of billions for the tragedy of Vietnam can do no less than meet the needs of its older citizens and meet them with sufficiency. Insofar as the Senate leadership is concerned, it will cooperate to the fullest with the President and the appropriate committees in order to bring about increases without delay.

With respect to reform of the District of Columbia government, the Senate has already completed action on the proposals which the President endorsed in his message. Action has also been completed on his proposals with regard to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I reiterate, Mr. President, what I said at the beginning of my remarks. The message sent to the Congress by the President over the weekend was temperate in tone and reasonable in expectation. The record of the Senate speaks for itself; it is a modest but respectable record to date, for a session which still has many weeks to run and for a Congress which has another session to run. Much remains to be completed; much will be completed before Christmas 1969, and still more before the end of 1970.

Insofar as President Nixon expressed a concern with particular items of legislation, his concern is noted. The Senate leadership will do for this President what it would do for any President. It will do whatever can be done, reasonably and practically under the rules, to accommodate to his wishes at least to the extent of bringing these measures to a decision one way or another on the floor of the Senate.

After the extraordinary agendas which have been disposed of in the Senate during the past 8 years, it seems to me that ample consideration of most of the President's requests should not exhaust congressional resources. Indeed, we should still be able to find time for additional congressional initiatives like those already taken this year in the area of tax relief and reform, electoral college reform and the approaches to crime legislation.

A quantum device has yet to be established to evaluate the work of the Congress. To count the bills passed is not an answer. To regard the extent of approval for the President's legislative program alone as the yardstick provides no measure for the congressional contribution which must be considered if the separate and independent role of the Congress is to have meaning under the Constitution. Moreover, how is the value of weeks of profound debate of the ABM to be measured? Is the passage of this measure—a Presidential item—to be debited or credited in the record of the Congress? Or is its value rather, in the intangible educational effect which will be felt in the treatment of similar budgetary requests in the future? What value can be attached to the work of a Senate committee exploring into the PX shenanigans? Will it forestall the outrageous bilking of GI's in the future even without further legislation? What can be said of the work of the Senate in exercising its constitutional function of advice and consent in foreign relations? Of a Senate which, having once gone along with a precipitate Vietnamese commitment, has stayed with this question ever since and will stay with it until the war is finally brought to an end?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the administration's bills sent to Congress and what their status is at the present time.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Subject	Administration Bill sent to Congress	Senate action
Draft reform	August 13	Senate bills introduced in February, House hearings underway.
Welfare reform	October 2	Await House action.
Revenue sharing	September 23	Considered in tax reform hearings.
Postal reform	May 23	Senate passed career postmaster—House markup underway on Corporation (initially rejected by House committee).
Manpower reform	August 12	Awaiting departmental reports.
Social security	September 30	House must act first.
Grant-in-aid	May 1	Will be reported in November.
Electoral reform	No administration draft.	Jan. 17 introduced; Passed House; Passed Senate Subcommittee.
District of Columbia Government reform.	May 13	Senate bill passed Oct. 1.
OEO reform	June 12	Passed Oct. 14.
Foreign aid	June 9	Pending before committee.
Mine safety	No draft bill	Senate bill passed.
Occupational Health and Safety Board.	Aug. 6	Senate hearings completed.
EEOC injunction power	No draft bill	Senate bill introduced June 19.
Voting rights	June 30	January 31 (Senate bill referred to Judiciary).
Food stamps	July 7	Senate bill passed Sept. 24.
Population commission	July 25	Passed Senate Sept. 29.
Crime:		
Increased appropriations for organized crime.	No budget request increase yet received.	
Antigambling jurisdiction	Oct. 7	Senate bill introduced Jan. 15, awaiting administration views.
Witness immunity	Oct. 7	Senate bill introduced Jan. 15, awaiting administration views.
Federal crime for local authorities involved in gambling.	July 11	Passed Senate Sept. 18.
District of Columbia court reorganization.	do	Jan. 22 Senate bill introduced.
Bail reform in District of Columbia.	do	Senate bill passed July 8.
Appropriations increase for narcotics enforcement.	Increased budget request expected next week.	
Tax reform	No draft bill	House bill passed August; Senate action this year.
Pornography (3 bills):		
Antismut	May 5	Awaiting Administration views.
Obscene mail	May 8	Reported from subcommittee in August.
Salacious advertising	do	Reported from subcommittee in August.
National Computer Job Bank	No draft bill	
Airport development	June 18	Hearings underway.
Public transit increase in authorization.	August 11	Awaiting agency views.
Extend unemployment coverage		House must act first (revenue measure)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 3, I reported to the Senate the legislative achievements of this body as they stood as of that point in this session. In conjunction with the President's message on legislation, however, I think it would be appropriate that the record be brought up to date, including the matters scheduled for completion this afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that a compilation of the Senate's legislative activity through today be included at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY, 91ST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, OCTOBER 16, 1969

AGRICULTURE

Durum wheat: Increased wheat acreage allotments in the irrigable portion of the Tulelake area of California each year from a 1969 total allotment of 5,374 acres to a total of 12,000 acres, effective with the 1970 crop. S. 858. P/S 9/23.

Food stamp authorization: Increased the authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 from $340 million to $750 million. S.J. Res. 126. P/S 6/24. H.J. Res. 934 H. Cal.

Food stamp program revision and expansion: Authorized $1.25 billion for fiscal 1970, $2 billion for fiscal 1971, and $2.5 billion for fiscal 1972; provided for self-certification; established a minimum of $125 per month for a family of 4; provided free stamps for family of 4 with an income of $80 or less; and required that every county in the Nation have a Food Stamp program by 1971. S. 2547. P/S 9/24 amended.

Great Plains program extension: Extended the Great Plains conservation program for 10 years and enlarged its scope. H.R. 10595. In conference.

Potatoes: Exempted potatoes for processing from marketing orders. S. 2214. P/S 10/16.

Potato and tomato promotion: Provided for a program of potato research, development, advertising, and promotion, to be financed by assessments of not more than 1¢ per hundred pounds of potatoes produced commercially in the States. S. 1181. P/S 10/16.

Marketing quota review committees: Amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that review committee members may be appointed from any county within a State and that the Secretary of Agriculture may institute proceedings in court to obtain a review of any review committee determination. S. 2226. P/S 9/24.

Seeds: Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to approve standards and procedures for seed certification. S. 1836. PL 91–

APPROPRIATIONS

1969

Continuing resolution: Continued appropriations through October 31, 1969. PL 91–33.

Second supplemental: Appropriated $4,352,357,644 in supplemental funds for Southeast Asia and various departments for fiscal

1969; set an expenditure ceiling of $191.9 billion for fiscal 1970; and repealed provision of law placing limitation on filling Government vacancies. PL 91–47.

Supplemental: Appropriated $36 million in supplemental funds for fiscal 1969 for Federal employees and ex-servicemen's unemployment compensation. PL 91–2.

Supplemental: Appropriated $1 billion in supplemental funds for fiscal 1969 for the Commodity Credit Corporation. PL 91–7.

1970

Agriculture: Appropriated a total of $7,642,797,650 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. HR 11612. In conference.

Interior: Appropriated a total of $1,546,273,300 for the Department of Interior and related agencies. HR 12781. In conference.

Treasury-Post Office: Appropriated $8,783,245,000 for the Departments of Treasury-Post Office, the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1970. PL 91–74.

ATOMIC ENERGY

AEC authorization: Authorized a total of $2,448,052,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1970. PL 91–44.

COMMUNICATIONS

COMSAT Board of Directors: Related the number of directors on the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation (Comsat) who may be elected by communications common carriers to the proportion of Comsat stock held by such carriers; specified that the articles of incorporation of Comsat may be amended by a vote of not less than two-thirds of all outstanding shares voting as a single class; and permitted Comsat to adopt bylaws which would permit its board of directors to transact business in the event of certain future national emergencies. PL 91–3.

CONGRESS

Commission: Increased from 5 to 7 the membership of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol by adding the majority leaders of the Senate and the House. PL 91–77.

Senate: Authorized a speech reinforcement system for the Senate Chamber. S. Res. 167. Senate adopted 4/15/69.

Library of Congress: Increased from $75 million to $90 million the authorization contained in the Act of 1965 for the construction of the third Library of Congress Building to be known as the James Madison Memorial Building. S. 2910. P/S 10/15.

DEFENSE

Coast Guard authorization: Authorized a total of $142.8 million for fiscal 1970 of which $55,584 was for vessel procurement, $17,188,000 for aicraft, $57,378,000 for construction and $12,650,000 for bridge alterations. PL 91–49.

Dismemberment insurance coverage: Added to servicemen's group life insurance coverage indemnity payments in the event of dismemberment or loss of use of a hand or foot, or loss of sight of an eye. S. 2186. P/S 9/18.

Extrahazardous duty: Provided double indemnity servicemen's group life insurance coverage for members of the uniformed services assigned to duty in a combat zone or assigned to extrahazardous duty. S. 1650. P/S 9/18.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman: Authorized the President to reappoint General Earle G. Wheeler as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for an additional term of one year. PL 91–19.

Legislative jurisdiction over lands: Authorized the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Army National Guard Facility, Ethan Allen, and the U.S. Army Materiel Command Firing Range, Underhill, Vermont. S. 59. P/S 7/29.

Marine Corps: Established the grade of General for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the personnel strength of the corps exceeds 200,000. PL 91–11.

Military procurement—ABM: Authorized $20,001,586,000, fiscal year 1970, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, for construction and deployment of the Safeguard Anti-ballistic Missile System, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces. S. 2546. In conference.

Servicemen's group life insurance increase: Increased from $10,000 to $15,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance. S. 1479. P/S 9/18.

Stockpile disposal: Authorized the sale of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national and supplemental stockpiles. PL 91–46.

Submarine pay: Provided that junior nuclear-trained submarine officers who have completed their minimum obligated service, but not more than 10 years, may be paid an additional $3,750 per year if they agree, by voluntary contract, to remain on active duty for an additional 4 years. PL 91–20.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bail Agency Act: Amended the D.C. Bail Agency Act of 1966 to require the Agency to supervise criminal defendants released under the Act to insure that they conform to the conditions of their release and actually appear for trial; and increased the Agency authorization from $130,000 to $360,000 for employing additional personnel to carry out the purposes of this bill. S. 545. P/S 7/8.

Commission on D.C. Government: Established a home rule study commission to make a study and report to Congress its recommendations 18 months after its establishment. S. 2164. P/S 10/1.

Court suits: Authorized suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for the collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when a reciprocal right is accorded to the District. S. 2502. P/S 9/3.

Debt adjusting: Prohibited the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association. S. 1458. P/S 7/8.

Delegate: Creates the office of congressional delegate from the District of Columbia and provides he shall be chosen by the qualified voters of the District, in a partisan, general election, following nomination by a political party by means of a party primary, or, in the alternative, following the submission of a nominating petition signed by 5,000 voters or 2 percent of the total District electorate, whichever is less. S. 2163. P/S 10/1.

Interstate compact on juveniles in D.C.: Authorized the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate compact on juveniles which is now law in 47 States and provides a uniform nationwide agreement for the disposition of juveniles who leave the State in which they have been found delinquent and also for the return of runaway youths to their home States. S. 2335. P/S 9/18. HR 8868. P/H 7/28.

Judges Retirement Act: Amended title 11 of the District of Columbia code to permit unmarried judges of the courts of the District of Columbia who have no dependent children to terminate their payments for survivors annuity and to receive a refund of amounts paid for such annuity. S. 2056. P/S 9/3.

National Capital Transportation Act of 1969: Authorized not to exceed $1,147,044,000 as the federal contribution for the 97.7 mile rapid rail transit system for D.C. and nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia; and authorized $150,000 to study the feasibility of a rapid rail line between Dulles Airport and the main metro system utilizing the median of the Dulles access highway. S 2185. P/S 7/8.

Reorganization of D.C. courts: Provided for a restructured court system in the District of Columbia. S. 2601. P/S 9/18.

Revenue: Provides approximately $61.6 million in additional revenues for the D.C. government and authorizes a Federal payment of up to $120 million. HR 12982. In conference.

Uemployment Compensation Act: Exempts certain public international organizations, which have headquarters or regional offices in the District of Columbia, from registering with the D.C. Unemployment Compensation Board and from the payment of the unemployment tax. PL 91–80.

Washington International School: Authorized the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to convey the Phillips School located in Georgetown, to the Washington International School, Inc. for the sum of $500,000. PL 91–63.

DUTIES

Chicory roots: Made permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots; and added two amendments 1) repealing the limitation on Federal participation in Aid to Families with Dependent Children scheduled under present law to become effective July 1, 1969, and 2) extended through June 30, 1971 the authority to provide temporary assistance for the care of repatriated Americans. PL 91–41.

Electrodes—Aluminum: Continued through December 31, 1970, the suspension of duties on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum. PL 91–26.

Heptanoic acid: Continued through December 31, 1970 the suspension of duties on heptanoic acid; and extended through July 31, 1969 the "surcharge" withholding tax rates. PL 91–36.

Istle: Continued the existing suspension of duty on certain istle through September 5, 1972. PL 91–65.

Metal scrap: Extended through June 30, 1971 the existing suspension of duties on metal waste scrap. PL 91–25.

Shoe lathes: Extended through June 30, 1972 the existing suspension of duty on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model or shoe last; and a 2-year suspension of the law requiring States to constantly expand the benefits of medicaid so that such services will be provided to all indigent residents. PL 91–56.

Spun silk: Extended through November 7, 1971 the suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn which expired on November 7, 1968. PL 91–28.

ECONOMY AND FINANCE

Bankruptcy Commission: Created a commission to study and recommend changes in the bankruptcy laws. S.J. Res. 88. P/S 6/20.

Commission on Balanced Economic Development: Established a bipartisan 20-member Commission on Balanced Economic Development to undertake a thorough study and analysis of current geographic trends in the economic development of the Nation. S.J. Res. 60. P/S 5/27.

Debt limit: Provided a permanent debt limitation of $365 billion and a temporary additional increase of $12 billion through June 30, 1970. PL 91–8.

Disaster relief: Provided for Federal loan adjustments, grants to States for disaster planning, shelter for disaster victims, food stamp program, assistance to unemployed individuals, clearance of lake contamination, fire control, debris removal, and timber sale contracts. PL 91–79.

Export Control Act extension: Extended through October 31, 1969 the authority to control exports pending enactment of legislation now on the Senate Calendar. PL 91–59.

Gold and silver content: Amended the National Gold and Silver Stamping Act to provide a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles made from gold and silver. S. 1046. P/S 5/23.

Investors study: Extended to September 1, 1970 the time in which the Securities and Exchange Commission has to study and make a report to Congress on institutional investing practices in the securities market, and increased the appropriation authorization from $875,000 to $945,000. S.J. Res. 112. PL 91–

Mutual fund reforms: Amended those sections of the Investment Company Act of 1940 which pertain to investment company management fees, mutual fund sales commissions and periodic payment or contractual plan sales commissions; amended various provisions of the Federal securities laws to permit banks and savings and loan associations to operate commingled managing agency accounts in competition with mutual funds; amended other provisions of the Investment Company Act and the Investment Advisers Act to update and improve the administration and enforcement of these acts; and postponed until 18 months after enactment the effective date of the section of the bill that deals with oil and gas mutual funds. S. 2224. P/S 5/26.

Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969: Authorized $2.048 billion for fiscal year 1970 and $2.048 billion for fiscal year 1970 and $2.7322 billion for fiscal year 1971 for carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and established a new alcoholic counseling and recovery program and a new drug rehabilitation program. S. 3016. Passed Senate 10/14.

Rates of interest and dividends on time and saving deposits: Extended for an additional 3 months until December 22, 1969, flexible authority to regulate the rate of interest on savings deposits paid by financial institutions. PL 91–71.

Regional economic development legislation: Revised and extended the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 through June 30, 1971 and authorized for the 2-fiscal-year period, exclusive of highway construction funds, $294 million; extended the highway portion of the program through June 30, 1973, and authorized $695 million for the 4-fiscal-year period; extended title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act for 2 years through June 30, 1971 and authorized for the 1-fiscal-year period $285 million; and extended title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act for 1 year which authorizes grants for construction of public facilities. S. 1072. In conference.

Small Business Administration: Increased the ceiling on the amount of loans which can be outstanding at one time for loans to State and local development companies under title V of the Small Business Investment Act from $300 million to $500 million. S. 2815. P/S 8/13.

Small Business Investment Act amendments: Clarified SBA's authority to enter into guarantee agreements on loans made by private lending institutions to small business investment companies. S. 2540. P/S 8/13.

EDUCATION

Educational TV: Authorized $20 million for fiscal 1970 and extended the appropriations authorization for the Public Broadcasting Act to July 1, 1974. Limited appropriations to $15 million for each of the fiscal years 1971–73. S. 1242. PL 91– .

Student loans: Authorized $20 million for fiscal 1970 and existing unused reserve funds of the insured loan program for temporary special allowances, and $40 million for fiscal 1971, to eligible lenders under the insured loan program of title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965; authorized an increase for fiscal 1970 from $275 million to $325 million and from $300 million to $375 million for fiscal 1971 for the national defense student loan program; increased the authorization for the educational opportunity grant program from $100 million to $125 million in fiscal 1970 and from $140 million to $170 million in fiscal 1971; and increased the authorization for the college work-study program from $250 million to $257 million in fiscal 1970 and from $285 million to $320 million for fiscal 1971; made the provisions effective 8/1/69. HR 13194. PL 91– .

National Center on Educational Media for the Handicapped: Authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the purpose of establishing and operating a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. PL 96–61.

National Commission on Libraries: Established a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as an independent component of the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and recommend overall plans for carrying out the national policy with respect to libraries and information science and to advise appropriate governmental agencies at all levels relative to the means of carrying out such plans. S. 1519. P/S 5/23.

NEA: Liberalized the corporate power of the National Education Association; eliminated the board of trustees and transferred their duties to the executive committee of the association. PL 91–37.

National Science Foundation Authorization: Authorized a total of $500,150,000 for fiscal year 1970. S. 1857. In conference.

New Hampshire-Vermont Compact: Gave Congressional consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont interstate school compact. PL 91–21.

Scholarships and child-care centers: Amended the Labor-Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school age dependents of employees. S. 2068. PL 91–

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Civil service retirement: Authorized annual payments directly from the Treasury to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund equal to the lost interest on the unfunded liability of the Fund; increased employee and agency contributions from 6½ percent to 7 percent, effective 1/1/70, and increased contributions by Congressional employees to 7½ and Members of Congress to 8 percent; used "high-3" instead of "high-5" for computing civil service annuities; added 1 percent to cost-of-living increases for annuitants; permitted accumulated sick leave to be added to computation of annuity; and permitted Congressional employees to receive 2½ percent credit for all years of Congressional employment. HR 9825. PL 91–

Employment of aliens: Authorized the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. S. 1173. P/S 6/19.

National Zoological Park: Removed all positions in the National Zoological Park police force from the classification system of the Civil Service Commission and authorized the Secretary of the Smithsonian, with certain limitations, to fix the salaries. PL 91–34.

Park Police age limit: Granted the Secretary of Interior discretionary authority to fix a maximum age for entry into Park Police duty in the 29- to 31-year age range. PL 91–73.

Postmaster appointments: Provided for the appointment of all postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third class by the Postmaster General; and prohibited political recommendations from being taken into account in the appointment of any person to any position in the Post Office Department other than Presidential nominees and policy making employees. S. 1583. P/S 8/12. (PR)

Travel per diem increase: Increased from $16 to $25 the maximum per diem allowance for travel in continental United States; from $30 to $40 for actual expenses; and from $10 to $18 per day the maximum actual expenses reimbursement for foreign travel authorized to be paid in addition to the maximum per diem established for the area involved. HR 337. P/S amended 10/8.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People: Established the Cabinet Committee to assure that Federal programs are reaching all Mexican Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, Cuban Americans, and all other Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans and providing assistance they need, and to seek out new programs that may be necessary to handle problems that are unique to such persons. S. 740. P/S 9/25. (PR)

Commission on Government Procurement: Established a temporary 9-member Commission on Government Procurement which would be directed to make a comprehensive study of Federal procurement statutes, policies, and practices, submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to Congress within 2 years from the date of enactment, and would cease to exist 120 days after the submission of its final report. HR 474. P/S amended 9/26.

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future: Established the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future to conduct and sponsor studies and research and to make such recommendations as are necessary to provide information and education at all levels of government in the United States, and to the public, regarding a broad range of problems associated with population growth and their implication for America's future. S. 2701. P/S 9/29. (PR)

Copyright protection: Continued until December 31, 1970, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this resolution, or the term as extended by PL 87–668, by PL 89–442, by PL 90–141, or PL 90–416, where such term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1970. S.J. Res. 143. P/S 10/6.

John F. Kennedy Center: Increased by $7.5 million (to $23 million) the Federal share for construction of the John F. Kennedy Center and by $5 million (to $20.4 million) the borrowing authority for the construction of underground parking facilities. H.R. 11249. PL 91– (PR)

Medical supplies: Authorized the head of any Federal department or agency who is responsible for the storage of medical materials or medical supplies held for a national emergency to determine when the shelf life is of too short duration for continued retention. S. 406. P/S 9/26.

Metric system study: Authorized a total appropriation of $2.5 million, over a 3-year period, to enable the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the study of the metric system authorized last year by PL 90–472. S. 1287. P/S 5/14. H. Cal.

Office of Intergovernmental Relations: Authorized the appropriations of such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Office of Intergovernment Relations established by Executive Order February 14, 1969, to advise and assist the Vice President with respect to his intergovernmental relations responsibilities as the President's liaison with executive and legislative officials of State and local governments. S.J. Res. 117. P/S 9/29.

Surplus property for public museums: Makes public museums, such as public libraries, eligible to secure surplus property which is usable and necessary for purposes of

education, public health, or for research for any such purpose. S. 2210. P/S 9/26.

HEALTH

Clean Air Act amendments: Granted a 1-year extension of the research authorization (sec. 104) of the Air Quality Act of 1967 at the current level of $90 million. S. 2276. In conference.

Medicaid: Provided for a 2-year suspension of the law requiring States to constantly expand the benefits of medicaid so that such services will be provided to all indigent residents. PL 91–56.

National Commission on Product Safety: Extended the life of the National Commission on Product Safety from November 20, 1969, to no later than June 30, 1970. PL 91–51.

Toy Safety Act: Amended the Federal Hazardous Substances Act so that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order to protect children from serious injury and illness, may ban from the marketplace toys and other articles intended for use by children which present electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards. S. 1689. In conference.

Water pollution control: Authorized the Federal Government to clean up oil spills; required Federal licensees and permitees to comply with water quality standards as a precondition of the license or permit; subjects vessel sewage to new methods of control; provided for consideration of environmental policies and brings other environmental policies into all other Federal programs. HR 4148. In conference.

HOUSING

Housing programs: Extended for 3 months, until January 1, 1970, all Federal housing programs which would otherwise expire on October 1, 1969. PL 91–78.

Housing and urban development act of 1969: Authorized $6.2 billion over the next two years for Federal Housing Administration programs, urban renewal, model cities, rent supplement, and public housing; provided rent subsidies for tenants of public housing; extended Federal Housing Administration loan guarantees to mobile homes; and raised the ceiling on the amounts that could be spent per room for constructing public and federally assisted housing. S. 2864. P/S 9/23. H. Cal.

Paraplegic veterans: Extended the eligibility requirements governing the grant of assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for paraplegic veterans to include loss or loss of use of a lower extremity and other service-connected neurological or orthopedic disability which impairs locomotion to the extent that a wheelchair is regularly required. PL 91–22.

IMMIGRATION

Western Hermisphere immigation: Facilitated the entry into the U.S. of executive officers and managerial personnel of Western Hemisphere businesses having branch offices, affiliates, or subsidiary corporations in the U.S. S. 2593. P/S 8/13.

INDIANS

American Indian rights: Clarified titles II and III of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 by providing that title II shall not be construed to affect any tribal property rights secured by law or treaty or to dilute the sovereignty of the tribal governments except to the extent of the prohibitions upon governmental action expressly set forth in title II, and by providing that the model code in title III will not become applicable to any tribe unless it is first adopted by the tribal council or other governing body of the tribe. S. 2173. P/S 7/11.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe: Provided that all right, title, and interest of the U.S. in 640 acres located at an old school site, together with all improvements, except fencing owned by an Indian permittee, shall be held in trust by the U.S. for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. S. 921. P/S 8/13.

Flathead Reservation in Montana: Provided for the disposition of an award in the amount of $190,399.97 to the Confederate Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in Montana. PL 91–75.

Fort Berthold Reservation: Declared that the United States shall hold certain lands in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation. S. 775. P/S 8/13. H. Cal.

Indian land: Compensates the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset against a judgment. The offset was $83,275, plus interest at 4 percent from December 4, 1944. PL 91–64.

Indians of the Pueblo of Laguna: Declared that the United States will hold approximately 1,016.65 acres of excess federally owned land in trust for the Laguna Pueblo, New Mexico. S. 210. P/S 8/13.

Loans: Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture,, through the Farmers Home Administration, to make loans to any Indian tribe or tribal corporation for the purpose of acquiring lands within the tribe's reservation. S. 227. P/S 9/12.

Long term leases: Authorized longer term leases of Indian trust or restricted lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico. S. 1609. P/S 8/13.

Long-Term Leasing Act: Increased from 50 to 65 years the maximum term of leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreation, residential, and business purposes. S. 204 P/S 8/13.

National Council on Indian Opportunity: Established an annual ceiling of $300,000 for the expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity. S. J. Res. 121. P/S 9/3.

Navajo Indian Reservation: Amended the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of 1950, to increase the total amount authorized for roads and trails by $5 million in order to construct and improve a road on the Navajo Reservation. S. 404. P/S 8/13.

Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation: Amended the 1963 act which authorized the sale or exchange or mortgaging of isolated tracts of tribal land on the reservation, to provide that any lands mortgaged shall be subject to foreclosure and sale pursuant to the terms of the mortgage and in accord with the laws of South Dakota. S. 73. P/S 8/13.

INTERNATIONAL

Foreign governments recognition: Expressed as the sense of the Senate that when the United States recognizes a foreign government and exchanges diplomatic representatives with it, this does not of itself imply that the United States approves of the form, ideology, or policy of that foreign government. S. Res. 205. Senate adopted 9/25/69.

International Conference: Authorized the Secretaries of State and Commerce, in consultation with other interested parties, to arrange to convene an international conference to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty and authorized the appropriation of $175,000 for this purpose. S.J. Res. 90. P/S 6/18.

International Development Association: Authorized the United States to contribute $480 million to the World Bank's IDA over the next 3 years. PL 91–14.

International expositions: Provided for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions to be held in the United States. S. 856 P/S 6/18.

National commitments: Defined national commitment as the use of Armed Forces on foreign territory, or a promise to assist a foreign government by use of Armed Forces of financial resources, and expressed as the sense of the Senate that a national commitment could result only from affirmative action taken by the executive and legislative branches by means of a treaty, statute or concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress providing for such a commitment. S. Res. 85. Senate adopted June 25, 1969.

Peace Corps amendments: Authorized $95,-450,000 for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1970. HR 11039. PL 91–

TREATIES

Agreement with Canada on Niagara River Diversions: Purpose of this agreement is to provide for the temporary diversion of water from the American Falls of the Niagara River for power production purposes pending a study of ways to prevent the continued erosion of the rock underneath. Ex. C (91–1). Resolution of ratification agreed to 5/13/69.

Broadcasting Agreements With Mexico: Two related but separate agreements concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcasting band and the operation of broadcasting stations in the standard band at presunrise and postsunrise. Ex. B (91–1). Resolution of ratification agreed to 6/19/69. (PR)

Convention on Offenses Committed on Board Aircraft: Established international rules providing for continuity of jurisdiction with respect to crimes and other offenses committed on board aircraft engaged in international aviation. Ex. L (90–2). Resolution of ratification agreed to 5/13/69.

Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons: Retards the further spread of nuclear weapons by prohibiting the nuclear weapon States party to the treaty from transferring nuclear weapons to others and by barring the non-nuclear-weapon countries from receiving, manufacturing, or otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons. Ex. H (90–2). Resolution of ratification agreed to 3/13/69.

JUDICIAL

Jurisdiction of U.S. Courts: Provided courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contract claims against nonappropriated fund activities of the U.S. S. 980. P/S 6/30.

National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws: Extended to 11/8/70 the time within which the Commission shall submit its final report and increased the authorization from $500,000 to $850,000 with authority for the Commission to carry over any funds not expended in 1970 into 1971. PL 91–39.

Omnibus judgeship bill: Created 70 new district judgeships of which 67 are permanent and 3 are temporary throughout the United States. S. 952. P/S 6/23.

Prince Georges County Court: Authorized the United States District Court for the District of Maryland to sit at a suitable site in Prince Georges County, as well as at Baltimore, Cumberland, and Denton, Maryland. S. 981. P/S 10/6.

LABOR

Construction workers: Promotes health and safety standards in the construction industry by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to set standards which contractors and subcontractors would be required to meet on Federal, federally financed, or federally assisted construction. PL 91–54.

Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969: Improved the health and safety conditions and practices at underground coal mines; provided protection in all other coal mines, including surface mines, not now covered by the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act as amended; established health standards; provided authority for the Interior Department to promulgate improved mandatory health and safety standards for all coal mines by regulation; authorized a 4-year $70 million Federal-State compensation program for victimes of pneumoconiosis or their widows; and authorized a $75 million research program to determine if pneumoconiosis can be cured or prevented. S. 2917. P/S 10/2.

Manpower Development and Training Act Amendment: Authorized $100,000 as the minimum amount which can be apportioned to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for job training. PL 91–4.

MEMORIALS AND TRIBUTES

American Fisheries Society Centennial Medal: Provided for striking medals in com-

memoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society on December 20, 1870. PL 91–13.

American motion picture: Designated 1969 as the Diamond Jubilee year of the American Motion Picture. H. Con. Res. 165. House adopted 4/21; Senate adopted 5/5/69.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission: Extended the reporting date of the Commission from July 4, 1969 to July 4, 1970, and extended the authorization for appropriations from fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1970. PL 91–84.

Apollo 11: Commended the Apollo 11 astronauts on their successful lunar expedition. S. Res. 224. Agreed to 7/25/69.

Baseball centennial: Extended congratulations of Congress to organized baseball to commemorate its 100th anniversary in 1969. H. Con. Res. 300. House adopted 7/15; Senate adopted 7/17/69.

Carl Hayden Project: Renamed the Central Arizona Project as the Carl Hayden Project. S.J. Res. 28. P/S 3/24.

Chouteau Lock and Dam, Oklahoma: Authorized that lock and dam numbered 17 on the Verdigris River, Oklahoma, be named for the Chouteau family. S. 1499. P/S 9/5.

Congressional Space Medals of Honor: Authorized the President to award, and present in the name of Congress, a medal of appropriate design, which shall be known as the Congressional Space Medal of Honor, to any astronaut who in the performance of his duties has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious efforts and contributions to the welfare of the Nation and of mankind. PL 91–76.

Dartmouth College: Expressed congratulations of Congress to Dartmouth College on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of its founding. H. Con. Res. 114. House adopted 4/29; Senate adopted 6/19/69.

Eisenhower Dam: Renamed Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam. S. 1613. P/S 6/30.

Eisenhower Dollar: Authorized the minting of approximately 300 million 40 percent silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower. S.J. Res. 158. P/S 10/15; P/H amended 10/15.

Eisenhower National Historic Site: Authorized $1,108,000 for the development of the Eisenhower National Historic Site at Gettysburg, Pa., designated as such in 1967. S.J. Res. 26. P/S 8/13. P/H amended 9/15.

Everett Bridge: Named the Tennessee-Missouri Bridge, now under construction across the Mississippi River linking the States of Tennessee and Missouri, in honor of the late Congressman Robert A. Everett from the 8th Congressional District of Tennessee. S. 769. P/S 2/4.

High Speed Photography: Expressed the sense of Congress that all interested Federal agencies should participate actively in the Ninth International Congress on High-Speed Photography to be held in Denver, Colorado, in August of 1970. S. Con. Res. 12. P/S 6/16.

Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site: Established the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site to consist of two principal areas and authorized $180,000 for its development. S. 2000. P/S 8/13.

St. Lawrence Seaway: Recognized the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. C. Con. Res. 17. Senate adopted 6/19; passed House amended 6/24; Senate concurred 6/26/69.

Taft Historic Site: Established the birthplace of William Howard Taft, the 27th President of the United States, as a National Historic Site located on Auburn Street in Cincinnati, Ohio, and authorized $318,000 for its restoration and development. HR. 7066. P/S amended 9/24.

U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service: Authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to strike bronze medals in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service. PL 91–48.

Winston Churchill Medal: Provided for striking a medal in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library at Fulton, Missouri, in May, 1969. PL 91–12.

PRESIDENCY

Mail: Authorized free postage for Mrs. Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower. PL 91–10.

Pay increase: Provided a $100,000 pay increase for the President of the United States. PL 91–1.

PROCLAMATIONS

Adult Education Week: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating the period September 1–7, 1969 as "Adult Education Week." S.J. Res. 45. P/S 5/5.

Day of Bread and Harvest Festival: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating October 28, 1969 as a "Day of Bread" as a part of international observances, and that the last week of October within which it falls be designated as a period of "Harvest Festival." H.J. Res. 851. PL 91–

Helen Keller Memorial Week: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating the first week in June of 1969 as "Helen Keller Memorial Week" PL 91–17

National Adult-Youth Communications Week: Authorized the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of September 28 through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communication Week." PL 91–72

National Archery Week: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning August 26, 1969, and ending September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week." PL 91–55

National Family Health Week: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating the period November 16–22, 1969, as "National Family Health Week." S.J. Res. 46. PL 91–

National Industrial Hygiene Week: Designated the period beginning October 12, 1969, and ending October 18, 1969, as "National Industrial Hygiene Week." S.J. Res. 150. PL 91–

Professional Photography Week: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating the period June 8–14, 1969, as "Professional Photography Week in America." PL 91–23.

Von Steuben Memorial Day: Authorized the President to issue a proclamation designating September 17, 1969 as "General von Steuben Memorial Day" to commemorate his birth and services to the United States. PL 91–70.

REORGANIZATION

Authority extension: Extended to April 1, 1971, the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress proposing reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government. PL 91–5.

HEW—Appointments and confirmations: Required that future appointments in the following positions in HEW be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate: Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service; Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services Administration; Commissioner of Medical Services Administration; and Commissioner of Assistance Payments Administration. S. 1022. P/S 3/4.

Plan No. 1: Reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the President to designate the Chairman and to vest administrative authority in the Chairman. Effective October 11, 1969.

RESOURCE BUILDUP

Apostle Islands: Authorized the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin and authorized $6,660,000 for land acquisition and $8,257,700 for development of the project. S. 621. P/S 6/26.

Buffalo National River: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to establish the Buffalo National River on not more than 95,730 acres in the Ozark Mountains of northwest Arkansas. S. 855. P/S 9/3.

El Dorado National Forest: Designated 63,469 acres in the El Dorado National Forest in California as a Wilderness preservation area. PL 91–82.

Environmental quality: Established an independent, high-level three-member Board of Environmental Quality Advisers in the Executive Office of the President to provide a continuing study and analysis of environmental trends and the factors which affect these trends, and to relate each area of study and analysis of the social, economic, health, and conservation goals of the Nation. S. 1075. In conference.

Everglades National Park, Fla.: Authorized $800,000 to acquire a 6,640-acre inholding in the Everglades National Park under option to the National Park Service and due to expire November 16, 1969. S. 2564. PL 91–

Feasibility studies: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to undertake feasibility investigations of eight water resource development projects which may subsequently be presented for authorization by the Congress as elements of the Federal Reclamation Program. PL 91–81.

Florissant fossil beds: Established the Florissant Fossil Beds as a National Monument in the State of Colorado. PL 91–60.

Golden Eagle program: Restored the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and guaranteed free access to and use of Federal lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. S. 2315. P/S 9/24.

Interstate oil compact: Granted the consent of Congress to a 2-year extension (to September 1, 1971) of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas. S.J. Res. 54. P/S 10/13.

Kennewick—Yakima project: Authorized $6,735,000 to construct an extension to the existing Kennewick division of the Yakima reclamation project in southeastern Washington to irrigate an additional 6,300 acres. PL 91–66.

Kortes unit of the Missouri River Basin: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to modify the operation of the Kortes unit of the Missouri Rivr Basin project, Wyoming for fishery conservation. S. 40. P/S 8/13.

Lincoln Back Country, Montana: Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana. S. 412. P/S 5/29.

Monomoy Wilderness: Designated the 2,600-acre Monomoy Island, located in the Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge in Barnstable County, Mass., as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. S. 1652. P/S 5/23.

National Council: Extended to June 30, 1970 the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development and reduced the annual authorized appropriation from $1.5 million to $1.2 million. PL 91–15.

National minerals policy: Established a national mining and minerals policy to foster and encourage the development of the domestic mining and minerals industry, the development of domestic mineral resources to meet industrial and security needs, and mining, mineral, and metallurgical research. S. 719. P/S 9/5.

Navajo Indian irrigation project: Increased the amount of appropriations authorized for project construction from $135 million to $175 million and included 8 additional townships in the area from which the project lands may be obtained. S. 203. P/S 8/12.

Oil and gas leases: Conferred discretionary authority on the Secretary of Interior to prevent, administratively, termination of certain oil and gas leases on Federal lands and reinstated terminated leases under cer-

tain limitations and conditions. S. 1193. P/S 6/2.

Padre Island: Authorized $4,129,829, plus interest, to satisfy a judgment against the United States in a condemnation action in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, for the acquisition of lands and interests in land for the Padre Island National Seashore. PL 91–42.

Parks and recreation: Authorized the sale of surplus Federal properties at less than the full 50 percent of fair market value to make surplus Federal property suitable for park and recreational uses more readily available to State and local governments. Required the Congress have 60 days to disapprove such sale. S. 1708. P/S 6/26.

Pelican Island Wilderness: Designated approximately 403 acres of the Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. S. 126. P/S 5/23.

Saline water conversion program: Authorized $26 million for fiscal 1970. Of this amount $17,223,000 is for research and development operating expenses; $5,355,000 is for design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities; $1,450,000 is for design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules; and $1,972,000 is for administration and coordination. PL 91–43.

Sawtooth National Recreation Area: Established the Sawtooth National Recreation area, in Idaho, to preserve and protect the scenic, historic, pastoral, fish and wildlife and other recreational values of the Sawtooth Mountains and adjacent valley lands. S. 853. P/S 7/2.

Tocks Island Dam: Amends existing law providing for the development of the Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, Delaware River Basin, to permit the head and water releases of the project to be utilized as part of a comprehensive pumped-storage hydroelectric power project by certain New Jersey electric companies. S. 2678. P/S 7/30.

Touchet—Walla Walla Projects: Authorized $22,774,000 for the construction and operation of the Touchet division of the Walla Walla reclamation project in southeastern Washington which will supply irrigation water to approximately 9,960 acres of land. S. 743. P/S 3/24.

Upper Niobrara River compact: Granted congressional consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. PL 91–52.

Ventana Wilderness: Designated approximately 98,000 acres in the Los Padres National Forest in California as the Ventana Wilderness. PL 91–58.

Wilderness areas in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Maine: Designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands Wilderness in the State of Michigan, the Wisconsin Islands Wilderness in the State of Wisconsin, and the Edmunds Wilderness and Birch Islands Wilderness in the State of Maine. All of the lands included are presently within the National Wildlife Refuge System. S. 826. P/S 5/26.

Youth Conservation Corps: Established a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 14–18 years of age, who would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges and other public lands administered by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture for periods up to 90 days. S. 1076. P/S 6/26.

SPACE

NASA authorization: Authorized appropriations totaling $3,715,527,000 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1970. Of this total $58,200,000 is for construction of facilities, $3,019,927,000 for research and development, and $637,400,000 for research and program management; and required disclosure of certain information by former employees, G–15 and above, of NASA who are employed by aerospace contractors doing $10 million or more annual business with NASA. HR 11271. In conference.

TAXES

Interest equalization: Extended the interest equalization tax to September 30, 1969. PL 91–65.

Interest equalization extension—gun registration: Extended the interest equalization tax until March 31, 1971; modified the President's discretionary authority to vary the tax rates so he may prescribe a lower rate of tax for new issues than the rate applicable to outstanding issues; and modified the Gun Control Act of 1968 to repeal the registration requirements related to persons purchasing shotguns and rifles, or component parts of these types of ammunition. HR 12829. In conference.

Surtax: Extended the 10 percent surtax through December 31, 1969. PL 91–53.

Unemployment tax: Accelerated the collection of Federal unemployment taxes by requiring they be paid quarterly rather than annually; phased in the transition from an annual to quarterly basis over a 3-year period; and exempted an employer from the quarterly requirement if his cumulative tax liability is $100 or less. PL 91–53.

TRANSPORTATION

Acquisition of air carriers: Provides that no person shall acquire control of an air carrier without first obtaining the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board unless such acquisition has been exempted by the Board from that requirement consistent with the public interest. PL 91–62.

Maritime authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $384,608,000 for the Maritime Administration for fiscal 1970. PL 91–85.

Vessel construction differential subsidy: Authorized a 1-year extension (June 30, 1970) of the present 55 percent ceiling on construction-differential subsidy payments and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships. PL 91–40.

VETERANS

Dependency and indemnity compensation increases: Provided an overall increase of 13 percent in the dependency and indemnity compensation program for the widows and orphans of servicemen and veterans whose death was service-related. S. 1471. P/S 9/18. P/H amended 10/6.

Twenty-year disability: Preserved disability evaluation in effect for 20 years for veterans with service-connected disabilities who have suffered certain anatomical losses or who are totally disabled with severe disabilities. PL 91–32.

VA Center at Fort Harrison: Ceded to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. over the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Montana, effective upon acceptance by that State. PL 91–45.

Vietnam era veterans' life insurance: Provided a special Government life insurance of $10,000 for veterans of the Vietnam era. S. 2003. P/S 9/18.

WELFARE

Dependent children—repatriated Americans: Repealed the limitation on Federal participation in Aid to Families with Dependent Children scheduled under present law to become effective July 1, 1969; and extended through June 30, 1971 the authority to provide temporary assistance for the reception and care of repatriated Americans. PL 91–41.

Older Americans Act amendments: Extended the grant and contract programs of the 1965 Older Americans Act beyond their June 30, 1969 expiration date and authorized increases for those programs; and authorized a National Older Americans Volunteer Program to provide service opportunities for older Americans. PL 91–69.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for his temperate and cooperative summation on proposed legislation before Congress.

As the President has rightly said, the American people are not going to be so much concerned about charges by the administration on what Congress has not done, or charges by Congress, or the congressional majority, on what the administration has not done, but that the American people will be very much interested in if we make this a competition between the parties, and between Congress and the administration, on how much constructive legislation we can get done. Then we can go back to the people in the normal electoral processes and there compete as to how credit may be fairly allocated among us.

I think that the majority leader's summary is quite fair. I have some small addenda which are in no sense critical, as his report is not critical, as to proposals on draft reform which come from both sides of the aisle, including some interesting proposals in the last Congress and in this Congress by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), some from me, and some from a number of other Senators.

On the matter of electoral reform, since it does not require a report from the executive branch, and since the President is not required to sign the joint resolution for a constitutional amendment or the amendment itself, I would hope that the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I sit, would act expeditiously. The subcommittee has reported and the President has indicated that electoral college reform is more important to him than the specific method used. I share that opinion.

I would say, with regard to the statement, that there had been no full response on the preventive detention bill, but this is a bill to cure a situation such as in Washington where a 17-year-old committed 15 crimes before he committed murder and was discharged every time, usually with some social science language, that he was mother repressed, or mother dominated, and so was left free to kill. Others have committed while out on bail—I do not think this happened in that case—but in other cases while out on bail, often on their own recognizance, a number of other crimes of violence, and that is what we seek to correct.

I would be surprised if there is not adequate response from the bureaus, because the President himself has pointed out in every executive request submitted to Congress in his messages, that the report is there, because the message itself is a report to the Congress saying that the President would not ask for this if he had not already satisfied himself that the Bureau of the Budget, Treasury, Justice, or any other involved agency had agreed.

As a matter of fact, they have to agree, Mr. President, if the President sends up a message, if they wish to continue their tenure in this lovely city of ours. So each message is a report.

But I am also told that adequate re-

ports are received whenever requested on major propositions.

On the crime bills, in every case the President sent up his message, outlined it, and therefore the reports are here. The desire of the President is clear. The desire of the administration is clear.

There is, I am happy to report, in the year 1969 a decrease in the rate of the rise of crime, but not a decrease in crimes; and we need legislation on obscenity, pornography, reform of the court system, and so forth.

On one other matter, I agree that the dreadful burdens of the Vietnam war are preventing our turning our attention to what we need to do about problems of hunger, ghettos, housing, education, and all those areas where the American people are anxious to see us do our part to improve the conditions of mankind within these United States.

I do have to point out, however, that while the percentge is not precise, I would estimate that about seven-eights of the burden of Vietnam was inherited by this administration—which makes it no less a burden, but it was not a burden that was put on the American people within the last 8 months. It is a burden which ought to be lessened. It is a burden which ought to be terminated, and at the soonest.

Not to belabor the whole matter too much longer, I would like to end this by again saying that the distinguished majority leader has performed a service in pointing out, as the President has done, that the real competition is not in what you do not do; it lies in what you do.

Therefore, our competition must always continue to be on the basis of how we get the legislation out, is it good legislation, is it constructive, will it work, can it be done within the parameters of the budget?

I like that word "parameter," Mr. President. I do not think I have ever used it before, but I will again. I like a new word every day. But within the parameters of the budget—let me say with pride of semantic acquisition—I think we can legislate in the public interest and in the national interest.

Again I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for having brought to our attention the fact that the Congress is moving. I may take a little pride, perhaps a little credit, in the fact that honest criticism interposed on a timely occasion may have spurred both downtown and uptown into greater speed. We are still operating well within the speed limits, but I do believe that we are now moving.

Again I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is not necessarily directed to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but to the subject matter that has been discussed here. It seems to me a Congress should be judged by what finally ends up in a statute book at the end of a session, not necessarily by the timing; but often we are judged because the preliminary work leading to the passage of legislation looks like a dragging.

I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania made the distinction about not being competitive.

A good example of some of our problems is that, as he knows, in our committee we have two major national problems on which we want to work with the administration. One has to do with the condition of our airports and airways and the growing needs there.

We had to wait a long time before the Department of Transportation came up with the administration's proposals. We finally had to call a hearing, and the administration then came up with a proposal.

I give this only as an example. When there is a new administration, this happens.

Another example is that we have to get at our merchant marine problems. The administration told us it wanted to send up its merchant marine proposals. So we set a hearing for Tuesday. Now we find they will not be ready until next Tuesday.

That adds to our problems, because they are trying to work out some of the problems and adjust some of them. I think that fact has contributed a great deal to the timing problem, including the 6 weeks we spent on the ABM matter. When we add all of them up, we have 2 or 3 months when it looked like Congress was not doing anything; but it was holding hearings.

It must be remembered that there are two budgets when there is a change in administrations. Of necessity, the Appropriations Committee must wait until the next one is presented, because they will vary. This takes 2 or 3 weeks after a President is inaugurated. I am talking about the time element.

Mr. SCOTT. I can tell the Senator about another mutual problem, and that is mass transportation, in which we are both interested. The Secretary of Transportation has one theory about how it should be financed. Some Members of the Congress have another theory. In working out the proper and final way to fund an enormous and a much needed project of this kind, it of necessity takes time. So the administration comes up with one way of doing it; Congress comes up with another; we have to decide which way is better before we take up the final legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have only a few remarks to make. First, I want to thank the distinguished minority leader for his temperateness in what he had to say.

Second, I want to say that he is correct when he states in effect that President Nixon was not responsible for the war in Vietnam, but that it became a part of his inheritance when he became President of the United States on January 20 of this year.

Third, I have always said, and will continue to say, that I do not intend to oppose just for the sake of opposition. When I oppose, I would hope I have something constructive to offer. I just do not believe in creating a Donnybrook merely for the purpose of getting a newspaper headline or creating a lot of speculation in the press and in public print.

Fourth, and lastly I ask unanimous consent that the message—a good one—sent by the President of the United States to the Congress last weekend be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the nine months since inauguration, a number of issues have arisen clearly calling for the Congress and the Administration to work together.

One such issue was the extension of the surtax, where our economic security was involved. Another was authority to build the Safeguard ballistic missile defense, where the national safety was the issue. On both occasions, when the time came to be counted. Congress subordinated partisan concerns and voted the country's interest.

The continuance of this working partnership between a Congress heavily Democratic and a Republican Administration, on occasions where great issues are involved, is imperative for the good of our country. I hope this partnership will survive the "spirit of party" that grows more evident weekly in the national capital. Yet, in recent days, the call to partisan combat has grown more compelling.

I am aware that members of the Administration have criticized the Democratic-controlled Congress for "dragging its feet" in the enactment of legislation, for holding hearings thus far on only half the Administration proposals before it, for having enacted but a single appropriations bill for fiscal 1970, a full quarter of the way through the fiscal year. From Capitol Hill there have come similar charges—that the Administration has been laggard in proposing legislation, that the Executive Departments have been slow in giving the Congress the reports it has requested, that some of the most far-reaching Administration proposals have only lately been sent to the Congress, and so, cannot be acted upon by the end of the year.

If a working partnership between men of differing philosophies and different parties is to continue, then candor on both sides is required. There may be merit in both charges; neither the Democratic Congress nor the Republican Administration is without fault for the delay of vital legislation.

But, in my view the American people are not interested in political posturing between the Executive Branch and Capitol Hill. We are co-equal branches of government, elected not to maneuver for partisan advantage, but to work together to find hopeful answers to problems that confound the people all of us serve.

Both the President and Congress have been commissioned by the same American people, for a limited time, to achieve objectives upon which the great majority agree. For our part, we are willing to travel more than half-way to work with Congress to accomplish what needs to be done. The time for staking out political claims will come soon enough.

Let us resolve, therefore, to make the legislative issue of the 1970 campaign the question of who deserves greater credit for the 91st Congress' record of accomplishment, not which of us should be held accountable because it did nothing. The country is not interested in what we say, but in what we do—let us roll up our sleeves and go to work. Before us are urgent legislative priorities.

The legislative program of this Administration differs fundamentally from that of previous administrations. We do not seek more and more of the same. We were not elected to pile new resources and manpower on the top of old programs. We were elected to initiate an era of change. We intend to begin a decade of government reform such as this nation has not witnessed in half a century. Some months ago, a Washington columnist wrote in some pessimism that if ours is not to be an age of revolution then it must become an age of reform. That is the watchword of this administration: *REFORM.*

REFORM OF THE DRAFT. I have asked Congress to make the most extensive changes in the way we select young men for military service since the draft became an accepted feature of American life. We have the administrative power—and we will exercise it if Congress fails to act—to make far-reaching reforms in the selective service system, reducing the period of prime vulnerability for young Americans from seven years to 12 months. However, we need Congressional approval to shift from the inequitable requirement of choosing the "oldest first" to the more just method of random selection. I asked Congress five months ago for this power; I ask again today. Basic fairness to our young people is the prime reason for this recommendation. I see no reason why this vital piece of legislation cannot be enacted *now*.

REFORM OF THE WELFARE SYSTEM. Last summer I asked Congress to make the most sweeping changes in the American system of welfare since the beginning of the New Deal. Last week legislation went to Congress outlining the proposal I have made for a new family assistance system to replace the demeaning and bankrupt system that now exists.

Under the present system, sometimes a father must desert his wife and children to make them eligible for benefits. Under the present system, some mothers with three children must survive with only $39 a month for the entire family to live on.

The family assistance system is built on a different set of principles. It provides incentives for families to stay together. It provides economic rewards for men and women on welfare who enter training programs and search out jobs. It provides a floor under income that assures the minimum necessary for food and clothing and shelter.

The present system has led this country into a morass. It has laid a heavier and heavier burden on the American taxpayer. It has loaded the relief rolls with more and more families even in times of rising prosperity and low unemployment. I ask that Congress begin hearings on the new family assistance system at once. The welfare system should be abandoned as quickly as we can discard it and a new system established in its place.

REFORM OF THE TAX CODE. In April I recommended to Congress the most comprehensive set of tax reforms in many years. Subsequently the House of Representatives responded with an even more far-reaching proposal of its own. The national momentum behind tax reform—to make the code more fair and equitable, to shift part of the burden from those who have borne too much for too long to the shoulders of others who have not carried their fair share—must not be allowed to dribble away while a partisan wrangle goes on over who deserves the political credit. We will give Congress as much assistance and as many hours of labor as it requires to enact extensive and responsible reform in this calendar year.

I do ask, however, that Congress, in acting on this major reform, not compromise this administration's effort to combat the most unjust tax of all, inflation. Specifically, I ask that Congress not convert this historic tax reform legislation into a sharp tax reduction that would unbalance the Federal budget and neutralize our campaign to halt the rising cost of living. I ask again that Congress repeal the seven percent investment tax credit, and extend for another six months the income tax surcharge at one-half the present rate. To fail to take these steps would be an abdication by Congress of its vital role in controlling inflation.

REVENUE REFORM. For the first time in the history of this government, we have recommended a national policy of permanent sharing of the Federal income tax revenues with the States and lesser political units in the country. For years, political students and leaders have contended that governments at the State, county and local levels have lost their creativity and lost the capacity to respond because they lack access to the great source of growing revenues available to the Federal government. I have recommended that Congress set aside a rising portion of Federal revenues each year and transmit them directly back to the States and communities to spend as they see fit and not as Washington sees fit. This concept has been debated by both parties and recommended by their majorities for years. The time has come to move it off the plain of discussion to make it a reality. I urge the Congress to move.

POSTAL REFORM. For more than a decade the American people have complained increasingly of the rising cost of postal service accompanied step by step with declining service. Today the United States postal system is inferior to that of many countries of Western Europe; it is grossly inadequate to the needs of our society. The nation has known this for years. I have acted in that knowledge—recommending that the existing postal system be scrapped, that a government-owned corporation replace the United States Post Office, that business principles replace partisanship in its management, and that merit and performance—rather than political affiliation—be the new criteria for appointment and advancement. Three years ago this month the Chicago postal system, a microcosm of the national system, collapsed under a flood of mail. The rapid delivery of mail is not a partisan issue. Distinguished leaders, of both parties, have endorsed the precise reform I have recommended. There is no reason why the Congress cannot enact the most complete reform of the United States Post Office in the nation's history—by the close of this session.

I am aware of the setback which postal reform sustained in a House Committee on October 8. That action must be reversed. I shall persist in behalf of both the taxpayers and the mail users in this country to press for this urgently needed reform. I still believe enactment should come by the end of this session of the Ninety-First Congress.

Here I must again urge responsible congressional action, and promptly, on the proposed increase in postal rates for all three classes of mail. When this Administration entered office in January, it confronted a deficit in the postal budget for fiscal year 1970 of more than $1.2 billion. We are already three months into that fiscal year—and this deficit is being underwritten by the taxpayers, rather than the users of the postal service, who should rightly bear the cost. I recognize that such a measure is hardly a political delight. Yet it is required in the interest of equity and fiscal integrity. I request the Congress to face up to this task.

MANPOWER REFORM. The history of the 1960s chronicles an intense political debate that has resulted in the old centralism of the thirties losing converts to the new federalism of the seventies. More and more progressive men in both parties have become convinced from the failures of programs run from Washington that important areas of government decision-making must be returned to the regions and locales where the problems exist.

I have attempted to take that conclusion out of the forum of debate and into the arena of action—Congress. I have recommended that management of a Federal program—the multi-billion dollar manpower training program—be consolidated, and turned over in a three-stage operation to the States and communities to run in a way that fits the needs of the immediate areas involved. No reform of this magnitude has been attempted since centralism became the dominant national trend at the depths of the depression. This recommendation represents the beginning of a revitalized federalism, the gradual transfer of greater power and responsibility for the making of government decisions to governments closest to the people. I urge swift Congressional action.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM. I have requested an across-the-board increase of ten percent in Social Security benefits to compensate elderly Americans for the losses they are suffering because of an inflation they could do nothing either to prevent or avoid. In addition, I have proposed a new reform, an escalator in Social Security to insure that benefits will rise correspondingly whenever the cost of living goes up. When this reform is enacted never again will those Americans least able to afford it be made to bear the brunt of inflation. These necessary steps can and should be taken by Congress before the end of this year.

One word of caution. I know the political temptations here. Why not balloon the benefits now, far above 10 percent, for political rewards in 1970? I remind the Congress that it is long since time that we stopped the political over-reactions which fuel the inflation that robs the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes. I urge Congress to hold to this ten percent figure—and let the new escalator protect older Americans against the possibility of future inflation.

A second reform I have proposed is to alter the system of social security to encourage and reward the workers who want to go on working past age 65—rather than discourage them. I ask Congress to enact this measure without delay.

REFORM OF THE GRANT-IN-AID SYSTEM. Among the first major pieces of legislation I asked of Congress was authority to make uniform the requirements for participation in many grant-in-aid programs that have proliferated in the last five years. If we are granted the power to draw these programs together, to group them by function—setting far more simple regulations—then States and communities will participate more and Congress' original purposes will be better served. We need that authority *now*. I know of no reason for delay.

ELECTORAL REFORM. While I originally favored other methods of reforming the electoral college system, I have strongly endorsed the direct popular election plan approved by the House. I hope the Senate will concur so that final favorable action can be completed before the end of this session. This must be done if we are to have this needed reform amended to the Constitution in time for the presidential election of 1972.

D.C. GOVERNMENT REFORM. For years there has been broad support for granting the people of Washington, D.C. the same right to Congressional representation other Americans have always prized, and the right to conduct their public business themselves. The Federal city has been a federal colony far too long. Months ago I presented to Congress a program to bring about the orderly transfer of political power to the people of this community. I recommended a constitutional amendment giving the District of Columbia at least one representative in the House and such additional representatives as Congress may approve, and providing for the possibility of two United States Senators. I urged Congress further to grant the city one non-voting Congressional representative in the interim, and recommended creation of a commission to prepare and present to Congress and the President a program to improve the efficiency and competence of the District Government—looking to the day of complete self-government. Favorable action has been taken by the Senate. I ask that this work be completed before the end of the year.

OEO REFORM. I have provided the Office of Economic Opportunity with a new director, a new structure, and added responsibilities

as the research and development arm of the nation's effort to deal with the problems of the poor. OEO is now strengthening its present operating programs, including the Community Action Agencies, VISTA, Legal Services, Neighborhood Health Centers, Family Planning, Emergency Food, Rural, Older Persons, Indian and Migrant Programs. In addition, there is new emphasis on research, the evaluation of existing Federal social programs, and developing and testing new approaches in community and economic development, manpower and education, to assist the poor to move into the economic life of the nation. I have asked for a two-year extension of the existing legislation, without crippling amendments. I believe that a reformed OEO has a major and continuing role to play in our national life. Here again, there is no need or justification for further delay.

In recent years the Federal Government has suffered a precipitous decline in public confidence. The reason can be found in the chronic gap that exists between the publicity and promise attendant to the launching of a new Federal program—and that program's eventual performance. If confidence in government is to be restored, the gap must be closed.

This is the purpose of the foregoing proposals and great goal of this Administration—not to establish some new arithmetical record for the number of programs proposed, but to do more than other Administrations have done—to devise new approaches, to make the worthy old programs work, and to make old institutions responsive. It is for this that we prize the mechanics and engineers of government who retool and improve its machinery as much as we do the planners and the idea men who develop new programs and new agencies. There is little publicity and less glamor in the labor of the mechanics and engineers of government but, with billions in tax dollars invested in scores and scores of ongoing Federal programs, the need is certainly greater. Let us together make government's performance and responsiveness more commensurate with its size.

REFORM OF FOREIGN AID. Our foreign aid program, sent to Congress in May, differs from earlier programs in three significant ways. First, it would place greater emphasis on technical assistance, especially in the areas of agriculture, education, and family planning, where the return would be greatest when measured in terms of national and human development. Second, the new program would create an Overseas Private Investment Corporation to provide a greater thrust for the channeling of private investment to the low-income countries. Third, it would increase the share of our assistance contributed through multilateral institutions.

I know of the economic miracles which foreign aid has helped create in Western Europe and in parts of Asia. I know also that our program is far from perfect. With this in mind, I have recently appointed a Presidential Task Force on International Development, charged with proposing new approaches to aid for the 1970s.

One fundamental question must be faced as Congress prepares to vote on this issue: will we in the United States live out our lives in comparative affluence, while denying reasonable help to those who are our neighbors in the world community and who are struggling to help themselves achieve a better life? To enable us to answer this question positively, I have requested $2.7 billion—the smallest request in the history of the U.S. aid program but an amount vitally needed to maintain our relationship with the developing world.

In addition to the reforms already cited, I have made other recommendations that call for new commitments by the Federal government, and offer more hopeful avenues of progress than the paths of the past.

Specifically, I have asked Congress to:

—establish a national computer Job Bank, which would enable the unemployed and the employer to come together through a computer matching system. The bank would have "branches" in every major labor market in the country. No longer would men have to go without work solely because they did not know where to find jobs.

—commit this country to the most extensive improvement of the Nation's air facilities in history. Under this program, the annual Federal appropriation for improving air facilities will rise from $93 million a year—the average of the last decade—to $250 million annually over the next decade. I have proposed further aid for airport development of $2.5 billion in Federal funds in the next ten years to be matched dollar-for-dollar by the States and local governments. This will mean an added $5 billion in funds for airport development. It will mean a running start on the national effort to build for the doubling of airline traffic expected by 1975 and its tripling by 1980.

—commit this country to the redevelopment of the nation's deteriorating public transportation system by providing an unprecedented measure of Federal support. In the six-year period ending with fiscal 1970, some $800 million will have been authorized by Congress to aid the nation's deteriorating public transit industry. I have proposed raising that commitment to $3.1 billion over the next five years and to a total of $10 billion over the next twelve.

—enact the most extensive improvements in the Federal-State unemployment system in a decade, with coverage extended to an additional 4.8 million workers, mostly low-income, with an automatic extension of benefits to workers during times of high unemployment.

—enact the strongest mine health and safety bill in history, one which empowers the Secretary of the Interior to upgrade the health and safety standards for coal mines as the technology develops.

—establish a national occupational health and safety board, with power to set standards to protect workers.

—empowers the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to bring suit in a Federal District Court to enforce federal laws against discrimination.

—ban literacy tests as a prerequisite for voting throughout the United States.

NEW INITIATIVES

THE HUNGRY. For many years in this richest of societies, we have heard rumors of malnourished children and hungry men and women. Now we know these rumors are true. This realization has prompted us to a commitment—that we eliminate every vestige of hunger and malnutrition from America. I have asked Congress to help us assure that every American family can have a nutritionally complete diet; I have asked that the poorest members of our national community be provided with food stamps free of cost.

The Senate has shown a willingness to join in this commitment and has acted with dispatch. I urge the House to move so as not to prolong any further the day when the ancient curse of malnutrition and hunger is eliminated in this most modern of nations.

POPULATION. There is a widely-recognized correlation between population growth and poverty in the under-developed nations of the world. I have asked Congress to support our endorsement of those individuals and organizations seeking voluntary answers to this global question in other lands.

To approach this question as it applies at home, I have called on Congress to create a national commission to undertake now a study of how the nation is to provide for the 100 million new Americans expected before the turn of the century.

Beyond this, I have asked that a new philosophy become American government policy. We will interfere with no American's freedom of choice; we will infringe upon no one's religious convictions; but we shall not deny to any American woman the family planning assistance she may desire but cannot afford. That is the goal I ask Congress to support.

THE CONTROL OF CRIME

There is no greater need in this free society than the restoration of the individual American's freedom from violence in his home and on the streets of his city or town. Control and reduction of crime are among the first and constant concerns of this Administration. But we can do little more unless and until Congress provides more tools to do the job. No crisis is more urgent in our society. No subject has been the matter of more legislative requests from this Administration. Yet, not a single one of our major recommendations on crime has been acted upon favorably. I have not even received yet the budget appropriation for the Department of Justice for this fiscal year which is three months old. In light of the rising crime statistics in the country—and in the nation's capital—I again call upon Congress to become a full-fledged ally in this national campaign.

ORGANIZED CRIME. To intensify the national effort against organized crime, I have asked for an arsenal of new legal weapons:

—a doubling of existing resources for the organized crime effort;

—authority for Justice Department agents to enter any community and shut down large-scale gambling operations;

—a modern general witness immunity statute under which witnesses in Federal criminal cases could be compelled to testify under threat of a prison sentence for contempt;

—finally, because organized crime would shrivel up without its enormous gambling resources, and because illegal gambling on a large scale cannot go on without cooperation of corrupt law enforcements, I have asked Congress to make corruption of local authorities who are tied in with such gambling operations a Federal crime. I must stress the great urgency of these measures. Let the Congress act—*now.*

D.C. CRIME. To deal with the increase in crime in the District of Columbia I have asked for an expansion and strengthening of the entire system of law enforcement and criminal justice, including a fundamental reorganization of the courts. I have stressed the urgent need for more police, more judges, more prosecutors, more courtroom space, a new public defender's office, better penal and rehabilitation facilities and reform in the procedures for dealing with juvenile offenders. Crime in the District of Columbia continues to rise to new records with each month. We cannot contain or control it with existing resources; we need more men and money; we need a speedier trial system and, as important as any other measure, the power to keep hard-core criminal repeaters in the District of Columbia off the streets, so they are not committing five and six crimes before they are ever brought to trial. The Congress should act—*now.*

NARCOTICS. In the Federal effort against the illicit narcotics trade, I have submitted a major revision of all Federal narcotics laws and requested more men and money to deal with a problem that long ago outstripped the capacity of government at every level. Existing manpower and resources are stretched to their elastic limits—they are demonstrably inadequate. We have to have the cooperation of Congress to attack this terrible problem. Let's get at it—*now.*

PORNOGRAPHY. To prevent the use of the nation's postal system for the mailing of unsolicited sex-oriented materials to

families that do not want the material and to children to whom it might do psychological harm. I offered three legislative proposals that will protect American citizens from the barrages of the filth peddlers, and will also be consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court interpreting the First Amendment. These bills are still in Congress. I ask that they be promptly enacted.

These are among my major legislative proposals in these first nine months in office. I believe they speak directly to the needs of a nation in distress. I can see no legitimate reason why—with good will and cooperation between us—we cannot make the great majority of these urgently needed programs law before the end of the year. We should have all of them—as well as the others now pending—on the statute books well before the Ninety-First Congress enters the history books.

To that end, I again pledge the cooperation of this Administration.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1969.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED RAILROAD SAFETY AND RESEARCH ACT OF 1969

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe rules, regulations and performance and other standards as he finds necessary for all areas of railroad safety and to conduct railroad safety research (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED HEALTH COST EFFECTIVENESS AMENDMENTS OF 1969

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a number of cost controls under the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the cost reduction and management improvement program in selected departments and agencies, dated October 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF CLAIMS SETTLED BY THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing claims settled by the Administration under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO COUNTERFEITING OF POSTAGE METER STAMPS OR OTHER IMPROPER USE OF METERED MAIL SYSTEM

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MONTOYA, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 13763. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-479).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

H.R. 11702. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-480).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TOWER):

S. 3038. A bill to authorize appropriations for expenses of the U.S. section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 3039. A bill to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the Pan American Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. DOLE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr MUSKIE:

S. 3040. A bill for the relief of Waclaw Janusz Ezeszotarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVEL:

S. 3041. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVEL (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 3042. A bill to provide for a study and evaluation of the air and water pollution and other environmental effects of underground uses of nuclear energy for excavation and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAVEL when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3043. A bill to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3044. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3045. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to modify the provisions relating to discretionary grants to the States, to limit the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to one block grant per State per year from 85 percent funds, and to provide authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 3038—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO COMMISSION FOR BORDER DEVELOPMENT AND FRIENDSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to introduce a bill today on behalf of myself and many other Senators who wish to extend the life of an organization whose continued existence is vital to preserving the special relationship between the United States and our great sister nation to the south, Mexico.

Our bill will provide the statutory authority that is necessary to enable our Government to continue its participation in the joint United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship. The friends of this organization call it CODAF, and that is how I will refer to it throughout these remarks.

CODAF was founded at the highest levels of the Governments of Mexico and the United States. It developed out of an agreement issued by the Presidents of the two inter-American countries following their meeting in April of 1966. At that time they decided the two nations would create a joint commission to find ways by which they could "improve the relations between the frontier cities of both countries" and also "elevate the life of those who live in the border region."

Pursuant to this agreement, two sections were set up by the respective Governments and the Commission got underway in July of 1967. The U.S. Section is composed of the Chairman and 10 Commissioners who are appointed from the Assistant Secretary level of eight major departments and three executive offices.

In addition to the Commissioners, there is a small staff serving in Washington and in three field offices located close to the citizens of the border region.

During its 2 years of existence, the U.S. Section has been funded by contributions and services from its member agencies. This means of funding was shut off, however, last year with the passage of Public Law 90-479. This law bars the financing of executive commissions unless they possess some kind of enabling legislation.

Thus, CODAF is without authority to receive further funding under present law and unless there is prompt action to remedy this situation, it will simply have to fold up.

Mr. President, to allow CODAF to disappear would be sheer folly and blindness. The failure to authorize a renewed charter for this organization would be to renege on the commitment made by the Chief Executive of the United States to the American citizens living on the border, would discourage the formation of the very useful parallel programs of border communities, would permit a large

number of problems to stand unsettled without any joint forum for the interchange of ideas, and would seriously injure U.S. efforts to keep our relations "simpatico."

Mr. President, in an earlier speech in the Senate on this subject, I traced the brief history of CODAF and summarized the very important role it plays on the inter-American stage. I mentioned the fact that it is charged with elevating the economic, social and cultural life of the peoples in the border area—and I would like to emphasize that this is no small matter.

The border between our two nations stretches across some 2,000 miles of territory and encompasses over 5 million persons.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the primary achievement of CODAF has been its success in stimulating the people on the border to focus their attention—even more than they have in the past—on developing and implementing programs for cooperative action, based on joint community needs, as voiced in the community, to solve their problems.

This has been achieved through the working groups of CODAF which hold meetings in the border communities where they listen to the local citizens. In turn, the full Commission receives recommendations from the working groups before approving its own suggestions for border programs.

Speaking as a person who has lived on the border all his life, I want to vouch for the fact that CODAF has done an outstanding job in such a short time. In fact, to my own mind, it is deserving of a permanent legislative base.

But, in order to assure that its difficulty will receive the earliest possible consideration in the most favorable light, we are offering a bill to extend its term for only the current fiscal year. This should be susceptible of receiving the broadest possible support by those who may wish to review the specific features which they would like to see incorporated in a permanent-type statute.

Our measure would authorize a sum of not more than $362,000 to cover the administrative costs of the U.S. Section for the 1970 fiscal year. This conforms with the bare-bones request made by the U.S. Chairman.

Mr. President, in introducing the bill I certainly shall not claim any pride of authorship. The text of the bill is identical to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL.

We are submitting a Senate version of the proposal in order to generate a movement in this Chamber by those who support CODAF. I was pleased to submit a statement to the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs endorsing the measure when it was before that group—it now has been reported favorably by the full House Foreign Affairs Committee—and it is an honor for me to join today with my distinguished colleagues in the introduction of a Senate companion to that measure.

Mr. President, I urge that this measure be given prompt consideration in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I hope that Members from all regions of the country will join us in the cause of keeping CODAF alive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of my statement the text of the bill we are introducing, the Executive communications by Presidents Nixon and Johnson relative to their support of CODAF and a summary I have prepared of 16 major accomplishments of this organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the communications, the summary, and the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3038), to authorize appropriations for expenses of the United States section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3038

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $362,000 for the fiscal year 1970 for the expenses of the United States section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, which Commission was established by an exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico in November and December 1966, pursuant to a meeting between the Presidents of the two countries in April 1966.

The material furnished by Mr. GOLDWATER is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 10, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On December 3, 1966, the United States completed an agreement with Mexico to create a "Joint Commission between the United States of America and the United Mexican States to study the manner in which the standard of living of United States and Mexican communities in areas along the border between our two countries could be raised by means of cooperative action." It was further agreed that the salaries of the Commissioners and their advisers would be paid by the Government by which they were appointed and other expenses of the Commission would be divided equally between the two Governments.

This agreement, reached through an exchange of diplomatic notes, was made in accordance with an agreement expressed by the then President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, and the President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, following their meeting in Mexico City in April 1966.

Subsequently, President Diaz Ordaz has on numerous occasions expressed his continued interest in what has become the "United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship." In addition, the Government of Mexico, through its Secretary of Foreign Relations Antonio Carrillo Flores and other high-ranking officials, has indicated that Government's desire to continue with the work of this Joint Commission.

I, too, favor the continuance of the Commission. Numerous local officials in the border area have expressed a strong support for the Commission, as well as such prestigious private institutions as chambers of commerce and the American Institute of Architects.

In the short 2 years this Commission has been operating, much groundwork has been laid and some very concrete accomplishments give us insight into the future potential of this Commission. To stop now would not only be damaging to the future development of the border area, but it would result in a waste of the time, effort, and money already invested in studying the problems of the area.

The proposed resolution which the State Department sent to Congress on May 21 of this year and which was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 22, has not been acted upon.

Should the Congress fail to authorize this Commission to continue, it would amount to a unilateral revocation of a commitment we have made to the Government and people of Mexico. We would also be remiss in our obligations and responsibilities to our own people in the economically depressed border area.

For these reasons, I strongly urge prompt action on the proposed authorizing resolution and provision of sufficient funds to cover the modest expenses of the U.S. Section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

JULY 2, 1968.

DEAR MR.———: Congress now has an opportunity to reaffirm the abiding friendship that is maintained between the United States and her neighboring sister republic, Mexico.

Prompt action will also encourage and stimulate the efforts of the two nations to improve the opportunities of the people living on both sides of the 2,000-mile long border.

The bill would establish the United States Section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship.

This bill would give Congressional recognition and endorsement to the April 1966 decision of the President of the United States and the President of Mexico to set up the joint Commission and would also provide a statutory foundation for the activities of the United States Section of that Commission. The United States Section now includes representatives at the Assistant Secretary level or above of nine Federal agencies and the Chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs.

I met with President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz in Mexico City in April 1966 to review the problems along our border. We decided then to establish a Commission to study ways and means of improving relations between border communities and of elevating the economic, social and cultural life of the people in the entire border area. Our decision was formalized through an exchange of notes on November 30 and December 3, 1966.

The first session of the Commission was held in Mexico City in October 1967. Fourteen working groups were established to explore and find solutions for the primary problems facing both countries in the border area. Another meeting of the Commission was held in Washington, D.C., in May of this year to review progress of the working groups and give them further directions.

Already there have been concrete results from this effort. Some of these are as follows:

1. A formal mechanism for cooperative action has been created to deal with future emergencies or natural disasters in the border area.

2. Pilot joint community service centers are being established on both sides of the border to provide basic community services, including mobile out-reach services, to the lower income groups of both countries.

3. Agreement was reached to establish a joint demonstration skill training center to assist the unemployed and underemployed

on both sides of the border and improve their capability to obtain employment.

4. An industrialization study is now underway to determine the possibility of creating new industries and jobs on the U.S. side of the border in order to relieve unemployment and to help expand the tax base of border communities.

5. The already excellent working relationships in the field of health are being further strengthened, especially in the fields of mother and child nutrition and of training auxiliary health personnel.

6. A joint workshop was held in Laredo-Nuevo Laredo to discuss mutual urban problems and to seek mutual solutions. Similar workshops are planned for other twin cities on the California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas border with Mexico.

These are a few examples of the accomplishments of the Commission, which has provided a focal point for the interested agencies of both governments in coordinating their efforts to solve the problems of the border area.

When the Commission was first formed, the United States suggested it carry the name "Border Development Commission." Mexico accepted this, but suggested that the word "Friendship" be included in the title. Indeed, the strengthening of friendly ties not only between the officials and technicians of the two governments, but also between the people of our two countries, has been a primary aim and achievement of the Commission's activities to date.

The passage of this bill will be a concrete indication to the Mexican Government of the full backing for this endeavor by the United States Government. I urge prompt action by the Congress on this legislation.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

SIXTEEN MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF CODAF

1. CODAF drafted the first formal agreement ever entered into between Mexico and the United States dealing with cooperative action in case of emergencies and natural disasters in the border area. This agreement was put into effect at the second joint meeting of CODAF.

2. For the first time in history, local, State, and Federal technicians from both sides of the border have been brought together to consider the twin border cities in a "single community" context. The Urban Development Working Group of CODAF has sponsored successful meetings in four of the twin border cities, and five more joint urban development workshops are scheduled.

3. The United States Section of CODAF has assisted in the development of a pilot program in which 80 "roundhouses," to sell for a maximum of $5,000, are being constructed in Del Rio, Texas. The Mexican Section has expressed interest in this approach to obtaining low-cost housing in border cities and is considering a similar undertaking on its side of the border.

4. CODAF has stimulated discussions with Mexico which have led to collaboration on the forthcoming American and Mexican 1970 census to guarantee collection of comparable data.

5. The Transportation Working Group of CODAF has initiated dscussions—

(A) for the development of joint transportation planning in the Brownsville-Matamoros area,

(B) for the location of a new bridge in Laredo,

(C) for the coordination of plans for building highways in the border area, and

(D) for the adoption of a uniform system of traffic signs in the border area.

6. The United States Section has obtained the publication of a major study relative to the special economic and social characteristics of the border as they relate to industrialization. This report, entitled "Industrial and Employment Potential of the United States-Mexico Border," was published in December, 1968. For its part, Mexico has a program for industrialization of the border zone well underway.

7. CODAF is about to achieve a significant breakthrough by arranging the establishment of a joint labor market and skill survey all along the border. As the first step towards this goal, the Manpower and Labor Working Group has initiated a pilot survey that has been conducted on both sides of the border at the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua area.

8. CODAF has proposed an imaginative scheme for the designation of a network of roads and highways along both sides of the border, to be known as the "Border Friendship Route." All four of our border States have approved designation of this route and the implementation of this concept is now being considered by the Tourism Working Group.

9. The Education Working Group scheduled a joint conference on the accreditation of university level studies which was held at the twin border cities of Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua-El Paso, Texas, in April, 1969. Approximately 30 educators from each country, representing universities, college accrediting associations, and the two Governments attended the conference.

10. The Education Working Group is seeking to inaugurate a pilot project for the exchange of high school language teachers between the cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

11. A Binational Sanitary Landfill Project has been established for Nogales, Arizona-Nogales Sonora. This project originated with the Public Health Working Group, was approved by the Mexican authorities and has been funded by the U.S. Public Health Service.

12. The Cultural Activities Working Group has recommended that CODAF promote conferences, workshops, and competition in the arts in the border area, and that two pilot cultural projects be established in twin border cities. United States and Mexican authorities have already set in motion the initial steps which will lead towards the creation of a national committee in each country, and local coordinating groups in the border communities, to act as mechanisms for carrying out joint cultural programs.

13. A CODAF-sponsored pilot project has been established for Laredo, Texas, by which five mobile trailer vans devoted to theatrical productions, recreation, educational and cultural films, history, and health services, will make scheduled visits to neighborhood centers in and around Laredo, to rural communities in Webb County and Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, across the border.

14. A similar CODAF-supported binational project is the Calexico, California, Community Services Project. This project includes a multi-service cultural unit, a vocational training electronics unit, and a mobile health services unit. As its contribution to this project, Mexico has purchased $83,000 worth of industrial equipment for CECATI, a vocational training institute in Mexicali, Baja California, which will be made available to U.S. trainees.

15. An adult education demonstration project, with CODAF participation, is in operation in a five-county area of Arizona. This project utilizes radio and a closed circuit mobile television unit to bring practical education courses to people in a widespread rural area.

16. CODAF has sponsored two annual "Border Beauty and Friendship Days," which were held on May 18, 1968, and April 19, 1969. The results of these events have been so encouraging that both United States and Mexican officials have concluded that border beautification efforts should be carried out on a continuing basis and that the day shall be established as an annual ceremony.

S. 3039—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN HIGHWAYS AS THE "PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY"

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which will neither ask the Federal Government to authorize nor appropriate any of its funds. My bill today is a promotion of good will with our neighbors to the south.

This proposal will provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the Pan American Highway.

The highway, which already crosses the United States from Canada to the Mexican border, largely follows U.S. Highway 81 with some minor variances. If created, it would connect with the Pan American Highway which begins at Laredo, Tex., and extends to Panama.

In the past several years there has been growing interest in several Plains States concerning the development of an intercontinental highway linking Canada, the United States, and Latin American countries. Organizations in many States have been working in unison for years to promote this idea, with a convincing argument being made on the basis of economic benefits to be derived from its creation, as well as various other advantages.

Mr. President, several of my colleagues from States through which this hemispheric good will highway would pass, have joined me as cosponsors of this proposal: Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, Senator MUNDT of South Dakota, Senator BURDICK of North Dakota, Senator TOWER of Texas and Senator HARRIS of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 3039) to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway"; introduced by Mr. DOLE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purpose of any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States, those highways which extend from Laredo, Texas, to the point where United States Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada and which are listed in subsection (b) of this section shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway".

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the highways which shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway", and the cities between which such highways extended, are as follows:

Highways: Interstate System Highways 35,

35E, 35W, 235, and 29; United States Highways 81, 77, and 377; and Nebraska Highway 92.

Extending from south to north between the following cities: In the State of Texas, the following cities: Laredo, San Antonio, Austin, Waco, Fort Worth, Dallas, Denton, and Gainesville; in the State of Oklahoma, the following cities: Ardmore, Pauls Valley, Oklahoma City, and Guthrie; in the State of Kansas, the following cities: Wichita, Newton, Lindsborg, Concordia, and Belleville; and in the State of Nebraska, the following cities: Geneva, York, Columbus, and Norfolk; in the State of South Dakota, the following cities: Yankton, Madison, Brookings, and Watertown; in the State of North Dakota, the following cities: Wahpeton, Fargo, Grand Forks, Drayton, and Pembina.

(2) If more than one of the highways listed in paragraph (1) extend between any two points between any two of the cities listed in that paragraph which are not separated by any other city listed in that paragraph, the Secretary of Commerce shall designate which of those highways shall be included in the group of highways to be collectively known as the "Pan American Highway".

S. 3042—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A STUDY AND EVALUATION OF THE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF UNDERGROUND USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I introduce today (on behalf of myself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MUSKIE) for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the study and evaluation of the air and water pollution and other environmental effects of underground uses of nuclear energy for excavation and other purposes.

This measure would create a 15-man study commission composed of leading scientific experts. They would evaluate the environmental risks attendant upon the use of underground nuclear energy and report their findings to the President and the Congress within a year.

The people of our Nation are more concerned about the environment than they have ever been. We in the Congress are continually investigating the known and suspected hazards related to automobile exhausts, industrial wastes, pesticides, and numerous other areas of pollution. Certainly we should give no less study to a pollutant—radioactivity—that is more deadly than all other scourges, and a menace which, once created by man, cannot be destroyed.

Another area of environmental danger related to underground testing is that of the seismic effects of the tests.

If there is an area of agreement among the scientific community concerning underground nuclear testing it is that no one really knows what effects such tests have on the earth's crust. The larger tests now being planned by the Atomic Energy Commission in my State of Alaska, and in Nevada and possibly other locations around the Nation present a risk to life and property. No one in a responsible position in our Government or who is a recognized leader in any scientific discipline can say with assurance what the risk will be. We are tampering in a field that we know little about. And the consequences of failure could be enormous.

This bill is timely in that it attacks a problem which is presently before this Congress in various forms—environmental hazards. This bill attacks areas of concern upon which far more study and evaluation is needed. The pressure for broadening the underground test program and increasing the applications for nuclear energy is intense. How will the President and the Congress make such decision without adequate scientific testimony.

An independent review by eminent scientists who are not presently on the payroll of the Federal Government and who are not otherwise contracted to the Government in this particular field of endeavor, would provide us with such an evaluation of the potential hazards and hopefully produce some solid ideas for guidelines and remedies.

None of us wants to unnecessarily impair the national defense effort. None of us wants to withhold from our society the practical benefits that nuclear energy can possibly produce. But neither do we want to look back 5 or 10 years from now and recognize that our decisions presented civilization with great dangers, that we were responsible for endangering man and his environment for lack of adequate study and evaluation before such decisions were made.

I think this is a modest proposal that could produce significant benefits and I would urge its early review by the Public Works Committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce this measure and urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3042) to provide for a study and evaluation of the air and water pollution and other environmental effects of underground uses of nuclear energy for excavation and other purposes; introduced by Mr. GRAVEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) on his creative initiative and leadership in the effort to protect our Nation, and indeed the world, from the incalculable potential dangers involved in underground nuclear explosions. He has been at the forefront in expressing national concern over the possible disaster attendant to the recent nuclear test on Amchitka Island in Alaska. Today he has introduced a well-reasoned proposal for a Presidential Commission to examine and evaluate the risks to man and his environment of using nuclear energy beneath the earth's surface.

One of the features of this proposal which seems especially important, refers to the use of nuclear power to lower or eliminate natural barriers that separate different marine ecosystems, such as could occur in the event a new interoceanic canal were constructed between the Caribbean and the Pacific. It is essential that there be a full understanding of the ecological effects of such a proposed canal, particularly, what might happen to marine life when a new predatory species from one body of water invades and attacks vulnerable organisms in the other. The implications for the fishing industry raise a cautionary cry.

If time and the pressure of work permit, I would hope that Members of the Public Works Committee could conduct field examinations of how this and other proposed applications of nuclear energy could adversely affect or endanger our environment.

I am gratified to join with the Senator from Alaska, as a cosponsor of this bill. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works to which the bill has been referred, I assure my diligent colleague that I will give it priority on the committee agenda. In consultations with Senator GRAVEL, a member of our committee, I have indicated that the bill will be referred to the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, under the able chairmanship of Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE. It is our expectation that public hearings will be scheduled in the near future.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) in introducing a bill to improve our understanding of the air, water, and land pollution problems associated with underground use of nuclear energy.

I share the Senator's concern with the environmental pollution which may be associated with the new technology of the underground uses of nuclear energy.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, of which I am chairman, has been concerned in the past with pollution associated with the release of radioactive material into the environment.

In 1966, the subcommittee held hearings on radioactive water pollution in the Colorado River Basin. We wanted to be sure that effective environmental control accompanied the greater handling and disposal of radioactive wastes as the peaceful uses of nuclear energy increased. The mines producing radioactive wastes now number nearly 400, and there are about 20 mills in operation.

The subcommittee has also held hearings on the extent to which environmental factors are considered in selecting powerplant sites, with particular emphasis on the ecological effects of the discharge of waste heat from nuclear powerplants into our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. When the production capacity of nuclear power facilities reaches 41.5 million kilowatts of power in 1974, the discharge of waste heat without proper treatment could be disastrous.

Early this month the United States set off a one-megaton underground explosion on the small Aleutian Island of Amchitka near the State of Alaska.

At the same time that the United States is conducting its underground nuclear testing program, the application of nuclear activity for excavation is being explored. One of the major goals of the Plowshare program is the excavation of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

The Atomic Energy Commission is studying the broader uses of the atom for the exploitation of new oil and gas re-

serves and for the construction of new harbors and channels.

It is clear from hearings on the subject that the subcommittee has already held that there is too little evidence available to the public about the environmental effects associated with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Too much of the information on environmental effects which is available has been developed by and for the Atomic Energy Commission rather than by independent, environmental agencies.

We have long passed the time when we should expect Federal agencies to evaluate adequately the environmental effects of their own activities.

The Commission proposed by Senator GRAVEL is one method of assuring independent evaluation. I would hope that the Office of Environmental Quality proposed in H.R. 4148 as passed by the Senate would assist in this function. Also, I would hope that existing Federal agencies with environmental expertise would participate in any decision which would tend to increase the release of radioactivity into the environment.

Because this bill would enable the Nation to develop a better understanding of the air, water, and land pollution questions which must be considered as we develop the full potential of the peaceful atom, the subcommittee will hold hearings on it at an early date. These hearings should be helpful in determining the most appropriate mechanism to review the potential air, water, and land pollution effects of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

S. 3043—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE RELEASE OF CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, legislation to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national and supplemental stockpiles. I am advised by the General Services Administration that this amount of cadmium, currently held by the Federal Government, is excess not now needed for stockpile purposes. It is, however, urgently needed for domestic industrial use not only in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but in plants throughout the Nation. The purpose of my bill is to provide the authorization which will enable the GSA to make this material available.

Cadmium, a byproduct derived almost entirely from the processing of zinc ores, is used in this country primarily for electroplating and metal finishing in such vital segments of the economy as the automobile, appliance, and aerospace industries. About 40 percent of U.S. cadmium consumption has this usage. Cadmium also is important in the production of chrome-color paints and pigments, and in the manufacture of special tools and dies, industrial molds, electrical fuses, and storage batteries.

The Metal Finishing Suppliers Association, Inc., and the National Association of Metal Finishers, national organizations with extensive corporate representation in Pennsylvania, have reported that employment in my Commonwealth, and elsewhere, is seriously threatened by the continuing cadmium shortage. My bill will help provide relief that is badly needed, and needed now.

Mr. President, this bill does not require the expenditure of Federal funds. All existing safeguards for the protection of the Federal Government against avoidable loss, and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against the avoidable disruption of their usual markets, would be preserved. Therefore, this bill would result in a return to the Treasury of the entire amount to be realized from the sale of this excess material, which is currently valued at approximately $14 million. Moreover, since the domestic cadmium industry now depends to a great extent on imported materials, the enactment of my bill would have a favorable impact on our balance-of-payments position.

Mr. President, I am persuaded that there is compelling need for action on this legislation. I urge prompt and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3043) to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3044—INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL OPEN BEACHES ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches, and for the orderly management and control thereof.

In recent years fences and barricades have blocked the public right to have access to our seas. We are becoming a landlocked people, fenced away from our own beautiful shores, unable to exercise the ancient right to enjoy our precious beaches. This tragic encroachment on the right to use our beaches has so shackled the public that today 95 percent of our recrational shoreline is barricaded to keep the people out.

Mr. President, we must preserve our beaches and protect the rights of the people to use them. These beautiful stretches of sand serve as the transition point between the seas and the land on which we live. They are natural resources, which rightfully belong to the people. Traditionally Americans have gone to the shoreline to relax, to play, to fish, to meditate, and to enjoy their beaches. Many have relied on these beaches for their access to the sea in order to support their families through commercial fishing. This ancient and well-established public right must be legally asserted and protected. That is the purpose of this bill.

It is my privilege and pleasure, therefore, to introduce the National Open Beaches Act, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by my distinguished colleague and fellow Texan, Congressman BOB ECKHARDT, of Houston. This bill declares that the public shall have free and unrestricted right to use the beaches of the United States and further declares that Congress shall constitutionally protect this right. It prohibits fences, barriers, and any other restraints on the use of the beaches by the public.

An important aspect of the bill is that it provides for a joint effort between the Federal Government and the States in protecting the public beaches. Several States, including Alabama, California, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, Oregon, and my own State of Texas have statutes concerning public right to the beaches. But it has been difficult for them to clearly establish that right in the courts. This bill defines that right and provides that the Federal Government will aid individual States in maintaining public jurisdiction.

The bill calls for a Federal-State partnership making available to any State interested in establishing a public right to the beaches the legal, geodetic, and historical research facilities of the Federal Government. States are encouraged through the bill to establish by law the public right to access to the beaches. The State is also encouraged to condemn rights-of-way, or easements, to those beaches which must be purchased from the landowner. The Federal Government will provide up to 75 percent of the costs of acquiring such easements, and may condemn the land so long as the State provide its 25 percent share of the funds.

Two important conditions must be considered concerning our beaches. First, they have been traditionally used by the public for recreational purposes and for commercial fishing. Second, title rights have not been as clearly defined on shorelines as in other places. The problem involved here is not a question of one man's right against another, but of one man's boundary against a State boundary, and the question of the shoreline landowner's right against an ancient usage of the public. The bill, therefore, deals also with the settling of boundaries and title rights along our seashores.

In addition, the bill charges the Secretary of the Interior and the U.S. Attorney General with protecting the public right, and it affords certain legal benchmarks in those areas of law involved.

A Federal interest is defined, therefore, and recourse to Federal courts is permitted. The bill, however, carefully guards against any Federal limitations upon the right of the States to hold and own property. On the other hand, no Federal property will be affected by this bill; the Padre Island National Seashore and other national parks will remain park lands, administered by the National Park Service of the Federal Government.

Any Federal action supports and protects the public right and the rights of individual States; any land or rights recovered inure to the benefit of the State.

Mr. President, the National Open Beaches Act will restore to all Americans use of some beaches, rightfully theirs, but now fenced up, often in private ownership. It will bring down the barriers and barricades on publicly owned beaches that have made us a landlocked people with very little access to the shore. The bill defines the public right to the beaches, a traditional right of Roman law which was exercised all during the Middle Ages. During the oppressive days of the Spanish Inquisition the people enjoyed more freedom on their beaches than Americans do today. The Spanish brought this law of the open beaches to America with them. Under my bill the public is insured free and unrestricted use of such seashores as can be reclaimed for public use under this bill; any barrier or restraint on this free use is expressly prohibited.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill to protect the public right to the beaches be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3044) declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the presence and accessibility of the sea, being a very substantial factor in the value and kind of interstate travel, and the beach being a marine resource created by the action of the sea, it is necessary and proper and promotes the public welfare to provide orderly protection of the public interest in the beaches.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. Congress finds that the sea beaches of the United States are of such character as to use and potential development as to require separate consideration from other lands with respect to the elements and consequences of title in littoral owners. Such land has been treated by and large over most of its extent and during most of the time that it has been controlled by European and Anglo-American law, as a common. It has been of little use for farming, grazing, timber production, mining or residency—the traditional uses of land—but has served as a thoroughfare and haven for fishermen and sea ventures and a place of recreation for the citizenry. The elements and consequences of title in littoral owners are thus colored by these traditional uses but are not fully formulated nor precisely drawn in the laws of the several States to meet the exigencies of the present day Congress finds that the traditional concept of the beach as a common is now being threatened by shorelines being fenced or enclosed upon assumptions not founded on clear legality.

SEC. 102. Congress declares and affirms that the beaches of the United States are impressed with a national interest and that the public shall have free and unrestricted right to use them as a common to the full extent that such public right may be extended consistent with such property rights of littoral landowners as may be protected absolutely by the Constitution. It is the declared intention of Congress to exercise the full reach of its constitutional power over the subject.

SEC. 103. No person shall create, erect, maintain, or construct any obstruction, barrier, or restraint of any nature which interferes with the free and unrestricted right of the public, individually and collectively, to enter, leave, cross, or use as a common the public beaches.

SEC. 104. (a) An action shall be cognizable in the district courts of the United States without reference to jurisdictional amount, at the instance of the Attorney General or a United States district attorney to:

(1) establish and protect the public right to beaches,

(2) determine the existing status of title, ownership, and control, and

(3) condemn such easements as may reasonably be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(b) Actions brought under the authority of this section may be for injunctive, declaratory, or other suitable relief.

SEC. 105. The following rules applicable to considering the evidence shall be applicable in all cases brought under section 104 hereof.

(1) a showing that the area is a beach shall be prima facie evidence that the title of the littoral owner does not include the right to prevent the public from using the area as a common;

(2) a showing that the area is a beach shall be prima facie evidence that there has been imposed upon the beach a prescriptive right to use it as a common.

SEC. 106. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be held to impair, interfere, or prevent the States—

(1) ownership of its lands and domains,

(2) control of the public beaches in behalf of the public for the protection of the common usage or incidental to the enjoyment thereof, or

(3) authority to perform State public services, including enactment of reasonable zones for wildlife, marine, and estuarine protection.

(b) All interests in land recovered under authority of this Act shall be treated as subject to the ownership, control and authority of the State in the same measure as if the State itself had acted to recover such interest. In order that such interest be recovered through condemnation, the State must participate in acquiring such interest by providing matching funds of not less than 25 per centum of the value of the land condemned.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. In order further to carry out the purposes stated in title I, section 101, it is desirable that the States and the Federal Government act in a joint partnership to protect the rights and interests of the people in the use of the beaches. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the terms and provisions of this Act and shall determine what actions shall be brought under section 104 hereof.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Interior shall place at the disposal of the States such research facilities as may be reasonably available from the Federal Government, and, in cooperation with the other Federal agencies, such historical, geological, geodetic, and other information and facilities as may be reasonably available for assisting the States in such protection of public rights. The President may promulgate regulations governing the work of such interagency cooperation.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to provide financial assistance to any State, and to its political subdivisions for the development and maintenance of transportation facilities necessary in connection with the use of public beaches in such State if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, such State has defined and sufficiently protected public beaches within its boundaries by State law. Such financial assistance shall be for projects which shall include, but not be limited to construction of necessary highways and roads to give access to the shoreline area, the construction of parking lots and adjacent park areas, as well as related transportation facilities. All sums appropriated to carry out title 23 of the United States Code are authorized to be made available in an appropriations Act to carry out this section.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The following terms as used in this Act shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Sea" includes the Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean and Bering Seas.

(b) "Beach" is the area along the shore of the sea affected by wave action directly from the open sea. It is more precisely defined in the situations and under the conditions hereinafter set forth as follows:

(1) In the case of typically sandy or shell beach with a discernible vegetation line which is constant or intermittent, it is that area which lies seaward from the line of vegetation to the sea.

(2) In the case of a beach having no discernible vegetation line, the beach shall include all area formed by wave action not to exceed two hundred feet in width (measured inland from the point of mean higher high tide).

(c) The "line of vegetation" is the extreme seaward boundary of natural vegetation which typically spreads continuously inland. It includes the line of vegetation on the seaward side of dunes or mounds of sand typically formed along the line of highest wave action, and, where such a line is clearly defined, the same shall constitute the "line of vegetation." In any area where there is no clearly marked vegetation line, recourse shall be had to the nearest clearly marked line of vegetation on each side of such area to determine the elevation reached by the highest waves. The "line of vegetation" for the unmarked area shall be the line of constant elevation connecting the two clearly marked lines of vegetation on each side. In the event the elevation of the two points on each side of the area are not the same, then the extension defining the line reached by the highest wave shall be the average elevation between the two points. Such line shall be connected at each of its termini at the point where it begins to parallel the true vegetation line by a line connecting it with the true vegetation line at its farthest extent. Such line shall not be affected by occasional sprigs of grass seaward from the dunes and shall not be affected by artificial fill, the addition or removal of turf, or by other artificial changes in the natural vegetation of the area. Where such changes have been made, and thus the vegetation line has been obliterated or has been created artificially, the line of vegetation shall be reconstructed as it originally existed, if such is practicable; otherwise, it shall be determined in the same manner as in other areas where there is no clearly marked "line of vegetation," as in (2), above.

(d) "Area caused by wave action" in subsection (b) (2) above means the area to the point affected by the highest wave of the sea not a storm wave. It may include scattered stones washed by the sea.

(e) "Public beaches" are those which, under the provisions of this Act, may be protected for use as a common.

(f) "Matching funds," as provided by a State, include funds or things of value which may be made available to the State for the purpose of matching the funds provided by the Federal Government for purchasing beach easements as, for instance, areas adjacent to beaches donated by individuals or

associations for the purpose of parking. The value of such lands or other things used for matching Federal funds shall be determined by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. State matching funds shall not include any moneys which have been supplied through Federal grants.

SEC. 302. The short title of this Act shall be the "Open Beaches Act of 1969".

S. 3045—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce a bill designed to extend authorization and to improve the effectiveness of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968—Public Law 90–351. That title created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The instant bill has two sections.

The first section would modify title I to provide and insure allocation and distribution of the 15-percent discretionary funds in a truly discretionary manner and to insure that each State receive but one block grant each fiscal year.

The second section would authorize appropriation of $650 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Present authorizations provide only to June 30, 1970.

PURPOSES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was designed to give the Federal Government the mechanism, through block grants to the States, to improve the caliber of the administration of the criminal justice system. Through the block grant program, the States may now improve recruitment techniques, educate law-enforcement officers and students for careers in law enforcement, construct new facilities to replace those long antiquated and establish overdue programs to combat organized crime as well as undertaking other necessary and worthwhile law-enforcement projects.

Some of the more imaginative projects underway include a six-State organized crime strike force, located in New York, in which representatives of Federal, State, and local police agencies are participating.

What good is it to be able to arrest a law violator, if he is not tried expeditiously? Conversely, what good is it to conduct speedy trials if the tools available to the police are not capable of effective crime detection?

The police must be given the benefit of modern technology, the courts must be given the benefit of modern management techniques, the prison system must be brought into the 20th century. All this and more is the overall goal of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

I have observed the operation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration very closely as I feel that its success or failure will have a significant impact on the administration of criminal justice for years to come.

FIRST SECTION OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill would modify the act to permit the allocation of the discretionary funds in a truly discretionary manner, and limit a state from receiving more than one block grant each year. Section 306 of the act allocates 85 percent of the funds to the State planning agencies, to be divided among the States on the basis of population. This section allocates the other 15 percent of the funds appropriated for discretionary projects. The reason for this allocation of 15 percent discretionary funds is simply that Congress wished to stimulate the improvement of the criminal justice system at all levels of the public and private sector and to give the LEAA administrators the flexibility to support a worthwhile project whether in the universities, in a private foundation, or in a city or a State law-enforcement body.

The current language of the act fails to provide the flexibility that we thought was provided when this legislation was enacted. At the present, discretionary grants now may be made only to cities or States. My amendment would permit discretionary grants to units of general local government, Federal, or State law-enforcement agencies, and universities.

The bill would also dispense with the matching requirement currently imposed on the States as they apply to discretionary grants. As a practical matter, of course, it is desirable to have State contributions and the administration should always strive for such contribution.

Quite frequently, however, the most worthwhile project will be conducted by an entity not capable of providing matching funds, or will involve a multi-State or Federal project. This bill would afford the flexibility for the LEAA to pursue all worthwhile enterprises as was originally intended when we passed the act.

Senator Dirksen, the author of this provision, intended this result when he drafted the section. Because of the subsequent ambiguity which developed, he wrote a letter to the Attorney General explaining that his intention was to create a truly discretionary allocation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Dirksen's letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks today.

The bill is also amended to clarify the provisions of title I relating to allocation and distribution of the 85 per centum. The amendment makes certain that the allocation and distribution of the 85 per centum of the funds to each State shall be truly single, block grants to each State planning agency pursuant to congressional intent expressed at the time of original enactment.

SECOND SECTION OF THE BILL

The second section is also an amendment to the Law Enforcement Administration Act. Section 512 of the act allows the Administration to carry out its programs from fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. My amendment would authorize appropriations for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, of $650 million.

The block-grant program of the LEAA has grown in size and scope from $63 million the first year of operation in fiscal year 1969 to a request for $300 million, the full amount authorized, in fiscal year 1970. We anticipated a $900 million program when fully operational. In submitting this authorization bill, I have only considered the next fiscal year although the program in general has 3 years to run before Congress reexamines it in total. I have done this for a very good reason.

The States, in submitting their plans, have asked for grants in excess of $1.1 billion for fiscal year 1971. The program for this fiscal year does not yet exceed $300 million. Thus, in setting the $650 million mark, I have tried to realistically balance the need for economy against the needs of State law enforcement. There is not any realistic basis for determining the scope of need beyond fiscal year 1971 yet. Thus, I have not suggested any amounts for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 since such legislation would be pure speculation. A bill for additional authorization for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 will follow in due time.

Moreover, by expanding the scope of this program as I have suggested, the Congress will not be expanding the bureaucracy here in Washington. At the core of the LEAA program is the block grant concept. Stated simply, this means that Federal funds are given to the States in a lump sum. The way the grant is spent, however, is left up to the States.

The LEAA provides technical advice and expertise. The LEAA insures that the funds are expended properly. The LEAA reviews the priorities submitted by the States. But the policy decisions are made at the State level right where they should be made, and not here in Washington.

What is accomplished then with this program is an effective revenue sharing plan, strictly for law enforcement improvement purposes, between the Federal Government and the States.

The time has come to recognize the needs and deficiencies of law enforcement and to do something about it. We started last year with the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and now we must continue by extending the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and by giving the States its support and aid.

Mr. President, many articles have been written, and many speeches have been made about crime in our Nation today. The public is developing an awareness, law-enforcement efforts are being beefed up, and improvements in the judicial process are being accomplished. Nonetheless, since 1960, serious crime has increased by 122 percent, the population has increased only 11 percent, and the police solutions of serious crime have declined 32 percent. Clearly, the crime problem has not been solved.

We must keep our guard up. We must remain vigilant, and we must make the streets of our Nation safe. We are off to a good start with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and we must continue our efforts.

Mr. President, the work of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has been the subject of great interest across the country in recent months.

Recently, a column in the Washington

Evening Star by James J. Kilpatrick called attention to some of the first-year accomplishments of the LEAA program. In addition, the 61st annual meeting of the National Governors' Conference commended the LEAA and noted that the block grant concept has worked out well.

Mr. President, because of the interest in steps being taken to combat crime, as embraced in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program, I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the RECORD, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3045) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to modify the provisions relating to discretionary grants to the States, to limit the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to one block grant per State per year from 85 percent funds, and to provide authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1971, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3045

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

SECTION 1. (a) The first sentence of section 301(b) is amended by striking the words "grants to States having comprehensive State plans" and substituting the words "one grant per Fiscal Year to each State having a comprehensive State plan."

(b) The proviso in subsection 301(b)(7) is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That in no case shall any part of a grant made under this section be used for the purpose of this subcategory without the approval of the local government or local law enforcement agency."

(c) Section 301(c) is amended to read as follows: "The portion of any Federal grant used for the purpose of paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (b) of this section may be up to 75 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant. The portion of any grant used for the purposes of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of this section may be up to 50 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant. The portion of any grant to be used for any other purpose set forth in this section may be up to 60 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant: *Provided,* That no funds granted under this section shall be used for land acquisition."

(d) Section 301, subsection (d) is amended by striking out the word "part" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof, "section."

(e) The first sentence of section 303 is amended by striking the word "grants" and substituting the words "a grant each Fiscal Year."

(f) Section 306 is amended to read as follows: "Eighty-five per centum of the funds appropriated to make grants under this part for a Fiscal Year shall be allocated by the Administration among the States according to their respective populations for grants to the State planning agencies of such States. The remaining fifteen per centum of such funds, plus such additional amounts as may be made available by virtue of the application of the provisions of section 509 to the grant to any State shall, in the discretion of the Administration, be allocated among the States for grants to State planning agencies or used by the Administration for grants for the purposes of this title to units of general local government, public agencies, Federal or State law enforcement officers or agencies, institutions of higher education, or combinations of the foregoing, according to such criteria and on such terms and conditions as the Administration shall determine consistent with this title. Grants made under the preceding sentence shall not be subject to the limitations set forth in subsections (c) and (d) of section 301."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 520 is amended by inserting immediately after "June 30, 1970," the following: "$650,000,000 for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1971".

The articles, presented by Mr. HRUSKA, are as follows:

AID TO POLICE A BRIGHT LESSON IN FEDERALISM

The President's advisers were trying to sell him "the New Federalism" a few weeks ago, as a neat little label to paste on his programs. Richard Nixon reportedly turned the label down, on the skeptical grounds that federalism isn't as familiar as corn flakes. How could he sell a new federalism to people who don't know the old?

In the superlative job done in its first year by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice the President could find an outstanding example of new federalism in action. One hesitates to write a rare review, but the LEAA's performance appears to merit the highest praise.

By way of background, it will be recalled that the Omnibus Crime Control Act became law in June of 1968. One section of the act authorized matching grants to states and localities "in order to improve and strengthen law enforcement." In August, Congress approved a $69 million budget. In late October, with only eight months remaining of the fiscal year, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration went to work.

Federal grants-in-aid, of course, are nothing new. Roughly 400 such programs are in operation now. But most of them, to judge from the complaints of local officials, are mired deep in bureaucratic swamps. They suffer from too many guidelines and too much paperwork. Most of the grants are characterized by regimentation, nitpicking demands, and maddening delays.

The miracle of this fledgling agency in Justice, under the direction of Charles H. Rogovin, is that apparently it has avoided all these morning-glory entanglements. In barely five months, the LEAA assembled staff, conferred with law enforcement officials in the states, and disbursed $19 million for planning.

The state governments, which so often are accused of apathy and incompetence, responded to these galvanic urgings with the zeal of ballplayers just offered cold beer. By April 10 of this year, California had filed the first action plan—a 26-volume application, amounting to nearly 6,000 pages.

Other states followed in a rush. By the time the fiscal year ended on June 30, everyone but American Samoa had come under the wire. In their scope and variety, the state-local programs provide a notable example of federalism at its best.

California is pursuing a dozen projects, ranging from alcoholism to court reform. Alabama and Iowa, among others, will use their grants in the field of juvenile delinquency. Idaho came up with training seminars for judges. Maine, Ohio, Arizona and Minnesota are concentrating on police selection and training. Nebraska, Texas, Nevada, Colorado, Alaska and Rhode Island are seeking to improve communications systems. Georgia won approval for a pilot program of work release for prisoners.

Meanwhile, 14 large cities have qualified for direct federal grants. Detroit got $100,000 to work on an "electronic robbery stake-out system." Dallas got $18,000 to study a first-offender program among juveniles. Los Angeles won $50,000 for an evaluation of "closed-circuit television capabilities in tactical situations." Chicago bid for "Operation Outreach," described as a detoxification, diagnostic, and referral center. In a separate program, academic fellowships were going to some 20,000 college men studying police techniques.

Doubtless some of the money will be wasted, in the sense that some of the experiments, pilot studies, and demonstrations will prove useless. But this is a part of what federalism is all about. What is new here is a bureaucracy with sense enough to keep its cottonpickin' hands off the states, and to let them make their own successes—and their own mistakes.

U.S. SENATE,
March 11, 1969.

HON. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am informed that some uncertainty exists as to the Congressional intent of the provision for 15 per centum discretionary funds in Section 306 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The sentence under questions reads as follows:

"Section 306. . . . Of such funds, 85 per centum shall be allocated among the States according to their respective populations and 15 per centum thereof shall be allocated as the Administration may determine, plus such additional amounts as may be made available by virtue of the application of the provisions of Section 509 to the grant to any State."

As the author of this provision of the Act, I wish to make clear that the intent of the above language is that the use of the 15 per centum and the additional amounts under Section 509 be truly discretionary. The Administration may allocate these funds to States, units of general local governments or combinations of such units, institutions of higher education, or private organizations.

Sincerely,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

COMMENDATION OF LEAA

The National Governors' Conference commends the Administrators and staff of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for their extensive and helpful cooperation with the states in implementing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90–351). Their actions in fostering the development of qualified staff at the state level, providing wide latitude to the states in developing plans for improving the entire criminal justice system, and generally supporting the federal-state partnership required in a block grant program, sets an outstanding example that could well be emulated by other federal departments. Their efforts to insure the success of this first program embodying a true block grant approach to an intergovernmental problem are noteworthy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2769

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2769, to pro-

vide an incentive for private employers to provide job training programs, including programs for individuals lacking skill or training necessary for steady employment, by allowing an income tax credit for the expenses of such programs.

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

S. 2890

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2890, to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title.

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

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 250

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to H.R. 13270, the so-called tax reform bill. This amendment relates to the subject of tax laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, and be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 250) was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 250

Strike sections 211, 212, and 213 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 211. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO CERTAIN FARMING OPERATIONS.

"(a) Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 277. LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO CERTAIN FARMING OPERATIONS.

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in this section and except in the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming as the principal business activity, the deductions attributable to the business of farming which, but for this section, would be allowable under this chapter for the taxable year shall not exceed an aggregate amount equal to the sum of—

"'(1) the gross income derived from the business of farming for the taxable year;

"'(2) in the case of an individual whose principal residence is on a farm, the gross income derived by such individual and his spouse for the taxable year from wages and salaries for personal services;

"'(3) the income derived from the sale of timber located on the farm;

"'(4) royalties derived from property on which the taxpayer's farming operations are conducted; and

"'(5) $15,000 ($7,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return), reduced by the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income (taxable income in the case of a corporation) for the taxable year attributable to all sources other than the business of farming (determined before the application of this section) exceeds $30,000 ($15,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

"'(b) BUSINESS OF FARMING.—For purposes of this section, the term "business of farming" includes the holding of property used in farming.

"'(c) FARMING AS PRINCIPAL BUSINESS ACTIVITY.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the business of farming is the principal business activity of a taxpayer for a taxable year only if the net income from the business of farming for the three preceding taxable years (or so many of such preceding years as the taxpayer has been engaged in the business of farming) equals or exceeds two-thirds of the total net income of the taxpayer for such years.

"'(2) NET INCOME FROM BUSINESS OF FARMING.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the net income from the business of farming of a taxpayer for any taxable year is the sum of—

"'(A) the gross income derived from the business of farming for such year minus the deductions attributable to such business, and

"'(B) the full amount (if any) by which the gains from sales or exchanges of property used in the business of farming (within the meaning of section 1231(b)) which are treated as gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets exceed the losses from such sales or exchanges.

"'(3) TOTAL NET INCOME.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the total net income of a taxpayer for any taxable year is the taxpayer's adjusted gross income (taxable income, in the case of a corporation) determined without regard to gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets or of property used in a trade or business, other than the business of farming. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, adjusted gross income and taxable income shall be computed by recognizing the full amount (if any) by which the gains from sales or exchanges of property used in the business of farming (within the meaning of section 1231(b)) which are treated as gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets exceed the losses from such sales or exchanges.

"'(d) EXCEPTIONS FOR DEDUCTIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO DROUGHT, FLOOD, AND OTHER CASUALTIES AND TO CERTAIN FARMING OPERATIONS.—No deduction shall be disallowed under subsection (a) if such deduction is attributable—

"'(1) to drought, flood, hail, or other abnormal weather conditions, disease, fire, storm, or other casualty, or theft;

"'(2) to a research or experimental farming operation conducted under a program approved by the United States Department of Agriculture, a State department of agriculture, or the agricultural school of an accredited college or university; or

"'(3) to farming operations consisting of egg or broiler production.

"'(e) OTHER EXCEPTIONS.—

"'(1) FARM ENTERPRISE ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any farming enterprise acquired by the taxpayer by devise or inheritance, or by distribution of a testamentary trust, for the taxable year in which such enterprise is so acquired and for the two succeeding taxable years.

"'(2) FARM ENTERPRISE ACQUIRED BY FORECLOSURE, ETC.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any farming enterprise acquired by the taxpayer in partial or complete satisfaction of a debt for the taxable year in which such enterprise is so acquired and for the two succeeding taxable years.

"'(3) ESTATES.—In the case of an estate, the limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to any farming enterprise comprising a part of the estate for the first and second taxable years of the estate if the business of farming was the principal business activity of the decedent for the last full taxable year before his death.

"'(f) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSSES.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—The disallowed farm operating loss for any taxable year (hereinafter referred to as the "loss year")—

"'(A) shall be a disallowed farm operating loss carryback to each of the three taxable years preceding the loss year and a disallowed farm operating loss carryover to each of the five taxable years following the loss year: *Provided,* That if there was no net income from the business of farming for one or more of said three preceding taxable years, the operating loss carryover period shall be extended by a like number of years; and

"'(B) (subject to the limitation contained in paragraph (2)) shall be allowed as a deduction for such years, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, in a manner consistent with the allowance of the net operating loss deduction under section 172.

"'(2) LIMITATION.—The deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year for disallowed farm operating loss carryovers to such taxable year shall not exceed the taxpayers' net income from the business of farming for such taxable year.

"'(3) DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSS.—The term "disallowed farm operating loss" means, with respect to any taxable year, the amount disallowed as deductions under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

"'(g) REGULATIONS.—The secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations applying the provisions of this section—

"'(1) to a taxpayer engaged in more than one business of farming,

"'(2) to a business of farming carried on by a partnership, and

"'(3) to a business of farming carried on by an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371(b)).

The regulations required under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall provide that the income and deductions of a partnership or an electing small business corporation which is engaged in the business of farming shall be treated as the income and deductions of the partners or of the shareholders of such corporation.'

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'SEC. 277. Limitation on deductions attributable to certain farming operations.'

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 225

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) be added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 225 to S. 2347, to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON MIGRANT HEALTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on July 18, I was pleased to introduce legislation, S. 2660, that would extend and expand the Federal health program for migrant workers. I have scheduled hearing on this legislation for Tuesday and Wednesday, October 21 and 22 at 10 a.m. in room 4232, New Senate Office Building.

The witness for the administration will be Dr. Roger Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who will appear on Tuesday, October 21, to discuss this underfunded program. Dr. James Peavy, commissioner of health for the State of Texas, will also appear to discuss this important program on Tuesday.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 8, I was privileged to introduce S. 2809, a bill to extend and expand the Federal program of formula grants for schools of public health. I have scheduled hearings on this legislation for Monday, October 20, at 10 a.m., in room 4232, New Senate Office Building.

There are only 16 graduate schools of public health to train the professional health personnel that are needed by Federal agencies, State health departments, county health departments, city health departments, and voluntary health agencies. I am pleased to report that the newest school of public health is located at the University of Texas in Houston. The dean is Dr. Reuel Stallones, who will be a witness on Monday.

The Federal formula grants for schools of public health were first authorized in 1958. Since then the number of graduate degrees awarded by schools of public health has doubled. At present, however, the schools of public health are faced with problems of expanding enrollments to meet pressing needs for professional public health personnel. The present level of financial support through Federal formula grants represents only 12 percent of the cost of basic operations and teaching expenses at the schools. These facts are revealed in a recently completed study entitled "A Progress Report on the Federal Program of Formula Grants to the Schools of Public Health, 1959–69." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FEDERAL PROGRAM OF FORMULA GRANTS TO THE SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH, 1959–69

PREFACE

This *Progress Report on the Federal Program of Formula Grants to Schools of Public Health, 1959–1969* describes how the nation's schools of public health have fulfilled their commitment to the Congress and the American people to help provide expanded and higher quality services to people by training of health personnel. The formula grants allocated to the schools under the Hill-Rhodes Act have been the key factor in training the vitally needed cadre of health specialists that are in such short supply in Federal, State, and local health agencies.

The schools of public health[1] and their Deans, faculty members, students, and graduates who are a part of this national health effort are grateful for the assistance, encouragement, and support given them by the Congress, the American taxpayers, and their colleagues in other health professions.

This *Progress Report* also outlines the historical background of the establishment of the formula grant program; the amounts and uses to which such funds have been utilized by the schools; the spectacular results that have been achieved during the past decade; the varied roles played by schools of public health; and the dimension of future needs for the Fiscal 1970–1973 period.

Finally, it shows how the schools of public health—with the assistance of the Federal formula grant program funds—have been able to fulfill their mission in serving the complex changing health needs of our modern society, in meeting new challenges to our health environment, and in seeking innovative approaches to the age-old problems of disease, chronic illnesses, and the protection and promotion of our national health and well-being.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Progress Report is to render an accounting of stewardship to the Congress and the American people on what has been accomplished during the past ten years in utilizing formula grants to augment the number of trained public health professionals to provide services to the people of our country through Federal, State, and local health agencies.

A relatively small amount of Federal funds have been invested in this program. But few Federal programs have produced such a significant impact in furthering national objectives and in meeting urgent national needs. This *Progress Report* describes how such results have been achieved, the key role that graduates of schools of public health play in our country, and projects the needs for continued formula grant support over the next several years.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Hill-Rhodes Act of 1958 (P.L. 85–544) was the first formal recognition by Congress of the Federal responsibility in providing formula grant assistance to institutions of higher education to assist in comprehensive graduate training in the public health professions.

The bi-partisan bill was sponsored in the House of Representatives by Rep. George M. Rhodes (D., Pa.) and was co-sponsored in the Senate by Senators Lister Hill (D., Ala.), John F. Kennedy (D., Mass.), Pat McNamara (D., Mich.), Irving Ives (R., N.Y.), and John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.). It was passed by a unanimous vote in both the House and Senate after extensive hearings and was signed into law by President Eisenhower.

The Act amended Section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act by earmarking $1 million a year for a two year period in grants to accredited schools of public health to provide comprehensive professional public health training. It specified that primary consideration be given in the allocation of funds to the number of Federally-sponsored students attending each school.

During the debate on the measure, it was pointed out that the eleven schools of public health were—in effect—the public health equivalent of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy in providing professional health training and leadership for the Nation. Most graduates of the schools go into the public service in staffing essential public health positions in municipal, county, State, and Federal governmental levels.

When the original formula grant legislation was enacted, there were eleven accredited schools of public health eligible for grants—five State universities (California at Berkeley, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Puerto Rico) and six privately-endowed institutions (Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Pittsburgh, and Tulane).

Since then, four new schools have been accredited and have shared in the formula grant program. Three are State universities (Hawaii, California at Los Angeles, and Oklahoma) while one is privately-endowed (Loma Linda University in California). Another State university—the University of Texas at Houston—was accredited in June 1969 and is eligible for formula grant funds for the 1969–70 school year. Several other schools are expected to apply for accreditation during the next several years to help meet the growing need for professional public health personnel.

In 1960, Congress enacted P.L. 86–720, which extended the formula grant program with a $1 million annual authorization and removed the time limitation on the program. It also authorized $2 million annually for project grants to schools of public health, nursing, and engineering to strengthen and expand graduate public health training.

A provision of the Community Health Facilities and Services Act of 1961 (P.L. 87–395) amended the original formula grant program by increasing the annual authorization from $1 million to $2.5 million to meet rising teaching needs and student enrollment at the schools. The program was also extended until June 30, 1966.

A section of the Community Health Amendments of 1965 (P.L. 89–109) increased the formula grant authorization from $2.5 million to $5 million for one year.

The Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Act of 1966 (P.L. 89–749) again extended the formula grant program to schools of public health for two years and authorized $5 million for each of the two succeeding fiscal years. This measure also transferred the program from Section 314 to Section 309(c) of the Public Health Service Act.

The Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967 (P.L. 90–174) further extended the formula grant program, authorizing $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $6 million for the year ending June 30, 1969, and $7 million for the year ending June 30, 1970. These step increases were further recognition by Congress of the growing magnitude of the public health training needs of the country. Authorization for the formula grant program will expire unless extended during the present Congress.

ALLOCATION FORMULA

Regulations promulgated by the Public Health Service pursuant to the legislative intent of the original Act have resulted in the following formula in the allocation of formula grant funds:

One-third of each annual appropriation is allocated equally among the schools of public health in recognition of basic teaching costs that do not vary in direct proportion to the number of Federally-sponsored students.

[1] Schools of public health are located at the following institutions—University of California (Berkeley), University of California (Los Angeles), Columbia, Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, North Carolina, Michigan, Minnesota, Tulane, Pittsburgh, Puerto Rico, Oklahoma, Hawaii, Loma Linda, and Texas (Houston), accredited in June 1969.

Two-thirds of each annual appropriation is allocated to the various schools in proportion to the number of Federally-sponsored students in each school, using the average of the past three fiscal years to avoid wide fluctuations from year to year.

Thus, the accreditation of new schools of public health (without a corresponding increase in appropriations) actually *reduces* the proportionate share of total funds allocated to each school.

CRITICAL NEEDS—FISCAL 1970 APPROPRIATIONS

This unfortunate situation presently faces all schools of public health in the 1969–70 school year. The University of Texas at Houston school of public health was accredited in June 1969 and is eligible for formula grant funds. Under the present law, $7 million is authorized for the Fiscal 1970 year; but only $4,554,000 of this amount has been requested in the new budget—the same amount as appropriated by Congress last year. Thus, unless additional funds are appropriated this year, each school of public health will *lose* part of its allocation to help provide funds for the new school in Texas.

Actually, even the full appropriation of the $7 million in formula grant funds authorized for this year would still fall short of meeting actual needs of the schools. In a survey conducted by the Association of Schools of Public Health in April, 1969 the fifteen presently accredited schools of public health have estimated their formula grant needs at $8.8 million for the 1969–70 school year. This amount would be required just to keep pace with increased student enrollment, higher costs, and to correct existing shortcomings in instruction. This is $1.8 million *more* than authorized by Congress for Fiscal 1970 and almost *double* the amount of formula grant funds requested in the Fiscal 1970 budget.

In the recent survey conducted by the Association of Schools of Public Health, schools have indicated that additional funds that are needed would be used to correct what they consider to be major existing shortcomings in instruction in such vital areas as:

Environmental Health, including Radiation Health and Occupational Health.

Comprehensive Health Planning and Health Administration.

Epidemiology and Related Fields.

Population and Family Planning, including Maternal and Child Health.

Mental Health.

Nutrition.

Medical Care and Hospital Administration.

FORMULA FUNDS VS. TOTAL COSTS OF SCHOOLS

Formula funds provided under the Federal program have *not* kept pace with rising costs of basic operations and teaching at the schools of public health. Table 1 shows that while total student enrollment has almost *doubled* since 1963, total costs have increased by almost *three times*. The proportion of costs met by formula grant funds in 1968 was actually less than it was in 1963. Meanwhile, the number of Federally-sponsored students at the schools have steadily increased and now amounts to *two-thirds* of the total enrollment.

While the 1,961 Federally-sponsored students attending the fifteen schools of public health represented 67 percent of the total student enrollment, tuition received by the schools for these students was only $2.1 million, or about 6.5 percent of the total costs for basic operations and teaching for the year. Even with the formula grants and various other restricted types of grants received by the schools under other Federal programs, it is clear that the schools are—in effect—heavily *subsidizing* the training of the essential cadre of public health professionals for all levels of government service. Limited State funds or private endowments *cannot* meet the rapidly growing needs of the schools of public health in fulfilling these vital national health responsibilities.

TABLE 1

Year	Total enrollment	Total cost basic operations and teaching	Formula funds allocated	Proportion of costs met by formula funds (percent)	Proportion of Federal-sponsored students in total enrollment (percent)
1963	1,618	$11,600,000	$1,900,000	16	56.4
1968	2,908	[1] 32,500,000	4,000,000	12	67.0

[1] When one adds research and service activities, the total becomes $64,099,000.

ROLES OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Schools of public health have a vital national and an international role. The Federal government and the 50 States are dependent on the fifteen schools in twelve States and Puerto Rico for the supply of graduate trained public health professionals. A survey shows that *only 25 percent* of the graduates actually work in the States where they attend public health school—a clear indication of the national characteristic of the schools. States that do *not* have schools rely on the continuing efforts of institutions in other States for trained public health manpower. The schools have also been heavily involved in the international health field for many years. Many graduates are foreign nationals, often sponsored by our government as part of the AID program. Most return to careers of public health leadership in their own countries.

The schools play essential roles in many diverse fields that are important to the national welfare:

Teaching: The teaching role of the schools prepares physicians, dentists, engineers, nurses, and other professional public health personnel to organize and administer programs and to perform research and teaching functions aimed at controlling and preventing disease and other health hazards. It is also directed toward the promotion of sound health practices among population groups at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Public service.—A survey of graduates of public health schools shows that *more than 90 percent* enter professional employment in public agencies at the local, State, or Federal health levels. Many faculty members of the schools also serve as expert consultants to public and private health agencies concerned with public health matters. The increasing concern with such health problems as air and water pollution, aging, chronic diseases, radiation, accident prevention, mental health, and nutrition has caused a corresponding increase in demands for new curricula and training of professional public health personnel in these and other fields to full existing vacancies in public agencies.

Research.—The schools' research role is oriented primarily to the search for the causes and for the means of controlling and preventing disease, accidents, and other health hazards on a mass basis, rather than to the clinical aspects of healing sick persons—the primary concern of research in medical schools and hospitals. Other public health research develops basic knowledge of the social, cultural, and economic factors involved in effective application of proven health measures among various population groups.

INVESTMENT AND RESULTS

Since the enactment of the Federal formula grant program in 1958, Congress has authorized $41 million in assistance to the schools of public health. Of this amount, $26,454,000 has been subsequently appropriated by the Congress, allocated by the Public Health Service, and expended by the schools to carry out the purposes of the program. Table 2 shows the figures for each fiscal year in which the program has functioned. During this period, the number of schools of public health has increased from eleven to the current level of sixteen, reached by the accreditation of the University of Texas (Houston) in June of 1969.

TABLE 2.—FORMULA GRANT ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH—AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED AND APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS—FISCAL YEARS 1959–70

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Number of schools	Amounts authorized	Amounts appropriated
1959	11	$1,000,000	$450,000
1960	12	1,000,000	1,000,000
1961	12	1,000,000	1,000,000
1962	12	2,500,000	1,900,000
1963	13	2,500,000	1,900,000
1964	13	2,500,000	1,900,000
1965	13	2,500,000	2,500,000
1966	14	5,000,000	3,500,000
1967	14	5,000,000	3,750,000
1968	15	5,000,000	4,000,000
1969	15	6,000,000	4,554,000
1970	16	7,000,000	[1]

[1] Appropriation pending.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $6 millilion in formula grants were authorized and $4,554,000 appropriated by Congress and allocated to the schools of public health. Grants ranged from a high of $639,000 for one school down to a low of $119,500. The average size grant for the fifteen schools sharing in the formula program was $303,000 for the 1968–69 school year.

The success of any program in which the public interest is involved must be measured by the amount of Federal funds expended and the significance of the results achieved. What has been the result of this investment of taxpayers' dollars in the type of programs carried on by the nation's schools of public health? To what extent have these expenditures helped to meet our health needs? Federal formula grant funds—plus those they helped to generate—have produced these dramatic results in the 1959–69 years since enactment of the program as compared with the comparable time period immediately preceding its enactment:

A 124 percent *increase* in the number of students enrolled at schools of public health (24,361 as compared with 10,872)

A 74 percent *increase* in the number of graduate degrees awarded by schools of public health (11,240 as compared with 6,451)

(See Table 3 for data listed by years for this period)

A 195 percent *increase* in the number of Federally-sponsored students at schools of public health (from 717 in 1959 during first year of program to 2,115 in the current school year)

A 187 percent *increase* in the total number of students currently enrolled at schools of public health in the 1969–70 year as compared with the 1957–58 year (3,525 as compared with 1,230)

An *increase* from 11 to 16 in the number of accredited schools of public health providing comprehensive graduate training and degrees in the health professions

The *addition* of hundreds of new courses in the schools to meet the health needs of our changing society, such as Environmental Health, Mental Health, Maternal and Child Health, Radiological Health, Medical Care for the Aged, Comprehensive Health Planning, Epidemiology, Nutrition, Hospital Administration, Industrial Health, and many others.

USES OF FORMULA GRANT FUNDS

Schools of public health, unlike other institutions, cannot rely on alumni contributions for financial support since virtually all graduates are engaged in public service activities. Thus, they must depend more heavily on grant programs than many of the other professional schools. Of the total expenditures of $64 million by the fifteen schools during the 1967–68 school year, the level of support they received from their parent institutions ranged from 6 percent to 33 percent of their operating expenses, with an overall average of only 23 percent.

In this situation the importance of formula grant funds is characterized not only by the amount but by the flexibility of this type of financial support, which enables the schools to stretch the funds for more effective use.

TABLE 3—U.S. SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH—TOTAL NUMBER OF GRADUATE DEGREES—STUDENT ENROLLMENT—1948-69

Year	Number of graduate degrees awarded	Number of students enrolled in credit courses
Before enactment of formula grant program:		
1948	460	638
1949	471	865
1950	524	969
1951	620	1,025
1952	604	1,039
1953	608	998
1954	584	915
1955	567	971
1956	582	1,045
1957	659	1,177
1958	772	1,230
Total (1948–58)	6,451	10,872
After enactment of formula grant program:		
1959	785	1,304
1960	744	1,266
1961	766	1,399
1962	747	1,619
1963	798	1,848
1964	1,032	2,047
1965	1,092	2,267
1966	1,195	2,608
1967	1,196	3,115
1968	1,337	3,363
1969	1,548	3,525
Total (1959–69)	11,240	24,361

Analysis of Table 3 shows, as is generally true in higher education, that there is a delayed and cumulative effect from the increase in formula grant funds. Thus, from 1959 to 1963 there was little difference in the number of graduates, which from 1963 to 1969, the last six years, the number of graduates practically doubled. A similar effect, with a shorter lag period and a greater proportional growth, is obvious for student enrollment.

Over the years, each school has devised methods to maximize the effective use of formula grant funds. In its questionnaire to Deans of the schools in April, 1969, the Association of Schools of Public Health asked for statements on how the formula grants have been used. Here is a representative sample of comments received:

"The major programs for which formula grant funds are currently being used . . . are public health nursing, maternal and child health, biostatistics, support staff for core curriculum, and strengthening field training needs in health education. Existing teaching programs have been expanded and improved by the purchase of audio-visual equipment, instructional and library materials, and laboratory equipment . . . In community service, continuing education has been a major support item of this School's activities for health workers in the State."

* * * * *

"Formula grant funds constitute an indispensable component of our budget for instructional purposes. Literally speaking, these funds undergird, in varying degrees, all of the ten academic departments . . . Between 1958 and 1968, student enrollment increased by more than 100%. This rapid expansion could not have taken place without the financial support of formula grant funds."

* * * * *

"Formula grant funds made possible a full-time obstetrician with training and experience in Maternal and Child Health and Population Problems, enabling us to offer courses in this area such as Family Planning, Maternal Health Guidance Programs, etc. Extension programs for outlying health departments were conducted as well as the organization and presentation of a program on Drug Abuse. Currently, a program is being initiated to develop community betterment programs in a Mexican-American community and another among a Negro and Mexican-American community."

* * * * *

Departments chiefly aided by formula grant funds are Microbiology, Behavioral Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Health Services Administration, Biostatistics and Demography, and Human Ecology. Since the formula funds have not significantly increased, they can provide little base for further expansion until appropriations are increased."

"The formula grant funds are interwoven into the fabric of this School's staff budgets to such an extent that, if they were no longer available, the entire program would be in jeopardy. They are used in practically every programmatic area in the School's teaching and training activities. Further, an increase in grant funds is needed urgently if existing programs are to keep pace with rapidly changing events and if programs needing basic development are to be instituted. Areas which need updating and improvement are environmental health, epidemiology, and public health administration. Newer areas which need development are within the scope of behavioral sciences as they affect the public's health, population control, and area-wide comprehensive planning."

* * * * *

"Formula grant funds play an extremely important role in the teaching program of the School . . . Changing social needs require flexibility in planning of teaching. Formula grants permit the development of specific training programs which will meet immediate needs, such as family planning, programs meeting health needs of ghetto areas . . . . and problems of urban populations."

* * * * *

"Formula grant funds have been used to meet a variety of needs in the School. They have provided for the employment of faculty in the areas of public health nursing and mental retardation . . . Formula grant funds also enabled the School to purchase some of the more expensive and urgently needed teaching equipment for which other funds were not available. Equipment such as calculators, microscopes, and projectors were purchased."

* * * * *

"Formula grant funds have enabled us to continue to meet the varied teaching responsibilities imposed by new and changing public health needs. Faculty have broadened and strengthened programs in Air Pollution, Biochemistry, Health Administration and Planning, Health Education, Occupational Health, Public Health Nursing, and Sanitary Engineering . . . The availability of these funds has been a significant factor in making it possible for us to more than double student enrollment during the past decade. Without these funds, it would have been practically impossible to expand our faculty to provide high quality training for the rapidly expanding student body . . ."

"Formula grant funds have been important in the instrumentation of various activities in our School which have had considerable impact on community affairs. Our School has functioned actively as consultant to various legislative bodies in health matters. Through an evaluation study we were instrumental in the reorganization of health services provided to workers through the State Insurance Fund. Our cooperation was also requested by the committee planning a project for a Model City . . ."

* * * * *

"If formula grant funds ceased during one month, the School would have to close down the following month. Thirty-five fulltime faculty members receive part of their salary from such funds and the entire salary of nine lecturers is dependent on these sources . . . This money has enabled us to approximately double our class size in three years, has equipped a good library for us, paid for a librarian, enabled us to obtain up-to-date teaching supplies, enabled our biometry section to begin converting its teaching from calculators to computer terminals, and brought many distinguished scientists to address our students and faculty . . . Formula grant funds are the oxygen supply of our scholastic body and we shall surely asphyxiate without them . . ."

NATIONAL HEALTH LEADERS

Graduates of schools of public health play vital roles in our national health effort. The list that follows represents the wide range of activities and agencies—Federal, State, and local—in which key positions are currently held by public health school graduates. This listing is drawn from a sample of graduates of the various schools.

Federal level

Public Health Service.
Food & Drug Administration.
Indian Health Service.
Air Pollution Control.
Migratory Workers Program.
Environmental Health Sciences.
Tuberculosis Control Bureau.
Accident Control Bureau.
Center for Health Services and Development.
Center for Radiological Health.
Chronic Disease Control Bureau.
National Institutes of Health.
Atomic Energy Commission.
Social Security Administration.
Regional Medical Programs.
Comprehensive Health Planning.
International Health Programs.
Population Control Programs.
Cancer Control Bureau.
Communicable Disease Center.
Center for Vital Statistics.
Heart & Stroke Control Bureau.
Office of Economic Opportunity.
Aedes Aegypti Eradication Program.

State and municipal levels

State Health Commissioners.
County Health Officers.
City Health Officers.
Public Health Nurses.
Nutrition Programs.
Mental Retardation Programs.
Dental Health Programs.
Health Education Programs.
Comprehensive Health Planning Agencies.
Rehabilitation Programs.
Rat Control Programs.
Maternal & Child Health Programs.
Tuberculosis Control Programs.
Veterinarian Service Programs.
Secretaries of Health & Welfare.

Vital Statistics Offices.
Sanitary Engineering Offices.
Mental Health Centers.
Comprehensive Health Service Programs.
Hospital Planning Councils.
Computer Units.
Regional Medical Programs.
Drug Control Programs.
Social Service Departments.
Alcohol Control Programs.
Air & Water Pollution Control Programs.
Venereal Disease Control Programs.
Laboratory Health Services.

Miscellaneous

Voluntary Health Agencies.
Health Insurance Programs.
Mental Health Agencies.
Cancer Societies.
Research & Teaching in Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Veterinary Medicine, Public Health, and Allied Health Professions.
Departments of Preventive Medicine in Medical Schools.
Health Foundations.
Heart Associations.
International Health Organizations.
Tuberculosis Associations.
Mental Retardation Agencies.
Population Control Organizations.

DIMENSIONS OF NEED—1971–1973

As has been already noted, the schools of public health have estimated their financial needs for the 1969–70 school year (FY 1970) at $8.8 million in formula grant funds. This amount is required just to keep pace with increased student enrollment, the need for new courses, and rising operating costs. This compares with a current authorization ceiling of $7 million for Fiscal 1970 and the President's budget request of only $4,554,000—the same amount as appropriated by Congress last year.

The serious financial crisis facing schools of public health during the next several years poses a growing threat for the 1970's in their ability to supply the increasing demands by health agencies for trained professional health manpower. Vacancies already exist in key health positions at all levels of government despite the tremendous increase in the numbers of skilled health personnel being trained each year by the schools of public health.

At their annual meeting in Minneapolis last April, the Deans of all the schools of public health in the United States expressed their concern in a communication sent to President Nixon, HEW Secretary Finch, and Budget Director Mayo. It said:

"Deans and Directors of the sixteen university schools of public health, meeting to review current educational situation, respectfully but urgently call attention to critical need to provide increased financial support for comprehensive preparation of graduate physicians and other health leaders needed for public service in Federal, State, and local governments, who are now vitally important to present and future health of our people, particularly those now deprived of health services in inner cities and poverty areas.

"Although $7 million authorized in fiscal 1970 for formula grants so essential to operation of schools of public health, only $4,554,000 requested by past administration. Unless Congress appropriates full amount authorized we must report that increased manpower shortage will seriously impair possibility of meeting nation's health needs."

It is clear that since the schools of public health are the *only* source to train these vitally needed health professionals, our national needs can only be met by increasing the appropriations level in the Fiscal 1970 budget and by raising the authorization ceilings by legislative action in the 91st Congress to more realistic levels. Only then and by the subsequent appropriation of adequate funds during the Fiscal 1971–73 years can our Nation be assured of meeting our national, State, and local health manpower requirements.

How can these needs be determined? The Association of Schools of Public Health in April 1969 solicited data to pinpoint specific quantitative and qualitative needs in a questionnaire to the Dean of each school of public health. Detailed data for each of the three years—1970–71, 1971–72, and 1972–73—were furnished by the schools and carefully analyzed. The results are shown below.

An estimated $51 million in Federal formula grant funds will be required by the nation's schools of public health during the Fiscal 1971–1973 period to meet the expanding student enrollment, teaching programs, and increases in basic operating costs:

	Million
Fiscal year 1971	$12.5
Fiscal year 1972	16.8
Fiscal year 1973	21.6

The schools have estimated that these funds, if authorized and appropriated by Congress, would be distributed approximately as follows in the various areas of instruction:

	Percent
Epidemiology	14
Environmental health, including radiation and occupational health	13
Health administration, including comprehensive health planning	13
Continuing education	10
Population and family planning, including maternal and child health	8
Health education	7
Biometry	7
Medical care and hospital administration	6
Mental health	5
Nutrition	5
Behavioral sciences	4
Public health nursing	2
Aging and chronic diseases	2
International health	2

The remaining two percent of the funds would be used to improve supportive services for the teaching programs of the schools of public health.

SUMMARY

This *Progress Report* has described how Federal formula grant funds have been utilized by the nation's schools of public health and presented the remarkable record of accomplishment made as a direct result of the financial assistance provided during the Administration of four Presidents by the 85th through the 90th Congresses under bi-partisan support.

It is clear that such progresss in public health training and practice could *not* have been made without formula grant funds, which provide the flexibility required in the schools' teaching and administrative structure.

It is also clear that future progress in the public health field in America depends, in large part, on the continuing and expanding support of the schools of public health through formula grant funds. Estimates of the dimension of these needs during the next several years have been provided.

To the achievement of this growing dimension of needs for the decade of the 1970's, the Nation's schools of public health rededicate themselves.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUSKIE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) participated in yesterday's Vietnam moratorium—as did a number of us in this body—by going home and talking with and listening to his own constituents.

Because the remarks of the Senator from Maine at Bates College are exceptionally to the point, and instructive for all who will heed them, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

I have been asked why I chose to speak at Bates College tonight.

I came to Bates because I believe today's moratorium can be a time for learning. For me it is a chance to continue an education started on this campus many years ago.

Today's protest is a sign of concern and frustration. It is a sign of broken communications.

There are those who say there is nothing to learn from the moratorium. There are those who downgrade the right to petition.

I say that on the issues of Vietnam we have much to learn from each other, and we can only learn if we are willing to listen to each other and to reason with each other.

This applies to the President and to those who protest. Only in this way can we develop policies on Vietnam which can meet our national interests and end the ugly divisions caused by our involvement there. I regret that the President has not seen this day as an opportunity to unite rather than divide the country. His participation, in a forum of his choosing, could have added a constructive dimension to this national dialogue.

We are engaged in a unique and somewhat awkward experiment. We are engaged in an effort to change a major aspect of our foreign policy in public view, while our country is involved in a war and in diplomatic negotiations to end that war.

Our national debate over the wisdom of past policies, the validity of present policies and our alternatives for future policies is open for world-wide inspection. The magnitude of today's moratorium, for example, transmitted almost instantaneously by radio and television, will have a significant impact in Washington, in Paris, in Moscow, in Hanoi, and in Saigon.

We cannot predict either the nature or the precise direction of the changes we shall cause. We may never be able to measure our impact, but we can be sure our voices will be heard.

That fact is one which should not be ignored. If we mean to be heard—if we mean to change the course of events—then we must be conscious of the responsibility we have assumed.

The right to have a voice in the development of public policy carries with it a responsibility for the results of that policy. Our proposals may not be adopted, but what we say and how we say it will help shape what happens at the negotiating table and on the battlefield.

A sense of responsibility for what we say and do should induce some caution, but it should not impose silence. One of the most dangerous assumptions in a democratic society is to conclude that only the President, the Cabinet and his generals are competent to make judgments on the national interest. Their judgment and their actions, which are fallible, must be subjected to constant scrutiny, tempered by the knowledge of our own, individual fallibility. As the President may be wrong, so may we be wrong.

If we want to make constructive proposals about our policies in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, we must understand how we got where we are, what our objectives now are or should be, and what alternatives are available to us.

Our involvement in Vietnam did not happen overnight or through the decision of one man. It was the product of post World War II policies directed against Communist expansionism and threats of expansion in

Europe, Asia and elsewhere. It was stimulated by our fear that Communist support for "wars of liberation" would topple the struggling countries of Southeast Asia and disrupt the balance of power in that part of the world. It was encouraged by the concern expressed by governments in that area which felt threatened by Communist China and North Vietnam.

We were persuaded that an aggressive communism threatened to exploit the emerging drive toward nationalism and self-determination which characterized that area. In the uncertain conditions following the withdrawal of Great Britain and France from Southeast Asia, American power seemed to hold a promise of security and support for those who lived in that area.

Although we followed a policy of "limited" involvement in Vietnam, we found our participation growing from technical assistance, money and weapons to massive armed intervention. We sought to buy time for the South Vietnamese against the combined onslaught of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, but in the process we made the struggle an American war and imposed terrible burdens on ourselves at home and abroad.

Time has changed our perspective on conditions in Vietnam. What once seemed clear is now uncertain. What once could be described in terms of black and white is now gray. We ask ourselves hard questions:

Should Vietnam have been divided by the Geneva Accords?

Should we have supported the political arrangements forecast by those Accords?

To what extent was the Vietnamese conflict a case of external aggression and to what extent was it a civil war?

History will render the final verdict on the wisdom of our decision to enter the Vietnam conflict. Our task is more immediate—to set new policies where old plans no longer apply, and to bring peace where there is none today.

We are engaged in the search for a way to end the fighting and the killing, to give the Vietnamese people the opportunity to work out their own political destiny, and to lay the groundwork for a more appropriate United States policy in Southeast Asia. Each of us has engaged in that search in his or her own way.

In the process I have made two trips to that part of the world—one as a member of the Mansfield Mission in 1965 and one as a member of the 1967 election observers group. I have read extensively and consulted with men who know the problems of Vietnam intimately.

I have reached some conclusions on what may be the best alternative strategies and policies, conscious of Clark Clifford's observation that "to reach a conclusion and to implement it are not the same, especially when one does not have the ultimate power of decision."

I offer my conclusions, not as one who has an absolute conviction of his own infallibility, but as one who seeks to contribute to a constructive policy for ourselves and for the people of Southeast Asia.

First, I believe our primary objective—for the Vietnamese as well as for American soldiers—should be to end the fighting and killing in Vietnam.

Second, I believe we should do what we can to advance the prospects for a political settlement in Vietnam. We should not design or impose that settlement, but we should do what we can to make it possible.

Third, I believe we should reexamine the nature of our interests in Southeast Asia and the kinds of efforts we can prudently make to help Asian nations achieve the economic, social and political stability they want and need.

It is clearly the deepening conviction of the American people that we must end our present involvement in Vietnam. That conviction must control our policy.

That fact is reflected in a number of proposals and policies for:

Disengagement;

De-Americanization of the war;

Withdrawal of American forces in accordance with a variety of formulas and timetables;

De-escalation of combat activities;

Ceasefires.

Implicit in most of these proposals are the twin objectives:

An end to American involvement—accomplished in a way which will enable the South Vietnamese to carry on without us—as soon as possible—in the event a negotiated settlement has not been achieved in the meantime.

The various formulas for withdrawals raise a number of questions:

1. Should we commit ourselves to a total withdrawal by a specified date?

2. If so, should our timetable be publicly announced?

3. Should be commit ourselves, publicly at least, only as to withdrawal of ground combat forces—leaving in doubt the date and conditions for withdrawing air aid logistical support?

Involved in the answers to such questions are:

The viability of a continued South Vietnamese effort upon our departure;

Maintenance of pressure upon Hanoi and the National Liberation Front to negotiate.

In the light of our involvement and its impact upon the Vietnamese people—whether or not history judges it to have been wise—do we have a responsibility to be concerned about such questions and the impact that the manner of our departure will have upon the situation we leave behind?

It is difficult to conceive of basically new proposals to add to those already advanced in a variety of forms.

As I have considered all of these, and the questions they raise, I have reached certain conclusions.

1. I believe we must disengage our forces—in an orderly way—as soon as possible.

I believe such a policy is dictated by several considerations:

Our efforts have bought the South Vietnamese people valuable time to develop political and military viability;

Whether or not they have developed the will and the capacity to shape their own future must be tested at some point;

There is no way for us to guarantee the existence of that viability;

In the last analysis, the Vietnamese people must create their own political institutions and select their own political leadership;

The imperatives of our problems here at home dictate that we now leave their future in their hands and turn our attention to our own.

2. I believe that withdrawal of our military forces should be orderly and phased in such a way as to give the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to adjust to it.

We should make it clear to the Government in Saigon that our withdrawal is geared to a specific time frame to which they must adjust.

The other side should be left in doubt—and we should reserve flexibility—as to the phasing out of logistical and air support. This point, it seems to me, could be relevant to their motivation to negotiate.

Even as we plan our withdrawal, it should be our objective to pave the way for a political settlement between the South Vietnam Government, the National Liberation Front, and other groups representing the several social and political tendencies in Vietnam.

The kind of withdrawal proposal advanced by former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford—of those which have been proposed—illustrates one way to serve this objective. It's based on the assumption that we should continue to seek a negotiated settlement in Paris as we plan for disengagement.

Accordingly, Secretary Clifford has proposed a two-stage plan which would move our ground combat troops out by the end of 1970 and which would provide air and logistical support for somewhat longer. Such a plan, while cutting American casualties, could provide an incentive for the South Vietnamese Government, the North Vietnamese, and the National Liberation Front to reach a negotiated settlement, hopefully even before our withdrawal is complete.

(3) I believe that a standstill cease-fire might open the way for a negotiated settlement and a quick end to the fighting and killing. This suggestion has been resisted by both sides which suggests to me its viability. Such an offer could be accompanied by a reduction in our offensive operations.

If the standstill cease-fire plan succeeded, the withdrawal of United States forces could be accelerated as international peace-keeping forces stepped in to insure observance of the cease-fire. If the standstill cease-fire offer did not lead to an early end to the fighting, a steady and methodical withdrawal plan would offer an effective way of reducing United States involvement and combat losses, while creating the conditions which favor a political settlement.

A standstill cease-fire and a staged withdrawal plan do not rise or fall on the success of the other, but they could reinforce each other. Each recognizes that our commitment and our obligations in Vietnam are to the Vietnamese people, not to a particular regime. Each provides an opportunity for a reasonable political solution. Each reduces the risk of political reprisals at the end of the war.

What I have said, up to this point, is the following:

1. That we commit ourselves to disengagement.

2. That we implement that commitment by means of a phased plan of withdrawal, geared to a timetable.

3. That, in planning our withdrawal, we seek to promote the prospects for a negotiated settlement.

There are those who, in their frustration, are pressing for immediate, unilateral withdrawal. There are others, equally frustrated, who suggest escalating the war again. As to both these suggestions, I raise the following questions:

Is it not possible—

That either course could make less likely a negotiated settlement between the parties?

That either course could mean an inevitable continuation of the war?

That either might open the way for a blood bath in South Vietnam?

That either could dim the prospects for a free choice by the South Vietnamese people?

Our power to influence the shape of postwar Vietnam seems limited to the way in which we decide to disengage. An abrupt and precipitate disengagement could leave chaos behind us.

To the extent that we can avoid that result, we should try.

A scheduled plan for withdrawal of American forces means that the United States will make its own decisions as a great country should—with an appreciation of its own interests, with understanding of its enemies and concern for its allies, and with the wisdom to learn from its past mistakes. In too many cases in Vietnam we have allowed ourselves to be diverted by narrow demands of the Saigon Government and deflected by the uncertain responses of Hanoi. We drifted with events and reacted to pressures. Now is the time for us to assert control over our own policies in pursuit of reasonable and just objectives.

Now is the time also to make clear to the Saigon government that we will not permit it to veto our efforts to explore new ways to end the war. Saigon blocked the proposed three-day cease fire at the time of Ho Chi Minh's death. We urged them to broaden their po-

litical base; they responded by enlarging the cabinet, but narrowing its political base.

It is not our prerogative to determine the future political complexion of the Saigon government, and we should not let it be assumed that we have any fixed or irrevocable views on that score.

There are additional steps which might enhance the prospects for a political settlement:

Agreement on a joint commission on elections, to avoid a "winner take all" election, feared by both sides.

Large-scale land reform.

A United States offer of medical aid, relief, and long-term economic and technical assistance to both Vietnams at the conclusion of a settlement.

These are steps for the Vietnamese to initiate, not for us to impose.

I do not assume that the suggestions I have made would guarantee immediate acceptance by the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front or by the Saigon government. But I believe that, taken together, they could provide incentives for both sides in Vietnam to begin planning for an end to the military contest.

Any of the proposals advanced for United States initiatives to disengage from Vietnam cannot be implemented by congressional resolution or by public demand. They can only be implemented by the President and his administration.

I believe President Nixon wants peace in Vietnam. I believe the Nation is ready to support him in meaningful moves toward peace. Such meaningful moves require new initiatives.

There have been, and will be, many different explanations of what this moratorium "means". Some will say it means that the American people want all our troops embarked this week for home, whatever the consequences. Some will say it means a complete repudiation of the administration's policies. The President's initial response to it seemed to support that second view—unwisely, in my opinion.

Let me tell you what I think this moratorium means.

I think it means that a very great number of Americans have decided that we should move much more vigorously than we have toward reducing our casualties, and toward ending the fighting and withdrawing from Vietnam.

The American people are in a position to encourage additional steps toward peace, by making known their commitment to a change in our strategies and a re-examination of our underlying international policies. That commitment will require an appreciation of the complexity of the forces with which we must deal, and a willingness to invest time and energy in the search for a better way to help the peoples of Asia, Africa and South America to achieve their own potential.

Our experience in Vietnam has taught us some painful lessons—lessons we wish we might have avoided or might have learned in a less painful way.

We are arrogant and mistaken if we believe that we of the western world are the sole possessors of the yearnings which motivated our own revolution. It is not our national responsibility or duty to stifle or pervert these yearnings when they appear elsewhere.

John Adams told us that, "power always thinks it has a great soul and vast views beyond the comprehension of the weak." Eric Sevareid reminds us that, "in that illusion lies the key to the ultimate crumbling of those sovereign states of the past that rolled not to, or toward, world supremacy. Power is not only not wisdom but often wisdom's enemy."

When we have truly learned that lesson and when it is reflected in our policies at home, this Nation will truly be on the road to the only kind of freedom that matters.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, October 14 was the anniversary of the birthday of our beloved former President and general, Dwight David Eisenhower. It is fitting that yesterday the Senate provided for the issuance of an Eisenhower $1 coin to commemorate this great leader. It was a fitting action which greatly honors a great man.

General Eisenhower will be remembered by all of us for his long term of service to the Nation as supreme commander of our Armed Forces, as a great President, and as a lasting figure in American life.

On November 23, 1953, President Eisenhower expressed his passionate feeling for things of the spirit and soul, and his abiding faith in the American people. He said:

> The things that make us proud to be Americans are of the soul and spirit. They are not the jewels we wear, or the furs we buy, the house we live in, the standard of living, even, that we have. All these things are wonderful to the esthetic and to the physical senses. But never let us forget that the deep things that are America are the soul and the spirit. The Statue of Liberty is not tired, and not because it is made of bronze. It is because no matter what happens, here the individual is dignified because he is created in the image of his God. Let us not forget it.

FUNDS APPROVED FOR THREE WEST VIRGINIA PROJECTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, I am proud that on October 14 we were able to secure the approval of House conferees with regard to funds for two highly important coal research projects in West Virginia, as well as for work that is needed at a federally owned camping site in Tucker County, W. Va.

Earlier, in subcommittee action, I was able to get the approval of my colleagues to restore $652,000 which the House had slashed from the fiscal year 1970 operating budget for "Project Gasoline" in Marshall County, W. Va., and to add $243,000 to preclude a reduction in force at the Morgantown, W. Va., Coal Research Center. My colleagues also agreed to add $65,000 to the budget to make repairs on a faulty sewage disposal lagoon at Camp Horseshoe, a facility owned by the U.S. Forest Service and operated by the YMCA in Tucker County.

I am gratified that we were able to persuade House conferees to agree to all three of these actions because each project, in its own way, is important to the State or the locality in which it is located. I believe that a summary of the needs of each project might be of interest.

The Project Gasoline pilot plant at Cresap is now operating with the full crew needed for continuous production. It has reached this condition after considerable modification that was required to eliminate mechanical difficulties. In order to obtain the maximum benefit from the large investment that the Government has made in this project, it is necessary to operate the pilot plant in the manner for which it was designed through the next year or two. If the present level of operations were to be substantially curtailed, it would be impossible to obtain the data which is needed to bring the project to a successful conclusion. Substantial curtailment now would result in a waste of Government funds in that anything less than full operation would be meaningless.

The original budget request prepared by the Office of Coal Research was $3,500,000. This represented OCR's best judgment as to the funds required for proper operation and did include a reasonable contingency factor. The cost of present full-scale operations is proceeding at a rate of about $3,000,000 per year. Thus in OCR's judgment the $2,652,000 originally in the budget was a barebones minimum, undoubtedly on the low side of that which will be needed.

As approved by the House Appropriations Committee, $2,000,000 was well below any possible sum which would have kept the pilot plant operating to produce the desired results. Operation at that level would have been almost meaningless.

As to the research money to be spent at Morgantown, this Nation has only a few research centers devoted to improving coal technology. We are in danger of losing skilled, professional scientists and engineers who are in extremely short supply at the Morgantown Coal Research Center. This loss would be occurring at a time when numerous studies indicate that the Nation's future energy demands will reach unprecedented levels and will severely tax the coal industry to meet the demand for coal.

The increased demand for coal, coupled with our concern for the health and safety of the coal-mine worker, dictates that it would be wise to increase our coal research expenditures rather than lay off experienced coal research personnel. Accordingly, I requested that an additional $243,000 be appropriated for the Morgantown Coal Research Center.

These funds would be used to determine the technical and economic feasibility of pneumatically transporting coal from the mining machine to an established underground mining system. Successful development of such a pneumatic transportation could increase the operating time of mining equipment, assist in controlling respirable dust concentrations in the mine atmosphere, and provide a controlled exit for methane produced during mining. These improvements would make coal mining inherently safer and more efficient than at the present time.

In the absence of the restoration of these funds, a reduction in force of 15 research personnel from the Morgantown station would have been necessary.

Turning from coal research, Camp Horseshoe organization camp was built and is owned by the U.S. Government. It is operated under special-use permit by the YMCA and in 1968 provided 16,000 visitor-days of use for 7,400 visitors. The camp can accommodate 160 persons at one time.

About 2 years ago, the YMCA started improving the existing sanitation system by constructing two combination

shower and toilet units, sewage disposal lines, and a sewage disposal and treatment lagoon. The Forest Service designed the sanitation system for the YMCA under a cooperative agreement.

The treatment lagoon subsequently failed, due to shortcuts taken in both design and installation. The site examination by the Forest Service in the system design did not disclose the porous nature of the soil, and, as a result, the lagoon will not hold water. Consequently, the YMCA has had to revert to use of pit toilets pending correction of the defective treatment system.

The Forest Service recognized that it has an obligation to the YMCA to correct the errors in the design of the lagoon and redesigned the system the latter part of fiscal year 1969. The reconstruction necessary work to correct this unsatisfactory situation will cost approximately $65,000. The need was not included in the fiscal year 1970 budget because it was only known subsequent to preparation of the 1970 recreation development program.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Cooperative Extension Service with headquarters at Auburn University has a long and illustrious history of service to farmers and citizens in rural areas of Alabama. Few, if any, governmental organizations have done more to improve living conditions of all rural people of Alabama.

Mr. President, the Cooperative Extension Service is one Federal agency that enjoys overwhelming support of all the people and justifiably so because it works closely and harmoniously with county governing bodies, with State legislatures, with adults and youth, with local public schools, with rural community organizations. In doing so it has remained in touch with the people and works with and for the people.

Before we travel too far down the road to "new federalism" it may be well to consider the effectiveness of the philosophy, the administrative structure, and the methods of the Cooperative Extension Service and take note of its emphasis on a genuine State-Federal partnership. It has much to offer as an example of traditional federalism and as a workable State-Federal relationship.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate today that eminently successful Federal programs designed to assist our farmers and rural population are under attack from ideologues, agitators, and irresponsible elements which seem to thrive on creating divisiveness, discord, and turmoil. It is hoped that the Cooperative Extension Service will be spared this disruptive and time-consuming ordeal.

Mr. President, I believe the following report of the Cooperative Extension Service at Auburn University may be useful in discouraging nit-picking and harping criticism of this truly outstanding organization from irresponsible elements of the left. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, AUBURN UNIVERSITY

I. RESULTS ACCOMPLISHED

A. Prior to 1964, non-white and white Extension programs were organized and operated largely as separate units. Non-white county staffs were located in 35 of the 67 counties and a state staff was located at Tuskegee Institute. Actions to implement the Civil Rights Act resulted in an administrative merger placing all programs and activities under the same administrative and supervisory personnel. Other actions and accomplishments were:

1. White and non-white personnel located in separate offices were relocated and housed together at both the county and state levels.

2. In many instances, county rental agreements were terminated, new office locations were secured and physical alteration of office space was necessary. The physical task of relocating county staffs and advising the public of these changes required a special public relations program with county officials and the public. All counties with white and non-white staff members were involved in this process.

3. Non-white state staff members who were housed in an Extension-owned building located at Tuskegee Institute, a predominantly Negro institution, were relocated with all but two staff members being housed in offices at Auburn University, the state headquarters for the Cooperative Extension Service. The remaining two staff members were located in area offices.

4. Non-white staff members had always carried the word Negro as part of their title prior to 1965. By act of the Board of Trustees, Auburn University, upon request of the Director, titles of non-whites as well as whites at the county level were changed to provide a uniform title for like positions. Such titles needing attention at the state level were also changed.

5. The transition in titles and responsibilities required a training program on the part of the organization to acquaint staff members, and particularly the public, with the new titles and the need to associate them with positions and responsibilities. This transition was accomplished in all 67 counties of the state.

6. All agency signs indicating separate office locations or services were removed and new signs designating a single office with one service were installed.

7. Public facilities such as water fountains, rest rooms, etc., used by Cooperative Extension Service staffs, were made equally available to all staff members regardless of race.

8. A detailed plan for implementation of the Civil Rights Act was developed in March 1965 and revised in August 1965. This plan was directed toward the major areas of (1) program planning and execution, (2) staff housing and facilities, (3) staff assignments and development, (4) special events, and (5) continuing state programs. This plan has served as a guide in implementation of the Act.

9. Specific policies and procedures for implementation of the Civil Rights Act were developed and copies provided and reviewed with all professional Extension Service employees by the Director. Policies covered all major conditions set forth in Title VI of the Act and subsequent regulations based upon the Act. Procedures were quite explicit as to the role of each employee in the implementation of these policies.

10. Organized groups were contacted to explain Extension's policies relating to service to them and participation in their programs and activities. Such action occurred at all levels of organization—county, district, area, and state. Mass media were also used extensively in this effort.

11. County staff competencies and abilities were reviewed and assignments made to best use their capabilities.

District supervisors worked with county staff members to determine areas of work toward which each might make the greatest contribution. Assignments were made, although not restrictive in nature, for each position.

12. Salary and travel allocations were adjusted to compensate employees in accordance with position held and their work performance. Such adjustments resulted generally in greater percentage salary increases for non-whites than for whites.

13. New office equipment and supplies were provided where needed to standardize facilities for white and non-white employees in like positions.

14. All county staffs were directed to hold weekly staff conferences to discuss plans and programs for the week. Usually, such conferences were held on each Monday morning and a discussion of activities reported to the district Extension chairman and associate district Extension chairman for their information and supervisory guidance.

15. Both white and non-white staff members were provided equal opportunity for formal training for informal inservice training.

16. Opportunities for attending off-campus graduate courses were inaugurated for all employees regardless of race.

7. Specialists and other staff members giving training to county staffs provided equal training to all county personnel without regard to race.

18. Upon merger of county offices, it was made possible for any county staff member to request specialist assistance through the county Extension chairman. This plan increased the opportunities for non-white employees to discuss the need for specialist assistance and to secure such assistance since white and non-white agents occupied contiguous offices.

19. All 4–H Club awards programs and activities were combined. The combining of programs meant that all literature, training awards, and other activities were equally available to all 4–H'ers without regard to race. Prior to 1964, 4–H Clubs were conducted on a segregated basis. All awards programs participated in by whites and non-whites are judged by committees composed of the two races.

20. There has been an increase in non-white 4–H Club enrollment since passage of the Civil Rights Act and the combining of offices and programs.

In 1964, there were 30,211 non-white 4–H Club members. In 1969 this number had increased to 44,770 members—an increase of 14,559.

21. Homemaker clubs were reorganized with emphasis placed upon leader training for club officials. Special interest groups have been emphasized. Home demonstration clubs were segregated prior to 1964 and met largely in homes, but staff emphasis is presently upon meetings of a bi-racial nature held publicly and on matters of special or wide interest.

22. Employment opportunities are open to employees regardless of race or sex. Qualified personnel are employed when available, to fill positions that become vacant. An example of this is found in Macon County. A non-white county Extension home agent was promoted to associate county Extension chairman in 1968, replacing a white employee who had held that position. This non-white employee has responsibilities for programs for both white and non-white women and youth of Macon County.

23. Special limited resource demonstrations, programs and literature have been designed to better serve low income families, a high percentage of which are non-white. Since 1964, there have been 81 different publications especially written for low income

groups, and 1,949,000 copies have been printed and distributed. Limited resource demonstrations have been conducted in all counties in increasing numbers each year.

24. Long-time Extension programs were revised at the county level in 1966 to better accommodate changes in staff and services to clientele. Since that time, a single Extension annual plan of work has been developed for each county embracing plans for all Extension activities in the county.

25. County Extension Advisory Councils have been revised. Before passage of the Civil Rights Act, there were white and non-white council groups involved in planning separate county programs. Presently, there is only one county Extension Council in each county. Sixty-five of the 67 counties have bi-racial council memberships.

26. Secretarial assistance has been made available to all county staff members. Thirty of the 35 counties with non-white employees did not have secretarial assistance prior to July 1, 1964. Since combining offices, all employees have access to secretarial assistance.

27. There were five non-white employees at the county level in 1964, but presently there are 18 non-white non-academic employees located in county offices. These employees serve both white and non-white staff members as do the white non-academic employees located there.

28. Seventy non-white professional employees are located in 35 different counties within the state.

29. At the state level there are six non-white specialists, an assistant editor and an assistant to the director occupying professional positions.

30. An especially designed Nutrition Education Program was begun for low income families early in 1969. This program presently makes use of non-professional program assistants, 123 of which are non-white. A vast majority of clientele served by this program is non-white.

31. Procedures for filing complaints have been posted in public places and released to the press. Publications covering this subject have been made available to the public.

32. Professional employee associations were organized on a segregated basis prior to 1964, but are now open to whites and non-whites. By-laws and other barriers to membership and participation in professional associations are removed and presently all professional associations of Extension employees are open to whites and non-whites.

II. ACTIONS TAKEN TO ACCOMPLISH RESULTS

The first action taken after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the receipt of regulations pertaining to Title VI applicable to the Cooperative Extension Service, was to begin discussion between staff members to explore ways and means of implementing the Act. Such discussions included both white and non-white staff members, and were directed toward ways and means of complying with the Act. After considerable discussion, and consideration of several alternatives, certain carefully designed concrete steps were taken to move toward compliance. Major steps taken were as follows:

A. The decision was made to keep each staff member fully informed of all regulations, instructions or policies pertaining to the Act, and their application to the Cooperative Extension Service. Direct letter communication, meetings, conferences, personal contacts and the weekly Official Letter were included in the methods used by the administration to accomplish this end. Examples of this action are:

1. Instructions for administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the Cooperative Extension Service, dated December 28, 1964, as received by Auburn University President Ralph B. Draughon from Federal Extension Service Administrator Lloyd H. Davis, was duplicated and sent to each staff member by the director of the Cooperative Extension Service.

2. Memorandum issued by Secretary Orville L. Freeman titled "Federal Participation in Segregated Meetings" was received from Administrator Davis and forwarded to staff members by the Director, June 23, 1964.

3. Adjustments in Extension programs under the Civil Rights Act were received from Administrator Davis, duplicated by the Director, and sent to the staff June 10, 1965.

4. The Director secured minutes of meeting of the Board of Trustees, Auburn University, relating to title changes of Extension personnel and forwarded copies to staff members June 11, 1965. This action was followed by further explanation in the Director's Official Letters numbers 306 and 307, dated June 11 and 18, 1965.

5. USDA regulations set forth in section 15.5 (b) pertaining to the necessity for keeping compliance records was sent to all staff members by the Director's Official Letter No. 307, dated June 18, 1965.

6. A statement and explanation of Extension's policy with respect to working with organized groups was prepared for county use and sent to county Extension chairmen by the Director in June 1965.

7. County program responsibility as assigned to the County Extension Chairmen was clarified by the Director in Official Letter No. 308, dated June 25, 1965.

8. July 2, 1965, the Director received from Administrator Davis statement titled (1) Adjustments in Policies and Practices of the Cooperative Extension Service to Meet Compliance Requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (2) Civil Rights Amendments to Instructions, and (3) Supplemental Instructions for Administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the Cooperative Extension Service. Copies of each of these documents were sent to staff members by the Associate Director.

9. Copies of the publication titled "Civil Rights Under Federal Programs," CCR Special Publication No. 1, was sent to all staff members with Official Letter No. 311, dated July 16, 1965. Attention was again called to the availability of this material in Official Letter No. 416, dated September 11, 1967.

10. Letter from the Director to county Extension chairmen and associate county Extension chairmen made references to the three pieces of material sent to counties July 2, 1965, called on county staffs to obtain letters of intent to comply from organizations served by the Cooperative Extension Service. This letter was dated July 16, 1965.

11. The Director sent letter to all state and area organizational heads cooperating on a continuing basis with the Cooperative Extension Service to explain compliance policies. This letter was dated July 20, 1965.

12. A statewide meeting of heads of major organizations was held in Auburn, Alabama, July 28, 1965, to explain regulations and policies of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as it applied to the Cooperative Extension Service. Explanations were made by the Director, followed by discussion with organizational leaders.

13. A state proposed plan of action under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was developed and presented to the Federal Extension Service. The plan was first developed March 3, 1965 and revised August 15, 1965. The latter plan was the last one developed and sent to Administrator Davis.

14. A statement of policies and procedures for implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was completed (based upon above mentioned plan) and forwarded to Administrator Davis. This policy statement was dated August 15, 1965.

15. The above mentioned policy statement was read by the Director to each professional employee in district meetings held: Auburn, August 30–31; Montgomery, September 1–2; Huntsville, September 13–14; and Birmingham, September 15–16, 1965. Members of the Federal Extension Service staff were also involved in these conferences to discuss related matters.

16. October 21, 1965, the Director sent to county Extension chairmen a copy of Administrator Davis' statement titled "Interpretation and Modification of Civil Rights Instructions" and called attention to the fact that under the modified regulations they were not required to secure compliance statements from organizations being served.

17. Official Letter No. 351, dated May 13, 1966, carried attachment of copy of letter from Administrator Davis pertaining to 4–H Clubs operating in schools where plans for school compliance had not been approved.

18. December 18, 1967, the Director sent each county Extension chairman a copy of Administrator Davis' letter outlining examples of Civil Rights violations found in Office of Inspector General audits in a sample of counties in six states. Comments were made about this document in the Director's Official Letter No. 431, dated December 18, 1967.

19. The Director issued to staff members a policy statement regarding service by Extension members to Homemaker Clubs. This statement was dated September 1968.

20. Staff members were reminded in Official Letter No. 498, dated May 23, 1969, to display publication "Civil Rights Under Federal Programs."

21. Official Letter No. 499, dated May 30, 1969, carried the official complaint procedure statement previously sent to counties in other documents and again called their attention to means of making complaint procedures available to the public.

22. A statement titled "Planned Action for Civil Rights Implementation in Response to County OIG Audits," was forwarded by request to Administrator Davis, July 8, 1969.

23. A report requested by the Administrator of program and staff data covering the (1) names, titles, race and salaries of staff in counties or areas having white and minority group professional staff as of July 1, 1969, (2) participation in selected 4–H events, (3) youth receiving awards in the 4–H program, (4) number of Extension related organizations, and (5) number of people in Extension related planning groups, was supplied by the Director August 13, 1969.

24. A report titled "Implementation of Civil Rights Plan in Response to County OIG Audits," was forwarded to Administrator Davis by the Director on September 15, 1969.

B. Actions other than administrative contacts through correspondence were also employed. District Extension chairman and associate district Extension chairmen held numerous and repeated conferences with district, area, or county groups to explain and discuss proposed or alternative actions that might and should be taken to implement Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Likewise, county Extension chairmen held staff conferences and met with individuals and organized groups in repeated sessions to discuss changes that were needed. These actions are reflected in weekly and monthly reports on file in counties and at the state office.

C. Reports were revised to better determine contacts and service to non-white clientele. Weekly reports were changed to reflect contacts with clientele by race and monthly reports carried a supplement that related service to clientele by race and economic status. This was explained to county staff members in letter from the Director dated January 18, 1966. Reports were regularly reviewed and analyzed by the supervisory staff.

D. Regular compliance reviews were conducted to determine extent of compliance and steps that might be taken to meet requirements of the Civil Rights Act. Reviews were both informal and formal in nature. Many of the reviews were of an informal nature and were conducted by the supervisory

staff and resolved with county staffs and informal reports presented to the Director. More formal reviews were also conducted by the Extension staff and other agencies.

E. Special compliance reviews were also conducted by different interested agencies. Some of these were concerned with complaints of individuals, situations, or a particular county program. Supervisory staff members of the state Extension Service also conducted special reviews. Action was taken on each compliance review conducted.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN GROUND WARFARE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the course of the hearing before the Committee on Armed Services, we learned of a number of new developments in ground warfare which were not sufficiently enough developed to be contained in this year's authorization.

I have seen a number of these devices in operation and I am very enthusiastic about what these will do for our ground forces and eventually, because the theory can be applied to all forces, what we will accomplish in the field of intelligence of the economy for the entire military.

On October 14, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, addressing the Association of the U.S. Army, gave a broad brush of the impressing, interesting, and exciting possibilities in the new approaches to intelligence and support. The paper, naturally, did not go into the subject in great detail, but I can assure Senators that if they are interested in what the Army of the next decade will look like and how it will function, they can get a fine beginning knowledge by reading the general's outstanding discussion. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

I always welcome the opportunity to address those who support this Association . . . I know I am among friends who are vitally concerned about our Army.

Our Army today is a dynamic organization undergoing change to stay abreast of a rapidly changing technology and society.

In our adult lifetime many of us have witnessed change unequalled in history—the jet airplane, nuclear power, television, and the computer—to name a few. And the social change that should have come within the last century has been our legacy to accomplish in our generation—now.

As an integral part of our changing society, the Army has also been challenged to meet those demands. We in the Army accept the challenge . . . just as we have accepted and met all our challenges in the past.

Today our Army is weathering a period not too unlike others in our proud history.

Today once again the fundamental principles of our profession—the pillars of discipline on which an Army is built—the trust and confidence that have traditionally motivated the soldier are being questioned. We cannot this time wait for a call to action. The problems that we must address exist within our own ranks . . . we share them with the entire Nation. With our troubled society questioning the role of the Army more than ever before, each soldier in a position of leadership is on trial . . . both his character and his integrity are being tested. To meet the test, he must stand on his principles . . . his personal and professional code of ethics, his dedication, his leadership. These are the principles that resolve the crucial . . . these determine the worth of a man's life. These are the hallmarks of the professional soldier in his finest tradition.

The U.S. Army has served its country proudly. It continues to respond to legally constituted executive authority. But the American people also must understand that their Army does not exist to fight without something to fight for. Our Armed Forces on the international scene are as necessary for the security of our country as our domestic police forces are necessary for law and order at home. Our Army can only be as effective as the spirit of its soldiers. And certainly this spirit is sparked by public trust, support, and confidence.

The Army is as dedicated now as it has been for nearly two centuries . . . dedicated to the preservation of our way of life. In guarding this trust, we have never failed. What more could a country ask of its soldiers?

Recently, a few individuals involved in serious incidents have been highlighted in the news. Some would have these incidents reflect on the Army as a whole. They are, however, the actions of a pitiful few. Certainly the Army cannot and will not condone improper conduct or criminal acts—and I personally assure you that I will not. We will always regard the rights of the individual and acknowledge due process of law. But the Army as an institution should never be put on trial as we deal with the few.

We are a proud Army. We do have confidence in our officers, noncommissioned officers, and soldiers who continue to provide the Army and the Nation with the selfless devoted service that has always been our cherished tradition.

This year, I take special satisfaction in addressing this audience—for I know you are dedicated to the maintenance of a strong, modern Army through military-industrial-labor-academic-scientific cooperation. This team provides the Armed Forces with the best equipment science and technology can produce. This cooperative effort is an element of national power that must never be eroded.

For this reason, I will focus now on purely military matters . . . on developments that are of special interest to this audience.

I will proceed on the assumption that neither the Congress nor the Nation wants us to lay down our shield of armed readiness. On the contrary, our citizens continue to demand from us the best military forces possible within the resources made available to us. This is a fair and demanding challenge which we accept.

In meeting this challenge, the Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. This revolution is not fully understood by many. To date it has received only limited attention. Analysis of the lessons from this revolution will influence the future direction of our Army both in fundamental concepts of organization and development of equipment.

When the first American units were committed in Vietnam, they were to a large extent a reflection of the organization, tactics, techniques, and technology of World War II, with one noteworthy exception. That exception, of course, was best demonstrated by the 1st Air Cavalry Division. For the first time, an Army unit of division size had been organized and equipped to free itself from the constrictions of terrain through the use of battlefield air mobility. The concept and resultant organization were logical outgrowths of the development of sturdy, reliable helicopters for troops carriers, weapons platforms, command and control, aerial ambulances, and reconnaissance vehicles and larger helicopters for carrying artillery, ammunition, and supplies. Even before the arrival of American combat troops, the effective use of the helicopter had been demonstrated in the support of the Vietnamese. I am confident that the vitality of air mobility is recognized and understood by this informed audience.

We learned that Vietnam posed a problem even more difficult than mobility. The enemy we face in Vietnam is naturally elusive and cunning in his use of the dense jungle for concealment. As a result, in the early days of the American commitment we found ourselves with an abundance of firepower and mobility. But we were limited in our ability to locate the enemy. We were not quite a giant without eyes, but that allusion had some validity. Whenever we engaged the enemy, we won the battle. Too often those battles were at enemy initiative and not our own. Too often battles were not fought because the enemy could not be found or because, after initial contact, he had slipped elusively into the jungle or across borders politically beyond our reach . . . or had literally gone underground.

Since 1965 a principal thrust of our experimentation, adaptation and development in tactics, techniques, and technology has been toward improvement of our capability to find the enemy. Each year of the war witnessed substantial improvement. In 1965, 1966, 1967, and early 1968 we increased the number of both air and ground cavalry units. We added a second airmobile division. As our troops arrived, we progressively organized special reconnaissance elements of all kinds, including long-range patrol companies and special forces teams. We found ourselves more and more using the infantry for the purpose of finding the enemy. When the enemy broke down into small units, we did likewise. We learned to operate skillfully at night. We mastered the enemy's ambush techniques. Technical means were reinforced and improved. Intelligence organizations were expanded and refined.

During this period, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering urged the scientific community to develop a new family of sensors and associated communications equipment to help locate enemy forces on infiltration routes. After proving these devices workable in test, we developed plans in 1967 to use them throughout the battlefield. In mid 1968, our field experiments began. Since then, we have integrated these new devices with the more conventional surveillance equipment and other intelligence collection means. As a result, our ability to find the enemy has improved materially.

Comparing the past few years of progress with a forecast of the future produces one conclusion: we are on the threshold of an entirely new battlefield concept.

Now let me briefly examine the past and relate it to the future.

The Napoleonic Wars are well documented in history texts. Firepower was limited. Mobility was limited essentially to the foot soldier. Support services were provided by contact or foraging. Cavalry, scouts and pickets provided intelligence. This chapter of military history is replete with numerous examples of battles that might have been . . . had the opposing forces known of each other's presence. But when forces made contact, they massed to do battle. At Waterloo, for example, over 140,000 troops crowded into less than three miles of front line contact.

A little over a century later, World War I brought trench warfare. The advent of the machine gun and massed artillery introduced sizable increases in the firepower capabilities available to ground forces. Mobility and support efforts experienced little change. Maneuver on the battlefield was almost nonexistent. Only a few visionaries saw real utility in the tank. Primitive aerial observation brought only marginal improvements in intelligence gathering. The density of troops in the front line, reduced from that of Waterloo, still re-

mained high as soldiers crowded shoulder to shoulder in their network of trenches. Without mobility and information about the enemy, the newly acquired firepower served little purpose.

World War II saw the tank mature, and armies organized to capitalize on this capability. Mobility began to gain on firepower. While the Navy was developing sonar and air elements proceeded with intercept radars, Army target acquisition systems remained essentially at the World War I level. The wheeled vehicle improved our support effort. But we were still confined to the ground with our airlift capability remaining minimal.

The increased mobility, however, did permit combat elements to disperse over a wider front, and the density of troops along the battle lines became smaller. Still, the absence of a refined intelligence capability permitted only small economics of force.

But the Vietnam War has seen a revolution in ground force mobility. We no longer assign units a sector of frontage. Instead, units are responsible for an operational area. And with the mobility of the helicopter, units like the 1st Cavalry and the 101st Airborne Divisions cover hundreds of square miles with their airmobile blankets.

The revolution I envision for the future comes not from the helicopter alone, but from systems that heretofore have been unknown.

For a moment, let us consider the basic combat role of the Army. As the Nation's land force, our mission is to defeat enemy forces in land combat and to gain control of the land and its people. In this role, we have traditionally recognized five functions. But we have emphasized only three: mobility, firepower, and command and control—in other words—move, shoot, and communicate. To me, the other two—intelligence and support—have not been sufficiently stressed. Placing the functions in proper perspective, I visualize the Army's job in land combat as:

First, we must find the enemy.

Second, we must destroy the enemy.

And third, we must support the forces that perform the other two functions.

By studying operations in Vietnam, one can better understand these functions.

Large parts of the infantry, ground and air cavalry, and aviation are used in what I will now call "STANO"—surveillance, target acquisition and night observation, or function number one—finding the enemy. In this function large areas can be covered continuously by aerial surveillance systems, unattended ground sensors, radars and other perfected means of finding the enemy. These systems can permit us to deploy our fires and forces more effectively in the most likely and most productive areas.

The second function—destroying the enemy—is the role of our combat forces—artillery, air, armor, and infantry, together with the helicopters needed to move the combat troops. Firepower can be concentrated without massing large numbers of troops. In Vietnam where artillery and tactical air forces inflict over two-thirds of the enemy casualties, firepower is responsive as never before. It can rain destruction anywhere on the battlefield within minutes . . . whether friendly troops are present or not.

Inherent in the function of destroying the enemy is fixing the enemy. In the past, we have devoted sizeable portions of our forces to this requirement. In the future, however, fixing the enemy will become a problem primarily in time rather than space. More specifically, if one knows continually the location of his enemy and has the capability to mass fires instantly, he need not necessarily fix the enemy in one location with forces on the ground. On the battlefield of the future, enemy forces will be located, tracked, and targeted almost instantaneously through the use of data links, computer assisted intelligence evaluation, and automated fire control. With first round kill probabilities approaching certainty, and with surveillance devices that can continually track the enemy, the need for large forces to fix the opposition physically will be less important.

Although the future portends a more automated battlefield, we do visualize a continuing need for highly mobile forces to surround, canalize, block or otherwise maneuver an enemy into the most lucrative target.

The third function includes an improved communication system. This system not only would permit commanders to be continually aware of the entire battlefield panorama down to squad and platoon level, but would permit logistics systems to rely more heavily on air lines of communications.

Today, machines and technology are permitting economy of manpower on the battlefield, as indeed they are in the factory. But the future offers even more possibilities for economy. I am confident the American people expect this country to take full advantage of its technology—to welcome and applaud the developments that will replace wherever possible the man with the machine.

Based on our total battlefield experience and our proven technological capability, I foresee a new battlefield array.

I see battlefields or combat areas that are under 24 hour real or near real time surveillance of all types.

I see battlefields on which we can destroy anything we locate through instant communications and the almost instantaneous application of highly lethal firepower.

I see a continuing need for highly mobile combat forces to assist in fixing and destroying the enemy.

The changed battlefield will dictate that the supporting logistics system also undergo change.

I see the forward end of the logistics system with mobility equal to the supported force.

I see the elimination of many intermediate support echelons and the use of inventory-in-motion techniques.

I see some Army forces supported by air—in some instances directly from bases here in the continental United States.

In both the combat and support forces of the future, I see a continuing need for our traditionally highly skilled, well-motivated individual soldier . . . the soldier who has always responded in time of crisis—and the soldier who will accept and meet the challenges of the future.

Currently, we have hundreds of surveillance, target acquisition, night observation and information processing systems either in being, in development or in engineering. These range from field computers to advanced airborne sensors and new night vision devices.

Our problem now is to further our knowledge—exploit our technology, and equally important—to incorporate all these devices into an integrated land combat system.

History has reinforced my conviction that major advances in the art of warfare have grown from the Fullers and Guderians—men who detected, in the slow, clumsy, underarmed, largely ineffective tanks of World War I, the seeds of the future. Between the two World Wars, they foresaw with clarity the blitzkreig of armored and panzer forces that introduced a new dimension to ground warfare.

More recently, Generals Howze and Wheeler and the late Lieutenant General Bill Bunker conceived air mobility long before the machinery existed to fulfill the concept. Today we witness both the airmobile concept and the airmobile division proved in Vietnam.

We are confident that from our early solutions to the problem of finding the enemy, in Vietnam the evidence is present to visualize this battlefield of the future . . . a battlefield that will dictate organizations and techniques radically different from those we have now.

In summary, I see an Army built into and around an integrated area control system that exploits the advanced technology of communications, sensors, fire direction, and the required automatic data processing—a system that is sensitive to the dynamics of the ever-changing battlefield—a system that materially assists the tactical commander in making sound and timely decisions.

To achieve this concept of our future Army, we have established, at the Department of Army Staff level, a Systems Manager, Brigadier General Bill Fulton, to coordinate all Army activities in this field. We have done this because of problem complexity. We are dealing with systems that are fundamental to the Army—its doctrine, its organization, and its equipment. We are on the threshold for the first time in achieving maximum utilization of both our firepower and our mobility. In order to succeed in this effort, we need the scientific and engineering support of both the military and the industrial communities.

To complement the systems management, we are establishing at Fort Hood a test facility through which new equipment, new organizations, and new techniques can be subjected to experimentation, adaptation, evaluation, and integration. This facility will be headed by Major General Jack Norton who will report to the Project Director, Lieutenant General Bev Powell, III Corps Commander and Commanding General, Fort Hood.

Hundreds of years were required to achieve the mobility of the armored division. A little over two decades later we had the airmobile division. With cooperative effort, no more than 10 years should separate us from the automated battlefield.

Some will say that this is an unrealistic expectation. Some will say that the current experience in Vietnam, in which the infantry continues to bear the brunt of combat, does not support this visualization of the future. History tells another story. The experience and technology at the time of the British Mark IV tank at Cambrai in 1917 and the H–34 helicopter in the fifties provided the evidence to define the future of these systems.

I believe our future path has been clearly blazed.

We will pioneer this new dimension in ground warfare and develop an integrated battlefield system. The United States Army will again lead the way. Our young officers and NCO's will accept the challenge.

SERMON DELIVERED AT WHITE HOUSE BY REV. ALLAN R. WATSON, CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, TUSCALOOSA, ALA.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 28, 1969, the Reverend Allan R. Watson, pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, Tuscaloosa, Ala., delivered a splendid sermon at services at the White House at the invitation of President and Mrs. Nixon. I was privileged to be present to hear the stirring message.

The Reverend Dr. Watson's sermon was entitled "One Nation Under God." It was strong in spiritual values, and full of wisdom couched in terms of commonsense.

Mr. President, the sermon contains so much of value that it should be made available to all the people of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

(By the Reverend Allan R. Watson, pastor, Calvary Baptist Church, Tuscaloosa, Ala., preached at the White House, Sunday, Sept. 28, 1969)

In an address delivered at General Beadle State College in South Dakota, our beloved President Nixon stated, "We have seen too many patterns of deception; in political life, impossible promises; in advertising, extravagant claims; in business, shady deals; in personal life we all have witnessed deceits that range from the little white lie to moral hypocrisy; from cheating on income taxes to bilking insurance companies. In public life, we have seen reputations destroyed by smear, and gimmicks paraded as panaceas. We sorely need a new kind of honesty that has too often been lacking, the honesty of straight talk." And on another occasion the President wrote, "I think some of our voices in the pulpit today tend to speak too much about religion in the abstract rather than in the simple personal terms which I heard in my earlier years. More preaching from the Bible rather than about the Bible is what America needs."

Therefore, in the light of this wise counsel and above all in keeping with my divine commission, I call to your attention this straight talk from God's Word, with the prayer that it may give the needed inspiration and guidance to you, who hold the destiny and well being of so many millions in your hands. We read in the 5th chapter of 1 Peter, "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God and in due time he will exalt you; cast all your anxieties upon him for he cares about you. Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary, the devil, prowls around like a roaring lion seeking to devour. Resist him, be firm in your faith, knowing that the same experience of trial and suffering is required of your brotherhood throughout the world. And after you have suffered a little while the God of all grace who has called you to his eternal glory in Christ will himself restore, establish, strengthen and settle you. To him be glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen."

Reflecting upon the tremendous problems facing us today, problems such as strained and frequently ruptured international relations, racial tensions and divisions, campus disorders, and general moral decay, I for one am inclined to agree with the sentiment expressed in an old country ballad, "I've enjoyed about all of this I can stand." Or perhaps your feelings are voiced more clearly by a current hit, "Life ain't easy for a boy named Sue." Undoubtedly there are times when, burdened by the indescribable responsibilities of his office, and pressured by public opinion for omniscient and omnipotent action, our gracious host for this family worship service, would like to sing a chorus of his own "Life ain't easy for a boy named Richard." Come to think of it, life isn't easy for any one of us, and upon more serious reflection we would have to confess that probably it is best that it isn't so for we are challenged thereby. As a coaching friend often says, "when the going gets tough, the tough get going." Yet, we long for a better day, a day of restoration, of stability, of peace. A day for the realization of man's personal and national ideals, a time for the securing an abiding stability with adequate resources, and for the securing of peace. Such a day is or should be the hope of each man and the goal of our corporate life. Beloved this glorious prospect is presented in the scripture read a few moments ago and should capture our imagination, compel our interest, and command our attention.

One of the wonderful things about the straight talk of the Bible is that it not only presents seemingly unbelievable possibilities, it also sets forth clearly the way whereby these hopes and dreams may be realized. Simon Peter, a man cut from the same cloth as you and I, with the added advantage of having done graduate work with the Master Teacher, reveals the way in these words, "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God."

Humility is a rare commodity indeed in our day. In an age of unparalleled scientific development, when man has moved from a stroll in the park to a walk on the moon. In a day the secularist dreamer worships himself in the laboratory cathedral. At a time when man is enamored with his tremendous achievements to the extent that he is convinced that in him dwells all good, and believes that wrong exists only in systems, institutions, and in the distribution of goods. In such a time as this, humility doesn't come easily. As long as man refuses to humble himself, he will continue to seek and to follow that which Gilbert Chesterton called, "Cures that don't cure, blessings that don't bless, and solutions that don't solve." The spirit that will open the door to a new day will come only as we look at ourselves in the light of God's perfect revelation of Himself and of His will for us in the Person of Christ. Then, and then only, will we cry out with the ancient prophet Isaiah, "Woe is me, for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips."

Now I do not wish to be misunderstood in what is being said or in that which I believe is set forth in this portion of God's Word. There is much which man can and should do to help usher in this longed-for new day. We must plan, we must have political machinery, there must be laws enacted, and social programs formulated. However, never let us forget that it is changed men that produce a changed society. Also, let us remember that man is not simply a creature of his environment. Rather through the power of God he may become the creator of a more favorable and desirable environment. In the light of these facts the making of a new man must be our magnificent objective, and he who has eyes to see recognizes this as a task for the divine and not for man alone.

The Greek dramatists used as a guide in their writing this principle, "never inject a god into a play until there is no other way out." Friends, it is my conviction that we have reached the hour when we must let God step on to the stage. We have kept Him waiting in the wings all too long. It could be that we have even lost Him in the discarded props of yesterday's productions. He must get into the act. Hence, if our civilization is to survive, it is imperative that individually and as a nation, we must give the more earnest heed to this solemn admonition: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God."

During the administration of the late President Eisenhower, he and his wife were worshipping on Sunday in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of Washington. At this particular service, the minister, The Reverend George Docherty, expressed the thought that in his opinion it was only fitting and wise to add the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance offered the flag of our country. The President and a large number of Congressional leaders responded to this challenge and today we proudly express our love and loyalty for "one nation under God." However, it is not sufficient merely to add words. The noble thought which they represent must be understood and acted upon. What is the significance of the expression "one nation under God?" It is not an echo of the idea embodied in our text, where the Apostle urges us to "humble ourselves under the hand of the Almighty." Do not these words mean that we should recognize the vital spiritual forces that were at work in the heart and life of those who founded our nation and constituted this Republic? Does not it imply that we are to manifest a continuing dependence upon God?

These truths we readily acknowledge and yet another more searching and revealing question must be faced. Namely—Ours shall be a nation under what kind of God? Shall it be a deity of our own creation, one who is but a reflection of our own personal desires, prejudices, and inflated egos?

Shall it be a God who is but a prominent figure of the past with little understanding of relevance to our present challenges and problems. More than a decade ago, the British Theologian, J. B. Phillips, gave the answer to these questions in a simple little book, "These gods are too small." The cry of the needy and oppressed and the crises of our day demand a personal, living, and loving God. This God, who cares, Simon Peter met as he walked the shores of Galilee centuries ago. This very one must be and longs to be our God and guide today.

Calvary Baptist Church of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in which I am privileged to serve as pastor, is located adjacent to the campus of the great University of Alabama, home of the Crimson Tide. Upon leaving my office one Monday morning, I chanced to glance into the sanctuary of our church and noticed a student standing behind the pulpit looking first in one direction and then in another. He said nothing but continued to look this way and that. After a few moments reluctantly the silence was broken by my question, "May I help you?" The young man answered, "I'm looking for God. I must find Him now." This wasn't the utterance of a mentally deranged man, one whom the pressures of life had driven to the point of emotional breakdown. Rather it expressed the need of a University senior, completely competent, but feeling deep within the restlessness and hunger for God of which Augustine did speak. Indescribable joy was mine as I endeavored to help him find the One whom he sought. Not a God of the mystics but the God whom I and millions of others had met in the Master. Not a god created by man's imagination or fashioned by his fancy, but the God of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob, the God "who so loved the world that he clothed himself in human flesh and came and dwelt among us. The Promised Messiah, the Christ, who by his death and resurrection brings life and immortality to those individuals who trust him."

Under the mighty hand of such a God our nation, and we as individuals, can experience a new birth of freedom. Without Him, who is the Light of the world, man's brightest ideas and most radiant schemes can only add to the blackness of the night. Without Him, the Lily of the Valley and the Rose of Sharon, society's garden, sown with the seed of man's most noble thoughts, tilled by his unceasing efforts, and watered by the sweat of his brow, can have little beauty and will ultimately end in desolation.

A simple experience from the life of Lord Shaftsbury, a noted British philanthropist, statesman, and social reformer, might well summarize and bring into clear focus the teaching of this portion of God's Word and the point of this message. Almost a century ago, the Christian gentlemen was standing at a busy London intersection. His attention was fixed upon a little girl who obviously was desirous of crossing one of the streets. Sensing her need of help she looked intently at a number of men and women but spoke not a word to them, allowing them to go on their way. After a few minutes, Mr. Shaftsbury, whose countenance reflected the concern and compassion of his heart, started to cross the street. Quickly the little girl looked at him and cried out, "Mister, can I walk across the street with you?" He extended his hand and she placed her small one in it and together they walked confidently and safely. Upon reaching the other side of the street, Mr. Shaftsbury

paused and said, "Little Lady, I noticed you looking at a number of people before asking me to help you. Why did you ask me and not them?" "Well, sir," she answered, "you looked so good that I felt that I could trust my life in your hands."

Ladies and gentlemen, one stands at the dangerous and demanding crossroads of our life today. Being a gentleman He waits for us to invite Him into our lives. He listens for our cry for help. Gazing upon His nail-scarred hands extended in unfathomable love, we too, should be convinced that we can trust our lives and the future of our Republic to His care and leadership. Then, as He dwells within us and the light of His Truth permeates our plans, illumines our thoughts and shines through our lives, the lamp of liberty and justice for all will burn more brightly beside and within the golden door.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE GOLD MEDAL AWARD TO WILLIAM L. TILSON

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, as the Senators will remember, the gulf coast areas of the United States were dealt a disastrous blow in August by Hurricane Camille. Great loss of life and property damage resulted from history's most ferocious storm.

Much of the credit for saving countless lives goes to William L. Tilson, meteorologist in charge of the Environmental Science Services Administration's Weather Bureau Office in Mobile, Ala.

On October 14, Mr. Tilson was awarded the Department of Commerce's Gold Medal for his outstanding weather warning service during the approach of Hurricane Camille.

The Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce, presented the award to Mr. Tilson during the 21st annual honors awards program here in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Commerce news release concerning Mr. Tilson's award to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS RELEASE, OCTOBER 14, 1969

WASHINGTON.—William L. Tilson, Meteorologist in Charge of the Environmental Science Services Administration's Weather Bureau Office in Mobile, Ala., today received the Department of Commerce's Gold Medal for his outstanding weather warning service during the approach of Hurricane Camille to the Gulf Coast in August of this year.

This Distinguished Federal Service Award was presented to Tilson by Secretary of Commerce, Maurice H. Stans, in the Twenty-first Annual Honors Awards Program held in Washington, D.C. Tilson was cited for his excellent pre-storm planning and staff leadership which resulted in exemplary team effort by the staff of the Mobile Office. By providing a continuous flow of vital warnings and information to all areas, including isolated and outlying districts, which permitted an early and orderly evacuation and prevented panic from arising, the Mobile Weather Bureau Office is credited with saving countless lives during the disaster.

Tilson, a native of the Asheville, N.C., area, began his Weather Bureau career in 1930 at Macon, Ga. In addition to his three assignments in Mobile, the last beginning in 1949, Tilson has been stationed at the National Hurricane Center when it was located in Jacksonville, Florida; at Pensacola, Florida; Nashville, Tenn.; and Raleigh, N.C.

He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and has done postgraduate work at the N.C. State University, Raleigh, and Spring Hill College, Mobile.

He and his wife have two daughters, Jane and Barbara, both students at the University of South Alabama in Mobile.

TAX REFORM NO. 2: DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP TAX REFORM BOOK

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today I am making available to Senators the second of eight parts of the Tax Reform Fact Book prepared and published by the Democratic Study Group—DSG. As I announced yesterday, this valuable research tool has been updated at my request to reflect final action on tax reform in the House. The section I shall place in the RECORD today discusses the taxation of oil, gas, and minerals.

Since this section of the fact book was prepared, the administration has softened its April proposals in this area. For example, the administration now recommends that if a taxpayer derives 60 percent or more of his gross income from oil and gas properties he should not have to include his intangible drilling expense deduction as an item of tax preference for purposes of the limit on tax preferences.

The House bill would eliminate percentage depletion with respect to foreign oil and gas production. When administration officials testified before the Committee on Finance last month, they recommended this provision be deleted from the bill.

As I mentioned yesterday, the full text of the statements and recommendations of the administration are contained in part 1 of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee. It is unfortunate that the administration was unable to provide us with its technical memorandum on the tax reform bill sooner. As it turned out, that memorandum was received by the committee just 3 days before the hearing record closed despite the request of the chairman of the Finance Committee (Mr. LONG) on September 4 that it be made available in time for public witnesses to address themselves to the specifics of the administration's position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the DSG Tax Reform Fact Book which discusses the tax treatment of oil, gas and minerals be printed in the RECORD. On Monday, I shall discuss the section which relates to capital gains.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DSG TAX REFORM FACT BOOK: SECTION ONE—OIL, GAS AND MINERALS

ELIMINATE DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING COSTS FOR PETROLEUM PRODUCERS

The problem

Oil companies for many years have deducted as current expense certain exploration and development costs which, by most criteria, would be considered investment in capital assets subject to gradual depreciation. This deduction, referred to as intangible drilling costs, results in a substantial and immediate writeoff of capital. It has evolved by administrative decision rather than Congressional action.

Present law

Costs of labor, materials and other goods incidental to drilling are deductible as intangible costs of drilling against gross income in the first year. Other oil and gas industry expenditures that can be immediately expensed (rather than capitalized) include dry hole costs, lease rentals, and production costs.

Pending proposals

The many reform bills introduced in the House this session do not attempt to deal directly with the intangible drilling costs provision.

Revenue impact

Treasury estimates $750 million a year in new revenue would be raised initially in closing this loophole. Later, however, revenue gain would drop to about $300 million as drilling costs are offset against the percentage depletion allowance.

Proponents and opponents

Opposition to this change is centered in the petroleum industry, which alone enjoys its substantial benefits.

Administration action

The Administration proposed making the intangible drilling deduction subject to the Limit on Tax Preference (LTP) provision to the extent it exceeded the deduction that would have been allowed under straight-line depreciation and capitalized.

House action

Although intangible drilling costs were put under the limit on tax preference provision of the bill at one point by the Ways and Means Committee, the bill as reported did not include this change.

The new minimum tax provision in the bill would apply to some income that now escapes taxation under the intangible drilling costs deduction.

Resource references

See Ways and Means hearings, Volume 9; Treasury Studies, Parts 3 and 4.

TREAT CARVED-OUT AND RETAINED PRODUCTION PAYMENTS AS LOANS

The Problem

A production payment is similar to a loan with oil, minerals, or some other underground resource used as collateral. Proceeds of these transactions, however, are treated as income for tax purposes, making substantial tax avoidance possible.

The transactions are used to juggle income from one year to another, enabling a company to inflate its income one year and have a self-induced loss the next. This makes it possible to circumvent statutory limits on percentage depletion, loss carry-forwards, intangible drilling costs, investment credit, and foreign tax credit.

In a *carved-out production* payment, the owner of the interest sells the payment to an outside party, usually a bank or other financial institution. In a *retained* production payment, the owner sells the working interest but reserves the production payment in himself.

Present law

Under present law buyers of *carved-out* production payments treat them as income subject to a deduction for depletion. Amounts used to compensate the owner for the production payment are excluded from his income during the payout period. Expenses of producing that income, however, are deducted in the year incurred.

The owner of the *retained* production payment receives depletable income during the payout period. The buyer of the working interest excludes from income amounts used to pay off the production payments during the same period.

Pending proposals

The many reform bills introduced in the House this session do not attempt to deal directly with the production payments provision.

Revenue impact

A Treasury study estimates the change, when fully effective in 1979, would increase revenue $200 million a year.

Proponents and opponents

Main opposition to changing the tax status of production payments is coming from the oil and gas industry. The American Mining Congress and other extractive industry groups also oppose this change.

Administration action

The Administration proposal would treat production payments as loan transactions. As a result the owner of the mineral interest subject to the production payment would be required to take income and expenses relating to that payment into account in the same taxable year. The proposed change would be effective for transactions on or after April 22, 1969.

House action

The House bill treats both carved-out and retained production payments as loans. As a result of this change, carve-outs would not accelerate income and therefore would have no effect on the net income limitation on the percentage depletion deduction, on the limitation in the case of foreign tax credit, or on the 5-year net operating loss limitation. The property in retained production payments would be considered as being transferred subject to a mortgage. As a result, the owner of the working interest would be treated essentially in the same way as anyone buying a business asset subject to a mortgage.

Resource references

See Ways and Means hearings, Volume 9; Treasury Studies, Parts 2 and 3.

REDUCE THE TWENTY-SEVEN-AND-ONE-HALF PERCENT OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE AND OTHER ITEMS ELIGIBLE FOR PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

The problem

Percentage depletion, the tax loophole that blazed the trail for all the others, is almost as old as the income tax itself. It was first adopted in 1926 as a substitute for a difficult-to-administer depletion allowance based on "discovery value." That allowance had been put into effect eight years earlier to spur the search for oil supplies needed in World War I.

Under the law that has stood since 1926, any oil or gas producer, or anyone with a financial interest in a well, qualifies for depletion at the 27½% rate. Since the allowance has no relationship to cost, the operator of a producing well eventually recovers his investment many times over. Percentage depletion has been extended since 1932 to a long list of resources ranging from oyster shells to iron ore. Oil and gas depletion, however, accounts for 75% of all depletion allowed and stands out as the best-known symbol of tax privilege in the public mind.

Present law

The oil depletion allowance permits the owner of an oil well to deduct each year from his taxable income 27½% of the gross value of the oil produced, provided it does not exceed 50% of the net income from the well. Similar provisions apply at rates ranging from 5% to 27½% for gravel, copper, and nearly 100 other eligible resources.

Pending proposals

Several pending bills call for cuts in percentage depletion; a few would eliminate it completely. H.R. 5250 (Reuss and others) would reduce oil and gas depletion to 15% with proportionate cuts for all other resources eligible for percentage depletion. Identical or similar proposals are H.R. 229, 1039, 1119, 1379, 2142, 3655, 6770, 7040, 7045, 7346, 7585, 8144, 9195, 9479, 9759, 9852, 10237, 10253, and 11782.

Revenue impact

Complete elimination of the depletion allowance for both corporations and individuals would increase income tax revenue about $1.3 billion a year. Reducing the allowance from 27½% to 15% on domestic oil and mineral recovery and eliminating it entirely on foreign oil and mineral recovery would produce a revenue gain of about $600 million a year, according to Treasury. Reducing the allowance to 20% on domestic oil and gas, cutting allowances proportionately on other eligible resources, and eliminating entirely the allowance on foreign production, would increase annual federal revenues about $450 million ($400 million domestic, $50 million foreign).

Treasury witnesses said it is difficult to assess the impact of cutting the depletion allowance because of the related effect of such tax-reducing factors as the intangible drilling cost reduction, production payment transactions, and the foreign tax credit.

Proponents and opponents

The main opponent of depletion allowance cuts is the oil industry. Testimony opposing cuts also came from such organizations as the Oil Shale Corporation, American Mining Congress, and American Iron Ore Association. The American Farm Bureau Federation also opposed changes in depletion allowances. Both the AFL–CIO and UAW want the depletion allowance eliminated after property cost is written off.

Administration action

The Nixon Administration did not recommend depletion allowance cuts to Congress. Nor did it commit directly on the possibility or desirability of cuts.

House action

The House voted to reduce the 27½% oil depletion allowance to 20%, to discontinue its use on foreign production, and to scale down percentage depletion on most other eligible resources. It excluded several minerals—gold, silver, oil shale, copper and iron ore—from the proposed cuts. They are in the 15% depletion category.

Resource references

See Ways and Means hearings, Volume 9; Treasury Studies, Parts 3 and 4.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL–LXVII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a regional natural resources committee, representing the five Upper Great Lakes States, has demanded immediate action to stop pesticide contamination of the Great Lakes basin "by any and all means available."

However, according to an article published in the Lansing, Mich., State Journal of September 11, 1969, the Governors of these same five States have asked only for a "phasing out" of these persistent pesticides as alternative controls are discovered.

There is no need for a gradual phasing out. Safe, effective alternative methods already exist. The State of Michigan is the only State of the five which has since banned the use of DDT. Since that ban was announced, it was learned that many of the alternative controls have existed for decades but have gone generally unused.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by James Phillips, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PESTICIDE CONTROL LAG SEEN LIKELY

(By James Phillips)

Despite the plea by the governors of the five Upper Great Lakes states to eliminate persistent pesticides, it appears unlikely that any drastic curtailment of their use will be accomplished soon.

The governors of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois and Indiana last week called for rigid restrictions to be placed on the uses of the chlorinated hydrocarbons and a phasing out of their use as soon as alternative methods of control become available.

The governors' agreements, however, did not reflect the urgency of a Natural Resources committee consisting of members of the five states to review the problem of environmental pesticide pollution.

The committee called for immediate action to be taken to eliminate the contamination of the Great Lakes basin "by any and all means available."

Of the five Great Lakes states, only Michigan has banned the general use of DDT. Bills to outlaw DDT or other hard pesticides in Illinois and Minnesota were defeated this year in their respective legislatures. A bill establishing a pesticide review board was approved by the Wisconsin legislature.

Legislators in Indiana apparently were not alarmed over the pesticide threat. No bills relating to pesticides were introduced in the Hoosier Legislature this year.

The governors' plan for a phasing out of hard pesticides in the Great Lakes basin is likely to simply be a replay of action taken in Michigan to ban the general use of DDT.

Agricultural interests at first said there were no alternatives available and thus postponed action on denying the registration of the pesticide. But when the general ban was announced and the alternatives named, it was discovered that some of the substitute pesticides had been around for more than a decade.

In some instances, the patent rights had expired on the chemical compounds.

Perhaps the most controlling factor in the gradual phasing out of hard pesticides will be economic. Insects which are presently vulnerable to the chlorinated hydrocarbons sometimes build up resistant strains and the immunity forces persons to turn to alternative methods of control.

But there is another potential danger looming on the pesticide horizon that is often overlooked because of the immediate problem of chlorinated hydrocarbons.

The possible problem is the widespread application of herbicides. The use of herbicides to kill or control weeds of other undesirable plants is expected to mushroom in the next decade.

Recently published papers dealing with pesticide pollution are starting to refer to the chlorinated hydrocarbons as insecticides. The action has an alarming inference to conservationists because it opens the door to a second type of pesticide pollution.

BLACK REPARATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the letters to the editor column of The Washington Evening Star of Monday, October 13, contained two important letters. In the correspondence, citizens from Maryland and Virginia gave their views on the recent demands of black militants that churches give money to Negroes for alleged acts of discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK REPARATIONS

SIR: According to what I read in The Star, the Black United Front is now using Hitler's old Mein Kampf advice: "If a lie is big enough and repeated often enough, it will eventually be accepted as truth."

I am referring to the absurd claim that white churches owe black people reparations for past injustices, real or fancied. The truth of the matter is that the blacks owe the white people reparations for all the buildings they destroyed with their firebombs in April 1968. They owe the white people reparations for all the whites they have raped and murdered, stores and banks they have robbed.

Anyone who has ever visited Gettysburg, Pennsylvania can see for himself all the white soldiers who died as reparation for each drop of black blood drawn by a slave whip prior to the War Between the States. How much more reparation can they expect?

When one considers that most of the recipients of welfare are blacks, and the most of the non-paying patients in various big city hospitals across the nation are black, it is the height of insolence and arrogance for the Black United Front to demand any kind of reparations from any white organization whatsoever. And when they brand our police as "savagely Gestapo," they are using the Hitler big lie technique and prattling the Communist party line. If our police really were savagely "Gestapo," the crime wave would be over in about one month.

R. A. MULLEN.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.

SIR: Let's look at this matter of reparations which certain Negro organizations are demanding of churches. Presumably it is on the basis of what the white church members' ancestors did to the ancestors of the Negroes.

In the late 1850s John Brown went through Pennsylvania and New England urging people from those areas to move to Kansas, so that when a plebiscite was held, Kansas would be free and Negroes would not be in slavery. My ancestors left prosperous farms in Pennsylvania and went to Kansas for the express purpose of giving Negroes an equal opportunity to live as free men. The family never regained the affluence it had in Pennsylvania. Therefore I demand reparations from the Black United Front. I think $50,000 would be about right.

This isn't all the reparations I want. I belong to a downtown church, although I live in the suburbs. A year and a half ago one of our best workers was attacked by two Negro youths who twisted and battered her shoulder so bady she will never be able to do the church volunteer work she used to do. A month ago another of our best volunteer workers was thrown to the ground, her skull fractured, and so badly injured that she never regained consciousness. I want reparations for my church for the loss of these volunteer workers. I think the Black United Front might owe us $100,000 for that.

We used to have two strong evening women's groups, raising money for the church and doing volunteer work. Many of these women are afraid to come out now—there are too many criminal blacks on the street. Some of this work has had to be curtailed. I demand another $100,000 from the Black United Front for that loss.

Let's get it straight as to who owes who reparations to whom for what! Those Negroes who go around demanding reparations could better spend their time training the Negro young in acceptable civilized behaviour. These black youngsters have as much potential as the white youngsters, but without proper training and example by their Negro elders, they won't realize it, whatever help white people may try to give them.

JANET M. JAMES.

Greenbelt, Md.

WHAT IS GENOCIDE?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the word "genocide" literally means the intentional destruction of national, racial, religious or ethnic groups.

Dating back to the sacking of Carthage or even earlier, this crime of crimes, as Dr. Raphael Lemkin, who coined the word puts it, "has repeated itself with the regularity of a biological law." But it was left to our generation to see it practiced on the largest scale by Nazi Germany; deliberately planned as state policy and carried out with every resource of science and complete absence of humanity.

The punishment of these abominable crimes, which shocked the conscience of mankind, became one of the main war aims of the allied nations. In 1945 the four great powers agreed that the persons responsible for the policy of Nazi Germany should be punished not only for violations of the laws or customs of war committed against civilian populations of occupied countries and for the crime of planning, preparing, and initiating a war of aggression, but also for crimes against humanity, committed against any civilian population before or during the war, or prosecutions on political, racial or religious grounds committed in connection with the war. Thus it was established that the treatment which a state, in this case Nazi Germany, meted out to its own nation, had ceased to be its exclusive concern but had become a matter of international concern. Consequently, the major war criminals and many of lesser rank in the hierarcy of Nazi Germany were found guilty and were punished for crimes committed against their own nationals. The action taken by the four allied powers and eventually by the Nuremberg tribunal was endorsed by 19 allied states and by resolutions of the General Assembly. It was felt, however, that penal repression of this kind should not be limited to acts committed in times of war and connected with war, but should be of universal application. Hence the idea of a special Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, irrespective of whether it is committed in war or in peace.

Mr. President, genocide shocked the conscience of mankind during the Second World War; and it must not shock us any less in 1969. This convention has lain dormant in the Committee on Foreign Relations for more than 20 years. To avoid the issue is to give credence to the crime of genocide. This must not persist.

DEDICATION OF THE WASHBURN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL BUILDING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on September 27, 1969, I participated in the dedication of a new building to house the law school of Washburn University at Topeka, Kans. The occasion was marked with appropriate ceremonies. The 10th Circuit Court of Appeals sat in extraordinary session in the school's moot courtroom, and the featured speaker at the dedication was Justice Byron R. White of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This event symbolized much more than the completion of a new structure, for the building it replaced, as well as much of the rest of the Washburn campus and a considerable portion of Topeka, had been destroyed by a catastrophic tornado in 1966. The opening of this building, indeed, represented the rededication and rebirth of a great institution and the great spirit which characterizes it.

I felt that Mr. Justice White's remarks were especially timely and well considered. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE WHITE

Ladies and gentlemen, there are hundreds of buildings finished in this country every year and although many are beautiful and useful structures, most of them are put to use without the ceremony and attention which accompany the dedication of this new law school building. This is not to suggest that there is anything untoward or unusual in the proceedings which are occurring here in Topeka. On the contrary, what the people of Kansas are doing is what people all over this country do when a new school building, as distinguished from other structures, is ready for use. Like other buildings, school buildings may be stone and mortar, but they have special significance here in America, a significance making occasions like this an appropriate time for joy and satisfaction.

We in the United States have always had deep concern for the individual and his welfare. People, we increasingly realize, are our major resource. This basic conviction stems from two very different considerations. First is the notion that everyone should be free, and have a realistic opportunity, to develop his personal talents to the maximum possible extent, to improve his knowledge of the universe, to increase his powers of observation and appreciation and to maximize his physical and intellectual skills. This is part of the pursuit of happiness, a value in itself, carrying its own credentials and requiring no further justification by resort to utilitarian considerations.

Necessity and utility, however, make up a second powerful stimulus to our urgent efforts to educate and develop our people. Our ancestors knew that ignorant men could not be free, nor could they govern themselves as our Constitution assumed they could. The untrained mind and the unskilled hand could not provide an acceptable standard of living, could not manage and utilize our resources, could not understand or use the unfolding sciences and could not fathom or solve the problems of an enormously diverse and growing population living together as one people.

Fortunately, the need was recognized and early provision made. Education has had its problems, but it has steadily grown in both the public and private sectors. In this century, it has mushroomed until our total budget for private and public education at all levels of government is now well over 50 billion dollars a year. This represents a massive investment in people, but an investment which has paid for itself many times over, as our gross national production so clearly indicates.

The truth is that our affairs have become so complicated that without the sophisticated mind and a reservoir of highly educated people, we could not exist today. As far as education is concerned, we have no choice but to make sure that every generation has the chance to equip itself for existence in today's world and to make sure that the search for well motivated talent among all our people does not subside. There is also the excruciating fact that

some of our major, more important problems have stumped the present adult generation, as well as those preceding it and apparently will be solved only by the young and their children if, that is, they can develop a new order of dedication and intellect.

Our developing experience also proved the need for lawyers and professional post graduate schools to train them. The federal and state constitutions created complex governmental structures and characteristically placed serious limitations on governmental powers vis-a-vis the people. Lawyers, if anyone, were to understand and make the system work, especially since the courts were to play a major role in implementing the basic principles of our system and since lawyers were responsible for bringing and managing this litigation. Of course, like all civilized countries, a system of laws regulating human conduct was essential and for their proper drafting, enactment and enforcement lawyers were indispensable.

Today, there are some 140 accredited law schools, with full and part-time faculty totaling approximately 4,000, a student body of 63,000 and graduating classes totaling 16,000. There are well over 300,000 lawyers licensed to practice law in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. At least 40,000 of them are in government service, including about 10,000 judges. Over 30,000 are employed by private concerns. The remainder are in private practice, perhaps 40,000 in large firms, 80,000 in smaller firms and the rest, say 115,000, are individual practitioners.

One cannot help but be proud of the contribution which lawyers and law schools have made in the process of building this great country and in arriving at the point on the domestic front where we are not so much concerned about sheer subsistence and survival but by the quality of our lives. I do not suggest that the millennium has arrived, for we have unsolved problems for which lawyers and law schools share the responsibility with the public at large. These problems, and the list is long, represent the frontiers of the law, just as they mark the frontiers of some other disciplines. Bringing some order into the international community, where large scale violence is not uncommon; understanding and managing an explosive population growth all around the world; realizing and doing something about the environment on which we depend for the basic necessities of life; solving the enigma of racial hatred and conflict—these are just some of the issues that our generation and those who preceded us have not been willing or able to resolve and which are necessarily of great concern to the modern law school and the modern lawyer.

The time has long since passed when the law school could view the law as a body of prescriptions handed down from on high and limit its function to teaching its intricacies to students who in turn would feel no responsibility for the substance of the law or for the institutions from which it came. Lawyers man all of the courts and of course they must know the procedures by which decision is made and the rules and principles by which cases are decided. Understandably, law schools have focused heavily on the courts, teaching the law by analyzing cases decided in the courts and having on their faculties experts in state and federal court procedure. My own observation has been that almost any community has lawyers who are extraordinarily skillful in the courtroom and who are wholly competent to try questions of fact as well as issues of law which arise under a great variety of state and federal regulatory statutes. But the responsibility of lawyers and law schools has a broader sweep.

Insofar as their duties relate to the courts, both the law school and the practicing bar could do better than they are doing with respect to at least two very large matters. Both are important to everyone and to judges in particular. The first pertains to constitutional litigation, that is, to those cases where construction and application of the United States Constitution are involved. Characteristically, the claim in these cases is that a federal or state statute or regulation, or some other official act, such as an arrest, a search, or a criminal conviction itself, is contrary to some provision of the federal constitution. Under that document, courts are empowered to adjudicate such claims. The issues are more often than not of great importance, having impact far beyond the case and the parties before the court. Does the First Amendment forbid actions for libel and thereby insulate a deliberate falsehood injurying a person's reputation? Does the First Amendment permit public aid to parochial schools or prevent officially prescribed prayers in public schools? Does the Equal Protection Clause forbid racial segregation in public facilities or control the apportionment of legislative business? Does the Fourth Amendment, which forbids unreasonable searches and seizures, permit official wiretapping in law enforcement? The majestic language of our Constitution does not furnish automatic or unarguable answers to these questions. The area of possible choice for the courts is frequently quite wide. The result is that the great bulk of what is known as constitutional law has been fashioned in the courts in the process of deciding individual cases requiring interpretations of particular constitutional provisions.

The impact and significance of the process of judicial review, as it is called, is immense. Unquestionably it is desirable that the process be structured to produce sound decisions which will stand the test of time. Ideally, the country's best thinking should be brought before the court in all of these cases. Ideally, if economic and social facts are relevant to the issue, they should be presented to the court if they are available or can be obtained.

Criticism of court decisions is a popular pastime. Law schools and law school professors are especially adept at it. This is as it should be. Court decisions are public property and constructive comment not only proper but highly useful. But if it is helpful to examine the results of the process, what about the process itself? I have a feeling—but I would be hard put to prove it—that both the law schools and the organized bar could do much more than they have to make sure that the format of constitutional litigation is designed to bring all relevant and useful considerations to the attention of the court, particularly in important cases having wide ramifications. I would suppose a law school would find it most interesting to maintain an ongoing audit of judicial review aimed at assessing and improving it as one of the major decision-making mechanisms in our system of government. It would be a large undertaking, but large matters are at stake.

But if a continuous study of constitutional litigation offers fertile ground, so does the matter of litigation generally. To say that our courts are in trouble and have been for some time is shopworn talk. But it remains true that they are in trouble. In many sections of the country caseloads are and have been out of hand. The time between filing and disposition has become unacceptably long. There have been countless ad hoc studies of the problems and the recently established Federal Judicial Center has great promise. But I am convinced in my own mind that in the long run judicial administration, like public administration generally, must become a course of study in our universities and that students be exposed not only to law and litigation but to the principles of management and administration which have proved themselves in other fields. Lawyers are sometimes said to resist intrusion from other disciplines but if litigation is to continue as a viable mechanism in this country, something besides good lawyers with those legal skills typical of today will be required. Obviously, the question is of utmost significance to the law schools.

I have been speaking of litigation and the decisionmaking process in the courts. But this affords only a narrow view of the law or of legal education. Much more law is made and changed in other quarters than is made or changed in the courts. Our constitutions vest exclusive legislative power in the legislatures and vast areas of law-making authority are in turn delegated by legislators to the executive branch of the government to the growing list of administrative agencies and even to some semi-private associations. Decisions originating in these other sources not only have great significance to everyone but involve the services of many, many lawyers. The private practitioner's clients often have as much need for services in connection with legislation, regulations or administrative practice as they do when they are parties to cases in the courts. If this is true, one might expect the law school to be as expert in the legislative and executive decision-making processes as they are with respect to litigation. But I suspect that this is not the case. Good law school courses in the legislative process are few and far between and the typical course in administrative law deals more with what can happen to the administrative decision when reviewed in courts than what happens or should happen in the agency or department. Law schools can't teach everything, but those licensed to practice law should know more than they do about how the law is made or changed in the legislative halls and the vast reaches of the executive branches of the federal and state governments. The courtroom model of decisionmaking is not the only way problems are resolved and, as a practical matter, it cannot be.

Ladies and gentlemen, as the population has grown and science and technology flourished the law has come to touch more and more areas of human conduct. Not surprisingly, the practice of law is as diverse as the law itself. Complexity has made specialization the rule rather than the exception; but even so, a great many lawyers, both in the city and the country, and in both large and small firms, still must cope with a wide range of problems, some involving only counseling but others requiring negotiation, litigation or some other technique for resolving conflict. But whatever a lawyer may do, whether he is a specialist or not, it has become increasingly important that he be familiar with the basic principles of several nonlegal fields, or what is even more important, with the methodology by which practitioners in those fields arrive at their important conclusions. Lawyers, to be effective, must develop further the capacity and the technique of digesting and putting to use the learning from other disciplines which is relevant to the solution of legal issues. We cannot consider the law to be a sterile, self-contained enterprise. One of its basic functions is to serve the needs of man. Law schools, like the lawyers they train, must have this fundamental proposition constantly before them. The result may be to keep legal education in constant flux, but changes in the social order inevitably changes the role of lawyers and hence of the schools which purport to train them.

I am impressed with what I have seen here at Wendham. Only energy and vision could have produced this building and those same qualities, I am sure, will be powerful influences towards continuing a relevant and vital educational enterprise in this beautiful structure.

AMERICA'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, many have spoken of the need to concern ourselves with the ever-increasing pressures and problems being created by the expansion of the world's population. In past references to overpopulation our minds immediately reverted to the developing countries, and we remembered such unbelievable statistics as the fact that 10,000 people die each day due to starvation, that seven out of 10 children in the "third world" suffer from malnutrition and that there is an average of only one doctor to every 4,000 people in the developing part of the world.

Today, however, we are beginning to realize the overpopulation is also posing a direct threat to the future course of the United States. This summer President Nixon became the first President to ever deliver a message to the Members of Congress pleading for an increased national effort to bring domestic and world population under control. The message brought home a much needed perspective on the population problem. The number of people of a nation is an integral factor influencing the economic and social development in nations—and, in brief, the quality of life is probably the prime factor influencing the quality of a nation's people. As long as a nation's prime occupation is with providing enough food to fill the multiplying number of mouths, the other problems from which communities suffer cannot be given adequate attention. As long as a nation's next consideration is one of providing enough space to accommodate its people, there is no opportunity for addressing the betterment of individual lives.

In meeting the emergency of the mounting problem, I strongly support the President's proposal for a national mobilization of resources and intellects in the formation of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future and his suggestion for working through the United Nations as an administrative agency for effective worldwide population control programs.

My colleague in the House, the Honorable WENDELL WYATT, has spoken eloquently on this subject at the recent Oregon State convention of the AFL–CIO on September 26, 1969. I recommend this speech to my colleagues here in the Senate as a most rational and thorough appraisal of the population problem and the implications that it holds for us in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that Representative WYATT'S speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

(Speech by Congressman WENDELL WYATT, Republican, of Oregon, before the State Convention AFL–CIO, Portland, Oreg., September 26, 1969)

It was a coincidence, but it was a real coincidence, that at the very moment man was setting his historic foot on the moon for the first time, President Nixon sent to Congress a message stating that the human race was disastrously overpopulating the earth. The irony is that this great human feat, accomplished at the most of many billions of dollars, offers no possible help in solving what must be the greatest challenge the world now faces, and certainly America's greatest challenge.

Unless we all become painfully aware of this problem, unless we devote great thought and action toward the solution of this problem, the seemingly insoluble problems of great magnitude which we face from day to day will become unimportant by comparison.

For the first 1600 years since Christ, the earth's population doubled from 250 million to 500 million. It took 100 years for the earth's population to double from one billion to two billion, which was achieved in 1930. Only 30 years later we added a third billion, and our world's population will be four billion in a period of just fifteen years, by 1975. At this rate in thirty more years, by the year 2000, the earth's population will be *seven* billion persons. After that it is predicted that one billion people will be added to our population at least every five years. We are literally turning our planet into a human ant hill.

Let's direct our attention to the population of the United States, and our problems in just the next thirty years.

It seems to be agreed by those in this business that our own population will increase by 50% in the next 30 years. By the year 2000 the United States will add an additional 100 million persons.

While we are struggling with the problems of the earth, what must we do in connection with the population problems of the United States?

The moon landing has inspired many of us with the confidence that there is no limit to our capabilities, once we set a national goal and make a genuine national commitment. In 1976 we will celebrate two centuries as a nation. Centuries filled with assorted challenges, the shaping of the nation, the winning of the West, the building of an industrial civilization—challenges that have at times drawn us close to greatness as a people.

As we rapidly approach 1976, we should and we must identify and set our goals for the future. What should these goals be? Fatter bottoms for everybody? A power boat for every family? TV sets in every car?

It is clear to me what our greatest task, our greatest challenge is. Physical America, the imprint we have made on the environment in America, is a mess. We are near strangulation in our own pollution; lack of zoning and careful planning has left our countryside a mish-mash; most of our major cities are sliding toward disaster; the center cities are festering sores.

Based upon population migrations of the past ten years, we are racing toward a society which promises that by the year 2000 the twenty largest cities in this country will be ninety percent black, surrounded by an iron ring of white suburbs. This prospect to me is intolerable. Add the problems of a 50% increase in our country's population, and you have so horrifying a projection that we simply must . . . and I say it is imperative . . . we must plan with vision, energy and the same kind of industry possessed by our forefathers to prevent this kind of America. Otherwise we will become a museum nation.

This challenge is as tough and exciting as any people in the history of our world have known. The goal must be: Rebuilding America.

We must build new cities. We must revitalize old cities. We must renew rural America.

The National Committee on Urban Growth has recommended the creation of 100 new cities with populations of 100,000, and ten new cities of one million people. And these new cities will only accommodate 20% of the increase in our own population during the next thirty years. Our challenge for new housing during this period is enormous. We would have to build the equivalent of a new city of 250,000 persons each month until the end of this century just to provide adequate housing for our present population and the one hundred million increase we know is coming during this time.

This is a goal which truly can lift and move our nation. It requires the same kind of vision, the picture of the future in our own minds, which inspired our own pioneer ancestors.

To accomplish this goal, *all* Americans must be motivated. This requires education as to the problem. That is why I am talking to the labor movement about this subject today. Labor has a great stake in this challenge. Your present and future members must be housed, fed, clothed, educated, and they must have jobs. If our country continues to decay, your movement will decay with it, and this we cannot let happen. So I say, spread the word, get excited, determine that you will make your contribution in this great task.

Growth on such a huge scale offers a matchless opportunity to bring about beneficent change. A time of growth is a time when shaping is possible. You can only shape children's teeth when they are growing. If we guide our growth wisely, we can change the face of America. We can replace blight with beauty. We can replace economic stagnation with dynamism. And we can eliminate once and for all those urban diseases which have proven so injurious to the human condition and the quality of life.

If we are to move toward new and more livable patterns of human settlement, we are going to have to bring some order out of the tangle of officials, actions that determine patterns of human settlement today. The men who determine the shape of our cities are the officials at local, state and federal levels who decide on the location of water, sewer and power lines, the location of highways, railroads, waterways and transportation terminals, the placing of state and federal facilities and so on.

Patterns of settlement are also affected, of course, by officials who defend tax inequities that discriminate against the city, who defend zoning practices that imprison the poor in the central city, who permit imbalances in welfare that promote migration.

But the characteristic of all who now influence patterns of settlement and population movement is that each is preoccupied with a splinter of the problem, and none is conscious of his impact on the total well-being of the society. It is that heedless every-bureaucrat-to-his-own-task approach to governing that has produced the present mess. We must have top-level leadership to provide us with an overview of all problems.

Both state and federal governments are already deeply involved in influencing patterns of human settlement—not always consciously or wisely. For some years now FHA mortgage insurance has been a significant factor in making the flight to the suburbs possible for middle-class homebuyers. The highway program has contributed to the growth of suburbia and exurbia. Federal defense and space contracts and installations have had a major impact on population movement in some regions.

The impulse toward more orderly planning has had some encouragement by the Federal government. Metropolitan and regional planning have been given considerable emphasis. But this is far short of a vast national enterprise involving the creation of many new cities, redesign of existing cities, and economic development of our rural areas.

A suggested approach, a first step but a necessary first step, should be the appointment of a Presidential Commission to make an official start in exploring the problem, formulating goals, identifying critical problems and proposing action. The commission should be directed to submit its preliminary recom-

mendations in twelve months. This twelve-month period would serve as a period of study, preparation and preliminary action for Congress, the states, cities and the private sector, with special emphasis on the contribution to this effort by organized labor.

Many will say this proposal is just for the creation of another federal commission, with the problem thereafter being swept under the rug and forgotten. But this is not my intention. Never have we faced a problem of this magnitude. We must proceed in an orderly manner, or we will fail.

Among the matters to be considered by such a commission would be the following:

1. Federal provision of financial incentives for state and local action.

2. Federal capital grants and low-interest loans to the cities for advance land acquisition.

3. Incentives to business and industry to locate in areas where growth is sought.

4. Careful provision for consultation between the federal government and state and local government on all forward planning.

5. The re-direction of present multi-state economic development and planning agencies.

6. Creation by the states, with federal help, of new statewide agencies with broad powers to plan new communities, to establish urban development corporations, to create "land banks," and so on.

7. Use by the states of their full authority to locate highways, air terminals, parks, hospitals, universities and so on in such a way as to implement a statewide plan for land use and population movement.

8. The development of sound patterns for the planning, building and governing of new communities.

To say that this is a challenge doesn't adequately describe its possibilities. Our future is full of challenges—moral, material, scientific, sociological, political. This one has attributes that make it almost uniquely exciting.

The sheer grandeur of it speaks to our condition. We need a lift of spirit as we approach the beginning of our third century as a nation. And it is a visible, concrete challenge. Among all the impenetrable complexities of our future, the task of rebuilding America has a kind of elemental comprehensibility.

It carries within it enormous potentialities for generating a new burst of economic activity. It would power our economy for decades to come.

This is a goal of moon-shot proportions. It is not a divisive goal. It is a goal which will generate by itself a fresh dynamism, literally millions of new jobs, and will lift the spirit of our people, uniting us as never before. This national commitment would provide the dynamic thrust our society has always had in the past but is in danger of losing. The scope and nature of the commitment is heroic.

It cannot be said too often that Americans are at their best when they are striving for something, when they are pursuing a shared goal. If we are not able to set some goals that stretch us as a people, goals that command our imagination, then we will slide into the torpor of the nations that are receding from history's forefront. And all the learned economists will be impotent to halt the downward skid of a nation that can't think of anything worth striving for.

In short, it is very much in the interest of all segments of our national life to set a great goal for the nation.

In one of John Galsworthy's essays there appears the following passage:

"On the eighth day of July in the year 1401, the Dean and Chapter of Seville assembled in the Court of the Elms and solemnly resolved, 'Let us build a church so great that those who come after us may think us mad to have attempted it.' The church took 150 years to build."

The proposal outlined here is not so generous of time. It gives us little more than 30 years to build our "church."

MARINE CORPS CLARIFIES ITS POLICY ON REGULATIONS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I recently had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial column written by John Crown, of the Atlanta Journal, regarding Marine Corps policy on black power haircuts and salutes.

The Marines are naturally interested in clarifying their policy, which apparently was misinterpreted, at least to some degree, in news accounts. I have always been a great admirer of the Marine Corps, and I am glad to hear from the Assistant Commandant, Gen. Lewis W. Walt, that "no relaxation in our proven high standard will be condoned."

Mr. Crown has written a second column that puts the matter in better perspective. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Sept. 22, 1969]

THE U.S. MARINE CORPS: HAIRCUTS, SALUTES, GESTURES AND DISCIPLINE

(By John Crown)

Earlier this month I recorded my dismay and shock at the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman Jr., caving in to militant demands as though he were a college president.

I was particularly concerned at his singling out for dispensation the Afro-style haircut and the Black Power clinched fist salute. The Marine Corps must be a unified and cohesive force to retain its elite combat status. Differences must be minimized, not accentuated.

Apparently that particular column reached the hallowed halls of Headquarters Marine Corps for I have received a letter from the Assistant Commandant Gen. Lewis W. "Lew" Walt, a man with whom I served extensively throughout World War II; a Marine whom I hold in the highest esteem and regard.

Gen. Walt noted that "perhaps your editorial would have been less harsh on our Commandant had you had access to the full text of the ALMAR." For the benefit of non-Marines an ALMAR is an acronym for a message from All Marines—All Marine Commands.

After reading it, I'll concede that I would have been less harsh. I had taken my material from news stories in which the haircut and the salute had been given much prominence. Such was not the case in the ALMAR.

One paragraph said it clearly and completely:

"Each Marine must understand why the Marine Corps has always demanded the highest standards in military appearance, military courtesy and proficiency and why we will continue to do so. These high standards breed pride, and pride, in turn, builds the kind of discipline that is essential to battlefield success with minimum casualties. These qualities have always been the hallmark of Marines and no relaxation in our proven high standards will be condoned. For example, uniforms will be worn correctly with no nonregulation items in evidence; haircuts will conform to regulations, no more, no less; proper military salutes will be rendered on appropriate occasions; the high quality of professionalism must be exhibited in every assignment; breaches of good order and discipline will be dealt with fairly, expeditiously and firmly. This is especially true for those Marines who instigate or execute violence against their fellow Marines."

But having said it all so well, why was it necessary to subsequently include the following paragraph?

"Commanders will permit the Afro/natural haircut providing it conforms with current Marine Corps regulations."

If "haircuts will conform to regulations, no more, no less," why shouldn't that take care of the haircut question?

In all fairness, the Black Power clenched fist salute was not specifically mentioned in the ALMAR, nor by Gen. Chapman personally. The references to it came out in a press conference at which the ALMAR was discussed, the following paragraph in particular:

"No actions, signs, symbols, gestures, and words which are contrary to tradition will be permitted during formations or when rendering military courtesies to colors, the national anthem or individuals. Individual signs between groups or individuals will be accepted for what they are—gestures of recognition and unity; in this connection, it is Marine Corps policy that, while such actions are to be discouraged, they are nevertheless expressions of individual belief and are not, in themselves, prohibited. However, they are grounds for disciplinary action if executed during official ceremonies or in a manner suggesting direct defiance of duly constituted authority."

Gen. Chapman was asked if the foregoing paragraph referred specifically to the Black Power clenched fist salute.

He replied: "Well, that's one of those that this particular subparagraph refers to, yes. There are others, though."

"What others, sir?"

"Oh well, the Marines, individual Marines, often have ways of gesturing to each other. . . . Anything from an informal wave of the hand to something a little more pointed."

In his letter to me, Gen. Walt wrote:

"We are placing new emphasis on leadership, especially small unit leadership, which, I believe, will do much to solve the problems. The Marines of today are no different than those of yesteryear, but the climate outside the Corps, adjacent to our bases and across the country, has caused new pressures to be brought on these young men. They responded to leadership and challenge on the battlefields of Vietnam and they have proved to be dedicated Americans and Marines there. They have turned in a superb performance. I am sure that, with proper leadership on the part of us in responsible positions, we can help them to be good Americans and proud Marines here at home too."

Okay, Gen. Chapman. Okay, Gen. Walt. Having read it all, I'll concede that my original column was somewhat harsh.

Lots of luck in what you're trying to do.

EISENHOWER STAMP

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this past Tuesday, October 14, I had the honor to participate in an occasion which was both pleasant and appropriate. The date marked what would have been Dwight Eisenhower's 79th birthday; it also was chosen as the first day of issue for a new postage stamp honoring him. The site chosen for issuing this stamp was Ike's hometown, Abilene, Kans.

As befitted the man and the occasion, it was a warm and genial meeting of those who had known and loved Ike as a personal friend and neighbor, as a soldier, and as a statesman. The ceremonies were arranged and supervised by the Chairman of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Commemorative Stamp Committee, longtime associate of the general

and former U.S. Senator from Kansas, Harry Darby.

The list of dignitaries who were present is much too long to recount here. But a few deserve special mention.

Serving as President Nixon's representative to the ceremonies was Brig. Gen. Robert L. Schultz, who placed a wreath, on behalf of the President, during a special memorial service, in the place of meditation at the Eisenhower Center.

The featured speaker of the day was Ike's former comrade-in-arms and retired Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, General Lauris Norstad.

Postmaster General Winton Blount was also present to relay a special message from President Nixon and to share some thoughts concerning President Eisenhower's legacy to our country.

No mention of those present would be complete without noting the attendance of the man who represented Kansas in this body throughout President Eisenhower's two terms in office: of course I am referring to my predecessor, the Honorable Frank Carlson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the program for the day's ceremonies and the text of Postmaster General Blount's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM

PLACE OF MEDITATION

Memorial services and wreath laying ceremony

Invocation and Reading of President Eisenhower's Inaugural Prayer: Lt. Col. John Blom, Chaplain, 24th Infantry Division.

National Anthem: 24th Infantry (Mech) Division Band, conducted by Warrant Officer Samuel Brown.

The President's Wreath: Brig. Gen. Robert L. Schulz, Special Assistant to the President.

Carillon: Specialist David E. Ralph, Member of The Fifth U.S. Army Band.

Taps.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY

First day of issue ceremonies

Invocation: Lt. Col John Blom.

Presiding: The Honorable Harry Darby, Chairman, Dwight D. Eisenhower Commemorative Stamp Committee.

Welcoming Address: The Honorable Robert Docking, Governor of Kansas.

Introduction of Guests: The Honorable Harry Darby.

Speaker: "Experiences With General Eisenhower," General Lauris Norstad, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation.

Address and Presentation of Albums: The Honorable Winton M. Blount, Postmaster General of the United States.

Benediction: Lt. Col. John Blom.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WINTON M. BLOUNT, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

I have a letter to all of you from the President of the United States which I should like to read at this time:

"My sincere best wishes go to all of you attending the First Day of Issue ceremony dedicating the commemorative stamp honoring President Eisenhower.

"It is particularly significant that on October 14, his birthday, this beloved man should be honored in this way. Few men in American history or in the world history have so dedicated their lives to peace through understanding and understanding through communications among the peoples of the world. A commemorative stamp, repsenting as it does the spirit of communication, of exchange of ideas, of freedom of expression, is a particularly fitting honor to be paid to Dwight Eisenhower and his vision of peace and brotherhood.

"This commemorative stamp will serve to remind millions of the man who said: 'Freedom of expression is not merely a right in the circumstances of today, its constructive use is a stern duty.' It is my hope that this stamp will be not only an important part of our postal system, but also a symbol of the man it honors, a man dedicated to free expression and communication as a means to just and lasting peace."

We are gathered here today to honor the birth of an American who helped give shape, purpose, and direction to the 20th century. But I do not wish to eulogize General Dwight David Eisenhower. Others have done that eloquently, and sometimes even adequately.

Rather, I would like to share with you some private thoughts on the Eisenhower legacy—on an America left free to seek its own destiny, under god.

The preservation of our national freedom is a part of the Eisenhower legacy, as surely as the preservation of the Union is a part of the legacy of Abraham Lincoln. In the face of the worst tyranny the world has known a sword has raised. The combined might of the allied nations forged that great sword. But it pleased God to see it placed in the hands of a single man: A soldier who knew the blood and degradation of the killing ground; a man of profound religious conviction who knew war, found it vulgar, and called it "stupidity." We have advanced little as a people if we do not find a moral lesson in the fact that the world's last great military captain was a man of peace.

On last Saturday, I stood at Abraham Lincoln's tomb in Springfield, Illinois, and today I cannot help thinking of Lincoln and Eisenhower and what they have taught us. As our President attempts to end the long and bitter war in Viet Nam, there is a sad similarity between his burdens and those which Lincoln had to bear. Always there have been those who would have us believe, in the name of peace, that if it was impossible to break the will of our adversaries, then it was imperative to break the will of our own people. As the war went badly for the Confederacy, it took courage and fought on, and men died, because, as Carl Sandburg has written: "One hope still held that the peace party in the north might so weaken the Lincoln administration that in time it would give up the war as hopeless."

One hundred years later, and half a world away, another war is raging where freedom is the issue. Again, we find ourselves ranged on the side of those who cherish this freedom as we do: against those who would expend any amount of human life for as long as necessary in order to impose their will on their brothers. And we hear an historical echo of Carl Sandburg's words in the words of the North Vietnamese Defense Minister, Vo Nguyen Giap: When he said the United States "does not possess . . . the psychological and political means to fight a long drawn-out war." And so the war goes on, while our adversary stands with both feet planted firmly in the fallacy encouraged and strengthened by those who would undermine our will.

To paraphrase Churchill: We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries, across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies, because we lack the "psychological and political means" to support the defense of freedom. But there are some among us who suppose otherwise.

There is a certain spiritual arrogance in those who suppose that they are more sensitive to the bloodshed in Vietnam than are the leaders of this country. The peaks of self-righteousness and moral superiority are as untenable as they are attractive: They are made slippery by the blood of those called to pay the price so that others may indulge their feelings of moral superiority. There are none in this land that more desire peace in Vietnam than the President of this Nation. There are none that can match his unceasing efforts to bring us out of this complex agony and there is no finer advocate for our Nation's desire for peace with honor.

The presumption of those who feel they know better than the President how to attain peace creates difficulties which ultimately diminish our prospects for peace.

In the life of General Eisenhower there is a lesson which many prefer not to see: There is an answer to those who accuse our leaders of immorality—who choose to believe and would have others believe, that this Nation has pursued its course in Vietnam because our leaders prefer war.

No soldier, whether he is a private or the Commander-in-Chief, prefers war. No President sees the fathers and sons and husbands of this Nation sent to their death with anything but the most bitter pain in his heart. And who can truly know that pain, but the man who bears it. General Eisenhower commanded four million men, and said: "Every one of those men is precious to me". As war material? No. As human beings. Who, in all decency, can pretend to desire peace more profoundly than the man who bears the final responsibility for war?

I would hope that all Americans, on this seventy-ninth anniversary of the birth of Dwight David Eisenhower, might turn to the example of this man who, at the head of our armies, led those armies in the greatest march for freedom ever undertaken and who, in the Presidency, led this people and all people of good will in the search for the day when nation would not lift up sword against nation, neither would they learn war anymore.

But for all that, it would be very wrong to raise Dwight Eisenhower so high in our esteem that we lose sight of him as a human being. For he was a man of gaiety and grace who took his duties seriously, but rarely himself. He was gentle as only the very strong can be. And he was forgiving, as only the very wise can be. Above all, he was a *believable* man. People knew they could trust him.

It was for these reasons, and not because of the positions he has held, or the deeds he had done, but because in his humanity he set an example for all men to look up to, that he became in his life a moral force for good, not only in America, but in the world.

Pericles said that "heroes have the whole earth for their tomb." Dwight Eisenhower came from these plains, and he returned to sleep beneath them. Yet, truly, the whole earth is his tomb; the free world his monument.

As his forces were preparing to cross the Rhine, and the preliminary artillery barrages split the night on March 23, 1945, Ike was out, as usual, with his men, comforting them, encouraging them, sharing with them their natural doubts and fears. He came to one young man who was obviously very frightened, put his arm around the boy's shoulder, and said:

"How are you feeling, son?"

The boy answered, "General, I'm awful nervous. I was wounded two months ago and just got back from the hospital yesterday. I don't feel so good."

"Well," Ike told him, "you and I are a good pair then, because I'm nervous too. Maybe if we just walk along together to the river we'll be good for each other."

After all the memoirs are written and all the eulogies spoken, the image of the Su-

preme Allied Commander and that frightened boy walking along to the river will still tell the story of Dwight Eisenhower best. He walked with America, and we are richer because of it.

It is a distinct honor for me now to give to the American people this stamp commemorating Dwight D. Eisenhower.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO EDGAR L. McWETHY, JR.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) shared with me today the moving experience of being present at the private ceremony when Mr. and Mrs. Edgar L. McWethy, of Baxter Springs, Kans., were presented a posthumous Medal of Honor, awarded to their son Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., by the President of the United States.

Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., was honored today for his gallantry in action while serving as a medical aid man with Company B, 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, Airmobile in Binh Dinh Province, Republic of Vietnam, on June 21, 1967. The citation accompanying this award follows these remarks.

Raised and educated in Leadville, Colo., Edgar was active in the Boy Scouts and served as a junior assistant scoutmaster of an Explorer troop there. He was a member of the Baptist Church and employed by the Post Office. As a young man he was, according to his mother, not especially interested in medical work, but while in the Army, he became very much interested in it and this interest made him effective as a medical aid man.

His parents, together with his brother Kenneth and sister Christie, now live in Baxter Springs. It was a privilege for Senator DOLE and me to be present with them at the White House ceremony this morning. We commend the bravery of their son and express condolence upon his death.

For his extraordinary bravery in action, despite wounds that eventually proved fatal, Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., was awarded posthumously both the Purple Heart and the Air Medal in ceremonies at Fort Riley, Kans., in September 1967. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that I ask unanimous consent that the citation accompanying his posthumous Medal of Honor be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

The President of the United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor posthumously to Specialist Five Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

Serving as a medical aidman with Company B, 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile), in Binh Dinh Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 21 June 1967, Specialist McWethy accompanied his platoon to the site of a downed helicopter. Shortly after the platoon established a defensive perimeter around the aircraft, a large enemy force attacked the position from three sides with a heavy volume of automatic weapons fire and grenades. The platoon leader and his radio operator were wounded almost immediately, and Specialist McWethy rushed across the fire swept area to their assistance. Although he could not help the mortally wounded radio operator, Specialist McWethy's timely first aid enabled the platoon leader to retain command during this critical period. Hearing a call for aid, Specialist McWethy started across the open toward the injured men, but was wounded in the head and knocked to the ground. He regained his feet and continued on but was hit again, this time in the leg. Struggling onward despite his wounds, he gained the side of his comrades and treated their injuries. Observing another fallen rifleman lying in an exposed position raked by enemy fire, Specialist McWethy moved toward him without hesitation. Although the enemy fire wounded him a third time, Specialist McWethy reached his fallen companion. Though weakened and in extreme pain, Specialist McWethy gave the wounded man artificial respiration, but suffered a fourth and fatal wound. Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his own safety, and demonstrated concern for his fellow soldiers, Specialist McWethy inspired the members of his platoon and contributed in great measure to their successful defense of the position and the ultimate rout of the enemy force. Specialist McWethy's profound sense of duty, bravery, and his willingness to accept extraordinary risks in order to help the men of his unit are characteristic of the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—ACTION OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, yesterday, October 15, the Committee on Finance met in executive session and announced decisions on a series of provisions contained in the House tax-reform bill. The subjects covered include the taxation of multiple trusts and accumulation trusts; multiple corporations; treble damages; foreign tax credit; and stock dividends.

So that Senators might follow the progress of these executive sessions, I ask unanimous consent that a press release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A press release from the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Oct. 15, 1969]

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—ACTIONS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Honorable Russell B. Long, (D., La.) Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance announced today that the Committee was continuing to make good progress in its effort to complete action on the Tax Reform Act of 1969 by October 31. He reported that in executive session the Committee had reached decisions on a number of important tax reform provisions contained in the House bill, and had corrected defects in several of them. The complete action of the Committee is described in the following paragraphs:

Multiple Trusts; Accumulation Trusts.—The Committee generally approved the provisions of the House bill which tax the beneficiary of accumulation trusts (including multiple trusts) in substantially the same manner as if the income had been distributed to the beneficiary when it was earned by the trust. However, it approved a series of amendments to correct certain defects in the House language.

(a) The definition of "distributable net income" was modified to include capital gains and dividends allocated by the trustee to the corpus of the trust, thereby preventing the use of trusts to accumulate these items at low rates to be distributed later to high-bracket taxpayers.

(b) The Committee agreed to apply an interest charge to the tax payments deferred by the use of accumulation trusts. This charge would be 6 percent of the tax involved for the period for which it is deferred, and would be assessed against the beneficiary who receives the accumulated income of the trust.

(c) The Committee decided to make the new rules for accumulation trusts applicable with respect to income accumulated in taxable years beginning with December 31, 1968 (rather than in taxable years beginning after April 22, 1969). Income accumulated in prior years will continue to be subject to the law in effect at the time the income was accumulated, except that the $2,000 deminimis exemption will not apply.

(d) The Committee modified the so-called "short-cut" method for computing tax upon the distribution of accumulated income in a number of relatively minor respects, the most important of which was a Treasury Department recommendation to prevent the creation of multiple trusts with staggered accumulation distributions in order to take advantage of the short-cut rule. This is accomplished by making the "short-cut" method inapplicable if during any of the preceding taxable years in which an accumulation distribution is deemed to have been made, prior accumulation distributions were also deemed to have been made by two or more other trusts to the same taxpayer.

Multiple Corporations.—The Committee approved provisions in the House bill tightening the rules under which large groups of commonly controlled corporations have been able to obtain substantial benefits intended primarily for small business The principal benefits are the $25,000 corporate surtax exemption, the $100,000 exemption from the accumulated earnings tax and the special additional first-year depreciation allowance. In approving the objective of the House bill, the Committee made the following modifications to the language:

(a) *Five-Year Phase-out.*—The Committee rejected the eight-year phase-out of these special tax advantages contained in the House bill and substituted a five-year transition period instead. However, the Committee delayed the effective date of the phase-out so that it would not commence until 1970. (The House bill would have become operative in 1969.)

(b) The Committee also approved a Treasury-suggested modification to prevent any part of a preconsolidation loss incurred by one member of a controlled group from being used to offset income of other members of the group until after the 5-year transition period referred to in paragraph (a). The House bill would have "phased-in" the allowance for these losses as it "phased-out" the other advantages. It also deleted references to controlled groups of mutual insurance companies in accordance with advice received from the Treasury that no such groups were in existence.

(c) The Committee also modified the bill to permit corporations which used surtax exemptions in the past to elect to shift immediately to a consolidated returns basis of tax reporting and to use loss carryovers within the group without reduction, if the group agreed to give up the multiple surtax exemptions it had claimed for the year the loss was sustained.

Treble Damages; S. 2631.—On the Chairman's motion, the Committee approved the text of S. 2631 as an amendment to the tax reform bill. This bill would disallow a tax deduction for two-thirds of amounts paid as treble damages growing out of criminal violations of the antitrust laws. The disallowance would apply in the case of a conviction

after December 31, 1969 in a criminal proceeding or in the case of a guilty plea or plea of nolo contendere entered after that date. The amendment also makes it clear that no deduction is allowable because of the payment to another person of bribes and other illegal kickbacks.

Foreign Tax Credits.—The Committee deleted those provisions of the House bill (Sections 431 and 432) which would have reduced the foreign tax credits available to taxpayers with income from foreign sources.

However, the Committee did agree to add an amendment to the bill making it clear that for Federal tax purposes, the continental shelf of the United States is to be treated as part of the United States.

Stock Dividends.—The Committee approved the portion of the House bill which taxes the recipients of stock dividends in those instances where one group of shareholders receives a distribution in cash and there is an increase in the proportionate interest of the group receiving the stock dividend. Before approving it, however, the Committee adopted an amendment to prevent avoidance of the House provision where a company had two classes of stock outstanding before the effective date of the provision but had not used them in a way which would give rise to a tax under the new rules. It amended the effective date provision in another respect also. Under this latter amendment a corporation which had two classes of stock outstanding on the effective date of the provision would be permitted to issue additional shares of stock of whichever class is the larger.

VIETNAM AND THE PROTESTS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) made an excellent address yesterday to the California Federation of Republican Women. His remarks are most pertinent to some of the ideas and resolutions that have been presented in the Chamber in recent days.

I might suggest that for an outstanding presentation of our reasons for being in Vietnam and our reasons for backing the President in his policy to achieve a victory in that hapless land, Senators and their aides should read this speech.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM AND THE PROTESTS

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

Madame Chairman, Senator Murphy and honored guests: It is a special honor for me to be here today to address this important meeting of the California Federation of Republican Women, and I say that for a number of important reasons. Let's take them in order.

First, California is where the Goldwater family got started in our country, and I have long regarded your state as a second home. I want you to know that two of our four children make their residence in California, and as you may know, one is in Congress.

Another important reason is that I like Republicans. The final reason, of course, is that I love women.

As most of you know, I arrived earlier today from Washington, D.C., which is in its usual state of ferment.

You know, Washington is a place where any Presidential appointee who owns stock is automatically suspect. It is also the place where if he sells that stock for a profit the transaction is regarded as at least prime facie evidence of skullduggery. In fact, in Washington a Presidential appointee can't even sell stock at a loss without incurring some blame. You see, to those anti-Nixon liberals in the Senate, no prospective bureaucrat, high or low, is supposed to have any money. If he does, the last place they want him to put it is behind a belief in the American free enterprise system.

Right now the Congress is wrestling with the whole idea of tax reform. And after we reform the tax, we plan to reform the taxpayers.

Washington also is the place where we hear a lot about Vietnam. President Nixon's critics want to end the war in Vietnam—just so we can do it without winning. Washington is the place where they want an adequate national defense—just so it won't cost any money.

Washington is the place where a new breed of isolationists is springing up—a breed so determined that it would like to see a Maginot line built around this country to prevent U.S. arms from slipping out to foreigners who might fight Communism.

Washington is that wonderland where men who spent 30 years committing this nation to an extreme policy of internationalism, who ran up a foreign aid bill of $122 billion, and who loaded down the American taxpayer with every conceivable kind of boondoggle that might garner a few liberal votes are now talking about economy and cutting government expenditures.

These new apostles of thrift, however, give themselves away. They aren't worried about fiscal responsibility. They could care less about inflation, balanced Federal budgets, payments on the national debt and similar facets of a sound economy.

No, these "savers" have a couple pet areas in mind. Naturally, they are areas that conform with the liberal philosophy and the liberal affinity for causes that range from the left of center to the Marxist-Lenin area represented by the so-called New Left.

In other words, the new savers want the savings to be cut out of this nation's defenses or its ability to retaliate to a possible first strike attack from Communist nations. They also want to cut those savings out of the space program and other areas where U.S. supremacy over the Soviet Union and Communist China are especially impressive and needed.

And while we are at it, Washington is the place where very soon we will have to get back down to brass tacks on the whole subject of Vietnam.

But I certainly don't mean doing it the way the so-called Moratorium protestors of the SDS, and other professional pacifists groups on the Far Left are doing it with their demonstrations today.

No amount of shouting, or banner-waving or street-clogging or mass assemblies is going to help the cause of peace in Paris or in Hanoi. This kind of activity would only have a minimal effect, even if the demonstrators—through some unforeseen miracle of belated patriotism—should protest on behalf of the United States position in Asia. As it is, the Communist press will take full note of the Moratorium demonstrations, add their own special brand of exaggeration and misinterpretation and present the leaders of our enemies with more phony evidence that the people of the United States are opposed to the war in Vietnam and that its government is rapidly approaching capitulation.

Understand me well, I want peace in Vietnam as much as anyone who calls himself a member of the October 15th Moratorium Committee, as much as any Democratic member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as much as any recently-appointed member of the Senate from New York and as much as, if not more than, any of the professional slogan-mouthing, leftist-oriented pacifist groups in this country.

But I want an honorable peace. The American people, all of them, want an end to the killing just as much as some of the people who seem to arrogate to themselves the idea that only they have any regard for humane qualities. When any member of Congress makes a public demand for American withdrawals from Southeast Asia, he is not out ahead of concerned Republicans like myself in his desire for peace. He is not out ahead of the American people. He is not out ahead of Richard M. Nixon. In fact, he isn't quite even with the President and his advisors when it comes to time spent in attempts to end this unfortunate and unhappy conflict we inherited from the Democrats.

And about the demonstrations being held today, let me say this: I don't care what kind of a fancy package you wrap them in. I don't care whether you call the agitations an expression of the American will to end the bloodshed. I don't care whether you call them proper exercises in the right of protest or the right of assembly or the right of free speech.

Regardless of what kind of a package you put them in, what kind of ribbon of reasonableness you try to tie around them, what kind of fancy labels marked "peace" you paste on them, the fact remains that these demonstrations are playing into the hands of the people whose business it is to kill American fighting men.

I am not objecting to the legality of these Moratorium demonstrations.

I am not questioning the deep, warmhearted sincerity of some of the people who take part in them.

But I am questioning, and I do denounce, the effect they will have on President Nixon's efforts to convince Hanoi that further war is useless. I do question also the effect these shows of dissatisfaction with official policy will have on the morale of our men slugging their way through the miserable slime of Vietnam's rice paddies, hills and jungles.

Put yourself in the position of a young man who is fighting this war for a country he has grown up to respect. If you take the average, he could be a young man whose parents or grandparents fled from tyranny in Europe to find opportunity and success and prosperity in the American way of life. How do you suppose he feels as he carries out his distasteful but necessary task as a part of the military organization in South Vietnam when he hears that thousands of his fellow citizens are making a spectacle of themselves in the United States to show their opposition for what he is trying to accomplish?

The newspapers tell us very clearly that our fighting men in Vietnam believe in what they are doing. Oh, yes, there are some exceptions, and these exceptions have a remarkable way of finding themselves in front of TV cameras and radio microphones. But the great majority of our men believe in their country, believe in its leaders, believe in its cause and will fight for them.

And on this particular day I should like our fighting men in Vietnam to understand that they have every single reason to be proud of what they are doing and to understand that the vast majority of 200 million people support them and are proud of them and wish them the very, very best of good fortune. I feel that it would be nothing less than tragic if we were to permit the wave of demonstrations which have been so carefully manufactured on the far left to fool any of our fighting men in Asia. They are making great sacrifices for their country, just as the men of earlier generations made sacrifices in Korea, World War II and World War I, and it would be shameful and tragic if they were to be given any solid reasons to think for one minute that their sacrifices were not deeply appreciated by their fellow Americans.

I have no objections to demonstrations, but I do object if they have the effect of prolonging the war and of causing our fight-

ing men even one moment of unhappiness. I believe a great many sincere Americans, if they were to truly look at these things and see what the effect of these demonstrations could be, that they would think twice about lending their support to any and all rag-tag appeals merely because they are skillfully promoted in the name of peace.

I find it a little frightening to see how many people, clergymen included, who seem to think they are doing a righteous and noble and daring thing when they join in protests against the announced policies of the United States Government.

At the very least, it is a sad commentary on the American attitude.

Where Vietnam is concerned, I am convinced that the nation's news media has a lot to answer for. I know they pass it off as a product of news judgment, but the fact remains that one of the easiest ways to get plenty of attention in the newspapers, on radio and television is to oppose the President of the United States.

Some public officials, knowing how eagerly some of the media accepts this kind of attack, are actually making it a full time occupation.

In Washington at least one newspaper has a name for it. Strangely enough, the name comes from the *Washington Post* which calls the process "the breaking of a President."

The whole idea is that certain liberal critics learned how to "break" Lyndon B. Johnson and force his retirement using the Vietnam issue as a club. These same forces, convinced that President Nixon is following much the same course, believe the process can be repeated.

It is interesting that they pay no attention to—or at least avoid mentioning in public—the fact that President Nixon is reducing the American commitment in Vietnam where LBJ was increasing it. They never mention that Nixon is withdrawing troops in Vietnam where LBJ was sending more over. And, of course, no mention is made of the fact that under Nixon, American casualty figures have sunk to their lowest level while under LBJ they established new peaks almost every month.

I guess you have gathered by this time that I am thoroughly in accord with official policies in Vietnam at the present time. If I had any changes to suggest they would be designed to shorten the war by convincing the Communists that they are defeated. In effect, my suggestions would be designed to offset the kind of nonsense that we are seeing demonstrated today by people who want a war ended but have nothing to suggest in the way of procedure except mass withdrawal and complete surrender.

I think the time is here for our government to notify Hanoi that if its representatives in Paris continue to block any and all attempts to reach a negotiated settlement, our only resource will be to bomb the north, to concentrate on destruction of the Port of Haiphong, to destroy the railroad along the Red River Valley from China and to take every other measure necessary to convince Hanoi that it has had its chance and that we have "just begun to fight."

Now let me address a few words to you as Republicans. I just want to say that I do not agree 1000% with everything that President Nixon does as head of the Federal Government merely because he is a personal friend and was my personal choice for the office he holds. But I believe the President of the United States, as Commander-in-Chief of the nation's Armed Forces and as the man designated by the Constitution to carry out the strategic policy of this country, deserves a lot better from his fellow Republicans.

I am not suggesting, nor would I suggest, any slavish adherence to each and every policy that comes from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue merely because its present resident is a card-carrying member of the GOP in good standing.

But I do believe that we must close ranks and give him the support he needs on big, fundamental, strategic decisions that affect not only the future of the United States and the Republican Party but the future of the entire free world. His policy in Vietnam is just such a fundamental matter. And I have no time for important Republicans who oppose the President in Vietnam—especially those who appear to be doing it for the sake of political advantage.

RESTORATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR GEORGIA SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago I wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding a matter that I deem to be of utmost importance to many thousands of schoolchildren, not only in my own State but also in many other States.

I wrote Secretary Finch to urge that he take affirmative action to restore Federal funds to Georgia school systems that have been cut off under title VI of the Civil Rights Act—and particularly to enable these school systems to reinstate school lunch programs for needy children. This was the second time in recent months that I have made this request.

In response to my letter of August 13, Leon Pannetta, writing for the Secretary, said neither yea nor nay. He did indicate that the matter was under consideration.

My request is sound. The school desegregation issue in Georgia is now before the Federal judiciary. A U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals decision strongly indicates that all title VI enforcement proceedings to date have been faulty.

To my mind, one of the most important factors is the health and welfare of needy children who are being deprived of school lunches because of these cutoffs. I submit that this is neither humane nor lawful. Congressional intent was very clear. School lunch programs were not to be jeopardized by title VI cutoffs.

I have not yet had an answer from Secretary Finch to my letter of September 24. Perhaps Mr. Pannetta will write again when he has time. I would hope, however, that I may hear from Secretary Finch on a matter of such importance.

In the meantime, some ten thousand deprived children—black and white—are having to go without school lunches, which in most instances are the only nutritious meal they receive a day. In the Senate last Tuesday, the distinguished Senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) spoke in behalf of S. 2982, The Child Nutrition Act of 1969, that he recently introduced. He urged greater public support of education and particularly of school lunch programs.

I am in complete accord with the Senator's observations that "school lunch programs must be considered a crucial part of our educational process."

I have also introduced a comprehensive bill to expand and improve the national school lunch program, which has widespread support among the Members of the Senate, including the Senator from New York.

I would also agree with him that school lunch programs should not be made a scapegoat of the so-called tax revolt. The nutrition and welfare of children trying to learn are too important. This is too important an area to be hamstrung by fiscal restraint.

This is the point of my communications with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not think school lunch programs should be made scapegoats of the school desegregation controversy—especially when it goes against the clear intent of Congress, and especially when it deprives schoolchildren of nourishment they so desperately need.

I hope that Secretary Finch will see fit to correct this situation at the earliest possible time.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVES' CONFERENCE ON WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. BOGGS. A conference of importance to American industry, and to the Nation's citizens generally, will take place in Washington October 23 and 24, 1969. This is the National Executives' Conference on Water Pollution Abatement, sponsored by the Department of the Interior.

Secretary Walter J. Hickel organized the conference and will play a key role in it. He will address the conferees at the opening session and will be the featured speaker at a banquet the evening of October 23.

The conference will be held at the Washington Hilton, and will include both morning and afternoon sessions during the two days that it is held.

Under Secretary Russell E. Train is chairman of the conference program committee. The conference director will be Karl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research. Klein will serve as moderator of the discussions during the two morning sessions, David D. Dominick, Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, will be the moderator for the two afternoon sessions.

The significance of the conference is that it launches a new era in public-private cooperation that must grow if the increasingly-serious problem of water pollution is to be brought under control.

Discussion will center around the experiences of industrial firms, here and abroad, in working with the problems of water pollution abatement. Thus, it will provide an instructive symposium for an examination of the whole area of water pollution control, and will offer plans and methods by which the problem may be dealt with in manageable cost ranges.

Water pollution is an international problem that is becoming increasingly critical for all industrialized countries with urban population densities. In recognition of the international aspect of the problem, the conference planners chose to include as chief speakers the top executives of six foreign industrial organizations and six major U.S. firms.

The conference schedule has been arranged in such a way that questions from participants will be welcomed, thus encouraging a full-range discussion of the points presented. The speakers are:

Mr. Wilfrid Baumgartner, president, Rhone Poulenc, France.

Dr. L. A. DuBridge, Science Advisor to the President.

Mr. Harrison F. Dunning, chairman of the board, Scott Paper Co.

Mr. Rein Hennriksen, director general, A/S Borregaard, Norway.

Dr. Neil Iliff, president, Chemical Industries Association, Ltd., United Kingdom.

Mr. Charles F. Luce, chairman of the board, Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, Inc.

Mr. Brooks McCormick, president, International Harvester Co.

Mr. Charles B. McCoy, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Rt. Hon. Kenneth Robinson, M.P., Minister for Housing and Planning, United Kingdom.

Mr. Robert M. Schmon, president, the Ontario Paper Co., Ltd., Canada.

Mr. Edgar B. Speer, president, United States Steel Corp.

Mr. John E. Swearingen, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

Mr. Russell E. Train, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Dr. Giorgio Valerio, president, Montecatini Edison, S.p.A., Italy.

Casimir Prince Wittgenstein, senior executive vice president, Metallgesellschaft A. G., West Germany.

"Water Pollution Is Your Business" will be the theme of the conference. Consideration will be given to the following topics:

Industrial recognition of pollution abatement responsibilities.

Management decisions, cost factors by dollars and percentages, sales factors, public relations factors, stockholders relations, and long-range engineering plans.

The development of attainable and tight timetables for industrial pollution abatement, and Government-industrial relations in achieving industrial pollution abatement schedules.

The realization in America of the imperative need for water pollution abatement is not so great as it inevitably must be if the growing demand for clean water, both by industry and the public, is to be supplied in the future. An awareness of the problem will increase in time. But our country must not wait until the overwhelming disaster of pollution-choked rivers, ruined lakes, and dead estuaries strikes vitally at our lives. Plans must go into action now to do something about the problem, to do much more than we are doing.

This is the basic meaning behind the coming conference. It is an important step that must be taken if success is to be achieved. The longer the job is put off, the more it is going to cost in money, in public health, in recreation, and in practically all aspects of community living. Our future environment and our national growth are at stake.

Organizers expect the National Executives' Conference on Water Pollution Abatement to mark a turning point in the struggle against water pollution. To assure that the conference achieves a level of recognition commensurate with its importance, arrangements are being handled by Robert L. L. McCormick, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTIONS AND PETITIONS ON VIETNAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I participated in yesterday's moratorium observances by returning to my alma mater, Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, to meet and talk with students, faculty members, and citizens of my State. I found there, as other Members of the Senate have found in their States, a growing concern over our involvement in Vietnam and a deepening conviction that we should disengage ourselves from that war.

At the conclusion of my speech I was presented with a resolution adopted by Bates students and petitions signed by other students and by Maine residents. I ask unanimous consent that the Bates program, including these resolutions and signed petitions, the expression of a free people communicating their views to their elected leaders, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATES COLLEGE—WORK FOR PEACE, OCTOBER 15

(Coordinated by the advisory board)

No community which calls its goal education can ignore the pressing national issues of the day. The war in Vietnam has had an overriding effect on this nation for more than five years and demands our immediate concern. Bates College will respond to the national call to set aside a day to focus attention on this issue.

We respond as an academic community and our response is what we judge appropriate. The initiation of the October 15 Moratorium at Bates occurred on September 28 when representatives of the faculty, students, and administration called for action. The details have been worked out at student government meetings. The responsibility for the success of October 15 as an educational experience rests with each individual student and faculty member who must make his own commitment, regardless of political views, to participate.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Tuesday, October 14th

8:00 P.M., Movie "A Face of War" (free), Filene Room.

Wednesday, October 15th

9:00 A.M. Movie "The Face of War" (free), Little Theatre.

8:00–1:00 P.M., Literature on Vietnam available, Co-ed Lounge.

11:00–1:00 P.M., Lewiston-Auburn community march and rally.

1:30–4:30 P.M., Teach-In, Chapel.

4:30–5:30 P.M., Resolutions presentation and vote, Alumni Gymnasium.

5:30–7:00 P.M., Dinner.

8:00 P.M., Address by Senator Edmund Muskie, Alumni Gymnasium—Students, Faculty, and Staff must enter with ID cards through Men's Locker Room Side Entrance in order to be assured preferential seating.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

Tuesday, October 14th 8:00 P.M. Filene Room

Movie, "A Face of War." "In an atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty, this film draws away the curtain and projects a sensitive image of the war in Vietnam. It pulls no punches, claims no sides."

Wednesday, October 15th 9:00 A.M. Little Theatre

Movie, "The Face of War." A documentary portraying the horrors of modern warfare, concentrating on its weapons and its victims.

Wednesday, October 15th 8:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. Co-ed Lounge

Literature on the movement to end the war in Vietnam will be available at a Students for Peace table. Those wishing to make appointments for draft counseling may do so at this time.

Wednesday, October 15th 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.

A Lewiston-Auburn community march to protest the war will begin at Lewiston High School and end in a rally at the public park. Concerned Bates faculty and students will be attending.

Wednesday, October 15th 1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M., Chapel Teach-In

Vietnam has certainly been one of the more complex happenings to occur in our nation's history. We have heard the spectrum of impassioned pleas for action from far left to far right. We have listened to their analyses of the situation, the causes, the effects, and the solutions. The results have been less than satisfactory, yielding only anger and confusion.

The purpose of October 15th and specifically the teach-in as we at Bates are concerned is to provide a time for rational discussion on Vietnam; its history, the war, and its effect on the United States. Because we have assumed this perspective, no particular political posture is being emphasized. The teach-in will provide information both from a personal experience and academic point of view. It is hoped that this educational experience will provide the stimulus necessary in order for the Bates Community to arrive at a resolution concerning the future role of the United States in Vietnam.

The teach-in is a unique opportunity to draw upon the resources of Bates College in examining the issue of Vietnam. For the experience of October 15th to be of significance, your support and participation are of primary importance.

ORDER OF SPEAKERS FOR THE TEACH-IN

1. Mr. Cole, "The Historical Background of the Involvement of the United States in the Vietnamese War."
2. Prof. Thumm, "The Foreign Policy of the United States and Involvement in the Vietnamese War."
3. Edward Barrows.
4. Atty. Louis Scolnik, "International Law and the Involvement of the United States in the Vietnamese War."
5. David Minster.
6. Mr. P'An, "Communist China as a Factor in Determining Policies of the United States Concerning Vietnam."
7. Richard James.
8. Assoc. Prof. Gyi, "South-East Asia and the Involvement of the United States in the Vietnamese War."
9. Francisco Mendizabal-Prem.
10. Fr. Roger Chabot, "The Catholic Church and War."
11. Thomas Doyle.
12. Prof. Chances, "The Economy of the United States and Involvement in the Vietnamese War."
13. Prof. Fetter, "Vietnamese Society and the Involvement of the United States in the Vietnamese War."

Wednesday, October 15th 4:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. Alumni Gymnasium, Resolutions Assembly

The purpose of our teach-in is to rationally re-examine American involvement in Vietnam and attempt to reach an agreement, in the form of a resolution on the direction we feel American policy should take. A stu-

dent-faculty committee was appointed by student government to draft resolutions to be presented for a vote on October 15th. This committee wrote several resolutions and presented them for revision at an open assembly of students on October 10th. The revised resolutions are printed below.

At 4:30 p.m. on October 15th the resolutions below will be voted on in an open assembly of students, faculty, and administration in the Alumni Gymnasium. It is vitally important to the success of the moratorium that all students, faculty, and administration be present at this assembly to vote on these resolutions.

RESOLUTION I

(330 present—45 in favor)

Be it resolved, that we declare our endorsement and support of the present United States policy in Vietnam.

RESOLUTION II

(266 in favor)

Be it resolved, that we declare our disagreement with the present United States policy in Vietnam. Be it therefore further resolved that we urge upon the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States the adoption of a policy of immediate cessation of all offensive military action in Vietnam and a total, unilateral withdrawal of American combat and support forces to be completed no later than the end of 1970.

Because of the difficulties involved in taking a vote of 1200 persons, revisions and resolutions from the floor will not be possible. However, it is our intention to allow as much time for discussion and debate on the resolutions as is available. *The resolution which receives the most votes will be communicated to President Nixon,* members of Congress, and the press. It will also be presented at the evening assembly to which Senator Edmund S. Muskie will speak.

Wednesday, October 15th 8:00 P.M. Alumni Gymnasium, address by Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

SENATOR MUSKIE: We, the undersigned from Leavitt High School, are opposed to the continuation of the Viet Nam War. We support the legislation that calls for complete troop withdrawal. We feel that the war continues to have a corrupting influence on every aspect of American life. Therefore, it must be stopped.

Rodney Tulonen, Ruth Geores, John Page, Paul Barter, Naney Pearl, Gerry Beandith, Merle Braley, Phyllis Fortin, Cliff Damon, Methyl Gagne, Nelson Judd, Dennis Langlin, Robert Griffin, John Dunn, and Robert Benson.

Barbara Enos, Connie Pelletier, Jeannette LaPointe, Darlene Henthorn, Cindy Rideont, Rita LaPointe, Brad Varney, Majorie Adams, Sheldon Buhier, Steve Leavitt, Sonia Morris, and Mary Varney.

Gail Plummer, Prudy McGouill, Penny Givens, Ellen Tully, Nancy Meisner, Steve Palmer, Judy Bragdon, Ted Smith, Brad Nickerson, Donna Gustus, Regina Gustus, Doris Libliz, Jo Hanna Goldrup, and Ronna Burgess.

Joy Pinkham, Paul Shaw, Patty Pratt, Lynn Latham, Mark Bonney, Phillip Smith, Richard Boutin, Mary Leavitt, Gary Judd, and John Camire.

Debbi Dudley, Bradley Buzzell, Mike Seamon, Susan Meisner, Dana Hood, Brenda Farnum, Denise Brewer, Shane Marston, Jane Libby, Edward Giroux, Kathie Fogg, Cathy Rowe, and Jann Poland.

Carmen Giroux, Andre Dastie, Veronica Howe, Bob Friendsen, Peter Ricker, Cathy Basil, Steve Talbot, Kathy Furbush, Steve Page, Sonia Morris, Pam Nichols, Bill Jones, and Walter Jones.

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: You have before you the combined efforts of The Lewiston-Auburn Citizens for Peace. In the course of four short days, this organization has gathered over 1,500 signatures asking for an immediate end to the Vietnam War. We, the Lewiston-Auburn Citizens for Peace, urge you to take notice of these names. Thank you.

Sincerely,

THE LEWISTON-AUBURN CITIZENS FOR PEACE.

The most important task facing the United States today is ending the war in Vietnam. This war continues to have a corrupting influence on every aspect of American life. To end the war now the United States must commit itself to complete troop withdrawal.

We, the undersigned, join with the supporting of Vietnam Peace Action Day in the demand for an end to the war now:

Charlotte Shapiro, Auburn, Me.; Nora Beaulieu, Auburn, Me.; Arlene Smith, Hallowell, Me.; Joanne Witas, Mexico, Me.; Laura Witas, Mexico, Me.; Kathy Hemphill, Auburn, Me.; Claire Wherty, Boston, Mass.; James Wither, Stratton, Me.; Frances Moneymaker, Auburn, Me.; and Roger Therieault, Auburn, Me.

Cheryl Morris, Auburn, Me.; Davis Manatte, Livermore Falls; Pauline Gannilla, Chisholm, Me.; Dorothy Voter, Phillips, Me.; Lambert F. Seger, Auburn; Lucille Witham, Stronty, Me.; Aldona Pingree, Farmington; Brenda Allen, Farmington; Kathy Belanger, Auburn; and Ruby Parson, Livermore Falls.

William Mullins, Lew.; Marie Quellette, Lewiston; Richard L. Casper, Lashon Falls; Edward Haby, Auburn, Me.; Mrs. C. Voltes, Lewiston, Me.; Joseph D. Brogan, Lewiston, Me.; Constance Brogan, Lewiston; Me.; Joseph Drummond, Aub.; Ida Drummond, Aub.; Colleen Durgan, Portland, Me.; and Mrs. Carl Durgan, Oxford, Me.

John Brennon, Frank J. Brennon, Louise H. Matthews, Elbert L. Matthews, Sandra Keough, Mrs. Wm. Cohen, Gertrude H. Berent, Rabbi David Berent, Muguelte Quellette, and David A. Nelson.

Selma A. Nelson, Mrs. Murphy, Mrs. J. Csoros, Mrs. George Buffard, Mrs. Viola Berube, Mrs. Enerelda Ryan, Mrs. Conrad Poulin, Mrs. Masal Chasse, Vincenta Bernier, and Jeanette S. Bennar.

Frances Brennen, Earl Isaacson, Marilyn Isaacson, Mamie St. Hilaire, John E. Libby, Arthur W. Prevost, Dorothy Kowbotham, Kathleen Leclair, Mr. and Mrs. Larry Day, R. E. Hall, Nancy MacLean, Mrs. E. Dulac, Elizabeth Pond, and Romeo A. Fourier.

Romu Pimulear; Bert James; Carmen Pintah, 55 Summer St., Lewiston; Arvilla Kay, 1 White St.; Emily Fortin; Eva Paquin; Roland Provencher, Lewiston; and Antoinette J. Jean, Lewiston.

R. W. Burnham; Mike Westleyh, Lewiston; Mrs. Alice Stone, Lewiston; W. S. Ward, Lewiston; Leonard J. Botar, Arnhim; Lorraine Stevens, Lewiston; Margaret Parsons, Lewiston; Claude Pelletus; Emma Rodriquez, Lewiston; Stela Rodriquez, Lewiston; Mrs. Carmen Miquelon; Mrs. Judy Bourget; and Mr. Gerald Clark.

Dianne Moody, George A. Lepage. Lauren C. Potter, John E. Darken, Jr., Gene Thibuden, Louise Thibuden, Patrica Paquette, Sandy Hart, Mary Chiaravelott, and Judy Nason.

Michael T. Goff, Richard Luksza, John Shalek, Glenn Karp, Leo Beaudin, John M. Cockorno, Barbara Libby, Cindy Levesque, Ron Marcotte, and Richard P. Ducharme.

Robert D. Rosenbaum, John R. Discheros, Titi Marin, William St. Pierre, Linwood Donovan, Becky Thompson, Guard LuBland, Paul E. Rodrique, A. J. Pelletier, J. R. Gendron, Mario Conturier, Dick Dutean, Beverly Maunn, and Diane Donohue.

Linda Parent, Adrian E. Bouchard, Justine Deiteau, Barbara H. Moreau, Clara Morin, Carlson Spraud, William J. Coffin, Jerrilyne N. Sartin, Michael Winer, Chaven Hull, K. F. Grunert, R. L. Townsend, Brian E. Boyucko, Lillian E. Brown, Sandy Polequin, and Scott E. Green.

Kay Bengel, Livermore Falls, Maine; Les Mercier, Berlin, N.H.; Marcella Desgrosullin, Berlin, N.H.; Marilyn Morris, Auburn, Maine; Marielle Rodriguez, Auburn, Maine; Bertha Herring, Auburn, Maine; Ed Gardner, Lewiston, Maine; Mrs. G. Lussier, Cape Elizabeth, Maine; Carla Powers, South Paris, Maine; L. D. Powers, South Paris, Maine.

R. M. Plourde, Auburn, Maine; J. B. Plourde, Auburn, Maine; Mrs. J. C. Miller, Auburn, Maine; Mrs. L. McAllister, Auburn, Maine; Charlotte Landry, Lisbon, Maine; Mavis Walker, Monmouth, Maine; Paul Boilard, Lewiston, Maine; Doris Laverdiere, Lewiston, Maine; Helen Linehan, Lewiston, Maine; Laura Linehan, Lewiston, Maine.

Daniel Gagnon, Lewiston, Maine; Loretta Roberts, Lewiston, Maine; Carlton Spencer, Lewiston, Maine; Mabel Spencer, Lewiston, Maine; Jean Brown, Auburn, Maine; John V. Oates, Auburn; Suzanne B. O'Sullivan, Auburn; Gerald Horagin, Auburn; Dominic Nadiau, Valleyfield; David Thibaudeau, Mexico, Maine.

Barbara Thibaudeau, Mexico, Maine; Jerome Young, Lewiston, Maine; Lorraine Young, Auburn, Maine; Anita LaPointe, Turner, Maine; Ruth Castner, Auburn, Maine; Rita Pepin, Lewiston, Maine; Irene Mahex, Lewiston, Maine; Christine Colley, Auburn, Maine; Lauries Cote, Lewiston, Maine; Antoinette Cote, Lewiston, Maine.

Terry Huntington, Dennis M. Williams, Tom Langley, Cindy Beaupre, Marcia Duplissis, Sandy Goeffroy, Rose Fortin, Carl Harrel, Conrad Maclean, Florence Doyan.

Jeanette Dogan, Lorarine Locke, Maureen Dagnon, Pat Bissonette, Diane Growel, Claire Berube, Roy Cloettier, Brian Foster, Gary Bell, Donna McKee.

Kathy Tuttle, Roy Turcotte, Chris Beaulien, Claire Beaulien, Sue Labrie, Tommy Rogers, Leanna Webee, Carmen Busieirie, Dolores Basse, Norman Turcotte.

Claire Bergerson, Carol Letourneau, Diane Cote, Diane Parent, Rita Parent, Henry Fountain, Robert Cote, Sue Martel, Colleen Parker, Lorraine Bergerson.

David Inmond, Janice Marcotte, Bro. Denis Luflamme, S.C., Claudette Luflamme, Calire Luflamme, Ray Moreau, Paul Beaulien, Maurice LeBlanc, Mike Clements, Mildred Lessard.

Edward Hammond, Darry Lessard, R. S. Dmittieff, Sue Toni, Kathy Lessard, Ronald Lorrine, Roland Bechard, Gerald Darling, Irene Cote, Michael T. Gilbert.

Lawrence Wood, Bob Cumo, Barbara Jennings, A. Dible Barlas, Steven S. Mason, Karen Ward, Randy Kenney,

Michael Heath, Richard Lindahl, Brion Gallagher.

Bob Valentine, J. Pompano, Cathy Coexas, Fred Wolff, W. Douglas Costello, Ken Johnson, Shirley Moulton, Nancy Blodget, Jim Scott, Nguyen Dop.

Liana Eastman, Ruhbus, Rob Center, Louis Garafalo, Ted Barrows, Jeff Tilt, Abigail Sickmund, Pam Farris, Helen Bain, George Thurston.

Barbara Smith, Michael Wilson, Joseph Machomber, Roberta Potter, Dave Counsbury, Anna Hosmer, S. Jeanne Hall, Lauozu Petibone, John N. Sheans, Kenneth Busby.

Sara Marsey, Sue Steer, Jean Streeter, David Pierson, Roger French, Marilyn Deson, Dan Johnson, Beth Maker, Martha George, Sunday Ciarlo.

Alan D. Hyde, Ronald A. Cromwell, Homa F. Shirazi, Faye Farmington, Gregory P. Fortine, Burt Roundtree, Peter W. Buchanan, Peter Mezza, Rick Porter, Dorn Brons.

Marilyn A. Lantery, Linda Rothman, Linda Hausmann, Lucy Taylor, Vincent Camire, Marty Collier, Roy A. Strickey, Albert Jackson, Deborah Clendenning, Wayne Yartward.

Mary Calhoun, Julio D. Stencil, Gene Schiller, Charles Kaufman, Michael E. Pouloumger, Lynn McMillan, Cheryl White, Mike Hutchinson, Dan Dionne alias Dino, Euclid R. Romean.

Carole Scannell, Ginny Remeika, Janet Boeshear, Beth Palmer, Maither Cassis, Hank M. Slesik, John Mac Leon, Esther Adagula, Carolyn Landis, Janna Lamline.

Wendy Scher, Helen O'Leary, Brad Elliott, Kathy Lynch, Susune, J. Stewart, A. Ursprung, Dana Dimods, Marty Grenon, Cintuleni, Marilyn Crocker.

John D. Baraldi, Leslie Miller, Ronald Johnson, Kathryn Lowe, Peter Murray, M. Seville, Bill Whitewith, Lorraine Swensky, Walter Tomas, W. Connally.

A. Kavanaugh, Jay Parker, Gordon Arthur Woodley, Paul Hendrick, Carl Sturgis, Ira Waldman, Daniel Rice, Mirian Weissman, Jocelyn Penn, Joseph Train.

Steven Rosenblatt, Elizabeth Taylor, Edward Myers, Edward K. Romine, Mary Chesey, Carol Stark, Christopher A. Wright, Richard Chasy, Robert A. Shepherd.

Phyllis Whitin, Susan L. Evans, Martha Peterson, Simon Koneshi, Steph. Ynkers, Glenn Thornton, Robert Kest, Shelly Lenon, Susan Person, Robert Schmidt.

Andy Moal, Sheila Tebbetts, Linda Eberhard, Linda Pierce, Marilyn Dacey, Nancy Hahn, R. King, Barbara Hagstrom, Stephen J. Andrick, J. A. Conkling.

Carlton J. Fitzgerald, James A. Rinak, Nancy Jestreby, Judith Andrews, Stephen A. Buyko, Robert Wusslor, Randy O'Neal.

Al S. Cardre, David Withut, S. Mellintic, J. Butland, R. D. Taylor, L. A. Carter, Bruce M. Wilson, Bill Jamison, Pamela Alexando, Edward Francis.

Brian Parker, Thomas Turner, Peggy Liversidze, Walter Di Ginsto, Clifford H. Boggis, Sue Graves, Mike Shine, Jan Bouldry, Anna Zaremoci, Melanie McHenry.

William Doherty, Thornton Cody, Terry Soildord, Sue Mone, M. Davis, Joe B. TenHove, David Doolittle, Tom Griffiths, John E. Paige, John A. Rand.

Michael B. Sawyer, Wayne Loosigian, Susan F. Cooper, Robert G. Whit, Mielendo Bowler, Louise Atwater, Donna Crapser, Judy Hancox, Rita O'Donnell, Dee Weber.

Michael Dorman, Dwight W. Fraser, Bryant A. Geinbrel, Sharon Earley, Eddie Thibodeau, Jane Sweeney, Steven Gamble, Judith Robinson, Peggy Montgomery, John Wilson.

Joan Cobb, Joanne Stato, Jim Miller, Joe Bradford, Dean Geelezian.

Mrs. Richard Ritchie, Mrs. Marcel Roy, Judy Roy, Earl Rowbotham, Frances H. Jordan, Marion B. Carver, Sheldon Anderson, Orfa Robertson, Donald F. Stultz, Phyllis Stultz.

Richard Thidbodeau, Mrs. William Herd, Robert R. Caron, David Amos, Diane Amos, Mr. and Mrs. Raul L. Caron, Mrs. Louis Ward, Ruth G. Cadarett, Betty Allen, Henry N. Orin.

Dorothea Martel, Fred Boucher, Romie H. Morin, Sr., Jacqueline C. Mavin.

Barbara West, Doris Duplissis, Doris Levasseur, Carmen Coto, Claire Bartlett, Marguette Ouellette, Irene Ouellette, Charlotte Harris, Wida Jalbert, Alice Wagner.

Leonard Dodge, W. T. Cutchey (William), Stacia Norrington, Barbara Smith, Mrs. Charlie Duncan, Kim Cusson, Sue Galasaeau.

Mrs. D. T. Gagnon, Auburn, Maine; Mrs. Conrad Martineau, Lewiston, Me.; Mr. Robert Marcotts, Lewiston, Me.; Mr. Akins, Raymore, Me.; Joseph Lymieci, Lewiston; Marie Lemiery, Lew; Adele Baillargeon, Lew; Rita Hood; Athena Harkins, Maine; Carleen Harkins, Maine.

Elizabeth Arsenault, Maine (Rumford); Mary S. Gilbert, Lewiston, Me.; Joanne Mills, Glens Falls, N.Y.; Irma Crockett, Buckfield, Maine; W. H. Brand, Ft. Wayne, Ind.; Wilfred Afotte; Debra Page; Henry Michaud, Conn.; Richard A. Duffers, Natick, Mass.

Bertha Herring, Auburn, Me.; C. Ruth Gray, Auburn, Me.; Rep. Norman J. Marquis, Lewiston, Me.; Joyce Edwards, Auburn, Me.; Constance Stevens, Auburn, Me.; Sybil B. Trepp, New Gloucester, Me.; Bernice Bertrand, Auburn, Me.; Fernand Gayni, Lew, Me.; Helene Chasse. Lew.

Janette Nichol, Lis. Fall; Marie Folsom, Lis. Falls; James P. Carl, Nashua, N.H.; Beatrice Towne, Lewiston; Lorraine Dussault, Lew.; Adrienne Carpenter, Aub.; Ruth Whitman, Hebron, Maine; Annie Caron; Emma Lora; Judy Nautrup, Auburn; Gerard Duphsis, Auburn.

Robert J. Lawson, Old Orchard Beach, Maine; Fernwood P. Freely, Auburn, Maine; Barbara A. Freely, Auburn; Claude J. Dulos, Auburn; Gemma Granger, Lewiston, Maine; Kathy Galder, Auburn, Maine; Shirley Lashua, Danville, Maine; Mary Newton, Auburn, Maine; Sandra Norton, Auburn, Maine; Mrs. Robert Tampany, Auburn, Maine.

Mrs. Adria C. Sabin, Lewiston, Maine; Kay Grant, Auburn; Mrs. A. Furalis, W. Lynn, Mass.; Helen Walczak, W. Lynn, Mass.; Sister Ruth Ann, Lynn, Mass.; Sister M. Linda, Lynn, Mass.; Joseph C. Duke, Lewiston, Maine; Lillian Flynn, Lisbon, Maine; Sharron Campbell, Lisbon Falls, Maine; Clark Allen, Turner, Maine.

Brenda Fournier, McFalls, Me.; Carol Ross, E. Poland, Me.; Cecil LaBrie, Lewiston, Me.; Sister Celeste, Lewiston, Me.; Mrs. M. Poor, Auburn, Me.; Mrs. Judy Wells, Auburn, Me.; Mr. & Mrs. B. Faloon, Auburn, Me.; Joseph H. Theriants, Auburn, Me.; Jeannette Varney, Turner, Maine; George Spaulding, Auburn, Me.

William Day, Larnier, N.H.; Helena Carville, Sabattus, Me.; Mary L. Bresky, Lew, Me.; Ida Lespesasce, Lew, Me.; Cecila Baillaiger, Lew, Me.; Julie French, Lew, Me.; Lucienne Libby, Lew, Me.; Ginette Colé, Sherbrooke, Ca.; Peter Radomaki, Auburn, Me.; Rose Durrant, Lew, Me.

R. Demme, Lewiston; Wm. Herring, Auburn; E. A. Hall, Auburn; Jane Morin, Lewiston; Carlene Smith, Auburn; Sherry Gagnon, Auburn; Olin E. Evans, Lewiston; Carmel Maheny, Auburn, Me.; Rose Rangue, Dryden, Me., and Georgetto Seger, Auburn.

Betty Hedgkian, Auburn; Doris Lefrance, Auburn, Me.; Clare McCallister, Auburn, Me.; Marguerite Arvard; Mary Michell, McFalls, Me.; Beulah S. Westcott, Portland, Me.; Bernice McIntire, Auburn, Me.; Damien Letourneau, Lewiston, Me.; H. P. White, Auburn, Me.; and Chester Knowles, East Wilton, Me.

Becky Jalbert, Debbie Pearson, Paul Bernard, Kenneth Pondarosa, Danny Paulin, Eric S. Bechtel, Bernice Pelletier, G. G. Gayne, Jim Daniels, and Virginia Fetter.

Geary Belanger, Steven J. Latvis, Daniel L. Laliberty, Raymond R. Beautien, Gary Bellmore, Steve Morgan, Daniel J. Laliberte, Vogel F. Vasseu, Robert Bagdad, Jeo Lafrance, Roger Bourgoin, and Daniel Bourgoin.

Tim Alexander, Lina Labbi, Lorraine Lepage, Suzanne Pelletier, John Doucette, Norm Bellenmore, Mike Crosilin, Lucille Leclair, Joanne Jacques, Mona St. Denis, and Deborah Ricker.

Linda Tapley, Marcel Turmenne, Vickie Blair, Robert T. Blair, Yvonne Rowe, Pat Schwiker, Carole Profnner, Terry Pellelier, Joline Laurendeau, Diane Gagnon, and Barbara Russell.

Tom Coulorde, Ron Mala, C. Cote, Gerald A. Granger, Sue Lapointe, Doris Belanger, Mary Ann Berry, Guy Mayman, Carole Simard, Normand Rioux, and Bertrand Caroyn.

George Camay, Pat Robichand, Linda Strong, Diane Poulin, Jackie Paulin, Michael E. Laughlin, Mrs. Robert Lefland, Sharon Latalippe, Susan Rioux, Annette Willette, and Sue Chenard.

Pat Legase, Sandy Dodge, Georgette St. Pierre, Anne G. Sar, Robert B. Morin, Robert Rudriojere, Morzie Brewer, Phyllis Fitzpatrick, and Arlene Levasseur.

Harvey Lincoln, Dorothy L. Polka, James H. Fowler, Jacqueline Boucher, Earle B. Bunnill, John Shalek, Lydia Morin, Lena Berube, Betty Legare, Beverly R. Kisonak, and Elizabeth Taylor.

Alice Morin, Richard Provenchen, Pat Brechette, Carolann Fraser, Bernice Gilbert, Jo Ann Ganno, Georgette Giroux, Dale C. Tempest, Pat Emerson, and Gerald G. Perry.

Robert J. Sefirvte, Virginia T. Chaplin, Mrs. John Nedza, Eddy Boulet, Estelle Silbet, Nancie Burchare, Bobbie Richards, Richod Genaris, Barbara Gewais, and Mary E. Geherti.

Bruce Mortimer, Mrs. John Polka, Mrs. Boland Ducharme, Miss Connie Polka, Mrs. Joseph Bazinet, Mrs. Philip Day, Ronald Morris, Beverly C. Morris, George Row, and Joyce Maloy.

Joselyps Bureau, Roy Stewart, Charlotte Vachon, Roger Morin, Rita Morin, Richard F. Snow, Patrica A. Snow, Ted Taft, Claris Ranger, and Al Rebichard.

Howard S. Gilley, Bertrand A. Lissard, Lee W. Emery, Mark Wiome, Allan G. Pressey, Bill Harris, Bee Harris, Vivian Hewey, Joseph R. David, George F. Melvin.

John Hopkins, William Blair, Cecil D. Stevens, Maria Chasse, Wm Hurring, Nelson Baillargeon, Maurice A. Beruho, Norma P. Gilbert, Darryl L. Johnson, Constance Lambert.

Emil Levesque, Robert Ouellette, Fred Ciguettae, Mrs. William Lalff, Mrs. E. Ouelletti, Mrs. M. Hutchins, Richard A. Barker, Jeanne Varney, Donald Davis, Linda Davis.

Jane Pendertin, John Wanes, Camille Cote, John F. O'Brien, Evelyn Learitl, David Merson, Irene Campbell, Diane Hertz, Sgt. Richard P. Chosson, Cecile Lessard.

Kathy Koulakis, Blanche Apsega, Janice Ogier, Lena Beaudoin, Grace Ricker, Gloria Ann Moore, Shirley Bennett, Pauline Laverdien, Aida Sepulveda, Domingo Sepulveda.

Doraleon D. McCarthy, Ben Ross, Eunece Gray, Pauline Quallitto, Sue Lafleur, Ann Huggard, Mrs. E. Shuman, Evelyn St. Pune, Philip Curless, Evelyn Curless.

Harry McNally, Gail Dumas, Sue Chinque, Sue Biron, Geraldine Biron, Mona Deshenes, Mike Lemienx, Lenny La Ferarce, Bob Lagusse, Miquel Alves.

Donald Boucher, J. C. Palmer II, Don Bernier, Jerry Boisoert, Joline Vaillancourt, Valerie Graffam, Lucille Hartford, Donald Gaithier, Ron Bussiere, Nick Knowlton, Jan Ricker.

Martha Larrabee, Denny, Willette, Diane Berube, Brenda McConnell, Nancy Parker, Cecil Boelard, Judy Frechette, Linda Genvais, Dan Bechard, Mark Bechard.

Mark Thibault, Dennis Oueelba, Cindy Videto, Jane St. Laurent, Mike Gamack, Grey Rand, Diane Gelinas, Judy Morse, Vis Bevolieu, Diane Letourneau, Jim Beach.

Frank Rogers, Neal Sharpe, Henry Tyler, Joyce Ricker, Donnce Cass, Elaine Gauther, Bernard P. Sraag, Ralph Pelletier, Gary Lecropyote, Ronald L. Marks.

Claude Dionne, Mildred H. Cohen, Marc Prooencher, Linda Urquhart, Dolores Samay, Carol Kramain, Linda Scott, Pam Hayman, Pauline McDowgell, Richard Ayres, Ronald B. Pomerlian.

Wendy Hammond. John Shenblon, Wendy Howland, Roberta Kasper, Pamela Alexando, Bruce Wilson, Marie Jabgt, Philis Farri, Brenda Gurney, Vernon Kennedy.

Jegnnette Albert, Dot McGovern, Josephine Vickery, Arthur R. Provncal, Germaine Coyle, Keith Tarmington, Nana Kevelli, K. Love, Albert Bickford, Brigit S. Libbey.

Alon Z. Nerton, Terry Fitzhubert, L. Beliser, Nora Leloutry, Fannetta Gogue, Mrs. Thomas Copp, Mr. Thomas Copp, A. Richards, Roland Geunel, Jeannie Hungui.

Harry LeBlanc, Marion Jones, Roland Baushi, Frances Passalaqua, Joanne Ressiter, Lucille King, Karen Dubar, Rebecca Perreault, Lorenzo Perregulo, Stella White.

Nancy Drake, Loraine Gagnon, Joan S. Baker, Marie Jeanne Murray, L. P. Daigle, Pauline Vallee, Mrs. A. Diome, Alfred Dionne, Mrs. Irene Cowan, R. Bhume.

B. Withee, Carmer Caron, Lsmaine Patry, Madeleine Perry, Mrs. H. A. Wilson, Weston Seamon, John W. Lmalk, Janis E. Rand, Edith Bartello, Linda White.

Robert Bosse, Mrs. E. J. Simones, Danny Dtuch, Rodney Spoller, Sr. Charlotte D'Auteuil, Sr. M. Solange, Sr. M. Helen, Sr. Emely Jones, Sr. Edwina Bouchard, Sr. Cecile Lebeau.

Sr. Elizabeth Rivers, Sr. M. Luanus, Marguerit Provencher, Mrs. A. J. Charest, Gerald Moris, Florence Fontaine, Doris Saucy, Debbie Boothley, Gloria, Bermier.

Yuett Carmil, John Sabi, Linda Godbout, Pat Tremblay, B. Hutchinson, M. Giroux, Marie A. Cote, Gerald N. Bouffard, Pauline Bouffard, Sandra Parsons.

Roger F. Connor, Mrs. Leandrus Caron, Julia Quellette, Theresa Leblanc, Constance Vallee, Eleanor Ritchie, Yvonne M. Gagne, Larry Pilletier, Adenne Normand, Constance Lawehelle.

Edw Chamber, V. J. Routhus, Madelyn Meservey, William Aaodler, Jr., Cecile Cadwin, Lucille Rward, Claudette King, Jeannette King, Mildred E. Neddin, Doris Goulet.

Kathy Cosgrove, Rev. M. James Martel, Virginia Pettingill, Bernadette Jarcotte, Mrs. J. D. Labbe, Mr. and Mrs. J. Anauld, Mrs. J. Aenauld, Carmen Daigle, Nancy Ketchum, Sandra Floyd.

Maurice Guerin, Harry Marshall, Gail Marshall, Jeannire St. Pierre, Robert Gosselin, O. A. Levesque, Claudette Levesque, Marlene A. Richards, Lawrence Fosti, and Marcel Charest.

Diane Charest, Forrest Snow, Marlene Dan, Charles Stone, Ceule Cadrin, Walter Ward, Glennis Ward, Lorraine Quellette, Iran Gravel, and Emma Baillargen.

Anita Baillargeon, W. Peill, Mrs. B. Brouillet, Mrs. Rosive Cortine, Eleanor E. Arsenault, L. Hodgkins, Ynotte Allard, C. Chicoine, R. Le Vassen, and Mr. and Mrs. Donel Pious.

W. D. Daggett, Helen K. Daggett, Doris Gagne, Louise Levenson, Pervine Livaarser, Joline Cormer, Muriel Laliborte, Rose Fremblay, and Moniquis Longton.

Nelle Quelletter, Roger L. Sutton, Mrs. Luern Sutton, Mrs. John J. Roberts, E. R. Gilman, J. R. Raymond, B. L. Gordon, A. C. Smith. M. C. Martel, and Rita L. Giguiere.

Frances Funk, Rena Funk, Michael Deslaurvey, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Lee Page, Mrs. Gracia Strout, Mr. and Mrs. Elore Pernd, Mrs. Isabel Lessard, Frederick Kearny, Virginia Gould, and Mrs. Bishop.

James Cameron, David Berison, Frederika Breust, Kenneth S. Keenan, Valerie Martin, Jay Schuma, Diane Carlson, Ann Helyar, Edward H. Callaghan, and Toby Lorenzen.

Peter Goodman, Francisco Mendezshol-Preu, Chip Small, Doug Week, John V. Shages, Dan Doyle, Robin Wright, Howard Sihe, Joel Thompson, and Manual Meregin.

David Schuh, Steve Scaratto, Erich Bye, Kevin Hartley, Steve Jeffery, Stephen C. Nelsen, O. Shenki, Dreece Field, Stephen Daniels, and Chris Doyle.

Maryann De Somma, Howard Tennen, Davy Mickalowski, Phil Jones, J. Waltz, Susan Hupp, Nan Ciano, Geofrey Marshall, Joseph Hanson, and Harold Emerson.

Karen Hermann, Mac Herrling, Randall White, Robert Devine, Edward Sullivan, Jeff Larsen, William Spencer, Bruce Lutz, Mitch Grosky, and Kevin Nonige.

P. Ulrey, David A. Rogers, Bob W. Zogellaar, Barbara Hampel, John W. Pardle, Dave Hardy, David B. Lentz, Bruce Littleton, July Fraser, and Linda Rafferty.

Euclide R. Beamon, Timothy K. Priestly, Catherine Landry, Angelique Comear, Laura Comear, Cecile Brouillette, Donald Cadwell, R. Leblend, M. McCarthy, Mrs. C. R. Jordan, and Mrs. George Webb.

Roland L. Anderson, Esther Gammon, Geneva Cascadden, Alfred Shenard, Constance LeBlanc, Robert A. LeBlanc, Allrine A. Labine, M. A. Knowles, Mrs. Margaret Patria, Lynn Patria, Eugene Barinet, and Mona Bussier.

Jeanette Leclair, Fred LaRochelle, Rene E. Dionnel, Jink Young, Rita Sedelinger, Mrs. Jeanette Lacassa, Antoine Quellette, and Mrs. Max Cohen.

Anita D. Schoff, Richard LaCasse, Linda Desjardins, Jeanette Pfeffer, R. O. Desparden, Terry Hentz, Andy Rancourt, Gaston Doyon, Jerry Boucher, and Patrick Clements.

Boland T. Clark, Linda Rancourt, L. E. Lowle, Mrs. Adeland Dumond, Debbie LaFayette, Danny Quellette, Venise Morin, and David Vachon.

Gaylord Therrien, Cecile Therrien, Priscille Gherrien, Liette Vachon, Albert P. LeYoung, Mrs. Leda Deschamps, Diane Quellette, and Marcel Dunnerlin.

Pat Doyle, Pauline Moen, Eva Culleton, Reynold Leeman, Lizzie Lang, Jeannine Tardiff, Gloria Boisuert, Gartan Tonguay, Frank C. Sawyer, Merguette Parent.

Michel Parent, Bilranne Allard, Ed Bloff, Edward Hamlin, Daniel Harkins, Yvette Renaud, Ralph E. Plantie, L. L. Smith, Jeanette Smith, Leode Cyr.

Tina Richard, Dink Plunns, Betty Piourde, Berti and R. Golet, Doretta L. Golet, A. Audibert, Janet Levesque, Vincent Morris, Carol L. Theme, Mrs. Wm. Volmer.

Giles LaBlanc, Alan LeBlanc, Leo Morris, Roger Lesoard, Frank Blaret, Albina Doughty, Roland C. Pelletier, Terry Laundry, Sandra Parey, Marc Simark.

Mrs. Robert Pankin, Mrs. Claire Sargnud, Claude Dube, Fernande Dube, Gerard Langloes, Lucia Anctil, Peter D. Murray.

Ronald G. Poulin, Yvette Morin, Fern Ouellette, Lorraine McKenzie, Cheryl Bouchard, Eddie Bouchard, Sally Greenleaf, Hulor Lemelm, Muriel Goding, Bea Wailus.

Gary L. Brousseau, Mrs. Michael Buell Dolan, Mr. Michael B. Dolan, Norm Oullette, Mrs. A. Philippan, Mr. Ray Beaubiu, Mrs. Pauline Morin.

Wilfred Morin, Joseph Bolger, George Harde, Patty Rainville, Suzanne LeBlane, Gerard Lambed, Doria Lambert, Lillian Lefebre, Anna Lamarre, Norm Gagne, Patty Bessiere.

Roy Hamm, Lewiston, Me.; Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Paradis, Lewiston, Me.; Mr. and Mrs. Gerard Pelletin, McFalls, Me.; Edith Wood, Lewiston, Me.; Louis M. Bellavance, Auburn, Me.; Lorraine Bellavance, Auburn, Me.; Mr. and Mrs. King Trembloe, Lewiston, Me.; Ken Charles Chances, Lewiston, Me.; Chris Ricker, Lewiston, Me.; Marlene Merchan, Lewiston, Me.

Kathy Quillette, Lewiston, Me.; Nancy Perrington, Lewiston, Me.; Pat Larson, Lewiston, Me.; Robin Ricker, Lewiston, Me., Cliff Stike; Brian Bogueki; Jesse Grenier, Auburn; Gary Smith, Auburn; Norman Moore, Auburn.

Janet Arsenault, Lewiston; Sue Cox, Lewiston; John Lersard; Lewiston; Richard Freve, Auburn; Lawrence Wood, Lewiston; Jim Scott, Lewiston; Bruce Revely, Auburn; Ronald Rerassu, Auburn; Cynthia Staires, Lewiston; Joanne Tulonen, Auburn.

Marty Collier, Lewiston; Dave Schulz, Lewiston; Robert S. Moyer, New Gloucester, Me.; Mike Latrie, Lewiston; Jeff Fusen, Lewiston, Ray Trevitt, Boston; Danny Charron, Lewiston, Maine; Lawrence J. Ward, Lewiston, Maine; Jan Smith, Oxford, Maine; Chuck Mailhot, Lew., Me.

Ken Reynolds Jr., Lewiston; Michael S. Assebin, Auburn; Mike Murphy, Auburn; Pamela Murphy, Auburn; Mary Klitahko, Rumford; Barbara Gulris; Rumford; Richard E. Atkinson, Lewiston; Jan Wilson, Lewiston; Sandra Papsadora, Lewiston; Donelly Smith, Lewiston.

Paul Gruim, Auburn, Maine; Edward W. James, Lewiston, Maine; Bill Voisine, Lewiston, Maine; Pauline Cliche, Lewiston, Maine; Doris Beaudic, Lewiston, Maine; Virginia Smith, Orford; Mark Trucker, Lewiston; Robert Paul, Lewiston; Peter Docon, Lewiston; Robert Oullette, Lewiston.

Robert D. Rosenbaum, Lewiston; Stephen E. Tom, Lewiston; Jim Palmer, Lewiston; Gerald Darling, Auburn; Wayne Elliott, Auburn; Paul M. Pare, Lewiston; Shelly Sampson, Lewiston; Terry C. Larson, Lewiston; William A. Salle, Jr., Lewiston, and George Thurston, Gloucester, Mass.

Kenneth L. Hamel, Lewiston, Me., Frederika Bruist, Lew., Peter Shostak, Lew., Robert Gaynon, Lew., Kathy Jackson, Norway, Paul Nadeau, Lewiston, Ken Sprague, Auburn, David Nickerson, Lewiston, Brian Foster, Auburn, and S. F. Sylvester, Lewiston.

Mark Camor, Lewiston, Maine, Norman Child, Lewiston, Maine, Elizabeth Atwood, Lewiston, Me., Wes Darling Jr., Sule, Me., Lucille Richer, Lewiston, Dick Paine, Lewiston, Me., Donald D. Boucher, Auburn, Me., Peggy Cook, Lewiston, Maine, Betty Hurtuluise, Poland Spring, and Gary Chroelean, Auburn.

Johnnie McDonald, Lewiston, Karl Greenman, Lewiston, James Leamon, Lewiston, Claudia Bechtel, Lewiston, Daniel Getchell, Lewiston, Elaine Pinard, Lewiston, James King, Lewiston, Wayne Westleigh, Lewiston, Me., Ralph Pellitier, Lewiston, Me., and Irene Fournier, Auburn, Me.

Paula Dadeau, Chuck Kenyon, Karen Prince, Jerri Anderson, Dennis Gellison, Debby Bowie, Florence Long, Diane Longchamps, Cathy Ray, Charlene Lorrind, Dick Harris, Janet T. Garsexault, Liz Adamson, and Joan Chingline.

Jim Quellette, Linda Truman, Delores Cote, Digne Kull, Gil Nadeau, Lorrine Blay, Peter Schaffer, Norman Camp, Bill O'Brien, N.Y.C., Michael B. Sawyer, Jana Sweeney, Lori Herchep, Kenneth Kog, Bruce Lakes, Michael Long, Jr., Leonard O'Conners, Lee Michaex, Sandy Beatty, and Anne Bunting.

Fred Stocking, Karen Creigous, David C. Cling, John Schroeder, Jean Sampson, Ann Ward, Arther M. Brean, Betty Brown, Lynn Willar, Seron S. Judiard, Judith Haner, Janet Gigner, Ken Chancey, Michael Wilson,, Dick Gaudreau, David Smith, Andrea Lutz, Bobby Feyers, Pam Ritz, and Joan Couley.

Jack Isaacs, Harry Monroe, Dana Dinom, Susan Shyalsker, Farge Farrington, Garry Stevens, Linda Rothman, Paul Bible, Brian Collins, Puss Fieldend, Nancy Jestrely, Diane Knowlton, Bill Matteson, Robert Bauer, Arthur Bourget, Joseph D'Alfonso, Donna S. Dustin, John Paige, Everett Davis, Steve Withee, Bruce Stangle, Julio R. Siando, Gloria Bernier, Eileen Cason. and Nadine Champagne.

Colleen Engemann, Rejlan Pare, Celeste Woods, Susan Brimigion, Daniel Asselin, Barbara Quinby, Richard Leavitt, Maurice Begin, Harold Emerson, Mac Herring, Kain Hermann, Gi Nadeau, Liz Marcotte, Tom Hall, Tony Crowley, and Maryann DeSomma.

Nan Ciani, Beth Russell, Janet Boesart, Steve Thomson, Sharon Earley, Vincent Comue, Debbi Piper, Randy Clenncy, Rob Kriger, J. Saddler, Steven Mason, Steven Jeffrey, David Young, Deborah Clendenon, and Philippe Breauchesne.

Barbara Adams, Joyce A. Brown, Linda Ebert, Rolande Pirriault, Toni Schreiber, Janice Parady, Susan Binette, Dave Hardy, Chuck Bevacqua, Rev. Eugene F. Gaffey, Elizabeth Tuland, Peggy Liversidge, Nancy Parody, Lorraine Blais, Theodore W. Bilorflie, Merrise Bruce, and Chris Doyle.

A. Chevalier, R. J. Morris II, S. Judy, Mike Fournier, Paul Laborte, Diane Blanchette, John Lauore, Oleskie O'Marks, Rachel Seguro, Fred Cloutier, Lawrence Edmunds, Mariette Ouellette. Marlene Bisson, and Theresa Ouellette.

W. C. Ramsay, Mrs. Ernest Selverman, Mr. Edward A. Cote, Mr. Leo U. Verreault, Maria P. Lavoie, Sandra Ward, Ann Ward, and Larry Ward.

Mae Callahan, Jeanette Franchee, Irma A. Schutt, George Morris, Fran Williamson, Arthur Saucy, Mrs. Jan Robertson, Mrs. Benj. Burrows, Leslie W. Bryant, Garvey I. MacLean, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Greenleaf, Leona M. Porris, Marie A. Morgan, Franklin V. Morgan, Rosario Sáeuz, and Ann Barker.

Ernest L. Edwards, Sr., Douglas I. Feinald, Julio Elarnager, Ramosh, Michael Johnson, W. J. Eaton, Robin Symonds, Linda Rothman, Ken Rich, Judith Andrews.

Scott E. Green, Paul E. Hills, Steve Thomson, Jean Street, Pat Abell, Kenn Sassocossi, John Johnson, Mary Ruckinskos, James Gionfriddo, David Martin.

Douglas Hayman, Kenneth T. Karch, Jr., Donald R. Wiener, Kevin Barry, Wayne Garthwart, Pauler F. Casey, Mike Brickey, Anna A. Liatios, Mark Harrris, David Sampson.

Hank Slosick, Walter Toons, Kerry J. Enright, Robert Pierce, III, Gerard Williams, Edward C. Barrows, John Shand, Linda Emma Edwards, Charlotte K. Howe, James Leahy.

Andy Cavel, Debbie Lindquist, Richard W. Suffern, John V. Shea III, Lewis W. Pettibone, William W. Tucker, John W. Pardee.

Bob Janson, Jeff Ray, Hick Ellis, Mary Emma Yard, Scott Alexander, Beverly Dunlop, Pauline Jurmain, Steve Tarn.

Sharon Earley, Pam Burghart, Carole Scannell, Sue Martin, Bart Smith, Chris Brown, Joan Madden.

Abby Pierce, Lynne Page, Paula Foresman, Merril Bunce, Martha O'Shea, Susan Zebrowski, Beverly L. Campbell, Ellen Carros.

Lorraine Blair, Linda Bornstein, Lorraine Bergerson, Billy Lumom, Danny Chamberland, Mike Ubbe, Tany Bolduc, Charlie Bear, Ronald Guller, Philip Calemn.

David B. Lentz, John Amok, E. Kenneth F. Connor, Rev. Roger Chabet, Robert E. Devine, Rebecca G. Wells, John Wing, R. Demme, Julio Elarriaga, Susan Tetro.

Ann Nagel, Thomas Stone, R. Osberryer, Mark Libbey, Clifford A. Spencer II, Donna McKee, Gary Mickalowski, Leanna Weber, Jo-Ann Wilson, Cara Thurston.

Marilyn Ottone, Linda Yurelonis, Mary Lee Auger, Roger Dyer, Thelma King, Bob Pelletior, Maurice Chicome, Dick Raymond, Steve Bernden, Susan Child.

Jay Sherman, Ann Helyar, Gi Nadeau, Liz Narcotte, Deborah Isaacson, Peter Murray, Mauria Lapointe, Ronald O. Bel, Edal Glaser.

Tony Crowley, Brian Gallagher, John Lappen, Lyme Page, Pete R. Acene, Melva C. Geores, Mary Oraim, Cathy Citeman, Gary Fontaine, Karen Ward, Douglas Fernald, Jerry Boucher.

Shetty Denon, Lewiston; Doley Arabes, Lewiston; Frances E. Porter, Buckfield; Ann Rich, Lewiston; Jack Penn, Lewiston; Margaret Kendall, Lewiston; Fred Wolff, Lewiston; Copper Hood, Lewiston.

Linda Fisher, Lewiston; William Spencer, Bates; Hugh Frederick, Bates; Dave Woods, Lewiston; Mary Lewiston.

Gordon Woodley, Bellevue, Washington; Mary McMahon, Burlington, Vt.; Martha George; Kathy Soucy; Tom Hall; Jack Dostie, Lewiston; A. Peter Legendre; Thomas L. Lalone, Lewiston; David J. Bourne, Bates; Susan Ciampa, Bates, Joanne Stato, Ridgewood, N.J.

Linda Fisher, Brenda Fisher, Bill Spencer, Neill Miner, Lewiston; Joanne Constantino, Mike Soucie, Jerry Tempesta.

ROADSIDE EROSION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on August 1, 1969, I introduced a bill that would protect against erosion of streambanks and roadbanks. At that time I pointed out that 60 percent of America's highway system is not covered by any erosion control program, and that this needless erosion destroys valuable land, defaces the landscape, causes excessive highway maintenance costs and pollutes many of our rivers and streams. I added then that studies have shown that silt losses due to roadbank erosion run as high as 356 tons per acre per year in parts of Wisconsin. An estimated 15 percent of the silt polluting Wisconsin water comes from this source.

In connection with this problem, I invite attention to an article published in the September 1969 issues of Soil Conservation which reveals the results of a survey of roadside erosion. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another article, which again indicates the need for this legislation. The article reports that construction of two major roads in Fairfax County, Va., caused erosion at a rate 200 times faster than normal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Soil Conservation, Sept. 1968]

ROADSIDE EROSION SURVEY

(By William M. Briggs, conservation agronomist, SCS, Madison, Wis.)

The eroding sections of Wisconsin roads, if joined end to end, would extend from the capital city of Madison to New York City, then back across the continent to Los Angeles.

This isn't to say that Wisconsin has more roadside erosion than any other state but that conservationists here have made a systematic survey of the situation and can name places and cite figures.

The inventory shows something more than 21,000 sediment-producing sites on the state's 87,000 miles of roads—a total of 3,711 miles of bare banks in an average of four locations in each mile. Figuring an average width of 16 feet, their combined area amounts to nearly 7,300 acres.

This is public land—your land and mine! Much of it drains directly into lakes and streams. For many years, students of sedimentation have recognized roadside erosion

as one of the principal sources of the material progressively filling and fouling our surface waters. The survey gives a clear picture of the problem in this state. The inventory is believed to be the first of its magnitude in the Nation.

The Wisconsin Chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America initiated this project in 1967. A subcommittee of the Natural Resources Council of State Agencies drew up procedures for a 100 percent inventory of all rural roads in Wisconsin.

Each county organized a local committee. Participating personnel and agencies included the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Wisconsin Department of Local Affairs and Development, soil and water conservation district supervisors, County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service committees, and county officials of Farmers Home Administration. Other local, state, and federal agency people frequently helped. The SCS district conservationist generally served as chairman. A number of county Technical Action Panels (TAPs) chose this as a special project.

Tabulations for each eroding area included length, width, and total area in square feet. Surveyors marked each location in a plat book now filed in SCS work unit offices. Compilations by townships were sent to the state committee for checking, then the information was summarized on a county and state basis.

Town and county roads account for 97 percent of all roadside erosion. Nearly three-fourths (73 percent) occurs along town roads; one-fourth (24 percent) along county roads; and the remaining 3 percent along state roads. Vegetation along state roads generally rates excellent.

The published report gives a state summary and a breakdown of the findings by counties. Tables include extent of erosion along roads—town, county, and state. One table ranks the 15 counties with the most erosion. It shows that one-third of all roadside erosion is found in six counties, and more than half occurs in 15 counties.

Persons making the inventory indicated the control needed on each eroding site. Total figures show that more than half (54 percent) of the sites could be controlled by fertilizing, seeding, and mulching. More than one-third (37 percent) requires sloping, fertilizing, seeding, and mulching. The balance or nine percent needs "the works" including structures, sloping, fertilizing, seeding, and mulching.

Only areas of more than 100 square feet were recorded. The figures, therefore, do not represent all of the roadside erosion. The committee prepared individual county supplements for town and county officials. These tabulate erosion along town, county, and state roads on a legal township basis.

Local news media publicized the survey widely and created an awareness of the problem. People and organizations have started an "action" program. Soil and water conservation districts are recognizing roadside erosion in their work plans. Districts and counties are purchasing hydroseeders and mulchers. Several counties and townships are developing policies for proper control of roadside erosion.

The report distributed widely, urges local, county, and state officials to take corrective action as soon as possible. Recommendations include:

(1) Develop action programs giving consideration to adopting timetables for achieving adequate control.

(2) Consider purchase and use of specialized seeding and mulching equipment.

(3) Within the next 5 years, control every site reported that is a major source of sediment in Wisconsin's surface waters.

(4) Consider incentive funds of some sort, including any available for public works, as a way to help speed up roadside-erosion control.

(5) Establish vegetation on all newly constructed road cuts and fills. Waiting for natural seeding is too slow. Provisions should be made to secure wider rights-of-way where needed.

(6) Build sediment-retention structures as a part of all new construction. Maintain them until permanent structures and vegetation achieve adequate control.

The time of gathering data proved opportune to collect other pertinent information. Local committees outlined selective brush management sites suitable for maintaining highway rights-of-way in native shrubs. They also recorded unsightly conditions, including dilapidated buildings, auto graveyards (three or more cars), and dumping grounds. These items were reported separately.

ROADSIDE EROSION AND CONTROL NEEDED IN WISCONSIN

Control needed	Town acres	Roads percent	County acres	Roads percent	State acres	Roads percent	All acres	Roads percent
Fertilize, seed, and mulch	2,640	50	1,130	64	150	69	3,920	54
Slope, fertilize, seed, and mulch	2,140	40	490	28	50	22	2,680	37
Structure, slope, fertilize, seed, and mulch	520	10	150	8	20	9	690	9
Total	5,300	100	1,770	100	220	100	7,290	100

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1969]

EROSION IS BLAMED ON TWO ROADS

Construction of two major roads through part of Fairfax County in the early 1960s caused soil erosion to zoom to 200 times the normal rate there, the U.S. Geological Survey reported yesterday.

According to a Survey study conducted between 1961 and 1964, about 16,600 tons of sand, silt and clay washed down Scotts Run each year because of construction of the Capital Beltway and the Dulles Airport access road.

The normal annual erosion for such an area, the study calculated, is about 38 tons.

Soil erosion clogs streams, reducing flood protection, contaminates water supplies, and destroys marine ecology by ruining feeding and spawning grounds and covering shellfish beds.

The report was released during a national conference on sediment control scheduled to end today in Washington. The document will be made available to Fairfax planners to aid them in tightening present erosion controls.

According to the report, about half the sediment that washed into Scotts Run remained somewhere in the stream basin. The rest was carried into the Potomac River.

The study concludes that during a period of normal annual rainfall, the average erosion for similar construction sites in Northern Virginia is about 150 tons per acre, or 96,500 tons per square mile.

Normal erosion is accelerated when natural cover is stripped off and the terrain rearranged.

SOME FACTS ON THE OREGON AND CALIFORNIA LANDS IN OREGON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on September 22, I introduced S. 2943 to amend the payment provision of the Oregon and California Land Grant Act of 1937.

For fiscal year 1970, 18 counties in western Oregon will receive payments in lieu of taxes totaling $32,000,000. I estimate that these payments will exceed the taxes paid on private timber lands by an average of 8.1 times. I estimate that one county's payments will be 149 times greater than taxes paid on comparable private timber and lands, another 99 times greater, a third will run 42.2 times greater, a fourth 34.5 times greater. A precise calculation might show some difference, but in general terms these facts show that the Government will pay these counties an average of $12.50 per acre in fiscal year 1970 while taxes on private timber land average only about $1.55 per acre.

In order that Oregon residents, including the Senators from Oregon, can have the opportunity to examine my figures, I ask unanimous consent that two tables of statistics be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I will readily admit that an application of exact millage rates by taxing districts would produce slightly different data but, in general, it is my position that these are reasonably accurate comparisons.

An analysis by the Bureau of Governmental Research at the University of Oregon for the O. & C. counties suggests that if the O. & C. lands in Josephine County were on the tax rolls they would pay $1,123,720 compared to the almost $3.9 million the counties will get this year. However, I estimate that private timber and land in Josephine County pays only 25 cents per acre in taxes and that if the O. & C. lands were taxed on the same basis as private timber lands the counties would have received less than $100,000.

Not only is the Federal Treasury being milked by the continuation of the Oregon and California Act payment provisions, but there is reason to believe that, in fact, private timber in Oregon is given preferential tax treatment. It is not taxed on the same basis as are farms, homes, and businesses. For example, in at least one major Oregon timber county the volume of timber standing on private lands by official U.S. statistics is over three times greater than the State and county tax assessors report for assessment purposes. This raises an additional question of whether private timber is carrying its fair share of Oregon's tax load.

There are 111.015 billion board feet of timber in 17 western Oregon counties which carry an assessed value of only $436.7 million. The assessed value of this private timber is less than $4 per thousand board feet, when, in fact—as testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee showed—timber is worth over $50 per thousand board feet.

In addition, in 1968 the O. & C. lands supplied on a sustained yield basis a harvest equal to about 650 board feet of

timber per acre. Private timber, much of which is not on sustained yield, provided a cut equal to about 520 board feet per acre.

The facts suggest that the O. & C. forest is doing more than its share for Oregon. Its timber is cut on a sustained yield basis; the revenue totally supports this sustained yield operation. These timber payments also support the construction of roads and schools, the funding of welfare programs and many other public services.

When I first started to look into this question, the only issue was the overpayments on the O. & C. lands. However, the facts also suggest that Oregonians ought to determine whether the private timber lands are undertaxed. If it is proper for the O. & C. lands to pay $12.50 per acre as a tax equivalent, then private timber lands should pay comparable taxes rather than the $1.55 per acre they pay. On the other hand, if $1.55 per acre is a fair tax on private timber, then the U.S. Treasury should not pay $12.50 per acre in lieu of taxes on the O. & C. lands.

EXHIBIT 1

ESTIMATED PAYMENTS MADE BY PRIVATE TIMBER AND LAND IN 17 WESTERN OREGON COUNTIES

	Private acres [1]	Land tax at 20 cents per acre [2]	Timber assessed value (millions) [3]	Estimated County tax rate (thousands) [4]	Timber tax [5]	Western Oregon additional timber tax, 1968 [6]	Estimated total tax [7]	Private tax per acre [8]
Benton	191,000	$39,000	$9.0	$19.00	$171,000	$19,000	$229,000	$1.20
Clackamas	324,000	66,000	11.3	20.00	226,000	46,000	338,000	1.05
Columbia	317,000	64,000	4.5	23.00	103,500	12,500	180,000	.60
Coos	597,000	120,000	42.4	21.00	890,400	195,600	1,206,000	2.05
Curry	310,000	62,000	15.0	19.00	285,000	67,000	414,000	1.35
Douglas	1,220,000	244,000	103.0	15.00	1,545,000	167,000	1,956,000	1.60
Jackson	566,000	114,000	15.9	19.00	302,000	42,000	458,000	.85
Josephine	228,000	46,000	.9	17.00	15,300	2,200	63,500	.25
Klamath [9]								
Lane	903,000	182,000	83.0	19.00	1,577,000	204,000	1,963,000	2.20
Lincoln	367,000	74,000	19.0	15.00	285,000	93,000	452,000	1.25
Linn	515,000	104,000	96.0	16.00	1,536,000	155,000	1,795,000	3.50
Marion	151,000	30,000	6.0	15.00	90,000	7,000	127,000	.85
Multnomah	56,000	12,000	.7	25.00	17,500	1,000	30,500	.55
Polk	235,000	48,000	7.1	17.00	120,700	21,300	190,000	.85
Tillamook	202,000	40,000	17.0	19.00	323,000	35,000	398,000	2.00
Washington	160,000	32,000	2.0	21.00	42,000	6,000	80,000	.50
Yamhill	192,000	40,000	4.6	21.00	96,600	6,400	143,000	.75
Total or average	6,534,000	1,317,000	436.7	17.46	7,626,000	1,080,000	10,023,000	1.55

[1] The significance of the O. & C. forest resources in western Oregon, p. 146.
[2] Calculated col. 1×20 cents per acre. Estimated assessed value average $11.50 for bare land.
[3] Oregon State Tax Commission report, 29th biennium, p. 91.
[4] See source [1] above table 31, col. 8 (rounded up to next whole dollar).
[5] Calculated col. 3×4 (rounded).
[6] See source (3) above, p. 105, col. 6.
[7] Cols. 8+11+12 (rounded)
[8] Calculated col. 1÷col. 7 (rounded).
[9] Timber taxed on a yield tax basis rather than ad valorem basis.

PAYMENTS AND OVERPAYMENTS ON O. & C. LANDS, OREGON

	Percent of record paid to each county [1]	O. & C. acres [2]	Distribution based on $25,500,000, fiscal year 1969 [3]	Per acre payment [4]	Distribution, fiscal year 1970, $32,000,000 [5]	Per acre [6]	Overpayment ratio, 1969 [7]	Overpayment ratio, 1970 [8]
Benton	$2.81	$52,521	$716,550	$13.65	$899,200	$17.10	$11.3	$14.2
Clackamas	5.55	91,807	1,415,250	15.40	1,776,000	19.35	14.7	19.2
Columbia	2.06	11,079	525,300	47.40	659,200	59.50	79.0	99.0
Coos	5.90	121,984	1,504,500	12.35	1,888,000	15.50	6.0	7.6
Curry	3.65	93,416	930,750	9.95	1,168,000	12.50	7.4	9.3
Douglas	25.05	706,334	6,387,750	9.05	8,016,000	11.35	5.6	7.1
Jackson	15.67	435,186	3,995,850	9.20	5,014,400	11.50	10.7	13.5
Josephine	12.08	366,600	3,080,400	8.40	3,865,600	10.55	33.6	42.2
Klamath	2.34	67,305	596,700	8.85	748,800	11.15		
Lane	15.27	374,305	3,893,850	10.40	4,886,400	13.05	4.7	5.9
Lincoln	.36	9,220	91,800	9.95	115,200	12.50	8.0	10.2
Linn	2.64	86,166	673,200	7.80	844,800	9.80	2.2	2.8
Marion	1.46	20,712	372,300	18.45	467,200	23.15	21.7	27.3
Multnomah	1.09	4,247	277,950	65.45	348,800	82.10	118.0	149.0
Polk	2.16	42,205	550,800	13.05	691,200	16.45	15.4	19.4
Tillamook	.56	25,570	142,800	5.60	179,200	7.00	2.8	3.5
Washington	.63	11,695	160,650	13.75	201,600	17.25	27.5	34.5
Yamhill	.72	41,453	183,600	4.40	230,400	5.55	5.9	7.4
Total or average	100.00	2,563,805	25,500,000	10.00	32,000,000	12.50	6.45	8.10

[1] The significance of the O. & C. forest resource in western Oregon, p. 60.
[2] Public land statistics, p. 133.
[3] Calculated col. 1×$25,500,000.
[4] Calculated col. 2÷col. 3.
[5] Calculated col. 1×$32,000,000.
[6] Calculated col. 2÷col. 5.
[7] Calculated private tax per acre÷col. 4.
[8] Calculated private tax per acre÷col. 6.

SCHOOL PRAYER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 8, 1969, I made a statement for radio concerning my proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The amendment would make clear the right of persons who are lawfully assembled to participate voluntarily in nondenomination prayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL PRAYER

I have introduced in the United States Senate a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution which would make clear the right of persons who are lawfully assembled to participate voluntarily in nondenominational prayer. The Federal courts have never prohibited voluntary prayer, and I want to make clear that they do not do this in the future.

I think that the fears which recent Federal decisions have inspired and the implications which they contain, together with the results which might flow from these Federal court decisions, make it imperative that the Congress take cognizance of the matter and act to give the people of our country an opportunity to make their feelings known and their voices heard on a Constitutional amendment which would clarify the matter of school prayer.

My amendment is simple. It does not place any responsibility upon anyone, and it does not authorize any person or authority to dictate the form or the content of a prayer. It merely makes clear that no court can take action to obstruct the right of persons who are lawfully assembled to voluntarily participate in nondenominational prayer even though such prayer is conducted in any public building, such as a school, which receives all or a part of its financial support through public moneys. My amendment gives no authority to any official body

to dictate the form or conduct of a prayer, but it does not restrict any official body from providing for or permitting voluntary participation in nondenominational prayer.

In all of the prayer cases, the decisions have been based on the Court's interpretation of the Federal Constitution. That Constitution was ordained by the people, and in Article V of the original Constitution the people reserved to themselves the right to amend it. And so the issue, as far as I am concerned, is quite clear.

Shall the people be afforded an opportunity to pass judgment on language which would clarify this vexing problem before it may be carried to ridiculous extremes in other suits which may be filed by atheists or agnostics?

My proposal would clarify the situation and remove the possible implications which constantly hover over every teacher and principal in the land as well as over the school boards and authorities who are charged with administering our public education system.

The adoption of this resolution by Congress would require a favorable vote by two-thirds of the members of both Houses. And this will be difficult, but I think a continuing effort should be made. For years, I cosponsored such an amendment with the late Senator Everett Dirksen. We were able to secure a majority vote in the Senate, upon one occasion, but we were unable to secure a two-thirds vote. And so I intend to keep on fighting for the adoption of this resolution.

Man must look to a God for comfort and as a source for inner strength and hope. Our Nation became a great Republic, and this can be attributed, in part at least, to the fact that the men and the women who have led the Nation from its birth have been individuals who believed in the existence of a Supreme Being. They came from many denominations and from many religious faiths, but the important thing is that they looked to God for guidance.

Throughout the years, the school children of our country have had exposure to prayer in the public schools. All too often, outside the school, they only heard a reference to God when His name was spoken in vain. The reference to the Deity in a school prayer was their only introduction to communion with a Supreme Being and their only experience with a spiritual atmosphere. The recent Federal Court decisions have caused a great deal of misunderstanding and the result has been that so many millions of our Nation's children no longer have even this brief exposure to prayer.

There are those who say that prayer should be something for the home and for the church, and this is true. But so often the home neglects its responsibility and parents fail in their responsibility to take their children to church. And, as a result, the burden falls on the school.

How strange that we spend millions of dollars in public funds every year to develop the physical fitness of American youth, but when it comes to developing the spiritual muscles through prayer, our children are being deprived.

I do not want to force any denominational faith or prayer upon anyone, but I do believe that the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people should be listened to and should not be subordinated to the whims of a handful of atheists.

I believe, therefore, that we should press for the adoption of this amendment and I intend to do this.

I am for rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, but I think that we should give God a little also.

TAXES ON FOUNDATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am quite concerned about the tax bill's provisions which may reduce the support for educational and charitable institutions, museums, and other beneficial activities supported by foundations or individual philanthropy. An excellent statement about the problem has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee by the president of the University of Minnesota, Malcolm Moos. Dr. Moos is uniquely qualified to address this issue because he is not only the president of one of the Nation's great universities, but is a former Federal official and a former officer of the Ford Foundation.

I believe this statement deserves the attention of my colleagues and of others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. MALCOLM MOOS, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, ON TAX TREATMENT OF FOUNDATION AND CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

These comments are offered from the perspective of one who is currently the president of one of the nation's largest public universities and was formerly a program officer of the Ford Foundation.

I should like to limit my attention to those aspects of the proposed Tax Reform Act of 1969 (H.R. 13270) which seem to me to have important and negative implications for public and private higher education, and the vital supportive role that the best of our foundations provide to both. The word "best" is used advisedly; I have no desire to protect those who would mask their profit-making or political or ideological activities by identifying their organizations as educational foundations. On the other hand, I hope to demonstrate that both public and private education in this nation are in need of greater, rather than less, support from the legitimate foundation activities threatened by the proposed reforms.

I should also like to point out that I am personally in favor of major reform in our tax legislation, and I do not know a single responsible member of the higher education community who is not. First of all, as observers and students of the national scene (and taxpayers ourselves), it is clear to us that inequities and potential for abuse in our current tax structures cripple the morale of taxpayers and raise legitimate questions from them about the degree to which they should be expected to subsidize the opportunism of others. Nothing except broad reform measures, of the scope contemplated by the Congress, can restore the integrity of American tax policy. Second, since the legitimate needs of public higher education in America will require additional tax revenues and since the availability of these additional funds depends on the continuing good faith of taxpayers, the American citizen must not become cynical about the burden of taxes he bears or the uses either of tax revenues or of funds exempted from taxation. Both reason and self-interest argue for major tax reforms.

However, I do take exception to some of the details of the legislation before this committee. In my judgment, they will have unfortunate consequences for universities. I also believe that Congress would not wish those consequences to occur. The health, and possibly the independence and autonomy of many of our institutions can be seriously damaged by the provisions which affect individual and foundation giving to public and private higher education.

USE OF PRIVATE FUNDS

Private gifts constitute vital income for the nation's institutions of higher education, both private and public. A state university like the University of Minnesota, of course, is not so dependent on gift income of various kinds for its general operating costs as a private university. I am certain that the private universities can adequately describe both their presently dire financial straits and the damage that reductions in gifts of various kinds would do. For some of them, their very existence would be threatened.

For all of them, the uncertainties add further to the already grave discussions of whether dual private and public systems of higher education sustained in the United States. I need not list the many reasons for the opinion of the higher education community in this country that the nation is best served through widely differing approaches to support organization and instruction in higher education. Any threat to the financial support and therefore to the quality and quantity of private higher education is a threat to all of higher education.

But private income plays an essential and irreplaceable role in public higher education, as well. At the University of Minnesota, for example, the complete budgeted expenditures of private resources totalled about $31 million during the past five years. These expenditures, of course, constituted a small proportion of the total University budget for that period of time, but analysis of those expenditures is revealing. They have an importance far beyond their amounts in dollars and cents.

1. Budget amounts from private sources are increasing substantially in total dollars and also provide an increasing proportion of the University's income. In the year ended June 30, 1969, the University of Minnesota spent $9,254,925 from these sources, up nearly 40 per cent from the previous year. In the year ended June 30, 1969, expenditures from these sources made up 4.5 per cent of the University's total budget, compared with 3.3 per cent four years earlier. Furthermore, the University of Minnesota is not alone in this regard. Efforts to improve investment of university funds and solicit greater support from private sources have paralleled the huge increase in higher education enrollments throughout the nation and the accompanying pressure on public sources of support.

2. Private support has been used for purposes absolutely critical to the excellence and progress of the University of Minnesota—purposes for which public funds could not be available at the opportune time or could not be available at all. For example, the following efforts undertaken at the University of Minnesota during the past five years could not have been accomplished without substantial or complete funding from these sources:

(a) The initiation of the Center for Programmed Learning.

(b) The initiation of the Department of Family Practice and Community Health in the College of Medical Sciences.

(c) The Community-University Health Center.

(d) The Office of Advanced Drama Research.

(e) Research on problems in law and society.

(f) The initiation of a program for low income minority students.

In short, the University of Minnesota depends on private resources for special efforts that are vital to its development and its relevance to the society of the 1970's, but for which public support is, for one reason or another, unavailable.

3. The capacity of a university to meet the demands of the public is directly tied to the availability of these private funds. Without them and the extra resources they provide

a university is less flexible, less innovative, less dynamic than it must be if it is to be truly excellent and responsive. With them, it can make the moves, undertake the studies, catalyze the change, strengthen the weaknesses, create the new units—meet the demands that are not susceptible to regular, proportionately increased state and federal appropriations. These are the hard and real demands of a rapidly changing and problem-ridden society which historically has turned to its resources of public higher education to address itself to these needs. It is ironic that so often it is the support by private gift or foundation that really enables the public university to do what the public demands of it. One important example at the University of Minnesota is the development of a new program in Family Practice and Community Health, which was made possible by a grant given by the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation. The development of this program was in response to the public demand of Minnesota that our health care delivery system is presently inadequate to meet the demands for health services.

4. Clearly many of the resources of a university that give it special distinction as a community or national resource are the direct result of gifts facilitated by the tax provisions which are under question before this committee. Works of art, collections of private papers, books, and even whole libraries often come into the possession of a university museum, or other institution as gifts with tax relief implications for the donors. Such gifts then become public resources, where they once were private and unavailable to their communities. They enhance the institution and the community and help the university to serve its historic role of heightening the quality of life in the society through the careful stewardship and cultivation of educational resources.

WEAKNESS IN THE LEGISLATION

Under Sections 101 and 201 of the proposed legislation, H.R. 13270, there could be serious disruption of these vital resources.

1. The proposed legislation would make gift planning extremely complicated for individual donors, especially where appreciated property is involved. The tax advantage to the donor, though it fortunately remains a significant one, would be less than under the present law. How much that one fact will affect the volume of private contributions is unclear. But even more important is the difficulty of estimating how much the tax advantage would be at any one time. In a given situation the planning of a large gift of appreciated property involves so many indefinites and interdependencies that a donor might be persuaded to do nothing at all, especially since the tax advantage is decreased in any case from its present status. While there is definitely a need to place some limitations on deductibility and avoid relieving donors from having any tax obligations at all, it is unfortunate from our standpoint that the proposed changes should compound the effects of limiting deductions by adding a good deal of confusion to the computation.

2. By discouraging large gifts, the proposed regulations would complicate the use of these gifts by the institutions which receive them. Large gifts have a double advantage for an institution like the University of Minnesota, for they cut the proportional costs of fund-raising at the same time that they make it possible for the institution to make better plans for their use. A single gift, if it is large enough, may be dedicated to a single, independent, long-range use, thus providing assurance of future availability of funds for that purpose. The limitation on gifts of appreciated property to 30 per cent in the case of individuals appears certain to reduce the size of gifts.

3. To the extent that these laws and regulations bring a general reduction in private giving to the University of Minnesota or other educational institutions—or even a reduction in the rate of increase of giving—the proposed laws will increase the pressure on students and federal and state treasuries for support of higher education. This is a time of significant change in higher education, and of phenomenal growth as well. Throughout the nation, state governments are reaching the limits of their ability to finance public needs and retain the good will of taxpayers at the same time; and the difficulties of federal financing of public education need no elaboration before this body. The result is that students in public institutions of higher education are being required to provide an escalating share of the costs of that education. At the same time, institutions are struggling to maintain quality instruction in the face of increased numbers and costs, while they are faced with constant and justified demands to provide education that is more relevant to our complex and technical society.

The members of this committee are well aware of the increasing demand for student assistance funds. In the case of loans a nearly unbearable debt burden is placed on students who are not fortunate enough to have their educations financed for them. To the extent that universities are caught between pressure to limit taxation and this anticipated reduction of private financing, the visible remaining source of income is our students. The proposed changes in tax legislation, while they do not affect public institutions as harshly as private institutions, will nevertheless cause a greater hardship for our students.

FOUNDATIONS

4. Finally, there is little doubt that the proposed regulations will adversely affect both the fund-raising and fund-distributing capacities of our private foundations. As a matter of fact, that appears to have been at least partly the intention of the House bill.

As I stated earlier, I have no interest in protecting any organization that tries to dignify its political, profit-making, or ideological thrusts through the protections that have been provided to private foundations under our laws. But it is absolutely vital to distinguish those misuses of the law from the legitimate and very valuable support and services provided by our best foundations to American higher education in particular and to the American society in general.

(a) First of all, every effect of the proposed tax reforms on private giving is an effect on foundations as well. Like the universities, they receive and manage gifts from individuals, using the proceeds for their own research and support efforts, many of which are carried on in the universities. Their gifts to the universities, in turn, assist those institutions in the same way that private gifts assist them—by providing support of critical efforts for which funds would otherwise not be available. A qualifying foundation under the proposed law, then, will suffer from the same problems and the universities will suffer the effects of those problems in potentially reduced income.

(b) Besides the total value of the support universities receive from our legitimate foundations, there are other important functions they provide as well. In its relationship to a university, a foundation reduces the costs of fund-raising for that university by acting as a sort of broker. To the extent that the proposed law reduces the capacity of the foundations to accept and distribute funds, it will complicate the fund-raising activities of individual institutions, which have in the past had a dependable and flexible intermediary in the private foundation. The impact of these laws would be especially great in the contribution of appreciated properties to foundations.

(c) The weakening of the role of foundations in higher education would reduce the contribution foundations make to the improvement of higher education as well. Many private foundations not only act as convenient resources for the collection and distribution of private funds to universities, but also function as coordinators of research and support of specific matters of substance.

A foundation may undertake to study a particular issue or procedure—for example, the development of university information management systems—and thus establish itself as a national resource in that field. Through such a function, the foundation reduces the necessity for overlapping studies in individual universities and increases the possibility that an acceptable common practice can be established. Such efforts are expensive and require resources which are not available in a single institution. The foundation can commit the required funds centrally and coordinate the use of resources—functions which no individual institution can manage.

In this function, in fact, private foundations provide a desirable alternative resource to the involvement of the federal government in such efforts, since the federal government is the only other institution which can muster the financial resources and operate throughout the nation to make use of resources in individual institutions.

(d) For foundations which make these contributions to American higher education, perhaps the most unprecedented and undesirable aspect of the proposed legislation is the 7½ percent tax on investment income of the foundations. The effect of this taxation would be a direct reduction in the amount of funds available to universities through the foundations, thus striking at the support of the vital university efforts outlined above. For foundations involved in legitimate educational efforts, this seems unnecessarily punitive.

The Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation in St. Paul is heavily involved in grants to institutions of higher education, including the University of Minnesota, and has provided information that indicates that the 7½ per cent tax, exclusive of tax on capital gains, would diminish the amounts available annually for grant purposes by at least $177,000. This relatively small foundation supported efforts at the University of Minnesota amounting to more than $600,000 during the fiscal year ending in 1969. If it should determine that the University of Minnesota must bear the entire brunt of its new tax-paying status, more than one-fourth of the critically-needed funds from this foundation would disappear from the University's budget. However, if it were to distribute the reduction, essential efforts would be curtailed in the institutions to which the Foundation provides grants. There simply would be that much less money available for distribution. And, as the spokesman for the foundation points out,. "Of course, all foundations would be subject to the same tax and would have less funds for grant-making purposes." Furthermore, if capital gains income should be taxed in this foundation, the loss to grant-receiving institutions would be approximately doubled. Interestingly enough, this loss to institutions would be a loss to those organizations which the proposed legislation, for the most part, specifically excludes from taxation.

It makes little sense to require taxes to be paid from funds which would have supported cancer research and student assistance programs but not from those which support the self-serving activities of trade associations and other lobbying organizations. The tradition of Congressional treatment of charitable organizations has been to place them

in a favored position. If there are deficiencies in the present tax law, I strongly believe that Congressional acumen can resolve them in a manner consistent with the traditions that have fostered support rather than diminished it. It is difficult to see why the Congress should change that emphasis at a time when educational and charitable causes need strengthening.

Finally, as a student of government stretching across a quarter century of teaching at Johns Hopkins, Michigan, and Columbia, I find the sections of the bill that would muzzle groups from making representations before Congress appalling. Such a sweeping restriction would tend to stifle the very breath of a pluralistic society and in my judgment ought to be eliminated.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the House of Representatives, faced by the praiseworthy pressures for general tax reform, did not give adequate consideration to certain less visible implications of the proposed tax reform bill. The leadership of American higher education, both private and public, hopes these critical issues will receive careful consideration before action is taken in the Senate. Speaking as the president of one of the largest public universities in America who has had experience with private foundations from both perspectives of grant-receiver and foundation officer, it seems to me that the following specific recommendations should be considered by this committee:

1. At the same time that limitations are placed on the deductibility of charitable contributions, including gifts of appreciated property, ways should be found to formulate deductibility so that the complexity of computation does not increase the likelihood of reduced gifts to institutions which need them so badly.

2. In considering the possible reduction in total giving which this proposed law may bring about, further attention should be paid to the public benefits which are achieved by the donation to institutions, libraries, and museums of paintings, books, and collections of valuable papers.

3. In establishing the amount of deductibility of charitable gifts, and therefore assessing the degree to which the federal government should, in effect, encourage such gifts, attention should be given to the public benefits which flow from those gifts—specific research and educational efforts which make it possible for public as well as private institutions to improve their service to students and the society; the widely accepted viewpoint that the educational quality of our institutions of higher education and the educational health of the nation both require strong private as well as public efforts in higher education; the relief that these gifts provide to state and federal governments and students, all of whom otherwise bear the burden of supporting a growing and changing higher education system in the Nation; and, therefore, the need to encourage increases rather than decreases in private gifts to higher education.

4. Serious consideration should be given to alternatives to the 7½ per cent tax on foundation investment income and stock ownership limitations by some means which will meet the regulatory necessities, but not weaken the capacity of these foundations to support vital activities either within the foundations or at the nation's universities. Alternatives are available to cover the costs of investigating and regulating the activities of foundations which would meet the recognized need to maintain constant examination of foundation activities, without penalizing institutions assisted by the foundations or reducing the clear public benefit that legitimate foundation activities now provide.

5. Finally, tax legislation that affects the income of public and private higher education should always be considered in the context of the important question of possible alternatives to the contribution made by foundations to research, instruction, and management of American higher education. Greater dependence on the federal government for financial and management support is the only alternative I can visualize.

GI BILL ACTION IN SENATE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on October 8, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman SAYLOR, placed in the RECORD an editorial from the Army Times charging the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and specifically its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, with "foot-dragging" on the proposed GI bill rate increases.

I feel that such a charge is very unfair in light of the most commendable and diligent record of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from California, Senator ALAN CRANSTON. As a member of that subcommittee, I speak from firsthand experience in pointing out the great amount of veterans legislation considered and favorably acted upon during this session by the subcommittee and the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, on the basis of 6 days of hearings.

At the full committee level, the Senator from Texas, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and its former chairman of 7 years, has most expeditiously moved this legislation to the floor with the vigorous leadership he has always displayed on veterans education and training measures.

I think that the unfortunate Army Times editorial is fully rebutted by an October 15, 1969, article in the Army Times entitled, "Senate Unit Ups GI Bill" and a letter to the editor from Senator CRANSTON published in the October 22 edition of the Army Times entitled, "Cranston Group Drags No Feet."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the material referred to immediately above be printed in the RECORD at this point in order that my colleagues may have a clear understanding of the true facts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army Times, Oct. 22, 1969]

CRANSTON GROUP DRAGS NO FEET

DEAR EDITOR: In your Oct. 1 edition, you published an editorial stating that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and its Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, had been guilty of "foot-dragging" on important veterans education and training legislation.

I think the record of the subcommittee and the full committee amply rebuts that charge.

The subcommittee has conducted six days of hearings in eight months, equal to the combined number of hearing days by the subcommittee during both sessions of the last Congress. These hearings have been published in three volumes containing more than 630 printed pages of testimony from 54 witnesses, again substantially more than the last two sessions combined.

On the day your editorial appeared, the subcommittee had already been scheduled to meet the next day, Oct. 2, on these bills in executive session, which it did.

On Oct. 9, based on the subcommittee's unanimous recommendation, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee unanimously ordered reported to the Senate eight veterans bills—two consolidated education and training bills and six hospital and medical care bills.

The Senate action represents the most comprehensive approach to the G.I. bill since it was originally enacted. First, it calls for a far larger and more realistic increase in G.I. bill education rates—46 percent—than the House bill—27 percent. Moreover, it proposes a new comprehensive education and training program, with an estimated first-year cost of almost 150 million dollars.

This comprehensive package of provisions from eight other bills would seek to encourage and assist veterans to make the maximum use of their G.I. bill benefits under the following circumstances.

For those still in service, the bill would authorize direct payment to schools to encourage their participation in a predischarge education program (PREP) conducted on or near military bases for servicemen shortly before discharge.

The bill would extend G.I. bill allowances to veterans in elementary as well as high school level courses.

It would also extend allowances to veterans in college preparatory courses on college and junior college campuses including courses for correcting academic deficiencies before entering college.

It would supplement educational coverage under the regular G.I. bill, regardless of the educational level, through direct payment to schools providing veterans with remedial tutorial, counselling or other special supplementary assistance to improve educational performance.

The bill would authorize grants to schools to establish special educational programs for veterans, including public service-oriented programs such as for the training of policemen, firemen, medical technicians, and inner-city teachers.

It would permit reduction of minimum college semester-hour requirements for full-time and part-time G.I. bill eligibility.

It would offer veterans the option of counting non-credit hour courses toward their eligibility for full-time allowances.

The bill would greatly expand and provide new orientation for the outreach services program to search out Vietnam veterans and counsel them regarding their benefits and assist them in obtaining them. Included would be payment of reasonable interview and relocation expenses when a veteran so assisted must move to enter a job or training program.

The bill contains some house-passed provisions as follows: (a) to eliminate most of the bars to so-called duplication of education and training benefits; (b) to liberalize measurement of high school courses; (c) to tighten up the prerequisites for pursuing G.I. bill flight training; (d) to permit more rapid payment of the initial G.I. bill allowance to veterans in non-college courses; (e) to make more flexible the measures of widows' and war orphans' eligibility for G.I. bill benefits; (f) and to permit V.A. approval of interstate transportation apprenticeship programs.

I hope this serves to set the record straight and I trust you will publish this letter.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs.

[From the Army Times, Oct. 15, 1969]

SENATE UNIT UPS GI BILL

(By Larry Carney)

WASHINGTON.—A Senate subcommittee has approved legislation to raise GI Bill education and training allowances by 46 percent

and make the increased payments retroactive to September 1.

The measure—approved by the veterans affairs subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee—is much more liberal than a similar proposal passed by the House early this summer. The House measure would raise GI Bill allowances an average of only 27 percent. Effective upon enactment.

Full committee action is expected some time around mid-October. Cost for the entire package is estimated at more than $500 million the first year.

Subcommittee chairman Sen. Alan Cranston (D., Calif.) said the GI Bill hike increase measure was among 19 veterans education and medical bills approved by his group last week.

Three of the bills are designed to encourage more veterans without high school diplomas to get their diplomas under the GI Bill.

To accomplish this, the subcommittee proposes establishment of a new pre-discharge education program for active duty personnel in their last 12 months of service. The subcommittee hopes to tie the program in with Defense Department's Project Transition which trains servicemen approaching separation for civilian skills.

Under the subcommittee bill, the government would pay up to $150 monthly directly to the school towards education and training costs of servicemen enrolled in duty-hour or off-duty study.

Aid would be limited to servicemen with at least 12 months' service. Those who take advantage of benefits would not have it counted against GI Bill entitlement.

The education program would be in addition to GI Bill benefits already available to servicemen with two or more years' active duty but the legislation would preclude servicemen from taking advantage of both programs at the same time.

Full Senate Labor Committee chairman Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D., Tex.) promises speedy action on the veterans package, hoping to get it to the Senate floor "by the end of October or early November."

The subcommittee bill would raise monthly GI Bill allowances from $130 to $190 for single veterans; from $155 to $218 for married veterans; and from $175 to $240 monthly for veterans with two dependents. Veterans with more than two dependents would get $15 additional in allowances per child. They now receive $10 additional per child.

Under the House-passed bill, monthly allowances for single veterans would go to $165 monthly; to $197 monthly for veterans with one dependent; and to $222 monthly for veterans with two dependents. It would provide $13 additional monthly per child to veterans with more than two dependents.

Other bills approved by the subcommittee would:

Pay special grants to colleges and universities which establish special training projects and tutorial services for disadvantaged veterans.

Provide a 46 percent increase in allowances for orphans and widows taking training under the VA-administered dependents assistance program. Allowances for service-connected disabled veterans taking instruction under the veterans vocational rehabilitation program would be raised to similar levels. Vocational rehabilitation training is generally limited to veterans with disabilities rated 30 percent or more.

Broaden on-the-farm instruction for veterans under the GI Bill.

Permit veterans to borrow up to $1000 for flight training lessons.

Give unlimited community nursing home care to veterans hospitalized because of a service-connected disability.

Provide hospital and outpatient care to veterans totally and permanently disabled for their non-service-connected ailments.

Entitle veterans drawing non-service-connected disability pensions admittance to VA hospitals without having to take a pauper's oath of inability to pay. A comparable House bill would drop the pauper's oath requirement only for veterans 72 years of age or older. The Senate bill would drop the age limitation and bring an additional 67,000 veterans under its provisions.

Pay for drugs and medical care for permanently housebound veterans, regardless of whether their disability is service-connected.

Increase per diem rates the VA pays state nursing homes for hospital care from the present $3.50 to $7.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD "TELLS IT LIKE IT IS"

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times of October 14, 1969, entitled "Tells It Like It Is," together with a speech, the subject of the editorial, delivered by the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) to the Weirtonian Lodge No. 183, Italian Sons and Daughters of America, in Weirton, W. Va., Saturday, October 11.

There being no objection, the editorial and the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, who has served 16 years in the House of Representatives and the Senate, spoke bluntly here Saturday about the expanding threat to the security of the nation by hostile minority groups.

He addressed the Weirtonian chapter of the Italian Sons and Daughters of America in the K. of C. and "told it like it is."

Of all the speakers invited to the long series of Weirtonian dinners, Sen. Byrd's remarks were greeted with the most enthusiasm and the most frequent applause.

He praised the great record achieved by nationality minorities who came to America in search of liberty and freedom and stayed to contribute heavily to this nation's great progress.

But the rise of the hippies, the leftists, anarchists and black militants, he said, has created a major crisis in America and he warned that the next 10 years may decide the future of American freedom and democracy.

He said the great majority of Americans—all of whom were in some sort of minority group in the past history of America—are the Forgotten Men of this generation. The Forgotten Men, he said, are those who pay their way, who ask nothing from their government but the opportunity to work and to rear families and be good citizens in an orderly and lawful society.

America's great majority, he said, is made up of many former minorities. They are not minorities anymore. The interwoven strands of the fabric of America have become inseparable.

Sen. Byrd declared that rebellious acts against the government by irresponsible minorities must not be tolerated.

Police should clamp down and the government authorities and the public should support them completely.

He urged that there be no amnesty and no probation granted in criminal cases.

He appealed for an end to terrorism and anarchy and demanded the constitutional rights of the citizens be protected fully.

Sen. Byrd is the third top ranking Democrat in the U.S. Senate, next only to Mike Mansfield and Edward Kennedy. He has great influence in Congress and commands the admiration of most of the people of West Virginia.

Sen. Byrd won his last Senate race by the greatest margin in the history of senatorial races in West Virginia.

He'll be running again in 1970. There isn't a Democrat (including Jay Rockefeller) or a Republican, at this stage, who will be able to stop him at the polls.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

Mr. Sinicropi, Congressman Mollohan, Mr. Grossi, Mayor Rybka, Father Altmeyer, Mr. Garnetta, members of Weirtonian Lodge No. 183, Italian Sons and Daughters of America, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a pleasure and a high privilege for me to be invited to address you on this delightful occasion.

While all of us are Americans, most of this audience consists of second and third generation Americans of Italian ancestry. The rest of the audience, including myself, consists of Americans whose ancestry is also European—other than Italian—and possibly there are some Americans here whose ancestry is rooted in the Middle East. But whatever the ancestry, as I say, we are all Americans.

In view of the fact that most persons here tonight are of Italian ancestry, I think it would be appropriate and, indeed, desirable for me to say that well over 25 million Americans today are proud to claim a part in the Italian heritage. Heirs of "the grandeur that was Rome," the people of Italy have, century after century, added new dimensions to that grandeur in all the arts and sciences known to man. The Italians of America—and their sons and daughters and grandchildren born here in America—have consistently contributed to our common American cultural heritage, a heritage which is, like love, "a many splendoured thing."

What is this heritage to which we all have contributed, regardless of whether our ancestry a century or two or three ago was Scotch, Irish, German, Italian, English, Polish, Greek, Jewish or Lebanese? And how is it meaningful for our Nation in these troubled days?

Let me suggest that this heritage is a composite of many elements and ingredients, which are especially pertinent to the problems we confront at this time in the history of our country and of the world.

Let me suggest that it is a heritage made up of a deep respect for law and good order, and a willingness to work hard and to raise one's self and one's family up in the face of adversity and to enter with ever-increasing effect into the mainstream of American life.

So, I do not speak to you tonight about the beauties of the old world cities, such as Florence and Venice, the golden Bay of Naples, or the hill towns of Tivoli and Assisi, which themselves are among the most beautiful creations of man; nor do I speak of the unique contributions to civilization made by such men as Dante, Michelangelo or Verdi. These have been chronicled beyond number.

But I do feel that I ought to speak of the legacy of strength and stability, resourcefulness and industry which have been so prominently associated with Americans of old world ancestry, and in which we can take such great pride today as we see all about us the need, in our American society, for these characteristics of enduring greatness.

Your ancestors and mine who came to this country from the old world asked no special favors. They sought no special status. They

took this country and this society the way they found it, and they made it their own.

They won the esteem, the admiration, and the respect of other people by their conduct, their industry, their love of home and family life, their desire to get ahead and to succeed on their own merits.

Let me say that I have never personally known of a Hungarian or a Lebanese, a Jew or a Greek or a German or an Italian, etc., being on relief. There may have been such cases, but I have not personally known of them. All whom I have known have worked too hard and have been too industrious and have had too much pride to descend to a life of depending on government handouts.

I do not say this in derogation of welfare recipients *per se*; there are many persons on welfare who are in need of help, but it is not true of all who are on the welfare caseloads today.

Everyone hears excuses today for those who live in the slums. But what are slum dwellers doing for themselves? That is what counts. You have heard the advertisement: "You can get Salem out of the country but you can't get the country out of Salem." I am of the opinion that you can get some people out of the slums, but you can't get the slums out of some people.

Some people will create slums wherever they go. Put them into the best of apartments or family dwellings. Within six months the plumbing will be ripped up, the bannisters will be broken down, the windows will be knocked out and the doors kicked in, garbage will be on the floor and in the yard, and rats will be running all over the place.

Most of our early immigrants were crowded into the cities, but they kept the floors scrubbed and their children clean. If there was a square foot of ground, they planted a flower. If there were a few square yards in the back lot, they planted some vegetables. They shined shoes, peddled fish, sold newspapers, and before long they had lifted themselves up by their own bootstraps and had put their children through school and had bought a little property of their own.

We have heard so much in the last few years about discrimination—and I do not defend discrimination based on color or religion. (I do, however, defend discrimination based on conduct.) But those early immigrants were also often discriminated against.

Did they burn cities? Did they go into the streets and loot and destroy? Did they turn in false fire alarms and then throw bottles and bricks at the firemen who came to answer the false calls?

No! They patiently labored to win the confidence and respect of others, and they took their rightful place in the mainstream of American life.

They did not push and shove and threaten and demand something for nothing. They showed themselves to be law-abiding citizens, of good conduct, and they made the grade. They were the rock-ribbed stuff that America was made of. They made their own way, educated themselves and their children, contributed to their communities out of their own talents and they were good neighbors, good citizens, and good Americans.

It was that sturdy stock which made America a great Republic. And if America is to be restored to its former greatness, it will be because those of us who live today are determined to perpetuate the ideals and the traditions, the respect for law and order, the high regard for work, the rugged individualism and the faith of our fathers.

If I may digress for a moment, some years ago, I was in Iraq, the land known in Biblical times as Mesopotamia—the land between the two great rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates.

One day, I journeyed with an old Arab guide from Baghdad down to the ancient city of Babylon on the banks of the Euphrates. He showed me the site where Belshazzar's hall had once stood, and we stood at the place where Belshazzar's feast had been held.

Belshazzar, you remember, was the King of Babylon who gave a great banquet for his friends, inviting a thousand of his lords. At one point in the banquet, the king asked the servants to bring in the sacred golden vessels that his father had taken from the house of God, the Temple in Jerusalem, and the king and his friends drank from the sacred vessels.

As this was taking place, the fingers of a man's hand appeared and began to write on the wall of the King's palace.

Belshazzar did not know what the words meant, and the wise men of his realm were unable to interpret the words for him. Finally, he sent for Daniel, one of the thousands who had been forced into exile, and who had won for himself a reputation for being able to interpret the meaning of things hidden from others.

Daniel interpreted the writing that was written:

". . . God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it . . . Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting . . . Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians."

The handwriting on the wall was a message of impending doom. That very night, king Belshazzar was slain and Babylon fell.

Do you see any handwriting on the wall today?

I suggest that the handwriting is plain and that it is just as timely and serious as it was in the ancient story, and that it calls us as a Nation to return to the great and abiding truths implicit in the heritage that is ours as Americans.

I think the average citizen is more deeply troubled about his country's future today than at any time since the great depression in the early thirties.

Every time we turn around there is a crisis of some sort—the welfare crisis, the urban crisis, the pollution crisis, the Vietnam crisis, the inflation crisis, the civil rights crisis—one crisis after another. There just seems to be no place where one can escape anymore.

We seem to be fightng a futile war abroad and living in a malignant racial atmosphere at home.

Middle class values are under more obdurate attack today than ever before—what you believed in, and what you learned in school, in church, and from parents.

The sanctity of work is questioned, and the stability of the family is becoming less and less an American virtue.

The American home is becoming the target for the most salacious pornography; and the exploitation of sex and nudity in the mass media erodes morals further every passing day.

Premarital chastity is old fashioned; filial gratitude for parental sacrifice is looked upon as something square; and work is something to be studiously avoided. Nobody wants to start at the bottom anymore.

We see violence and sex and drugs on television; and the streets and parks are filled with hippies with their love beads and black militants with their African bush haircuts.

The SDS is making inroads into the high schools; teachers are beaten up; hoodlums brandish switch-blade knives in the hallways; and policemen have to be stationed in city schools to keep order.

Black militants—and not all Negroes are black militants—have interrupted church services to demand—and they are getting—reparations from the churches; they threaten to close down the banks and industrial plants; and the Kerner Commission blames it all on white racism. The fact is there has been racism on both sides.

We are told we must feel guilty for the sins of the slave owners a century or two or three ago; and society is blamed for having made the rapist, the murderer, and the mugger what he is.

The past half-dozen years have seen protest marches, civil disorders, so-called civil disobedience, demonstrations, race riots, and city block after city block destroyed by the torch.

Motorists have been pulled from their automobiles and their cars set afire.

Looting has become all too commonplace, while the National Guard has been ordered to stand by with guns empty.

Policemen have been abused, maligned, assaulted, and stomped to death in the streets by mobs.

Militants have taken over local school board meetings, city council meetings, and the halls of state legislatures; and, in some instances, they have been led by individuals who claim to be clergymen.

University speakers have been forced to cancel speeches by dissenters who cannot brook dissent.

College Presidents have been ejected from their offices by student extremists.

Militants, armed with shotguns, hatchets, and knives, and shouting Black Power slogans, have taken over administration buildings, and TV viewers have seen school officials capitulate to the arrogant demands of troublemakers.

Black Panthers and street gangs foment revolution and advocate guerrilla warfare.

Inflation erodes everybody's pay check, and the government adds a surtax on income.

Illegitimacy is growing apace, and the Federal Government is subsidizing it through welfare spending.

Welfare rolls are burgeoning—and I am not against welfare for the needy. Militant welfare mothers have formed an alliance to demand higher welfare checks, and they will spit in your face if you dare suggest that they go to work.

Government anti-poverty programs have been used to incite unrest and rebellion.

The nationwide increase in crime is 9 times the increase in population, and the Nation's Capital is fast becoming a city of fear and violence.

The state of the Nation is increasingly a matter of concern to the thinking citizen, and the future of the Republic is to be viewed with alarm.

One may, with justification, ask the question: "Will the Republic survive?"

This will depend, in my judgment, largely upon the kind of leadership which is given to the Nation during the next ten years.

If we have leaders who show continued weakness in the face of threats, who yield to the demands of militants, and who sacrifice the good of the Nation for political expediency, then our country has seen its best days.

On the other hand, if we have the kind of leaders which the times require—men who are willing to take a stand against those who want something for nothing nad against those who seek to acquire, by intimidation and threat, property and privileges which they are unwilling, or which they lack the ability, to acquire through hard work, perseverance, and deserving effort; men who will put country first and votes second; men who will insist upon equal rights for *all* people and not just for a minority—then there may yet be some hope for the future.

Somebody is going to have to talk sense—common sense.

What is needed is more discipline and more guts, with less pandering to the demands of a militant minority.

Militants who take the law into their own hands should no longer be granted amnesty for their criminal acts.

Defiance of authority—whether in the

schoolroom or in the street—must not be tolerated.

School boards, school principals, and college presidents who insist upon discipline must be given the strong backing of the people.

Law enforcement authorities and the chief executive officers of state and nation should make it indubitably clear that whatever power is necessary will be used with firmness, determination, and without hesitancy to deal with riots and rioters, mobs and mob violence, and that innocent law-abiding citizens—both black and white—and their property will be protected at whatever cost is required.

Criminals should be taught once again that crime does not pay. And every public official in this country ought to take a stand for the police and against the hoodlum.

The great silent majority, which has been patient so long, must not allow itself to be further browbeaten, intimidated, and mesmerized into a state of uncertainty and fear.

People are going to have to think for themselves and not let left-wing commentators and left-wing big city newspaper columnists and pseudo-intellectuals overly influence their opinions and viewpoints.

Both political parties must espouse integrity in government, respect for law and order, and fewer handouts to people who are able to work for themselves.

In this regard, may I say *that I want to help people who need help;* and it is our duty to assist the widow and the orphan, the poor, and the afflicted. But we do no man a favor by encouraging him to live on the dole when he is physically and mentally able to work and when there is work to do.

Americans must speak out against violence, hooliganism, and disorder. They must also speak out against cheaters, whether at the public trough or on the welfare rolls.

We need to be concerned about principles as much as about programs. Our country has strayed too far afield from the fundamentals from which its strength and greatness have been derived. We cannot continue along the road we lately have been traveling without inviting eventual disaster.

Government has tried to do too much in areas beyond its competency in seeking to compel social change.

In all of the excessive attention that has been paid to appeasing a small but militant minority of our people, the average American citizen has somehow come to be the forgotten man.

I believe that your ancestors and mine—those persons of whom I spoke at the beginning of these remarks—were probably the people that the American sociologist and educator William Graham Sumner was thinking of in the 1880's when he wrote these lines:

"The Forgotten man . . . delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school . . . he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and in the big divide.

"Such is the Forgotten Man. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but his chief business in life is to pay . . .

"Who and where is the Forgotten Man in this case, who will have to pay for it all?"

The answer to the question is obvious. The Forgotten Man is the great majority—they who pay their way, who ask nothing from their government but the opportunity to work and raise their families and be good citizens in an orderly and lawful society.

All of our ancestors, as I said at the beginning, came from somewhere other than the place we meet tonight. America's great majority is made up of many former minorities. They are not minorities anymore. The interwoven strands of the fabric of our land have become inseparable.

The progeny of those early immigrants are now the majority. Let us, then, as we look to the future of our republic, resolve that we will act within our own spheres of influence in accordance with the great traditions that have come down to us from many cultures and many climes. The legacy of strength and stability, of resourcefulness and industry, which we have inherited from our old world ancestry and in which we take such pride, can help us restore America to the bright promise it was meant to be.

Our Republic, conceived in liberty and purchased with blood, can be preserved only by constant vigilance.

May we guard it as our children's richest legacy, for what shall it profit our nation if it shall gain the whole world and lose "the spirit that prizes liberty," law and order, and constitutional government as the heritage of all men in all the land.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. Calendar No. 412, a bill (S. 1181) to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to give the bells a chance to do their job, I shall postpone for a moment the request I am about to make, so that Senators will have plenty of time to come to the Chamber, and will not be confused by a succession of seven or eight bells.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR STAR PRINT OF S. 2264 TO DESIGNATE ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday when the communicable disease control bill (S. 2264) was reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, inadvertently the name of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), a principal supporter of that legislative proposal, did not appear on the printed version of the bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be a star print of the bill (S. 2264), indicating Senator KENNEDY's cosponsorship.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR STENNIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the pending measure and the one which will follow it, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the supposition and the hope and the prayer that we can finish the two potato bills this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. If, however, we do not finish the potato bills this afternoon, I will have to make a change in that request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 1:30 p.m. today.

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

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 10 min-

utes p.m.), the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 1:16 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the 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, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13000) to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13000) to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1181) to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The pending business is S. 1181, a bill to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, the purpose of title I of S. 1181 is to permit potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program. Title II of the bill would add tomatoes to the list of commodities for which paid advertising can be provided under marketing orders.

Title I of the bill provides for authority to establish a plan to collect assessments on potatoes produced in the 48 contiguous States of the United States. Producers with less than 5 acres will be exempt from assessments. The assessments will be used for promotion of potatoes including paid advertising. In addition, assessments can be used for research and development projects. The costs incurred by the potato industry in administering the program will also be paid from assessments. Prior approval by the Secretary of Agriculture for all projects and expenditures is provided for as a safeguard against improper use of funds.

The bill provides for a maximum assessment rate of 1 cent per hundredweight. Handlers are responsible for payment of the assessments, and they may deduct them from their settlement with the producers. Producers will be able to obtain a refund on the assessments paid by them, if they request it in the time and manner prescribed. The bill provides that hearings with respect to a proposed plan be held when requested by potato producers. A favorable referendum vote, by two-thirds of the potato producers voting in such referendum, or two-thirds of their production and not less than a majority of those voting, is required to approve any plan issued pursuant to this bill. If such a plan is favored by producers, a board will be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture from industry nominations of eligible producers. Such board will administer the plan under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Provisions in this bill are similar to those in a bill enacted by the 89th Congress, and cited as the Cotton Research and Promotion Act. Promulgation and referendum proceedings for any "plan" issued pursuant to this bill are similar to those in marketing orders authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Administrative provisions are also similar to those in marketing orders. There are no provisions for quality control or compulsory inspection in this bill.

Several potato producing areas have State orders or commissions to promote potatoes produced in their specific areas. This bill is intended to supplement these existing programs with a nationally coordinated program.

Title II of the bill authorizes paid advertising for tomatoes under marketing orders. At present such advertising is authorized for cherries, carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, nectarines, celery, sweet corn, limes, olives, pecans, and avocados.

Mr. President, title II would merely add tomatoes to that list so that marketing orders covering tomatoes could, if those affected so desired, cover paid advertising assessments, as well as their other assessments.

Mr. President, I note in the Chamber the distinguished leading sponsor of the bill, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG). He may have a statement and I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose, if he wishes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the Senator yield for a short statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I made a statement explaining the bill at some length yesterday when it was called up.

This bill is sponsored by practically all the Senators from the principal potato-producing areas. There is great need for this legislation.

There are only about one-half as many potato producers in this country as there were 10 years ago. Producing potatoes presents a greater risk than any other kind of farming. There are no price supports for potatoes, but through self-help programs, such as the one authorized by the pending bill, producers are attempting to improve their product and promote increased consumption of potatoes. It could go a long way toward increasing the sale of potatoes and keeping the potato farmers from going broke.

Mr. President, there are many misunderstandings about potatoes as a food. For example, many people think that potatoes are a fattening food high in calories. The fact is, the potato is not a high-caloried food. This is the sort of thing that the potato producers hope to bring before the public by intelligent advertising. This will help the sale of potatoes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota who is one of the cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. MONDALE. First, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his excellent work on this bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I know that he has held extensive hearings and heard from all of us who are most concerned about this legislation. He has brought a bill to the floor of the Senate today which is, I believe, in excellent condition.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) and I represent neighboring States which have an important potato industry. Indeed the Minnesota Valley Growers Association, which supports this measure, is the largest grower organization in my State. It is an industry that involves nearly $17 million worth of income to the farmers in my State alone.

This is a long overdue measure which will permit them to deal with some of the problems which the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) has already made reference.

Under this act, the people of my State would be able to supply a better product to the consumer. They could develop new and better methods of handling the product. New products from potatoes could be developed.

Last, but not least, the true story about potatoes can be presented to the consumer.

This does not carry any price tag. The farmers themselves contribute to the fund. I believe I am correct in saying that any farmer who wishes can have his money returned so that any farmer that

does not wish to participate in this program can do so.

This is long overdue legislation, and I compliment the Senator from Florida for his leadership in this field.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. It has been a pleasure to conduct the hearings and to handle this matter in the full committee and the subcommittee. I am glad that we have finally been able to get it to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine. I am happy that we have been able to get this bill to the floor and to see my good friend from Maine here today.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Florida. Let me say how very much I appreciate the courtesy which the distinguished Senator from Florida has shown to me all week in holding this bill for consideration until today. Any delay that I have caused was inadvertent and certainly not intended, but the Senator from Florida with his usual courtesy and cooperation, nevertheless, has been of great assistance to me. I compliment him on bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. President, today we are going to vote on two bills that will have a profound effect on the producers of potatoes.

The first, S. 1181, will enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their market for potatoes and potato products. The general public does not fully appreciate the nutritional value of the potato, and in fact has serious misconceptions about the role of the potato in the American diet. This legislation will provide an opportunity for potato growers to improve the quality of their product and improve consumer acceptance of potatoes.

The bill provides for authority to establish a "plan" to collect assessments on potatoes produced in the 48 contiguous States of the United States. Producers with less than 5 acres will be exempt from assessments. The assessments will be used for promotion of potatoes including paid advertising. In addition, assessment can be used for research and development projects. The costs incurred by the potato industry in administering the program will also be paid from assessments.

The potato producers have been confronted, in recent years, with increased competition from other products marketed as easily prepared convenience foods. Some of these products are promoted on a national basis. Potato producers have not been able effectively to match this competition because production and marketing of potatoes is performed by numerous individual farmers in every State in the United States. This has made it difficult for them to finance and carry out adequate research and promotion projects to maintain a competitive position in the markets. This bill would give potato producers authority to help themselves by financing such projects.

Not only will S. 1181 benefit the potato grower but the kinds of programs envisioned would also work toward improved marketing and merchandising to the benefit of the American consumer.

S. 1181 is supported by all segments of the potato industry.

I urge the Senate to vote for passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I am happy, of course, to support the bill, and to again compliment the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), for sponsoring and bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Maine. Before I yield to the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), there are two things about this bill that I wish to mention at this time.

First, this is the first effort of the national potato growers organization in which the potato growers of the State of Florida have been willing to join. Thus, it must have merit beyond all the efforts heretofore of the National Potato Council.

Second, if it becomes effective and is followed by a marketing order as proposed, this bill will be the first effort in the field of perishable commodities to set up a national advertising, sales promotion, and research program; and I am sure, we will all be watching with a great deal of interest.

I thank the Senator from Maine for his comments and I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Florida. I commend him and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) for bringing to the floor this fine piece of legislation. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill. I believe it will do a tremendous amount of good for the potato-producing industry.

I believe it is well known that Idaho's fertile acres produce about one-fifth the total U.S. potato crop. The State now harvests about 300,000 acres of high-quality potatoes, which, in an average year, yield about 64 million hundredweight. Potato acreage in Idaho has doubled since the mid-1950's.

In achieving this leadership in potato production, the State of Idaho has demonstrated the value of promotion. It is not enough merely to grow the finest potatoes in the world; they must be promoted and sold.

To this end, the State of Idaho has established the Idaho Potato and Onion Commission which has done an excellent job in promoting the use of Idaho potatoes nationally and internationally. To support this program, Idaho growers and processors pay 2¼ cents per hundredweight for promotion and research, an assessment higher than the rate applied in any other potato-producing State. This industry financed promotional program has helped make Idaho potatoes synonymous with potatoes of the highest quality. Moreover, the growers who pay the bill are enthusiastic about the program and a representative of the 4,400 Idaho growers supported this legislation in committee hearings. The State's promotional program not only has aided producers in the State but also has aided the entire potato industry, the congressional committees were told by Idaho potato grower Clarence Parr, of Burley.

The efforts of such local and State promotion programs will be supplemented and coordinated nationally by this legislation. This would be done by authorizing the growers to establish a National Potato Promotion Board, and to operate a grower-financed promotion and research program. This program would be similar to that provided under the Cotton Research and Promotion Act of 1966.

Assessments on growers would be limited to a maximum of 1 cent per hundred pounds of potatoes handled. Potatoes grown by producers with less than 5 acres of potatoes would be exempt from assessment, which means that the program would be financed by about 17,000 of the 310,000 potato producers in the United States.

Promotion plans would have to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture after public hearings and then ratified by at least two-thirds of the growers under a referendum to be conducted by the Secretary. Furthermore, any grower not in sympathy with a plan adopted could apply for and receive a refund of assessments paid. I am informed that refunds under the cotton promotion program have been less than 5 percent.

Potatoes are one of our most important crops, bringing into the farm economy an average of about $561 million a year in sales revenues. However, the per capita consumption of potatoes has declined during the last 30 years from 122 pounds to 110 pounds per person, and potatoes have been meeting increased competition from other products marketed as easily prepared convenience foods. These factors, coupled with more efficient production techniques, have contributed to crop surpluses and resulting surplus removal programs in most crop years since 1953.

It is hoped that this national marketing and research program, in concert with program on the State level, will help correct the imbalance between supply and demand for potatoes and improve returns to producers.

On behalf of the potato growers of Idaho, who have supported this legislation by formal resolution, I urge its passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), a cosponsor and strong supporter of S. 1181, is necessarily absent today. The Senator, however, had prepared a statement which he planned to make on this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator MURPHY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURPHY

As a co-author of S. 1181, the potato marketing bill, I support the measure and urge its speedy enactment by Congress.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, (Mr. HOLLAND) and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) for their efforts and work in guiding the bill through the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This is a most important bill for California, as my State is the third largest potato producing State in the country. Kern County, which is ably represented in Congress by Representative Bob Mathias, produces fifty per cent of the potatoes in my State and is the second largest potato-producing county in the country. I am also deeply grateful for the help given me by both Representative Mathias and Mr. Don M. Johnston, of Bakersfield, California.

The bill, S. 1181, is similar to the Cotton Research and Promotion Act enacted by Congress in 1966, which I also supported. The bill would provide a mechanism through which potato producers may conduct a much-needed national research and promotion program for potatoes.

The per capita consumption of potatoes has been steadily decreasing for many years. In order to reverse this trend and expand potato markets, a program of research, development, advertising, and promotion is essential. The reason for this decline in consumption has been the increased competition from other often easily prepared convenience foods. The potato producers have not been able to meet this competition because the production and marketing of potatoes in the country is done by many individual farmers in every State. As a result, it has been difficult for the potato industry to launch an adequate research and promotion effort to maintain their competitive position in the market place.

In 1966, the National Potato Council established a voluntary nationwide promotion program with a goal of $75,000 for 1967. Despite the depressed market that existed in 1967, the voluntary program was successful as the program exceeded their national goal of $75,000.

This voluntary program has helped to demonstrate the value of research and promotion. It has also demonstrated that if the program were really going to be successful, it would have to be much larger in magnitude. This, then, is the background for the potato research and promotion measure that is before the Senate today. I want to emphasize that this is a self-help program. The taxpayers of the country are not being asked to foot the bill, nor should they, for this research and promotion program.

Under the bill, the research and promotion activities authorized by the measures would be financed by the producers themselves through an assessment of not more than one cent per 100 pounds of potatoes produced commercially in the 48 contiguous states. At the maximum assessment rate, it is my understanding that approximately $2 million annually would be available for the research and promotion program. The program would not only be producer-financed, but producer-controlled. The research and promotion activities will be administered by the National Potato Promotion Board, composed of representatives of the growers selected by the Secretary of Agriculture from nominations made by the producers. Also, I want to emphasize strongly that the participation in the program would be voluntary on the part of the various growers. Under the bill, every producer or grower can, upon request, receive a complete refund of the assessment made.

In short, the measure would establish a badly needed research and promotion program for potato growers. I urge its enactment.

POTATO PROMOTION—IT WORKS FOR IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, today the Senate is to act on S. 1181, the Potato Research and Promotion Act. This legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, would enable the potato industry to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion effort, and through its own resources and ingenuity, to build strong markets and preserve its position in our Nation's agricultural economy.

There is no doubt in my mnd that a promotion program, properly organized and effectively run, can increase the demand for the potato as a consumer item, with a resultant increase in income to the farmer and the potato industry as a whole. One only need look to my State of Idaho for a fine example of what can be done when an outstanding product is properly marketed. Idaho has actively promoted its high-quality potatoes for many years, and today the Idaho potato is sought by housewives throughout the country who want the very best.

This bill gives the potato industry the wherewithal to promote its product. It will aid both the large and the small production State by educating the consumer to the part that the potato should properly play in his diet. It will aid the consumer, since the research programs made possible under the act will result in more and better potato products.

The use of sound marketing practices in the distribution and sale of our agricultural commodities is a must. Passage of the Potato Promotion Act will be a step in that direction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before a vote is taken, lest there be a misunderstanding, I want to make sure it is understood that title II affects tomatoes and differs from title I in that it does not contemplate a nationwide promotion program, for tomatoes produced in all areas, and also in that there is no provision for refund. It simply permits tomato growers in any area where there is a marketing order to add provision for advertising and promotion to such marketing order if in their judgment and in the discretion or the Secretary of Agriculture it is decided that that is advisable in their case.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc. I know of no opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrosment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) has just reminded me that there was an intention on the part of one of the Senators from Alaska to investigate the question of whether Alaska and Hawaii should be included in the program and added to the 48 contiguous States to which the potato amendment applies. If the Senator from Alaska wishes to offer that amendment, or some other Senator wishes to offer it for him, I would have no objection to it. I would yield to the sponsors and authors of the bill on that matter.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I think it is a good amendment. It would affect only the people of Alaska and Hawaii. I think they should be permitted to come into the program.

I would like to offer the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossment and third reading of the bill be vacated.

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

The amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendments as follows:

On page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "forty-eight contiguous States of the".

On page 5, line 1, strike out the words "forty-eight contiguous States of the".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1181) was passed, as follows:

S. 1181

An act to provide for potato and tomato promotion programs

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

TITLE I—POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

This title may be cited as the "Potato Research and Promotion Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Potatoes are a basic food in the United States. They are produced by many individual potato growers in every State in the United States. In 1966, there were one million four hundred and ninety-seven thousand acres of cropland in the United States devoted to the production of potatoes. Approximately two hundred and seventy-five million hundredweight of potatoes have been produced annually during the past five years with an estimated sales value to the potato producers of $561,000,000.

Potatoes and potato products move, in a large part, in the channels of interstate commerce, and potatoes which do not move in such channels directly burden or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products. All potatoes produced in the United States are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products.

The maintenance and expansion of existing potato markets and the development of new or improved markets are vital to the

welfare of potato growers and those concerned with marketing, using, and processing potatoes as well as the general economic welfare of the Nation.

Therefore, it is the declared policy of the Congress and the purpose of this title that it is essential in the public interest, through the exercise of the powers provided herein, to authorize the establishment of an orderly procedure for the financing, through adequate assessments on all potatoes harvested in the United States for commercial use, and the carrying out of an effective and continuous coordinated program of research, development, advertising and promotion designed to strengthen potatoes' competitive position, and to maintain and expand domestic and foreign markets for potatoes produced in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this title

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other entity.

(c) The term "potatoes" means all varieties of Irish potatoes grown by producers in the United States.

(d) The term "handler" means any person (except a common or contract carrier of potatoes owned by another person) who handles potatoes in a manner specified in a plan issued pursuant to this title or in the rules and regulations issued thereunder.

(e) The term "produced" means any person engaged in the growing of five or more acres of potatoes.

(f) The term "promotion" means any action taken by the National Potato Promotion Board, pursuant to this title, to present a favorable image for potatoes to the public with the express intent of improving their competitive positions and stimulating sales of potatoes and shall include, but shall not be limited to, paid advertising.

AUTHORITY TO ISSUE A PLAN

SEC. 4. To effectuate the declared policy of this title, the Secretary shall subject to the provisions of this title, issue and from time to time amend, orders applicable to persons engaged in the handling of potatoes (hereinafter referred to as handlers) and shall have authority to issue orders authorizing the collection of assessments on potatoes handled under the provisions of this title, and to authorize the use of such funds to provide research, development, advertising, and promotion of potatoes in a manner prescribed in this title. Any order issued by the Secretary under this title shall hereinafter in this title be referred to as a "plan". Any such plan shall be applicable to potatoes produced in the United States.

NOTICE AND HEARING

SEC. 5. When sufficient evidence is presented to the Secretary by potato producers, or whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that a plan will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this title, he shall give due notice and opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed plan. Such hearing may be requested by potato producers or by any other interested person or persons, including the Secretary, when the request for such hearing is accompanied by a proposal for a plan.

FINDING AND ISSUANCE OF A PLAN

SEC. 6. After notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue a plan if he finds, and sets forth in such plan, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing, that the issuance of such plan and all the terms and conditions thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this title.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to make such regulations with the force and effect of law, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and the powers vested in him by this title.

REQUIRED TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 8. Any plan issued pursuant to this title shall contain the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing for the establishment by the Secretary of a National Potato Promotion Board (hereinafter referred to as "the board") and for defining its powers and duties, which shall include powers—

(1) to administer such plan in accordance with its terms and conditions;

(2) to make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and conditions of such plan;

(3) to receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations of such plan; and

(4) to recommend to the Secretary amendments to such plan.

(b) Providing that the board shall be composed of representatives of producers selected by the Secretary from nominations made by producers in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. In the event producers fail to select nominees for appointment to the board, the Secretary shall appoint producers on the basis of representation provided for in such plan.

(c) Providing that board members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in performing their duties as members of the board.

(d) Providing that the board shall prepare and submit to the Secretary for his approval a budget, on a fiscal period basis, of its anticipated expenses and disbursements in the administration of the plan, including probable costs of research, development, advertising, and promotion.

(e) Providing that the board shall recommend to the Secretary and the Secretary shall fix the assessment rate required for such costs as may be incurred pursuant to subsection (d) of this section; but in no event shall the assessment rate exceed 1 cent per one hundred pounds of potatoes handled.

(f) Providing that—

(1) funds collected by the board shall be used for research, development, advertising, or promotion of potatoes and potato products and such other expenses for the administration, maintenance, and functioning of the board as may be authorized by the Secretary;

(2) no advertising or sales promotion program shall make any reference to private brand names or use false or unwarranted claims in behalf of potatoes or their products or false or unwarranted statements with respect to the attributes or use of any competing products; and

(3) no funds collected by the board shall in any manner be used for the purpose of influencing governmental policy or action, except as provided by subsection (a)(4) of this section.

(g) Providing that, notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any potato producer against whose potatoes any assessment is made and collected under authority of this title and who is not in favor of supporting the research and promotion program as provided for under this title shall have the right to demand and receive from the board a refund of such assessment: Provided, That such demand shall be made personally by such producer in accordance with regulations and on a form and within a time period prescribed by the board and approved by the Secretary, but in no event less than ninety days, and upon submission of proof satisfactory to the board that the producer paid the assessment for which refund is sought, and any such refund shall be made within sixty days after demand therefor.

(h) Providing that the board shall, subject to the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of this section, develop and submit to the Secretary for his approval any research, development, advertising or promotion programs or projects, and that any such program or project must be approved by the Secretary before becoming effective.

(i) Providing the board with authority to enter into contracts or agreements, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and carrying out of research, development, advertising or promotion programs or projects, and the payment of the cost thereof with funds collected pursuant to this title.

(j) Providing that the board shall maintain books and records and prepare and submit to the Secretary such reports from time to time as may be prescribed for approximate accounting with respect to the receipt and disbursement of funds entrusted to it and cause a complete audit report to be submitted to the Secretary at the end of each fiscal period.

PERMISSIVE TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 9. Any plan issued pursuant to this title may contain one or more of the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing authority to exempt from the provisions of the plan potatoes used for nonfood uses, and authority for the board to require satisfactory safeguards against improper use of such exemptions.

(b) Providing for authority to designate different handler payment and reporting schedules to recognize differences in marketing practices and procedures utilized in different production areas.

(c) Providing for the establishment, issuance, effectuation, and administration of appropriate programs or projects for the advertising and sales promotion of potatoes and potato products and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes: *Provided, however,* That any such program or project shall be directed toward increasing the general demand for potatoes and potato products: *And provided further,* That such promotional activities shall comply with the provisions of section 8(f) of this title.

(d) Providing for establishing and carrying on research and development projects and studies to the end that the marketing and utilization of potatoes may be encouraged, expanded, improved, or made more efficient, and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes.

(e) Providing for authority to accumulate reserve funds from assessments collected pursuant to this title, to permit an effective and continuous coordinated program of research, development, advertising and promotion in years when the production and assessment income may be reduced: *Provided,* That the total reserve fund does not exceed the amount budgeted for two years' operation.

(f) Providing for authority to use funds collected herein, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and expansion of potato and potato product sales in foreign markets.

(g) Terms and conditions incidental to and not inconsistent with the terms and conditions specified in this title and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such plan.

ASSESSMENT

SEC. 10. (a) Each handler designated by the board, pursuant to regulations issued under the plan, to make payment of assessments shall be responsible for payment to the board, as it may direct, of any assessment levied on potatoes; and such handler may collect from any producer or deduct from the proceeds paid to any producer, on whose potatoes such assessment is made, and such assessment required to be paid by such handler. Such handler shall maintain a separate record with respect to each producer for whom potatoes were handled, and such records shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes handled by him including those

handled for producers and for himself, shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes handled by him which are included under the terms of a plan as well as those which are exempt under such plan, and shall indicate such other information as may be prescribed by the board. To facilitate the collection and payment of such assessments, the board may designate different handlers or classes of handlers to recognize difference in marketing practices or procedures utilized in any State or area. No more than one such assessment shall be made on any potatoes.

(b) Handlers responsible for collection of assessments under subsection (a) of this section shall maintain and make available for inspection by the Secretary such books and records as required by the plan and file reports at the times, in the manner, and having the content prescribed by the plan, to the end that information and data shall be made available to the board and to the Secretary which is appropriate or necessary to the effectuation, administration, or enforcement of this title or of any plan or regulation issued pursuant to this title.

(c) All information obtained pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and of the board, and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary, or to which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the plan with reference to which the information to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit—

(1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of handlers subject to a plan if such statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or

(2) the publication by direction of the Secretary of the name of any person violating any plan together with a statement of the particular provisions of the plan violated by such person.

Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this subsection shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, and shall be removed from office.

PETITION AND REVIEW

SEC. 11. (a) Any person subject to a plan may file a written petition with the Secretary, stating that such plan or any provision of such plan or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition, in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final, if in accordance with law.

(b) The district courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction to review such ruling: *Provided*, That a complaint for that purpose is filed within twenty days from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law, it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in its opinion, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not impede, hinder, or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 12(a) of this title.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 12. (a) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any plan or regulation made or issued pursuant to this title.

(b) Any handler who violates any provisions of any plan issued by the Secretary under this title, or who fails or refuses to remit any assessment or fee duly required of him thereunder shall be subject to criminal prosecution and shall be fined not less than $100 or more than $1,000 for each such offense.

INVESTIGATION AND POWER TO SUBPENA

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary may make such investigations as he deems necessary for the effective carrying out of his responsibilities under this title or to determine whether a handler or any other person has engaged or is engaging in any acts or practices which constitute a violation of any provision of this title, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued under this title. For the purpose of any such investigation, the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, and documents which are relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, including a handler, the Secretary may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; and such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Secretary, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found. The site of any hearings held under this section shall be within the judicial district where such handler or other person is an inhabitant or has his principal place of business.

(b) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, and documents before the Secretary, or in obedience to the subpena of the Secretary, or in any cause or proceeding, criminal or otherwise, based upon, or growing out of any alleged violation of this title, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued thereunder on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that any individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of potatoes for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of a plan is approved or favored by producers. No plan issued pursuant to this title shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such plan is approved or favored by not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in such referendum, or by the producers of not less than two-thirds of the potatoes produced during the representative period by producers voting in such referendum, and by not less than a majority of the producers voting in such referendum. The ballots and other information or reports which reveal or tend to reveal the vote of any producer or his production of potatoes shall be held strictly confidential and shall not be disclosed. Any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture violating the provisions hereof shall upon conviction be subject to the penalties provided in paragraph 10(c) above.

SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF PLANS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary shall, whenever he finds that a plan or any provision thereof obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this title terminate or suspend the operation of such plan or such provision thereof.

(b) The Secretary may conduct a referendum at any time and shall hold a referendum on request of the board or of 10 per centum or more of the potato producers to determine if potato producers favor the termination or suspension of the plan, and he shall terminate or suspend such plan at the end of the marketing year whenever he determines that such suspension or termination is favored by a majority of those voting in a referendum, and who produce more than 50 per centum of the volume of the potatoes produced by the potato producers voting in the referendum.

AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

SEC. 16. The provisions of this title applicable to plans shall be applicable to amendments to plans.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 17. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the vadility of the remainder of this title and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 18. There is hereby made available from the funds provided by section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress (49 Stat. 774), as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That no such sum shall be used for the payment of any expenses or expenditures of the board in administering any provision of any plan issued under authority of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 19. This title shall take effect upon enactment:

TITLE II—TOMATO ADVERTISING PROJECTS

SEC. 201. Section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "or avocados" in the proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof "avocados, or tomatoes".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for potato and tomato promotion programs."

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 414, S. 2214.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2214) to amend section 608(c)(2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, strike out:

That section 608(c)(2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended as follows:

And insert:

That section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation is amended as follows:

In line 9, after the word "In", strike out "subparagraph" and insert "clause"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "In", strike out "subparagraph" and insert "clause"; and after line 6, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act and ending two years after such date.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2214

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, is amended as follows:

(1) In clause (A) after the words "vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning or freezing", insert the words "and not including potatoes for canning, freezing, or other processing"; and

(2) In clause (B) after the words "fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing," insert the words "including potatoes for canning, freezing, or other processing,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act and ending two years after such date.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this bill, reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has some amendments, but I will first discuss the purpose of the bill.

The purpose of the bill now before the Senate, S. 2214, is simply to place potatoes for other processing—such as dehydration—into other potato products on an equal basis with potatoes for canning and freezing which are now exempt under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

In other words, the Marketing Agreement Act now already exempts potatoes for canning and freezing from coverage in any marketing order issued by the Department of Agriculture.

I might add that the term "other processing" is intended to include only that preparation of potatoes for market which involves the application of heat or cold to such an extent that the natural form or stability of the commodity undergoes a substantial change. This occurs in dehydration and in the manufacture of shoestring potatoes and potato chips. The act of peeling, cooling, slicing, or dicing, or the application of material to prevent oxidation does not constitute "other processing."

The committee's Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices held hearings on the bill. Some producer groups opposed the bill, while processors generally approved it.

The subcommittee and the committee felt that consistency in the treatment of potatoes was necessary. However, in order to provide protection to producers, the exemption carried by the bill is limited to a 2-year period.

The Department of Agriculture favored inclusion of all potatoes under marketing order authority, or exclusion of all potatoes for processing. Inclusion of some and exclusion of others creates competitive disadvantages. Inasmuch as potato products are in competition with each other in the national market, this bill would result in uniform treatment of potatoes for processing regardless of the final use made of the product.

The Department also reported that the use of potatoes for food processing has increased sharply during the past decade. Only 14 percent of 1956-crop potatoes used for food were processed. In 1967 about 42 percent were processed. Utilization for freezing was the most important in terms of volume, but large quantities were used for canning, potato chips, shoestrings, and dehydration. Dehydrated potato processing increased sixfold during the 1956 to 1967 period, while the use of potatoes for chipping and shoestring potatoes more than doubled. Continued expansion of sales to all food processing outlets is expected in coming years.

Mr. President, there was some difference of opinion in the committee. Some of us would have preferred to put all potatoes destined for processing within reach of the potato producers, within their marketing orders, if they chose to cover potatoes used for processing. Others favored the method used in this bill; that is, to exclude all potatoes used for processing by which the natural form of the potatoes changes, from coverage of the marketing agreement and order.

The final settlement made by the committee was to permit this to be done as provided by the bill for a period of 2 years, to see whether or not the experiment of excluding all processed potatoes from the coverage of marketing orders would be satisfactory in general to the producers, who, after all, would be the ones most interested in marketing orders, as they are the only ones who can initiate such orders.

The bill as reported does just that. It would exclude all potatoes for processing from marketing orders, but only for a trial period of 2 years, so as to see how this program would work out.

Mr. President, these are all the comments that I have. If other Senators would like to be heard on the bill, I shall be happy to yield. Otherwise, I ask that the amendments be considered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The bill now before us, S. 2214, was the bill in connection with which the hearings were centered on a locality in northern California and in Idaho and some of the adjacent States; was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. This was the bill in which certain processors who used potatoes grown in northern California and Oregon felt that they were being discriminated against under a regional marketing order applicable only to that area, and they asked to be put in the same position as other processors using other potatoes from that area who were excluded from the coverage of the marketing order.

As I have already stated, the committee was not of one mind about this, but finally decided to give the program, as provided by the bill a 2-year period of trial, to see how it would work out.

Mr. CURTIS. My recollection is that the testimony that the committee received was somewhat divided, that one group of growers favored the legislation and another group did not.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for the way he has handled the bill. I believe it was the junior Senator from Nebraska who suggested we might try it for 2 years, to see how it worked out, in fairness to all parties; and I am delighted that that was the way the bill was presented here.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend for that comment, and I am glad to say he is correct in his recollection; he was the one who suggested this compromise, which was finally accepted by all members of the committee, and we are all willing to see this program tried out for 2 years, as I recall the vote of the committee.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, S. 2214 is a bill to amend section 608(c)(2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. Briefly, this bill exempts all potatoes used for processing from Federal marketing orders.

Federal marketing order legislation has played an important role in the orderly marketing of potatoes:

Marketing orders assure the adequate supply of high quality potatoes to the consumer at steady and reasonable prices.

The Federal marketing order has prevented the exploitation of both the consumer and the farmer by the middleman.

Current law exempts from marketing orders those potatoes that are to be processed by canning or freezing. Proponents of S. 2214 argue that processors of other types of potatoes are placed in an unfair competitive position with the canners

and freezers. I recognize this problem, but the solution is not in more exemptions to the marketing order. The solution to achieving equity among processors, while at the same time preserving the benefits of marketing orders for the producers and consumers, is in the removal of all exemptions.

In my own State of Maine the Federal marketing order has been shelved. Many Maine potato producers are pressing for the reinstatement of that order. If more exemptions are granted for processors, it will be virtually impossible to convince the Maine potato growers, who produce for both the fresh and processing markets that the reinstatement of the marketing order is in their best interest.

For the good of the potato producer and the consumer I oppose the passage of S. 2214. At the same time, understanding the inequity faced by a part of the processing industry, I urge that the Agricultural Committee prepare substitute legislation to remove all exemptions from Federal marketing orders.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the principal author of S. 2214, is necessarily absent today. The Senator, however, had prepared a statement which he had planned to make on this measure. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURPHY

As the author of S. 2214, I urge its passage. The bill would update the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937. The purpose of the 1937 act was to assist in stabilizing prices of fruits and vegetables in the fresh market at a profitable level. Canning, the only major method of food preservation in 1937, was exempt from the act's provisions. By 1946, freezing had become a common method of food preservation, and Congress updated the Act by expanding the exemption to include fruits and vegetables for freezing.

Today, dehydration has also become a major method of preserving foods, and S. 2214 would place all processors of potatoes—canners, freezers, dehydrators, potato chippers, and shoe string manufacturers—on a fair, equal and competitive basis.

I believe that the bill is in the best interest of the potato industries, both growers and processors, and the workers in the processing plants, as well as of the American consumer.

I support and urge its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to exempt potatoes from processing from marketing orders."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the scheduled business of the Senate for today. There will be no further votes.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 445, S. 1508. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1508) to improve judicial machinery by amending provisions of law relating to the retirement of justices and judges of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment after line 6, to insert:

(b) The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the last comma therein the following: "or at any age after serving at least twenty years continuously or otherwise."

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1508

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 371(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", or at any age after serving at least twenty years continuously or otherwise."

(b) The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the last comma therein the following: "or at any age after serving at least twenty years continuously or otherwise."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to previous order, the Senator from Mississippi is recognized for a period of 1 hour.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the chair.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to make clear in the very beginning that my concern and my advocacy with respect to the subject I shall talk about today is in the interest of public school education. I shall refer to the problems of our schools in the South and the problems and conditions in the schools of the North, but I am prompted, all the way through, by my advocacy of the survival, in all areas of the Nation, of the public school system. I have never entertained the idea or joined in any movement that would try to establish a private school system in any appreciable area to replace the public schools, because I know that even though the private school has its place and has a good function to a limited degree or in a specific area, and has a good influence throughout the Nation, it is the public school system, I am fully convinced, that is necessary to train and educate the masses of our children.

I wish to make it clear also that I am not seeking or advocating the repeal of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I know that it is the law, and I said after its passage that it could not be ignored; that it was the law and, of course, would have to be obeyed.

Mr. President, for several years the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Justice Department, have conducted an intensive campaign to bring about total integration of public schools in the South. Both HEW and the Justice Department have launched a crash program to integrate the races in every school in the South. This drive for all-out integration has been so intense and demanding that the education and welfare of the students and teachers have become secondary. The prime objectives has been all-out integration. My complaint is about the administration and interpretation of that law.

I wish to make it clear that I want every child, and I have always wanted every child, to have every opportunity to obtain adequate schooling and training under just as favorable conditions as can be had. I want faculties and others who are engaged in schoolwork generally to have conditions as favorable and as encouraging as possible.

I know, too, from the experience of the last 2 years, that most of the burdens of the social change that is coming about in our country is dumped in the lap of the public school system, to the extent that it cannot longer carry that load unless there is some moderation in the policy, the practice, and the administration of this Federal law. I am just as certain of that as I am that night follows day. I am certain that something will have to be done about it.

I also feel that this fact is not realized throughout the Nation. It is not realized by enough of the membership of this body, because they have not felt the impact of the imposition of the school program as administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice, for it is really not administered in great areas of the country, to any appreciable degree at all, as I shall illustrate.

For several years, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Justice Department have conducted or

attempted to conduct a campaign to bring about a total integration of the public schools in the South. Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice have launched a crash program to integrate the races in every school in the South.

This drive for all-out integration has been so intense and so demanding that the education and welfare of the students and teachers have actually become secondary. The prime objective has been all-out integration.

I believe this crash program has been and is a tragic mistake. The students have suffered in their school courses, orientation, and attainments. The teachers have suffered and are unable to make adjustments and effectively carry on under this crash program that demands almost everything now and everything a year from now. The parents have suffered, and the effectiveness and efficiency of the schools have been greatly diminished.

Unhappily, those who are directing this campaign have either failed to recognize, or have deliberately chosen to ignore, the fact that this localized effort against the South overlooks segregated conditions in the North that are as pronounced, and in some instances even more pronounced, than segregation in the South which is actually the sole target of this massive integration program.

If the alleged wrongs that are being so vigorously attacked in the South are, in fact, wrongs, the same situation, the identical circumstances, the extensive segregation, is also wrong in the North.

To attack these claimed inequities with such vigor in the South and at the same time overlook them elsewhere, is either a clear admission that: First, the alleged wrongs in the South are not, in fact, wrongs at all; or, second, there are great wrongs in the North that are neglected and uncorrected.

In brief, the law is not being enforced equally throughout the Nation.

If it is true, as the advocates of integration claim, that segregation deprives the Negro student of an equal education, millions of Negro students in the North are being deprived of their rights.

It is unquestionably clear that segregation in the schools exists in many major areas of the North to an equal extent, if not a greater extent, than in the South. I shall support this statement by official records that are admitted to be correct.

The records I shall cite have been obtained from the files of HEW—obtained in a legitimate way by a regularly constituted arm of the Senate. I have taken these matters up with Mr. Finch. I make no personal attack on Mr. Finch. He says that he does not contest the figures I am going to cite and that, so far as he knows, they are correct.

Regrettably, the deplorable situation of the North and West has been overshadowed and kept out of public sight and notice because the national bureaucracy responsible for enforcing integration in the schools has played an overly bright spotlight on the struggling schools of the South.

The goal for the school years 1969–70 and 1970–71, has been total abolition of all schools predominantly white or predominantly black. Total adjustments and change have been demanded as to students, curriculum, courses, transportation, equipment—everything—within this time frame. That is the general pattern that has been demanded in most of these districts. They are all moving in that direction. A few of the districts may be an exception to this general summary statement that I have made, but that is the trend, and that is the overall look.

I know most of these things from my personal knowledge, because I have had contact with many of them. I have appeared before the examiners with many school boards that have come to Washington from my State for hearings with reference to their matters. I have been there with them. I have testified in some of those cases as to facts with which I am familiar. I mention that just to show that this is not a strange subject to me.

Public attention has been concentrated on complaints of harassed educators and distraught parents in the South.

The policy of singling out the South for enforcement of the 1954 Supreme Court decision prohibiting discrimination in the public schools on account of race is based upon the idea that enforcement should be directed against areas of the Nation that once had State or local government laws that required or allowed segregated schools. I say that this was the policy.

This is known as de jure segregation. Segregation in public schools that has arisen out of a fact, or a combination of facts, not required or permitted by law is classed as de facto segregation.

By establishment of this policy—that is, a differentiation between de jure and de facto segregation—Federal officials have sought to excuse their inaction against segregation in the North while pursing an intense program to achieve total and immediate integration in the South.

The effect of this policy is to say that segregation in the South is wrong but segregation in the North is not wrong.

It is merely a policy. This procedure, this approach, is merely a policy. It is not supported by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 nor by the Supreme Court decisions.

I cannot find anywhere in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or in the Supreme Court decisions any direction or any holding that the law made a distinction between one part of the country and another or one kind of school segregation and another. The basic part of that decision of 1954 is very clear.

Now, this policy to which I have referred, and it applies to previous administrations and not only this one, is not a policy of law, it is not a policy of reason, and it is not a policy of right. It is a policy of the wrong and the strong; the "strong of the Federal Government bringing its vast power and talent against many small school boards and school officials in the South; the "wrong" of political expediency in leaving untouched the politically powerful and controlling States of the North and the East. I shall specify some of them before I conclude my remarks.

This has been a willful and deliberate pattern of conduct known to the top officials of Health, Education, and Welfare over the years and in fact evolved by them. They have told this to me, as well as to other Senators. Along with other Senators, I called it to the personal attention of two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and received firm promises that action would be taken. This was in 1966, 1967, and in 1968. Virtually no action has been taken. During the passage of the Education Act in the fall of 1967, these facts were brought to the attention of the Senate and this pattern of non-action in the areas outside the South was denounced by the then Senator Morse of Oregon, who was handling that education bill and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gave a letter to Senator Morse, which was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, promising action in the non-southern areas. Virtually no action has been forthcoming since the time of that letter.

Mr. President, I could not readily locate that letter. That is my best recollection. The letter was placed in the RECORD and I think I shall find it and make proper reference to it.

However, even if it should be conceded that such an inequitable and unequal policy is acceptable under the law, the States of California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia should come under the de jure classification.

Let us look at the facts: 91 percent of the total Negro student enrollment in all Northern and Western States is concentrated in these eight States and the District of Columbia. Segregation of races in the public schools was at one time either required or permitted by law in each of the above-named jurisdictions. I cite here some additional revelant facts:

Indiana has State statutes authorizing separate but equal public schools until 1949.

In New Jersey separate schools for Negroes were maintained well into the 20th century despite an 1881 statute prohibiting the exclusion of children from schools on the basis of race. In 1923 the State commissioner of education ruled that local school authorities could provide special schools for Negroes in their residential areas and allow the transfer of white students from these schools to white schools. The ruling was reaffirmed in 1930.

State statutes authorizing separate but equal public schools were in effect in New Mexico and Wyoming until 1954.

A State statute permitted separate but equal public schools in New York until 1938.

Many State courts in the North have upheld racially separate school facilities. For instance, courts in Ohio, Delaware, New York, and other States allowed exceptions to geographical attendance for the purpose of maintaining the segregation of Negroes.

I cite these instances as facts of life and to prove that even under the de

jure-de facto theory or policy, segregated schools in these States should be proceeded against in the same manner as the "de jure" schools in the South are being proceeded against.

I do not concede that the de jure-de facto policy is either logical or legal. I believe it is, in fact, both illogical and illegal. If segregation is unlawful because of the 1954 decision of Brown against Board of Education, it is illegal whether or not it results from de jure or de facto reasons, and it is illegal whether it occurs in the North or in the South.

Make no mistake about it. Let there be no misunderstanding. There is no real difference between segregation in the North and the South. The figures show many places in the North are more segregated than some places of the South.

I quote now from official HEW records to which I have already referred. Again, I make no distinction between the Negro students and the white students, and their right to go to school and have what can best be afforded. My point is that the way this matter is being handled is injurious to education; that the pattern of integration is superseding the higher object of education; that it is not being conducted equally and fairly throughout the Nation; but that the policy is deliberately and positively pointed to these Southern States.

These official records show that of 139,006 students in Washington, D.C., only 0.9 percent are desegregated. That is the term the records use. I shall explain it more later. Of the 308,266 Negro students in Chicago, Ill., schools, only 3.2 percent are desegregated. Of the 29,826 Negro students in Gary, Ind., schools, only 3.1 percent are desegregated.

The Negro student population in public schools in Buffalo, N.Y., is 26,381; 15,304 are in schools that are segregated 98 to 100 percent. Cleveland, Ohio, has 87,241 Negro students. Of these, 70,642, or 81 percent, are in schools 95- to 100-percent segregated. That means they have that percentage of Negro students, 95 to 100 percent.

In Atlantic City, N.J., 40 percent of the Negro students are in five schools that are 100-percent Negro.

In Chicago, there are 214 schools attended by 248,000 of the total Negro school population of 308,000, and each school contains 99- to 100-percent Negro student bodies. Of these 214 schools, 108 are 100-percent Negro. All-Negro schools are found throughout the State of Illinois.

The same is true of several other States in the North.

Now, Mr. President, I remember 2 years ago—perhaps it was 3 years ago—there was some kind of proceeding filed by the HEW in Chicago as to lack of integration in their schools. It was all in the newspapers. There was a visit by Mayor Daly and a telegram given to the press and something to the White House. That thing flooded the country for a few days and then it faded out. It was taken under advisement. So far as that proceeding is concerned, my information is that nothing has been done about it yet.

A few months ago the city of Chicago was notified or some demand was made for integration of the faculty and they wired back that in order to integrate the faculty it would cost x number of dollars and please to send the money, that it would cost that much extra money and send the extra money. I do not know what happened since then, but I do not think any money has been sent there. I do not think there has been any real proceeding which has been effective about it.

With reference to the population of schools, the same is true of several other States in the North.

For instance, in Ohio, in 68 schools attended by 69,000 of the total Negro population of 87,000, the student enrollment there is 95 to 100 percent Negro.

That is in 68 schools where 69,000 out of a total 87,000 Negro students attend and those schools are 95 to 100 percent Negro. They are all-Negro schools throughout the State of Ohio.

In Dayton, Ohio, 18,000 of a 22,000 total Negro school population attend 20 schools that are 92.8 to 100 percent Negro. Eight out of the 20 are 100 percent Negro.

Mr. President, I do not bring this up as any reflection on the Negro students—not one bit; this is no more a reflection on the Negro students than on the white students.

I am citing here what is not being done about the massive, total demand for integration now.

I know, too, that until the pinch of this thing is felt by the mothers and fathers, teachers, and students, both Negro and white, throughout the great areas of this country, why we in the South are just at the mercy—I repeat, just at the mercy—of whatever may be the policies, or the demands of the administration in power. The South will be largely at their mercy.

I do not accuse them of exercising bad faith in every case. We have had some people there from HEW that did not know topside from bottom about school administration or school problems or anything in that field. Then we have had some that were understanding, capable, and competent but they were usually overruled, that latter kind.

Let me give credit where credit is due. I do not claim that Mr. Finch is indifferent to this situation. He has an awfully big job to fill. He has got a lot of people in there who are zealots on the subject, according to my definition. I know that he is concerned about it some. I do not accuse those predecessors of his, who promised to move in on this matter and make it uniform, and, therefore, make it possible to get a more moderate policy, of falsifying or deliberately going back on their word. Their hands might have been tied by a higher power. I do not know. But I do know what the result is. It is not contradicted. It will not be denied. They may try to explain away some fragments of this, but the bald, central facts I have just related are taken from the record here. I shall introduce some of the computerized information into the RECORD, if it is the will of the Senate that it stand in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Going back to the States, in the great State of Michigan, in Detroit 66,000 out of 175,000 Negro students go to schools in 68 schools which are 99 to 100 percent Negro. Let me repeat that: In the great State of Michigan, in the city of Detroit 66,000 out of the 175,000 Negro students attend 68 schools which are 99 to 100 percent Negro.

Now, Mr. President, I have not heard any clear calls for fairness here from anyone in those States, asking HEW to come in there and stir the people up and enforce its edicts, as they are in the South. I have not heard any clamor for that. I judge by that that they are not interested in the things being done in their area of this country, but they are willing to vote and demand that it be done in the Southern area of this country.

I think the facts and figures here unmistakably and conclusively prove that that is the pattern, that generally it has the consent of the people in those States and is not going to be disturbed in any appreciable way unless this matter can be focused properly and brought to the attention of the people of the Nation. Whenever it is, I am very practical and frank about this.

Whenever it is brought into action with the unbearable demands that we sustain in areas of the South, there will be a moderation of this policy. It will be done right here on the Senate floor, in my opinion, or in the House, or in both. But long before we have to do it, I would hope it would be done through these departments.

The pattern of all-white and all-Negro schools in the North is not confined to big cities but also exists in the small areas as the charts which I shall introduce will show.

The conditions which I have outlined above would not be tolerated under the rules and regulations applied to schools of the South.

HEW and the Justice Department have moved with great speed and strength and repeated demands, although at times with some misunderstanding, against schools in the South that are as scarcely segregated as the examples in the jurisdiction that I have cited.

The governing authority of every public school district is required by HEW to sign a compliance or assurance agreement that the school will operate in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a prerequisite to receiving Federal funds. In the North a simple agreement—form 441—is used. This form simply states intent to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It has been and is the practice of HEW to accept compliance statements from schools in the North without making a check to determine if the school is, in fact, in compliance. In the South before the compliance form is accepted it has been and is the practice of HEW to check to see if the school is, in fact, in compliance. If there is an indication of noncompliance HEW then requires school officials to sign form 441–B which requires them to agree to desegregate the school—thereby admitting segregation—and to file a plan to accomplish desegregation.

The contrast between the North and South as to investigation and enforcement of integration by HEW is shocking.

When I say "North" I mean areas outside the South.

In the North only 46 of 7,015 compliance agreements filed have been given a preliminary check by HEW.

If my quick figures are correct, that is sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent that have been given a check in the North.

In the South 2,994 districts have filed form 441 and all have been checked, 100 percent. That is according to the records; that is not an estimate. It is according to the records; 1,107 districts have filed form 441–B outlining a voluntary desegregation plan.

In the North only, six out of 7,015 total districts of the North have been sent letters of noncompliance.

In the South, 568 out of 1,107 school districts of the South have been sent letters of noncompliance.

In the North and West, only one out of 7,015 school districts have been the subject of administrative action by HEW.

The tragedy of this so-called crusade against discrimination on a sectional basis is that it is within itself discrimination against a geographical section of the United States. The figures I have quoted showing the extent of segregation in the North are from the official files of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but school segregation in the North has been long recognized and admitted by other Federal agencies.

In 1961, the Civil Rights Commission stated:

> Public schools enrolling Negroes almost exclusively in some cases, and whites almost exclusively in others, are found in many cities throughout the North and West. . . .

In 1966 the U.S. Office of Education stated:

> When measured by that yardstick (segregation), American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country, including all those where Negroes form any significant proportion of the population.
>
> The great majority of American children attend schools that are largely segregated—that is, almost all of their fellow students are of the same racial background as they are . . . (vol. 1, Civil Rights Com. Report, 1967, p. 2)

In 1967, the Civil Rights Commission reported that racial isolation or segregation in the North had increased, not decreased.

The Commission stated flatly:

> The extent of racial isolation in Northern school systems does not differ markedly from that in the South.

The March 1, 1969, report of the Secretary of the Deparment of Health, Education and Welfare—Civil Rights Commission Report 1967, Volume I Page 7—admitted that almost nothing is being done in the North while a crash-enforcement program is underway in the South.

I quote from that report of March 1, 1969:

> During 1968, for example, there are Title VI compliance reviews in more than 400 southern school districts as compared to only 40 northern district reviews in thirteen northern and western states. In October 1968, there were 67 Title VI staff members assigned to the South and only 32 persons covered the northern and western states. While significant steps have been taken in hundreds of urban and rural school districts in the South, the large and sprawling urban centers of the North remain relatively untouched.

I call these conditions to the attention of all the people of the Nation. I call them to the special attention of the parents of all the children in these affected schools in the East, the North, and the West. If the Federal Government should ever decide to enforce their edicts in your areas as they have in the South, then you will lose your community school. Your educators will be replaced by administrators and directors from Washington. Your school boards will find themselves virtually helpless and your administrators will be overruled and the pleas of the people for moderation will be rejected. I do not cite these facts with anything except the greatest regret and downright unhappiness.

I am a strong advocate for and defender of the public school system. I vigorously withstood pressure and agitation to join in a movement for private schools soon after the Supreme Court decision of 1954, because I knew that only the public school can serve the children of the great masses of the people. A private school here and there has a fine purpose, and has its place, but for the education of the masses we must preserve the public school, and I want to preserve it as a school and not as an experiment in social change. And this entire burden of social change has been placed on the doorsteps of our public school system.

I am not attacking as such the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and am not trying here to get it repealed. I have said that it is the law. But the extreme administration of that act, including this willful, deliberate discrimination in its application to only one section of the country is not in keeping with the letter or spirit of that law.

Mr. President, it would be nice to have the attention of Senators on this point. I am quoting here from the Civil Rights Commission report of 1969, filed March 4, during the present administration. This report says:

> While significant steps have been taken in the hundreds of urban and rural districts in the South, the large and sprawling urban centers of the North remain relatively untouched.

That is the very thing I set out to prove and have been trying to prove, with facts and figures from that office.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I had rather yield when I have finished, if the Senator does not mind. I shall be through shortly, and will be happy to yield to him then.

Mr. President, it is clear that racial segregation exists as much in the North, and in some areas much more, than in the South. It is also clear that enforcement of the civil rights law by the Federal Government is not equal, and does not attempt to be equal. There is no effort made for it to be equal in all sections of the Nation. It is even more clear that the Federal departments charged with responsibility are not acting with the speed and effectiveness necessary to remove the problems in the North and the West.

I do not accuse anyone of bad motives, but I know if any administration wanted to move into those areas with the vigor and effectiveness that it has moved in our area, it could do it. They could get the money for a while. I think a reaction would set in then, though, and it would bring about a more moderate policy.

That is what we have to have, if the public schools are to retain their educational function. If they are to be used to carry virtually all of the load of this social change, then I think they will be destroyed as institutions for education. I am not wanting them to be destroyed in the North. I want this policy enforced in the North, though, if it is to be enforced against us, until it generates a reasonable reaction to moderate this civil rights policy as applied to schools—a policy that is not justified by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This discrimination against one area of the country is not justified nor authorized. This artificial distinction between so-called de jure and de facto segregation is nothing in the world but the tool of the administrators, to have an excuse to go into the areas where it will be politically profitable nationally to enforce that policy, whereas if they go into the States I have mentioned—which are not the only ones that have these conditions—I think they know it will be politically unprofitable, and there will be a political reaction. They are going to hear from a lot of mothers, I think, mothers of Negro students as well as of white students, when they go to bodily tearing the schools to pieces in New York and Chicago. They are going to hear from the people.

I say Mr. Finch is an honorable man, and I had the privilege of exchanging thoughts with him a few days ago on the Appropriations Committee. He stated in substance what is shown in the record; anyone interested can read it, but as I understood him, he said that housing problems in these cities and the congestion of city living have made it much more difficult, or almost impossible, he might have said, to have this policy carried out.

Well, I can tell you how you can mix them up. Just use the same method used in the South. You can take 200 of those children out of one of those schools that is composed of all black students in Chicago, and haul them out there into the suburbs somewhere, and put them in a school that has been all white, or virtually all white; and then take 200 of those white children out of that school out there in the suburbs and bring them and put them in this school that has been composed of all Negro students. Then you will have them integrated.

That is the way they are doing us. They are proposing to the courts that the courts enforce their plan to haul children from one end of the county to another, back and forth. They take the school buildings that are there, and they "pair" them. If there are nearly all

colored students in the south end of the county, they will haul some of those to the north end of the county, where the schools have been all-white or nearly all-white, and they will haul some of those white students back to the southern end of the county, and they will call that compliance.

I believe I have demonstrated here that there is not one single syllable of authority for requiring compliance like that. But if it is the law, it ought to apply in Chicago the same as it does in Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, or anywhere else. We have been going on here, year after year, and I can see the political impact of this thing. I have already explained my purpose in wanting it enforced up there too. But they are smarter than I am. They know the political impact, and they know the political reaction, and they have not gone in there. I do not think they ever will, to the extent that they have in our country, because if they should undertake it, I repeat for the benefit of those who have just come in, it will force a moderation of this policy. And if we are going to continue to have public schools that serve as institutions of education for the children, there must be moderation.

If we want to use the schools, I repeat, to carry on some other form of social change, all right; education will be secondary. But if we are going to do that, it ought to be done uniformly. And without imputing any bad motives to anyone, I say his thing has not been done.

Mr. President, I will be heard from further on this matter. I have additional facts, and I intend to offer an amendment that I believe will bring the matter into sharp focus, right here on this floor, and everyone is going to have a chance to say whether he believes in this policy. Senators are going to have a chance to say, "I believe it should be applied not only in the South, but in my State also." We shall see what happens on that vote.

That is not threat. It is simply justice in writing. And I believe these charts bring this thing into sharper focus and more accurate focus than any words could do.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Louisiana has to leave the floor shortly, I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what the Senator from Mississippi has said reminds me of my old days in the Navy when some officers who were not too popular with the men ordered their men to do something that the officers did not want to do themselves or the officers did not want to abide by a standard of conduct which the men were supposed to follow. When their hands were called on the matter, some would say, "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

It seems to me that the burden of the argument of the Senator from Mississippi is that the people in Illinois, New York, or Ohio seem to want a policy that they themselves are not willing to abide by. However, if it is good enough for us, it should be good enough for them.

It seems to be hard for everyone to understand that if it is the law, everyone should abide by it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his fine comment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama. He is a man who knows a lot about this problem as it exists in the South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I commend the very able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his wonderful address. It does pinpoint the problem and does point out the discrimination that exists in our country in the enforcement of school desegregation policies.

I was particularly interested in his remarks along the line of the de jure segregation that at one time existed in the Southern States and in the State of Alabama, and the de facto segregation that existed, and still exists in many sections of this country outside the South.

I share with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a certain amount of doubt and uncertainty and questioning as to why HEW should seek to do away with de jure segregation while at the same time not doing away with de facto segregation.

It seems to me that the two should be treated alike.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has pointed out the fact that the law is not being enforced uniformly throughout the country.

I point out to the Senator from Mississippi and to the Senate that in Alabama—and I am sure in other States of the South—we are concerned with the Vietnam war, and we back the President's efforts to secure an honorable peace in Vietnam. We are concerned with Vietnam. And approximately 1,000 Alabama boys have given their lives in Vietnam in the defense of our country and in the defense of our democratic institutions.

We are concerned with problems of inflation in Alabama. We are concerned with taxation. And we have a desire for tax reform. But the No. 1 consideration of the people of Alabama is seeking to save the public schools of Alabama from being destroyed by the policies and actions of the National Government. The Junior Senator from Alabama, along with the people of Alabama, the leaders of Alabama, and the Alabama State government wants to see every boy and girl in Alabama obtain a quality education. And we tax our people to build schools. We have taxed our people to raise the standards of education in Alabama so that we can bring the benefits of a quality education to every boy and girl in our State, and that is the desire of our people.

Mr. President, I suggest, too, that many people believe that all of the Negro population of the South favors policies of the National Government in the enforcement of these discriminatory rules in the South.

That is far from being the truth. I received an urgent call from Negro friends of mine in Alabama several days ago protesting the closing of a fine Negro high school. They had a fine building, almost a brandnew building. They had a fine band. They had a fine athletic program, and a nice auditorium that was used for community activities. And that school was ordered closed and about 400 students transferred to white schools.

They are up in arms against that. And the people of Alabama do not want to see these discriminatory policies applied in the State of Alabama.

I called the attention of the President of the United States to the discrimination that exists; the discrimination that is apparently the public policy of the National Government in the enforcement of the school policies of this country.

I read from the letter I wrote him:

> May I respectfully remind you of the opinion you expressed in a September 12, 1968, television broadcast that you did not believe, "it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Federal courts to, in effect, act as local school districts in determining how we carry out the (Supreme Court Brown decision) and then to use the power of the Federal Treasury to withhold funds or give funds in order to carry it out. . . ." Your judgment at this point was, "I think, we are going too far."

I also reminded him that under the 1968 appropriations bill to HEW, no part of the funds contained in that act were to be used for the purpose of busing any students, for closing any schools, or for forcing any parent to send his children to a school other than the school of his choice.

I received a letter from Mr. Finch subsequent to that in answer to my communication to the President. He was trying to explain why it was that there was one set of rules for Alabama and the South and another set of rules for the rest of the country.

I read in part from his letter:

> The legislative history of these provisions, as well as the decisions of the Federal courts, make it clear that they were intended to preclude any requirement that school officials take steps to overcome racial imbalance which has resulted from fortuitous patterns of residence.

In the North, in other words, where they have "fortuitous patterns" of residence—concentrated black population in one area and concentrated white population in another area—they are not required to desegregate schools.

I continue to read from the letter:

> Where, however, racial segregation of students in a school system has been caused, in whole or in part, by the official action of the State, these statutory provisions provide no barrier to any steps necessary to desegregate the schools and are not steps to overcome racial imbalance prohibited by those laws. For this reason, I believe that the statutes to which you refer are inapplicable to the situation in Mobile.

We have this type of situation in Mobile. We have it in every section of our State. We have some 95 school systems in Alabama under Federal court order; and I might say that, despite all I have read and heard about a relaxation of the desegregation policies of the National

Government, I see absolutely no indication of that in Alabama. There is a great speedup. They say, "Well, we are not enforcing it through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by withholding Federal funds. Instead of that, we are going into the Federal courts and enforcing compliance by Federal court decrees." So they are going at it in a different way and are trying to take the burden, or the onus of these intolerable plans they are forcing on the people of Alabama off their shoulders and trying to put it on the shoulders of the Federal courts.

I have been keeping close track of a situation that exists in Choctaw County, Ala., which has approximately 5,000 students.

Of the high schools in the county two of them were approved by the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. Four were approved by the State of Alabama. One high school was not approved by either accreditation agency.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sent one man into Choctaw County. He did not talk to a single pupil; he did not talk to a single parent; he did not talk to a single teacher or school official. He sat down and wrote a program for the Choctaw County schools, which was submitted to the courts and was forced on the people of Choctaw County.

In his plan, he referred to Choctaw County, Ala., as being Choctaw County, Miss. I do not object to the reference to Mississippi, I say to the Senator from Mississippi, except that Choctaw County is not in Mississippi but is in the State of Alabama. He spoke of Choctaw County being a parish rather than a county, as we call them, of course, and as they are called in the State of Mississippi. Apparently, he did not even realize that he was in Choctaw County, Ala., when he wrote out this plan based, apparently, on a 1-day visit to Choctaw County.

Of the six high schools that were approved by one accreditation agency or the other and of the one that was not approved by any accreditation agency, they kept the nonapproved highschool and ordered the closing of the two schools that had been approved by the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

So it is the contention of the junior Senator from Alabama that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not in the slightest interested in providing the schoolchildren of Alabama with a quality education. If they were concerned with quality education for our young people, they would not come up with these types of plans. They are interested in social or sociological programs. They are interested in getting votes in sections outside the South. It is purely a political maneuver on the part of the national administration to force these plans on the people of Alabama and on the people of the South, having one rule in Alabama and the South and another rule in the northern States.

I make this statement—and this has not always been the sentiment of the people of Alabama: If the National Government will give the people of Alabama, and I believe of the South, freedom of choice, let any school in the State be opened to any school child in the State, subject only to residence requirements and scholastic requirements, no complaint will be heard from the junior Senator from Alabama thereafter. If the schoolchildren of Alabama are permitted to go to the schools to which their parents want to send them—the white children to go where they want to go, the Negro children to go where they want to go—we will not have any further trouble.

Actually, the Supreme Court has not ruled out freedom of choice as such, as the junior Senator from Alabama understands it. They have held that where a freedom of choice plan is used, it is not going to be satisfactory unless it has resulted in complete integration of the school. So they have not ruled out the plan as such.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama very much for his remarks. I do not know of anyone who has gained more respect and confidence, in such a short time, on the floor of the Senate than the junior Senator from Alabama, who began his service in the Senate in January of this year. He is interested in this subject as well as in others.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reference already has been made to the question of busing. When the Civil Rights Act was before Congress, Congress wrote, in clear and unmistakable language and in simple phrases that are easily understood, that none of the funds authorized under this act would be used for the busing of children in order to overcome racial imbalance. Those words have fairly simple and clear meaning. That was the will of the legislative branch, and it was approved by the Chief Executive.

I have not reviewed this matter lately, but, in effect, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the courts have joined to a degree to say, "Well, that is all right, so long as it is an area that at one time had these laws with reference to segregation."

I pointed out today the States that had laws of that type until fairly recently, and there has not been an "i" dotted or a "t" crossed except a very slight effort in those areas to do anything about this doctrine.

But, further with respect to the question of busing, a very apt amendment has been passed by the House on this matter and will be coming up here. I anticipate, along with others, to present a most thorough consideration of just what is involved in the language and in the administration of it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield briefly to the Senator from Alabama because I do have an appointment.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he saw the article entitled "School Busing in Trouble," which was published in U.S. News & World Report of October 13. I am sure the Senator did.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I saw the article.

Mr. ALLEN. It has already been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I speak with great deference to any individual involved in this matter, but these so-called educational experts come into our area of the country on the call of the court, more or less, and are sent by HEW. I said these things to Mr. Finch, so I am not talking behind his back. Some of them are well qualified, and some of them are wholly unqualified. One of the qualified ones made a remark in my State not long ago. Under a pressure of time by a court, they wanted a plan submitted by a certain day. In effect, he made the remark, "This is a farce. We are called on to do all this work in a week or 10 days, when as a minimum we should have 4 months and a full staff."

That is what Mr. Finch testified to in court in New Orleans. The court upheld him there and said there was not sufficient time. That is a case that has been appealed to the Supreme Court. I make no further remarks about it.

I am talking about these shotgun methods to which we are subjected. In that case, when Mr. Finch found out about it, he moved in, and he made a statement. He found out there was not sufficient time. He has been verbally assaulted all over the country and criticized all over the country for that one matter alone. I shall not dwell on it any further.

I wish to make a further comment. I said the other day that schools that have total enrollment of Negroes, could have that situation partly because they want it that way. Our statements are subject to being discounted or ignored.

I am familiar with this situation because of my personal contact with leading colored citizens. Negro citizens, at least from my State, that I have known all of their lives, tell me, "We want to keep our schools. We want our games, our teams, our band, our programs, and our days."

I know of a little area down in Mississippi where there are thriving, industrious Negroes. Right after the war 100 years ago they started in the smallest way in buying a little land on credit and getting it paid for. That has spread and spread. They were not colonized but families after families for 100 years have been able to buy little farms. They are entirely independent, and they have livestock, cattle, grow cotton or whatever they wish to grow. They have schools and they do not want to give them up. Of course, they do not want to give them up. I represent them as much as anyone else. I know some of them personally and I have know the third generation of them.

They tease me about a case I once had as a judge where I did not approve an appearance bond signed by a lot of men of my color and race. They brought the bond back to me with the signature of an old colored man I knew and I approved the bond. I know what I am talking about on that subject.

They feel as if something is being taken away from them. They come to me and they talk about these things. I go to them and talk about these matters. They feel free to tell me exactly the way they feel. I know they are interested in education, not integration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the school population in the District of Columbia is 95 percent Negro, while the overall population of the District of Columbia is 75 percent Negro. I wonder if the Senator could state for the RECORD how many department heads who live in the District of Columbia and who have children of high school or elementary school age, send their children to public schools in the District of Columbia. Does the Senator have that information?

Mr. STENNIS. No, I am sorry. I am not informed on that subject. My estimate would be very few. If the Senator from West Virginia is informed on that matter, I would appreciate his telling me and other Senators the figure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is the Senator aware of the number of individuals in the U.S. Office of Education who live in the District of Columbia and who are in policymaking positions, administrative positions and so on, who are sending their children to public schools in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STENNIS. I am sorry. I am not informed on that subject. I do not know. I hope the Senator from West Virginia has that information and if he does I wish he would supply it for the RECORD. The Senator did an outstanding job for so many years handling the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia was fortunate to have him; and they have a good successor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is the Senator aware of the number of Senators who live in the District of Columbia, who have children of elementary and high school age, and who send those children to the public school in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know of any. I know when I came here several years ago Senator Morse of Oregon and I belonged to the PTA near here and we used to have a big time. But I do not think any Members of Congress have children in those schools.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I do want to emphasize today that my interest is public school education for all the people. I know that public school education for all the people cannot continue to exist in major areas of this country under the present policy. Something must be done. I believe that a much more moderate policy called freedom from force, freedom of choice, or whatever one wishes to call it, is a necessity.

Without referring to any case or any judge, I believe, too, that judges who sit on our courts which have been dealing with this problem—and they are honestly dealing with it—are rapidly swinging around to the conclusion that there is a lot more to school than the race division of children.

It takes a great deal to make up a school. It takes educators. It takes people advanced in the technology of education. It takes administration. It takes parent support and contentment. It takes children who are reasonably quiet and contented. It takes local interests who support local taxes in the form of bonds and retirement money for those bonds.

My prediction is that they are grasping this problem more as it is and that they, too, will have a more moderate view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following documents printed in the RECORD:

Table 1: Status of Public School District Desegregation in Selected Southern Cities.

Let me just refer there, by comparison with cities in the North: Atlanta, Ga., for instance, has a higher percentage of desegregation than Gary, Ind., or Chicago, Ill., I could give other illustrations, but that figure will speak for itself.

Table 2: Status of Public School District Desegregation in Selected Northern Cities.

A table entitled "Exhibit 13–C(1)", with additional tables on the same subject.

These show the total number of school districts in the various areas of those States, the total Negro population and then the percentage, and then the percentage of segregation or integration, whichever we call it, in that last column.

A statement on Negro student enrollment in the Northern and Western States.

A brief, one-page statement made to me by a noted educator of my State who is honestly trying to do something about this problem. He has spent his life in the schoolrooms, and in school administration. He has a doctor's degree. He is highly respected and very well known among his fellow educators.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—STATUS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT DESEGREGATION IN SELECTED SOUTHERN CITIES

City/State	Number of schools	1968–69 enrollment				Percent enrollment		Students in predominantly white schools		Percent desegregated [2]	
		Total enrollment	Negro	Total minority [1]	White	Negro	Total minority [1]	Negro	Total minority [1]	Negro	Total minority [1]
Mobile, Ala	92	75,464	31,441	31,441	44,023	41.7	41.7	3,430	3,430	10.9	10.9
Little Rock, Ark	44	24,854	8,955	8,959	15,895	36.0	36.0	1,460	1,464	16.3	16.3
Dade County Fla. (Miami)	215	232,465	56,518	96,867	135,598	24.3	41.7	7,032	23,427	12.4	24.2
Atlanta, Ga	160	111,227	68,662	68,721	42,506	61.7	61.8	3,724	3,780	5.4	5.5
Orleans Parish, La	131	110,783	74,378	76,110	34,673	67.1	68.7	6,524	7,787	8.8	10.2
Jackson, Miss	56	38,773	17,919	17,980	20,793	46.2	46.4	544	599	3.0	3.3
Raleigh, N.C	39	22,993	6,245	6,327	16,666	27.2	27.5	1,341	1,423	21.5	22.5
Columbia, S.C	63	40,122	18,735	18,735	21,387	46.7	46.7	3,236	3,236	17.3	17.3
Richmond, Va	66	43,115	29,441	29,573	13,542	68.3	68.6	1,890	2,003	6.4	6.8

[1] Total minority includes American Indian, Negro, oriental, and Spanish surnamed students. [2] These figures indicate the percentage of Negro and total minority students attending predominantly (over 50 percent) white schools.

TABLE 2.—STATUS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT DESEGREGATION IN SELECTED NORTHERN CITIES

City/State	Number of schools	1968–69 enrollment				Percent enrollment		Students in predominantly white schools		Percent desegregated [2]	
		Total enrollment	Negro	Total minority [1]	White	Negro	Total minority [1]	Negro	Total minority [1]	Negro	Total minority
Washington, D.C	188	148,725	139,006	140,445	8,280	93.5	94.4	1,250	1,810	0.9	1.3
Chicago, Ill	610	582,274	308,266	362,796	219,478	52.9	62.3	9,743	32,391	3.2	8.9
Gary, Ind	50	48,431	29,826	34,368	14,063	61.6	71.0	916	1,572	3.1	4.6
Topeka, Kans	49	25,737	3,058	4,321	21,416	11.9	16.8	1,904	2,864	62.3	66.3
St. Louis, Mo	181	115,582	73,408	73,770	41,812	63.5	63.8	5,244	5,547	7.1	7.5
Buffalo, N.Y	101	72,115	26,381	28,173	43,942	36.6	39.1	8,169	9,500	31.0	33.7
New York, N.Y	853	1,063,787	334,841	596,422	467,365	31.5	56.1	65,853	101,403	19.7	17.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	106	86,807	37,275	37,576	49,231	42.9	43.3	8,110	8,366	21.8	22.3
Milwaukee, Wis	157	130,445	31,130	35,284	95,161	23.9	27.0	3,849	6,536	12.4	18.5

[1] Total minority includes American Indian, Negro, oriental, and Spanish surnamed students. [2] These figures indicate the percentage of Negro and total minority students attending predominantly (over 50 percent) white schools.

EXHIBIT 13–C(1)

SCHOOL DISTRICTS CONTAINING SOME SCHOOLS WITH NEGRO ENROLLMENTS OF GREATER THAN 80 PERCENT OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT—BASED ON HEW–IBM DATA FROM 1968–69 ESS SURVEY REFLECTING DISTRICTS WHERE 1 OR MORE SCHOOLS WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OF OVER 80 PERCENT ARE LOCATED

ILLINOIS

Total districts	Total schools	Total Negro	Total white	Total
473	3,220	[1] 398,257	[2] 1,448,168	[3] 1,920,984

[1] 20.73 percent of total.
[2] 75 percent of total.
[3] Includes other minorities.

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation: Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
1. Blue Island	6	1,076	16.3	1	613	100
2. Blue Island district No. 130	10	375	10.5	1	215	100
3. Chicago Heights	13	1,779	34.8	2	1,229	100
4. East Chicago Heights	3	1,581	93.3	3	1,581	99,100
5. Harvey	8	879	24.6	1	427	100
6. Maywood	10	2,062	47.7	2	1,882	99.3,99.8
7. Posen	9	2,156	74.1	4	1,730	99–100
8. South Holland	6	846	32.5	1	309	97.5
9. Argo	4	534	27.8	1	239	98
10. West Harvey	6	2,394	79.6	3	1,538	95–97.5
11. Chicago	610	308,366	52.9	214	248,677	99,100
				(25) 239	274,497	90–100
				(28) 267	285,788	80–100
12. Kankakee	15	1,459	19.4	1	538	97.1
13. North Chicago	2	652	81.5	1	486	97.6
14. Waukegan	20	1,907	18.4	2	773	91.6–97
15. Alton	32	2,430	18.3	1	32	100
16. Madison	16	1,287	45.4	2	929	100
17. Peoria	39	4,732	17.7	3	1,225	86.1–95.7
18. Lovejoy	1	486	100	1	486	100
19. Cahokia	13	1,458	17.8	1	491	88
20. East St. Louis	41	16,586	71.6	24	12,787	95.2–100
				2	869	86,87
				26	13,656	
21. Springfield	41	2,261	9.9	1	420	91.3
22. Danville	22	1,754	16.8	1	259	95.2
23. Lockport	2	603	70.8	1	163	98.2
24. Joliet	27	2,797	23.9	3	1,271	98.5–100
25. Rockford	55	4,434	12	1	472	89.8
Total	1,003	364,894		430	316,752	86.8

OHIO

Total districts	Total schools	Total Negro	Total white	Total
640	4,222	[1] 287,440	[2] 2,093,321	[3] 2,400,296

[1] 11.9 percent.
[2] 87.2 percent.
[3] Includes other minorities.

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation: Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
1. Lima	18	2,626	23.6	1	804	96.8
2. Hamilton	23	1,554	10.0	1	673	82.5
3. Springfield	30	3,924	21.3	1	464	81.9
4. Cleveland	180	87,241	55.9	68	69,728	95–100
				(5) 73	75,048	90–100
				(5) 78	79,221	80–100
					79,221	80–100
5. East Cleveland	9	5,200	70.3	5	3,581	77.7–99.1
6. Shaker Heights	12	1,698	21.6	1	499	88.8
7. Columbus	168	28,729	26.0	29	16,341	80–100
8. Cincinnati	106	37,275	42.9	23	18,957	80–100
9. Lincoln Heights	2	1,898	100.0	2	1,898	100
0. Lorain	23	2,280	13.2	1	201	92
1. Toledo	76	16,473	26.7	12	10,551	81.3–100
2. Youngstown	43	10,905	40.9	9	4,665	81.3–100
3. Dayton	69	22,790	38.3	20	18,837	92.8–100
4. Jefferson Local	5	1,889	66.9	1	658	99.5
5. Alliance	12	1,127	18.0	1	251	90.3
6. Canton	33	4,318	19.6	1	386	95.8
7. Akron	71	15,137	25.8	10	5,958	83.4–100
				6	9,432	52.4–100
				16	9,432	
18. Warren	24	3,206	22.4	2	735	88–97
Total	904	248,270		204	168,154	

MICHIGAN

Total districts	Total schools	Total Negro	Total white	Total
500	3,642	[1] 275,878	[2] 1,764,431	[3] 2,073,369

[1] 85 percent of total.
[2] 13 percent of total.
[3] Includes other minorities.

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation: Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
1. Benton Harbor	(28)	5,359	(45.4)	5	2,539	(83.3–100)
2. Battle Creek	(21)	2,756	(24.2)	1	411	(91.5)
3. Flint	(55)	17,212	(37.0)	11	6,423	(96.9–100)
				1	7,297	(86.5–100)
				12	7,297	(86–5.100)
4. Lansing	(84)	3,469	(11.3)	3	775	(83.5–97.2)
5. Kalamazoo	(39)	2,786	(14.6)	2	971	(88.3–92.2)
6. Grand Rapids	(65)	7,721	(21.6)	6	2,894	(96–100)
				2	4,055	(91.3–100)
				1	4,305	(86.3–100)
				9	4,305	(86.3–100)
7. Mount Clemens	(13)	1,421	(21.0)	1	283	(97.9)
8. Muskegon	(17)	1,989	(19.4)	1	525	(98.3)
9. Muskegon Heights	(12)	2,953	(70.4)	3	1,307	(96.4)
				1	1,359	(81.2)
				1	1,660	(81.2–100)
				5	1,660	(81.2–100)
10. Ferndale	(12)	817	(10)	1	365	(100)
11. Pontiac	(36)	6,990	(29)	7	3,536	(91.4–100)
12. Oak Park	(10)	602	(9.7)	1	304	(99.4)
13. Saginaw	(40)	7,510	(33)	9	4,178	(95–100)
				2	5,580	(91.8–100)
				1	5,625	(87.0–100)
				12	5,625	(87.0–100)
14. Buena Vista	(8)	1,354	(36.2)	2	586	(84.5–92.6)
15. Port Huron	(30)	808	(5.4)	1	123	(88.3)
16. Ypsilanti	(14)	1,565	(21.3)	1	498	(92.6)
17. Detroit	(301)	175,316	(59.2)	68	66,058	(99–100)
				40	103,579	(95.1–100)
				18	119,986	(90–100)
				16	137,616	(80.6–100)
				142	137,616	(80.6–100)
18. Highland Park	(10)	5,992	(76)	5	2,819	(81.3–100)
19. Inkster	(9)	3,878	(84.1)	6	3,351	(88–100)
20. River Rouge	(5)	1,712	(45.6)	2	1,041	(100)
21. Romulus	(9)	919	(18.1)	1	345	(82.5)
22. Dearborn	(7)	1,889	(34.2)	1	583	(80.7)
23. Ecorse	(7)	2,203	(53)	2	804	(100)
Total	832	257,221		222	176,362	[1] (80–100)

[1] Scale.

NEW JERSEY

Total districts	Total schools	Total Negro	Total white	Total
321	1,907	[1] 200,117	[2] 986,488	[3] 1,234,470

[1] 16 percent of total.
[2] 79 percent of total.
[3] Including other minorities.

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation: Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
1. Atlantic City	(14)	5,357	(62.3)	5	2,883	(100)
2. Englewood	(8)	1,921	(46.5)	1	31	(91.2)
3. Hackensack	(7)	1,416	(23.6)	1	202	(96.3)
4. Camden	(31)	11,909	(58.9)	19	10,008	(81.2–100)
5. Vineland	(20)	888	(9.3)	2	33	(88.6–89.2)
6. East Orange	(14)	8,769	(78)	11	7,448	(83.3–99.3)
7. Essex	(5)	1,043	(39)	1	478	(89.5)
8. Montclair	(13)	2,847	(36)	1	538	(95.6)
9. Newark	(80)	55,057	(72)	65	48,686	(81.3–100)
10. Orange	(9)	2,808	(64)	2	469	(89.6–98.9)
11. Jersey City	(36)	15,998	(43)	10	7,995	(92.8–100)
12. Trenton	(21)	11,143	(66)	12	7,005	(80.3–99.5)
13. New Brunswick	(11)	2,675	(40)	4	1,129	(87.6–94.6)
14. Perth Amboy	(11)	771	(12)	1	60	(84.7)
15. Asbury	(4)	2,152	(61)	1	941	(98.7)
16. Long Branch	(11)	1,538	(27)	1	201	(90.9)
17. Township	(11)	2,544	(34)	1	183	(97.9)
18. Passaic	(11)	2,632	(31)	3	824	(88.1–94.3)
19. Paterson	(29)	11,479	(45)	10	6,669	(80.2–99.1)

EXHIBIT 13–C(1)—Continued

SCHOOL DISTRICTS CONTAINING SOME SCHOOLS WITH NEGRO ENROLLMENTS OF GREATER THAN 80 PERCENT OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT—BASED ON HEW–IBM DATA FROM 1968–69 ESS SURVEY REFLECTING DISTRICTS WHERE 1 OR MORE SCHOOLS WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OF OVER 80 PERCENT ARE LOCATED—Continued

NEW JERSEY—Continued

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation		
				Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
20. Elizabeth	(25)	5,357	(34)	5	2,251	(83.2–96)
21. Linden	(14)	1,519	(20)	1	395	(84.3)
22. Plainfield	(15)	5,463	(59.6)	3	729	(85.3–91.8)
23. Roselle	(6)	1,226	(34.3)	1	438	(90.5)
24. Township of Union Public Schools	(10)	986	(11.3)	1	370	(94.9)
Total	416	157,498		162	90,966	[1] (80–100)

[1] Scale.

PENNSYLVANIA

Total districts	Total schools	Total Negro	Total white	Total [1]
454	3,978	265,019	1,841,846	2,120,870

[1] Including other minorities.

PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

	Total number of schools in district	Total Negro school population	Percent Negro students to total school enrollment	Actual number of schools, Negro students, and degree of Negro student isolation		
				Number of schools	Number of Negro students	Percent
1. Bradcock	(4)	781	66.7	1	297	(90.5)
2. McKeesport	(23)	1,336	12.7	1	487	(83.5)
3. Penn Hills	(16)	809	5.7	1	246	(100.0)
4. Pittsburgh	(113)	29,898	39.2	23	17,936	(80.9–100)
5. Wilkinsburg	(7)	1,773	39.5	1	471	(97.9)
6. Aliquippa	(10)	1,775	38.5	1	391	(84.4)
7. Harrisburg	(18)	6,668	49.4	5	2,924	(86.3–97.7)
8. Chester City	(17)	8,120	70.3	8	4,992	(84.8–100)
9. Darby	(3)	1,232	70.4	1	384	(100.0)
10. Norristown	(14)	1,981	20.4	1	360	(83.1)
11. Philadelphia	(278)	166,083	58.8	132	127,641	(80.2–100)
Total	503	220,456		175	156,129	80–100

NEGRO STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN 10 NORTHERN AND WESTERN STATES, WHICH AGGREGATES 91 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NEGRO STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN ALL NORTHERN AND WESTERN STATES

(All except one of these states within recent years have had either laws, judicial decisions or other legal basis that required or permitted separate but equal schools. Thus, giving rise to de jure segregation.)

1. California	382,525
2. District of Columbia	139,006
3. Illinois	398,257
4. Indiana	105,772
5. Kansas	30,052
6. Michigan	275,878
7. New Jersey	200,117
8. New York	473,253
9. Ohio	287,400
10. Pennsylvania	265,019
Total Negro student enrollment, 10 States	2,557,279
Total overall Northern and Western States (Negro student enrollment)	2,834,083

(91 percent of Negro student enrollment in the North and West should be under the same policy as now applied to the South even if a distinction is made between de facto and de jure segregation.)

STATEMENT

The race problem is America's most involved domestic problem. School desegregation is a very critical part of the solution of the race problem.

The Court has ordered that "educators" work with the school districts in the development of sound plans for ending segregation. There are all kinds and grades of "educators." Most are generalists like general practitioners in the medical field. Some educators are specialists, as some physicians are specialists: cardio-vascular surgeons, etc. The specialists required for the discharge of the task the Courts have set out should have specialized training and experience in a very wide range of basic areas of school administration: school transportation, including a study of traffic flow and hazards; in school building capacities and utilization; in planning educational programs both on a building and district-wide basis; in school curriculum and instruction; in sociology; and in school finance.

To have a generalist without specialized training and experience in these fields make recommendations in the intricate matters involved in the Court Orders would be like asking a general medical practitioner or a specialist in the diseases of the eye to perform an operation that calls for a heart transplant. The results, of course, would be fatal and the results to the whole matter of integration fatal when less than experts work at it.

Therefore, we recommend that the Courts require the Office of Education to pick educators with specialized training in school administration in the fields listed above, that they have an earned Doctor's degree in one or more of these fields and have experience as a school superintendent or as a professor of school administration in a first rate university. In a team, and a team of workers is required, there should be one or more persons with a Doctor's degree and with experience in school curriculum and instruction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is too voluminous to place in the RECORD, but in the files of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, there are composite tables showing the listing of every school in the city of Chicago and the division of Negro and white students, and other nonwhite students in that area. Any Senator who wishes to, may look at that file.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for his indulgence and the Senate for its patience in listening to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Coming from Wyoming as I do, I am not familiar with the details of a great many of the problems to which the Senator has addressed himself. I must say, however, that I think it would be a valuable and timely exercise, at this juncture in history, for every Senator and every other American to read carefully and note what the distinguished Senator has said.

The Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964. I am going to have to place a great deal of the blame for what has been done in one section of the country that may not have been done in another section, in implementing that act, upon the previous administration.

Having said that, let met add that the present administration should be measured by the same standards that apply to that.

I see no reason or justification for applying a national law any more leniently or any more strenuously in one part of the country than in another.

While I do not know from personal experience, I must say that I am certainly strongly persuaded by the very eloquent argument made this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

It will be my purpose to urge all my colleagues, in order that they may have a better understanding of their country and its problems and the lack of uniformity in application of the laws, to read the eloquent address of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much. I thank him not only for myself, but also for those who work in school activity in the area here that is being moved in on and taken over to such a rigorous degree.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for all of them. That includes county school trustees, the administrations, the faculty members, regardless of whether they are Negro or white—and all the citizens who live in that entire area.

I thank the Senator for his keen understanding and sense of fairness. I am most grateful to him.

Mr. HANSEN. The point I want to make is that I am not trying to imply that the Civil Rights Act is wrong or that it is right. It is the law, and as part of this country it should apply uniformly throughout the country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13194) to authorize special allowances for lenders with respect to insured student loans under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 when necessary in the light of economic conditions in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and to increase the authorizations for certain other student assistance programs.

ASSOCIATION OF SENATOR HOLLINGS WITH REMARKS OF SENATOR SCOTT BEFORE AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), I wish to state that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) would like to have his name associated with the remarks of Senator SCOTT before the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee on the occasion of Israel's 21st birthday, which are printed in the RECORD of April 25, 1969, at pages 10491–10492.

OCTOBER 15 REVISITED

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, columnist Jack Anderson, in his "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column printed in this city, October 15, 1969, makes some interesting comments concerning the moratorium which has received so much publicity.

Mr. Anderson reported from Tokyo, and the second paragraph of his column seems particularly pertinent to any post-mortem which will be conducted in regard to yesterday's demonstrations. Mr. Anderson said:

> 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.

If Mr. Anderson's sources are correct, then thousands of good, patriotic Americans who participated in the Vietnam moratorium with the very best of intentions should be powerfully disturbed when they learn of the motives of some of the leaders of the movement.

It is my hope that my concern in this matter will not be misunderstood. I am not for a moment questioning the patriotism of the vast majority of those citizens who took part in the October 15 program. They are well meaning and, like all of us, are weary of the war. None of us, of course, want to see the conflict continued a single day longer than is absolutely necessary and I am keenly aware that most of those persons who saw fit to protest the war—for the most part, in a careful, nonviolent manner—should be saddened and perplexed by this turn of events.

Further, it is most discouraging that many sincere people, apparently because they are so weary with the war, are placing wholly unreasonable demands upon the President which, if he even tried to meet, would surely not serve the best long-range interests of our country.

The significance and influence of our strength has been in the believability that can be ascribed to our stated purposes in Vietnam.

These include the fact that we seek no permanent bases in Vietnam and no military ties. We are willing to agree to neutrality for South Vietnam if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose. We believe there should be an opportunity for full participation in the political life of South Vietnam for all political elements that are prepared to do so without the use of force or intimidation. Our Government is prepared to accept any government in South Vietnam that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves; we have no intention of imposing any form of government upon the people of South Vietnam, nor will we be a party to such coercion.

As President Nixon has stated:

> In pursuing our limited objective, we insist on no rigid diplomatic formula. Peace could be achieved by a formal negotiated settlement. Peace could be achieved by an informal understanding, provided that the understanding is clear, and that there were adequate assurances that it would be observed. Peace on paper is not as important as peace in fact.

The President has devoted a great deal of careful study to Vietnam. He wants to be sure that our policies there will best serve America. He has examined the question from every possible viewpoint, and the resulting policies are a considered judgment born of long study.

I am convinced that our country's policy in Vietnam represents a most serious effort to serve the long-range best interest of all of our people. It is obvious that the protest and demonstration did not present any new evidence. It is also obvious that the moratorium people, no matter how sincere, reduce the question of U.S. involvement in Vietnam to the simplest terms and repeatedly "demand" the unilateral withdrawal of all U.S. troops.

Simply to be the strongest nation militarily in the world does not guarantee that our influence for peace and justice will always follow in corresponding degree. As the protestors should know, we have ruled out any attempt to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield. But we have also ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal from Vietnam or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised American defeat.

As President Nixon has pointed out:

> When we assumed the burden of helping to defend South Viet Nam, millions of South Vietnamese men, women, and children placed their trust in us. To abandon them now would risk a massacre that would shock and dismay everyone in the world who values human life.

There is a very real danger involved here. A precipitate abandonment of our peacekeeping pledges there and our peaceful goals throughout the world would jeopardize more than the lives of the South Vietnamese.

We must not renege on our pledges. We must be worthy of our trust as a great nation. We must continue a realistic policy that offers the best chance of assuring a livable world for our children's children in an atmosphere of freedom that is devoid of fear.

Along with our country's considerable military might, which is the strength, must be the desire to stand by our word, which is the will.

To allow either to be seriously weakened will cause our influence to vanish. And such a thing, if ever allowed to happen, would mean that the worldwide respect for our Nation's integrity, our long history of defending principle and resolutely meeting obligations, would be lost.

Other nations' confidence in our reliability would be forever gone.

A sudden abandonment of our effort in Vietnam, no matter how seemingly desirable, no matter how sought after by so many, would greatly enlarge the possibilities of future involvement in other places. That is so because it would give encouragement to a number of ruthless leaders throughout the world who could take comfort from Hanoi's success and would be more than willing to risk a reckless confrontation with the United States.

Such a move would bring our integrity into serious question; our prestige would be severely damaged; our influence would be dangerously diminished throughout the world; and, worst of all, we would be forced to demonstrate our convictions and beliefs by the active use of arms. This would be an intolerable situation.

What I am saying—and what some of the demonstrators do not seem to understand—is that not only must we be strong, but people everywhere must believe us.

That is why a surrender in Vietnam should remain unthinkable. That is why the President must continue, steadfastly, to pursue his realistic policies in Vietnam, no matter how unpopular they seem to be.

Mr. President, because they shed light on this question, I ask unanimous consent that the comments of Jack Anderson, referred to earlier, and an editorial from the San Diego Union entitled, "Truth Must Rise Above Clamor," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) 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 restrospect, 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-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."

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."

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Oct. 9, 1969]

VIETNAM SURRENDER UNTHINKABLE—TRUTH MUST RISE ABOVE CLAMOR

Again there is a strong riptide of activity in the United States of America which seeks to induce President Nixon simply to abandon South Vietnam.

The riptide is visible in Congress where, individually and in small groups, legislators are urging a condemnation of the American commitment in Southeast Asia.

The riptide is also visible in the national agitation—professional or naive—for a demonstration Oct. 15 to force President Nixon to make a more firm but generally undefined commitment to retreat.

Amid the clamor of the claques, there are some things that are evident and even more that are not—things that Americans would do well to keep in mind as they try to distill some truth from the confusion.

The first is that whatever the mistakes of the past, the United States cannot roll back the calendar in South Vietnam. We have to deal with the war on the basis of the present realities.

And we must, in seeking the truth, challenge the depth of thinking as well as the credentials of the experts, be they self-styled or real.

It is a truth and a reality that the United States is diminishing its Vietnam commitment at a rate deemed prudent by the person upon whose shoulders falls the responsibility for making the awesome judgment—the President of the United States.

What exactly do the critics of our current actions want? More rapid withdrawal? How rapid? Is open retreat their real object?

Do the critics of the war know whether it is possible to move our men home from Vietnam more rapidly simply from the standpoint of logistics?

Would those who favor pell-mell withdrawal be willing to endorse the inevitable bloodbath in Southeast Asia that such a retreat would create?

Are those who urge our surrender in Vietnam prepared to accept the responsibility for its effect upon the hundreds of our young men being held prisoners by North Vietnam? Several already have been executed and Hanoi says it may "try" the remainder as war criminals.

Is the Greek chorus baying at the heels of the President prepared to face the worldwide implications of a United States' surrender?

The fact is they advocate nothing but the negative—get out. Has anybody heard acceptable positive programs from these self-style experts to preserve the seedling of self determination in Vietnam and prevent the writing of an ignominious, bloody chapter in our history?

We have not heard them.

All that we have heard so far is that if we vaporize the American presence in Vietnam immediately, somehow everything will turn out all right despite the obvious and imminent dangers. It will not.

Americans should view with suspicion the thought that there is an instant solution in instant surrender.

MORATORIUM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me commend the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN). I certainly share the views he has expressed. Let me say, additionally, that the first Vietnam moratorium is over. The Nation moves on and President Nixon continues to pursue the difficult road to an honorable peace.

Nothing really has changed and hopefully the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have not been heartened by signs of divisiveness in our land, plus the fact they were aided yesterday by another estimated billion-dollar agreement for military aid from Communist Russia.

Today, I wonder, Mr. President, if any American President, Kennedy, Johnson, or Nixon, backed by a united people might not already have secured peace in Vietnam.

That is, perhaps, a terrible thought, because, if true, then many young Americans, now dead, would be alive and home today.

One of those might have been Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., of Baxter Springs, Kans. Instead he died bravely fighting, as Americans have always fought, in the cause of honor and freedom. Today his parents received, in his name, at a White House ceremony, the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor. They would give that medal willingly if peace could be brought a day nearer.

Specialist McWethy is one of three young Americans who received posthumous Medals of Honor from the President today.

Can anyone here say the President can make these presentations without a deep yearning for peace?

But, Mr. President, he has on his shoulders not only the bringing of peace, but also the larger burden. Those who call for peace at any price can do so, because the responsibility is not theirs.

Only the President bears the responsibility. If we surrender and retreat in Vietnam, only to face renewed, reinvigorated Communist aggression elsewhere, who will take the blame?

If the United States surrenders and retreats in Vietnam and the Communists take over that country, as surely they will, and institute a massive purge, as surely they will, who will take the blame?

If the United States surrenders and retreats in South Vietnam, and the free world, knowing it can no longer depend on the word and the strength of the United States, bows to totalitarian communism, who will take the blame?

Mr. President, those who planned this moratorium are planning another next month. However, before this, the Presi-

ident has scheduled a report to the people on our situation in Vietnam.

I have no inside information on what he will say. But I do know he can point with pride to what has already been accomplished by this administration—60,000 men to be home by the first of the year. That is a significant number. To those who say it is not, ask what they would have said if President Nixon had added 60,000 troops.

A major drop in casualty rates—for the last 3 weeks, they have dropped below 100. Nobody knows better than the President that any casualty, even one, is too many. But, Mr. President, those Americans who die are being killed by enemies who by their own statements say they receive encouragement from Americans who are far from the battlelines.

Of course, we have no guarantee that the enemy will not launch a sudden offensive with a resultant climb in the casualties, but still, it is worth noting that at no time last year did our casualty figures drop below 100. Mr. President, can anyone here say the President has not reduced the level of combat?

Mr. President, as I have said, I do not know what the President will say on November 3. But I am confident that I know what he is doing; he is working for peace with all his heart and all his might.

Those in this country who possibly prolong the war, also in the name of peace, might at least bear that in mind—if they are sincere.

Let me add one personal word. Yesterday was a significant day in America for many. As the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, the great majority who participated were probably sincere young Americans. They were against the war, as is everyone in this body.

My participation in moratorium day was a visit to Walter Reed Hospital last night, where I visited some 50 or 60 young Americans who had been injured or wounded while serving their country.

I would suggest that if anyone had cause or justification for being prejudiced or bitter about the war in Vietnam, these young men have—some with one arm gone, some with two arms gone, some with three limbs gone, and some with very serious neurological or other disabilities, many of whom will never be the same.

Almost without exception, they seemed to indicate two things. First, they felt the war was right, not because they had been there, not because they had been wounded, but because they felt communism was a threat to us and the free world.

One young man who said, "I was opposed to the war when I went, and am opposed now, but we cannot pull out immediately."

My point is that here are 800 young men, patients in Walter Reed Hospital because of Vietnam who have just cause to be bitter; but, having visited some 60 or 70 of them with the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), these young Americans have made a great sacrifice for their country and understand what this is all about. They will bear the scars of it permanently, yet almost without exception they have confidence in other young Americans. They believe the great majority of young Americans want peace.

Mr. President, with a few possible exceptions, all the young men I visited with felt President Nixon is on the right course, and that he is pursuing the path of peace.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kansas, and with the views he has expressed. I was especially impressed with his statement about visiting some of the wounded veterans in Walter Reed Hospital. There was a day, Mr. President, when the Senator from Kansas was also a wounded combat veteran. He, too, was among those severely and painfully wounded, with permanent effects, and it took weeks and months in the hospital for him to recover from his injuries. The weeks and months he spent in convalescence gave him time to ponder upon the meaning of the type of experience which he had gone through. So when he gives us the appraisal he has given of those young men in Walter Reed Hospital, it comes from one who is very well qualified to make it.

I commend him for the remarks he has made, and certainly commend his remarks to the attention of all who should give this subject the same type of thoughtful analysis and consideration he has given it.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS, TOGETHER WITH MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted to file reports, together with minority and individual and supplemental views, during the period of adjournment between tonight and Monday next.

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

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 14, 1969, p. 29937, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am authorized by the able Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) to state that the principal difference between the House and the Senate in the Peace Corps authorization was the amount authorized for expenditure and this was set by the conferees at $98,450,000 for fiscal year 1970—a figure half way between the $95,800,000 in the Senate amendment and the $101,100,000 in the House bill.

The only other differences—besides technical drafting changes—were: First, the funding of the volunteers-to-America program from Peace Corps appropriations which the Senate authorized but the House prohibited, and second, the addition of a new purpose by the Senate to encourage international programs of voluntary service.

On the first item, the Senate conferees receded with some reluctance in view of other priorities on our resources. On the second item, the House conferees receded with a minor change in language which will permit the Peace Corps to explore international cooperation in voluntary work through establishing an international register of volunteers from which multinational teams of volunteers may be drawn by countries which prefer international programs to bilateral ones. What the Committee on Foreign Relations wanted was to add a new dimension to the Peace Corps work and the conference agreement permits this.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS FROM HANOI ON THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, syndicated columnist Jack Anderson reported on Tuesday, October 14, in the Beckley, W. Va., Post-Herald, that—

> A few rabid revolutionaries who seek to dominate the anti-war movement in the United States are receiving instructions from Hanoi.

The column appeared in newspapers from coast to coast.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RABID REVOLUTIONARIES MAY BE RECEIVING DEMONSTRATION ORDERS DIRECT FROM HANOI

(By Jack Anderson)

TOKYO.—For the millions at home who will demonstrate against the Vietnam war tomorrow, 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 pull-out of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a Communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolf 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 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 (SDS) 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 youth and students in this fall struggle movement."

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 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."

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.

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."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1969

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 20, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, October 16, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Roger E. Landgrebe, Calvary Lutheran Church, Gary, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Unto You, O God, do we lift up our hearts in thanksgiving for the joy of life in the world which You have given us to dominate and subdue. The whole creation is Yours; but we seek Your help as we attempt to govern it and establish the welfare of our portion of its people.

We boldly request, yet humbly demand, Your presence here. Consume the minds of the men and women in this high Chamber so that the work they do here will be an instrument of Your law and a reflection of Your love. The opportunity is here, O Lord, to see You in a mirror dimly and also to effect wisely our confrontation with You face to face. O God, let it happen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2910. An act to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12781) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 20, 24, 35, 40 to the foregoing bill.

REV. ROGER E. LANDGREBE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is honored today to have one of the youngest ministers in the State of Indiana offer the opening prayer.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Roger Landgrebe's ministry is located in my congressional district. The Reverend Roger E. Landgrebe is the youngest son of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. EARL LANDGREBE of the Second Congressional District of Indiana.

Although having entered the ministry but 3 years ago and having come to the city of Gary as the pastor of the Calvary Lutheran Church, he is known throughout the Calumet region for the outstanding work he is doing not only for his parishioners as a minister of the Calvary Lutheran Church but also for many charitable and civic activities.

He has participated along with various groups and organizations to help and aid not only some of the more economically unfortunate citizens of our community, but he has taken an active part in various drives for funds to support causes and programs which are highly necessary for the progress and general welfare of our younger folks in the Calumet region of Indiana. Unfortunately more of our young citizens have not emulated his career in church and religious work in which Reverend Landgrebe has been so successful. His civic and charitable work has been a great benefit to all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Reverend Roger E. Landgrebe for being with us today and also to commend his father, our colleague, Congressman LANDGREBE, for the great work and success of his son as a minister and outstanding citizen in my congressional district.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague in the adjoining congressional district in Indiana, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), for his kind words in behalf of my son. I really appreciate the remarks the gentleman has made.

I would also like to express my thanks and appreciation to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for extending this invitation to my son, and also my sincere appreciation to Dr. Latch for his fine cooperation and assistance.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 14001

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 14001.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in response to my question, Mr. Robert Myers, respected actuary for the Social Security System, stated that a 15-percent across-the-board increase could be made in social security benefits without increasing the taxable base or the taxable rate. The Social Security Administration fund is as follows:

OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL, H.R. 14080

Progress of the OASI and DI trust funds, combined, under present law and under the system as modified by the administration proposal, fiscal years 1970–73

[In billions]

	Income administration		Outgo administration	
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal [1]
Fiscal year:				
1970	$35.2	$35.2	$28.4	$29.1
1971	38.6	36.8	29.6	32.9
1972	43.1	39.3	30.8	35.4
1973	47.4	43.4	32.0	36.5

	Net increase in funds		Assets, end of year	
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal
Fiscal year:				
1970	$6.8	$6.1	$38.7	$38.0
1971	8.9	3.9	47.6	41.9
1972	12.3	3.9	59.9	45.7
1973	15.4	6.8	75.3	52.6

[1] Assumes no automatic increase in benefit rates under the cost-of-living provision.

Source: Office of the actuary, Baltimore, Oct. 1, 1969.

As we can note, the President's proposal reduces the social security fund by $22.7 billion from its projected asset value of $75.3 billion to $52.6 billion. We must closely examine the effect of this loss of revenue to the fund.

But the testimony clearly indicates the proposal for increasing social security by 15 percent is both sound and responsible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this week it was my privilege to be chosen as one of two Members of Congress to attend the International Secretariat for Volunteer Services Conference at The Hague in the Netherlands. Because I was out of the country, I regret I was not able to participate in the deliberations of the House on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week. I therefore respectfully request that my absence be excused due to official business.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 230]

Albert	Findley	O'Konski
Arends	Fisher	Patman
Aspinall	Flowers	Pollock
Berry	Flynt	Powell
Blatnik	Fulton, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Brasco	Fulton, Tenn.	Pucinski
Bray	Gallagher	Quie
Brooks	Garmatz	Railsback
Brown, Calif.	Griffin	Rarick
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Reifel
Burton, Calif.	Hanna	Reuss
Cahill	Hastings	Rivers
Camp	Hays	Rodino
Carey	Holifield	Rosenthal
Cederberg	Hosmer	Roybal
Celler	Ichord	Ruppe
Clark	Jones, N.C.	St. Onge
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Saylor
Corman	Kirwan	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Shipley
Dawson	Landrum	Sisk
Devine	Latta	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	Lloyd	Steed
Dingell	Lujan	Stokes
Eckhardt	McClory	Taylor
Edmondson	McCloskey	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, Calif.	McMillan	Tunney
Edwards, La.	Martin	Utt
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Waldie
Fallon	Meeds	Wampler
Farbstein	Mills	Watts
Fascell	Minshall	Whalley
Feighan	Montgomery	Wold

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ACTION URGED ON PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to urge my colleagues to consider the President's message on his legislative proposals and act upon them quickly. Partisan politics cannot become a stumblingblock in our responsibility to the welfare of the Nation.

Certainly, one of the most pressing issues facing us is the need for draft reform. The President's plan to update our draft procedures will give our young men greater freedom and security in planning their lives and careers. In reducing the period of vulnerability from 7 years to 12 months, the potential draftee will no longer have to face an unreasonable period of uncertainty in planning his future. The draft does not need to be a threat over 7 long years.

However, it must be manifestly clear that those who defer their period of vulnerability because of educational, or other legitimate pursuits, will become eligible for a 12-month period when they finish their education.

I also think it is important that we continue investigating other possibilities and methods for filling the military manpower needs of the country and the President. In the meantime, if we expect our young men to serve our country with dignity and honor, we owe them a fair shake in return.

I want history to point to the 91st Congress as one of positive action and accomplishment. I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of party, to carefully and thoughtfully consider the President's proposal for selective service reform and other basic reforms so vital to the welfare of American citizens.

OEO INEFFICIENCY

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, a nationally syndicated news column reported that Office of Economic Opportunity bureaucrats had gone against administration policies by writing and distributing to various community action groups a manual advocating riots as a legitimate weapon of the poor.

Reacting to this alarming news, on October 3, I directed a letter to the OEO Director, Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, asking that individuals concerned be disciplined and that I be reassured against a recurrence of such an event.

I regret to say that to date I have not received a reply from Mr. Rumsfeld. It may be that those same bureaucrats who write such manuals also intercept the mail coming into the Office of Economic Opportunity. If this be the case, then it is understandable why I have not received a reply from Mr. Rumsfeld.

Hoping to avoid this possible contingency, I am entering these comments into the RECORD, which I will have delivered to Mr. Rumsfeld. I want to make certain that those same individuals who advocate riots do not also advocate losing correspondence from Members of

Congress. On the other hand, this may just be another striking example of the inefficiency of the OEO.

SUPPORT FOR POSTAL LEGISLATION

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address myself to the legislation affecting the postal employees of this country. I have and always will be a strong supporter of this group.

Recently, I had the opportunity to vote for a bill—H.R. 9825—which assures a decent retirement income for all civil servants. I believe this a good step in providing adequate benefits for the postal workers.

On Tuesday, I voted with 310 Members to pass H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act, to provide decent salaries for postal employees. This has been long-awaited legislation and one which will correct the inequities in the system. It is a known fact that the Post Office Department has had difficulty in retaining competent employees and we all know about the deteriorating service in the Post Office. One of the causes of these problems stems from the fact that the postal structure, as it now exists, makes an employee serve a period of 21 years before reaching the top pay level. H.R. 13000 changes this to a period of 8 years giving the postal workers a fighting chance of surviving the constantly rising cost of living.

I was glad to see that the Postal Service Act was defeated by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I would be the first to agree that the Post Office Department and its operations are badly in need of improvement. H.R. 11750 would have set up a postal corporation, thereby removing the postal employees from the protection and regulations of the Civil Service. I feel that these improvements can be effected within the present framework of the Post Office Department. Much concern has been expressed by my constituents regarding the creation of a postal corporation. The defeat of this bill assures the postal workers that all their years of service have not been in vain.

I commend the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the fine job they are doing and they may be assured of my support on all legislation which proves to be in the best interests of the postal employees.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13194, EMERGENCY INSURED STUDENT LOAN ACT OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Kentucky will take ample time to explain what transpired in conference?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is my intention.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will yield some time to those who may desire to ask questions?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 13, 1969.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the conference committee on H.R. 13194 has reached agreement. The conference report was worked out, as I recall, unanimously. In my judgment, it is an effective piece of legislation which greatly strengthens all student assistance programs.

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. The report was not unanimous. I did not sign the report.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. I ask that the RECORD be corrected accordingly. I think you were the exception.

Mr. Speaker, we reached agreement only after numerous hours of debate and lengthy discussion. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), whose untiring efforts and leadership in this endeavor have produced a major piece of legislation. And I wish to express my appreciation to all of the House conferees for their full cooperation and hard work. There were many many difficult decisions which had to be made, and it was because of the strong bipartisan effort that we were able to reach an agreement which is acceptable to 17 of the 18 House conferees.

With respect to the insured student loan program, I am particularly pleased to advise the House that the fundamental thrust of the original House bill is retained in the conference report. The three most essential elements of the House approach remain.

First, under the Senate amendment, only loans made between August 15, 1969, and June 30, 1970, were eligible for an allowance. Second, payments were only authorized during the same period. The conference report follows the House approach and authorizes the payment of a special allowance which may not exceed 3 percent on loans made between August 1, 1969, and June 30, 1971. Also, any loan made during the eligible period will qualify for the special allowance during the life of the loan if in subsequent years market conditions warrant the payment of such an allowance.

Third, the amount of the allowance will be determined after the close of the period to which it applies rather than, as was the case in the Senate bill, prior to the beginning of the period to which it would apply. Under the House approach, which is retained in the conference report, the rate will be determined after a review of actual market conditions instead of being based on projections and guesswork as was required by the Senate amendment. In addition, the application of the rate retrospectively will be much more economical.

Mr. Speaker, the most controversial aspect of the Senate amendment related to the provision designed to limit discretionary authority of local lenders. The Senate amendment required the Secretary to prescribe procedures to the effect that lenders making loans eligible for an allowance pursuant to the act do not as a condition precedent or subsequent for making any such loan, require a student or any member of the student's family to carry out any business activity with the lender other than activity directly related to the administration and payment of such loan. The Conference agreement greatly modifies this Senate provision.

Under our agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine, with respect to the student insured loan program as authorized under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the act, whether there are any practices of lending institutions which may result in discrimination against particular classes or categories of students, including the requirement, as a condition to the receipt of a loan, that the student or his family maintain a business relationship with the lender, the consequences of such requirement, and the practice of refusing to make loans to students for their freshman year of study, and also including any discrimination on the basis of sex, color, creed, or national origin. The Secretary shall make a report with respect to such determinations, and his recommendations, to the Congress on or before March 1, 1970.

Second, if after making such determination the Secretary finds that, in any area, a substantial number of eligible students are denied an opportunity to obtain an insured student loan because of practices of lending institutions in the area which limit student participation, he shall take such steps as may be appropriate, after consultation with the appropriate State guarantee agencies and the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, relating to such practices and encourage the development in such area of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for such students. He shall also, within 60 days after making such determination, adopt or amend appropriate regulations pertaining to the student insured loan program to prevent, where

practicable, any practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students.

In my judgment, these provisions of the conference report differ significantly from the original Senate amendment. It is true that in time the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, through amendment or adoption of regulations, prohibit the practice of limiting loans to customers, as he was directed to do by the original Senate amendment. But, if such regulations are prescribed, it will be because the Secretary has found the practice widespread and that it results in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students. In applying such regulations, the Secretary is given considerable latitude under the terms of the Conference Report. If such regulations become necessary and must be applied, the Secretary will be able to take into account mitigating and extenuating circumstances, such as the special problems of credit unions, where the application of such a regulation would not be practicable. Most importantly, the Conference Report deals with all lending practices which may result in discrimination rather than focusing on just one such practice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conference report responds not only to the emergency situation with respect to the insured student loan program, but also to the emergency situation which exists with respect to all student aid programs. As college costs and college enrollments continue to rise at an unbelievable rate, it is necessary that student aid programs be greatly expanded to meet the increasing needs. Thus, the conference report retains the Senate amendments providing increased authorizations for the national defense student loan program, the college work-study program, and one-half of the Senate increase for the educational opportunity grant program.

The need for these increases is clear. The total amount, which is now available for the three college-based programs, falls far short of the amounts requested and needed by colleges and universities across the Nation.

Presently the national defense student loan program is operating at the $155 million level. This compares with a fiscal year 1969 operating level of $190 million. The present level of operation is less than half of what institutions requested and over $100 million less than what the regional panels approved.

It should be made clear that in retaining the Senate increases for NDEA student loans and the other two college-based programs, the authorizations established are not chosen arbitrarily. They are related to and approximate very closely total institutional requests for 1970 and Office of Education estimates as to total institutional requests for fiscal year 1971.

Under the conference report $325 million will be authorized for student loans this year rather than the $275 million which is presently authorized. The increase will provide loans for an additional 85,000 students. The fiscal year 1971 increases from $300 million to $375 million, will result in loans to an additional 100,000 students. If the student loan program were funded at the authorized level contained in the conference report, 689,500 students could obtain loans this year and 781,400 could obtain loans next year.

By increasing the fiscal year 1970 authorization for the college work-study program $25 million, we will make it possible for an additional 58,000 students to participate in the program. The increase to a $320 million authorization next year will provide work-study opportunities for 748,500 students, almost 100,000 students more than could be provided opportunities under the existing authorization of $285 million. In connection with the work-study program, it should be noted that the new authorization for fiscal year 1970 is identical with the total institutional requests for work-study funds, but that the proposed authorization for fiscal year 1971, is still $15 million short of what the Office of Education estimates will be total institutional requests.

The situation with respect to the educational opportunity grant is similar. Under the conference report, $125 million will be authorized for initial year grants as compared to the present authorization of $100 million. With the increase provided, 227,300 students will be able to receive initial year grants. The authorization for fiscal year 1970 is increased from $140 million to $170 million. This will result in an additional 50,000 initial year awards. Here too, the authorization we have agreed upon represents a substantial increase, however, the fiscal year 1971 authorization will still be approximately $5 million less than the Office of Education estimates colleges and universities will request.

Mr. Speaker, approval today of this conference report will be another indication of the determination of the Congress that no student be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial barriers. Like the original House bill, the conference report provides for an effective solution to problems we have experienced with the insured student loan program. And, in addition, it modifies the college-based student aid programs to provide needed increases in authorizations so that the programs may operate at a level which is commensurate with the need. I urge every Member of this House to support the conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the amount in the conference report for fiscal year 1970 was raised $125 million?

Mr. PERKINS. Which programs is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Title IV, the higher education.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. The report increases the authorizations for national defense student loans, educational opportunity grants, and college work study. The total increase is over $200 million.

Mr. GROSS. It is $200 million?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In the fiscal year 1970?

Mr. PERKINS. No; over a 2-year period. To break it down, we increase NDSL loans for fiscal year 1970, from $275 million to $325 million, and for fiscal year 1971, from $300 million to $375 million.

Mr. GROSS. Let us stay with fiscal year 1970. Is it not true that more than one-quarter of fiscal year 1970 is already gone?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, but let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that it is estimated, an additional 85,000 students could borrow under the increase of $50 million. The demand for national defense student loans is well known. Applications from institutions across the country far exceed the amounts presently available.

May I say to the gentleman, I did not vote in conference for this increase.

We cannot deny the need for an increased authorization. I would certainly hope that the appropriation would match the increased authorization.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman then is for this rather substantial increase?

Mr. PERKINS. The reason I did not vote for the increase in conference is that I tried to maintain the House position. Nevertheless, I am convinced we need more money for national defense student loans. Nothing could be clearer.

Mr. GROSS. What about the budget? This is really budget busting; is it not?

Mr. PERKINS. I did not understand the question.

Mr. GROSS. What about the budget for 1970?

Mr. PERKINS. As I recall, we have only appropriated $229 million of the $275 million authorization.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering under the circumstances whether this is overfunding or whether it is changing the criteria to take care of just about everybody?

Mr. PERKINS. Taking into account the great need, we are not overfunding. We have authorized above what the Bureau of the Budget has gone on record in favor of spending. I am hopeful that they will change their minds on this issue.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for his patience and also for his determination one and at the same time to see the conference report through to a successful conclusion. I also express my thanks to two staff members, Mr. Gaul and Mr. Hogan, who worked in preparing the conference report.

This conference report is a compromise. It probably does not represent 100 percent the views of any one conferee. But in my judgment the purpose of the House bill was accomplished.

That purpose was to encourage lending institutions to make more funds available to students.

The chairman has already outlined the major compromise agreements that were reached by the Senate and the

House. I should like to turn my attention to an amendment that seemed to me the most important if the House position were to be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to limit the discretionary authority of lenders participating in the insured loan program was clearly the most controversial item before the Conference Committee. There were a number of assumptions underlying the Senate amendment which would have denied the Federal guarantee to banks which followed the practice of limiting loans to persons having a customer relationship with the lender.

It was assumed, but not known in fact, that numerous lenders engaged in such practices. It was assumed that such practices were evil. It was assumed that such practices were inconsistent with the objectives and purposes of the insured loan program. And it was assumed that implementation of the Senate amendment would result in greater availability of insured student loans. The validity of each of these assumptions should be and was questioned in our conference by House conferees. In so doing, I believe we have reached an agreement which can be characterized as a positive step forward rather than a negative reaction, and one which indicates that we are more interested in assisting students rather than in chastising the banks.

We direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review the total insured loan program for the purpose of determining the extent to which any discrimination of any kind exists that was not intended in the law—by any and all lending institutions: Banks, credit unions, and administrators of pension funds. The Secretary is to be guided by his concern for the students and not by any desire to chastise the banks. The problem that this bill is addressed to is the one of inducing lending institutions to make loans to students. It is not a vehicle for expressing animosity toward the banks. There is no assumption in the conference report that any particular practice is wrong, rather, may I repeat, we direct the Secretary to determine whether the practice results in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students who are eligible for these loans under the law.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on this very point in the discussion in the other body on the adoption of the conference report, the chairman of the conference, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) said this:

> The language of the conference report carries out the original intent of the Senate that lenders should not require students or their families to conduct business activities with the lender as a condition for receiving a student loan.

I would ask the gentlewoman whether or not that is an accurate assessment of the conference report.

I would say, parenthetically, I do not believe it is fair to say that the intent of the original Senate amendment was carried out in the conference report. We do require a finding and make no prejudicial judgment about the rights or wrongs of a practice carried out by lending institutions.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely right, in my judgment. I think those who interpret the law should be disabused of the very narrow reading given to it by Members of the Senate. It is not, in my opinion, the purpose of the conference agreement to chastise banks and prohibit certain ones from having the Federal guarantee if they required a prior business relationship in making a student loan. Quite the opposite.

Also we broadened the scope of the study that the Secretary is to make to include many kinds of discrimination, which I want to discuss in just 1 minute.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet mentioned what I consider to be the most disconcerting aspect of the original Senate amendment. As proposed, the amendment touched only one aspect of a more general and, quite frankly, more serious question—Are insured student loans available equally to all eligible students? It seemed to many of us that if we were going to prohibit certain lending practices because they were viewed by some as discriminatory and inconsistent with the purposes of the act, then it was important that we look at all lending practices under the program.

The question arose as to whether we should prohibit restrictive lending polices relating to customer status, while at the same time tolerate policies not only of banks but also of certain State guarantee agencies which limit the availability of loans for freshmen students, or for out-of-State students, or State residents attending a private institution rather than a State college.

We thought also that we should concern ourselves with the fact that under the insured loan program, only 36 percent of the borrowers are female, whereas under the NDEA student loan program, 45 percent of the borrowers are female; and the fact that under the NDEA student loan program, 18 percent of the borrowers are nonwhite, but that under the guaranteed student loan program, only 10 percent are nonwhite.

And what of the wide disparity which exists among States with respect to the availability of guaranteed loans? Participation in the insured student loan program in North Dakota represents 37.8 percent of full-time college enrollment in that State—and in New York and New Jersey, over 20 percent. Yet in one State, participation is only at the 2.5-percent level, and in the District of Columbia, it is even less.

Mr. Speaker, all of these problems require study, and I am pleased to report to the House that the provisions of the conference report require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make determinations with respect to each of these issues and not in only one area.

The language of subsection 6(b) gives the Secretary extremely wide discretion in deciding whether he should take action upon any finding of objectionable discrimination. He is directed only to take "such steps as may be appropriate—to encourage the development—of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for such students." The language is so broad that it would support the Secretary, if he should find, for example, that banks which prefer their own customers have a much better record in making loans than do banks which do not have such a preference.

I do want, however, to state as strongly as possible, that the language of this bill does not constitute any prejudgment that practices by banks are per se bad.

In this connection, it is important to observe that the banks have an important stake in choosing among applicant borrowers. There are many more requests for loans—than the funds available during these days of tight money and high interest. The lending institution carries the cost of administration and collection costs and must face the risk of loss of interest. The Federal guarantee applies only to the principal. The loans can run for as long as 10 or 15 years, and the loss of interest after such a substantial period can be a matter of real concern to the bank. Collecting from students who may be scattered over the world is quite different than collection problems for borrowers of other kinds of loans who reside in the geographical area served by the bank.

Similarly, in the reinsurance program, by which the Federal Government reinsures State-guaranteed loan programs, the Federal guarantee runs only to 80 percent of the principal insured by the State. In four States, the State guarantees only 90 percent of the loan principal, and in one State only 80 percent. In those States under the reinsurance program the lending bank faces a possible loss of part of the principal as well as a loss of the interest. It is also important that in the reinsurance program the Federal Government guarantees only 80 percent of the State guarantee. The effect is to confront the State also with the possibility of loss, and to that extent the State may be concerned that the lending banks exercise their good judgment in selecting borrowers.

The last clause of subsection 6(b) directs the Secretary within 60 days after making the determination, which in another section is required to be made on or before March 1, 1970, to issue regulations to prevent "where practicable" any practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students. I do not agree with those who would impose limited reading of the words "where practicable." Fortunately, the words themselves are clear. The words would have to be ambiguous before inquiry could be made about legislative intent. The words here clearly give the Secretary discretion to consider any facts which are relevant to his decision regarding the adoption of regulations to prevent discriminatory practices. I can, for example, conceive of nothing more relevant to the wisdom of issuing such regulations than consideration of

whether prohibition of discriminatory practices would increase or decrease the number of loans. Any regulation which would result in a decrease in the number of loans would, in my judgment be impracticable.

The Secretary shall by rule or regulation—where practicable—take steps to prevent any discriminatory practices which he finds result in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students, whether it be discrimination based on sex, creed, color, or discrimination against freshmen students, or discrimination against persons not having a customer relationship, or discrimination against out-of-State residents, or discrimination against State residents attending private institutions.

Mr. Speaker, some have called this legislation "the bankers' bill." With the original Senate provision I have been discussing, some described the legislation as the "antibank bill." Mr. Speaker, the conference report is neither—it is precisely what it should be—a bill to increase the availability of financial assistance for needy college students.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman of our committee upon her leadership on this and upon her very important clarification of the conduct of the conference.

I would also like to ask her, as we have asked her privately, if in the coming months we will look into the entire area of student assistance, not only student loans. I hope that our committee might examine this total question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that this entire area must be looked at. This Higher Education Act expires and the subcommittee will be turning its attention to this question in November and December this year. We hope that early in 1970 we can come up with another bill.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference report. I think that the conference report maintains the basic elements of the bill as passed by the House concerning the allowance of up to 3 percent over the 7 percent statutory limitation now paid to lenders in the guaranteed student loan program.

The three-month period for the computation that was in the House bill is retained in the conference report. The fact that the computation would be made at the end of the period is retained in the conference report as it was in the House bill. And the fact that the computation would be made on the average unpaid balance during the three-month or quarter period is also maintained, so that the substance of the bill as passed by the House is in the conference report.

I think the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), who has just addressed the House in the well, has properly directed herself to the one question which was the most plaguing to our conference committee, and that was the question of the so-called Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the main reason the conference took so long in reaching agreement was the so-called Kennedy amendment. This amendment, as passed by the Senate, would have required the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to prohibit lending institutions from requiring a student or any member of the student's family to carry out any business activity with the lender other than the activity directly related to the administration of the loan. Now, no one is for discrimination. At first glance, this might look like a reasonable requirement for the Secretary to carry out. But the House conferees were convinced that we did not have nearly enough information to pass judgment on any practices of lending institutions before we knew the extent of such practices and their consequences. No hearings were held in the Senate on this amendment, so we did not even have the benefit of expert testimony about the possible effects of this amendment if it were to be passed.

I believe the House was able, against strong resistance from the Senate conferees, to achieve a reasonable compromise on this issue. In the bill reported by the conference, we do not make an a priori judgment that there exists substantial discrimination on the part of lending institutions, nor that such practices, to the extent they exist, are necessarily detrimental to the purposes of the program. As a matter of fact, several letters from lending institutions indicated that they would drop out of the program if the Kennedy amendment became law. We do not know to what extent that actually would have occurred. I think no one was certain of the ramifications of the amendment.

What is certain is that this program is unique among the various financial aid programs. It uses a small amount of Federal money and the guaranty of the Federal Government to generate large sums of money—a total of 1.5 billion dollars so far—from the private sector. The program is totally dependent on the voluntary participation of lending institutions. Our objective should be to increase the number of institutions in the program. Ths seems to me to be the best way to increase the availability of student loans to larger numbers of students.

The Senate agreed in conference to our amendment which calls for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine to what extent any discrimination against any particular class or category of student does in fact exist. If he finds that a substantial number of students in any area are denied the opportunity to obtain an insured loan because of discriminatory practices on the part of lending institutions, he is then instructed to take appropriate steps to encourage the development of a plan in that area to meet the financial needs of such students. The solution, it is important to note, allows the Secretary to work with all financial aid programs, not just the insured loan program. This approach is the most reasonable if we are truly concerned about helping students attend college.

The Secretary is also required, if he determines that a substantial number of students in an area have been unable to secure loans because of discriminatory lending practices, to "prevent, where practicable," such practices. The phrase "prevent, where practicable" is to give the Secretary broad discretion in adopting or amending regulations pertaining to the student loan program. For example, it would not be practicable to prevent credit unions from requiring membership in their organization as a condition for receiving a loan. Nor would it be practicable to require banks to lend to any and every applicant from outside his normal banking area. I believe that the intent of a majority of the House conferees, at least, was to consider not practicable any action on the part of the Secretary which would drastically reduce the number of participating lenders, and therefore reduce the total number of loans available to students in an area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should recognize the valuable contribution over 19,000 lending institutions are making to our society by participating in this program. Many extend loans as a public service when they could get a significantly higher return on the same money through different types of loans. Many lending institutions have gone ahead in making loans this past 2 months, trusting that the Congress would pass a bill similar to that which is before us.

I sincerely hope that we will, with this bill, attract hundreds of additional lending institutions and that all of them will carry out the intent of this program by making as much money available as possible and without any special preference given to one category of students over another.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support enactment of the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 and I commend the work of the conferees.

The Nixon administration, too, deserves real credit for proposing the creative innovation embodied in this legislation as "special allowances." Thousands of students will be able to go on with their educational program because of this meaningful remedy to the interest problems associated with loans under present economic conditions.

But as significant as this step is, it is responsive only to part of the need. The real "gut issue"—one which must be met head-on if we are to make a breakthrough of the kind needed in this next decade—is the way we can and must increase lender participation.

It is becoming abundantly clear that this cannot possibly be achieved without attention to the liquidity problems facing lending institutions in connection with student loans. Some of us are already at work on the establishment of a secondary market mechanism for student loans and I am anticipating legislation on the subject soon.

Tax policy must also, in my opinion, be given increased attention as a vehicle

to help achieve the country's educational needs. I certainly support the administration's proposed amendment to the tax reform bill providing a special tax deduction to financial institutions as an incentive to make socially desirable loans such as student loans, and so forth. This is a giant step in the right direction.

In addition, we need a comprehensive approach to tax incentives for students investing in their own education and meaningful tax relief for those paying dependents educational expenses and/or establishing funds for this purpose. I am carefully exploring these possibilities.

While it is justifiedly appropriate for us to feel satisfaction with the passage of this legislation, much remains to be done in order to provide maximum educational opportunity for all our young people. This must be the goal for which today's legislative accomplishment is the launching pad.

As a personal aside, I have had several opportunities to discuss the whole array of student assistance programs with the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN). I admire their grasp of the whole field and appreciate their willingness to consider suggestions. I commend their continued leadership in this area.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Words were used by the chairman of the full committee on labor and public welfare in the other body in this way:

> The words "where practicable" are intended to give him leeway in devising regulations for credit unions, or other lenders who in their charters or bylaws restrict their activities to members, and do not do business with the general public.

Based on what the gentleman from Illinois just said in his very eloquent statement, do you agree that this interpretation is attempting to give the Secretary the kind of leeway the other body has discussed?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I think that interpretation is much too narrow. That is certainly one of the things the Secretary can do in his discretion as to what is practicable. It was rather our intention, and I hope we are making legislative history here today, to show that the words "where practicable" have a much broader meaning. Basically, what we want to do is to see that the passage of this law will encourage participation of lenders in this program rather than to discourage their participation, which the Kennedy amendment would have done without any question.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification of that point. I think it is very important. I concur with him, as one of the House conferees that the analysis given of this in the other body is much too narrow on this point. It is much broader and I think the language of the amendments adopted by the conference committee clearly indicates a broader definition.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I commend the gentleman for his statement in connection with the bill. As indeed, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, for his fine elucidation of a number of points of importance in the bill.

There is one particular question I would like to ask the gentleman in the well which is along the line of the testimony that you have now been giving.

Is it not true in the study which is to be made by the Secretary of the situation that exists so far as the banks and these loans are concerned, it was specifically added in the conference that he would look not only at the practices but look into the consequences of certain practices.

Is it not also true, I would like to ask the gentleman in the well, that the major purpose in insisting on the study include consequences is corelative and contributory to the basic purpose of the bill, namely, increasing the student loans?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is correct. I think it was understood throughout the conference that the Members of the House were not ready to make the judgment that the Members of the other body apparently made, that certain practices existed on a widespread basis and that the consequence of those practices was bad.

We are asking the Secretary to make a study to determine whether certain practices do exist, and, if they do, their consequences. This is very important because I do not think we can take any responsible action in the light of those practices unless we know what their consequences are. That is what we are asking the Secretary to determine, and then to take action based on that certain knowledge.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is his opinion that the purpose of this bill is to attempt to regulate banks, or whether the purpose of this bill is to help students get loans, and in this idea of the consequences it would be hoped that the Secretary's actions would be aimed at practices which would stop students from getting loans which are needed, but if he feels a practice helps students to get loans, he would not move in an attempt to prohibit or interfere with those particular practices.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I agree with the gentleman. As I stated in the conference, I would hope that our action is intended to help students and not to slap the banks.

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

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

Mr. AYRES. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, and those on our side who worked with them in the conference to bring out what I believe to be a very satisfactory conference report. After all, the intent of the original legislation was to make it possible for deserving students to get loans. That is what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 will prove to be a very significant step forward in providing a greater number of students with the necessary financial resources for a college education. The insured loan program, without this bill, would be in substantial danger because of the unusually high interest rates now demanded by lending institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of the GI bill for many years. The Congress can be proud of its record in helping veterans secure a college education. Likewise, we can be proud of our other programs to assist students in continuing their education—especially the NDEA loans, economic opportunity grants, the college work-study program, and Government-insured loans. Each of these programs was aimed to meet a particular need. Each has a specific purpose. And together they form a balanced and impressive effort on the part of the Federal Government to assist hundreds of thousands of students.

Now it is important for us to remember the unique purpose the guaranteed student loan program was designed to fill. This particular program was specifically aimed at helping to reduce the burden of meeting higher education expenses for middle-income families. Large amounts of private credit would be generated by having the Federal Government guarantee individual loans, thereby attracting lending institutions to participate, on a voluntary basis, in meeting the needs of these families. This approach has been successful in generating approximately $1.5 billion of private funds for student loans.

It is interesting to note that, so far, 55 percent of the federally guaranteed loans have gone to families with adjusted incomes of less than $6,000. Seventy-nine percent of the loans to families with adjusted incomes of less than $9,000. So this program is assisting thousands of students who would most likely find it otherwise impossible to attend a college or university. Because the great majority of loans are going to such families, I have no problem with the Federal Government paying lenders a special allowance, up to a maximum of 3 percent as this bill provides, to allow them to continue extending loans to these very needy students.

Mr. Speaker, our objective should be, if we believe in the concept of this program, to do whatever we can to encourage even more lenders of all types to participate in this program. I do not mean to provide lending institutions with possibilities for making large profits on Federal money. Most lending institutions have been willing to participate as a public service, but they do need to be assured of at least breaking even on this program. I believe this bill allows the Federal Government to adjust the return to the lenders, in a fair and equitable manner, whenever economic conditions require in order to see the program continued and hopefully expanded.

I think the House conferees were successful in reaching a fair compromise

on a Senate provision which would have restricted certain practices of some banks—and maybe even resulted in the withdrawal of many banks from the program altogether—before we knew the extent and consequences of those practices. Part of that compromise, about which the House was most emphatic, will require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore ways of using any of the several student financial aid programs to help meet the needs of students who are unable to secure an insured loan in their home areas.

Mr. Speaker, the House conferees shared the strong concern of the other body that a substantial number of students might be discriminated against by some banks for any of several reasons. But we felt just as strongly that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should not endanger the total program by taking action prior to the knowledge of the real need for any action.

I believe all of us want to see this program administered in such a way that the greatest possible number of eligible students are able to secure an insured loan. This bill is directed toward the goal.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I particularly want to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentlewoman from Oregon for having done so much in the subcommittee, the full committee, here in the House, and in the conference. The fact that the conference report came back to us is due to the leadership given by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), all of whom were persevering and dedicated.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), and the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), for their leadership, as well as, indeed, to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

The bill before us today represents a reasonable compromise to which Members of both the majority and the minority side can, I think, in good conscience, give their support. It is a compromise to which Members on both sides made significant contributions.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment only briefly on some aspects of the conference report before us which I think are worthy of attention.

One of the significant developments in this session of the Congress to which I think a number of observers have given attention is that Congress has seized the initiative from the President in respect to some of the many important public issues that face us in this country. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, turn the attention of Members back to what happened earlier in this Congress, when this House went on record by a 2-to-1 majority in support of the so-called Joelson amendment, which provided for an increase in appropriations earmarked for education substantially above what had been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, and $1 billion above the President's proposed budget for education. The Joelson amendment and the increased money for education which it embodied received such extraordinary support, both from Republicans and Democrats in this House—my memory tells me that there were only 120 votes against the appropriations increase—is, I believe, a prime indication of the initiative in Congress to which I have made reference.

What we in the House of Representatives were in effect saying is that the elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States believe that we should, as a nation, be giving much greater priority to education than the President has been willing to do.

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

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

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by the gentleman's comments on the Joelson amendment and I am discouraged by what is happening to it or not happening to it in the Senate. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will encourage the other body to act a little more expeditiously in regard to this bill. We are already 4 months into the fiscal year. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana would join me in urging that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would be delighted to do so, and I will be glad to mention those views to my colleagues in the Senate if my colleague from Michigan will communicate his judgment to his friends in the administration, and then maybe we could have a little pincers movement on this matter.

Mr. ESCH. I will be happy to.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to make another point on the bill before us. It increases authorizations for three major student programs—college work-study, national defense loans, and educational opportunity grants and thereby represents another instance of Members of Congress indicating their deep sense of concern that we are not doing enough to support education, in this particular case, to support student assistance programs.

I quite realize, Mr. Speaker, this is an authorization bill, and that we are not here appropriating money, but I suggest respectfully that in agreeing to these increased authorizations Congress is once again, as we did in the Joelson amendment, saying that we think education is profoundly important.

Mr. Speaker, a final point I want to make has to do with the special allowance that is written into this bill for the purpose of encouraging banks, credit unions and other lending institutions to make more loans to students. I think all of us worked on this bill from the outset—and it was a bipartisan bill—in the hope that we could make possible greater sources of student financial assistance, especially for middle-income students in America.

We all know that we are in a tight money situation which has caused a number of lenders to back away from participating in the insured loan program. I believe that they now have a justification for moving ahead and for being more zealous in providing student assistance loans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other point in this respect. The pattern of participation in the guaranteed loan program across the country has varied considerably depending not only on the interest rate structure, but also on the enthusiasm and initiative and leadership of private lenders in the various communities and States around the country. In certain States, the banks, for example, do a splendid job, and in other States the banks have been doing very little.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the House today in passing this legislation will be taken as an indication to the private lenders of the country of the hope of Congress that those institutions will now regard what we are doing as a vote of confidence in their willingness to loan money to students, and that the banks and other lenders will, in turn, respond by much more zealously and enthusiastically initiating loans to the students of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana said if we pass this bill, we are approving something in the nature of a vote of confidence in the bankers. I know of no reason why there should be a vote of confidence in the bankers in this instance when they can collect 10 percent interest on guaranteed loans.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not asking a question of the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) has control of the time.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I support the conference report on H.R. 13194 on the so-called emergency student loan bill. However, I am very disappointed with the position taken by the House conferees.

The purpose of a conference, supposedly, is to achieve a compromise. Unfortunately, in my humble opinion, the House conferees surrendered to the other body on the only points of difference that really mean anything. We salvaged absolutely nothing out of the House bill.

Aside from mere technicalities that do not matter one way or another, the Sen-

ate-passed bill differed from the House version in three major respects.

First, unlike the House bill which amended the Higher Education Act to provide a loan adjustment payment to lending institutions at any time these adverse interest rate conditions occur during the life of that act, the Senate bill is completely separate legislation. This leaves the strong suggestion with the lending institutions that these adjustments are not to be a regular part of the insured loan program whenever necessitated by high interest rates, but are completely apart and may not be renewed after 2 years. I think this is very unfortunate, because the whole purpose of this provision is to reassure lending institutions that they will at least break even on student loans.

The House bill was strictly limited to the matter of the adjustment allowance. Everyone will recall that the student loan bill was brought before this House under suspension so that no amendments could be offered. However, the Senate amended the bill in ways never considered by the House or even by our subcommittee on education. The second major point on which the House capitulated was on one such amendment. The Senate bill contained a provision to prohibit participating banks from restricting insured loans to their own depositors. There were indications that rather than accept such a restriction the banks would simply withdraw from the program and devote their loan funds to more profitable purposes. This, of course, would defeat the purpose of the entire legislation. Also, banks alone would not be affected, but credit unions which by law must require borrowers to be members, and labor unions who make loans to students, but usually only to the children of members.

The House agreed to a compromise on this provision, but the compromise simply orders the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a determination of the effects of such practices and then authorizes the Secretary to do by regulation what the Senate bill would have mandated by legislation.

The point is that none of these provisions was included in the House bill, and for a very good reason. There was not one iota of testimony before our committee concerning the subject of this provision, and, I might add, virtually nothing before the Senate committee. We were forced to legislate in the dark simply to get a bill passed.

The third major difference was the provision in the Senate bill which amended three other student assistance programs to increase their authorizations for fiscal 1970 and 1971 by a total of $240 million. The other body never held one single day of hearings on these authorization increases.

These figures not only are far in excess of the budget, but they virtually double the higher student aid figures already voted by the House in the 1970 HEW appropriations bill.

In the extremely unlikely event that the Senate actually agreed to the appropriation of such funds and the House concurred for fiscal 1970, we would have ended any chance to hold to the budget. A far likelier result of this reckless action is to raise false hopes that virtually unlimited student aid will be available this year.

This bill was passed in the House without any opportunity for amendments and now is brought back to the House with increased authorizations totaling nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, on every item covered in the Senate bill and not found in any form in the House bill, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN)—the distinguished chairwoman of the Special Subcommittee on Education—had planned extensive hearings. That is the proper course—that is normal procedure—find the facts and then legislate on that basis. The work planned by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) should not have been preempted by a conference committee.

I hope this body takes a long, hard look before it again agrees to consider proposed legislation of this magnitude under a gag rule.

In order for this badly needed student loan program to serve its purpose, I will reluctantly support this bill. The initial delay in passage of this legislation lies with those unwilling to let this body work its will.

But, Mr. Speaker, what really is disturbing is the great semantic game that the House and Senate has played by calling this the Emergency Student Loan Act.

How much of an emergency was there when this conference took 5 weeks to conclude?

How much of an emergency was there when we are already 5 weeks into the present school year?

Or was the term "emergency" used merely as a means into lulling the House into failure to take proper action on this bill in regard to those students who are involved in disorder on our campuses?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding to me and wish to commend him for his very significant role in connection with securing adoption of this conference report.

I rise in support of this bill and urge this body adopt the conference report today.

I think it is of major importance to keep clearly in mind that the purpose of this bill is to help students secure loans to assist their education. There is no requirement that any bank participate in the student loan program involved in this bill. In the modern money market any bank can make loans which will yield it a more substantial return than will be possible to obtain from student loans. Even with the special allowance provided for in this bill that will be true. But this special allowance will, we earnestly hope and expect, cause many banks in the country to participate in making badly needed loans when the economics of the present money market might well otherwise have kept them from doing so.

I call that fact to the attention of my colleagues once again as we prepare to vote on adoption of this conference report. As I have indicated on this floor before, I own some bank stock. This stock is in Oregon banks and was originally acquired a considerable number of years ago because of my desire to support and be involved in an industry of very considerable importance to the citizens of my State. Although I have never inquired and do not know, I expect and indeed hope that both such Oregon banks have made loans to students to help them secure a desired and desirable education.

The amount of gain that either of these banks will make under the provisions of this bill is apt to be quite small, and the gain, if any, accruing to my stock ownership extremely small. But I feel that the gain to students and to the cause of education will be very substantial.

For that reason I rise in support of this bill and I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for just 1 minute?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, nothing has changed in this legislation since it was first considered in the House except to make it worse. There is no antidemonstration amendment. The interest rate on these Government-guaranteed loans still goes to 10 percent with 3 percent of it paid for by the taxpayers. The only thing that has changed in this legislation as it left the House has been to bust the budget by about $230 million or $240 million.

Mr. PERKINS. To be exact, $240 million. There is $100 million for fiscal year 1970 and $140 million for fiscal year 1971. However, we feel that outside of the increased authorizations, the House prevailed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report and was proud to serve as a conferee. The House position has been essentially upheld. The increase in the authorization for three higher education programs was not a part of the House bill but a majority of the House conferees receded on this point.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the August 1, 1969, starting date for the incentive payment is not what I would have liked. July 1 as the House bill adopted was preferable. But I am persuaded the August 1 expective date will treat equitably both students and lending institutions. The record of banking institutions in Wisconsin, for example, is excellent in this past August—having granted more loans this year than last year. This record of willingness to assist students is a good one and it is a part of the reason why this conference report is so urgent. We dare not let down the commitment to both the students and lending institutions.

The length of time needed by the conference to resolve our differences is unfortunate but with adoption of the conference report today the insured loan program can continue and grow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.

BOGGS). The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 pro tempore. 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 326, nays 10, answered "present" 2, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—326

Adair	de la Garza	Johnson, Pa.
Adams	Delaney	Jonas
Addabbo	Dellenback	Jones, Tenn.
Alexander	Denney	Karth
Anderson, Calif.	Dennis	Kastenmeier
	Dent	Kazen
Anderson, Ill.	Derwinski	Kee
Anderson, Tenn.	Donohue	Keith
	Dorn	King
Andrews, Ala.	Dowdy	Kleppe
Andrews, N. Dak.	Downing	Kluczynski
	Dulski	Koch
Annunzio	Duncan	Kuykendall
Ashbrook	Dwyer	Kyros
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Langen
Ayres	Eilberg	Leggett
Baring	Erlenborn	Lennon
Barrett	Esch	Lipscomb
Beall, Md.	Eshleman	Long, La.
Belcher	Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Bell, Calif.	Fallon	Lowenstein
Bennett	Fish	McCarthy
Betts	Flood	McClure
Bevill	Foley	McCulloch
Biaggi	Ford, Gerald R.	McDade
Biester	Ford, William D.	McDonald, Mich.
Bingham		
Blanton	Foreman	McEwen
Blatnik	Fountain	McFall
Boggs	Fraser	McKneally
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald, Mass.
Bolling	Frey	
Bow	Friedel	MacGregor
Brademas	Fuqua	Madden
Brinkley	Galifianakis	Mahon
Brock	Gallagher	Mailliard
Broomfield	Gaydos	Mann
Brotzman	Gettys	Marsh
Brown, Mich.	Giaimo	Mathias
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Broyhill, N.C.	Gilbert	May
Buchanan	Goldwater	Mayne
Burke, Mass.	Gonzalez	Melcher
Burleson, Tex.	Goodling	Meskill
Burlison, Mo.	Green, Oreg.	Michel
Burton, Utah	Green, Pa.	Mikva
Bush	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Button	Grover	Miller, Ohio
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Minish
Byrnes, Wis.	Gude	Mink
Cabell	Hagan	Minshall
Caffery	Halpern	Mize
Carter	Hamilton	Mizell
Casey	Hammer-schmidt	Mollohan
Celler		Monagan
Chamberlain	Hanley	Moorhead
Chappell	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan
Clancy	Harrington	Morse
Clausen, Don H.	Harsha	Morton
	Harvey	Mosher
Clawson, Del	Hathaway	Moss
Clay	Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.
Cleveland	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Cohelan	Hechler, W. Va.	Myers
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Collins	Helstoski	Nedzi
Colmer	Henderson	Nelsen
Conable	Hicks	Nichols
Conte	Hogan	Nix
Corbett	Holifield	Obey
Corman	Horton	O'Hara
Coughlin	Hosmer	Olsen
Cowger	Hull	O'Neill, Mass.
Cramer	Hungate	Ottinger
Culver	Hunt	Passman
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Patten
Daddario	Ichord	Pepper
Daniel, Va.	Jacobs	Perkins
Daniels, N.J.	Jarman	Pettis
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin
Pickle	Satterfield	Udall
Pike	Schadeberg	Ullman
Pirnie	Scherle	Van Deerlin
Poage	Scheuer	Vander Jagt
Podell	Schneebeli	Vanik
Poff	Schwengel	Vigorito
Preyer, N.C.	Sebelius	Waggonner
Price, Tex.	Shipley	Watkins
Pryor, Ark.	Shriver	Watson
Purcell	Sikes	Weicker
Railsback	Skubitz	Whalen
Randall	Slack	White
Rarick	Smith, Calif.	Whitehurst
Reid, Ill.	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Reid, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.	Widnall
Rhodes	Snyder	Wiggins
Riegle	Springer	Williams
Roberts	Stafford	Wilson, Bob
Robison	Staggers	Winn
Rogers, Colo.	Stanton	Wolff
Rogers, Fla.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.	Wydler
Rooney, Pa.	Stokes	Wylie
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wyman
Roth	Stuckey	Yates
Roudebush	Sullivan	Yatron
Roybal	Symington	Young
Ruth	Taft	Zablocki
Ryan	Talcott	Zion
St Germain	Thompson, N.J.	Zwach
St. Onge	Thomson, Wis.	
Sandman	Tiernan	

NAYS—10

Abbitt	Gross	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Hall	Thompson, Ga.
Blackburn	Landgrebe	
Burke, Fla.	Lukens	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Pelly	Quillen

NOT VOTING—93

Albert	Fisher	Powell
Arends	Flowers	Price, Ill.
Aspinall	Flynt	Pucinski
Berry	Fulton, Pa.	Quie
Brasco	Fulton, Tenn.	Rees
Bray	Garmatz	Reifel
Brooks	Gray	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Griffin	Rivers
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Hanna	Rosenthal
Cahill	Hansen, Idaho	Ruppe
Camp	Hastings	Saylor
Carey	Hays	Scott
Cederberg	Howard	Sisk
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Stephens
Conyers	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Taylor
Dawson	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Devine	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	Lloyd	Tunney
Diggs	Lujan	Utt
Dingell	McClory	Waldie
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Wampler
Edmondson	McMillan	Watts
Edwards, Calif.	Martin	Whalley
Edwards, La.	Meeds	Wilson, Charles H.
Evans, Colo.	Mills	
Farbstein	Montgomery	Wold
Fascell	O'Konski	Wright
Feighan	Patman	
Findley	Pollock	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

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 pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there were three points of difference between the Peace Corps authorization which passed the House and the bill which passed the Senate.

First. The House bill authorized $101,100,000 for fiscal year 1970. The Senate authorization was $95,800,000.

The conference split the difference between these figures so that the authorization is $98,450,000.

Second. The House bill prohibited the use of any Peace Corps funds to bring volunteers from other countries to the United States under the Volunteers to America program or any other such program.

This amendment was adopted on the floor of the House.

The Senate bill authorized the use of Peace Corps funds for this purpose.

The Senate receded. The prohibition in the House bill remains in effect.

Third. The third difference was an authorization in the Senate bill to contribute up to $300,000 for an international Peace Corps.

The House conferees opposed this provision. We finally reached agreement that contributions could be made for an international register of volunteers, which would provide information to interested organizations or governments as to the availability of volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we have brought back from conference is identical to the House bill except in two respects.

We split the difference on the funds authorized so that the figure is $2,550,000 below the amount that the House approved.

We also authorized contributions of Peace Corps funds, not to exceed $300,000, for an international register of volunteers.

I believe that we have served the House well, and I urge the approval of the conference report.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the House conferees agree to this $300,000 for—what is it—a register of volunteers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. The figure is just a ceiling. It is not an authorization. It is a $300,000 ceiling on the amount of Peace Corps funds that can be used for this purpose. I do not believe they will be using that much.

Mr. GROSS. Ceilings around here have a habit of representing the amount of spending, do they not?

Mr. MORGAN. I have seen many authorizations pass here which turned out to be much higher than the appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we spend $300,000 to provide information to interested foreign organizations or governments as to the availability of volunteers?

Mr. MORGAN. This is just a register. The $300,000 or less can be spent only to establish this register, which will be a list of names. We did it to avoid getting involved in an international Peace Corps, which was in the bill that passed the other body. You recognize that we stood fast on the amendment prohibiting any contribution to the Volunteers to America, which was written into the House bill on the House floor.

Mr. GROSS. This might well be construed as being only a little less worse than the other?

Mr. MORGAN. This is much less than the provision in the Senate bill. We have not authorized an international Peace Corps. This authorizes only a register where, when people are available, their names can be furnished to organizations or governments who want volunteers.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In furtherance of what the gentleman has been saying, let me say to my good friend from Iowa that this does represent a real diminution of the authority proposed in the Senate bill. They would have authorized this amount of money to carry on programs, which was the word that was used. So, as one of the compromises in this bill, we, trying to uphold the House position, changed that and we were successful in protecting our position. We limit it only to maintenance of a register. I would say further that the $300,000 figure is obviously an upper limit, and I for one would doubt that any substantial expenditure of that amount of money would be or could be used.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I suppose with the explanation of my friend from Indiana we can always be thankful for small favors, but I do not consider it very much of a favor to earmark $300,000 for this purpose.

Let me ask the gentleman one final question, if I may.

How many foreign countries, since the House bill was passed, have kicked out the Peace Corps or threatened to kick it out?

Mr. MORGAN. I think there has been one, possibly, Mr. GROSS, since the House passed the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Only one recently. As the Peace Corps is kicked out of foreign countries I assume the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will, since he is always amenable to reason, be more than glad to cut back on the appropriations for this organization.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. ADAIR. I rise in support of the conference report on the Peace Corps bill. The House conferees worked very diligently to uphold the position of this body, and I am satisfied that the result is a bill which will make possible an effective and improved Peace Corps program in fiscal year 1970.

Chairman MORGAN has explained in detail the changes made in conference. The dollar figure of $98,450,000 represents a compromise between the House and Senate figures, and is the smallest amount authorized for the Peace Corps since 1964.

However, I believe that this bill will enable the very competent Peace Corps Director, Joseph H. Blatchford, to continue his efforts to improve the agency's efficiency and effectiveness.

The Peace Corps, under Mr. Blatchford's leadership, is moving in a deliberate and reasonable manner toward an emphasis on quality rather than quantity. I agree with this approach. It is far better to have fewer volunteers with more skills that meet the needs of the host countries, rather than to emphasize the numbers of volunteers. Also this approach is more consistent with this year's Peace Corps bill, which recognizes the need for fiscal restraint while endorsing the continuation of this worthwhile program.

I urge your support of the conference report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, we will continue now with the consideration of the Export Control Act which comes to us under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. We will conclude that bill today and there is no further program for the balance of the week.

In further response to the gentleman's inquiry, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday we will have the call of the Consent Calendar.

We have also scheduled for consideration on Monday two bills under suspension of the rules as follows:

H.R. 14030, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; and

H.R. 14195, the Federal Contested Elections Act.

For Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar and, also, for Tuesday and the balance of the week, the first bill to be considered is H.R. 13827, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, under an open rule, with 3 hours of general debate.

This bill is to be followed by the consideration of H.R. 13950, the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, again under an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

Following the disposition of that bill there will be for the consideration of the House H.R. 14001, the Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969, subject to a rule being granted.

I understand the committee completed action on that bill this morning. We would hope that a rule will be granted and that we will be able to consider that bill next week.

As the gentleman knows, conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In view of the light schedule of business on Monday, would it be possible to consider the rules for the first two bills listed for Tuesday and the balance of the week?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further; no, I am afraid not. We have notified the Members that we will only consider suspensions on Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is no prospect for the consideration of any appropriation bill next week?

Mr. BOGGS. No, there is not. There are none ready at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT EXTENSION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 575

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. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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 any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now printed in the bill. 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 with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 575 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4293. A bill to provide for the continuation of authority to regulate exports. As introduced by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill called for a simple 4-year extension of the existing Export Control Act. It was reported with an amendment to provide for a reduced 2-year extension in order to afford Congress an opportunity for reexamination within a relatively short period. The 2-year extension was considered preferable in view of the significant changes which have taken place and continue to take place in our foreign policy since the Export Control Act was passed in 1949. The shorter extension was also deemed necessary because of the possibility of future changes in the U.S. balance-of-payments position, the increased availability to Eastern European countries of goods restricted for export by the United States, and the rapid expansion of Soviet and other Eastern European markets, which now present a significant opportunity for American businessmen.

For the purpose of reducing costs to American exporters, the bill was further amended in committee to direct the administration to revise reporting, recordkeeping and export documentation requirements, consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. This amendment would save American exporters an estimated $100 million annually, and was deemed especially appropriate in view of recent developments in documentation, computerization, and containerization of merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 575 in order that H.R. 4293 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has ably stated, House Resolution 575 makes in order for consideration H.R. 4293 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for an additional 2 years—through June 30, 1971. Additionally, the bill directs the administration, in carrying out the enforcement provisions of the act, to design and develop reporting techniques which reduce the cost to American exporters with respect to recordkeeping and export documentation required by the act.

The Export Control Act of 1949 grants to the President the authority to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States. The act authorizes such control for three purposes: national security, foreign policy, and shortage of supply. Under these limitations, current export policy includes embargo on exports to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba and, strict limitations on export to Russia, and Eastern European countries. In furtherance of foreign policy, to cite one example, an almost total embargo on exports to Southern Rhodesia has been in force for several years.

The administrative mechanism of the Export Control Act is carried out by the Department of Commerce which controls U.S. exports through issuance of an export license, to qualified exporters.

The 1949 act has been extended periodically since 1949. The most recent was enacted in 1965 when a 4-year extension was provided.

The bill provides for only a 2-year extension, primarily because the committee wishes to undertake a total evaluation of the program in the near future. Additionally, language was written in the bill requiring improvement in reporting, recordkeeping, and documentation because testimony from U.S. exporter interests indicate that the present recordkeeping system was excessively expensive to carry out. An estimated $100 million can be saved by American exporters, without loss of any necessary information, with an improved system of recordkeeping.

Supplemental views have been filed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY). He notes that in 1949, when the Export Control Act was first adopted, the situation in Europe was substantially different than today. He believes we should reevaluate the program in light of changed circumstances. We are no longer the only technically advanced nation in the Western World. By eliminating or strictly limiting the sale of nonstrategic goods to Communist or unfriendly countries, we limit our export market severely. Additionally, continued pressure on our allies to follow our lead in this matter has placed a strain on our relations with friendly nations. He points out that trade of Eastern Europe with non-Communist nations in 1967 was almost $14 billion. The United States has virtually cut itself off from this trade between allies and Eastern Europe. He believes in view of the situation, Congress should structure the act to bring it in line with reality.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) has also filed supplemental views indicating that he believes the act should be amended to authorize the President to exercise control over drug exports, which are likely to be unlawfully shipped back to the United States. He has contacted the Attorney General and, if a favorable report is received, he will offer such an amendment.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE) has also filed supplemental views. He points out that restrictions in the current law require, as a condition to obtain a license for exporting wheat and feed grains, that 50 percent of such export be shipped in U.S.-flag vessels. He points out the high cost of using American vessels. In the last few years, shipments of wheat and feed grain has fallen off—at the same time it is rising in other countries. He notes that in the last

3 years not a single bushel of wheat has been sold subject to cargo shipment regulations. This has the effect of neither protecting our merchant marine nor assisting our agricultural producers in disposing of surplus. He believes policy should be revised.

Supplemental views have also been filed jointly by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE). They point out that the Export Control Act authorizes the President to prohibit the export of material to any country without notification to, or approval of, the Congress. They believe such a complete embargo is tantamount to economic warfare, and therefore, the consent of Congress should be required. They propose to offer an amendment along these lines at the appropriate time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) has also filed supplemental views. He, too, believes that the economic and political realities of today and in the 1970's are fundamentally different than the situation during the postwar period. He proposes an amendment that requires the President to take into consideration the availability of a proposed export product for any nation we have a defense treaty commitment with in determining whether an export license should be granted for its sale abroad. He believes that to the extent our friends and allies operate under liberalized trading agreements, that we should revise our thinking in the matter rather than unilaterally removing ourselves from competing with them. He believes that this may be of assistance in arriving at mutual agreements with our friends and allies on which items should be made available and which restricted.

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

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, having 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. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

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. 4293, with Mr. ABERNETHY 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 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency met and, by a vote of 35 to 0, reported H.R. 4293, as amended, to extend and amend the Export Control Act of 1949.

The act provides the President with the authority to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States for reasons of national security and foreign policy, and to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand.

In the course of the hearings before the subcommittee on international trade, chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY), the question was raised whether the export control programs might be continued under other legislative authority, such as the Trading With the Enemy Act, and whether extension of the Export Control Act was necessary.

It was pointed out, in response that the Trading With the Enemy Act contains different criminal sanctions for violations than those found in the Export Control Act, and makes no provision for the civil penalty provided for in the Export Control Act.

A good deal of the flexibility available to the administration in the conduct of the control program would thus be lost.

Originally the bill H.R. 4293 called for a simple extension of the Export Control Act for 4 years.

As a result of 5 days of hearings, the subcommittee recommended an amendment which would provide for a 2-year, rather than a 4-year extension, in order to afford the Congress an opportunity for review within a relatively short period.

Extensions of this length have been more typical in the past since initial enactment of the act in 1949.

In view of possible changes in the near future in our foreign policy vis-a-vis Eastern Europe and in our foreign trade and balance of payments it was felt that a 2-year extension is more appropriate at this time.

A second amendment provides that reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements should be designed to reduce costs to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Testimony by both administration and public witnesses indicated that recent innovations in documentation and computer techniques point up the need for the Department of Commerce to revise and update its procedures for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics.

Superfluous requirements, according to testimony received are costing American exporters an added $100 million annually. Hence, the committee is pleased to recommend legislation which would help to make American exports more competitive, without subsidy, particularly at a time when our trade surplus is all too slender.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4293, to extend the Export Control Act for 2 years. I think it is essential that Members understand what this legislation is and what it is designed to accomplish.

The Export Control Act provides the statutory basis for control over the great bulk of U.S. exports. Its policy objectives are to control exports to the extent necessary for reasons of national security, foreign policy, and short supply.

First. Section 3(a) of the act provides for denial of any requested authorization to export commodities or technical data from the United States "to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States if the President shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States." In administering the act, the Department of Commerce pursues certain key principles to fulfill this directive:

Controls are exercised over U.S. commodities and technology having significant national security aspects.

Particularly close control is exercised over the export to the Eastern European and Asiatic Communist countries of commodities and technical data that the United States and our COCOM allies have agreed to subject to multilateral control.

Control lists are continually reviewed to retain or tighten controls when warranted, and to relax or remove controls when no longer warranted.

Applications for licenses on individual export transactions are approved or denied following a determination on whether they would be detrimental to the national security and welfare. Such a determination is based on a full study of such factors as the nature of the item involved, the availability abroad of comparable commodities and the likely end-use or end-user, whether civilian or military.

The act permits peaceful trade with Eastern European countries, and its administration by the Department of Commerce is designed to facilitate such trade.

Second. Controls over exports are exercised, as necessary, to further U.S. foreign policy objectives and to fulfill U.S. obligations resulting from international agreements. At present, controls under this provision are exercised on exports to the Middle East, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Cuba, the Far East Communist countries, and on nuclear-related commodities in support of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Third. The controls are used to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. At present, only nickel and copper products are under short supply control.

The bill as reported would add a new subsection (d) to section 6 of the act. This provides that reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be designed to reduce costs to exporters to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Action to revise these requirements is to be included in the first quarterly report issued after revisions are made. This requirement that the Department of Commerce revise and update its techniques for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics gives recognition to the developments which have and are taking place in documentation, computerization, and containerization of merchandise facilitating the movement of goods in our export markets. It is anticipated that the change will facilitate our trade and save our exporters substantial sums of money.

The act, in its present form, provides needed broad flexibility for the President to cope with any contingency. It is essential to give the President such flexibility during these troubled times.

I urge Members to support H.R. 4293.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Export Control Act was enacted in 1949 as a temporary measure and as a necessary weapon in the evolving cold war. At that time Western Europe, still economically weak from the ravages of the Second World War, appeared to the Congress to be in realistic danger of attack from the monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc under the leadership of Stalin; and it was further believed, comparing our industrial might with both Eastern and Western Europe at that time, that goods withheld from the Soviets by means of controls on American commodities could not be elsewhere obtained.

Responding to the aggressive, monolithic communistic structure which confronted the free world in 1949–50, two separate administrative agencies were established to impose restrictions on free world trade with Eastern Europe. One was our own Office of Export Control and the other was the combined COCOM apparatus by which Western Europe, Japan, and the United States sought cooperatively to withhold certain goods and commodities from the Communist-bloc countries.

It is normal for a country to impose export controls in case of war or other overriding national emergencies. Our 20-year export controls are not of that character. With specific exceptions—as when there are shortages of particular commodities because of strikes or other reasons—the whole machinery of U.S. control has been directed to one end—to severely limit exports to the Communist countries.

This is illustrated by the fact that these two mechanisms, the Office of Export Control and the COCOM, both designed to restrict trade with the Communist nations, have never been closely coordinated. For example, commodities such as milk and cream, not controlled by COCOM, require a validated license for export to some countries of Eastern Europe, but not for export to Poland and Rumania. The wide differential in goods we control unilaterally, but which are not controlled by COCOM, continues in the face of the congressional mandate set forth in section 2(2) of the Export Control Act that:

> It is the policy of the United States to formulate, reformulate, and apply such controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and to formulate a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations.

The Subcommittee on International Trade received testimony indicating that we continue to unilaterally control hundreds of categories of goods on political grounds. Testimony taken by the subcommittee indicated that even now, 2,029 commodity categories are under control for such countries as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R., while 1,753 of these are controlled for Poland and Rumania, at the same time that COCOM has designated 552 categories for control.

The United States has demonstrated an almost compulsive tendency to regard the denial of trade with Communist nations as a primary instrument or weapon of the cold war, whether trade be in strategic or nonstrategic goods. The countries of Western Europe and Japan, on the other hand, have sought through COCOM to prevent strategic exports to Communist bloc nations, but they have regarded trade in nonstrategic goods and commodities to be not only in their commercial interest but also a means of reducing East-West tensions.

West European allies have seen the embargo as playing into the hands of Stalin. It enabled him to consolidate control in the Communist bloc and forced the small Eastern European countries closer to the Soviet Union. On balance, they have seen the embargo as resulting in a strengthening of the military-industrial sector of the Communist bloc. Under the circumstances, it has been advantageous to the Kremlin.

The United States has exerted a tremendous effort to enforce the embargo. U.S. measures have been so stringent that we have risked American political good will with our allies. West Europeans have further resented the accompanying American economic intelligence work within their countries. They have found U.S. pressures alien to a voluntary alliance.

What has been the net effect of this costly and, to our allies, abrasive effort? Any realistic appraisal must admit that the Soviet Union has become a highly industrialized, technologically sophisticated nation with a military force capable of engaging any adversary in the world. The embargo has failed to shift the balance of power. Communism has not been, and it is now even less likely to be, blockaded out of existence.

The Soviet economy, unlike the smaller East European countries, is practically self-sufficient. Total Soviet imports represent a mere 4 percent of the country's gross national product. It is rich in natural resources. Modern science permits great flexibility through substitute alternatives. A bottleneck approach simply does not work with a nation of such natural endowments and technological level. Besides, the embargo items are not unknown to the Communist intelligence network and, in some respects, the list has aided Soviet planners with important information for determining what commodities to purchase, produce, or stockpile.

At this stage of development, the United States has at least as much to gain as the Communist countries from mutual trade and the barring of this trade today is hurting us more than them. This is true because they can find substitute suppliers for almost everything important, while we cannot find substitute markets in a time when we need more exports desperately, and the concept that we have almost all the advanced know-how and products while they have very little is out of date. As far as the export controls are concerned, we have already lost much leverage for concessions from the Communist countries. At the same time, the controls on commercial goods continue not only as an irritant to our allies but as a loss in business to U.S. firms.

If there is any question about this, we need only consider the fact that the trade of Eastern Europe with the non-Communist world in 1967 was almost $14 billion, of which Western Europe and Japan accounted for almost $9 billion. The United States is virtually a nonparticipant in this trade; while we account for about 16 percent of world exports, we have only about 3/10 of 1 percent of the exports to Eastern Europe. It is worth mentioning, too, that East-West trade has more than doubled during the past 10 years and has grown faster than trade either within the Eastern European bloc or among the Western countries themselves. Over the past decade, world trade has been growing at about 8 percent a year, while East-West trade has been growing at about 12 percent. But because of the frozen trade policy pursued by the United States, we have forfeited any advantage from this increased commerce, and in so doing have given other trading nations a most unique and enviable competitive position.

From the standpoint of our national security and the conduct of our foreign affairs, which of course remain paramount in our consideration of export controls, as well as from domestic economic considerations, we have moved into a period in which the Congress should maintain a close, in-depth review of our export control laws with a view to reshaping them in light of political, economic, and technological changes taking place in Western Europe, Japan, and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Just as the special drawing rights needed to be created in order for the world economy to grow and for the U.S. economy to grow with it, so,

too, must long standing nontariff barriers to our export trade, including those we have ourselves created, such as our export controls, be more closely and more frequently scrutinized as to their necessity.

Hence, the committee voted unanimously to reduce from 4 years to 2 the time for which the act should be extended.

Mr. Chairman, the direct exclusion of so many of our exports from the Eastern European market has not been without added side effects which have contributed still further to the deterioration of our competitive position in world trade. The desire to severely limit exports to the Communist countries has, over the years, spawned a system of enforcement implemented by an extremely elaborate machinery and a great deal of involved procedure without regard for the cost, both to the government and to the exporter. The elaborate enforcement procedures have continued after better means of control have been discovered. For a long time, proposals for simplifying the policing of the Export Control Act met with little or no action by the Office of Export Control.

Until the Committee on Banking and Currency voted unanimously in favor of the amendment offered in committee by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. REES, providing that reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be designed to reduce costs to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics, the way in which the enforcement of the current Act was being carried out was costing American exporters an added $100 million annually just to process one outmoded document, the shippers' export declaration. Until then, the American export community had been meeting for over a year and a half with the Office of Export Control in attempts to do away with one wasteful practice.

The Subcommittee on International Trade heard convincing testimony on this problem from the export community. And in testimony before the subcommittee, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Kenneth Davis admitted that—

> Recent developments in documentation, computerization, containerization of merchandise, and continuous movement of goods require revision and updating of our techniques for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics.

Yet it was not unti lthe Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote recommended adoption of the amendment that Secretary of Commerce Stans announced important changes, effective October 1 and November 1, in export documentation requirements consistent with the amendment and the testimony of public witnesses.

Prior to these changes, which are described in the Federal Register—volume 34, No. 180—for September 19, it has been necessary to prepare a separate document to accompany every export shipment with a value of over $100. The cost of preparing and processing each shippers' export declaration has been estimated at more than $160. The export shipments from the United States number between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 annually, valued at more than $30 billion. This means that many millions of separate pieces of paper have had to be separately prepared to satisfy the Office of Export Control's requirements. This method of policing each individual shipment labored under the misapprehension that all shipments violate the Export Control Act until and unless proven otherwise.

In this philosophy of enforcing the act, the Office of Export Control in its 83d quarterly report, covering activities for the first quarter of 1968, discussed the results of its work. For the preceding fiscal year, when more than 6 million shippers' export declarations were caused to be prepared, it is stated that:

> During 1967 the Department's Office of Export Control opened 169 preliminary inquiries and 210 new investigations. Last year these investigations resulted in the referral of 29 cases to the Department's Office of the General Counsel for consideration of administrative or criminal-civil actions. The Department's Office of the General Counsel referred six of these cases to the Department of Justice for consideration of criminal prosecution.
>
> During 1967 the Department recalled to the United States one shipment valued at $13,854. In this instance, there were reasonable grounds to believe the shipment would ultimately be diverted to a proscribed destination.
>
> Under statutory authority separate from the Export Control Act, the Bureau of Customs is empowered to seize and have forfeited to the U.S. commodities thereunder. During 1967 District Directors of Customs seized 208 shipments, which the Customs Bureau appraised at $29,276.
>
> During 1967 this civil penalty was invoked once, against a carrier, who was fined $1,400 for minor violations of the export regulations.

From this experience it seems obvious that the method of policing practiced until now did not pass the test of practicability. It was almost like diverting the entire military attention of the United States to another possible annoyance in Anguilla.

Effective October 1, exporters will not be required to file shipper's export declarations for general-license shipments—those not requiring a validated export license from the Office of Export Control—to free-world countries when the shipments are valued at $250 or less. This change alone could eliminate 1½ million documents a year, or almost 20 percent of the total now required. At the same time, it would affect statistically only about 1 percent of the dollar value of U.S. exports.

Effective October 1 high volume exporters meeting requirements established by the Office of Export Control and Bureau of the Census have the option of filing monthly export declarations instead of a declaration for each export shipment to free world countries of goods under Department of Commerce jurisdiction. Reports may be filed in specified written summary form or provided appropriately on computer tape or punched cards that are compatible with systems used by the Bureau of the Census.

This change will reduce paperwork on export shipments as the number of qualified exporters availing themselves of this option increases.

Under a proposed rule change to become effective November 1, exporters no longer will be required to submit export declarations to the Bureau of Customs for authentication before loading merchandise moving under Department of Commerce general licenses to free world countries by air or sea. Instead, they may submit the documents directly to carriers that agree to review the declarations for acceptability before loading and to forward them subsequently to Customs.

This proposed change could affect between 85 and 90 percent of all declarations covering shipments to foreign countries other than Canada, which already is exempt from the preauthentication rule. The effect could be to reduce the expense of documentation processing and runner time, reduce storage and demurrage costs caused by delays in paperwork, and speed export shipments.

Mr. Chairman, without danger to our national security, this represents an important step to our efforts to expand our country's commercial exports. The action of the committee to which this reform is related constitutes a congressional mandate, the rejection of which now could only be interpreted as a repudiation of a significant measure to expand peaceful trade.

I urge adoption of the committee amendments when they are offered.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is the definition of "peaceful goods"?

Mr. ASHLEY. That of course is an administrative judgment which is reached through a committee system of representatives from our defense establishment, representatives from the Congressional establishment, representatives from the Department of State and so forth. They arrive at these definitions.

In response to the gentleman's question, I think he will be amused to find that some of the goods we are excluding include the following: insecticides, weed killers, waxes, cotton tire cord, tobacco cures, water purifiers, prepared knots and tufts, cotton or wool, for broom or broom making.

These are some of the commodities that are included in the restricted list.

Mr. GROSS. Would tools and machines to make automobile crankshafts be "peaceful goods"?

Mr. ASHLEY. It would depend, I suppose, on their ultimate use. If they are used for automobile making, I doubt if they would be considered strategic, that is, with respect to COCOM, but I would have to look at our own export control list to make sure.

Mr. GROSS. Could you use an internal combustion engine to power a tank or an airplane?

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman is quite

right. If I understood his question, he is quite right. There is simply no real effort on the part of our Export Control Office to distinguish between those goods and products such as brooms and wigs, which are obviously only for peaceful use, and other products which might perfectly well have a use of strategic importance to the consumer.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE).

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Export Control Act and the basic reason for its extension without crippling amendment is to provide the President with flexibility in controlling commercial trade with the Communist bloc. Under the terms of the act, the President has authority to license trade or to restrict it if the national security is involved. Those who support the act, without amendment, look to the Executive branch to make crucial day-to-day decisions on individual commodities and products if our security is not to be jeopardized.

Since the list of items which properly should be embargoed frequently changes—sometimes quite rapidly by congressional standards—the Export Control Act of 1949 provides the best protection by calling upon the Department of Commerce to continually review and regulate our trade flow with the East.

Many feel the Department of Commerce exceeded its authority under the act, however, in 1963. While negotiating a massive wheat sale to the Soviet Union, representatives for the then President Kennedy required at least 50 percent of the shipment to be transacted on American-flag bottoms. The U.S. merchant fleet was unable to accommodate the surge in business at that time, so the requirement was waived on much of the 1963 consigment. But the Department, acting under extreme pressure from shipping interests, and certain unions promulgated regulations which made the 50 percent cargo preference, and other part-cargo requirements, a continuing obligation and prerequisite to trade in several agricultural commodities.

In 1963 wheat was in very short supply in the bloc countries. Today, regrettably, the Soviet Union has a surplus of wheat along with every major producing nation in the world. Competition for wheat sales is intense. Under restrictions imposed by cargo preferences and part cargo requirements, the United States has been priced out of the market in bloc countries, to the positive detriment of shippers and farmers in the United States.

In supplemental views to the committee report on the extension of the Export Control Act, I urged the Nixon administration to repeal these discriminatory regulations. Issued under apparent authority vested by the Export Control Act, they bear little relation to the language or legislative intent of the act. Students of these preferences contend that they are wholly unsupportable and illegal as artificial restrictions to purely commercial trade.

I call attention to my supplemental views, and sincerely hope that other Members will join me in urging the Department of Commerce to repeal the cargo preferences on wheat and feed grains trade with certain bloc countries:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

The Department of Commerce should discontinue its practice of imposing discriminatory shipping requirements as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and feed grains to several East Europe destinations. These restrictions became effective at the time of a 1963 Presidential decision to sell a large quantity of wheat to the Soviet Union. Since that time, they have remained in force, and having effectively denied a significant market to U.S. grain shippers and farmers.

Since the 1963 Soviet wheat purchase, the Department of Commerce has administered the Export Control Act in such a fashion that at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to several Eastern European countries is required to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels. Testimony before committees of both Houses of Congress has convinced me that these restrictions, imposed on all such sales whether or not they are "Government sponsored" or purely private commercial transactions, are in violation of at least 30 commercial treaties in force between the United States and other nations of the world.

In addition to the questionable legality of the Commerce regulations requiring cargo preferences on grains, there has been an unacceptable practical result The preferences deny U.S. grainmen markets which they desperately need in a period of world oversupply and buyer's market.

The preferences make the U.S. price unacceptably high. From U.S. gulf ports to Black Sea ports, U.S.-flag shipping rates average about $18 per long ton on ships of over 20,000 tons displacement. Comparable foreign vessels will ship the commodities for about $7 per long ton. This disparity in shipping rates has been the reason, by and large, for the failure of American sales in the years the preferences have been in force. During fiscal years 1965 through 1968, the United States shipped just under 2.5 million bushels of wheat to affected destinations. During the same period of time, Canada shipped 551 million bushels; Australia shipped 53 million bushels; and France shipped 102 million bushels. The United States was able to make sales in countries where the restrictions do not apply. In those same years, our sellers shipped 138 million bushels to Poland and Yugoslavia.

I considered offering an amendment to the Export Control Act placing a specific prohibition against the preferences. However, I declined to do so because the origin of the restriction is not in a congressional act but in a decision made by the executive branch. The preferences, therefore, should be removed by the executive branch.

In the past 3 years not a single bushel of U.S. wheat has been sold to any nation subject to cargo preference shipments. Thus, any supposed protection or benefit for the U.S. merchant marine is wholly illusory. The 75,000 members of the maritime union have had no shipments to carry; therefore, they have had no work guaranteed them by the preferences. On the other hand, 1 million U.S. wheat-farmers and thousands of shippers and consignors have been frozen out of a market in which they otherwise would have been competitive bidders.

Meanwhile, the U.S. surplus of wheat has risen to over 800 million bushels, and could soon reach 1 billion bushels. This year, severe allotment cuts for wheat farmers were necessary due to oversupply at home and abroad.

The preference wrongfully interfere with sales of nonstrategic goods. They contribute to the financial burdens of the United States, for they require grain to be stored at home, at Government expense, when it could be sold abroad. Most important of all, they contribute to the crisis of our faltering agricultural exports, which is partially responsible for disgracefully low market prices for commodities in the United States.

Elimination of cargo preferences would in no way curb the flexibility which the administration desires in the Export Control Act. Just as before, any shipment to any Eastern European country could be prohibited for reasons of national security or foreign policy or domestic short supply. Cargo preferences in no way contribute to the stated legislative goals of the Export Control Act.

I support the administration's desire for flexibility. To this end, I have supported a straight extension of the act, without amendment. But I call upon the executive branch to eliminate discriminatory restrictions on purely commercial trade. They are probably illegal; they are certainly unsupportable from a budgetary point of view. They are clearly not in the best interests of all the people.

I should observe that cargo preferences on "Government-sponsored shipments" have historic precedent. Those shipments, such as food-for-peace consignments, are entirely independent of any criticism I have advanced here. As national policy, we have decided that Government-sponsored shipments should be consigned to a large extent on U.S.-flag ships. I have no basis for opposing that policy—there is good evidence to show that without those preferences, the U.S. merchant fleet would become insolvent through inability to compete on the high seas.

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

Mr. MIZE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE), and join him in urging the Department of Commerce to eliminate discriminatory cargo preferences and part cargo requirements on shipments of wheat and feed grains to selected Eastern European destinations.

The executive branch has the authority, under the terms of the Export Control Act, to restrict or prohibit shipment of any commodity or product to any bloc country for national security reasons. I would urge nothing to deny the President that authority.

Cargo preferences, however, are based upon Commerce regulations using the Export Control Act as apparent legislative authority. There is, of course, nothing in the language or legislative history of the act which calls for cargo preferences on commercial shipments of wheat and feed grains. The preferences are in violation of commercial agreements this Nation has an obligation to honor. They are applied to commodities determined to be nonstrategic. Their effect has been to deny a lucrative market to U.S. farmers and shippers that they otherwise might well enjoy as competitive bidders.

During the past 3 years, there has been no U.S. sale of wheat or feed grains to any Nation covered by the preferences. Meanwhile, our Canadian, Australian, and French competitors have conducted a lively trade in wheat with those very countries.

I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas for his forthright and well-reasoned supplemental views calling for elimination of cargo preferences on pure-

ly commercial sales. There could be no more appropriate time for such action, for never has competition for commodity sales been more intense among exporting nations. U.S. farmers have an 800-million-bushel carryover in wheat that must, in substantial part, be sold abroad if prices in the market place are to be improved. One million U.S. wheat producers, and thousands of consignors, have a direct financial stake in the elimination of cargo preferences on purely commercial sales.

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

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also wish to associate myself with the most important remarks of the gentleman from Kansas and to express the hope that they can be implemented. This is most important to our agricultural foreign trade.

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

Mr. MIZE. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my fellow Kansan on the Banking and Currency Committee (Mr. MIZE) in calling on the Department of Commerce to discontinue discriminatory shipping requirements as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and feed grains to Eastern Europe.

Since 1963, the Department has required at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to selected Eastern European countries to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels. The unintended result has been a complete cessation of such sales. U.S.-flag shipping rates average about $18 per long ton compared to about $7 per long ton on foreign vessels. Thus, this executive branch decision has made the U.S. price for these commodities unacceptably high, and not a single bushel of U.S. wheat has been sold to the nations in question for 3 years.

The publicized justification for this regulation was the protection of our merchant marine. However, since the regulation has eliminated all of these sales, there obviously can be no benefits to shipping interests.

The practical effect has been the freezing of a potential export market for our 1 million U.S. wheat farmers. Our wheat surplus may soon reach 1 billion bushels, a situation which has led to drastically low domestic market prices and severe allotment cuts for next year's crop.

There is no legitimate reason for continuing this regulation. It has not worked, and it has caused much damage to an important segment of our economy. It should be discontinued.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Kansas (Mr. MIZE) and I want to congratulate him for calling attention to the discriminatory Executive order which requires at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to Eastern European countries be shipped in American bottoms.

Since this restriction has been in effect, since 1963, I have objected to it as an intolerable situation without justification. Spokesmen for the maritime industry have insisted that this restriction is essential in order to maintain this country's merchant fleet at a level necessary for defense purposes. I presented this view to then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in 1966 when he appeared before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and he replied:

> I will say without any qualification that I see no excuse for insistence on the use of U.S. bottoms for shipping anything other than military goods as a foundation for maintaining a merchant marine capability for defense purposes.

That same year Secretary of State Dean Rusk told our subcommittee the solution must be worked out "between the maritime unions and the maritime industry."

The fact is, the net result of this restriction has been our merchant fleet has been shipping 50 percent of nothing because these countries are not inclined to pay the premium price this restriction imposes on U.S wheat and feed grains.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues in urging President Nixon to rescind this Executive order.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague, CHET MIZE, concerning a matter of vital importance to the wheat industry.

I am greatly concerned that the Commerce Department has used the Export Act since 1963 to place wheat and feed grains in a special category for export regulations.

I have been unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent shipping requirement helps the U.S. merchant fleet or any other segment of our economy. I believe that it is a self-defeating device that has limited U.S. agricultural trade opportunity and has weakened our position in world trade.

Agricultural producers should be given equal opportunity to compete in world markets without restrictions presently imposed by the Department of Commerce policy. With intense competition in world trade, this regulation has resulted in the elimination of U.S. wheat and feed grain markets in Eastern Europe. The important role of wheat and feed grains in our critical balance-of-payments situation is another important consideration in reviewing this regulation.

This discriminatory trade practice tends to defeat our efforts to improve trade relations with the Eastern European nations.

The existence of this regulation actually undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade.

I think it is significant that the entire agriculture community has urged in recent hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the Department of Commerce discontinue this practice of imposing discriminatory shipping regulations as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and feed grains to several East Europe destinations. The list is most impressive: The American Farm Bureau Federation, National Association of Wheat Growers, Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, Grain Sorghum Producers Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, National Grange, North American Grain Export Association, U.S. Feed Grains Council, National Grain Trade Council, and the Chicago Board of Trade.

Although an amendment to the Export Control Act would not be an appropriate vehicle for removing this discriminatory trade practice, I want to emphasize my strongest possible support for the request of my good friend and colleague, CHET MIZE, that the Department of Commerce discontinue this trade practice involving our wheat and feed grain industry.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we consider extending the Export Control Act which will otherwise expire at the end of this month.

After hearing the remarks on the floor and examining the existing law, I am in favor of letting it expire. The absence of any law would offer greater national security than this law.

The American people have been led to believe that this law restricts trading in strategic materials with Communist nations. It apparently does no such thing. What it does is conceal from the American people the names of those who are thus trading with the enemy under Government license. The tenor of the debate makes it plain that big industrialists and not small businessmen are the Americans so favored.

The American people know who the enemy is and reserve the right to regard and treat them as such. The Government should guarantee that they are, in fact, able to exercise this basic right—by publishing the names of firms who are doing business with Communist countries. If the people, then, wish to build any bridges they may do so voluntarily. But if the man and woman who has a son in Vietnam would prefer to see to it that none of their personal dollars go to a firm trafficking with their son's potential killers, they may. Perhaps, in this way, the Government will bring official policies into line with the expression of the national will.

If this law did what it was intended to do—restrict shipment of strategic material to Communist nations—I would certainly be in favor of its extension and its strict enforcement. If we allow it to expire it is possible that a new law which will actually do what Americans thought this one was doing can be enacted.

It is amazing that most of the debate here today indicates this law is being clandestinely manipulated to conceal the identity of the large business interests who deal with the enemy. Members have reported that licenses are refused to small businessmen to export items in the nature of brooms, milk, and cheese. But on the other hand, we find that the offi-

cial export control report of the Department of Commerce tells of the licensed export of sophistical industrial machinery including automatic piston machine, automatic crankshaft machine, and industrial furnaces, as well as cold-rolled carbon steel sheets, electronic computers, and scientific and electronic instruments and equipment made in the United States going behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks at this point excerpts of the report to which I referred:

EXPORT CONTROL REPORT

EXPORT LICENSING TO EASTERN EUROPE

Commodity applications approved

License applications for commodities valued at $36.8 million were *approved* for export to Eastern Europe during the third quarter 1968. Principal destinations were the U.S.S.R., $15.2 million, and East Germany, $9.3 million. This third quarter total compares with $441 million approved in the previous quarter and $23.1 million approved in the third quarter 1967.

Industrial machinery accounted for $15 million of the total value approved, principally to the U.S.S.R., $11.3 million, and Rumania, $1.5 million. The passenger automobile plant being built by FIAT in the U.S.S.R. was the destination for $10.8 million of these goods, including automatic piston machines, $5.1 million, automatic crankshaft grinders, $2.3 million, and industrial furnaces, $1.3 million.

Agricultural commodities valued at $12.3 million were licensed for export, primarily to East Germany, $7.4 million; Hungary, $2.7 million; and Czechoslovakia, $1.5 million. These commodities were corn, $8.5 million; yellow grain sorghums, $2.3 million; and flax, $1.5 million. Chemicals worth $5.3 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe. The U.S.S.R. was the destination for $3.3 million of these, including aluminum oxide worth $1.4 million.

Cold-rolled carbon steel sheets valued at $1.4 million were approved for export to Rumania. Other approvals for Eastern Europe included electronic computers, peripherals, and statistical machines, totaling $1.7 million; and scientific and electronic instruments and equipment, totaling $1.2 million.

EXPORT LICENSING TO CUBA

The Department *approved* exports to Cuba worth $12,533 during the third quarter 1968. These exports consisted of insecticide sprayers, worth $11,960, for the Pan American Sanitary Bureau's yellow fever program; clothing, personal effects, drugs, and medicinals, valued at $523, for American citizens detained in Cuba; and $50 worth of parts for a teletype printing machine used in connection with refugee flights from Cuba.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is familiar with the fact that in this quarterly report under the Export Control Act they talk about the licensing of these commodities to Eastern Europe. The report says, moreover, that industrial machinery accounted for $15 million of the total value approved, principally going to the U.S.S.R., and that the passenger automobile plant being built by Fiat in the U.S.S.R. was the destination for $10.8 million of these goods, including automatic crankshaft grinders, $2.3 million; and for industrial furnaces, $1.3 million.

I would like to ask the chairman if these matters were brought up in any of the committee hearings on the bill and what was done by the committee to try to put some teeth into this law to stop this practice?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) in order to respond to the gentleman, but before I yield to him I would state to the gentleman from Louisiana that this was all nonmilitary, nonstrategic material.

Mr. RARICK. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me just 1 minute and let me make this comment. Some of my boys are serving in Vietnam. Recently we have heard a lot about the fact that the Russians are now putting tanks into North Vietnam and also Russian helicopters.

If we have been shipping to them automatic piston machines and automatic crankshaft grinders, these are sophisticated machine tools. Machines which make pistons and crankshafts do not care what type of machinery the pistons and crankshafts will operate. When they are placed into items of military hardware, such as tanks and helicopters, might that not be classified as strategic—even military?

If you are going to build gasoline engines to be used in automobiles, they can be taken out of the automobiles and used to power helicopters, tanks, or other of military equipment. We know that Volkswagen engines are used—by amateur mechanics, even—to power light aircraft.

I include at this point in my remarks news stories relating to the presence of Soviet bulldozers and helicopters in Vietnam:

RUSSIAN BULLDOZER CAPTURED

A SHAU VALLEY.—A Russian-built bulldozer has been uncovered in the A Shau Valley.

The enemy equipment was found recently by Lt. Col. Joseph L. Hadaway, commanding officer of the 3rd Squadron, 4th Cav., 9th Infantry Division while flying over the area in search of Communist trails and bunker complexes.

The bulldozer was partially buried and hidden by brush on the valley floor. It is a model resembling the U.S. Army's D–6 dozer both in size and estimated capability.

Hadaway contacted the 59th Engr. Co. (Land Clearing) to make the actual recovery of the vehicle.

The commander directed the engineer unit's bulldozers as they cut a road to the Russian-made equipment. After recovery, the dozer was taken to FB Rendezvous.

Lt. Col. Stuart Wood Jr., commander of the 27th Engr. Bn. remarked, "It's rather surprising to come upon a piece of enemy equipment which is more or less the counterpart to some of your own. Possibly, it was building a road just like ours—only from the opposite end.

"We've decided to make the machine operational, if possible," he added.

The task of putting the vehicle in operating condition again is under the direction of Lt. Robert A. Goodell, the battalion maintenance officer.

He commented that the dozer was in fairly good shape. "I think our main problem is going to be replacing unrepairable parts. I don't know if the Russian equipment uses metric threads," he said.

SOVIET-BUILT COPTERS USED BY NORTH VIETS

SAIGON.—The North Vietnamese are now using a small but significant force of Soviet-built helicopters in Laos and Cambodia, U.S. officers reported Wednesday.

Some of the helicopters are the world's largest, capable of speeding troops and cargo from North Vietnam to bases in those two countries adjacent to South Vietnam.

The choppers operate at night at near treetop level along the route of the Ho Chi Minh trail stretching down from Vietnam through Laos and into Cambodia.

Officially, the U.S. Command has no comment on the reports. A ranking officer admitted, however, that such reports had been cropping up and that it was known the North Vietnamese had a force of Soviet-built helicopters available.

There has been no visual sighting of the helicopters from the Vietnamese side of the frontier. The reports have come from agents from radar sightings and at least one prisoner of war who reported being brought from North Vietnam to Cambodia in a troop-carrying helicopter.

Most of the helicopter sightings have been by radar. So far as is known, none has been shot down.

"They operate almost every night," one U.S. officer reported. "They prefer to operate when there is no moon or when the weather is overcast. On moonless nights we get 20 to 30 reports."

BIGGEST IN WORLD

They are put down in American intelligence reports the same way that flying saucers are listed, as "unidentified flying objects."

One type in operation is the M16, code named "Hook" in American military parlance, U.S. officers say. The biggest helicopter in the world, it can carry up to 120 people or around 2.2 tons of cargo.

It gets its name "Hook" because a hook often is suspended from the helicopter to carry additional cargo.

Another type believed in operation is a "Flying Crane" helicopter capable of transporting tanks such as the Soviet-built PT76 models that hit a U.S. Special Forces Camp at Ben Het recently.

Ben Het is in the central highland just across from a densely jungled area of northern Cambodia largely controlled by the North Vietnamese. This is the farthest south that enemy armored vehicles have entered into combat.

In addition to the giant choppers, the Russians are believed to have furnished liaison and light observation helicopters.

Military officers do not expect the enemy to move troops by helicopters to the Vietnamese side of the border. With American control of the air, anything more than a hit-and-run mission would be suicidal.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to propose an amendment to the bill under consideration, a bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949. As you are aware, with the authority granted to the President under the Export Control Act, he can declare an economic embargo against any nation as he sees fit through the institution of certain procedures described under section 3 of this act. He does not have to inform the Congress of his action or ask the Congress for their consent. The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is invested with the Congress by the provisions of our Constitution. It is an abdication of our duty to allow the President to institute such proceedings without some action by the Congress.

A complete embargo is tantamount to a declaration of economic warfare. I do not believe that the President should be allowed to declare economic war upon any nation without first receiving the consent of the Congress. At this time,

when the Congress is concerned over the foreign commitments of this Nation, it should be giving equal attention to economic commitments. An economic embargo is a national commitment and, therefore, the Congress should pass upon it. Today I am proposing an amendment which will require the President to obtain the consent of Congress before he can maintain any long-term economic embargo. We are aware that international situations can arise in which immediate executive action is required. A prime example would be the Cuban missile crisis.

I stipulate in my amendment that the President can impose an embargo for 60 days without first receiving the consent of the Congress, but if consent is not obtained within the stated period the embargo is immediately lifted and cannot be reimposed for at least 12 months without first obtaining congressional authorization.

During the past few years, we have seen an ever-increasing share of the power of Congress over international relations delegated to the Chief Executive. As representatives of the people of the United States, the Congress has a responsibility to pass upon matters of economic importance which affect the international trade policies of the United States. I believe that my amendment is a step in restoring some control over this vital area of the foreign commerce policies of the United States.

All Members of this body know that the international trade policies of our Nation have a direct impact upon the daily affairs of our citizens whether they be laborers, managers, or investors. The Members of Congress, as spokesmen for these citizens, should exercise authority in the area of international economic policy commitments.

Therefore, I urge the Members of this body today to favorably consider my amendment when it is read for approval.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take time during general debate on this bill, but I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) a few questions about the significance of his proposed amendment.

As I understand the gentleman, his is an astonishing attempt to try to restrict what the Export Control Act actually delegates to the executive branch, and I wonder what he is attempting to accomplish.

In the first place, the amendment, as I understand it, refers to an embargo on exports, which are supposed to be substantial or total in their effect. But the act itself does not even use the word "embargoes." It is basically an export control act, trying to restrict certain goods of a national security nature from countries that might use them in ways hostile to us.

True, we have delegated that responsibility to the Executive. As I understand it, the gentleman does not trust those in the executive branch to carry out their responsibility to prevent certain goods from falling into the hands of an enemy. Does he feel there must be an automatic lapsing of those controls, unless the Congress takes affirmative action?

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. This act, of course, deals with the whole spectrum of export policy and there can be no greater export control, of course, than total prohibition against an export to any nation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I point out to the gentleman——

Mr. BLACKBURN. In that regard, if the gentleman will allow me to continue, I think my amendment certainly addresses itself well to this act.

Now the implication that I or the Congress does not trust the Chief Executive, I think is an improper implication. It is not a question of trust—it is a question of responsibility.

As I read the Constitution, the responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce does rest with the Congress. I think it is a matter of policy to which we address ourselves today; the question, to what extent should the Congress have a right to delegate completely its responsibility to the Chief Executive.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that all the gentleman's amendment would accomplish, if I understand it correctly, would be to hamstring the Executive in what the legislative body has said we would like the Executive to do. That job is to define what kind of goods should not be exported to certain countries, if this amendment were approved, it would not be possible for a decision on export controls to stick unless we took affirmative action to support the Executive.

Yet, if we take affirmative action, we have added nothing to what the Executive has already done. If we take negative action by saying in effect that we think certain goods which those in the executive branch think are strategic are not then these goods could go to those who might possibly be enemies or might possibly use the goods in ways that are inimical to our national security. To suggest that this act itself covers any kind of control over exports or embargoes is not—I hope—quite true. At least I hope the gentleman's amendment does not attempt to interfere with the embargoes that the United States has agreed to. Would it apply to embargoes applied at the United Nations with respect, quite frankly, to Rhodesia? I had assumed that perhaps that was the objective that he was seeking, to prevent the Executive from applying such an embargo.

Under this act is there authority for the Executive to act in this area or not?

What he seems to be driving at is trying to change or check on the nature of goods that can be exported, or the countries that may be exported to. I do not see what would be accomplished by this kind of hamstringing. Actually, it would require affirmative action by Congress regarding a great deal of complicated lists that have been developed, and which change from time to time. It is all very well to suggest that the Congress should have certain prerogatives with respect to international trade. Congress has been exercising its prerogatives. In this case it has delegated certain responsibilities to the Executive, an action which I think is entirely appropriate.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Well, I suspect that you and I just have a difference of opinion, and I respect your right to differ with me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that I am unclear what the objective is of the gentleman—whether he really thinks that by undoing what the executive branch is attempting to do in restricting imports is going to accomplish very much, except perhaps to release goods that otherwise would not be allowed to leave our shores, and to release them to those that I would assume the gentleman would not want to benefit.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield, in the first place I do have some confidence that this body will exercise its responsibility with good judgment. I think if the administration makes a reasonably good case for its export policies that they will be supported by this body. But I for one do not, to put the parallel, mistrust the Executive with what I consider to be exercising the responsibilities of this body.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the gentleman attempting in any way to interfere with national commitments that have been made at the U.N., or with respect to the total embargo placed on certain goods from Rhodesia?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would be willing, to be very candid with the gentleman, to do so, but I do not think the amendment could have that effect, because this embargo to which you refer was placed as a result of the U.N. Participation Act. But the President in his proclamation also cited the Export Control Act as a part of the authority that he was utilizing.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So does the gentleman think that this amendment in some way could tie the President's hands with respect to international commitments which have been made and which have been endorsed on several occasions by the United States at the United Nations?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am not going to try to look that far into the future. I, for one, am perfectly willing to look into some of these commitments and determine for myself, and I will ask Congress to make the determination.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is not answering my question. If there is any possibility that this might in any way restrict obligations which this country has entered into at the United Nations; if that might be the effect, I think that is an automatic reason for opposing it most strongly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield further for a quick response, I do not interpret this as having any

effect on the United Nations Participation Act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe the administration has had any opportunity to evaluate the effects of this particular amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we are here today discussing the extension of the Export Control Act. Probably the most significant aspect of that law is its strategic goods provisions. The strategic goods provisions of the Export Control Act are in the law because we wish to control and deny receipt of certain exports to certain nations whose interests are inimical to our own. Probably when we look at it from that standpoint it would be more appropriate for us to call this act the "Unfriendly Nations Receipt Control Act," because that is the basic objective of the act. By these provisions of the law we intend that nations whose interests are inconsistent with ours will not get goods from our exporters which will help them and be detrimental to our national security.

But that law, in order to be effective, must do more. It must have an impact above and beyond our own exporters if we are going to deny receipt of goods to unfriendly nations, to Eastern Europe and to the Russian bloc nations.

The 1949 enactment of the Export Control Act reflected circumstances and conditions that existed at that time. Our friends and allies in 1949 were not competitive in the export market because they did not possess the necessary level of sophistication in technology, nor the productive capacity, to be competitive. Therefore our unilateral controls through the Export Control Act were adequate for controlling receipt of goods by unfriendly nations.

Today is a different story. Our friends and allies are aggressive traders. They oppose controls on trade with the East and do not restrict their industries in the export of goods to the extent that we do ours.

The net effect is ironic. Our Export Control Act provides our friends and allies with an unchallenged market and denies to our industries a market for their goods.

This harms our balance of trade, yet does nothing to further the objectives of the Export Control Act, because elimination of our source of supply to the East does not prevent the receipt of the same goods from Western Europe, Japan, and other free world nations.

Modification, I think, is needed. When we talk about modification, we have two routes we can take. The first I consider to be the realistic approach, and the other is an approach which I think is politically unacceptable.

I reject as politically unacceptable modification which has as its policy liberalization of our definition of strategic goods and trade therein. I reject as unrealistic a continuation of the present policy which does not accomplish our objective, but penalizes our industries and our workers and really harms our balance of payments situation.

In view of this I propose to offer two amendments. Briefly stated the first will give much more flexibility to the President in determining what items can be controlled. Presently the "findings" of the Export Control Act deal only with "materials." My language would add to the word "materials," the words "information and technology," so that the President under the Export Control Act would have the right to control the export of not only materials, but information and technology which would be detrimental to the national security of the United States. Therefore, the President is given broader authority to control by this amendment.

My second amendment is probably the crux of the strategic goods question. It provides very simply and, I might add, very realistically that the President in determining the impact upon our national security of an export, shall look at the availability of that export elsewhere—not elsewhere in the East, but available elsewhere from a friendly nation, a nation with which we have a defense treaty commitment.

At this time I will not expand further upon the amendments.

I think the previous administration was wrong in thinking we could at this point in time, with the problem in Vietnam, get the American people or even the Congress to think politically acceptable, legislation which would liberalize the definition of strategic goods and trade therein.

At the same time, I think it is unrealistic for the present administration to advocate a straight extension of the act, when they don't deny that most of the things I have said are true, and in fact admit that they are using availability elsewhere" as a factor in making some of their present decisions. I think Congress should approve use of that factor and do it now.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the House of Representatives at this time, H.R. 4293, is to extend the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, for an additional period of time, until June 30, 1971. I support this legislation.

It is because of the Export Control Act of 1949 that we have a program under which items and data proposed to be exported from the United States are systematically evaluated to determine whether their shipment to various destinations would be in keeping with our national interests.

The export control program is an important element in our national defense effort. It is necessary that we have the machinery to help prevent shipments of equipment and data which can help to build up the economic and military potential of Communist nations. This is why it is so essential that the act be extended.

The bill would also amend the Export Control Act by adding a clause stating that in every way feasible reporting requirements under the act should be kept at a minimum to reduce as much as possible the cost for reporting, recordkeeping and export documentation consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Attempting to help reduce nonproduction costs is a worthwhile goal in that it could help ease the economic impact of the program on exporters and to that extent such a provision would in my view not be objectionable and in fact could represent a useful addition to the Export Control Act.

I would trust however that in carrying out such a provision the Department of Commerce, which administers the Export Control Act, would exercise every due care to be absolutely assured that the effectiveness of the program is not diminished through weakened reporting requirements. Certainly, too, it should by no means be viewed as a reason or excuse to halt issuance of the Department publication entitled "Export Licenses Approved and Reexports Authorized" which is issued on a daily basis. Several years ago an attempt was made to halt this publication and from all appearances the basic reason for that proposal was to withdraw the document from public scrutiny so the people would not know what is going on in this area, such as what kind of export licenses are being issued, to what countries exports are authorized for shipment, value of the goods, equipment or data sold, and so forth. The attempt should not be repeated.

Though the primary purpose of H.R. 4293 is to provide essentially a straight extension of the Export Control Act this legislation touches on issues much more involved than just the matter of extending the program. It is regrettable that over the years, in spite of the need for a strong export control program because of the threat posed by Communist aggression, the Export Control Act has been administered in such a way that increasingly less stringent policies have been followed in policing the flow of goods to the Communist nations. With the export Control Act due for extension, there have been persistent efforts to seize the opportunity to try to modify the language of the act in such ways which would have the effect of further diminishing its effectiveness in restraining shipment of commodities, goods, and data to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations. These efforts must be turned back.

It has been alleged, for example, that modifications are needed because the act is outmoded, that it is too restrictive, and so forth. These allegations in my view are simply without merit.

While restrictions on exports are also for the purpose of controlling short supply items and for foreign policy generally, the central purpose of the Export Control Act of 1949 is to control exports because of their significance to our national security. The act contains a declaration that the "unrestricted export of materials without regard to the potential military and economic significance may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

It provides that rules and regulations

adopted to carry out the act "shall provide for denial of any request of application for authority to export articles, materials, or supplies including technical data, or any other information, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States if the President shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States."

This language sets forth the very minimum we must maintain as a test to apply in determining whether proposed exports should be cleared for shipment overseas.

I certainly do not agree that the act is outdated or outmoded.

During these critical times there is a continuous need for a strong export control program. Secretary of Commerce Stans in a recent letter to me stated:

> It is the Administration's position that this is not the time to significantly reduce our export controls unilaterally.

The argument is sometimes advanced that there is a large potential market in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European countries for U.S. goods and commodities and that we are missing the boat economically so to speak if we do not practically scrap the Export Control Act and expand trade with those countries. This approach is misleading and is not based on reality. The hearings on the legislation to extend the Export Control Act contain repeated warnings that the potential for trade between the United States and Eastern Europe should not be exaggerated. A Commerce Department spokesman said that it is not likely to amount to more than 1 percent of our total annual trade in the foreseeable future, even with significant lowering of barriers to commercial East-West trade. It was testified that the prospects for an increase in nonstrategic trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union under present conditions are modest at best.

Also, the impact of our export controls in limiting the volume of our trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has frequently been exaggerated. It is pointed out that in fact there are serious trade impediments on the part of the Eastern European countries. These include the inconvertibility of their own currencies on world money markets, the limited amounts of convertible currency they have to buy our goods, the fact that they are bilateral trade agreements extensively, the limited appeal in the United States of the kinds and qualities of goods and technical data they produce, the controls the Communists have on all aspects of their foreign trade that result from their totalitarian system of government.

Now, if we are not talking about a wide range or a large volume of goods, precisely what kind of trade is involved in references made to trade with the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European nations which comes under the controls by virtue of the Export Control Act of 1949?

What is involved to a considerable degree is sophisticated equipment, commodities, and technical data because the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations are attempting to utilize the United States as a shopping center to obtain advanced equipment, techniques, factories, and supplies.

This means such items as electronic equipment, machine tools, petroleum equipment, mining equipment, chemical facilities, industrial processes, computers, and whole factories. Allowing Communist nations to buy such things here means that they can fill gaps in their industrial and economic makeup, or obtain prototypes to eliminate timely and costly research. In other words, they would capitalize on our industrial, scientific, and related achievements. At the same time it allows them to continue channeling inordinate amounts of their resources into military efforts, their space programs, and other high-priority programs which the Kremlin has decreed are needed to help advance the cause of communism around the world.

In this regard, it is sometimes stated that if we do not sell items to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist countries they will obtain them anyway from other Western countries. This argument for lessening export controls is invalid on a number of counts and likely will remain invalid for a long time to come.

A professor of economics, Prof. H. E. Michl, of the University of Delaware, during the hearings on this legislation assessed this argument very well when he said, in part:

> The . . . argument of those who support increased trade, that we should supply these countries because if we don't they will obtain the goods from other countries of the West, is weak and, even if true, is immoral. It is not a fact that the East can obtain from other countries of the West the items they want most—items that embody sophisticated technology. Even when such items are available elsewhere they are frequently of inferior quality or are subject to long delays in delivery. To supply our enemies with goods and equipment which they can use against our troops in Vietnam or in future wars for the sake of a small decrease in the deficit of our balance of payments is, in my opinion, indefensible.

The Export Control Act should be extended. It should not be weakened. We must also require that it be administered in such a way so that we have maximum assurances that equipment, technologies, commodities, and data going to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations are not detrimental to our national security and welfare.

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

Mr. BARRETT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) for a very important report.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PODELL was allowed to speak out of order.)

WELL, WHADDYA KNOW? THE METS ARE WORLD'S CHAMPS

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, when the greatest city in America, New York, goes in for any major effort, it goes all out, producing the best or most unique of almost anything it turns its hand to. Such is the case in political campaigns, some mayors, and professional football and baseball teams. Not too long ago, a fearsome aggregation of behemoths from somewhere in Maryland encountered Joe Namath and the New York Jets. The Jets are now world's champions of professional football.

Today we have had a repetition of this wonder in professional baseball, for the New York Mets just became the world's champions as they have swept their fourth straight game in this year's world's series, and that another team from somewhere in Maryland has bitten the dust at the hands of our metro's Mighty Mites. New York City should change its name to "Championship City," because it is truly the city of champions.

The team beaten today by the Mets was a mighty mover and shaker in its day, striking terror into the hearts of all opposition. Astronomical was the number of runs they scored. Baseballs sailed out of stadiums wherever they went, and the moan of the opposing pitching coach was heard in the land and across their league, whose name also escapes me. Batting averages were stratospheric. Earned run averages were microscopic.

Enter David from the peaceful rural hamlet of New York City: The New York Mets of the National Baseball League. Words cannot describe the caliber of their play. An amalgam of the Bums and Giants, who followed the holy grail of more cash into the far-off interior, the Mets occupy a special place in all New York hearts. They are loved by the sufferin' fan. To the stupefaction of all save New Yorkers, the Mets won the pennant in 1969, demolishing a not-so-Brave team from somewhere in straight sets. The world series stage was set for their dismemberment, and the horselaugh of the out-of-town sportswriter, oddsmaker and fan was heard across the Republic.

Today the New York Mets are woild's champeens. Shades of Bedford Avenue and the "Duke." That I should have seen this day—that other team—are they still in the league?

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

Mr. PODELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was that statement cleared by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL)?

Mr. PODELL. It was concurred in after the ball game by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, we are again engaged, as we have been eight times in the past 20 years, in deliberations as to whether the Export Control Act of 1949 ought to be extended. Actually, there does not seem to be too much controversy about its extension—most of us seem to agree that it ought to be extended. The controversy rather is centered primarily around whether it ought to be significantly changed in the light of the present realities of international trade, especially trade with the countries of the Communist bloc, against which the act is primarily aimed.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that in 1949 legislation designed to control and curtail the expor-

tation of American goods and knowhow to the Soviet bloc, and especially to the Soviet Union, was well-advised. In 1949, you will recall, the memory of the Soviet Union's tightening of its grip on Poland and gaining control of Czechoslovakia the year before, was still fresh in everyone's mind. The cold war had escalated to fever pitch.

In addition to these political grounds for the economic isolation of the Communist countries, such a policy of isolation implemented by the United States appeared feasible also on economic grounds. The countries of the Soviet bloc, ravaged by the destruction wrought upon them by war operations, had barely begun to dig out from under the ruins and to rebuild their economies. In this process, they were in great need of supplies, raw materials and capital goods, from abroad. Most of their traditional suppliers, the countries of the industrialized Western Europe, had been themselves devastated by war and could not be, initially, counted upon to satisfy even partially the needs behind the Iron Curtain. The only potential supplier, economically strong and untouched by the ravages of war, was the United States. In 1949, then, interdicting or controlling U.S. exports to the bloc was tantamount practically to interdicting or controlling all significant exports to the bloc.

With the gradual recovery of Western economies, greatly helped by the Marshall plan, the exclusivity of the United States as the potential source of supplies for the bloc, gradually began to wane. True, the American program of export control was supplemented at an early stage by the international export control program, operating through the Consultative Group-Coordinating Committee network, whose effectiveness was further enhanced by the threat of sanctions embodied in the Battle Act of 1951. Yet, this threat of sanctions, tied as it was to Western Europe's dependence on American foreign aid, became less and less effective as our allies regained their economic strength and grew more and more independent of our assistance. Their economic recovery on the one hand provided the Soviet bloc with alternative sources of needed supplies and knowhow, and on the other hand, made any international export control system increasingly less subject to the U.S. pressures and more contingent on the willingness of our allies to cooperate in it.

Thus a situation exists today, Mr. Chairman, where our allies, who are at the same time members of the international export control system, follow, by and large, a considerably less restrictive and less discriminatory export policy toward the countries of the East. While they all support in word and deed the international program of strict control over clearly strategic materials and information, they also conduct with the countries of the Soviet bloc brisk trade in other commodities which the international consensus as expressed through the Coordinating Committee does not consider of prime strategic importance yet which the United States still persists in subjecting to its own unilateral export controls.

I should like to emphasize that this international consensus is reached by agreement of all the COCOM members, including the United States, as to what types of export controls ought to be placed internationally and on what categories of commodities. Thus the United States seems to follow an inconsistent, not to say clearly schizoid policy in this respect. In international forums it is of the opinion that certain commodities are not strategic enough to be controlled as far as their exports to the Soviet bloc are concerned, while in its own bailiwick it still maintains controls over their exportation.

We may now ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, what the net result of this somewhat confused and confusing export control policy has been. Has it really achieved the purpose for which it had originally been designed? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it has not, at least not in the extent or the manner that would be really significant. I am quite willing to agree that by pursuing with the Soviet bloc a considerably more restrictive trade policy than our industrialized allies have, we have been expressing in a tangible way our special disapproval of the international policy of the Soviet bloc in general and of the Soviet Union in particular. But this can be classified only as an act of political import with but scanty bearing on economic realities.

In the extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on International Trade, of which I have the honor of being a member, the point was stressed repeatedly that our export control policy may have, indeed, initially retarded somewhat the economic recovery of the Soviet Union and its satellites and limited the subsequent technological development of some sectors of their economy. On the other hand, the same interdicting policy also spurred them, especially the Soviet Union, into relying almost exclusively on their own resources and developing a high level of industrial and military technology, perhaps even much higher than they would have felt the need to develop under less adverse and hostile circumstances. Let us admit that, if the intent of the U.S. export control policy has been one of preventing the Soviet Union from becoming a first rate world power, both economically and militarily, the policy has failed. I fear it has failed dismally.

Whatever significant or insignificant gains our policy may have made, it also placed our producers and exporters at a distinct disadvantage, for they could not and still cannot export to the Soviet bloc countries a whole array of commodities that our allies have been selling to them for years, all within the international regulatory framework to which the United States itself had agreed. I would like to point out the paradox of the situation. By its official action the United States permits a British, or German, or French, or Japanese manufacturer to make a sale which it does not permit one of our own businessmen to make. The bloc is not thereby deprived of a Western commodity, but the American manufacturer of the same commodity has no chance at all of profiting from it.

It is high time, Mr. Chairman, to put an end to such an anomalous situation. There is, of course, no question about relaxing controls over the exportation of strategic commodities and know-how that would jeopardize our national security. But trade in peaceful goods, goods which our allies have been selling to the Soviet bloc with our consent for years, can only be of benefit to all concerned.

I would be, of course, overly optimistic if I expected that a relaxation of our export controls would or even could result in an immediate large increase in the trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc countries. I am fully aware that developing and expanding such trade ties takes time, especially in a situation where a lot hinges also on the policies and practices of one's trading partner. But I am firmly convinced that progress cannot be made unless the unreasonable fetters placed on such trade by our side are first removed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I also intend to support any other legislative action that would be directed at eliminating any unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on our exports.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, and no further comments on the New York Mets, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 9; 50 U.S.C. App. 2032), as amended, is amended by striking out "1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. Section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2032) is amended to read as follows:

" 'TERMINATION DATE

" 'SEC. 12. The authority granted in this Act terminates on June 30, 1971, or on any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.' "

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHLEY: Page 2, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2021) is amended (1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and (2) by inserting the following new subsection immediately after subsection (a):

" '(b) Expanded trade in peaceful goods

and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations can further the sound growth and stability of the United States economy as well as further our foreign policy objectives.'

"SEC. 3. Section 2(3) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except to the extent that the President determines such trade to be against the national interest.'"

And redesignate the succeeding section accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is time to give full congressional recognition to the value in expanding trade in peaceful goods and technology with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe; and I believe it is time our export control laws and policy implemented this objective.

The Export Control Act should be amended to include a finding that expanded trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations can further the sound growth and stability of the U.S. economy as well as further our foreign policy objectives. The act should be further amended to include a declaration that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except to the extent that the President determines such trade to be against the national interest.

Let me emphasize that I am talking about trade in peaceful goods. The United States and COCOM nations would continue to maintain lists of products of direct military relevance which, indeed, should not be sold or transferred to Eastern Europe. These include direct military items, items in the atomic energy field, and a list of nonmilitary items which are considered to be closely related to the military capabilities of the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. These items are embargoed and are not sold at all or if sold, are sold only after full consultation with the members of COCOM. This would continue to be the situation.

Briefly stated, the basis for this new finding is no more than a return to the historic and traditional policy of the United States to engage in world commerce with nations with whom we are not at war. Our Nation has many obligations but none is more important than our responsibility to the cause of peace. This cause, as we know from our history, can be promoted by contacts—including trade—with nations with whom we have very real ideological differences. It is equally clear that inflexibility and refusal to communicate and explore contacts can only foster deeper antagonisms and bring us closer to war.

There logically follows from this a new, additional congressional declaration in section 2 that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest. There has been an entirely unwarranted stigma attached to legitimate trade with Eastern Europe which has inhibited many firms from actively pursuing trade opportunities which would cumulatively serve our national security, foreign policy, and economic welfare. It is time to remove what may be even so much as a hint or trace of any such stigma.

As I indicated in my remarks in general debate, the Subcommittee on International Trade received testimony indicating that we continue to unilaterally control hundreds of categories of goods on political grounds. Testimony taken by the subcommittee indicated that even now, 2,029 commodity categories are under control for such countries as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R., while 1,753 of these are controlled for Poland and Rumania, at the same time that COCOM has designated 552 categories for control.

Hundreds of these commodities which we continue to control are viewed as peaceful, it seems, by everyone but our Office of Export Control. Consider, for example, the following which continue to be controlled: milk and cream; wheat, rice, barley, corn, rye, oats, grain sorghum; oil seeds, flaxseed and vegetable oils. The grains among these are subject to such restrictive requirements that they are virtually impossible to sell competitively from the United States.

Other examples of categories embrace all types of the following: Waste and scrap and reclaimed rubber, coloring materials, varnishes, insecticides, disinfectants, weed killers, waxes, farm tractor tires, sponge rubber and foam rubber goods, cotton tire cord, fiber glass yarn, glass in balls, rods, or tubes, cast iron soil pipe, hand tools for pipe threading, shoe lasts, ovens, furnaces, cane and maple syrup evaporators, crop dryers, forage dehydrators, tobacco curers, pulp and paper mill machines, water purifiers, softeners, filters and other machines for water treatment and sewage disposal, weighing machines and scales, propellors and paddle wheels for watercraft, electric steam cabinets for turkish baths, face and hand dryers, storage batteries, electrical traffic control equipment, electrical components and parts for machinery and appliances, electrical apparatus and parts, nonmilitary buses, parts and accessories for nonmilitary vehicles, prepared knots and tufts, cotton or wool, for broom or brush making, vacuum bottles, jugs and chests, and miscellaneous manufactured articles, not elsewhere classified.

Here are some of the items destined for Eastern Europe which, in just the past few days, required a specific export license:

A $184 control instrument for office building air conditioning in Czechoslovakia.

Door seals for passenger cars, valued at $3, in the U.S.S.R.

Synthetic leather, valued at $27,000, for the making of shoes in East Germany.

A motion picture sound track, valued at $980, for Czechoslovakia.

Yellow corn, for animal feed, valued at $6,100,000, broken into two licenses, for East Germany.

Chemical analysis equipment, valued at $3,987, for wine products research, authorized for reexport from Switzerland to Hungary.

It should also be understood that thousands of items for which licenses to ship to non-Communist countries have been approved must be amended if the value of the shipment for one reason or another, changes. For example, a licensed shipment of resistors to Taiwan, changed in value from $312,458 to $317,649, required approval of an amended license.

In this attempt to police the world, the Office of Export Control requires validated licenses for the reexport of thousands of items from one free world country to another. Just the other day, it was necessary for one of our exporters to obtain specific permission to send $4,382 of industrial chemicals from Belgium to Argentina. A license was required to send $100 of synthetic resins from West Germany to France, and to send an oscillator valued at $600 from West Germany to Italy.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that our international business firms find it increasingly difficult to compete in the world economy? It costs more than $160 just to process the shippers' export declaration. The licensing process itself is costly. Its use to inhibit the flow of peaceful goods in these times is indefensible. My amendment to the Export Control Act would mandate the Department of Commerce to shear the unwarranted shackles that have been put on our export trade. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. Chairman, the many fine American military personnel of Swedish descent serving valiantly in Vietnam must be tragically disappointed by the ungrateful and morale-defeating attitude of the mother country, to which they bear close ethnic and emotional ties, for her harsh snub to the United States. Sweden, the European haven for American deserters and draft dodgers, has just announced plans to support Hanoi to the tune of $40 million in loans and grants over a 3-year period. State Department information indicates that these moneys are scheduled to begin flowing to Hanoi next July 1.

Before Sweden can give these millions to an avowed enemy of the United States, we should insist this "professionally neutral" country repay the balance of her multi-million-dollar loans from the Export-Import Bank, which is wholly American supported. Even though amendments to the Export-Import Bank legislation demand a complete credit cutoff to any country aiding North Vietnam, those provisions do not go into effect before the fact. Consequently, Sweden could continue to borrow hard-earned American dollars until next July. It had obviously never occurred to Sweden that the U.S. Congress could be far-

sighted enough to enact legislation which would automatically stop any further dollar drain through the Export-Import Bank in situations like this. Sweden did not know there was a limit to just how much of an international patsy the American taxpayers could be forced to be.

The new Swedish Prime Minister, Olof Palme, former Minister of Communications, will be responsible for implementing this policy and has already announced his intention to increase Swedish aid to Cuba. His "credentials" include participation, with a North Vietnamese diplomat, in the anti-American torchlight parade which triggered the recall of the American Ambassador from Stockholm, and Palme's appearance in the highly controversial and allegedly pornographic Swedish film "I am Curious, Yellow."

The United States has always considered Sweden a friend worth aiding, both financially and with favorable trade agreements; but it is the height of folly for this country to support those who give aid and cash comfort to our enemies. Since when is friendship a one-way street?

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) was the author of an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which cuts off loan applications to countries who give aid and comfort to the enemy. Is the same restriction in this bill and if not, should it not be?

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. In specific answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, the Export Control Act of 1949 does not contain language to which the gentleman has referred and which was incorporated in the act known as the Export-Import Bank Act of the United States.

As the gentleman suggested, an amendment was offered and adopted which would prohibit a loan from the Export-Import Bank to any country with which we are engaged in armed conflict, or to any country dealing directly or indirectly with any country with which we are engaged in armed conflict. The same restriction is not in the Export Control Act of 1949 specifically. Although I am told by persons in the Department of Commerce that the executive branch has imposed economic sanctions along the lines that the gentleman from Iowa has suggested and, as a matter of fact, no export trade is authorized with North Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea or Red China.

As the gentleman pointed out, however, Sweden has borrowed money from the United States through the Export-Import Bank which is wholly owned and wholly controlled by the United States, and Sweden is, in turn, loaning the same money—I suppose it is the same money—to North Vietnam.

Now, I compliment the gentleman from Iowa——

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I would prefer that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) be permitted to complete his statement.

Mr. WYLIE. I would just like to say that I compliment and agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

It seems to me that to trade with those who aid the war potential of an enemy nation that is at this moment killing our boys in Vietnam is a travesty and is morally indefensible.

The Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C.A., App. 2021–2032) in section 2, declares that exports should be controlled "to further the foreign policy" of the United States and enhance our national security. It further states that the United States should apply the controls in cooperation with allied nations in trading with Communist dominated countries.

The President is given broad authority to implement these policies by prohibiting or curtailing exports from the United States.

Common knowledge indicates that many of our allies and other friendly nations engage in active trading with our Communist enemy in North Vietnam. This trade strengthens the industrial base of North Vietnam and relieves pressure on their domestic economy, thereby helping place North Vietnam in a position to manufacture some of its own war materials.

I would like to urge the President to exercise every effort, legally and morally, to convince our friends and allies to refrain from trading with North Vietnam. If these efforts fail, I would suggest that the President take appropriate steps to curtail or halt all U.S. trade with those nations that trade with North Vietnam.

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

(On request of Mr. ASHLEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHERLE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should be made clear. If the gentleman from Ohio is saying that the Export-Import Bank issued credit to Sweeden, which in turn was loaned by Sweden to another country, then the gentleman has a rather remarkable misunderstanding of the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank finances domestic manufacturers in their sales abroad, so the statement by the gentleman from Ohio would be manifestly wrong.

Mr. SCHERLE. Along with good common business sense a principle also is involved. It would be utter hypocrisy to extract money from the American taxpayer and give it to a "neutral" country like Sweden and they in turn loan it to the very people who are dedicated to killing our boys on the battlefields of Vietnam. How stupid can we get?

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

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

Mr. WYLIE. With reference to the statement by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) in the Export-Import Bank bill it says that the bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product, technical data, or other information by a national or agency of any nation which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise.

And then there is another section which applies the same prohibition to a country which deals directly or indirectly with a nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if for no other reason than principle alone, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) should be voted down.

One ironic coincident is that on the very day that Sweden's Foreign Minister Nilsson announced that that country was going to grant $40 million in assistance to Hanoi, the U.S. Tennessee Valley Authority awarded a $2 million order for electrical transformers to ASEA, a Swedish heavy electric equipment company.

It is also my understanding that a group of junketing Swedish parliamentarians are soon to visit this country. They are reported to want to visit with American Congressmen. I am sure that the purpose of that trip is to find additional ways for Sweden to "tap the till" of the American taxpayer.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the amendment because I think it is good business for the United States, and I think it is good for our foreign policy. Right now we have a group that you have heard about during the debate called COCOM, which is a group of industrialized nations, that have agreed upon a list of materials that will not be sent to Communist nations because these materials directly aid their war potential. But the list that we have in our Export Control Act is far more comprehensive than the COCOM list, includes many items not related to the military potential of a country. The problem for an exporter is that he has to deal with three different governmental agencies to try and find out what he can export to an Iron Curtain country.

I am an exporter by trade, although I have only dealt with Mexico. It is tough enough just dealing with non-Iron Curtain countries when you have to go through all the bureaucracy that we have in the Federal Government to obtain the export license and the export financing that you need.

When one has to go through COCOM to get an OK by the State Department and the Defense Department and the Commerce Department, it means money lost and at times a lost export because of the delay.

So American exporters of American products do not get into many of the Iron Curtain countries, and I think it is good that our products get there because it makes for a dependence on American technology and on American supplies.

Let me give you one example.

Yugoslavia, considered a "hard" Iron Curtain country in our Export Control Act, is in between. But Yugoslavia just a few years ago was a "hard" Iron Curtain country. Yugoslavia a few years ago did most of their trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc. But today Yugoslavia is dealing primarily with the Western bloc.

If you want to study their economy and ideology, you probably will find that Yugoslavia's economic system is closer to our own economic system than they are to the Soviet system.

Just last week it was announced that a consortium of Western banks from the United States and Western Europe, is now going into equity financing of investments in Yugoslavia.

So here is a country that was once a hard-line country. Now they were able to trade with the Western bloc and have developed a stable currency and become a member of the International Monetary Fund. We find Yugoslavia is independent—they are no longer a confirmed, iron-core Communist country. When we have a tragic event like the invasion of Czechoslovakia, we find that Yugoslavia has the guts and the independence to stand up and condemn this move.

Look at other Iron Curtain countries, for example, Rumania. Here is a country that is trying to develop an independent policy, independent from Soviet domination. I think we should be doing everything we can in our own foreign policy and in our own trade policy to try to encourage Rumania to have trade relations with the West and become less dependent on the Soviet bloc.

This amendment is a good amendment. It will build up our trade. As you know, our trade balance has been going into the red. We should be encouraging trade, not discouraging it.

An enlightened policy puts our products into a country where product dependence will be built up. Also, it means, eventually—looking at what has happened historically in the past—it will bring these countries closer to the United States and further away from the Soviet economic domination.

I am convinced that if we had had a more liberal policy with Czechoslovakia, the invasion might not have happened.

If we were able to grant Czechoslovakia the most-favored-nation treatment, and if we were able to develop a more liberal trade policy toward Czechoslovakia, perhaps the Soviet tanks would not have gone in there and smashed the Dubcek regime.

The amendment is good for the United States, and it is good for our business. It is good for our foreign policy. I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. Are we not now exporting to Yugoslavia under this law?

Mr. REES. Yes. Yugoslavia is an exception from the Export Control Act, an exception from this bill. But what you have going on is that Rumania might bring this country into the same situation as Yugoslavia. This amendment would hasten this trend.

Mr. WYLIE. The point I am making is that under the present law, the executive branch could authorize trade with Czechoslovakia if it felt it to be in our best interest just as it has authorized exports to Yugoslavia; could it not?

Mr. REES. No; there are several restrictions. One is the most-favored-nation treatment not granted to other countries of the Iron Curtain except Poland.

The Executive does not have the power automatically to grant most-favored-nation treatment.

Mr. WYLIE. Is Yugoslavia a most favored nation?

Mr. REES. Yes; Yugoslavia and Poland are two countries that have most-favored-nation treatment. I think Rumania should be considering their foreign and economic policy.

Mr. WYLIE. Within the purview of the present law, could we not grant the same treatment to Czechoslovakia if in the opinion of the executive department such action was proper?

Mr. REES. This act has to do strictly with export control. What we are trying to do here is to remove nonstrategic goods from the control of the triumvirate of the bureaucracy that now controls export licenses.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHLEY) there were—ayes 10, noes 23.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. LANDGREBE: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 4(c). No commodities, military or otherwise, shall be authorized for shipment to any foreign nation which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from any equipment, materials or commodities or gives any form of assistance to North Vietnam."

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, the wording of the amendment is almost identical to the wording of Resolution No. 89, which I introduced earlier in this session, and which so far has received no consideration. The wording and intent of the amendment are crystal clear.

For many years—actually, no one knows how many years—we have been involved in a military struggle with the small nation of North Vietnam. We have honored boundaries, sanctuaries, agreements. We have played by the rules. We have honored Geneva treaties on warfare. Yet, this flyspeck on the globe continues to infiltrate South Vietnam and continues to kill and maim a significant number of our troops as well as our friends in South Vietnam, civilian and military. It would be absolutely impossible for this small country to continue to hack away, hammer away at us without the support of many of the major nations of the world.

I know there are many industries, and so forth, in this country that are most anxious to continue to expand their markets, and I am all for them—after a cease-fire has taken place. There is only one way in which we are ever going to bring about a cease-fire. We have pleaded with the North Vietnamese. President Johnson and President Nixon have done so. We have made every conceivable offer. It has even been suggested on the floor of the House this week that we completely withdraw our troops in the hope that the people of this tiny nation would be kind enough to stop shooting our people and stop murdering the civilians of South Vietnam.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's amendment is very similar to one which I offered to the foreign aid bill in 1967. The amendment was adopted by the House and, as is so often the case, it was lost in conference. I commend the gentleman for offering his amendment. It ought to be adopted.

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman's amendment any country that has any trade whatsoever with North Vietnam would be affected.

Mr. LANDGREBE. It would be excluded.

Mr. REES. Yes. So it would mean under the gentleman's amendment, it would be prohibited for the United States to trade in any commodity with any country that traded with North Vietnam.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Exactly right.

Mr. GROSS. Right. But all those countries would have to do would be to cease trading with North Vietnam, and it would not disturb our relations at all with them.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I am really not interested in closing the factories of the United States, nor am I anxious to further cripple our farmers, but I am most terribly concerned about the number of American boys who are being shipped home from Vietnam in boxes, without any assistance or without any sympathy from those great nations such as West Germany and England and so on.

We are committed to fighting this battle and we fully believe our commitments there are good and proper, so how can we continue to trade and deal with countries who are aiding the enemy which is killing our boys and our friends?

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for the nobility of his purpose in offering this amendment. I think it is the solution to our floundering struggle for peace. If we dis-

continue trade with the countries trading with North Vietnam, we will have bloodlessly crippled that country's capacity to wage war. I wholeheartedly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

I could repeat what I said and speak until midnight on my convictions about the Vietnam war—I have heard many other Members expound at length on this subject in the last few days—but I will close with a sincere plea to my colleagues on both sides to support this amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 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 California (Mr. REES), a member of the committee.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If this were passed, it would mean we would have no exports to our major trading partners, including Japan, Great Britain, Canada, Mexico, Scandinavia, West Germany, Italy, and most other major trading nations. This would ruin our balance-of-payments situation. If Members think we have inflation now, it would be 10 times worse if this passed. We would have complete economic chaos in this country.

We must realize the countries which are supplying North Vietnam are primarily the Soviet Union and Red China, and very few supplies come from Western Europe and Japan. There are some exports from those countries, but they are not necessary to North Vietnam in their continuation of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with those people who deplore the fact that our men are being killed in a questionable war, but the amendment will not help our Armed Forces; it will only ruin the United States economically and bring it into complete chaos by destroying our foreign trade.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-four 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. 232]

Abbitt	Celler	Fisher
Albert	Clark	Flowers
Arends	Conte	Flynt
Aspinall	Conyers	Fountain
Baring	Cunningham	Fulton, Tenn.
Berry	Dawson	Garmatz
Blatnik	Dennis	Gibbons
Brasco	Devine	Griffin
Bray	Dingell	Haley
Brooks	Dorn	Hansen, Idaho
Brotzman	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Harsha
Broyhill, Va.	Edmondson	Hastings
Burton, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Hays
Burton, Utah	Edwards, La.	Hébert
Byrnes, Wis.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Caffery	Fallon	Hosmer
Cahill	Farbstein	Jarman
Camp	Fascell	Johnson, Calif.
Carey	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Cederberg	Findley	Jones, N.C.
Kee	O'Konski	Smith, Calif.
Kirwan	Olsen	Steed
Kluczynski	Patman	Steiger, Wis.
Kyl	Pepper	Stokes
Landrum	Pollock	Stubblefield
Latta	Powell	Taylor
Leggett	Price, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Lloyd	Pucinski	Tunney
Long, La.	Quie	Utt
Lujan	Reifel	Waldie
McClory	Reuss	Wampler
McCloskey	Rivers	Watts
McMillan	Roberts	Whalley
Martin	Rodino	Wilson, Charles H.
Meeds	Rosenthal	Wold
Mills	Ruppe	Wright
Montgomery	St. Onge	
Morton	Saylor	
Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, 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. 4293, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 314 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. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), in his opposition to this amendment, said that he sympathizes with the Americans who are being killed in Vietnam. Perhaps this is understandable, because the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), also told us that he is an exporter.

There is not one thing that this amendment will do to injure any nation which is supplying the North Vietnamese Communists. All any nation needs to do to avoid being penalized is stop trading with the North Vietnamese.

I want to go further than sympathizing with dead men. I say to Members of the House it is time the Congress spoke out; it is time this Congress displayed enough morality to say to these countries that there will be no more trading with the United States if they are going to supply those whose principal interest these days is the killing of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, if the House rejects this amendment and again refuses to penalize those who are helping prolong the war in Vietnam, it will have made a mockery of the purpose of this legislation—export control—and I will have no alternative but to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, we are considering an amendment which will prohibit trading with any country trading with North Vietnam.

Insofar as North Vietnam trade is concerned, there is only one trade that we should even consider—a trade of war prisoners.

There are no fewer than 40,000 reasons to support this amendment—40,000 Americans murdered by North Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, all are acutely aware that in many instances our fighting men are being maimed and killed by sophisticated weapons. These weapons are known to be supplied to the enemy by the nations to whom we are building trade bridges and others to whom trade dollars and profit are worth more than American lives.

Since our military is restrained from interdicting the flow of enemy weapons—the least we can do is to make sure that no American profits from the sale of weapons to kill other Americans. Fratricide for profit strikes most Americans as immoral. If it is our national policy that our fighting men not be permitted to win militarily, then we can most assuredly win this war economically—simply by ceasing to aid the enemy.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment and urge its adoption.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mr. ASHLEY.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in all truth should be defeated. I say that sharing the frustration of many who would tend to support the amendment because of the conflict in Vietnam. But, Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this amendment would be to make our export policy considerably more restrictive than it is today.

Let there be no question about this: The administration in office today opposes this amendment. The administration wants a straight extension of the Export Control Act on the basis that there is ample flexibility within the Export Control Act to achieve the purposes and the policies of this administration.

This amendment may have some superficial appeal, but Mr. Chairman, it could work against the very purposes that the author and supporters of this amendment have in mind. I urge its defeat.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this important amendment to halt all exports to, and trade with, those countries trading with North Vietnam. I regret that we cannot get a record rollcall vote on this vital matter.

So long as hostilities in Vietnam continue, so long as Americans are fighting and dying in a foreign land, it is immoral, it is unconscionable, and it is un-American not to use every available means to stop vital supplies from reaching the enemy, and flowing through channels provided by countries receiving American tax dollars in aid and grants and/or trade or exports.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 53, noes 84.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Michigan: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 5. Section 1(c) of the Export Control Act of 1949 (as so redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

(c) The unrestricted export of certain materials, information, and technology may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, although my interest in modification of the Export Control Act has been looked upon by some as reflecting a liberal approach, let me assure the Members that on this issue I am a hawk. I want an export control policy that works, not one that just penalizes our exporters.

The amendment which is before the committee at this time, one of two I shall offer, broadens the findings of section 1(b) of the Export Control Act of 1949 to conform to the 1965 amendment to the act, which gave the President authority to prohibit or curtail the exportation of "technical data and other information."

The amendment would further broaden the finding by removing the test of "potential military and economic significance" in regard to the exportation of materials which may adversely affect the national security. By removing those words "potential military and economic significance" the amendment reshapes the findings to accommodate the economic and technological changes of the past 20 years. The 1949 findings are limited to a condition that existed in 1949 and are unrealistic in light of the circumstances of today and of the 1970's.

Certain materials no longer fall within the category of military and economic significance, but still those materials might be detrimental to the security of the United States.

The amendment to section 1(b) would conform to the amendment of section 3(a), the intent of which is to give the President greater flexibility in determining what materials, information, and technology should be approved for export.

As I have said, this amendment basically broadens the discretion of the President as to what items may be controlled under the Export Control Act. He no longer will have to tie the denial of a license to a finding that this particular export has a military or economic significance. If it has any detrimental impact upon the national security of the United States he may deny the export license.

I believe the amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his amendment. As I understand the purpose of his amendment, it is to introduce a fact of life with respect to the formation of the list of commodities to be excluded. It would require the Department of Commerce to consider availability as one of the criteria. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentleman from Ohio is partially correct. The amendment which more specifically deals with the question of availability will be the second amendment I will offer. This deals with findings. The other deals with the alternative section of the statute. They complement one another.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Michigan: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The third sentence of section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2023(a)) is amended by changing 'shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military for economic potential of such nation or nations which' to read 'determines, taking into consideration its availability from other nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, that such export'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) alluded to, which, in simple terms, says that in determining whether or not an export license shall be granted or whether a commodity shall be denied the right of export, the President shall look to see what our friends and allies are doing. Then, if the export is readily available from our friends and allies with whom we have defense treaty commitments, that then a license can be granted.

This amendment adds new language to section 3(a). It requires matters to be considered in connection with controlling exports, such as the availability of such exports elsewhere. This amendment does not force the President to approve of an export that would be detrimental to the national security of the United States. It says, though, that in making such determination of the impact on our national security the availability of this export from nations with which we have defense treaty commitments—that the availability shall be taken into consideration and shall be a factor in determining whether an export license is granted or denied.

Now, why do we need this language? We need the language, I believe, because we need to have Congress tell the executive branch of the Government that we approve of this practice and approve of their looking to other friendly nations to see what they are exporting in determining what our policy shall be.

A further impact of this is in touchy areas where there are dual-use products and matters of that nature, where our administration, in negotiating with friends and allies toward a multilateral policy of restrictions on trade, will be able to say, "If you are going to trade in these items, then we are going to trade in them, also." In many of these areas which are of questionable strategic value we can trade in them more advantageously and we can sell cheaper and, as a consequence, we would be getting the trade that other nations are presently getting. At that point in time our friends and allies will recognize that it would be as much to their advantage to put the item on the restrictive trade list as it would be to leave it off. In that way our export control policy would have a multilateral and multinational effect instead of an impact only on our exporters, as it presently has.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Is the position of the administration that the gentleman's amendment would make export licensing easier or more difficult with regard to the arguments you have made?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. At the outset I cannot speak for the administration, because it requested an extension and I am seeking a modification.

Mr. HANNA. Getting an export license is not easy in almost any respect and we are discouraging a tremendous amount of trade simply because we botched up our export licensing applications so much that businessmen are getting a little bit sick of it. I hope you are not making it more difficult than it already is.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentleman is correct. It would make it easier. He is correct on a further point, that a part of the problem is the delay in granting an export license. Granting an export license, even though it is eventually granted, oftentimes has an impact on denying to our exporters trade that they would otherwise have, which, of course, harms our balance of trade.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Again, I think that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLACKBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BLACKBURN: On page 2, after line 4, add the following language to the committee amendment:

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

"'(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, any embargo imposed by the President against any nation shall

lapse sixty days after it is imposed or sixty days after the enactment of this subsection, whichever is later.

"'(2) With the approval of Congress expressed by a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses within sixty days before or after the imposition of an embargo by the President against any nation or, in the case of an embargo in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, passed within sixty days after that date, the embargo may be continued against that nation until such date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may determine.

"'(3) If an embargo against any nation has lapsed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection or been terminated pursuant to paragraph (2), the President may not impose a new embargo against that nation within 12 months after the date of lapse or termination unless specifically authorized by legislation enacted after the date of enactment of this subsection.

"'(4) As used in this subsection, the term "embargo" refers to a total or substantially total embargo imposed under authority of this Act.'"

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I wonder what effect the gentleman's amendment would have on the mandatory sanctions and international legal obligations of the United States?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I assume the gentleman is referring specifically to the Rhodesian embargo?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. BLACKBURN. My interpretation would be that this would not affect that situation, although I would be perfectly willing to approach that problem at the proper time with the proper legislation.

My understanding is that that is imposed by reason of the U.N. Participation Act, and it involves the authority of the President of the United States, acting under the U.N. Participation Act, under which this action was taken.

However, the Export Control Act is primarily aimed at restricting trade with Communist-oriented countries. I do not think there has been any charge that the Rhodesian Government is Communist dominated or Communist oriented. So I do not think this act is the one under which the President is acting.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Very frankly, I will say that the gentleman is one of the most capable members of our Committee on Banking and Currency and is well respected by the members of that committee on both sides. However, I am inclined to think that this type of amendment may distort our intentions with other countries throughout the world. It is my further opinion that if this were explored further by holding hearings, we could explore all its ramifications. However, at this time I am inclined to think I cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his candor.

I would like to point out to the Members of this body, however, that it is going to be at least 2 years before we bring this back up for consideration—at least the lethargy of the House being what it is—it will be 2 years before this act expires. I think there is involved a very important policy matter upon which we must act today. It is an important question that I present to the House today: To what extent do we in the Congress have the right to completely delegate the authority under the Constitution to regulate foreign commerce?

I recognize the Chief Executive is charged with the duty of handling our foreign affairs, and that he must give us direction in the handling of foreign commerce. But I think that this body, as the spokesman for the people of the United States, should have some voice in deciding whether or not the President, acting under the authority of this act, should have the total power to declare total economic warfare against any country.

One of the things that has been debated in recent weeks is the degree to which the Congress is subject to some criticism, perhaps, for permitting the Bay of Tonkin resolution to be treated as a blank check for total involvement in Vietnam.

If the Congress is going to continue to permit its power to be eroded by legislation which the Congress enacts, then it is subject to criticism.

I think it is our responsibility to the people of the United States, before we allow economic warfare being declared against any nation, that the Congress should reflect the desires of the people.

Under my proposal the President could declare such an embargo for a period of 60 days without congressional approval, but during that 60-day period the Congress could look into the matter, could hold hearings, and then the Congress could pass a resolution approving it if in the opinion of the Congress such embargo should be continued.

What I am saying is that the Congress has the responsibility, and I think the people of this country have the right to expect us to shoulder that responsibility and not give it away. That is the reason that I have introduced this amendment before this body today.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by a member of the committee was never offered for consideration in the debate during the period of consideration before the Subcommittee on International Trade, or before the full committee.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from Ohio to be completely candid with the Members of this body.

I circulated a letter. As I recall, at the first meeting we had of the subcommittee, before we started preparing any amendments, and before we decided what we were going to do about the bill, that there was an agreement that each of us would circulate a letter outlining what we thought we might want to do in the way of amendments. I circulated this amendment to the members of the subcommittee. I later circulated it to the members of the full committee. I explained that because of the request of the administration that this bill should be brought before the floor of this House without any substantial amendment I withheld my amendment. But I told everyone from the very beginning that my amendment would be introduced.

So I certainly would take some exception to any implication that I have brought this in at the last minute without previous notice to the members of the committee.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to infer any such activity, or motive on the part of the gentleman from Georgia.

However, I do not quite understand the differentiation in the offering of the amendment now and in failing to introduce the amendment in a timely fashion before the subcommittee, or before the full committee.

The gentleman says this was at the behest of the administration, yet the gentleman is not at all reluctant to offer it on the floor of the House today. I simply do not see what the difference is.

All it means is it was not possible for it to have the full consideration and a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia during the period of time when the bill was being considered and marked up.

The administration is opposed to this measure. This administration, just as the last administration, does not want a less flexible trade policy than we now have. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida most certainly would render our trade policy considerably less flexible if that amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Members of this body, and to the gentleman who is speaking, that other amendments have been offered here today by Members of the committee which we did not consider and vote upon in the committee, and there has been no objection made to this body considering those amendments. So I do not think the argument is a valid argument against my amendment any more than it would be against any other, and I really do not think it is a valid argument in any event.

Mr. ASHLEY. All I am suggesting is, of course, if the gentleman had offered his amendment in timely fashion, the administration witnesses who appeared before our committee would have been obliged to take a position on his amendment. His failure to offer his amendment and to discuss his amendment at the time of our hearings, of course, make it impossible for this body to be apprised of the position of the administration.

The reason I can say that with some assurance that the administration is opposed to the amendment is because they have indicated no later than this morn-

ing, because they made it abundantly clear—and I am talking about the Defense Department, the Commerce Department, and the State Department—they do not want a less flexible policy than we now have. They do not want a more liberal policy. They say they want the same policy that they feel they can administer satisfactorily.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would just make the observation, of course, that the initial amendment I had proposed contained language which is not in the current amendment. After I had prepared my initial proposal in which I made my amendment apply to any act which is on the books, it became readily apparent—and, of course, we had the committee print out and we were working under great pressure at that point—and it became apparent that this would be subject to a serious question of parliamentary procedure. That being the case I have deleted the language which would have caused strong objection from the administration. But the fact that the administration neither approves nor disapproves or has not taken any action on this, should not act as a deterrent to this body in exercising its will.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am in perfect agreement with the gentleman on that. I acknowledge that the amendment, that is the other amendment, would certainly have had far greater implication than does the amendment now before us. My opposition to the amendment is simply on the basis that we have not yet had sufficient opportunity to go into all of the aspects that attend an amendment as broad even as this one is.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. The U.S. obligation to embargo Rhodesia under the U.N. Charter is implemented under the Export Control Act. Therefore, the administration is against the Blackburn amendment even as it is constituted right now.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak against this amendment, but also to bring the attention of this House to something I think has not been made very strongly here.

We have, I think, been addressing ourselves as the gentleman from New Jersey just now pointed out to you on some policy in the wrong direction. We have a Trading With the Enemy Act. Policies with reference to trade with an enemy country should fall in that area of the law. We have an Export Trade Act in which we can direct ourselves in terms of our trade in the international market.

What we are talking about now is extending legislation that we hope will encourage and expand genuine exports by our country. Mr. Chairman, we live in a marginal society just like everybody else in this world. Four percent of our gross national product now is in international trade. If it falls below that, we are in trouble.

I will tell you. When you sell anything today—and when you buy your car, you buy your car and you buy your financing. If it is a choice between whether you are going to get a first-class Pontiac or a first-class Chevrolet, you are going to find out what your financing benefits are. If you can get a better financial package buying one way rather than the other, gentleman, that is what you do. Everybody in the whole world, when they are buying react exactly as you do. Our job in this Congress is to encourage trade under this Export Act and to help finance it under the Export-Import Bank legislation.

By comparison with competing free world countries our financial package is beginning to look pretty sorry. The ability of our business to get licenses to trade is beginning to look rather sorry and we are going to be hurt if we are going to fall below 4 percent of our GNP that is going into international trade.

You are not in this bill talking about trade between some country and our enemies. You are talking of trade between American businessmen and an international purchaser. This is the only trade that you are talking about in this bill.

I think you had better get your sights squared away on what you are doing here. I do not think you want to do what it appears to me you are doing. I suggest that this amendment just like some others have pointed out how seriously we can go awry when we let our emotional binges take over instead of our good solid judgment.

If you want to be against some of these things, address yourselves in the appropriate legislation that can effectively deal with that problem. But do not foist it upon an exporter who simply is trying to sell an American product with some kind of financial package; a competitive financial package with what the businessman in a competing country can offer to the same customer.

If we are not prepared to do that, gentlemen, we are prepared to help put this country down the road to a diminishing trade and worsening balance of payments and a real impact upon the economy that will mean loss of jobs, including a further impact on unemployment. This is the best way I know of to start a cycle of depression in this country.

We are able to protect ourselves against those cycles in the domestic economy, but we have no protection against the impact that will come from our international trade. If 4 percent of $1 trillion does not mean anything to you, you had better sharpen up your arithmetic. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) desires to speak. I wonder if the time for debate on the amendment could be limited.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee is so disposed.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BARRETT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 5 p.m.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Did the Chair recognize the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes? Would that be included in the limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. No, the Chair has not recognized the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would amend his motion so as to have the time expire, say, 5 minutes after 5.

Mr. BARRETT. That would be satisfactory. I so amend my motion.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is an outrageous operation to cut off debate on a matter of such substance, and I regret very much that the Chairman made the move he did.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. Its effect would seem to be to require a lifting of controls on strategic goods that the executive branch decides should not go to certain countries, unless the Congress takes certain action. And it would also seem quite possible under the terms of the amendment to require a lifting of an embargo such as that imposed against Rhodesia by Executive order. The fact that the sponsor of the amendment says he is doubtful whether it would have that effect, but that he hopes it will, is no consolation to me at all.

I would suggest that if we have our wits about us, we will vote down the amendment. This has been a disheartening debate. It has been seriously suggested that we ought to cut off trade relations with our major trading partners because we are unhappy about their trade with North Vietnam. Now because of an individual's feeling, we must consider an ambiguous and far-reaching amendment such as the one proposed, but with no opportunity to consider the specific language, its purpose or its effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be given to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Strangely enough, the gentleman from New Jersey objects. But I rise to support the position that he took.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would like to point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that this amendment will not affect any partial banning of strategic goods, and it is not designed for that purpose. I think to the extent the gentleman has addressed himself to the fact that this would cut off any restriction on trade is not a valid observation, because the amendment itself defines the term "embargo" as being a total or substantially total embargo.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. No, I will not yield to the gentleman since he would not agree to my unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to some of the comments made by the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA). The gentleman's presentation, as I recall, was that my amendment is going to restrict the growth of international trade. I would like to point out we are the body who should be the spokesman for the very businessmen about whom the gentleman was expressing such concern.

When the President declares a total economic warfare against another nation and puts our businessmen out of the business of selling goods, and Congress lacks the power to approve or disapprove this act, I think the gentleman's argument is more in favor of my position than against it. We should be the ones to stand up and take the responsibility of saying to the businessmen no, you do not trade with those countries, or we should say that we think the President is wrong. It is time we exercise our responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I expressed the view this amendment would apply to the embargo under the United Nations Participation Act. The gentleman has explained it would not apply in his view, because that embargo is imposed under a statute of the United Nation Participation Act. But surely any embargo imposed by the President must be pursuant to a statute. He cannot impose an embargo on his own executive authority. Therefore, the first sentence of this must apply to any embargo the President applies pursuant to the statute, and that would apply to the Rhodesian situation. It would be contrary to our position under the U.N. charter, and it would be to the benefit of 200,000 whites who are ruling Rhodesia as a small minority in that country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) to close the debate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACKBURN) there were—ayes 28, noes 44.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2026) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) In the administration of this Act, reporting requirements shall be so designed as to reduce the cost of reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation required under this Act to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be periodically reviewed and revised in the light of developments in the field of information technology. A detailed statement with respect to any action taken in compliance with this subsection shall be included in the first quarterly report made pursuant to section 8 after such action is taken.'"

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PODELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. PODELL: On page 2 after line 4 insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to prohibit exports to any country which permits the refining, manufacturing, or trading in narcotic drugs (as defined in section 4731(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) or depressant or stimulant drugs (as defined in section 201(v) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act).'"

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say I must apologize to the committee for not having submitted this amendment during committee deliberations on the bill. This amendment has coalesced since that activity concluded.

This is a permissive amendment. It does not require the President or the Congress to do anything, but merely declares it is the policy of the United States of America to prohibit exports to any country permitting refining, manufacture, or trading and dealing in narcotic drugs as defined by the Internal Revenue Code.

We do know that now, in Marseilles, France, there is a refining operation, permitted by that country, which is refining opium into morphine and heroin, and exporting all or almost all of these finished products into this country. Organized crime operates with impunity, and we here in America suffer.

If we walk the streets of our country, no matter where, we will find youngsters on those streets and children in our schools becoming narcotics addicts. We have in New York City upwards of 100,000 narcotic addicts, stealing approximately $100 a day in goods to feed their habit. This is what is turning our urban areas into jungles.

We are talking about 40 percent of the crime in our country today. Now we know what is causing this, and it is about time the Congress spoke up and did something about this. Words have flowed endlessly. Now we have a chance to put certain governments on notice that their tolerance of this traffic is at an end.

All we do with this amendment is to give official notice to the President that it should be the policy of this country to stop trading with those countries that permit refining, manufacture, or trading in opium and various narcotics as defined by the Internal Revenue Code.

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

Mr. PODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman have a definition, as described in the amendment, of the provision in the statute?

Mr. PODELL. I do not have that section of the Internal Revenue Code here. It defines and outlines narcotics, barbiturates, and stimulants which do come under official regulation.

Mr. WHITE. Some of those are manufactured in the United States for legitimate purposes. If the definition said the "illegal manufacture" of course I would go along. If it merely defines the barbiturates and narcotics, perhaps we are doing an injustice to the legitimate trade and the legitimate manufacture in the country. Every country does manufacture or produce.

Mr. PODELL. The section we refer to here deals only with illegal traffic.

Mr. WHITE. Is that the definition?

Mr. PODELL. In the section, yes. First it deals only with illegal traffic. Second, it permits the President to make such policy. There is no congressional mandate. He will make policy only under circumstances where, of course, the activity is patently illegal.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Would not this section prohibit the trading with any country that is selling us drugs for medicinal purposes at the present time?

Mr. PODELL. If the President or administration in its wisdom felt that a particular country was permitting such drugs to be illegally exported to our country, the administration or the President would have a right to exercise this prerogative and prohibit further exports.

Mr. WIDNALL. The amendment does not say that.

Mr. PODELL. It certainly does. May I repeat it for the gentleman:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States—

That it is merely the policy—

to prohibit exports to any country which permits the refining—

Obviously, those countries which do refine drugs for medicinal purposes certainly would be permitted to continue to do so, and we may continue to deal with them.

Mr. WIDNALL. It says nothing about "illegal."

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

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. I wonder if the gentleman would entertain an amendment to his amendment to add "pornography." I believe, if the export policy is going to handle communism and our drug problems, we ought to have an export policy of this Nation taking care of pornography.

Mr. PODELL. If it is the gentleman's purpose and desire to be facetious, let me remind the gentleman to ask Art Linkletter, from his own State, whether he would feel we are being premature in dealing in such a manner with drug problems in our country. The gentleman might ask some of his neighbors down the street. On any street, for that manner. This flood of poison pours like cancer into our bloodstream, ruining lives, weakening our society's fabric and fattening up organized crime. We must serve notice on nations tolerating such traffic, and their authorities are fully informed on it, that we shall retaliate economically at any regime which allows further activities of this sort to continue within its borders.

I submit to the gentleman that this is the most pressing domestic problem in our country today. Our children, yours and mine, in the schools of this country are being infected with this horror. It is about time we took a forward step and took action in this area. Each of us knows of one case after another where drugs have crumbled the existence of young Americans. Remedies are available, and we have one here at hand.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the gentleman from New York and the amendment he has offered. I agree with him that there are few matters of more pressing domestic concern than the increased availability and the increased use of drugs among our young and among many Americans.

In all truth, though, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is not a Christmas tree to be adorned with ornaments. The gentleman is quite right when he says that our committee did not have an opportunity to study the amendment that has been proposed. It does seem to me that a matter as pressing as the matter to which his amendment is addressed should certainly have the consideration of the legislative committee reporting the bill. This is the view that has been taken by the Department of Commerce. In a letter received quite recently, the Department of Commerce says as follows:

The Department fully supports enactment of comprehensive Federal legislation designed to effectively meet the narcotic and dangerous drug problem at the international as well as domestic level. However, we oppose a premature and fragmented attempt to deal with the problem of illicit drug trade such as is contemplated in H.R. 13792.

This is a bill very similar to if not exactly the same as that incorporated in the gentleman's amendment. Continuing:

To regulate exports without concurrent controls over imports of dangerous drugs would not preclude the clandestine importation of those commodities produced abroad, nor the diversion of domestically produced drugs into illicit channels. The surveillance of exports of such drugs can be carried out through cooperation between the investigatory units of various Federal agencies including the Department of Commerce, without unnecessarily burdening lawful trade in these commodities, as would be the case if we imposed validated licensing requirements.

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

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

Mr. PODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not correct that this bill will not come up for passage again for 2 years?

Mr. ASHLEY. That is not necessarily true. The bill before us calls for a 2-year extension, but this obviously does not preclude my subcommittee or the full Committee on Banking and Currency from considering amendments to the Export Control Act that might be introduced during the intervening period.

Mr. PODELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes.

Mr. PODELL. Does the gentleman believe, as the administration does believe, according to their letter, that action on behalf of this problem is being premature? Does the gentleman believe we have any more time in dealing with this narcotic problem in our country? Does the gentleman really believe we can waste 1 more second or 1 more minute in stopping countries like France from refining these poppy narcotics and having them sold here in our country?

Mr. ASHLEY. I do not believe we can afford to waste one moment at all, but I think we are wasting time when we consider an amendment such as the one the gentleman offered very properly and in good faith but which has not had full consideration, full deliberation and testimony from those who are competent to give it. I think in answer to that that consideration of the amendment is not appropriate at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 2, line 19, add the following new section at the end:

"SEC. 3. Section 8 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking all including the heading thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'REPORTING AND INFORMATION

"'SEC. 8 (a) The head of any Department or agency or official exercising any functions under this Act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder. In each such report, the Secretary of Commerce shall review all lists of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, the exportation of which from the United States, its territories and possessions, is prohibited or curtailed with a view to making promptly such changes and revisions in such list as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the policy, purposes, and provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall further include a detailed statement with respect to actions taken in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 3 and the justifications thereof in the second quarterly report (and in any subsequent report with respect to actions taken during the preceding quarter) made by him to the Congress after the date of any extension of this Act.

"'(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall use all practicable means available to him to keep the business sector of the nation fully apprised of changes in export control policy and procedures instituted in conformity with this Act. Pursuant thereto, and in order to enable United States exporters to coordinate their business activities with the export control policies of the United States Government, the agencies, Departments, and officials responsible for implementing the rules and regulations authorized under this Act shall, insofar as it is consistent with the national security, the foreign policy of the United States, and the effective administration of this Act—

"'(1) inform each exporter of the considerations which may cause his export license request to be denied or to be the subject of lengthy examination;

"'(2) inform each exporter of the circumstances arising during the Government's consideration of his export license application which are cause for denial or for further examination;

"'(3) give each exporter the opportunity to present evidence and information which he believes will help the agencies, Departments, and officials concerned to resolve any problems or questions which are, or may be, connected with his request for a license, and

"'(4) inform in writing each exporter of the specific reasons for a denial of an export license request.'"

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose would make no change in the trade policies of this country, but is designed to improve administration and operation of the export control system for the benefit of American business. It is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Specifically my amendment would:

First. Require the Secretary of Commerce to review on a quarterly basis all items prohibited or curtailed for export, with a view to making promptly such changes and revisions as may be desirable consistent with the purposes of the act;

Second. Require that all officials responsible for implementing rules and regulations under the export control system fully inform exporters of consider-

ations which may cause license requests to be denied or subject to lengthy examination;

Third. Require that exporters be given full opportunity to present evidence and information on behalf of export license applications; and

Fourth. Require that prospective exporters be informed in writing of the specific reasons for denial of any export license request.

I would like to read from a telegram sent yesterday to me and other Members by Mr. Hilton Davis on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

The National Chamber has long called for the thorough and continuous reexamination and reevaluation of the present system of export controls, with the view to eliminating those not necessary for the security of the U.S. and which result in discrimination harmful to its competitive position. The chamber also believes that authority given to administrative agencies should be policed by Congress and that these agencies should be required to keep the public fully informed as to their structure, functions and actions.

The Bingham amendment seems designed to carry out these objectives as they apply to export controls. We urge your vote for this amendment.

HILTON DAVIS,
General Manager, Legislative Action.

I repeat: the amendment to the Export Control Act extension that I am proposing makes no change in the trade policies of this country. It is designed, instead to help eliminate the apparent trade disadvantage and difficulty encountered by many businessmen as a result of the complexity of the system of trade restriction and the clumsiness of its implementation. I refer specifically to the fact that a great many items continue to appear on the list of items restricted for export—particularly those items restricted unilaterally by the United States—which have no apparent national security or foreign policy significance. Looking through one recent version of the list, for example, I noted the following: "knots and tufts for broom or brush making," "animated displays for window dressings," "cow dip," "belt clasps," "typewriters"—multitype only)—"type fonts," "lavatories and plumbing fixtures," "used clothing." "voice and music recorders," and "terrestrial and celestial globes." While there may be good reason to restrict these items, they certainly are not apparent, and Federal authorities should be required to review and report their reasoning in restricting these items.

As I understand it, for purposes of most destinations in Communist dominated areas, all items are assumed to be prohibited for export unless ruled otherwise. As a result, the list of items for which licenses must be granted is long. It is gradually being "shaken down" through what one Federal official has called a "gradual evolutionary process." That is, certain items are removed from the list as applications to export them are filed and determination is made that there is no need to restrict their export. In addition, there have been occasional general reviews of these lists—the latest one as far as I can determine in 1965—which have resulted in the removal of literally hundreds of irrelevant items.

The Department of Commerce claims to make a continuing review of the commodity control list without waiting for specific applications for exports to be made. The specific results of these reviews for individual items, however, are not made generally available. It is, therefore, difficult for policymakers or businessmen to challenge these findings or conclusions should they wish to do so. As many businessmen have claimed in testimony, the justifications for retaining certain items on the restricted list and the kinds of considerations that are made is a very "foggy" and confusing area.

My amendment would assure that broad reviews of the commodity control list are undertaken on a continuing basis. Without such general reviews, removal of irrelevant items proceeds quite slowly, impeding and slowing down legitimate trade by necessitating added license applications. My amendment would require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a continuing general review of all lists with an eye toward removing those that are irrelevant even before any export license application is filed; it will further require that justifications for retaining or removing items be reported to Congress quarterly.

Any export control system, regardless of the policy pronouncements on which it is based, is a difficult mechanism to administer and inevitably detains and restricts trade unless it is efficiently and smoothly administered. In the course of hearings on both the House and Senate sides, it has become evident that a great many businesses are losing trade opportunities not only because license applications are refused on certain items, but also because of the great delay that often occurs in reaching a decision on license applications and the lack of information available to businesses on the status of the applications and the relevant considerations being used to determine whether a given application will or will not be granted. This is particularly the case when the item under examination falls in the "gray" area—items which have both clear, peaceful, and potential military uses.

I note with satisfaction the efforts that are continuing to be made by the Department of Commerce and other agencies with authority under the Export Control Act to streamline the procedures for ruling on license applications. In May 1968, for example, the Department announced a new procedure that permits an exporter to receive an export license for samples of his product without any advance determination being required as to whether a commercial quantity might also be approved. It is the latter process which so often takes inordinate and critical time. But I am persuaded that much remains to be done to make the process of ruling on license applications more efficient and more responsive to the needs and requirements of the business community. My amendment, therefore, would require that potential exporters be fully informed at all stages of the licensing process of the status of their application and the considerations which may cause the application to be delayed or denied. It would also require that exporters be given an opportunity to present evidence and information which they believe will help their case and help the agencies concerned reach a rapid and favorable decision on license requests.

Finally, my amendment would require that exporters be notified in writing of the specific circumstances and considerations surrounding any denial of an export license request. It is my belief and hope that these requirements will expedite and improve the licensing process and enable businesses to salvage much potential trade which they are now losing merely as a result of the clumsy and closed operation of the licensing mechanism.

The requirement I mentioned earlier that the Secretary report his justifications for retaining or removing items from the commodity control list quarterly, will also enable businesses to operate with more knowledge and rationality in the export field, and permit them to challenge judgments of the Federal Government responsibly should they have evidence which they feel are contrary to official findings.

I hope my amendment will be approved.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York. It is a good amendment.

As I pointed out in my earlier remarks, both statistically and by example, the control lists embrace hundreds of categories accounting for thousands of products which are unrelated to the strength of the Eastern European countries within the context of the potential threat they pose to our national security.

The redtape that emerges from this vast network together with the admission by administration witnesses that little has been done to clean out the control lists, certainly indicates the good sense of an amendment with language requiring a systematic justification of the need to maintain the vast list of barriers to trade.

From testimony taken from several public witnesses, together with other written communications, it does appear that there is a need to establish closer coordination between business and government in the implementation of our export control policies.

The Subcommittee on International Trade took extensive and detailed testimony which pointed up the frustrations of exporters in attempting to work through this program. Not only are they faced with long delays which discourage further sales efforts on their part and cause them to lose sales to foreign competitors whose governments process applications much faster, they are also left uninformed about the status of their license applications and are not given reasons for denial which might enable them to reorient their marketing and production activities. The amendment, as I understand it, would diminish another of the barriers to the pursuit of export sales by enabling American businessmen to

keep abreast of the status of their applications without unduly hampering the functions of the Department of Commerce.

Hence, I support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is no objection on the part of the committee members on this side of the aisle to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment has some very good ideas, but it would be the quickest way to build up a large bureaucracy in the handling of these matters. The sixth section of this bill provides for reporting requirements which I feel are ample, and which would expedite action, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the businessmen who have had experience under this act, as they testified before the Senate committee and the House committee, have indicated that they are floundering, that they are not given guides, and they do not know what the criteria are, and they have difficulties. This is an attempt to solve their problem by increasing certain reports.

I might add that this amendment has been adopted in practically the same fashion by the committee in the other body, and recommended to the other body for passage.

I hope that this amendment, which is a pro-American business amendment, will be adopted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 23, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, 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. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, pursuant to House Resolution 575, 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. WYLIE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYLIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYLIE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4293 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. ASHBROOK. 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 273, nays 7, not voting 151, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—273

Abernethy	Collins	Green, Oreg.
Adair	Colmer	Green, Pa.
Adams	Conte	Griffiths
Alexander	Corman	Gubser
Anderson, Calif.	Coughlin	Gude
Anderson, Ill.	Cramer	Hagan
Anderson, Tenn.	Culver	Halpern
Andrews, Ala.	Daddario	Hamilton
Annunzio	Daniel, Va.	Hammer-schmidt
Ashley	Daniels, N.J.	Hanley
Ayres	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Barrett	Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.
Beall, Md.	de la Garza	Harrington
Belcher	Delaney	Harvey
Bennett	Denney	Hathaway
Betts	Dickinson	Hawkins
Bevill	Diggs	Hébert
Biaggi	Donohue	Hechler, W. Va.
Biester	Dowdy	Heckler, Mass.
Bingham	Downing	Helstoski
Blackburn	Dulski	Henderson
Boggs	Duncan	Hicks
Boland	Edwards, Ala.	Hogan
Bolling	Eilberg	Howard
Bow	Esch	Hull
Brademas	Evins, Tenn.	Hungate
Brinkley	Fish	Hunt
Brock	Flood	Hutchinson
Broomfield	Foley	Ichord
Brown, Mich.	Ford, William D.	Jacobs
Broyhill, N.C.	Foreman	Johnson, Pa.
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Jonas
Burke, Mass.	Fraser	Jones, Tenn.
Burleson, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Karth
Burlison, Mo.	Frey	Kastenmeier
Burton, Utah	Friedel	Kazen
Bush	Fulton, Pa.	Keith
Button	Galifianakis	King
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Kleppe
Cabell	Gaydos	Koch
Casey	Gettys	Kuykendall
Chamberlain	Giaimo	Kyros
Chappell	Gilbert	Langen
Cleveland	Goldwater	Leggett
Cohelan	Gonzalez	Lennon
Collier	Goodling	Lipscomb
	Gray	Long, Md.
Lowenstein	Obey	Sebelius
McCarthy	O'Hara	Shriver
McClure	O'Neal, Ga.	Sikes
McCulloch	O'Neill, Mass.	Skubitz
McDade	Ottinger	Slack
McDonald, Mich.	Passman	Smith, Calif.
McFall	Patten	Springer
McKneally	Pelly	Stafford
Macdonald, Mass.	Perkins	Staggers
MacGregor	Philbin	Steiger, Ariz.
Madden	Pickle	Steiger, Wis.
Mahon	Pike	Stephens
Mailliard	Pirnie	Stokes
Mann	Poage	Stratton
Marsh	Podell	Stuckey
Matsunaga	Poff	Sullivan
May	Preyer, N.C.	Symington
Mayne	Price, Tex.	Talcott
Melcher	Pryor, Ark.	Teague, Calif.
Meskill	Purcell	Thompson, N.J.
Michel	Quillen	Thomson, Wis.
Mikva	Railsback	Udall
Miller, Calif.	Randall	Van Deerlin
Miller, Ohio	Rees	Vanik
Minish	Reid, Ill.	Vigorito
Mink	Reid, N.Y.	Waggonner
Minshall	Rhodes	Watkins
Mizell	Robison	Watson
Mollohan	Rogers, Colo.	Weicker
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Whalen
Moorhead	Rooney, N.Y.	White
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Whitehurst
Morton	Rostenkowski	Widnall
Mosher	Roth	Wiggins
Moss	Roudebush	Williams
Murphy, Ill.	Roybal	Wilson, Bob
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruth	Wolff
Myers	Ryan	Wydler
Natcher	Sandman	Wyman
Nedzi	Satterfield	Yates
Nelsen	Schadeberg	Yatron
Nichols	Scheuer	Young
Nix	Schneebeli	Zablocki
	Schwengel	Zion
	Scott	Zwach

NAYS—7

Ashbrook	Landgrebe	Wylie
Clancy	Rarick	
Gross	Scherle	

NOT VOTING—151

Abbitt	Edmondson	Meeds
Addabbo	Edwards, Calif.	Mills
Albert	Edwards, La.	Mize
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Montgomery
Arends	Eshleman	Morse
Aspinall	Evans, Colo.	O'Konski
Baring	Fallon	Olsen
Bell, Calif.	Farbstein	Patman
Berry	Fascell	Pepper
Blanton	Feighan	Pettis
Blatnik	Findley	Pollock
Brasco	Fisher	Powell
Bray	Flowers	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Flynt	Pucinski
Brotzman	Ford, Gerald R.	Quie
Brown, Calif.	Fulton, Tenn.	Reifel
Brown, Ohio	Fuqua	Reuss
Broyhill, Va.	Garmatz	Riegle
Buchanan	Gibbons	Rivers
Burton, Calif.	Griffin	Roberts
Byrnes, Wis.	Grover	Rodino
Caffery	Haley	Rosenthal
Cahill	Hall	Ruppe
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	St Germain
Carey	Harsha	St. Onge
Carter	Hastings	Saylor
Cederberg	Hays	Shipley
Celler	Holifield	Sisk
Chisholm	Horton	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Hosmer	Smith, N.Y.
Clausen, Don H.	Jarman	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Calif.	Stanton
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Stubblefield
Conyers	Kee	Taft
Corbett	Kirwan	Taylor
Cowger	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Kyl	Thompson, Ga.
Dawson	Landrum	Tiernan
Dellenback	Latta	Tunney
Dennis	Lloyd	Ullman
Dent	Long, La.	Utt
Derwinski	Lujan	Vander Jagt
Devine	Lukens	Waldie
Dingell	McClory	Wampler
Dorn	McCloskey	Watts
Dwyer	McEwen	Whalley
Eckhardt	McMillan	Whitten
	Martin	Wilson, Charles H.
	Mathias	

Winn Wright
Wold Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Dent with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don Clausen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Reigel.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wold.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS, CROSS REFERENCES, AND PUNCTUATION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 4293

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct section numbers, cross references, and punctuation in the enrollment of the bill just passed, H.R. 4293.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the executive offices when the vote was taken on the bill, H.R. 4293, the Export Control Act extension and was, therefore, unable to be here for the purpose of the voting.

Therefore, I want the RECORD to reflect my position as being in favor of the extension of the Export Control Act, and had I been present I would have voted aye.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I was on my way to the floor of the House at the time of the rollcall and would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed had I been able to reach the floor in time to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will appear in the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement with reference to the vote on the student loan bill conference report. I was returning from my Pittsburgh office for today's session and my plane was several hours overdue at the Washington National Airport.

Had I been able to be present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of the student loan bill conference report on rollcall No. 231 this afternoon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 13950

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill H.R. 13950.

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

There was no objection.

THE OIL INDUSTRY WINS—THE TAXPAYERS LOSE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, while the Nation is paying major attention to the moratorium and world's series, the oil industry is quietly carving out of the House-passed tax reform bill provisions eroding its accumulated tax privileges. Yesterday, the Senate Finance Committee began the quiet process of evisceration, dropping from the tax reform measure two sections which would have cost the oil industry $65 million in added taxes. This is just a bare beginning. The first benefit handed back on a silver platter to the oil industry was the foreign tax credit, which the House had repealed. This is the credit American companies may take on their U.S. tax returns for taxes paid to a foreign government. So oil companies, under action taken yesterday, would still be able to deduct losses on new overseas operations against domestic income in 1 year, then apply the foreign tax on those same operations against income earned here in another year.

This confers a double benefit upon the oil industry, violating the rule that a foreign tax credit cannot be larger than the U.S. tax that would otherwise have been paid.

Mr. Speaker, the tax reform bill now before the Senate Finance Committee is the most delicate of compromises. In it, each vested interest affected has lost a small but significant portion of its accumulated tax privileges, all gained at the expense of the average lower- and middle-income taxpayer. This bill is broad enough, but certainly not deep enough. Nonetheless, it is acceptable for now as a beginning, although many Members of the House, myself among them, approved of its final form grudgingly, because it was too shallow in total cuts made in tax privileges.

Many vested interests in the Nation were prevailed upon to accept a cut in tax privileges on the ground that all other interests were sacrificing some of their tax benefits so the average taxpayer could receive some relief. The specter was often raised of one industry or interest using its influence to render itself immune to such a compromise. It was added that such an act would be foolhardy, because it would unravel the entire skein of compromise which was

the backbone holding the entire tax bill together. Few felt one industry would be foolish enough to do such a thing, but it has now happened.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry is destroying the entire tax bill, depriving every American taxpayer of desperately needed financial relief and tax justice. Oil will undoubtedly succeed in eliminating almost every provision of the bill applying to its operations. This, in turn, will be the signal to every other concentration of strength to do the same. If the oil crowd is thumbing its nose at the public and getting away with it, why not the rest?

I shall never vote to accept any conference report which allows the oil industry to get away with such a blatant outrage. It is a deliberate insult to every person in this country who demands tax reform. Think of the prices we shall all have to pay this winter for fuel oil and gasoline. Twice what the going world rate is to any other consumer outside the United States. We are even going to have to pay indirectly for the many full page ads they are running in the papers defending their privileges, for these are all tax deductible.

There can be no tax reform without including the oil industry. They have shown their contempt for the actions of this House and needs and requests of the American people.

In 1967, major oil companies paid out 8.3 percent of their net income before taxes as Federal income tax. Last year, in 1968, that figure dropped to only 7.7 percent of their income in the form of Federal tax. Sinclair Oil earned a $101 million profit before taxes and received a tax credit from the overburdened taxpayer of $2.7 million. Together Atlantic and Sinclair netted $341,537,000 while paying a total combined Federal income of $200,000. Gulf cut its tax rate from 7.8 percent to less than 1 percent, while netting almost $1 billion. The lowest percentage rates belong to large companies able to apply their royalties abroad against Federal tax liabilities, which is exactly the penalty removed yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee.

This is the cold, harsh truth. If the people want to know who is arrogantly cheating them while daring them to do something about it, there they are. I fervently hope this House will reject any tax bill benefiting the oil industry.

TAX REFORM, WILL WE GET IT?

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that both the Nixon administration and the Senate are determined to scuttle the tax reform bill passed by the House in August. First, there came the administration's ironic complaint that the House-passed reform bill would provide too much tax relief lor lower- and middle-income taxpayers, while shifting too much of the burden onto corporations and the wealthy. Then, the Senate began showing signs of bending under the pressure mounted by special interest groups organized in opposition to tax reform.

One by one, long-sought reform measures are being placed on the Senate's chopping block. How is this all being justified? As one Member of the Senate remarked, "The general public's intense fervor for tax reform has greatly subsided since summer."

Apparently the Senator has been listening and talking with a strangely different "general public" than I have. The message I have been receiving lately from the district which I represent merely underscores the average citizen's demand that Congress deliver on last year's promise for tax reform and deliver now. If the enthusiasm for tax reform has cooled, it has cooled in the executive suites of America's corporations. Ever since the wealthy has discovered that for once they may have to pay something that resembles their "fair share" of the Federal income tax, there has been nothing but wailing from one end of Wall Street to the other.

Of course, the sad fact for the millions of average American taxpayers is that these cries against tax reform are being heard. I was pleased to note, however, that instead of trying to squeeze more "reform" out of the House tax reform bill, Senator YARBOROUGH suggested that the Senate add to this legislation by raising the personal exemption.

Along with other Members last April, I introduced H.R. 10592, which provided for an increase in the personal exemption of the Federal income tax from $600 to $1,000. Much to my disappointment, the Ways and Means Committee failed to include any increase in the personal exemption in the tax reform bill presented to the House. Although I believe the tax reform bill represents a great milestone in tax legislation, no tax reform can be complete without raising the personal exemption.

Since its adoption in 1948, the personal exemption has not been raised despite the fact that the cost of living in America has jumped nearly 53 percent. If Congress is to begin living up to its obligation to the average wage earner, who is paying the lion's share of America's tax bill, then it must start by increasing the personal exemption to at least $1,000. I, therefore, hope the Senate will heed the advice of Senator YARBOROUGH and amend the House-passed tax reform bill to include a $1,000 personal exemption.

DEMAND FOR RESIGNATION OF DR. YOLLES

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, all of you are aware of the liberal attitude taken by Dr. Stanley Yolles, head of the National Institute of Mental Health, relative to his position on the sale and use of marihuana.

But yesterday at our crime hearings this gentleman testified, and in response to my specific question as to whether or not he favored dropping or removing minimum mandatory jail term for sellers of hard drugs, specifically heroin, to minors and teenagers, Dr. Yolles responded in the affirmative.

Dr. Yolles' response to my specific question about drug pushers and other questions, as well as the context of his testimony, convinced me that he is unfit to serve longer in this or any other administration. His views are indefensible, and they are completely contrary to the efforts of the Nixon administration to crack down on narcotics. Regardless of what may motivate his thinking, in my judgment his permissive approach to this critical national problem will come as welcome news to every dope peddler in the country.

Dr. Yolles' views are an affront to every decent, law-abiding citizen in America. At a time when we are on the verge of a narcotics crisis, a supposedly responsible Federal official comes along with the incredibly ridiculous idea of dropping mandatory jail sentences for those who push dope, even for those adults selling hard drugs to minors.

I do not believe that Dr. Yolles' views are shared by one-tenth of 1 percent of the American people. It is obvious to me that he has no grasp whatsoever of this problem. But time just does not allow us an opportunity for him to escape from his ivory tower and get in touch with reality. He can peddle these views as a private citizen if he likes, but I do not think the American taxpayer should have to foot the bill for such irresponsibility. I call upon Dr. Yolles to resign forthwith, and in the event he fails to do so, I do not think that this administration should any longer put up with the embarrassment he has caused it.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, our country has long been disturbed by the war in Vietnam. Now, when we delve into the reasons for our being in Vietnam, three basic ones are given: First, to permit self-determination by the people of the type of government the majority desires; second, to contain communism; and, third, the domino theory.

In 1964, it was evident that the 17,000 American troops and the South Vietnamese were facing defeat and that our forces were on the brink of being thrown out of Vietnam.

The Tonkin Gulf incident occurred at this time, purportedly two of our destroyers, the *Turner Joy* and the *Maddox*, were attacked while on the high seas. Immediately, the United States retaliated by bombing North Vietnamese bases. Next, Congress was given the above information and was asked to pass the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which it did with small dissent.

Today, it is accepted that the *Turner Joy* and *Maddox* were not under attack.

The commanding officers do not so state; actually, they were with South Vietnamese ships attacking North Vietnam. Suppose Miami were under attack by Argentina's vessels and two Mexican ships were in their midst, actually we would shoot at all the ships, would we not? Yet, it is not shown that our ships were fired upon.

By the authority of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, our troops were increased in number to 542,000, and the bloodiest conflict since World War II was begun.

It seems quite logical that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a ploy to arouse public indignation, and support of intervention.

The ruse was transiently effective. With the country feeling our ships had been attacked, the increased troop deployment was approved.

On investigation and study of the reasons for increased involvement, the purpose for the creation of the Tonkin Gulf incident was perceived by many people throughout our country, thousands, even millions of our citizens became convinced that we were no longer basing our actions on the premise that right makes might—in other words, our country was departing from the paths of righteousness.

Conduct of the war was strictly controlled from the White House; advice of military leaders of recognized ability was disregarded. The enterprise, winning the war in Vietnam, lost the name of action. Vacillation and indecision were costly in lives and treasure. By 1967, it was clear that the war in Vietnam was being lost and that there was not the determination in the leadership to win.

With Congressmen STANTON, of Ohio, and DUNCAN, of Tennessee, at our own expense, we visited Vietnam in 1965. We were with the "Big Red One," the 1st Division at Bienhoa, and with the 1st Cavalry Division at An Khe. We saw the finest, best-trained, best-equipped young soldiers the world has ever seen.

We visited villages supposedly pacified, one in particular was called Happy Valley.

I also visited general hospitals in the Saigon area. Conditions were terrible. Two or more patients were often in one bed. Diseases rarely seen here were rampant there—malaria, tuberculosis, leprosy.

The Vietnamese are of small stature. The average weight is about 110 pounds and height 5 feet, 4 inches. But for all their illnesses and smallness in stature, they are highly intelligent.

In 1966, I was a member of the Speaker's Committee of Combat Veterans of World War II sent to evaluate the war effort. On this occasion, we visited I Corps commanded by Gen. Lou Walt. We were privileged to see our Marines in action. Again, they were the finest young men I have ever seen.

We visited the 1st Cavalary Division at An Khe. This time artillery was firing from the division perimeter, "Happy Valley," the pacified village, was neither happy nor pacified. We were no longer permitted to enter.

I visited the Mang Yang Pass where, in 1954, 5,000 of the flower of the French Army was attacked by the Vietnamese, where 3,900 lonely graves mark the spot where these young Frenchmen lost their lives.

We also visited the Montegnard villages and saw these people in their native habiliments. The men wore loin cloths. The women wore only short skirts. Their houses were built of bamboo with thatch roofs. Their educational level evidently was quite low. It was my feeling that they knew nothing about the war, communism, or any other ideology. They apparently wanted peace—and this desire was evident in all villages throughout South Vietnam.

What has this war cost us? The lives of 40,000 of the flower of American manhood, 250,000 maimed and mangled, and 120 billions of dollars.

Every 30 days as much blacktop is laid in Vietnam as there is in the New Jersey Turnpike. Every 60 days as much concrete is poured as is in Route 495, Washington's outer drive.

Also, this war has caused serious dissension among the youth of our country who may be called to serve. The questionable morality of the war and the serious inequities of the draft have caused thousands of youngsters to lose faith in our beloved country. Again, the war must be brought to a conclusion to cut short incipient revolt and rebellion.

The purposes of our being in Vietnam stated by the previous administration will be discussed in order.

First. That we are there to contain communism.

Does it make sense to contain communism 10,000 miles from home when Communist Cuba lies 90 miles off our shore, with its cancerous tentacles infiltrating and enmeshing the countries of South and Central America? Not only that, known Communists are permitted to work in our defense plants here.

Second. That we are in South Vietnam so that they may determine the type of government they want.

Numerous authorities, including Eisenhower, stated that 80 percent of the people would have gone with Ho Chi Minh if they had been permitted to hold fall elections in 1956, as had been provided by the Geneva Conference Convention, but our country went blindly in on the side of the 20 percent. Therefore, our argument for self-determination is spurious.

Third. That all countries of Southeast Asia would fall to communism.

The countries which would be affected do not fear this or they would have combat forces to the limit of their abilities in South Vietnam. Australia has fewer soldiers in Vietnam than it had at Tobruk. The Philippines have no combat forces. Malaysia and Indonesia have none. If they do not fear invasion, why should we sacrifice the lives of our young men to prevent it?

Our young people in America know the sordid reasons for this war. They feel that when they die in Vietnam, their lives are not given in defense of the United States. And their lives are all they have. They feel that their visions, dreams, and hopes for the future are sacrificed to keep a few Vietnamese dictators in power.

I submit that this is the basic reason for unrest in our colleges and universities. The war must be ended expeditiously. I support the administration's policy for ending it.

Before entrance into any war, we must know beyond reasonable doubt that the future of our country is threatened, basing our actions on the words of Lincoln:

> Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it.

We cannot fail.

ARTHUR GOLDBERG WRITES ABOUT THE GREEN BERETS

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I insert with these remarks an editorial from this week's issue of Life magazine by Arthur Goldberg, formerly an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, a man who has rendered distinguished service as our Ambassador to the United Nations and who performed most effectively as Secretary of Labor under the late President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, from the first unfolding of the recent Green Beret incident, I had a strong sense of personal disquiet. Somehow the development did not conform with American traditions nor with the traditions of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence which form the foundations upon which the legal system of this Nation is built.

Freedom has been recognized throughout history as fragile requiring protection of every facet of its many sides if the whole was to survive. I believe that in the recent Green Beret case something of great significance was taken from the American Government and the American people. Arthur Goldberg expresses quite eloquently and objectively the nature of that element of loss. After reading it I hope that many of my colleagues will share my feeling that something more must be done than to just brush this case under the rug.

Those the Government charged initially with a crime will, I think, throughout their lives be faced with the fact that no mechanism is provided to clear them, if in fact they are not guilty. On the other hand, if they were guilty no mechanism is provided to then impose punishment which our system demands must be given if law is to continue to be the basis for our society.

Mr. Goldberg's article follows:

ARTHUR GOLDBERG WRITES ABOUT THE GREEN BERETS

The dropping of murder charges in the now famous Green Beret case has almost everywhere evoked a widespread sense of relief.

I must confess that I find this reaction—and, even more, the powerful political clamor against prosecution which preceded the

dropping of charges—profoundly disturbing. In them I note an appalling, indeed frightening, deterioration in our national standards of morality and law.

Two comments are necessary by way of preface. First, what I say must not be construed as reflecting adversely upon the soldiers who were charged with murder, or as a judgment upon the facts of the case. Although the eight men will now not have their day in court, the old principle that persons accused of crime are presumed innocent until found guilty still lies at the heart of our legal system. The charges that were levied against the Berets were only charges. They were not evidence. Still less were they a finding of guilt.

Second, I do not have access to information which would enable me to judge whether the national security would indeed have been jeopardized by disclosures which might have resulted had the case been brought to trial. Nor, in fact, do I have any quarrel with the general proposition that considerations of national security may sometimes justify a decision by the authorities not to prosecute a particular set of charges.

What does alarm me is the way we have responded as a nation to the grave allegation that one or more of our uniformed soldiers *executed without trial* a foreign national whom they had in their complete control, because they suspected him to be a double agent.

Few of our people, and even fewer of our leaders, have manifested any sense of outrage that such an execution without trial might have occurred, or might have been ordered by American officers. Indeed, General Creighton Abrams, our commander in Vietnam and a brave and forthright soldier who knows the rules of war, has come under sharp public criticism for having insisted on their applicability in this case—to the point of ordering that murder charges be brought.

Of course war is hell. I suppose there has never been a war in which troops under the stress of battle have not committed acts of savagery which they would not think of performing under other circumstances. And I recognize that a counter-guerrilla war in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam is peculiarly prone to instances of misconduct of this kind.

But the Green Beret incident, as alleged, does *not* involve lapses of discipine under battlefield conditions. The charge was that a South Vietnamese agent in our employ and control was simply executed—rather than being detained, or tried, or turned over to the South Vietnamese for trial. No civilized nation can permit individual members of its armed forces to take this kind of action on their own initiative. Down that road lies anarchy.

Article 106 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides that alleged spies caught behind our lines and not in uniform may be punished by death—but not before trial and conviction by an appropriate tribunal. Articles 93 and 118 of the Code make it a crime for an American serviceman to murder or even to practice cruelty toward "any person subject to his orders." The Geneva Conventions to which we subscribe impose similar restrictions.

At the end of World War II we participated in war crimes trials at Nuremberg and elsewhere in which enemy military personnel who mistreated prisoners under their control were prosecuted, convicted and punished. We sentenced General Yamashita, the "Tiger of Malaya," to death not for his own acts but for his failure to control the conduct of troops under his jurisdiction. We treated as war criminals those German generals who had executed uniformed soldiers and agents whom the Office of Strategic Services had sent into occupied Europe to train partisans, gather intelligence and commit sabotage—despite the generals' defense that Hitler had ordered them to do so. Under international law, as we applied it, an order such as Hitler's was an unlawful one, and therefore not entitled to obedience.

I take great pride in this nation's historic fidelity to the rules which govern civilized societies even when they are at war. Traditionally we have never allowed expedience to justify departures from these rules. In August of 1776, when our nation's very ability to survive was in doubt, the Continental Congress provided that alien spies were to be executed only according to the law and usage of nations, and on the sentence of a general court martial. The rule was followed from the bleak days at Valley Forge to the end of the war.

In 1942, when our struggle against the Axis powers was at its most desperate, the United States Supreme Court interrupted its summer recess for the first time in 22 years to reconvene and review the procedural protections being afforded eight Nazi saboteurs in civilian garb who had been landed in this country by submarine.

Has the time now come, after all these years, to adopt a lower standard of conduct?

The war in Vietnam is a tragic war, marked by events which no human being can applaud. Whether or not the national interests assertedly at stake there warrant our participation in it—at such sacrifice in lives, treasure and morality—the situation in Vietnam cannot justify us as a nation now, for the first time in our history, to tolerate—more, to legitimate—the cold-blooded murder of individuals wholly under the control of our troops. We may jail spies or prosecute them. But individual American soldiers may not take it upon themselves, away from the battlefield, to serve as prosecutor, judge and executioner. That is utterly unacceptable—now, as it was in 1776.

If the price of the war in Vietnam includes our coming to tolerate or applaud this sort of moral breakdown, it is one I am not willing to pay. Nor should any civilized nation. As a great patriot, Tom Paine, once said:

"He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent that will reach to himself."

PRISONERS OF WAR: THE MEN IN LIMBO

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of American citizens, members of the armed services, being held prisoner in North Vietnam. We have been able to positively identify 401 men as captured. Approximately a thousand others, who are listed as missing in action, are thought to be help captive.

Today I am introducing a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that our Nation and the people of the world do all in their power to obtain the humane treatment and prompt release of prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese.

The Communist government calls the men "war criminals," and denies that as such they are entitled to the basic rights under the Geneva Conventions. In fact, they are the victims of the guerrilla war engineered by the Government of North Vietnam.

I believe it is time that the antiwar protesters in this country begin looking at the Communist nation that is responsible for the countless deaths in South Vietnam and the atrocities being committed daily in the name of a "war of liberation."

It would be a great step forward if American boys received treatment half as humane as that received by Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army prisoners. The noisy demonstrators here at home would be well advised to work for this goal rather than the often meaningless slogans of the "new left."

People advocating the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces do not seem to remember those of our troops over whom we have no control: the men held under subhuman conditions by the north.

I believe it is time to make every possible move to put pressure on Hanoi through diplomatic channels to free American men held by the Communists.

There are "free" nations which are on cordial terms with Hanoi. Sweden, for example, has most recently agreed to a $40 million aid package for Hanoi. It is difficult to imagine that efforts by the Swedish Government in behalf of humane treatment for POW's would be unproductive.

I include the text of my resolution in the RECORD at this time:

H. CON. RES. 414

Whereas the United States Government and the Republic of Vietnam have continuously honored the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war;

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly appealed to North Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to respect the requirements of the Geneva Convention, which North Vietnam has endorsed;

Whereas the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have disregarded the provisions of the Geneva Convention and refused to release the names of prisoners of war who are members of the Armed Forces of the United States, to permit the regular flow of mail to or from those prisoners, and otherwise to accord humane treatment to those prisoners, and to permit inspection of the facilities in which those prisoners are held: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and all other concerned departments or agencies of the United States Government, the United Nations, and the peoples of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war and to take such steps as may be appropriate to obtain the prompt release of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States so held as prisoners of war.

AID FOR BIAFRA

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some of us who are interested in alleviating dire hunger, privation, and suffering in Biafra have been making urgent, persistent efforts to step up the aid being rendered by our Government, take satisfaction in knowing that our efforts are continuing, and that our intercessions and those of interested private, charitable, and religious groups are also helping a great deal to ease this horrible situation.

I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of the House the recent action of President Nixon in making available two C–97 transport planes to joint church aid for their Biafran relief operations. Mr. William E. Timmons, Deputy Assistant to the President wrote me on October 10, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 10, 1969.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: As you recall, I wrote you on August 29 in response to your letter to the President on behalf of the Interfaith Effort for Biafran Relief. At that time, I stated I would be in further touch with you. I have been requested to inform you that the two C–97 transport planes have been transferred to Joint Church Aid for their relief operations.

The transfer of these aircraft is another indication of the President's deep and abiding concern to help relieve suffering in this tragic conflict. You can be sure we will continue our generous support of these humanitarian efforts.

With cordial regard,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

This is good news indeed, but it remains very clear that we must not rest on our oars in this matter. I recognize the operational problems of getting adequate relief to the sources, and they are serious, but some of the agencies concerned have found ways to circumvent them, and are managing to get urgently needed supplies into this distressed land to save the lives of young children and people who are suffering indescribably from lack of food and other necessaries of life.

From the start, I have been making every possible effort to increase our aid to these woefully stricken people, and in thanking the President for his most recent action, I am again urging him to see to it that we keep up our country's strong financial support, in joining as we have been doing so generously, to send specific help to these stricken people.

Up to this time our Government has made available about $63 million in aid which represents two-thirds of the global contributions, and which includes very substantial food donations under Public Law 480, to such commendable, human-spirited outside relief groups as the Catholic Welfare Service, Church World Service, Protestant, Jewish and other relief groups, UNICEF, and the world food program.

In addition, private U.S. organizations to date have made available about $12 million in funds to assist the Biafran cause.

I am saddened to note, however, that some of the planes performing acts of mercy to bring food and other supplies to these poor people have been shot down, and otherwise restricted in their missions of mercy, making it very difficult in carrying out their dedicated, often hazardous, work to help these desperately needy people.

Nevertheless, this work must go on, and we must do everything we can, not only to provide funds, but where possible, to provide aircraft that other people are so bravely willing to fly in order to bring food and material relief to the sorrowfully afflicted children and people of Biafra.

I know that we who are so deeply interested in this great, humanitarian cause must and will continue to do everything we can to alleviate the truly deplorable hunger and privation which have caused widespread deaths, emaciation and untold distress.

Let me thank and hail the wonderful leaders and helpers enlisted in this cause. I am very proud of the church folks and others in my own great congressional district who are contributing such glorious efforts and very generous help to this great, human mission. The Good Lord will bless them and I am confident their work will continue until this great battle of mercy has been won.

I especially want the President to know of our deep gratitude for his effective and sustaining help.

MRS. NIKI ABINANTI

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, all too seldom in this day and age does anyone make a concerted effort to publicize the constructive activities of American youth, especially those who are attending America's universities and colleges; a fact in itself that is deplorable and inexcusable.

If one were to believe only what is reported concerning American youth, it would seem that the radical, irresponsible, and disruptive young people were in the majority. Quite frankly, such is not the case. In my judgment, the publicity seeking radicals constitute only a very small minority of our young people, while the majority are responsible and are constructively seeking ways to improve society.

Recently a young mother in my district in California set out to prove to the general public that the young people attending Humboldt State College were, indeed, acting constructively and responsibly, and her efforts have been more than successful.

Mrs. Niki Abinanti of Arcata became aroused by the reports in the media concerning the college riots and other disruptive activities of a minority of students and decided that it was time that someone publicized the responsible actions of the majority.

In order that my colleagues may know of this dynamic lady's efforts, I am including an article written about her from the Humboldt Times-Standard. I hope that, in this way, others might be encouraged to step forth and become involved in a similar way.

LAUDING HSC WORKERS: SHE SPEAKS OUT FOR OUR QUIET STUDENTS

A petite one-woman steamroller has been quietly at work championing the activities of college students on the Humboldt State College campus.

Her concern is that "the radical, rowdy, publicity—seeking minority of students on California campuses and throughout the nation" have been getting the spotlight in the news.

In the meantime, the vast majority is not only unheard—but unheralded—a situation which, she says, broadens the so-called generation gap.

WRITING, PHONING

Mrs. Niki C. Abinanti, 1112 Chester Ave., Arcata, is either at her typewriter or on the telephone these days in a concerted effort to start a movement to publicize the constructive activities of students here. She has high hopes the movement will spread, with the help of other adults, throughout the state and nation.

To this end she has sent communications to CBS's Walter Cronkite, Harry Reasoner, Roger Mudd and Mike Silver; to Joey Bishop, who, she says has indicated some interest; California's Governor Ronald Reagan; Time Magazine's San Francisco headquarters.

She has also been in touch with a friend who could contact Danny Thomas; Kay Hart, a singer at Bimbo's Supper Club, local legislators and state legislators, including Assemblyman Jess Unruh.

So far she has a lot of communications she can exhibit for her efforts, some 80 registered air mail letters to CBS alone—but no takers.

A Time official said it was possible they could draw a "parallel" in the fall.

CELEBRITY VOICE

The housewife-mother believes that celebrities with their facility to reach millions of people could interest others, like herself, in projecting the good which is predominent in the youth of today. This could be done from community to community, in programs which would vary depending on environmental factors.

Mrs. Abinanti began searching the news, collecting accounts of the activities of college students on the HSC campus when campus troubles elsewhere were at their peak. She said "It was exceedingly gratifying to find that a vast majority of students were not only refraining from revolt, but were actually engaged in constructive activities, to the benefit of the entire community."

It was she who conceived the idea, and through the cooperation of Channel 3 and TV executive Paul Hoff, a student question and answer program was taped and presented in prime time locally. After the students' opinions were aired, the station received a barrage of mail and an extremely favorable public reaction.

She believes that such coverage nationwide would be highly relevant and would afford a pleasant change of pace besides giving the "forgotten majority" its chance to be heard.

ADVICE WELCOME

Reluctant to take the limelight, Mrs. Abinanti is quick to point out in her communications to others she has not had any experience in "this type of thing," and if she can do anything at all to get the ball rolling that is sufficient evidence that others can readily do it too.

Her approach to the problems relating to inadequate quarters and accommodations at Humboldt County's Juvenile Hall and Probation Building over the past years, however, was hardly reluctant.

It was her perseverance, along with that of interested community officials, which is largely responsible for the building of a new facility, now under construction.

If anyone can promote her present idea to fruition and wants to wager—best bets would be on this soft-spoken ball of fire.

AFTER THE MORATORIUM

(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, as the tumult and shouting of the moratorium demonstrations fade into history, certain facts seem clear to me.

In the first place, a great many Americans earnestly desire peace in Vietnam.

No American desires this more than the President of the United States himself and he has embarked on a course which he hopes can bring honorable and lasting peace there.

The second fact which emerges is that the multiplicity of voices of critics of the Vietnam policy have, for all their noise and thunder, failed to come up with a clear and viable alternative to the President's present policy of step by step withdrawal and Vietnamization of the war.

This stands in vivid contrast to the tragic disregarding of any hope for freedom and self-determination for the people of Vietnam and the total waste of billions of dollars and 38,000 precious American lives which total and immediate withdrawal would entail.

The third thing that is clear to me is that many critics underestimate both the strength and virtue of the elected government in Saigon and underestimate the weakness and evil of its Communist challengers.

When I visited Vietnam in February of this year, I found a strong note of confidence in the increasing strength and popularity and the viability of that infant constitutional republic expressed by its military, government, and business leaders and by our military officials and those in our State Department.

There is every reason for such confidence.

The 1968 Tet offensive decimated the Vietcong forces, which were created and have already been sustained by Hanoi, and strengthened the hand of the Saigon regime. Its growing strength and responsiveness to the people have increased its popularity.

And as it grows month by month stronger and able to assume the burden of combat and as it grows more experienced in government, I am confident it can and will succeed in securing freedom and self-determination for the people in South Vietnam.

I urge every American to support the President's right and honorable course in Vietnam.

I feel the Governor of Alabama spoke for the overwhelming majority of the people of my State and for millions of other Americans in the following statement which was published in the Birmingham News:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Oct. 15, 1969]

WHICH: THE EASY—OR HONORABLE WAY?

Another time of testing has come to America.

Many times in our history as a nation, we have had to decide between the easy way and the honorable way, both at home and abroad.

While our decisions to stand firm in behalf of freedom and justice have not always been universally popular, they have always been supported by the great majority of American people.

Today, we reach a time when we must decide again between the easy way and the honorable way.

Our flag flies in battle on foreign soil—while at home there are those who would have us believe that our people have lost the will to meet our commitments.

Let the word go forth from Alabama and America today that this vocal minority does not speak for the tens of millions of silent Americans whose deep desire for peace burns as brightly as the fires of our warriors' camps but who know that a peace without honor and justice is no peace at all.

Let every enemy, wherever he may be, know that we as Americans have again chosen the honorable way. (Albert Brewer, Governor of Alabama, Oct. 15, 1969.)

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, while many of us have been critical of the conduct of the war in Vietnam—some of us desiring a more decisive military policy and others advocating total, immediate withdrawal—President Nixon has embarked, in a relatively short time, on a course in Vietnam which I believe may well prove sound.

It consists of a step-by-step withdrawal of American forces coupled with the Vietnamization of the war over a period of time so that the government in Saigon, created and elected by the people of that nation, shall not be undermined in the process and so that the Vietnamese military will have time to take over combat operations.

If this policy is allowed to proceed, I have every confidence that the South Vietnamese Government and military will become strong enough to guarantee self-determination for the people of the Republic of Vietnam and a free choice of their own government and governmental leaders.

Total and immediate withdrawal of American forces at this time would constitute nothing less than unconditional surrender and the unnecessary undermining of any hope of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam not to mention the wanton slaughter of thousands of individuals in that land. After the expenditure of 38,000 precious American lives and the investment of billions of dollars, such a withdrawal is, of course, unthinkable.

Self-determination for the people of Vietnam is the one basic principle which the Nixon administration feels is not negotiable.

Under these circumstances, the war moratorium proposal is, in my judgment, destructive and remarkably unrealistic.

Had the President escalated the war or made new, unreasonable demands on the Communists, such demonstrations as those we have witnessed this week might be understandable, although I would disagree with those who participated.

Supporters of the moratorium say they are demonstrating to stress to the President their feelings and bring the situation to his attention.

Earlier this year, in a speech to the Nation, Mr. Nixon expressed his extreme concern about the Vietnamese situation saying nothing had taken so much of his time and energy as the search for a way to bring lasting peace to Vietnam.

He said, and I quote:

I want to end this war. The American people want to end this war. The people of South Viet-Nam want to end this war. But we want to end it permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Viet-Nam will not have to fight in the future in another Viet-Nam someplace else in the world.

There is no question of the President's concern.

Also, there are already indications that the growing vocalization of opposition to Mr. Nixon's policies are hampering our efforts in the Paris peace talks.

According to a wire service story last week, negotiators for the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong appealed directly to the American public to increase opposition to the President's policies to force him to accept their negotiation proposals in Paris.

The release goes on to say that Col. Ha Van Lau and Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, and I quote, "whose governments apparently are setting great hopes on opposition to Nixon, warmly applauded the dissent in Washington."

The Communists could not ask for more in the way of support for their goals nor for their reluctance to negotiate a peace settlement.

Just what is our policy in Vietnam today, which is being so violently attacked?

One major negotiating position of the United States is the withdrawal in stages over a period of 12 months the major portions of all United States, allied, and other non-South Vietnamese forces immediately after an agreement is reached.

An international supervisory body, acceptable to both sides, would be created for the purpose of verifying withdrawals and for any other purposes agreed upon between the two sides.

This international body would begin operating in accordance with an agreed timetable and would participate in arranging supervised cease-fires.

As soon as possible after it began functioning, elections would be held under agreed procedures and under the supervision of this international body.

The United States does not insist that North Vietnam admit that it has forces in South Vietnam, for, as you know, no such admission has ever been made by the North Vietnamese delegation.

Arrangements would be made for the

earliest possible release of prisoners of war on both sides.

This country is seeking no bases or military ties in Vietnam and we are willing to agree to neutrality for the country if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose. Nor does this country have any intention of imposing any form of government upon the people of South Vietnam.

Our negotiators have said that we are prepared to accept any government that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves.

The proposal to pull totally and immediately out of Vietnam or to tell the North Vietnamese that we will withdraw by a specific date could be disastrous not only for South Vietnam, but other nations in Southeast Asia which are trying desperately to determine their own futures without outside interference.

Vietnam represents a commitment by the United States to freedom in the world. It is a seedbed of individual rights which, if nurtured by American support, can spread these rights and keep them alive throughout Asia.

If the United States withdraws from Vietnam now, it will mean that this country has foresaken its obligations to the world and especially to Asia. It will open the floodgates of communism which would suppress their freedoms.

I do not want to bear the responsibility for this in Asia and I do not think the American people want to sit by and watch while one nation after another succumbs to Communist aggression.

Our policies in Vietnam during the last two administrations were unwise and led to the problems facing this Nation today. We should not, therefore, at a time when we are finally on the right track, turn around and resort to another egregious error in Vietnam policy—the immediate withdrawal of American troops.

Under previous administrations, we made the mistake of sending American combat troops to Vietnam. Once we sent them to that country, we should have had unrestricted military policies aimed at a real victory.

Massive campaigns by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong over the past year and a half, such as the Tet offensive in 1968, have ended in total failure and have, in fact, resulted in stronger support of the Republic of Vietnam's Government.

The Tet offensive was aimed at displaying the strength of opposition to President Thieu's government by taking over cities and attracting the wholesale support of the people.

Instead, the people of South Vietnam fled in terror and were further alienated from those who were supposedly liberating them by the Communist atrocities committed in the process.

These offensives have decimated the Vietcong so that current opposition in South Vietnam is composed of about 75 percent North Vietnamese forces.

It is generally agreed that following the failure of the Tet offensive in February of 1968, the Vietcong were placed on the defensive. North Vietnam was hard-pressed to supply enough men for the battle in the South and Hanoi reflected noticeably the effects of U.S. bombing while South Vietnam, in the wake of national elections, showed new confidence and ability in governing and defending itself.

After the Vietcong's unsuccessful 1968 Tet offensive, if President Johnson and Secretary McNamara had listened to the urgent request of our military leaders, the enemy forces could have been brought to their knees and negotiations started on our terms.

This, however, was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many critics of this administration's policy in Vietnam and some of them, in my judgment have assumed the National Liberation Front to have greater strength than it in fact has.

The NLF, which was created, sustained and has been directed by the North Vietnam Communist government, lost much of its intrastructure during the Tet offensive and has reached a position of relative impotence.

The Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, to contrast, has grown step by step stronger through the support of the people of that country which created the government in Saigon.

It is unjust and highly inaccurate to refer as some Members have done to both governments as two dictatorships without recognizing the basic distinctions between the government in Hanoi and the government in Saigon.

The Saigon government is moving toward freedom and individual rights and it is my desire to see it become stronger and purer and a better government.

Most importantly, this desire is strongly shared, to my personal knowledge, by many in the legislative and executive branches of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

To equate the infant representative republic in South Vietnam with the gangster government of Hanoi is, in my judgment, libelous.

It is as though these critics are saying that a child who has the measles is as sick as one who has cancer, so it is good to give the first child cancer because there is no hope for him anyway. Or it is to equate a sometimes-errant teenager with a hardened psychopathic criminal.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand this position.

On the positive side, within the past 2 years there has been created a constitutional republic in South Vietnam with the constitution drafted by a representative assembly and approved by a free vote of the people. It created a tripartite system of government including an executive branch and legislative branch elected directly by the people plus an independent judiciary.

The present Government of South Vietnam under President Thieu is not perfect, no government ever is. But it is the elected government, chosen by the people of South Vietnam in a free election despite acts of terrorism by the Vietcong.

President Thieu and others in the South Vietnamese Government want peace and have made a number of concessions to the North Vietnamese to attain this goal.

Their country has been war-torn for years. It is unrealistic at this time, when an acceptable solution is in sight, to abruptly halt our efforts.

The Government of South Vietnam is becoming stronger, so is its military. Many critics of the war are addicted to disparaging remarks about the South Vietnamese people, about their alleged corruption, their laziness, their unwillingness to fight. As one who has visited Vietnam on several occasions, talked with her leaders and to many others who have been in Vietnam, I must set the record straight.

The South Vietnamese are a resourceful people who, although engaged in a war of survival for nearly 20 years, have held free elections, kept fighting in the face of often impossible odds and displayed incredible energy and ingenuity in so doing.

I am confident of their ability to sustain a viable, stable government and to take over the operations of the war in their country if given the time to do so.

In keeping with his drive for peace in Vietnam, President Thieu, in a speech following his Midway Island conference with President Nixon last summer, offered to talk privately with the National Liberation Front without preconditions toward the solution of the internal political problems of South Vietnam.

He called for the participation of all political parties and groups, including the NLF, in elections if they renounce violence and pledge themselves to accept the results of the elections. Thieu has said his regime would abide by such results.

This, in my judgment, is not too much to ask. It is a reasonable step.

At the same time, President Thieu warned that the other side should not misconstrue his desires for peace as a sign of weakness. He said, and I quote:

> It should not be induced by our repeated acts of goodwill into believing that it has only to remain adamantly negative for us to accept eventual surrender.

The United States has provided a foundation on which the Republic of Vietnam can build itself militarily and politically. To remove that foundation without permitting South Vietnam to shore up its own strength would be to topple that nation.

It would seem to me, therefore, that under the circumstances, the movement toward step-by-step withdrawal which the President has initiated, is in order. While the limitations of our policy in the past have prevented a clear-cut victory, I think it would be a mistake to believe that nothing has been accomplished in Vietnam or that we will make no further progress.

What can still be accomplished is freedom and self-determination for the people of the Republic of Vietnam, a better hope for peace and stability in all of Asia, and the continued confidence of other nations in the strength and the will of our own great republic.

THE NAVY NEEDS TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE TRUE SHAPE OF THE SOVIET SUBMARINE THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Nation's press featured stories attributed merely to "Navy sources" which poof-poohed the Soviet submarine threat and spoke in glowingly optimistic terms of the Navy's ability to handle this threat.

These stories represented a very grave distortion of the actual facts. Having had the privilege for the past 3 years of serving as chairman of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, and as such having acquired some knowledge of where the Russians stand in the submarine field as well as where we stand in our ability to counter them, I simply cannot in good conscience allow these damaging anonymous stories to remain unchallenged.

These reports appeared widely on October 8 and 9, and proclaimed that the United States has a very comfortable 10-year lead over the Soviets in both the submarine and antisubmarine field. Here are a few of the more sensational assertions made in these stories, contrasted with what are the actual facts:

First. The "U.S. is about 10 years ahead of the Russians in antisubmarine capability." The fact is that our lead is in only one single aspect of antisubmarine warfare. In many others the Russians are plainly ahead of us, for example, in the sheer size of their submarine fleet, in their vastly greater capacity to build new and different submarines, and in the two new antisubmarine helicopter carriers of the *Moska* class, now operating in the Mediterranean, which have been termed the most advanced new ships in any navy today by Jane's Fighting Ships.

Second. The newest Soviet submarines are "noisier than expected and thus less able to conceal their location." This just is not so. Vice Admiral Rickover testified to our committee in 1968 in the published record that in terms of quieting, the Soviets had reached a point in 1968 that our intelligence experts had not expected them to reach until 1975. In other words, the Russians are 7 years ahead of our expectations, not 10 years behind.

Third. "The Soviets have never deployed missile-firing submarines within range of this country." This, too, is false. Soviet missile-firing submarines patrol regularly in range of Hawaii, and in December 1967, at the time of the wedding of President Johnson's daughter Linda Bird, one came so close to Washington that the whole Atlantic command was placed on alert and urgent efforts were made to chase the missile-firing submarine out of range.

This notion that the seriousness of the Soviet submarine threat is just a fantasy of some alarmist Congressman, which one local newspaper had charged on the basis of these stories, is utter hogwash. Admiral Rickover told Congress in 1968 that if he had to choose between commanding the present Soviet submarine fleet or the present American one, he would choose the Soviets without any hesitation. But Admiral Rickover, these anonymous Navy sources are also quoted as saying, "lacks the antisubmarine warfare expertise of other top officers."

The fact is that Vice Adm. Turner Caldwell, who is the Navy's own antisubmarine warfare czar and possesses probably more expertise in this field than any other Navy officer, testified before our committee this year on recent Soviet progress in the submarine field as follows:

> Last year I was concerned. This year I am frightened.

Of course, the net effect of all these stories, if they are allowed to remain officially unchallenged by the top leadership of the Navy and the Pentagon, will be to undermine everything that Congress has tried to do in recent years to improve one important area of our Nation's defenses which, because of a certain lack of glamor, has all too often been the Navy's own stepchild.

So if the Navy really wishes to keep its ASW forces intact, and continue to do a better job of intercepting intruders than the Air Force did in Florida the other day, I would suggest that they take off the gloves, come out fighting, and set the record straight publicly and unequivocally for quotation.

Various news stories follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 9, 1969]

UNITED STATES YEARS AHEAD OF RUSSIA IN SUBS, NAVY SOURCES SAY

(By Orr Kelly)

The Soviet Union is lagging at least 10 years behind the United States in submarine development, according to well-informed Navy sources.

Although new Soviet subs have come close to the speed of the most modern American subs—a fact which caused a flurry of apprehension when it was first discovered in January 1968—the Soviet subs are far noisier than their American counterparts.

This means that American sailors can hear Soviet subs twice as far away as they can be heard. In undersea warfare, this would almost certainly be a critical difference.

This margin of silence is also one major reason U.S. Navy officers are confident their subs would more than hold their own against the Soviet sub fleet even though they would be outnumbered more than 3 to 1 in the event of war.

REDS HAVE 350 SUBS

The Soviet Union now has some 350 submarines and is engaged in a vigorous construction program. In less than two years, four new classes of Russian subs have been seen—two of which are of special interest to the U.S. Navy.

One is the Yankee class, which is similar to the American Polaris and carries 16 medium-range missiles. It has not yet been determined whether the missiles carry multiple warheads. One model of the Polaris missile now carries a cluster of three warheads and the Poseidon, which can carry 10 or more small, independently targetable warheads, is under development.

Of the half dozen Yankee class boats so far produced, two have recently deployed for what appeared to be training cruises in the North Atlantic, but neither came within missile range of the United States.

NEVER WITHIN RANGE

In fact, Navy sources said, the Soviets have never deployed missile-carrying submarines within range of this country.

On the other hand, Polaris boats have long been stationed within range of Russian targets, prepared to fire if the United States were attacked.

For several years, the Soviets have had diesel-powered Golf and Hotel class submarines on station in the Atlantic.

They carry three relatively short-range missiles in their sail, or conning tower. The missiles could not reach this country unless the subs moved in much closer.

Navy officers had speculated that the Golf and Hotel subs might have been sent out to prepare the way for the nuclear-powered Yankee class subs with their longer-range missiles. So far, however, the new subs haven't moved into the positions occupied by the older boats.

Because they have produced relatively few of the Yankee class subs and have not yet deployed them in a meaningful pattern, Navy experts don't yet know how they will be used or what threat they may pose to this country.

The other submarine being watched with special care is the Charlie class. On its bow, it has four tubes, angled upward at an angle of about 30 degrees. So far, the Navy hasn't seen the tubes used and doesn't know what they are for.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1969]

NEW SOVIET SUBS RELATIVELY NOISY, EASY TO DETECT

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, October 8.—Recent intelligence reports on Soviet nuclear-powered submarines have convinced military analysts that in the rivalry for supremacy under the seas the United States is likely to stay ahead for some years to come. The reports find the newest Soviet submarines noisier than expected and thus less able to conceal their locations.

The information became available during recent Soviet maneuvers in the North Atlantic with the newest submarine, the "Y" class. The nuclear-powered submarine has 16 long-range missiles similar to those of Polaris system.

Some analysts say that because of the noise American nuclear attack submarines should be able to determine the location of Soviet submarines at about twice the distance that the Russians need to become aware of an American submarine.

OBSERVED IN THE ATLANTIC

But the rate and variety of Soviet submarine development and construction is of some concern, the analysts say. Over the last year or so, American intelligence has learned of four new types of Soviet submarines, three nuclear-powered and one propelled by a diesel-electric engine.

Within the last several weeks, according to these sources, the Russians have ventured into the Norwegian Sea and the North Atlantic with some of their first six deployed "Y" class submarines. Three or four others are being made ready for deployment and an undetermined number are under construction in covered construction yards. The Soviet Union is believed capable of building 7 to 12 nuclear submarines a year.

While the Russians have placed older missile submarines, whose missiles have a 700-mile range, on patrol within 1,000 miles of the coasts of the United States, the new "Y" class, with a missile range of 1,000 miles, has not yet been stationed near the United States.

Because Soviet submarines are so noisy, some military analysts are inclined to be less concerned than Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover over the potential vulnerability of the

41 Polaris submarines during the next decade.

DETECTION GEAR AT ISSUE

Their concern seems to be based on the belief that the Soviet Union could achieve a technological breakthrough in the field of underwater detection that might be hard to counter.

The analysts contend that the American antisubmarine warfare program is 10 years ahead of the Soviet program.

So far the "Y" class submarines have been assigned to the Northern Fleet, operative in the Barents Sea. None are believed to have operated in the Pacific, the Mediterranean or the Indian Ocean. As their number increases, they are expected to be assigned to all Soviet fleets.

According to the intelligence reports, the other new Soviet types of submarines are:

The "C" class, a nuclear-powered attack submarine with a bulbous bow that is believed to contain a new type of weapon. The analysts do not know whether this is an antisubmarine rocket, an antishipping missile or a coastal bombardment missile.

The "V" class, a more conventional nuclear-powered design, believed to carry homing torpedoes for use against shipping.

The "B" class, a diesel-powered submarine, smaller than the others, believed designed for close-in defense near the Soviet coasts.

The Soviet Union has about 350 to 375 submarines, roughly 65 of which are nuclear-powered. The United States has 156 submarines, of which about 85 are nuclear-powered.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 9, 1969]

NAVY GIVES REDS 10-YEAR SUB GAP

(By Mike Miller)

The U.S. has a 10-year lead on Russia in the quality of attack submarines and anti-submarine warfare (ASW) capability. Navy sources said today.

This surprisingly optimistic assessment of the U.S. submarine program conflicts, however, with many public statements by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird.

During the recent congressional debate over the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, Mr. Laird voiced fears that the missile-firing U.S. Polaris' strategic subs might become vulnerable to attack by Russian submarines in the next five years.

But the Navy sources predicted it will be perhaps as long as 20 years before the Russians can score a technological breakthru that would enable them successfully to track Polaris subs at sea.

The sources also gave this comparison of the relative capabilities of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear-powered attack submarines—vessels designed to find and attack other submarines and ships rather than fire missiles like the Polaris.

The latest Russian attack subs are comparable to the Thresher class of U.S. subs deployed 10 years ago. To catch up, the Russians will have to go thru a similar 10-year period of technological development.

While the Russians have demonstrated dramatic speed increases with their latest models, pulling about even with the speed of U.S. subs, they have done so at the expense of noise. Meanwhile, the U.S. has concentrated on building quieter submarines to avoid detection by enemy ASW forces.

Russia's latest nuclear subs are about twice as noisy as the advanced U.S. models. Thus, the U.S. subs can hear the Russian ones long before being detected. Speed then becomes a secondary factor because there is plenty of time to move away and avoid detection by an approaching Russian sub.

Meanwhile, the U.S. is developing a new, high-speed nuclear attack sub, which promises to be faster than anything the Russians have fielded, and an experimental super-quiet model.

Sources said U.S. sonar equipment is far superior to that of the Russians, enabling the Navy to do a reasonably successful job of tracking the position of Russian subs in vital areas of the high seas.

They acknowledged, however, that the world's oceans are too vast and the problems of ASW too complex for the Navy to pinpoint the specific location of all the Russian subs as sea at a given time. The problem is particularly acute in the Mediterranean, where a high noise level from ocean currents makes detection difficult. The Russians have substantially increased their Mediterranean fleet, including submarines, since the middle east war of 1967.

The Navy sources added that:

Despite years of trying, the Russians have never succeeded in tracking a U.S. nuclear sub, attack model or Polaris, at sea. U.S. subs use various secret methods to evade Russian subs which loiter outside U.S. nuclear submarine ports and try to follow them.

Russia now has six Polaris-class strategic submarines equipped to fire 16 missiles each. Two of these have made shakedown cruises in the Atlantic but their paths caused no alarm in the U.S. intelligence community over the possibility of an attack. None of the Russian Polaris-class boats has yet remained at sea long enough for the U.S. fully to assess its capabilities.

Some congressional committees have expressed concern in recent years over Soviet nuclear submarine advances and the fact the Russians have 350 submarines to 145 for the U.S. These reports are fueled by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the "father" of U.S. nuclear subs who is impressed with the Russian program and wants the U.S. to build faster models.

While hailing Adm. Rickover as the foremost builder of nuclear subs, the sources said he lacks the ASW expertise of other top officers.

The sources also sought to put down persistent reports the nuclear submarine Scorpion, lost in the Atlantic last year, may have been destroyed by a Russian sub. There were no Russian submarines in the area at the time, the sources said.

RUN SILENT, RUN DEEP

After all the reports about Russia developing new terror weapons, it is comforting to hear that the United States has a 10-year lead on the Soviets in quality of nuclear-attack submarines and anti-submarine warfare capability.

This assessment, reported in The Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, comes from highly reliable Navy sources.

It is both surprising and encouraging because for years we have been hearing mostly scare stories that Russia is rapidly overtaking the United States in submarine technology, posing a grave military threat. It turns out that we have not been getting the whole story.

According to the Navy sources:

Russia's latest subs are fast—about as swift as our models. But they are noisy—twice as loud as ours. This means the United States subs can detect Russian subs long before being heard themselves. To overcome this gap will cost the Russians heavily in time and rubles.

The Navy's sonar detection equipment also is years ahead of Russia's. This enables the Navy to do a reasonably successful job of tracking Russian subs in vital areas of the high seas. The Soviets are said never to have successfully tracked a U.S. nuclear-powered sub at sea.

Congressmen and others who often sound the alarm about Russian subs want the United States to continue building rather than stopping with 41 Polaris missile-firing strategic nuclear subs and 69 nuclear-powered attack subs—the program established by former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. They may have a good point.

But the Navy sources, by getting out the word on relative capabilities of current U.S. and Soviet subs, have performed a public service. And Russia is learning the hard way that modern nuclear subs should run silent as well as deep.

ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the people of this country made the decision in the fall of 1968 to change the complexion of their Government by electing a Republican President, there was evidence enough of the need for change and redesign. The overcreative approach of the past two administrations had far outstripped the basic requirement of Government to manage efficiently the affairs of the Nation and to solve the problems current to our society. This resulted in a climate of promise and in a catalog of false hopes.

In order to respond to the demands of the people of America who brought into being the Nixon administration, the new President has addressed himself to the hard task of solution. The time now is for picking up the pieces—the time now is for management, for discipline, for constructive action. The time now is to face four-squarely the reform of those things which consume the public resource but do not contribute to the public welfare. In short, the time is for reorganization and for hard decision.

The overriding problem, and the one most churning in the national conscience, is the war in Vietnam. It represents a position not well enough understood by the American people. It grew out of a tradition of assistance to emerging nations; it developed from a belief in the principle that peoples have an inherent right to establish government of sovereignty vested in themselves.

The failures to recognize sooner the effects of massive involvement of American manpower were a matter of history before Mr. Nixon took office in January 1969. Nevertheless, these failures, along with the fatigue and sacrifices, we have experienced as a nation because of years of involvement without the kind of success which has been traditionally ours, weighed heavily not only on us, but also on the nations who were historically our friends.

Out of this the President has developed a new direction, a new leadership toward peace. It must be a peace that will work amid the massive political forces inherent to Southeast Asia. It must not be a false peace which will content Americans who may be living in a dream world of neo-isolationism. If it is a peace that results in the massacre of dissenters who believe in their own right to elect their own government, it will not be a peace at all but an outright surrender. It will be a turning of the tide in this world toward the subordination of man's spirit to a totalitarian concept of communism which we have rejected time

and time again as being inadequate to serve the best interests of mankind.

No President in history has inherited a more complex, a more difficult, or a more frustrating situation than is represented by our involvement, for more than a decade, in the wars of Vietnam.

The opportunity for solution, the opportunity for broadening the basic principle of self-determination, will be greatly enhanced by the singleness of purpose and sense of unity on the part of the American people.

Wars are terminated by hard decision, and skilled leadership. Effective leadership nearly always is a reflection of national purpose. The purpose here is to bring about a lasting conclusion and a meaningful peace. No one in this administration, from the President on down, deviates from that purpose. Is it asking too much that, as the world's most powerful nation, we Americans join hands and hearts in a spirit of national pride and overriding dedication to our own institutions of government, to our own President? It has been this great spiritual dimension of America that has brought us to a point of magnificent opportunity to perfect our civilization with new technologies. It has been this spirit which has kept alive the desire for freedom in the hearts of men wherever they exist on this planet. It has been this spirit which has been the source of our great strength and our contributions to mankind.

Today in history when the American spirit is needed so badly, why do we consider the proposition of abandoning it?

THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed ironic that the hard-won freedoms for which millions of Americans have fought and died since the beginning of the history of our Republic should now serve the purposes of those who would destroy it and those same freedoms on which they must depend to sustain their cause. But this was not unpredictable; our forefathers foresaw the possibility, and indeed, the right to dissent openly and freely has held an important place in checking what some may call "government by consensus."

And so, today, the Vietnam moratorium proceeds unobstructed, and as characteristic of the inherent nature of dissent, it has the unfortunate tendency of being construed as the mouthpiece of public opinion, because it is organized and because dissent generates its own sensationalism which readily finds its way into print for mass consumption. How true it is that dissent will always motivate overt action, while the lack thereof is merely tacitly relished, leaving the mind at rest and giving little cause to rant and rave as to one's own peacefulness that all is well.

Thus, the moratorium has become the symbol of dissent of an unpopular war abroad, but in my view, is also the manifestation of the present-day objective of protest for whatever alleged grievance—to force upon the majority the dissenters' views, if not by persuasion, by threat of or actual violence. This is the alternative, in the view of an impressionable minority, to seeking change through the established institutions of representative government. The President is claimed to be "insensitive" to the demonstration; he is chastised for "failing" to be responsive to the realities of public concern. It is difficult for me to conceive of the naivete of those who believe that today's demonstration should be the cause for the President to radically alter his policy, for the only alternative presented to him is total and unconditional withdrawal of our forces within a specified period of time. I go on record as stating my unequivocal support of the President's policy of seeking an honorable and durable peace in Vietnam, as it would be presumptuous of me, or anyone else, to think that we as individuals have the wisdom or, more importantly, the means to implement and effect the intricacies of negotiations in the absence of a policy of total and unilateral withdrawal, a completely repugnant option to me and, I believe, to the majority of concerned Americans.

Consider the President's own words:

First, there is a clear distinction between public opinion and public demonstrations. To listen to public opinion is one thing; to be swayed by public demonstrations is another. A demonstration—in whatever cause—is an organized expression of one particular set of opinions, which may or may not be shared by the majority of the people. If a President—any President—allowed his course to be set by those who demonstrate, he would betray the trust of all the rest. Whatever the issue, to allow government policy to be made in the streets would destroy the democratic process. It would give the decision, not to the majority, and not to those with the strongest arguments, but to those with the loudest voices . . .

The planned demonstrations will tell us that a great many Americans are deeply concerned about the war; that some of these consider U.S. participation immoral; that many want U.S. troops withdrawn immediately and unconditionally. But all of us in the Administration are already well aware of this sentiment . . .

There is nothing new we can learn from the demonstrations. The question is whether in the absence of any new evidence or any new arguments, we should be turned aside from a carefully considered course. The policies we are now following reflect our own best judgment, based on exhaustive study of all available evidence, of how to achieve that goal. To abandon that policy merely because of a public demonstration would therefore be an act of gross irresponsibility on my part . . .

One of the first acts of my Administration was to review, exhaustively and comprehensively, every aspect of the nation's policies in Vietnam. We have drastically altered the policies we inherited . . . For nine months, we have worked every day for a just end to a conflict which has been building for more than eight years.

Indeed, if for no other reason, the motives of the so-called moratorium are suspect for proclaiming that the President has done "nothing" to end the war—one that has gone on for 8 years—during the period of only 9 months in office. The only conclusion to be reached, again, is that the dissenters will consider nothing less than total and unconditional withdrawal of American forces, regardless of the consequence of this Nation's vital interest in the security of that part of the world; the credibility of its commitments throughout the world; the tenacity of its adherence to the principles of individual freedom and self-determination for all peoples and nations; and the sure fate of a bloody and barbaric Communist suppression of the South Vietnamese people. I do not believe that the spirit of this Nation could withstand the consequences of such a move at the cost, already, of some 40,000 American lives in South Vietnam.

To be sure, the President's course of action, even in the face of the implacable North Vietnamese and Vietcong negotiators, has been radically altered from the past realities of escalation and the virtually complete domination of the war by American forces. Succinctly stated, a recent article in the National Review summarized:

The outlines of President Nixon's Vietnam policy have now become clear. During the next eighteen months a substantial number of American troops will be withdrawn—around half the number now there. Drastic tactical changes and increasing use of Vietnamese troops and regional forces will 1) greatly reduce American casualties, and 2) eliminate the possibility of a Communist takeover. Those American troops remaining in Vietnam will be volunteers, largely professionals, rather than draftees.

This strategy is entirely plausible—so plausible, in fact, that the hard Left is moving at full speed to counter it. The principal instrument thus far has been designed by the "Vietnam Moratorium Committee" and consists of a McLuhanized variation on the old General Strike . . . There will be teach-ins, demonstrations and all the rest of it. The Moratorium Committee also proposes that the strikes expand by one day each month as long as the war continues. The Left has thus threatened to disrupt higher education, and whatever else it can get its hands on, in the interest of bringing about a humiliating American defeat in Vietnam . . .

It is unprecedented, not to say unspeakable, that American forces in the field should be undercut at home by an effort of this sort, and it is even more contemptible in light of the President's now evident strategy. What the October 15 movement tells us is that de-escalation is not enough; that a reduction in casualties is not enough; that fighting a de-Americanized war with volunteers is not enough. Nothing but an American defeat, with a consequent Communist takeover in the South . . . will do.

Even more damaging than the moratorium itself, in terms of jeopardizing the lives of American forces remaining in Vietnam and solidifying the gap between the Paris negotiators, is the weight given to the cause of defeat and Communist victory by the overt support of a number, however few, of persons who, by virtue of their positions in government, education, or elsewhere, give backbone to an otherwise ill-advised, ill-informed, and generally impulsive minority who would, and do, protest anything—from saying a prayer on the moon to fighting a war, any war. In a word, columnist Richard Wilson, basing his observation on an in-depth survey by the respected Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan, says:

Members of Congress, college presidents and government administrators who, *because of expediency or intimidation,* have aligned themselves with the war protest and have joined an anemic, if rowdy, company with no political clout. [Emphasis added.]

It is for certain that such individuals have, in recent days, been vigorously competing for television time to express their views on Vietnam. Richard Wilson's column, appearing in the October 13, 1969, issue of the Washington Evening Star, follows:

VIET PROTESTERS DELUDE POLITICIANS, SURVEY SHOWS

President Nixon says that he will not be affected by anti-war demonstrations and he has very sound ground for ignoring them. They do not represent significant political opinion even among the young.

It is possible to say this with more than impressionistic assurance on the basis of indepth surveys of the 1968 presidential election by staff members of the highly respected Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.

Members of Congress, college presidents and government administrators who, because of expediency or intimidation, have aligned themselves with the war protest have joined an anemic, if rowdy, company with no political clout. The protesters are a small fraction of the young. Most of the young who oppose the Vietnam war disapprove their tactics. Others oppose not only their tactics but everything they stand for.

Such conclusions flow naturally from the findings of the Michigan researchers on the phenomena of the 1968 election which have upset a great many preconceived ideas of the mass media, especially television, on what happened in that dark and confused year, viz: Gene McCarthy's support came as much from hawks who hated Johnson for bungling the war as from the peaceniks who wanted him to end it.

Other astonishing conclusions bear on the present resurgence of war protest which has unhinged so many members of Congress, probably to their future regret.

One such astonisher is that George Wallace got more than his share of the support of the young. "One of the major ironies of the election," the Michigan researchers wrote, "was that Wallace made his appeal to the old but mainly received the vote of the young."

The Michigan academicians saw it this way: "Although privileged young college students angry at Vietnam and the shabby treatment of the Negro saw themselves as sallying forth to do battle against a corrupt and cynical older generation, a more head-on confrontation at the polls, if a less apparent one, was with their own age mates who had gone from high school off to the factory instead of to college, and who were appalled by the collapse of patriotism and respect for law that they saw about them."

The vanguard of youthful revolution, the researchers found, is numerically swamped even within its own generation. The wave of the future for 1970 and 1972 promises several times more votes to politicians by leaning toward George Wallace than by leaning toward Gene McCarthy, the researchers found.

If the Michigan researchers are right (they support their conclusions with the most advanced sociological techniques) the Vietnam Moratorium is more likely to create an unfavorable reaction than to advance the cause of Peace. But even if the researchers have been so scientific as to mislead themselves, common observation supports their intimation that great masses, young and old, do not like this kind of thing.

President Nixon's problem is to marshal this mass reaction on his side, which he has not been too successful in doing. If he is to pursue his course of measured disengagement without sacrificing his ultimate goals then he probably will have to speak and act in more blunt terms.

He will have to ask and answer what the consequences will be if he withdraws abruptly from Vietnam, as the peace elements demand.

Will such an abject surrender create strong undercurrents of resentment which will fester in American life for generations? It will not be enough to say that he will not be the first American president to preside over a military defeat, nor that he will not be influenced by the anti-war demonstrations. He will have to spell out why in the most direct and simple terms, not sparing the members of his own party whose political courage in these circumstances is not equal to his.

The reason the President will have to speak this way is so that he can command the respect and support of the middle America he supposes he represents. Nixon will have to demonstrate that the noisy manifestations of dissent are those of a minority who will be satisfied with nothing less than abject and apologetic defeat as a lesson against such involvements in the future and irrespective of the fate of the Vietnamese people, the prestige of America and the future of Asia.

If the President does not wish to do this, if he wishes to continue to be ambivalent so as to appease those who are trying to destroy him, he will sooner or later discover that they cannot be appeased short of total American humiliation in Vietnam. That does not go for the great numbers who are sick of the war but want an honorable settlement. It does go for radical activists, their academic and intellectual sympathizers, and frightened politicians.

There are those who have said they are tired of hearing the same "old" argument that antiwar protests in the United States have the effect of aiding and abetting the enemy. But, in fact, it is no secret that the Communist North Vietnamese and Vietcong have long savored the unrest caused by the anti-Vietnam protesters which has certainly been given consistent and broad coverage in the news media. I dare say that from the arguments and demands set forth by the antiwar demonstrators and the Communist negotiators, it is difficult to determine who is feeding whom the line. The occasion of this moratorium is the first, I believe, where the Communists have so blatantly and outspokenly endorsed the antiwar movement and denounced the President in connection with it. Said Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, the foreign minister of the Communist provisional revolutionary government—a government in fiction only:

The Vietnamese people warmly acclaim this movement of the American people who demand that the Nixon administration put an end to the war of aggression in Vietnam and rapidly and totally withdraw American troops.

The gist of this propaganda—to end the war according to the Communist design—was again broadcast by Radio Hanoi last night and monitored throughout the country. No better a propaganda forum has been available to the Communists than the Paris negotiations, and no more damaging propaganda has been supplied them than that by their "sympathizers" here in the United States. While paying lipservice to "peace," they denounce and make a mockery of the only means by which an endurable peace can be achieved—through the office of the President of the United States. As columnist David Broder has said, writing in the Washington Post:

Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

This column, appearing in the October 7 issue of the Washington Post, follows:

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

(By David Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we may rightly ask what purpose the Vietnam moratorium serves. Will it alter the President's course of action? As he has stated, no. Does it express the desire of the majority of the American people to unilaterally, totally, and unconditionally withdraw within a fixed time? I do not believe so. Is this alternative, as sought to be imposed on the President, designed to be constructively critical? The fact that it is a fixed alternative answers that question in the negative. In my estimation, the only purpose to be served at all, if any, is to limit the options to two: First, unilateral, total, and unconditional withdrawal in a specified time, or, second, support of the President's policy to negotiate a lasting peace, with the cooperation of the Government of South Vietnam, and without a fixed time limit for withdrawal or a wholesale, unilateral withdrawal in the absence of mutual withdrawal—and to polarize American opinion accordingly. I am firmly of the belief that given these two choices now at issue, the overwhelming majority of Americans will come to the support of the President. The spirit of the American people to end this war honorably and the interest of international peace depend on it.

THE WRONG CURE FOR INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we in this country are consumed with our desire to terminate the war in Vietnam, and to do so in such a way that the peoples of South Vietnam will continue to have the right of self-determination, and to protect the lives of our own troops in withdrawal, and to prevent the butchering of hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese by the North.

However monumental this effort may be, we simply cannot let slide or gloss over the state of the domestic economy. We are in most serious trouble. The $25 billion deficit which we suffered in fiscal 1968, on top of substantial previous deficits, together with what I consider to be the irresponsible action of the Federal Reserve Board in ballooning the supply of money during the last half of fiscal 1969, shifted our country into high-gear inflation. I have great concern over the efforts which have been made thus far in an effort to deal with this tremendous problem. The efforts have been courageous and well intentioned, but I for one feel that they are not hitting the mark, and are not strenuous enough.

My concern as a Congressman from the Northwest in regard to the measures which have been taken are perhaps more exaggerated than that of the average Member. As in the past, the traditional cures for inflationary trends have an immediate depressant effect on the homebuilding industry and on construction generally. We in the Northwest feel this effect exactly the same as all other areas in the United States. However, there is another and a secondary effect, much more devastating, that we feel which is not felt in other parts of the country. Oregon's economy is timber and lumber oriented. The woods fiber industry is the backbone of our entire economy. When home building and construction drops, the core of our economy is hurt. Thus we suffer with all other areas, and we suffer acutely the additional problem of hardship in the woods fiber industry.

At the present time, there are in excess of 10,000 unemployed in this industry in the Northwest. It appears obvious that the situation is going to become much worse before it starts to recover for the Northwest.

With the start of President Nixon's administration, the Federal Reserve Board wisely reduced the rate of increase of the money supply, a policy of gradualism, until May of this year, when the supply's increase was completely cut off, a situation which I am advised still continues. Our economy has started to slow, reacting to the policy of gradualism in money supply and to other brakes placed on the economy. I am advised further that it will probably be nearly the first of the year before the "no increase" policy of money supply will be felt. I would expect that there will be grave and extended reaction at that time, which, of course, will make the economy of the country and of the Northwest in particular suffer much more intensely than at the present. This policy must be changed.

Perhaps this is a price that we could and would pay if we were certain that our inflationary problems would be cured in the process. However, I see no real signs of any relief, and very little promise of meaningful relief. I believe that it is evident that wage demands will be even higher than in the past, and that prices subsequently will follow the resultant upward path in the continuing cycle.

Although there is some argument about it, I am convinced that we are in the cost-push type of inflation, as distinguished from the traditional high demand-low supply type. The use of fiscal and momentary controls has and can be effective against traditional inflation, but I do not think it is the proper medicine for cost-push inflation. If wage demands continue high, prices will continue to rise, and the cycle goes on, catching in the squeeze the millions of people in this country who cannot protect themselves.

I would respectfully suggest that the administration should immediately restudy our posture in the war against inflation, lest we be caught in the dreadful position of the worst of both worlds, simultaneous recession with continued high inflation.

Specifically, I would suggest the most serious consideration of the following measures:

First, an immediate return to the policy of gradualism by the Federal Reserve Board in increasing the money supply;

Second, the imposition of selective credit controls on many installment consumer purchases;

Third, continuation of the Kennedy investment tax credit at its present level, thus permitting productivity to increase, and permitting the United States to maintain a better position of competition in the world markets;

Fourth, an immediate halt to statements by officials of this administration that wage and price controls are not being considered. This situation is akin to a spectator watching a fire blazing out of control, and announcing repeatedly that the nearby water hydrant will not be used.

Fifth, a request by the administration for standby wage and price control legislation, with a clear and loud public announcement that it will be implemented by the President retroactively if wages and prices continue to accelerate;

Sixth, muscular jaw-boning by the President himself in an effort to persuade industry and labor that they each have a very high interest in containing inflation. The past administration attempted the jaw-boning technique so often, with no parallel governmental effort to reduce its own spending, that the process was cheapened to the point of uselessness. President Nixon has made

an excellent start in fulfilling his campaign pledges of reducing Government spending, and has made substantial cuts, even in the previously sacrosanct defense budget. He has thus established his own credibility and I believe would be effective in efforts in the private sector; and

Seventh, concerted effort should be made in addition to the foregoing suggestions to spread the sacrifice around, and not concentrate it in the home building and construction industries. The recent Federal construction cutback will have little immediate effect, other than to cause hardship to many contractors, and in the end will result in even higher construction costs. Any one huge industry cannot be mobilized and demobilized, and once again mobilized without the consumer ultimately paying a substantial penalty. High interest rates and tight money are the principal causes of the drastic reduction in our commitment to the housing goals of this Nation. Placing contractors in a worsened position will not solve either of these basic problems, and will have no real effect on home building starts.

Focusing specifically on the homebuilding problem, in addition to the other suggestions, I believe immediate attention should be given to the following possibilities for relief:

First, appropriation, on a loan basis of a substantial amount of money for the home loan bank system to enlarge their credit supplying capacities to savings and loan associations;

Second, exempt the first $750 of interest earned on savings in institutions which invest a substantial percentage of their deposits in single-family home mortgages;

Third, legislation limiting the Federal tax exemption enjoyed by pension and retirement funds to those that invest a substantial percentage of their funds in single dwelling family home mortgages; and

Fourth, legislation permitting the Veterans' Administration national service life fund to be available for direct loans for single family homes for veterans.

There are several other programs suggested by the National Association of Home Builders which merit very careful and immediate serious consideration.

I know that the President and other high ranking officers in the administration are determined to break the inflationary cycle. I know that great effort has been made to correct this situation. I am, however, fearful that too much emphasis has been placed on textbook remedies, and not enough consideration has been given to the practical proposals which I believe would spread the burden of the fight more evenly, and would bear much more promise of success than what has been undertaken to date.

We are in a domestic emergency of frightening proportions, and I am only asking that a reevaluation of our remedies be made, and that it be made on an objective, practical basis. I hope that our administration never makes the mistake of automatically attempting to justify past policy, with the inevitable result of a hardheaded continuation on a course which, without a genuine review, might turn out to be wrong.

EXCHANGE OF FOOD STAMPS FOR PREPARED MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 78 other Members of Congress, I am introducing legislation which would amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by nonprofit organizations.

The bill is identical to language contained in the recently passed Senate food stamp bill and was originally sponsored by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania. It would extend the benefits of the food stamp program to elderly persons now denied eligibility because they are physically unable to cook for themselves. Under this legislation, nonprofit, charitable organizations would be authorized to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared either for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

Under the present law, persons who otherwise meet age, residency and income reqiurements are not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their households. If individuals are physically incapacitated or have a chronic illness which makes it impossible to shop or prepare food, and if they have no one to do these things for them, these persons are in effect denied the use of food stamps. We see no reason why these citizens, who are often among the most isolated and needy in the community, should be denied the benefits which the Food Stamp Act was enacted to provide.

This legislation would amend the Food Stamp Act to meet this problem. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations carefully prescribed and administered by him, to designate specific church and other nonprofit organizations of a bona fide charitable nature, to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of these stamps would assist eligible groups in the purchase of food, the stamps themselves would be issued only to individuals who would be the direct beneficiaries of this amendment. By engaging the cooperation of nonpofit, charitable organizations, this proposal would be in keeping with the current trend of relying more heavily on private initiative for solutions to pressing national problems.

In these times of unprecedented economic achievements, the basic goal of "having enough to eat" still remains, for too many Americans, a promise rather than a reality.

GIMMICKRY BY THE BIG FOUR AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a brutal automobile accident occurred in Syracuse, N.Y., in my congressional district. This tragic event compels me to speak out on a matter which has been on my mind for some time.

During the last few years, an ominous trend in automotive manufacturing has taken place, foreboding an increasingly dangerous situation on our Nation's highways. With the advent of the so-called supercar, the death rate and the incidence of partial and permanent maiming resulting from highway accidents have skyrocketed. Only a short time ago, the Nation's foremost insurance companies announced that they were increasing the premiums on supercars by over 50 percent. I am not addressing myself to the merits or lack of merits of the insurance companies' decision to increase their premiums. I am citing their decision rather as a concrete example of the concern which has been raised over this situation. Nor am I questioning the freedom of an individual to purchase the automobile of his choice. That freedom, of course, is an essential ingredient in the democratic process. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and what every parent and responsible American should be concerned about is the gimmickry which the automobile manufacturers, the big four of the industry, engage in in attempting to induce our young people to purchase these highway missiles.

We have witnessed a great deal of debate and discussion recently on the issue of automobile safety. We have witnessed massive recalls of defective automobiles, defective from both a mechanical and a safety standpoint. These alone should make one stand up and take notice. But, coupled with a monumental sales campaign put on by the automobile manufacturers to convince the public that happiness is a warm, supercharged automotive animal, capable of leaping tall buildings at 100 miles an hour, the whole situation demands an element of self-imposed restraint on the part of the manufacturers.

Day in and day out, in the newspapers and on the radio and television, the manufacturers offer an engaging invitation, particularly to our young people, to get away from it all in overpowered, superperformance, death-defying cars that purportedly are the envy of an Indianapolis contestant. Yet, whether intentionally or not I cannot say, they offer us these earthbound spaceships in the sublime surroundings of a traffic-free highway, a lonely seashore or a Nevada desert. Now, I do not know about the rest of my colleagues in the Chamber today, but I for one have not traveled on a traffic-free highway in some time, and I guarantee that only a tiny percentage of our population spends much time cavorting around the Nevada deserts. The point here is that high-powered, supercharged automobiles are presented to the public in surroundings that exist only in the mind of some Madison Avenue huckster. The fact is that these cars are going to be driven on city streets and country roads which are designed for conventional highway travel. They should be advertised and sold to the public on that basis. If a youngster is brainwashed into believing that a supercar is supposed to be driven at 80 miles an hour, the chances are that he might be tempted to do just that.

I do not believe that Congress, or any other legislature, has or should have the right to tell automotive manufacturers how to advertise their products. But I do believe we have a moral responsibility to plead with them to consider the consequences of their decisions. One can multiply the tragedy in Syracuse a thousandfold across the country.

No one is suggesting that supercars be banned from manufacture; no one is suggesting that the public be denied the right of choice in its purchase of an automobile. I am suggesting, however, that automobile manufacturers redirect their advertising campaigns to avoid the implication that supercars are harmless toys that offer a measure of security, a sense of social acceptance, and a high rating on the popularity chart simply by depressing the accelerator as far as it will go.

FRESHMAN ECONOMICS NO. 8—UP, UP AND AWAY GO PRICES

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that this administration will succeed in being the first American Government to maximize unemployment, cost of credit, and interest rates while inflation hits an alltime high. Truly a breathtaking accomplishment, given all the factors involved. If it were not so sad, the soothing gurgles passing for public statements of the ruling economic whiz-bangs would be amusing. As it is, they are merely ludicrous. Let us therefore proceed to further explorations into the world of freshman economics.

The aluminum industry rates a gold star this time, because it has shown the greatest corporate irresponsibility in recent price increases. Kaiser upped aluminum ingots $20 per ton on primary metal forms, plus it increased prices for insulated wire and cable by 4 percent. Alcoa followed in a spirit of true American competition. And was it not surprising that the rest of the industry followed the same day with the same hikes?

Louis Allies Co., a subsidiary of Litton, raised induction motor prices 7 percent. Gould, Inc., increased prices on rechargeable batteries. Not wishing to be considered nonconformist, Goodyear upped prices on its passenger, truck, and farm tires and tubes by 2½ percent. This rise is the second for Goodyear in 4 months. The rest of the newsprint industry raised their rates. More good news followed as RCA, United States Steel, and Armco Steel played follow the leader in a variety of hikes. TV sets, stereo receivers, stainless steel, foundry coke, grinding and lapping machines, and insulated wire and cable product prices shot upwards, as industry again demonstrated its public spirit and desire to ease inflation.

Retail meat prices are a national scandal, as meat producers continue to enjoy the privilege of grazing their animals on millions of acres of public domain at bargain prices. In the past 5 months, retail meat costs to consumers have risen at the rate of 12.6 percent. Yet we are told by the administration's consumer advocate that they are actually going down.

Then Control Data Corp. raised charges for computer products and maintenance services. Monsanto, Container Corp. of America, and Mead Corp. further brightened our lives by upping prices on chemicals, folding cartons, and white paper. Note that all these products are basic to everyday life, being either sold directly to consumers or used in a wide variety of essential products.

Meanwhile, public holders of almost a quarter of Government securities maturing October 1 and December 15 decided they would rather be paid in cash than take new Treasury notes yielding as much as 8 percent, the highest return on Government issues in 110 years. Confidence in our Government is mounting, as we can see. Reflecting pressures exerted by American policies, British and Belgian banks upped their prime rates.

Construction costs have risen more rapidly in recent months than at any time since World War II. The Nation's railroads have agreed to seek an across-the-board freight rate increase of 6 percent. Unless the ICC intervenes, these will take effect October 18. Net new orders for machine tools, the production machinery that goes into the Nation's assembly lines, continued their precipitous decline.

This was all capped by a momentous announcement by the Labor Department, which announced the greatest jump in unemployment in 9 years. At least half a million more Americans are pounding the pavements looking for jobs as a result of the economic policies of the administration. The Secretary of the Treasury announces that such a 4-percent unemployment level is "acceptable." Enlightening and eloquent, to say the least. Compassion and sympathy are his middle names.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government grows richer through the progressive growth of its sources of taxation. Simultaneously, the tax sources of our cities shrink in proportion to their rising costs of operation. And the administration gaily slices away at essential programs, such as model cities and medical research, to name only a pair, for the entire list is as long as it is sad and depressing. Plenty of money for wars and military boondoggles, such as ABM. Nothing for the cities.

This type of national policy is as silly as raising homing pidgeons and then moving. At this rate, by the time we will have caught up with the Joneses, they will have refinanced or gone to the poorhouse, if one remains. Our Government has a combination of the financial cold wobblies and economic cholera morbus. The average major corporation leader sports an income as fat as a young sequoia as unemployment lines lengthen. The facts are plain, yet the Government ignores them, tightens the screws, and pretends that all is well. Was it not a little boy who was supposed to whistle as he passed the cemetery? Such folly is 110 proof.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the last several years, I have maintained a keen interest in the activities conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act and have been most impressed by the institutional programs conducted under this act. Some 540,400 trainees have been reached through over 10,000 projects since the inception of the act.

The Division of Manpower Development and Training in the Office of Education has been constantly attuned to the needs of the unemployed it serves particularly the so-called hard core trainee and has provided outstanding leadership in the development of programs specifically structured to their needs.

The institutional programs—under MDT—offer trainees the only opportunity for hard-core individuals to obtain a base of occupational knowledge that will permit them not only to become employed but to advance in the occupation. Entirely new opportunities for upward mobility have been opened up in the health field, the clerical field as well as in other occupations. This training has made possible for nurses aides to utilize their base of training to progress as licensed practical nurses.

The clerical training program has made available to the disadvantaged in such new areas of endeavor as stock brokerage clerk.

I have recently become aware of a new development that can be supportive to any of the programs that relate to the disadvantaged, that is the Area Manpower Institutes for Development of Staff—AMIDS. These are in five separate locations and are conducted through contracts with the Office of Education. They were developed to provide needed training in relating to the needs of the trainees served by manpower programs. They have served not only instructors, counselors, and administrators of these programs, but also employment service counselors and coordinators, national contractors, and personnel from industry.

It is with interest that I follow this program and I commend the Division of Manpower Development and Training, Office of Education, for the contribution it is making in breaking the cycle of poverty for the disadvantaged that are really being reached in the institutional programs under MDTA.

A CONVINCING CALL FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, there has just been brought to my attention the recent statement of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions

Development, entitled "Leadership and the Educational Needs of the Nation." This powerful appeal to action was sent by a distinguished panel of educators and lay citizens to the President, to the Senate, and to our own House of Representatives earlier this month. It strikes out in poignant language about the national mood of "cutting back":

Everywhere the mood appears to be one of cutting back—withdrawing—seeing how little we can get along with; in short, a steady retreat from the bold plans the nation launched several years ago.

The statement goes on to demand that the political leadership of America—in the executive branch and in the Congress "demonstrate to the young that the Nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities. We could do no better in this than to start with the field of education itself." It continues:

If the Executive Branch feels that Congress has not moved in a fashion appropriate to the time, let it take leadership. If the Congress feels that the Executive Branch has not sensed the urgent need for a bold educational policy for the nation, let it provide the leadership. But let us have leadership.

Because this cogent and carefully reasoned statement deserves widespread discussion, I include the text of the entire statement of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development in the RECORD at this point:

LEADERSHIP AND THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE NATION

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development is charged with reviewing and evaluating programs of the Federal government which support the training and development of educational personnel. We come to Washington several times each year to review with those responsible for the administration of these programs the progress they are making in their efforts to provide the best teachers for our schools and colleges. We have just concluded one such meeting. We are deeply disturbed about what we find.

Everywhere the mood appears to be one of cutting back—withdrawing—seeing how little we can get along with; in short, a steady retreat from the bold plans the nation launched several years ago.

Specifics are not hard to come by. Only last week the U.S. Commissioner of Education pronounced the "right to read" for every youngster in the nation. At that very time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was directing the Office of Education to cut $8 million of a $13 million program, a substantial portion of which was designed to improve the preparation of teachers of reading.

Just two months ago, the House of Representatives cut appropriations supporting the chief program of the Federal government for the preparation of college teachers. The 1969 appropriation of $70 million was reduced by $14 million.

In neither case has there been offered any compelling evidence to warrant such reductions.

But it is not only a matter of reduction in funds. There is also an absence of any bold planning to meet the problems of tomorrow. We have reviewed a recently-completed report recommending programs related to the training of educational personnel that should be undertaken by the Federal government. This report, a plan for the next five years, was prepared by one of several sub-groups of a Task Force on Education appointed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are many worthy programs in this plan. We commend the Department for taking this kind of initiative in looking ahead. But we find the conception and scale of the plans no match for the needs. In fact, the so-called plans are timid and token. It would appear that instead of taking as a point of departure a searching inquiry into the needs of education and concluding with a determination of the resources required to meet these needs, this group was faced with an assumption of severe financial constraints and the necessity to fit its planning into this assumption.

In dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. The Council believes strongly in this notion of partnership. We reject any suggestion of domination of the Federal government. But each partner must do its *share*. And when we find that the States have, in the last two years, increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% for elementary and secondary education by 28%, and when we find that at the same time the Federal government is cutting back, we can conclude only that there is, in fact, a default of responsibility on the part of the Federal government.

Recently the House of Representatives voted a substantial increase in appropriations for education. We commend the leadership of both parties in this effort. But apart from this action—which has yet to be voted by the Senate and signed by the President—retrenchment is the only signal coming out of the Federal government at the present time. This signal creates a mood—a mood that is affecting the thinking and actions of those in the Federal agencies responsible for administering educational programs and of those in the field who are trying to provide new prospects for the young.

While we sit for two days as members of a Federal Advisory Council and read this signal and sense this mood, we bring with us a sense of another reality "out there"—as the principal of an elementary school in a ghetto, as a school board member in Oregon, as president of a university in Appalachia, as a graduate dean in a private university in New England, as a superintendent of schools in the fourth largest city in the nation, as a profesor of physics in a Midwest university, as a guidance counselor in Arizona—as people from a variety of educational settings and various parts of the country. Here we read a different set of signals, sense a different mood.

Above all, we sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges. While increased controls by school and university authorities may be necessary to check the activities of certain small destructive groups, we assert that present national conditions are deleteriously affecting the studies, the hopes, and the convictions of a wide and responsible segment of the educational community. A new and ugly cynicism and anti-intellectualism is infecting American education. Repressive measures will not arrest this trend, and may even accelerate it; positive and affirmative leadership promptly to end the war and to address forthrightly our domestic problems *can* do so. While these attitudes stem from the war and the disparity between the ideals of the nation and present realities, it is the judgment of this Council that, as Representative Brock and his colleagues so sensitively discerned, the source of much of the disquiet can be traced to fundamental inadequacies of education itself. The needed improvements and reforms will come about only if appropriate leadership is offered, leadership in the educational community and leadership in government, particularly—as we have noted earlier—from the national government.

Too many of our young are concerned by what they are *against*—the war, racism, poverty, corruption. They need, as have all youth in all times, to be *for* things, to have a star, a dream. While we recognize that such affirmative leadership is subtle, and will require politically difficult actions, we feel that the growing dismay and cynicism of our youth could develop into a calamity of devastating proportions. The future college and school teachers—*the people of greatest concern to this Council*—are a centrally important group among our youth, and their disaffection can have serious effects in future years.

It would be unfortunate if our political leadership were to take the position that a response to the dissatisfactions of the past—or the yearnings for a different kind of future—must await the ending of the war, or some other development. It is now we must plan. It is now we must act. It is now that we must demonstrate, *mainly to ourselves*, that a nation which can take such just pride in its extraordinary achievements in the material realm is no less resourceful, no less vigorous, no less sacrificing in dealing with matters of the spirit.

Competent observers have noted a growing sense of purposelessness on the part of an influential segment of our student population—a feeling of these young people that it is not possible for our social institutions to cope with an increasing complexity.

If politics is the art of the possible, then our political leaders have a special opportunity to demonstrate to the young that the nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities. We could do no better in this than to start with the field of education itself. More policemen in the schools is not a policy; it is an admission of failure.

If the Executive Branch feels that Congress has not moved in a fashion appropriate to the time, let it take leadership. If the Congress feels that the Executive Branch has not sensed the urgent need for a bold educational policy for the nation, let it provide the leadership. But let us have leadership.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Adron Doran, President, Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky.

Annette Engel, Director of Special Education, Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona.

Rupert N. Evans, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Susan W. Gray, Director, Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Laurence D. Haskew (Chairman), Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

E. Leonard Jossem, Chairman, Department of Physics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Marjorie S. Lerner, Principal, George T. Donoghue Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois.

Kathryn W. Lumley, Director, Reading Clinic, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Carl L. Marburger, Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

Edward V. Moreno, Executive Secretary of the Mexican-American Commission, Los Angeles City Schools Districts, Los Angeles, California.

Lloyd N. Morrisett, President, Markle Foundation, New York, New York.

Mary Rieke, Member, Board of Education, Portland, Oregon.

Theodore R. Sizer, Dean, Graduate School

of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Bernard C. Watson (Vice Chairman), Deputy Superintendent for Planning, Philadelphia School System, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Joseph Young, Executive Director.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), objected to a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 582, jointly sponsored in a bipartisan effort by both the majority and minority leaders. It was acknowledged that the resolution was in response to the open letter to the American people from the Premier of North Vietnam in support of the Vietnam moratorium, or, as the Premier called it, "their fall offensive" whose purpose he construes to be forcing the United States "to withdraw completely and unconditionally" from Vietnam. The specific purpose of the resolution was twofold:

First, to endorse the right of all Americans to responsible and peaceful dissent, but to abhor the Premier's attempt to associate those Americans who demonstrate for peace with the cause of our enemy; and

Second, to repudiate the Premier's letter and call upon all Americans to disassociate themselves from North Vietnam's declaration.

As I understand the gentleman's reasons for his action, under leave to extend his remarks, they are that—

First, the subject matter is too important not to be given due consideration;

Second, there is some hidden implication in the words of the resolution;

Third, it was wrong for "certain prominent" Americans to call attention to the Premier's letter in the first place; and

Fourth, it would be more appropriate to condemn those of our own citizens who sought to give attention to the letter with the inference that it was done to discredit the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, the words of the resolution are in plain and clear English and it was certainly not intended to support or reject the administration's policy. Regardless of the gentleman's reasons, his action is certainly another feather in North Vietnam's propaganda cap and that is all that will be reported in the Communist press. I include the text of the resolution for all to judge accordingly:

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 wihch 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.

AN ARTIST PASSES

(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, I have lost a friend. The world has lost an artist who took great delight in extracurricular activities in every phase of civic endeavor including chairmanship of the Redding-Georgetown Democratic Town Committee.

I was personally proud in June 1966 when Hugh Donnell made the principal nominating speech in my favor at the district congressional nominating convention. It was a sad day for me on September 26, 1969, when I received word of Hugh Donnell's death following a short illness.

The Redding Pilot of October 2 published the report of Hugh Donnell's death and included with it a biographical report replete with identity of the many commendable areas of interest to Hugh Donnell, and in which he performed with a genuine feeling for the public interest. I include the report from the Redding Pilot herewith:

HUGH DONNELL DIES AT AGE 66

Hugh Donnell, chairman of the Redding-Georgetown Democratic Town Committee from 1951 to 1966, died at Age 66 last Friday at Danbury Hospital following a short illness.

A familiar figure on the Redding scene, Mr. Donnell was active in almost every field of civic endeavor. He was particularly visible at town meetings, where over the years he crusaded for diverse personal and political causes ranging from the Saugatuck Reservoir battle of the late 1930's to the workmanship of a neighboring developer as late as this summer.

A skilled and humorous public speaker, Mr. Donnell was called upon to nominate U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan at the June 1966 Fifth Congressional District convention. He himself ran on the Democratic ticket for State Representative from Redding in 1960.

Although his was a distinctly minority party in a heavily Republican region, Mr. Donnell used to recall that when he and Mrs. Donnell moved here from New York in 1928, the first selectman and most other major town officials were Democrats. And he used to predict that the tables would someday turn again.

His involvement in community affairs sometimes went beyond the community. He even served as chairman of the Danbury Chamber of Commerce. In Redding, he served on the Police Advisory Board until his death, and he was at one time a commissioner of the West Redding Fire Department.

His skills as a professional artist were put to use in creating a distinctive image for the Annual Town Reports, the Bicentennial program in 1967, and numerous pamphlets and publications for the town's two libraries, the Boys' Club, and the Boy Scouts.

Mr. Donnell was born in New York City in 1902, the son of the late Samuel J. and Dorothy Lang Donnell. He attended the Art Students League in New York and in 1928 married Lola Michele, his only survivor.

The Donnells came to Redding immediately following their marriage and made their permanent home on Diamond Hill Road.

A commercial artist by profession, Mr. Donnell also developed a highly personal style for this "serious" painting, reworking vacation sketches into warm, multi-faceted land and seascapes; one of his pet causes, unrealized, was to obtain a gallery of some kind in which Redding's many resident artists could display their work.

Early this year, Mr. Donnell dropped his account with Volkswagen of America, for which he was art director of "The Weather Vane." But he continued his long association with Hal Foster of Lee Lane, creator of the "Prince Valiant" comic strip, as colorist, working in his crowded studio at the rear of his home.

His work has been represented in one-man or group shows at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Silvermine Gallery, and New York's ACA Gallery. He served for several years on the Connecticut Commission for the Arts.

The Rev. James B. Yee, pastor of the First Church of Christ Congregational, officiated at a burial service at Umpawaug Cemetery on Monday, Sept. 29.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in concert with Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska, I have introduced a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act enacted last year.

This legislation would make two principal changes. First, it would authorize $650 million for fiscal year 1971. Second, it would promote greater flexibility in the administration of the 15 percent discretionary funds authorized under section 306 of the act.

For the current fiscal year, moneys available to fund the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration do not yet exceed $300 million. Plans submitted by States if fully funded would require more than $1.1 billion for fiscal 1971. While most of these plans appear meritorious and while some might even be called urgent, it is felt that $650 million is a more realistic estimate of the total commitment that can be made at this time. While our legislation does not make any provision for fiscal years 1972 and 1973, it is anticipated that when the program becomes fully operational, it will require an appropriation in the neighborhood of $900 million.

I do not look upon these expenditures as an extravagance. On the contrary, they represent an essential investment. I have made it my concern to survey the work of the Law Enforcement Assistance

Administration, and I must say that I am much pleased with the progress it has made. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was designed to activate a working partnership between Federal, State, and local governments insofar as such a partnership can properly function without violence to jurisdictional concepts in the Constitution. In its truest sense, the process of monetary grants by the Federal Government to the States and localities is a splendid example of the new concept of revenue sharing. It can become a showcase for utilization of the concept on a broader scale.

When title I was passed, it was assumed that section 306 was broad enough to permit LEAA the discretion necessary to administer the discretionary fund in a genuinely discretionary manner. Under that section, 85 percent of the funds is allocated to State planning agencies. The other 15 percent can be used by LEAA as it thinks best in promotion of the criminal justice system. In practice, the language has been found to be too restrictive. The amendment proposed in the legislation Senator HRUSKA and I have introduced would make it possible to make discretionary grants to units of general local public agencies, Federal or State law enforcement offices or agencies, institutions of higher education, or combinations of the same.

I hope the Committee on the Judiciary can give early attention to this legislation.

MORATORIUM

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is by intention and not by oversight or omission that I have withheld comment about the moratorium until the day of observance has passed.

I have waited not only to find out whether it was peaceful or violent, but because I did not want to associate myself in any possible way with the efforts of the National Moratorium Committee who have called for the immediate and total withdrawal of all our troops from South Vietnam without at the same time making any demands whatsoever of the North Vietnamese.

Not a single one of us wants to continue this war any longer than is necessary to secure an honorable conclusion. One thing we must never forget, however, is the consequence of an immediate and unilateral withdrawal. We must think of the effect this will have, not for the moment, but for the future. Throughout all of Asia, whether in the Philippines, Taiwan, Japan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand there exists gnawing fear of the consequences of a hasty United States withdrawal from Vietnam. Put in a few words, there would come into being the widespread feeling that no one in the future could rely on the United States as they have in the past.

If we disengage without some type of honorable conclusion but simply walk out and turn South Vietnam over to the Communists then we have charted our course not simply for Vietnam, but for all of Asia.

The head of the independent State of Singapore has said that as much as he hates communism, if the United States makes no firm stand but acquiesces to all of the demands of North Vietnam and the Vietcong, then he will have no future course but to embrace their principles and accept their dictation as a matter of self-survival.

If leaders of the National Moratorium Committee could only realize that their demand to disengage immediately and unilaterally means to charge off all of Asia, not just Vietnam, and leave our friends to the mercy of their foes, then, they might make a more responsible request for a moratorium in the hope that the war would end as a result of mutual deescalation. If they had any intention to be more responsible they would limit their demands to a temporary cease-fire to see if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong would respond. If on the other hand the present policy advocated by the moratorium committee were followed the consequences would amount not to peace but to a policy of surrender.

The worst thing about the moratorium movement is that it may give the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris the impression that the mood of our country is one of surrender. If this impression is gained by our enemy then the advocates of "peace" may actually be serving the complete opposite purpose of prolonging the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was present in the House last Tuesday night. I participated in my own way by listening to those who had asked for special orders as well as those who challenged their remarks. My participation did not take the form of speaking or engaging in debate. Instead, my contribution was to be present to vote to protect the rights of those whose persuasions were in opposition to my own views. I voted against both motions to adjourn. I was present and answered to my name on the quorum calls.

Who can say whether those who spoke in favor of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, last Tuesday night, changed the minds of any one single House Member? Even if that did not happen, I left the floor late Tuesday evening greatly impressed with the dignified manner in which the proceedings were conducted. Although I must state frankly I was not swayed from the course I feel we must follow in Southeast Asia, I was proud of the respect shown on the House floor for conflict of opinion.

I bow to no one who may think he has a greater desire to see an end to the hostilities in Vietnam than myself. I think we all want peace returned to the world. Yet, it is wrong to conclude that the large outpouring of thousands of demonstrators yesterday and last night and the eloquence of the speakers on the House floor Tuesday night accurately reflects the sentiments that the majority of our people want to let Hanoi take the war by default and for our country to suffer the loss of prestige and honor that would result if we were to turn tail and run leaving thousands of South Vietnamese helpless before the onslaught of a heartless and murderous Hanoi takeover of all of Vietnam.

Every one of us is as weary of the war as those speakers who expounded on an immediate and unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. Clearly, the most significant thing about the moratorium is the fact that those who spoke and those who marched were able to do so in this land of the free. They could march, carry their candles, show their placards, and openly express their views. The most impressive thing of all about the moratorium is that a protest of this kind could take place in an orderly manner without many incidents of violence. Even though I found their arguments defective, I am happy and proud that my colleagues were given the opportunity last Tuesday evening to express their views by speaking on the House floor. There are far too many countries in the world where such freedom of expression would not be tolerated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for October 17, on account of official business as U.S. observer to NATO parliamentary Conference.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. Moss), for today through Monday, October 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.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 60 minutes, on October 21.

Mr. WYATT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GOLDWATER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BIESTER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN immediately following the remarks of Mr. ERLENBORN on the conference report on H.R. 13194 today.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 13194, today.

Mr. MORGAN during the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 11039.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota immediately following Mr. MIZE during general debate in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SEBELIUS to follow the remarks of Mr. MIZE during general debate today.

Mr. FOREMAN prior to the vote on the Landgrebe amendment during consideration of H.R. 4293.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RARICK during debate on H.R. 4293 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUDE.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. PELLY.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. HORTON in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.
Mrs. DWYER in three instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mrs. REID of Illinois.
Mr. BOW.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. RAILSBACK.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.
Mr. KEITH.
Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in five instances.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. FARBSTEIN in four instances.
Mr. BIAGGI in six instances.
Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. REUSS in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.
Mr. FUQUA.
Mr. MOSS.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.
Mr. CLAY in five instances.
Mr. GIBBONS in three instances.
Mr. NEDZI.
Mr. SISK.
Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.
Mr. MANN in three instances.
Mr. HANNA.
Mr. NIX in two instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. ADDABBO in five instances.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.
Mr. MURPHY of New York in three instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN in five instances.
Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

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. 2910. An act to amend Public Law 89–260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

H.R. 13194. An act to authorize special allowances for lenders with respect to insured student loans under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 when necessary in the light of economic conditions in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and to increase the authorizations for certain other student assistance programs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 20, 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:

1263. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe rules, regulations and performance and other standards as he finds necessary for all areas of railroad safety and to conduct railroad safety research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1264. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7618. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8664. A bill to authorize an increase in the number of flag officers who may serve on certain selection boards in the Navy and in the number of officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve who are eligible to serve on selection boards considering Reserves for promotion (Rept. No. 91–572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9564. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band (Rept. No. 91–573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8662. A bill to authorize command of the U.S.S *Constitution* (IX–21) by retired officers of the U.S. Navy (Rept. No. 91–574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10317. A bill to adjust the date of rank of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11548. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit naval flight officers to be eligible to command certain naval activities and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14001. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act (Rept. No. 91–577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 584. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13950, a bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–578). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14376. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 14377. A bill to amend the Social Security Act concerning psychiatric benefits available under titles XVIII and XIX; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 14378. A bill to provide for additional penalties for commission of a crime in the District of Columbia when armed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14379. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for sex education in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 14380. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14381. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (for himself and Mr. CHAPPEL):

H.R. 14382. 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. RYAN:

H.R. 14383. A bill to prohibit the procurement of California table grapes by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 14384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14385. A bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 14386. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 14387. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 14388. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14389. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 14390. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY (for himself and Mr. CABELL):

H.R. 14391. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Monument in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 14392. 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. GUDE:

H.R. 14393. A bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 14394. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14395. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 14396. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 14397. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to modify the provisions relating to discretionary grants to the States, to limit the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to one block grant per State per year from 85 percent funds, and to provide authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 14398. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Peace Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REUSS, Mr. KEE, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota):

H.J. Res. 957. 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. 13111 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. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 958. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 959. 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. 13111, 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. SYMINGTON:

H.J. Res. 960. Joint resolution to designate Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as the Eisenhower Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 961. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 412. 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. McCARTHY:

H. Con. Res. 413. A Concurrent resolution condemning the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam and urging the President to initiate appropriate action for the purpose of insuring that American prisoners are accorded humane treatment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 414. A Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and their compliance with the Geneva Conventions on Prisoners of War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MESKILL introduced a bill (H.R. 14399) for the relief of Nelly J. Ainslie, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

295. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York State Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, relative to placing the flag in public school classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

296. Also, petition of Louis Cohen, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to ending the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NONSECRET MOON FLIGHT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to view the accomplishments of our national space program and particularly the recent monumental success of Apollo 11 in landing men on the Moon. The Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, Pa., on Thursday, July 17, 1969, carried an interesting article by Mr. Max Lerner pointing out the significance and value of the open space program that the United States is conducting. As Mr. Lerner points out:

I welcome the stress on manned and humanized space flight as against the Soviet stress on unmanned and the impersonal.

The importance of Mr. Lerner's words should not be forgotten as we seek direction as to the future of our national space program. The article follows:

NONSECRET MOON FLIGHT

(By Max Lerner)

WALTHAM, MASS.—There has never been a moment in human history so massively and carefully prepared and so intensely watched by the whole sweep of the earth's population as the projected landing on the moon by the American astronauts. But there are no sure precisions in the cosmos, whether in the world of nature or of man. After everything has been planned for, there remains the element of accident or contingency—what we call "luck."

What the world therefore will really be watching—each group with whatever form of prayer or propitiation it owns up to—is to see whether luck or mishap will attend the fateful moment.

PRESTIGE DAMAGED

Soviet leaders, it seems to me, have chosen with an unsurprising lack of grace, to barge into this moment of history and crash the party. It is a way of recognizing that science is not only science but a form of political and prestige rivalry, too.

The original Sputniks and the slow American start in space gave the Russians a huge start some 12 years ago. They have since fallen behind, as the Americans have moved toward space primacy in the past eight years—since President Kennedy's grave decision. Mr. Kennedy said to Khrushchev, at the summit meeting in 1961, "Let us go to the moon together." The Russians refused. Now their intent seems to be to undercut or upstage the drama they've been unable to prevent.

There's more than rivalry at stake here. There are two basic life-styles and civilization-styles engaged in the same effort, and the way they operate in it sheds considerable light on their nature and destiny.

The usual way of seeing the difference between the two approaches is to stress the difference between unmanned and manned flight. But there is a larger difference into which that fits—the difference between secrecy and openness.

PRICE FOR OPENNESS

There were Soviet economic and technical failures in the first half of the Sixties that slowed the Russians, including some tragedies with a high cost in human life, never officially revealed. Nobody knows the troubles the Russians have seen in recent years, although Sir Bernard Lovell estimates that they have again fallen a year behind in their schedule.

The Americans have had to pay a high price for their openness, especially when the grisly death of three astronauts made them stop and revamp their technological and safety apparatus. But even here it was a case of one step backward and two steps forward.

The openness of the tragedy goaded the Americans into an urgency they might not otherwise have achieved.

The American program is bound to have tragedies again. The open society, like the closed society—the open life, like the secret life—cannot escape the tragic, but its wrestling with the tragic and its transcending of it are also open, and inspiring.

AMERICAN APPROACH

By the American style, the harvest—if all goes well—is a greater focusing on the symbolic event before and after it happens, a greater drama and, therefore, a greater glory. If things go badly, the misery and heartaches also are greater.

The Soviet method cuts not so much the loss or tragedy as the vulnerability to open failure.

The corollary to secrecy is in personality. Young Americans have the right intuition when they worry about becoming impersonal items in a computerized world and when they link it potentially with a closed society. Yet, the fact is that this linkage, which has been made in modern totalitarian society, is being resisted in America, and not only by the young rebels. That is why I welcome the stress on manned and humanized space flights as against the Soviet stress on the unmanned and the impersonal. You have to mix science and technology not only with vast economic resources and planning, but also with compassion, imagination, sweat and a big chunk of humanity.

MRS. ANNA CORNEHL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I recently informed the President's office that a very fine lady who is one of my constituents would be celebrating her 100th birthday. The President responded by sending the lady a congratulatory telegram. She was, of course, overjoyed and grateful. I, too, wish to say "thank you" to the President for his thoughtfulness and consideration.

The lady is Mrs. Anna Cornehl, and an excellent weekly newspaper known as the Bronx Press-Review also contributed to the enjoyment of her birthday by publishing an article about her. As a tribute to Mrs. Cornehl, I am entering the complete text of that article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

A 100-old woman recalls with gratitude that when she came to Unionport as a bride the townsmen refrained out of delicacy from "shooting over my head," in deference to the fact that she wasn't a local girl.

The shooting wasn't to have been in anger: it was a form of "shivaree," rough and rustic romping to mark a local wedding night. The playful shots were reserved for local girls in the village of 500, back in 1893.

"The bride of that time is Anna Cornehl, of 2953 Philip Ave., who last Sunday was tendered a special reception in the church she helped to found, walking the rural roads and traveling by wagon, to sign first members.

Mrs. Cornehl is a spry lady this day. She complains a little of a partial hearing loss, and of twinges of arthritis. But she still is able to prepare meals, and to talk of the old days to friends and neighbors who come to see her often. "I love to have people drop in," she says.

She was born Anna Heick in Wehrendorf, Hanover, Germany, and came to this country with her mother and sister. Her great grandfather and grandfather had come to the United States earlier. The family chafed against the "Prussianizing" of their native land. For a time she lived in Hawkeye, Iowa, on a farm, then came to New York. Employment was difficult, and she was untrained, like most women, for work. She found a post as a maid in a home next door to the family of former Governor Alfred E. Smith, in Greenwich Village.

She married a maritime officer, George H. Cornehl, and they came uptown by train to Van Nest and were taken to their home on Havemeyer Ave. by public coach, driven by a man named Dannenfeiser, she recalls.

The villagers who forbore from shooting guns over the bride's head greeted them at a celebration given by the couple, at which all who wanted were treated to food and drink.

The Cornehls were to occupy several other quarters after their first. They lived on Gleason Ave., and then Lurting Ave. Mrs. Cornehl lives now with her daughter, Augusta, in the Philip Ave. house.

She sighs as she notes that "people nowadays" aren't as "nice" as they were in her girlhood. "They think too much about themselves now," she says a little mournfully.

She doesn't look mournful often. Mrs. Cornehl is a woman of high spirits, with a wide smile in her age-carved face. She is slight but active and she still has traces of a German accent. She and her daughter amiably disagree over some of her recollections, which she has to strain through nearly a century of remembrance. Details sometimes differ from the family records handed down to her daughter orally.

When she came to Unionport, there were two main East-West streets, Westchester Ave. and Eastern Blvd. (now Bruckner Blvd.) and three North-South streets, Aves. A (Zerega Ave.), B (Castle Hill Ave.) and C, (Havemeyer Ave.) Castle Hill Ave was the local shopping center, but for important purchases Unionporters went to "The Village," at Westchester Square.

The centenarian recalls that when she came to Unionport there was no policeman, but that somehow there was a jail on Gleason Ave. The Odd Fellows Home was on its present site, but then consisted only of a small frame building. PS 36 on Castle Hill Ave. gave public school instruction.

The religious centers were historic St. Peter's Episcopal Church, attended by the owners of the beautiful large estates that bordered the East River waterfront, and St. Raymond's the "Mother Church" of the Bronx Catholics.

But she was a German Lutheran, and there was no church for her. So she started out to organize one. She visited the many German families resident in those days in Unionport, and the young matron soon had the congregation founded. It is still active, in a small frame building at 2134 Newbold Ave.—St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church of

Unionport, where the celebration was held on Sunday.

Every once in a while she recalls, with some emotional warmth and some economic pain, that she used to buy milk at three cents a quart. "There were cows all around here," she notes. "Chickens, too." She paid ten cents a dozen for eggs.

She remembers that the boys from the old Catholic Protectory, the site of which is now occupied by Parkchester, used to bathe in Westchester Creek. Mrs. Cornehl remembers good times in Sehring Park, on Starling Ave. where there was bowling and dancing. But a "rough crowd" from Bergen Ave. broke up the place one night, and it was not reopened, she recalls.

There was a home for alcoholics on Westchester Ave. in those days, too.

Progress came to Unionport when the IRT Pelham Bay Line subway was built—the community was changed from rural to suburban. She says "it's being heard today that 'some of the nicest people moved away'."

"Mrs. Cornehl bore two children, and was attended by a Dr. Droogan, who made house calls on a bicycle. Another local physician was Dr. Ellis, of Doris St. She doesn't recall first names.

Her son Fred, a Certified Public Accountant in government employ, died last year in St. Petersburg, Fla. Her daughter, Augusta, called Connie, still lives with her. They live an amiable and interesting life, entertain often, talk lightly.

"I've had a good life," Mrs. Cornehl says. "People will age less if they keep active. I've always been on the go. My church work has been greatly rewarding, religiously and socially." She admits she likes an occasional glass of champagne.

Her husband won a citation for saving survivors of the U.S. battleship Maine, at Cuba—the sinking incident blamed on the Spaniards which was a cause celebre in the Spanish-American war. He was first officer of the City of Washington, which joined in the rescue work. Later he became a captain of Ward Line vessels plying to Cuba. Mrs. Cornehl recalls that when they met "it was love at first sight."

It was love at first sight when she encountered life. She still is in love—although sometimes slightly bewildered by its changes—with life.

"But it doesn't seem like 100 years," she says.

LEAD-POISONED KIDS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a silent epidemic in the ghettos of our urban centers affecting children who live in dilapidated housing. It is lead poisoning.

Lead poisoning results from old paint which peels off walls and fire escapes and falls within easy reach of children who eat it. The disease in its early stages is just like a virus, and most often is not reported until it has reached its most critical stages. When it gets this far, it results in epilepsy, cerebral palsy, permanent mental retardation, and death.

It is estimated that 25,000 to 30,000 children suffer from lead poisoning in New York City alone.

I have introduced three bills to combat lead poisoning: H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699. In July, these bills were reintroduced with 18 of my colleagues as cosponsors. These bills are H.R. 13256, H.R. 13254, and H.R. 13255.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the October 21 issue of Look magazine. Written by Margaret English, the article, "Lead-Poisoned Kids," cites the seriousness of this disease around the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to read this well-documented article, and to support the essential legislation to alleviate the problem:

LEAD-POISONED KIDS

(By Margaret English)

On April Fool's Day, 1969, two-year-old Yanda Russell began throwing up everything she ate. On April 4, her frightened mother took her to Children's Hospital in Washington, D.C. Six hours after she was admitted, Yanda went into convulsions and became semi-comatose. The resident on duty had seen too many similar cases, and he half expected Mrs. Russell's answers to his gentle questioning. Like most people in the area, she lived in a decayed, prewar tenement. The paint in her apartment peeled away in strips, and holes in the plaster were within easy reach of a two-year-old. For 11 months, she had been yelling at her daughter to quit picking at the paint.

Tests showed that Yanda's blood contained more than three times the safe amount of lead. X-rays revealed lead deposits in her bones. Lead in her brain had caused it to swell inside her skull and had brought on the vomiting and convulsions. She was treated with chemicals that flushed the lead out of her system, and, in three weeks, she was walking, talking and eating normally. Now, she has a 50–50 chance at a healthy life. If she is unlucky, she will suffer permanent neurological damage. Her chances of fighting her way out of the slum she was born in have been reduced by half, all because she ate as few as three flakes a week of lead-containing paint from the walls of her home. There are thousands like her.

Lead paint has not been used on interiors for over ten years, but in old buildings, it lies just beneath the surface of the newer coats of lead-free paint. When the walls are not properly maintained, the old paint lifts away in layered chips along with the new. This is the decor of slum housing.

Most of the children who eat paint have pica, a vaguely defined craving for non-food substances that afflicts about one child in five. Some pediatricians say that pica is caused by minor brain damage, insufficient mothering or overuse of oral pacifiers. However, Dr. Agnes Lattimer, director of Ambulatory Pediatrics at Chicago's Michael Reese Hospital, tends to put down the psychological causes of pica. "Most of these children are anemic," she says. "We're not sure just why, but we find that when we treat the iron anemia, the pica improves." In any case, to her, pica is almost a side issue. A child who lives in a new or well-maintained house can have all the pica in the world, and he won't get lead poisoning.

About 200 kids die from lead every year. Between 12,000 and 16,000 are treated and survive. Half of these are left mentally retarded. Only about one case in 25 is treated. This means that every year, as many as 400,000 kids may be poisoned, half of them ending up with a permanent handicap, like behavior problems or impaired intellectual ability.

The early symptoms are mild and vague. Constipation, clumsiness, lethargy, crankiness or nausea could mean lead poisoning or any number of other childhood ailments. Often, the symptoms go completely unnoticed and disappear, leaving the child with only a little bit of brain damage—perhaps just enough to keep him from getting through high school or holding down a steady job later on. No one can positively identify these victims, but we understand enough about lead poisoning to know that they must exist.

Health officials have learned that when they go out looking for cases, they find them, and the more they look, the more they find. Chicago began a mass screening program in 1966. In 1967, 27,959 Chicago slum kids were tested. Although only a third of the children were in the high-risk age group (one to three years), 2,379 had dangerously high levels of lead in their blood.

Chicago prides itself on having the most extensive screening program for lead poisoning in America, but Mrs. Catherine Smith, of the South Side, is not impressed. Four of her children have been poisoned. Only when she withheld rent for five months did her landlord repair the paint and plaster in her apartment—and then just in the most conspicuous spots. There is still loose lead paint within reach of her youngest son, who nibbles at it when her back is turned. Mrs. Smith would like to get her kids into a housing project where the paint is tight and lead-free. So would the 70,000 other people on the public-housing waiting list in Chicago. If Mrs. Smith could have a safe home, she would be a little more impressed.

Baltimore doesn't have a screening program, but the city does get very tough with landlords of lead-poisoned children. Once a Baltimore child is hospitalized, the Health Department will force the landlord to remove all peeling paint and any tight lead paint from chewable surfaces below a height of four feet. Mrs. Burrie Green's apartment walls in Baltimore were partially stripped after her infant son Larry was hospitalized in the summer of 1968. But when he came home, flakes of old paint still fell within his reach, and a year later, he was poisoned again in the same apartment that had been officially declared lead-free. Twice poisoned, Larry now has little hope of a full recovery.

Still, Chicago and Baltimore are two of the best cities to live in if you can't afford to settle anywhere except in the lead belt.

If Mrs. Barbara Last lived in Chicago instead of Boston, her daughter Debbie might have been screened and treated before she started getting stomachaches and acting crazy. Then maybe she could have been promoted from the first grade last year. Specialists at Children's Hospital Medical Center, Boston, have developed a method for detecting lead poisoning in children from the lead deposits in their hair. This is how Debbie's case was finally diagnosed. Yet Children's Hospital couldn't get the necessary funds to run a mass hair-testing this summer.

When Mrs. Brenda Scurry left Florida for New York in 1964, she wasn't thinking about lead poisoning. She just thought that things were better up North, which may account for why she didn't end her journey in Baltimore. If she had, perhaps her daughter Janet would be alive. Dr. J. Julian Chisolm, Jr., of Johns Hopkins says of the Baltimore Pediatrics clinics, "We take the attitude that any child who vomits in the summertime has lead poisoning until proven otherwise." If Janet had arrived at a Baltimore hospital in a coma and with a history of paint eating, she might have been tested and treated in time. As it was, she was taken to a Bronx hospital on April 15. No one thought of testing her for lead poisoning until April 21. On April 22, she died. More than a week after she buried her daughter, Mrs. Scurry learned the results of the blood test: Lead poisoning.

This can be stopped. Mass screening and testing programs help, and every city with prewar dilapidated housing should have them. Cracking down on a landlord after a kid has been poisoned helps too. But Paul Du Brul, an anti-lead activist from New York's Lower East Side, believes we should go further: "There shouldn't be any lead poisoning, at least not on the scale that we

have it in this country. It is completely within our power to prevent mental retardation in thousands of children a year. All we have to do is keep lead paint out of the reach of little kids who put everything in their mouths." That means making their homes lead-free—either by stripping the walls and repainting them or covering the old paint with wallboard.

It's no use telling women not to let their children eat paint. They try, but it does about as much good as telling a child not to suck his thumb. Dr. Lattimer of Chicago lays it out: "You have to have a home safe enough to put a child down in while you do the washing and ironing. You can tie him down, but then he doesn't get to explore his environment. Then the Head Start people tell you he's culturally deprived. If you live in a lead trap, you can't win."

The landlords will squawk when they have to panel or strip their buildings. They'll say they can't afford it, and some of them won't be able to. Dr. René Dubos, who won a Pulitzer Prize for his book, *So Human an Animal*, likens the elimination of lead poisoning in the slums to the pasteurization of milk. At one time, the dairy people insisted there was no way to market milk that was guaranteed not to give you tuberculosis. The public demanded, and it was done. Dr. Dubos says the same must be done with lead: ". . . This problem is so well defined that it may provide an occasion to introduce a kind of social accounting. . . . If we do not act in a ruthless manner on this limited problem, then I believe that our society is intellectually and morally dishonest in talking about improving social conditions or improving our total environment. If we, with all our technological means, are not willing to make the effort that would be demanded to get rid of [lead poisoning], then our society deserves all the disasters that will come to it."

In St. Louis, a few concerned people are trying to organize a lead-poisoning program. It hasn't really gotten off the ground yet, because the medical folk believe that they have to run a pilot test to find out if there is really enough lead poisoning in St. Louis to bother with. You have to get funding for this kind of thing. Mrs. Sandra James lives with her two-year-old son and a couple of older kids, in a tottering frame house down on Mills Street in St. Louis. She hasn't heard of the citizens' committee, and she doesn't know too much about lead poisoning. In her apartment, the paint lifts off the walls in sheets, and there are holes in the plaster right through to the beams. One of them is about a foot off the floor next to the kitchen door. "That's the hole my baby eats out of," she said. "I smack him for it, but he keeps doing it anyway." I ask Mrs. James if I could have a piece of the paint: "Help yourself," she said. I brought it back to New York and had it analyzed. Of course, it was full of lead.

SENATE DESIRE TO CUT TAX PRIVILEGES FOR WEALTHY LAGS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 the House passed the most extensive tax reform bill in history. This bill is not yet adequate, but it is a major step toward fairness to the middle-income taxpayer. Portions of my own bill to close 13 loopholes, including the oil depletion allowance, through which the wealthy escape paying their fair share of the tax burden and thereby dump it on the rest of us were part of the tax package which passed the House.

The tax reform bill now lags in the Senate, where it appears to be rapidly losing momentum. Until the Senate passes the tax reform measure, tax inequities will persist.

The American people have not forgotten the urgent need for tax reform. Congress should not forget that need either. Mr. Stuart S. Smith, a correspondent for the Baltimore Sun, recently wrote a penetrating and well-balanced article on the tax reform package which I share with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SENATE DESIRE TO CUT TAX PRIVILEGES FOR WEALTHY LAGS

(By Stuart S. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The most sweeping tax reform measure in the history of the republic is in danger of foundering because the ordinary American citizen is no longer paying attention.

Important proposals to ensure that wealthy individuals and powerful corporations shoulder a fair share of the federal budget burden are in jeopardy. The flagging interest is reflected in a sharp drop in mail demanding tax justice. All last winter, spring and summer Capitol Hill offices were flooded with letters insisting on knowing who was getting a tax break and why.

Numerous writers told their congressmen they had just been reading astonishing and to them little-realized facts about the Internal Revenue Service. Not infrequently they enclosed clippings. Some said they had learned for the first time, that all too many wealthy individuals and more than a few big businesses pay taxes on gross income at a lower rate than, say, a scrubwoman earning an income below the federal poverty level.

PROTECT NO. 1

Carried along on this tide of consternation, the House last August passed the most forthright set of Revenue Code amendments ever adopted since the income tax was established in 1913. In the interim, however, this flow of mail has ebbed and changed. Those who write now are no longer outraged small businessmen, pensioners or fathers and mothers supporting families from modest salaries.

These days most of the letters are written by those who get, and want to keep, the special benefits the House bill reduced or eliminated. The signers include persons who are allowed specific advantages from undistributed corporate profits, tax-free bond interest, estate tax manipulations, capital gains deductions, dividend credits, accelerated real estate depreciation, inflated expense account deductions, intangible oil and gas drilling expense write-offs and oil depletion allowances. Altogether, these privileges, which all but a miniscule per cent of the nonrich cannot obtain, cost the Treasury an estimated $22.1 billion a year and reduce the tax base by almost $50 billion. Even though the House only slightly narrowed this escape hatch (or "loopcavern," as one expert called it), those who stood to lose were incensed.

Meanwhile, the reform legislation was handed to the Senate Finance Committee, a majority of whose members have strong ties to large industrial and financial circles and who time and again have demonstrated their partisanship for special interests on the Senate floor.

Shortly after returning from the summer holidays, the committee began hearings. It took testimony from 269 witnesses and received more than 400 supplementary statements. Almost all who appeared in person or sent in written comment for the committee record argued against one or another of the House provisions. This testimony was offset only in small part by the mere handful of individuals who bothered to speak up in behalf of the general public.

IMPORTANT ISSUES BECLOUDED

Moreover, the issues of paramount importance to the ordinary consumer have been beclouded by the noisy dispute over deductible gifts to non-profit institutions and tax-free municipal bonds—problems which concern less than 5 per cent of the personal income tax payers.

To be sure, Senator William Proxmire (D., Wis.) testified one day that "any tax system which requires 2.2 million people under the poverty level to pay federal income taxes, yet allows Atlantic Richfield Oil Company to earn over $465 million between 1964 and 1967 without paying one red cent in federal income taxes clearly requires revision."

However, the senator, who is not a committee member, never received an answer to his implied question; that is, what mechanism permits this injustice and what does the committee propose to do about it? Indeed, the panel heard very little testimony at all about the special tax advantages oil firms enjoy, especially including drilling cost deductions as well as oil and gas depletion allowances. Some Washington commentators suggested that this was not by chance. The Associated Press discovered and reported that Senator Russell B. Long (D., La.), the committee chairman, has since 1964 collected at least $329,151 in oil royalties that were tax-free because of the 27.5 per cent exemption he is currently defending in Congress.

The somewhat mysterious figure of 27.5 per cent was a compromise set a quarter-century ago after the House called for 25 per cent and the Senate said 30 per cent was better. It permits any oil well owner to deduct that amount from each well's gross earnings—year after year even though no additional drilling expenses are ever incurred.

GRANDER THAN TEAPOT DOME

The House measure made the relatively modest proposal of dropping the depletion figure to 20 per cent. After all, as even the Supreme Court once pointed out, the deduction is "arbitrary" and "bears little relationship to the capital investment."

It is, furthermore, one of the biggest giveaways to a wealthy special class ever dreamed up by United States officials, and by its sheer enormity makes even the noxious Teapot Dome episode seem like a minor boondoggle.

In "The Rich and the Super-Rich," Ferdinand Lundberg, a New York University adjunct professor and former newspaper financial writer, charged that "the depletion allowance is a plain gouge of the public for the benefit of a few ultragreedy overreachers and is plainly the result of a continuing political conspiracy in the United States Congress."

Even Milton Friedman, one of the country's most prominent conservative economists and the man who advised Richard M. Nixon on financial matters during the presidential campaign, abhors this tax favoritism with his customary vehemence.

Testifying before the Joint Economic Committee's economy in government subcommittee October 6, Mr. Friedman declared: "The alleged objective of our scandalous collection of special measures about oil—prorationing, depletion, oil import quotas and still others . . . is the preservation of oil reserves for time of national emergency. It would be far cheaper, and far less corrupting politically, to subsidize this objective directly—if indeed any subsidy is necessary—than to continue our present policies."

TAXPAYERS REVOLT PREDICTED

To be sure, President Nixon does not listen to such experts alone. In the South and West, oil is an invincible political force and is not to be scorned in the East, either. In the year 1965 alone, Standard Oil Company of New

Jersey had a gross revenue of $11.471 billion—which exceeded the combined revenues of 30 state governments, which that year raised $11.375 billion.

The Internal Revenue Service refuses to disclose by how many millions Standard Oil was able to reduce its corporation tax through depletion deductions and other write-offs, but President Nixon made plain his reluctance to tackle such influence. Harry S. Dent, one of the President's chief political aides, even had the temerity to write a Republican inquirer in Texas in Mr. Nixon's behalf that David M. Kennedy, the Secretary of the Treasury, would "soon" correct his Finance Committee testimony accepting the allowance cutback to 20 per cent. Mr. Kennedy, however, failed to reappear before the committee.

Some senators are ready for a showdown, with or without administration and committee support. Noting that the Treasury has calculated that the depletion and intangible oil well drilling expense write-offs result in $1.3 billion in lost revenues every year, Senator Proxmire pointed out that this amount is three times the federal law-enforcement expenditures, 15 times over the federal court budget and three times more than the school lunch and food stamp program budget.

Other congressmen have warned that their current mail does not reflect the country's true sentiment and have predicted that a taxpayers revolt will result if meaningful reform legislation is not enacted.

The committee, which went behind closed doors last week to ponder the matter in secret, has promised to report to the Senate by the end of this month. At that time the letter writers on both sides will learn how much their pleading and cajoling accomplished.

KOREA'S POLITICS—IN PROSPECTIVE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, Korea has always been a focal point of the world's attention. Its land is still divided into north and south, and the Communists in the north pose a constant threat to the south. Korea is a frontier of freedom in the Far East and plays an important role for the security of the United States as well as the free world nations in the Far East. As Korea has a strategical significance, the United States maintains its troops in Korea for the common defense of freedom.

Despite the invasion and continuous threat of the Communists in the north, Korea has enjoyed political and economical stabilities over the past several years. Furthermore, Korea's internal policies to attain self-sustaining national defense and economy have been successfully carried out. All of this has been accomplished with the help of the United States. A feat of which we can be justly proud.

The fact that Korea has made immense progress should not divert our attention from the fact that Korea still has many typical domestic problems, detrimental factors which stand in the way of insuring a free political system and economical growth. There remains, of course, the ever-present threat from the north.

The proposed constitutional amendment bill permitting President Park to seek the third consecutive term brings the issue of Korea's future clear to the forefront. Many question whether any other leader on the scene today is capable of leading the country through the trying times ahead. President Park's record is impressive. He has successfully normalized Korea-Japan relations. He has made the controversial decision to dispatch troops to Vietnam. Both of these actions will serve the interests of our country.

The third term also raises the question of Korea's commitment to democratic government. In my judgment, the lack of experience in the practice of democracy has caused a head-on crash between the supporters and oppositionists over the proposed amendment of the constitution. I expect it will take a considerable time to see Korea reflect the qualities of democratic government as they exist in advanced nations. The experience of our Nation would indicate that when national survival is at stake, progress in the development of democratic institutions is retarded. In fact, Korea is still under quasi-war conditions and the achievement of self-sustaining readiness in national defense and economy is so paramount that progress in the other aspects of social development must, of necessity, be slow.

Whether President Park is to be allowed to seek a third term is an issue for the Korean people. To those who question the practice of amending the constitution to make this possible, I would point out that we as Americans should recognize that our national interest has been ill served when we meddled in the internal affairs of other nations. Korea is proud of the progress made in constructing its institutions and we should be constructive in our criticism, lest this brave little nation and strong ally shrink from the common cause which binds us.

CAN LAW RECLAIM MAN'S ENVIRONMENT?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the August-September 1969 issue of Trial magazine carried a most informative article entitled, "Can Law Reclaim Man's Environment?" So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I insert its text at this point in the RECORD:

CAN LAW RECLAIM MAN'S ENVIRONMENT?

"For a long time I made speeches. I thought that was the answer. Now I am convinced the answer is in the courtroom."

So spoke Dr. Clarence C. Gordon, botany professor at the University of Montana to more than 1000 lawyers at the recent Denver, Colo. convention of the American Trial Lawyers Association.

"The nation just hasn't time to wait to correct environmental insults," he warned—a warning echoed by noted conservationist, Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr. of the State University of New York, Atty. Victor J. Yannacone. Jr. of the Environmental Defense Fund, Consumer Crusader Ralph Nader and Prof. James W. Jeans of the University of Missouri-Kansas Law School.

The lawyers were hearing for the first time why they must join the front ranks of fighters to preserve our biosphere from disintegrating.

They were being told—in no uncertain terms—that "insults to our environment by modern technology" belonged in a new category of "corporate crime."

Nader urged them to treat this crime as "one which utterly dwarfs into insignificance crime on the streets—in terms of people injured and killed because of dangerous machinery, pollution, and unsafe household products."

"And a major group of corporate criminals are those industries responsible for environmental pollution," he said.

"Those companies are pushing mankind to the brink of environmental doomsday," Dr. Gordon added.

Yannacone—who through the Environmental Defense Fund has been battling U.S. and state governmental agencies, large industries and the many self-motivated groups—declared that civil law suits, based on damages, are "necessary to protect Americans fast enough before they are dead."

"Every member of the trial bar," he said, "must knock at the door of courthouses throughout the nation and seek the protection of equity of our environment.

"Let each man and every corporation so use his property as not to injure that of another, particularly so as not to injure that which is common property of all the people. Let no wrong be without a remedy."

Yannacone made these points: that legislative relief is too slow and cumbersome; that U.S. agencies (the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Agriculture, Atomic Energy Commission, state flood control agencies, etc.) are too self-centered in their role as defendant, judge and jury; that the billion-dollar agriculture industry sways state legislatures even in the face of death-dealing pesticides (DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbonates); and that modern scientific methods have been developed to determine relative social costs and benefits of "public improvement" projects for this and coming generations.

Yannacone said:

"Conventional conservation education and action will not save any natural resource which has become the object of private greed or public blundering.

"Only imaginative legal action on behalf of the general public in class actions for declaratory judgments and injunctive relief will get the story told and lay the matter before the conscience of the community in a forum where the conflict can be resolved and evidence tested in cross-examination.

"Although we in the trial bar consider it a major part of our professional obligation to avoid litigation, and encourage settlement and compromise, there is a time not to settle. There is a time not to compromise. There is a time to try the case. Litigation seems the only rational way to focus the attention of our legislators on the basic problems of human existence—the protection of the basic elements of our environment, air and water and the diverse, viable population of plants and animals on the ground, in the air and in the seas."

Do we have sufficient time on this earth to delay taking action—legislative and judicial? TRIAL has made an exhaustive survey of environmental insults and ensuing dangers, and it states editorially: We don't have time.

As Barry Commoner, director of the Center for Biology of Natural Systems, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., warned the Senate Governmental Relations Subcommittee:

" . . . we need to reassess our attitudes toward the natural world on which our technology intrudes. . . . Modern technology has

so stressed the web of process in the living environment at its most vulnerable points that there is little leeway left in the system.

"And the time is short; we must begin now to learn how to make our technological power conform to the more powerful constraints of the living environment."

Dr. Commoner cited the prediction from the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council of a crisis in water pollution by 1980.

The warning is simple and stark: Because of natural biological cycles by the present technology of sewage treatment and crop production we have begun to stress the self-purifying power of the nation's surface waters to the point of biological collapse.

Representatives of the growing breed of scientists willing to become involved in public crusades against such things as DDT, highway building, air and water pollution, Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich, population biologist at Stanford University, asserts:

"The trouble with almost all environmental problems is that by the time we have evidence to convince people, you're dead. . . . Drastic action is needed to head off a catastrophic explosion. . . . If we had a 100 years to solve it, I would be optimistic. . . ."

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, organic chemist at the State University of New York, calls for an end of the world's great experiment with DDT, charging that the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides are contaminating and seriously degrading biotic communities in many parts of the world. Ecological sanity is needed today," he asserts.

Dr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Administrator, Public Health Service, pinpoints just a few of the environmental stresses on the average American today:

1) toxic matter released in the air at the rate of 142,000,000 tons a year from motor vehicles, factories, power plants, municipal dumps and backyard incinerators.

2) microbiological contamination of food (compounded by the use of "convenience foods" which require little or no heating); 50% increase of food additives in the past 10 years; pesticide residues on food crops; traces of veterinary drugs in meat, milk and eggs.

3) more than 3.5 billion tons of solid waste discarded each year—marring landscapes; adding to malodorous, polluting dumps; and breeding rats, disease organisms and filth.

4) more than 500 new chemicals and chemical compounds introduced annually into industry, along with countless operational innovations—causing thousands of workers to suffer from cancer, lung disease, loss of hearing, dermatitis and other ocupational diseases.

5) chemical, viral and bacteriological wastes contaminating our rivers and lakes—increasing the difficulty to find water supplies treatable for human consumption.

6) radiation sources from large-scale applications of nuclear energy, laser and microwave technology, medical X-rays and radionuclides, and household electronic equipment—against which science has only begun to develop protection.

7) thousands of new miracle drugs produced by pharmaceutical research to treat specific disease problems that often cause unforeseen side effects and possibly serious genetic defects.

The economic cost of this pollution—in medical bills, household maintenance, etc.? Each of the 200 million Americans pays $65 per year in less polluted areas and as much as $200 per year in highly polluted areas.

Recent events indicate the rising concern of our federal and state governments:

The U.S. Health, Education and Welfare Department is sponsoring a scientific symposium to determine full biological effects and health implications of the gigantic microwave industry, medical use of radionuclides, use of microwave ovens, and other electronic equipment which is used in homes.

A secret special committee within the Agriculture Department has called for stoppage of all aerial dusting with DDT and its use in aquatic areas.

Congress is going beyond President Nixon's budget to allot $750 million a year to combat water pollution.

New Jersey has instituted suit against seven major airlines for $55,000 in damages for air pollution due to exhausts from their jets.

States, overwhelmed by the tremendous costs of fighting environmental insults, are seeking help from industry. (One exception: California bowed to the $4.4 billion agriculture industry and allowed the continued use of DDT.)

The following hypothetical problem offered by Dr. J. Douglas Smith and Dr. Joseph J. Harrington of Harvard University, president and vice president of Process Research, Inc. (a water pollution control firm in Cambridge, Mass.) dramatizes the complexities of environmental control. Lawyers must be prepared to resolve the legal ramifications of such a problem:

Cranberry growers on Cape Cod, concerned with improving agricultural benefits, have adopted a policy of spreading chemical fertilizers on their cranberry bogs; these fertilizers eventually run off into the tidal inlets of the Cape, where there exists a concerned clam digging industry. As well as stimulating cranberry growth, these fertilizers stimulate the growth of other sorts of plant life; on the tidelands of the Cape, the growth of unicellular algae has recently been prolific. Clams feed by filtering food from large volumes of water and collect appreciable quantities of such algae. When the accumulated algae decompose, they generate enough gas to make the clams buoyant. Great numbers of clams have floated to the surface and drifted to sea on outgoing tides. Along with seriously endangering Cape Cod's clam digging industry, tons of rotting clams washed onto the beaches at Newport, Rhode Island, have created an air pollution problem of such magnitude as to threaten cancellation of this summer's Newport Jazz Festival.

U.S. REVOLUTIONARIES LINKED TO HANOI

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, October 15, Jack Anderson has a thought-provoking column concerning the link between Hanoi and the anti-Vietnam war movement in the United States. I recommend this to all readers of the RECORD, especially those who are participating in today's moratorium. I cannot help but think that among the demonstrators are those who would withdraw if they knew just how much they are aiding Hanoi's efforts. The article follows:

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-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."

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."

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ADVISORY BOARD

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a meeting is now taking place at the General Services Administration that offers great encouragement for the new direction of the Federal Government under the Presidency of Richard Nixon. I refer to the recently created National General Services Public Advisory Council, which is meeting today for the first time.

It is with justifiable pride that I announce one of the members comes from my home State of Arizona, Mr. Gordon Marshall of Phoenix, vice president and general manager of American Concrete Pipe Co. Mr. Marshall joins the Council with many years of experience in the contracting business and a varied background of public service. He is a past president of the Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors, an associate director of Associated General Contractors of America and chairman of the Bureau of Reclamation Task Unit. He acts as treasurer and member of the Executive Committee of the Arizona Association of Manufacturers and serves on the City of Phoenix Finance and Services Committee and the conservation committee. He is a member of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, is on the board of the Visiting Nurse Service, a vestryman, and past senior warden of All Saints Episcopal Church, and past precinct committeeman and member of the State Republican Committee.

The Chairman of the Council is Mr. Robert A. Forsythe, a Minneapolis attorney and former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Forsythe is no stranger to the Senate, having served as administrative assistant to the late Senator Thye of Minnesota.

Topics under discussion at today's meeting range from GSA activity in product testing and Federal procurement to Federal building projects and property management. Included on the agenda are discussions on Federal communications and transportation, disposal of surplus property, retention and disposal of Federal records, and the programs of equal employment opportunity and minority business enterprise.

Mr. President, I call the new National General Services Public Advisory Council to the attention of Senators to show an example of the positive actions being taken by the executive branch to make this Federal Government more responsive to the people. This direct involvement by the public, through the advisory council technique, will strengthen present programs and lead the way for sound planning for the future.

The 16-member panel was sworn into service by Administrator Robert L. Kunzig, who heads GSA, the multibillion dollar agency that acts as the business manager of the Federal Government.

Administrator Kunzig is to be commended for establishing this advisory group for the purpose of injecting a greater degree of public involvement in the affairs of GSA. It is interesting to note that the lady and gentlemen who are council members come from the business, academic, and other segments of the general public. These are successful people who will contribute much to the General Services Administration. As public minded-citizens, they are meeting without pay.

The other members of the National General Services Public Advisory Council are Jay Davis, Jr., vice president and director of Southern Counties Gas Companies of Los Angeles; William J. Dorgan, former mayor of Palisades Park, N.J., and a partner in Torway Warehouse, Inc., of Edgewater, N.J.; Kenneth C. Foster, of Newark, N.J., executive vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America; Robert L. Froemke, of Pompano Beach, Fla., dean of the College of Business and Public Administration of Florida Atlantic University; Stanley Gaffin, who heads his own public accounting firm in Boston; John W. Galbreath, who operates his own real estate, mortgage and insurance companies out of Columbus, Ohio, and is president and principal owner of Pittsburgh Pirates baseball club; Robert T. Handren, an architect-engineer who is a senior partner in the firm of Handren, Sharp & Associates of New York City; Ralph A. Hart, president and chief executive officer of Heublein, Inc., a Hartford, Conn.-based food and beverage manufacturer, importer and exporter; Stanley W. McKiernan, partner in the law firm of Slane, Slane, Lane & McKiernan of Los Angeles; Mrs. Carmel C. Marr, a New York attorney who presently serves on the New York State Human Rights Appeal Board; George M. Page of Austin, Tex., a principal of Page, Southerland & Page, architects and engineers; Alfred M. Snipes, a prominent administrator-businessman from Oklahoma City; Ray A. Watt, of Washington, D.C., president of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships; and John T. Wiley, of Atlanta, assistant vice president of Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.

THRIFT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, while the administration is waging the frustrating battle against inflation, it might be wise and prudent at this point to determine how we got into such financial trouble in the first place, as well as how to prevent it from occurring again.

There are many self-proclaimed experts who have ready answers to the spiraling boom we are in today. Many have just cause to debate the issue for they are truly knowledgeable of their field; others might best keep quiet and let the experts attempt to find ways to stem inflation.

However, I think it important to bring to the attention of my colleagues a piece by Fred Emery of the Galesburg, Ill. Labor News.

His column, "Point of View," offers a succinct and logical exegesis of the roots of inflation. Mr. Emery correctly points out that the incentive for thrift is disappearing in our society along with the individuality of the working man. A man must be rewarded for saving instead of penalized; borrowing must not be so attractive and the credit card so popular.

I commend this article to my colleagues for I believe it should be read by all who are sincerely interested in solving the economic problems of not only individuals but of the Nation.

The article follows:

POINT OF VIEW

(By Fred Emery)

The incentive for thrift in our society is being lost today and with it we are losing our freedom as individuals.

The worker who is thrifty and tries to become self-sufficient by putting aside a portion of his paycheck each week is penalized by the government who rewards his efforts by taxing his savings and the interest on his savings. On the other hand the worker who spends his paycheck each week on loan payments is rewarded by a tax exemption on his interest payments.

The worker who tries to provide for his old age through saving for the future, finds that inflation which is fed by easy credit has destroyed the value of his savings faster than he can save. Thus, why save at all he reasons.

Personal savings and personal security were once the basis of personal pride and integrity. Today however, personal pride is gained by the amount of credit cards a person can boast of and the level of living one can obtain through credit.

By the destruction of habits of thrift in our society, people are becoming more and more dependent on the government to provide for their personal welfare and consequently losing the freedom that comes from personal responsibility.

The thrifty worker has long provided the basis for his own welfare in a capitalist society because his savings provide the necessary capital to business to provide the jobs that provided his income.

Today when credit replaces thrift as a basis for our economy the borrower finds that the increased cost of his purchase leaves him less for the necessities of life and makes an ever increasing income imperative, thus feeding the fires of inflation that are destroy-

ing his ability to become a financially responsible citizen.

Credit unions, bank and all lending institutions have depended on the thrifty to provide the capital for loans both business and personal. But because people today find that being thrifty is becoming a liability rather than an asset they are losing confidence in savings institutions to help them provide for their personal social welfare and are looking increasingly to their government and employer to provide their social security needs. This in turn enslaves them to their employer and government.

Even credit unions, which are owned by the shareholders or savers, strive to give the borrower greater advantages and limit their saving members to less and less benefits, thus killing the incentive for thrift. Some credit unions today are taking away some of the savings insurance benefits of their savers that have encouraged their members to save and become less dependent on their employer and government.

As personal responsibility for one's own welfare decreases so does freedom. When a worker becomes dependent on his employer for his retirement benefits he becomes enslaved by his employer.

When social security benefits become his only other means of retirement income because inflation has wiped out the value of whatever else he might have accumulated, the worker finds that he becomes totally dependent on others for his welfare. We must have social security benefits and other types of group retirement programs, but the individual must also be given the opportunity to provide an even greater measure of security in his personal life.

If our free capitalist society is to survive and freedom along with it, the incentive for thrift must be restored. Personal thrift, initiative, and financial responsibility of the workingman must be rewarded instead of penalized.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SHICK

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most respected and popular State house reporters in New Jersey, George Shick, of the Trenton Evening Times, recently passed away. His life provided memories of integrity, professionalism, humor, and warmth to countless friends. His death leaves a void impossible to fill. In its final tribute, the Evening Times simply and eloquently stated what so many of us feel about George. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Oct. 13, 1969]

GEORGE SHICK

Some people, they say outlive their enemies. George Shick didn't. He never had any to begin with. The Times Newspapers' longtime State House reporter liked life and liked people very much and you had to like him too, and the better you knew him the more drawn you were to his extraordinary personality, which blended humor and irreverence and old-fashioned graciousness and a lot of other good qualities in a compelling mixture.

Nobody could resist it. Not the three New Jersey governors who came to his retirement dinner; not the legion of other movers-and-shakers whom he knew and bantered with during his 41 years of covering the State House; not the two generations' worth of reporters and editors who worked with him; not the hundreds—maybe it was thousands—of other people who neither wrote for papers nor appeared in them, but whose friendship he treasured.

He was much more than just a man everybody liked, although that alone would have marked him as distinctive. He was also a thorough professional who was doing exactly the kind of work he wanted to do and so repaid the fates for this good fortune by always giving the job the best that was in him, which was considerable. And in covering four decades of news stories he inevitably came to know as much about state government, how it worked and who made it work as anyone under the gold dome, and he shared his knowledge gladly, to the unending gratitude of a long procession of young reporters from his own and other newspapers.

There is nothing tragic about the death of a man at 74 with a rich life behind him, a legacy of fine children and grandchildren, and a state full of friends who remember him with great affection. You have the feeling that this is how it ought to be; that the passing of all humans should come as George Shick's did, with the job done and the potentialities all fulfilled.

WASHINGTON POST INSULTS NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if one wants to find out why things are as wrong with people in this country as they are, especially with certain alienated young people, one needs look no further than a page 1 story in the Washington Post of today, the day after the so-called Vietnam moratorium. This story, written by Colman McCarthy of the Post's staff, insults New Hampshire in general and Nashua in particular by suggesting that the values which obtain in the granite State are old fashioned, obsolete or church-dictated. The Post was put out that little attention was paid to the moratorium in Nashua and its article included such choice exercises in prejudice as:

The 300 Nashuans who publicly rallied for peace in Viet Nam did it without help from their neighbors who preferred peace in Nashua but of a different, sleeper kind. . .

Without Sanders Nashua would be just another minor shrub in the rocky New England garden. . .

Although town meetings are traditional in New England, and much boasted about, town demonstrations are not. Private feelings even about the war, even when 204 New Hampshire boys have been killed, are not meant for public display. . .

Nashua is still basically an old French Catholic town. The authoritarianism that was basic to pre-Vatican II Catholicism is still in the bones and in the souls. . .

Possibly the deepest reason is that it is now a quiet season in Nature. . .

As for the rest of Nashua, the large majority who ignored the moratorium, it is getting along fine with the world. At least today.

Mr. Speaker, such writing in a metropolitan paper like the Washington Post is not surprising but it is downright insulting to the good citizens of New Hampshire who are deeply grieved about the tragic losses of their sons in Vietnam, yet who know the United States is at war there. They are not going to undermine negotiations by the American President for an honorable end to the war. Beyond that fundamental, New Hampshire men and women are not buying Hanoi's bidding to Americans to demonstrate against their Government.

Nashua, N.H., is a progressive, dynamic, growing community, with fine schools, expanding industries, and enlightened self-government. It would survive and flourish with or without any single industry. For the Post to imply that the resentment of its citizens against war in general and the Vietnam war in particular is dulled or stilled by dependence on a war-related industry is slanderous in the extreme for it is false and suggestive of dishonor.

As for those precepts of respect, courtesy, honor, propriety, and religious conviction of which the Post speaks with thinly disguised distaste, well, we have such principles and precepts in New Hampshire in good measure and we are proud we do. The Nation could use more of such principles. So could the Washington Post.

However, the Post would not understand, for it consciously reflects the urban blight that dims individual independence and sublimates character to the metro dry rot syndrome that helps to destroy personal strength of character in so much of urban United States of America today.

The article by McCarthy follows:

FOR SOME IT MEANT CHANGE BUT OTHERS IGNORED PROTEST

(By Colman McCarthy)

NASHUA, N.H., October 15—The jackhammer of the antiwar protest that pounds other parts of the land today produced little more than trembles in this small, solid town in the Merrimack Valley, a part of simpler America and its quieter culture.

The shops stayed open to serve the town's 50,000 citizens, the schools did their teaching, most of the mothers kept to the chores of home, and the businessmen, always in groups and breaking out cigars or breaking into laughter, lunched as usual in undingy places like the Berkshire Country Inn.

The 300 Nashuans who publicly rallied for peace in Vietnam did it without help from their neighbors who preferred peace in Nashua, but of a different, sleepier kind.

The Nashua Telegraph, which has been dispensing conservatism since the days of local hero Daniel Webster and his devil, ran a Page 1 story Tuesday on veterans who agreed with a statement by New Hampshire's senior senator, Norris Cotton. Moratorium day was anti-American, said the senator; further, it was anti-Nixon, anti-peace, and pro-Hanoi.

The Telegraph, which apparently savored the senior senator's statement as much as the vets, had no space for junior Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre who gave a speech in the state the same day. Once pro-war, lesser fry McIntyre searched his politician's soul before an audience in Hanover, saying the U.S. should now "get out of Vietnam with all due speed."

As for news of the upcoming events of moratorium day. Tuesday's Telegraph put it on an inside page, between the obituaries and a listing of recent drunk drivers.

A second possible reason for Nashua's mood of guarded quiet is the presence of

Sanders Associates, Inc. As the state's, as well as the town's largest single employer—over 7,000—Sanders produces electronic equipment and devices. Its biggest customer is the U.S. government, particularly the Defense Department. Last year, Sanders did $198 million worth of business, much of that for the production of war tools.

Few in Nashua are naive enough to fear that if Vietnam suddenly ends, the Sanders defense contracts will terminate and then who will replace this goose and its golden Defense Department eggs? Yet among many citizens who talked about the company today, moratorium day was unfigurable. The event did not strike them as a destructive act; it seemed more like a defacement. It was indirectly hacking at Nashua's foliage, the part which has grown thick enough to conceal the stem of the town that knows that without Sanders. Nashua would be just another minor shrub in the rocky New England garden.

ANTIWAR TEACHER

What peace activity there was in Nashua began early among those whose necks will soon be on the Selective Service line: the high school juniors and seniors. At 7:30 a.m., the English class of William Hodge met in a second-floor room of Nashua Senior High. Hodge, strongly antiwar, has been warned by the principal against imposing his views on students.

"I don't," says Hodge. "Whenever I say something about the war that is not in the area of fact, I say, clearly. 'This is my opinion.' The kids know this. So they shoot back with their opinions.

"These are ways of getting the kids informed about the war, rather than merely getting them riled. I think if they have all the facts, then they can't do anything but oppose the war. If they are going to refuse in conscience to cooperate with the government, then it's my job as a teacher to help inform those consciences. With facts, not arguments."

In other classes this morning, mostly in English and social studies, students discussed Vietnam. More opposed the war than not. But even to many of them, their own remarks came out formless and wan. They know that next year at this time they might be in Vietnam, no matter what they say or think now.

At 8 a.m., local station WOTW held a discussion on the moratorium. In a near parody of talk shows that love to pit lefties against righties, nothing new was said about the war.

One radio tuned to the show was that of Mayor Dennis Sullivan. But the mayor was out of town, so it was his secretary who had it on. "Even if Mayor Sullivan was here," she said, "he had planned to totally ignore the moratorium in Nashua. For him, it isn't even happening." What is happening is the mayor's re-election campaign, which he announced two days ago. Neither of his two opponents has mentioned the moratorium, either.

At 11 a.m., a church service was held. The gathering of 200 was mostly young people, mostly male. At noon, they marched to City Hall Plaza, the spot where John Kennedy launched his presidential campaign in 1960 and where Gene McCarthy spoke to a crowd of 8 people early in his New Hampshire campaign. Speeches were made and donuts were passed through the crowd.

At 1:30 p.m., the people, still munching, broke up. The kids, who were almost the whole crowd, drifted away. A few of them joined with adults in cars and headed for Manchester, the state's largest city, 17 miles north. It was hoped the yearning for peace would be more visible and vocal there.

The life-as-usual mood of Nashua today was not created by any large pro-war sentiment. Many say the town is about evenly divided about the war, so one group does not dominate the other. Paradoxically, the mood of Nashua was created not by those who oppose the moratorium, but by those who supported it but didn't turn out.

DOVES STAY IN COOP

Three reasons exist for the Nashua doves keeping to their coops.

First, they maintain with some impatience that they already declared themselves for peace in Vietnam 18 months ago when they sent Gene McCarthy on his way. This New Hampshire expression for peace was done through the ballot box, the proper and truest form of democracy; so why repeat it now with marches and vigils, a lower form?

Second, Yankee propriety. Although town meetings are traditional in New England, and much boasted about, town demonstrations are not. Private feelings, even about the war, even when 204 New Hampshire boys have been killed, are not meant for public display.

Third, Nashua is still basically an old French Catholic town. The authoritarianism that was basic to pre-Vatican II Catholicism is still in the bones and in the soul. Since the Catholic hierarchy itself is divided on Vietnam, or is when it occasionally gets around to the subject, what can the humble Catholic in the pew be expected to know?

Possibly, the deepest reason for Nashua's quiet mood is that it is now a quiet season in nature. The Merrimack Valley is plush with color-tossed trees, rich in russets, mauves and spirited yellows; everywhere is the wrapping paper of autumn.

A few miles from Nashua is Derry, where Robert Frost once farmed and wrote poems. The epitaph he wrote for his tombstone would serve well as the motto of the peace seekers today: "I am in a lover's quarrel with the world." As for the rest of Nashua, the large majority, who ignored the moratorium, it is getting along fine with the world. At least today.

THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS COUNTER-DEMONSTRATION TO THE MORATORIUM ON THE WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., publisher of the Birmingham News and Post-Herald newspapers in Alabama is to be highly commended for his counter-demonstration to the moratorium on the withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam. The manner in which the News backed our men in Vietnam was highly impressive.

Mr. President, the News devoted the entire front page to counter these incredible demonstrations. The front page displayed a large American flag in colors. The headline banner quoted President Nixon's sentence:

Our road is not easy, not simple. . . . But right.

In large type across the bottom of the front page, the News printed a quotation from the Honorable Albert P. Brewer, Governor of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent for his quotation to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the quotation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHICH: THE EASY—OR THE HONORABLE WAY?

(By Albert P. Brewer)

Another time of testing has come to America.

Many times in our history as a nation, we have had to decide between the easy way and the honorable way, both at home and abroad.

While our decisions to stand firm in behalf of freedom and justice have not always been universally popular, they have always been supported by the great majority of American people.

Today, we reach a time when we must decide again between the easy way and the honorable way.

Our flag flies in battle on foreign soil—while at home there are those who would have us believe that our people have lost the will to meet our commitments.

Let the word go forth from Alabama and America today that this vocal minority does not speak for the tens of millions of silent Americans whose deep desire for peace burns as brightly as the fires of our warriors' camps but who know that a peace without honor and justice is no peace at all.

Let every enemy, wherever he may be, know that we as Americans have again chosen the honorable way.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Hanson sent a letter along with a copy of the News to U.S. Senators. His letter appropriately describes the actions of the demonstrators. I was very much impressed with Mr. Hanson's patriotic response to the demonstrators, and I commended him in a telegram which reflected my opposition to the moratorium.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hanson's letter and my reply be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS CO.,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SENATOR: Whatever their motivation, whether misguided thinking or, in some cases, traitorous intent, those who are leading and supporting the so-called "Vietnam Moratorium" are doing the United States grave damage. At the minimum, these people are encouraging the Communist North Vietnamese to intensify their intransigence so amply demonstrated in the months of futile talks in Paris.

If the North Vietnamese succeed, with the help of these Americans, in their obvious aims, the credibility and influence of the United States in its historic and demonstrated efforts to create a world of peace and justice will be drastically reduced, leading to possibly catastrophic consequences.

Wednesday, October 15, 1969, was a black day for the United States. The Birmingham News resorted to its own counter-demonstration, using all its front page to show that most Americans strongly dissent from the views of the "Vietnam Moratorium" crowd and their ilk.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,
Publisher.

OCTOBER 16, 1969.

Hon. CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,
Publisher, Birmingham Post-Herald and News, Birmingham, Ala.:

The front page of your October 15 edition is impressive and thanks for sending me a copy. The counter-demonstration as displayed by your newspaper reflects the true and dedicated American spirit. I wish more of our Nation's media would respond like the Birmingham News. The following is a statement I made on October 14:

"I do not agree with the National Moratorium Committee's October protest movement to withdraw all U.S. troops from Vietnam. I support President Nixon's current initiatives for a lasting and honorable peace. Such withdrawal proposals strengthen Hanoi's position, prolong the war, forfeit all the

objectives supported by four Presidents and break faith with our brave men who have given their lives for their country, world security and freedom."

Keep up your fine patriotic work.

STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senator.

VIETNAM IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have wanted to restate my views on Vietnam in greater detail. Perhaps this reflects an uncertainty in the correctness of my position, and perhaps it does, since I know of the intelligence and patriotism of my friends who hold contrary views. In the final analysis, the correct policy for America is a matter of informed judgment, and where precise answers are not possible, reasonable men can, and often do, disagree.

The October 15 moratorium provided the immediate catalyst for the exposition of my views. I harbored strong, strong feelings about the propriety of this event. Its sponsors did not truly seek to develop a dialog on the war as was announced. The repetition of such nonsense was insulting to the listener. The sponsors all possessed positive and often expressed opinions against the war in Vietnam. Their objective was simply to change current U.S. policy by forcing our political leadership to capitulate to their views. It is not unfair to characterize such coercive tactics as a repudiation of democracy. Although tactics may be deplored, the right of such protesters to dissent is unquestioned. It is the utter impossibility of our President conducting an intelligent foreign policy when badgered by fanatics and publicity seeking politicians—as well as concerned, confused, and frustrated Americans—that I find so offensive. The moratorium was not helpful to the President in exercising his constitutional responsibility to shape our foreign policy. That, at least, is one fact about which I am absolutely sure.

I have often thought that any responsible appraisal of Vietnam policy would first require certain emotional catch phrases to be discarded. One of the most abused is "Peace in Vietnam." How often have we heard that peace in Vietnam can be achieved only if American troops are withdrawn? Of course, this is utter nonsense.

An illusory "peace" will come to America if we no longer engage in war in Vietnam. But the war and the killing will surely continue until it is ended, as all wars are, by one side achieving a victory over the other, or at least so imminently threatening to do so that a negotiated cessation of hostilities affords the best chance of salvaging national interests. Unless we cling to a selfish definition of "peace" for America, and to hell with the world, it must be evident that precipitous withdrawal will not bring peace to Vietnam, but will merely enhance the chances of victory by the forces of North Vietnam, or at best, a negotiated settlement upon their terms.

The question is, therefore, will such a foreseeable consequence be in the long-range policy interests of the United States?

At this point, it is not a digression to discuss this policy interest of the United States and how it evolved.

Although some might disagree, I could never be shaken from my absolute conviction that the main thrust of American foreign policy in this century has been peace—world peace—a secure peace—genuine peace. World peace is America's foreign policy.

Since World War I—to pick a convenient starting place—the methods of achieving this shining goal have changed in response to domestic pressure and world events. But we have never lost sight of our objective, and this objective—world peace—surely is the only defensible reason for our present involvement in Vietnam.

Immediately after World War I, our statesmen and returning doughboys were united in one firm conviction: the world had bled enough. We must never permit such a catastrophe as a world war to occur again, it was said. But tactics differed. The League of Nations, a world forum for resolving disputes short of war, was best calculated to maintain the peace, thought some. Others were fearful of standing international organizations and preached nonalinement and selective multilateral disarmament pacts. In the end, much of the world took the former course and the United States, the latter.

During the period between the wars, a new generation was born which did not share that conviction so deeply held by those who had fought and suffered in World War I. This new breed had ample reason to take up the torch for internal social change. For after all, dust was blowing across the Great Plains, displacing millions of farmers; the economy was sick and soup kitchens for the hungry were a real fact of life. In this environment, the young became involved, seeking economic and social change. Under these circumstances, they were to be excused, perhaps, from failing to notice that equally powerful forces were afoot elsewhere in the world.

The Japanese began a long war of conquest against China. The "rape of Nanking" and the attack on the Panay rated newspaper mention but did not truly arouse our interest.

The Italian venture into Ethiopia and the pitiful plea of Haile Selassie for assistance before the League of Nations were not sufficient to arouse our national interest either. Nor did the early machinations of Adolph Hitler in Europe. After all, it was said, these events were "halfway around the world" and the "pressing priorities at home" demanded that we not "stick our nose in other people's wars" or become an "international policeman."

It was expedient during the thirties to rely upon the inexpensive and relatively painless course of isolationism. But it did not work and proved very expensive and tragically painful after all.

The world became involved in a war and it ultimately and inevitably involved the United States.

Twenty years ago, events had reached full circle. Immediately after World War II, our statesmen and returning GI's were united in the same conviction held by their fathers a generation earlier: the world had bled enough. We must never permit such a catastrophe as a world war to occur again. "If only they had stood up to Hitler when he marched into Austria, all this could have been avoided," was the generally accepted postmortem.

This time, however, there was little disagreement upon tactics. An international body must be organized and the United States must be a part of it. And we must never again be indifferent to aggression anywhere in the world. Aggression feeds upon itself, we learned at a fearful price, and must be stopped by concerted action early before it consumes us all.

Such was the lesson of World War II. And we learned it well, for it has been the main source of American foreign policy ever since.

The Truman doctrine, our support of Greece, the Marshall plan, the policy of containment, intervention in Lebanon, regional alliances, the Berlin airlift, our response in the Middle East in 1956, massive retaliation, the Korean war, our policy in the Congo, and, yes, Vietnam—are all manifestations of, and variations from, the same theme.

The exception, proving the rule, was Hungary. But Hungary, and more recently Czechoslovakia, merely reflected certain military realities; and more importantly, Hungary and Czechoslovakia were not considered a part of the free world to which our policy has consistently applied.

It is a fact which should not be forgotten that the basic reason for American intervention in Vietnam in the first place was that our then President was persuaded that world peace could best be maintained by resisting acts of aggression against a piece of geography which we chose to include as part of the free world.

Whether that initial decision was a wise one depends upon one's view of America's basic postwar policy of resistance to aggression; whether aggression in fact occurred; and whether we correctly included South Vietnam within the penumbra of free world protection.

It is my judgment that the initial decision was correct.

I shall not defend our basic policy further than to say that it has been the policy of every President and every Secretary of State since World War II. Their collective wisdom is impressive and it reflects the hard lessons of history.

Nor is it necessary to dwell upon the favorite debating point of some that aggression never occurred in Vietnam, since Ho Chi Minh was merely a popular nationalist leader bent upon reunifyiing his country. The facts are otherwise. He was a cutthroat of the worst kind, who was fanatically obsessed with imposing a Communist totalitarian government upon all of the territory embraced by

former Indochina, and perhaps beyond. This remains the policy of North Vietnam today.

A more debatable question concerns the propriety of including South Vietnam within the free world's protective sphere.

Again, it is unnecessary to belabor this overworked point. The decision was a judgment one and was based, I am sure, upon an appraisal of the world and its prospects for peace if South Vietnam were permitted to fall. Pertinent to this decision was the lesson of Korea where an armed invasion promptly followed a misunderstood decision to exclude Korea from free world protection; the question of a SEATO commitment to Thailand, and the credibility of our treaty commitments elsewhere; the likely extension of Ho Chi Minh's domination into Cambodia and Laos; the effect of American timidity upon the future actions of China against Formosa, for instance, or by North Korea against South Korea, for another.

In summary, the risks to world peace, if aggression were permitted to succeed in South Vietnam, were sufficiently clear and present to justify our intervention.

If one accepts the correctness of the initial intervention, then the often-repeated refrain that "we should not have become involved in the first place, but our honor requires that we see it through" makes no sense at all. Honor, saving face, or prestige have nothing to do with it. It is world peace we are after and there is nothing immoral nor inconsistent in fighting to maintain it.

A proper decision reached more than 10 years ago should not be followed blindly, however, if circumstances have changed. Many point to the schism between Peking and Moscow as evidence of a fundamental change in the Communist world, justifying policy changes on our part. Whether communism may or may not be monolithic is a matter of academic interest only. It is irrelevant to their potential and propensity for aggression against their neighbors. Such differences as may exist within the Communist world have not disturbed their common opposition to the United States, nor their zeal to export revolution.

Try as I might, I cannot see any change in the objectives of North Vietnam. The very actions by the Communist North which provoked our intervention in the first place still exist today. Unless resisted, North Vietnam still intends to force its will upon the people of South Vietnam and neighboring countries. And this aggression must be resisted, in the name of peace.

It does not follow, of course, that adherence to a policy of resisting aggression requires that American troops bear the brunt of the fighting and the dying. Local forces have the first responsibility for defense. President Nixon's "plan" which tantalized the electorate last fall is now being implemented and involves a proper shift of combat responsibility to the South Vietnamese themselves. If successful, it may involve a withdrawal of American troops, but it does not represent a retreat from those basic American policy interests which prompted our involvement in the first place.

Those who passionately cry "Peace now!" seldom confuse their thinking with a sober consideration of the consequences of precipitous withdrawal. But the President must.

For example, if America withdraws from Vietnam, is it more or less likely that the "quiet war" in northern Thailand will intensify? If the fighting increases, what should our response be? Should we honor treaty commitments to Thailand, if requested to do so? If we do not, what will be the effect upon the credibility of our commitments elsewhere? Are the prospects for peace in Europe enhanced if the other side has reason to doubt the American resolve to honor its NATO commitments?

Will China be more likely to attempt to remove Formosa and Nationalist China as a thorn in its side, if America manifests weakness in Asia? If China should try, what should our response be?

Will the irresponsible and unpredictable government of North Korea be more or less likely to keep its promise to invade South Korea, if we withdraw under pressure from North Vietnam? If the war in Korea is resumed, what should our response be?

The questions go on and on. And each must be carefully considered in connection with our Vietnam decisions because they are all interrelated and any miscalculation, on our part or theirs, could bring us eyeball to eyeball with a nuclear war.

Much of what I have said will, of course, be rejected out of hand by the professional "doves." Over the years, I have heard all of the contrary arguments and believe, in sum, they represent either basic disagreement with America's postwar foreign policy—an alternative is seldom mentioned—or genuine faith in the peaceful intentions of the major Communist countries. How simple the questions of defense become if one admits of no threat. Constructive debate at this time should not focus on the emotional issue of bringing the boys home, but rather on workable foreign policy alternatives in the seventies.

Reason will not reach the professional doves, but I am supremely confident of the willingness of the American majority to unite behind their President if he takes them into his confidence and shares with them the peaceseeking reasons for his apparently warlike actions.

Johnson was never able to verbalize the reasons for a similar policy. Nixon must try harder or he may be faced with the necessity of abandoning tested policy abroad as the price of internal stability at home. To force our President into such a decision would be a tragedy for American and for world peace.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK, OCTOBER 19–25, 1969

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the week of October 19 to 25 our Nation will once again observe National Business Women's Week which was established by the National Business and Professional Women's Clubs in 1928.

This annual observance gives all of us an opportunity to honor once again the working women in the United States who now number more than 29 million. It also calls attention to their accomplishments in the past and the present, and spotlights the urgent need for constructive use of women's full capabilities in business and the professions in the future.

As a woman in the Congress, as well as member of the Aurora, Ill., Business and Professional Women's Club, I am proud that women all across the country are more aware than ever of the importance of an informed, active electorate and realize the necessity for civic responsibility and service. The more than 3,800 affiliated clubs with over 180,000 members throughout the United States are affording commendable leadership to women everywhere.

This past July the national federation held its 50th anniversary convention in St. Louis. These 50 years have seen great strides made by working women in all fields—business, education, the professions, and so on. Today, women can be found in each of some 480 occupations listed by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is a marked contrast to the era when the Business and Professional Women's Clubs were first organized—when only a few types of jobs were open to women.

I hope all of you will join with me in applauding the achievements of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs during National Business Women's Week, and will give your support to their praiseworthy efforts for a better America.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La. The editorial follows:

[From the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., Sept. 4, 1969]

NIXON AIDE TESTIFIES: BIGGER TRUCK DECISION IS LEFT UP TO CONGRESS

(By Dan Rapoport)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration left it up to Congress Wednesday to decide whether heavier and bigger trailer trucks and buses are safe enough to be permitted to travel on interstate highways.

Federal Highway Administrator F. C. Turner told a House Public Works subcommittee his agency did not have "sufficiently reliable evidence" to determine whether the increased sizes of trucks and buses proposed in controversial legislation would mean additional safety hazards to motorists.

If Congress decides motorists' safety is not affected "measurably," Turner said, the Administration would urge that implementation be delayed until July 1, 1972, rather than on the date of passage. The government needs the three years to set performance standards for the bigger trucks, he said.

Turner's long-awaited disclosure of the Administration position on the bill, while not an endorsement, brought smiles to the faces of subcommittee members who support the legislation.

An opponent, Rep. Fred Schwengel, R-Iowa, said it was "incredible" that the Transportation Department did not recommend delay in action on the bill until it could collect adequate safety data.

The bill, supported by the trucking industry and opposed by the American Automobile Association, would increase from 8 feet to 8½ feet the maximum allowable width of trucks and buses using the interstate highway system.

The limit on weight would be raised from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds. The length, which is not limited now, would be set at 70 feet. Turner recommended a maximum length of 65 feet.

The trucking industry says bigger vehicles would permit more economical movement of freight and more comfortable bus travel. The bill's opponents say the larger vehicles would increase the risk of traffic accidents and cost the government millions of dollars each year in repairs caused by added wear and tear on the highways.

Turner acknowledged that large trucks affect "the mental and emotional attitude of the general motoring public." But he said government studies presented no evidence that such trucks are involved in more accidents than smaller ones. He did say that when a car is struck by a truck 15 or 20 times its size, "the truck tends to demolish the smaller vehicle."

Schwengel said President Nixon had declared during his election campaign last Fall he would oppose any legislation that did not protect the "safety and convenience" of the traveling public.

In view of Turner's testimony, Schwengel said, "I have a feeling that Dick Nixon didn't get the full story. I intend to do my best to see that he does."

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader termed the Administration's decision "a flight from responsibility because Congress does not have the resources" to decide the safety issues.

But Nader said "Mr. Nixon's Transportation Department does and the Federal Highway Administration should immediately disclose all the secret studies it has conducted regarding the hazards of giant trucks." Nader said Turner is deliberately suppressing the studies.

On Tuesday, two law students working for Nader issued a preliminary report of a summer-long study of the trucking industry which charged that it operates defective tractor trailers and overworks its drivers.

Under federal law, truck drivers are limited to 10 hours of driving at a time. The students claimed the law has been consistently ignored. In two cases, they said, drivers were killed in accidents attributable to fatigue and defective equipment.

SST WILL BE ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE WITH SUBSONIC JETS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the SST has been accused with being an airplane for the "elite," or for the "jet-setter." The inference is that the average person will not be able to afford to fly in the SST because of the cost of the aircraft to the airlines.

The truth is that the SST will be four times as productive as the Boeing 707 subsonic jet now in service. This fact makes it possible for the price of a ticket on the American SST to be competitive with the fare on a present-day 707.

Mr. Speaker, associate editor of the Seattle Times, Robert L. Twiss, has written an article which appeared in the October 5, 1969 edition, which adds to this contention. The article follows:

SST WILL BE ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE

(By Robert L. Twiss)

Two factors studied at length by The Boeing Co. show the firm's Model 2707 supersonic transport will be competitive economically with the best of the subsonic jets, H. W. Withington said yesterday.

Withington is a Boeing vice president and manager of the Supersonic Transport Division of the firm's Commercial Airplane Group.

"The SST definitely will be competitive with the subsonic jets, at first from higher load factors resulting from its passenger appeal and then from resistance to inflation," Withington said in an interview.

Withington said he bases his conclusions on extensive studies completed by Boeing in the past year.

"This is one of the most important things to come out of this program in the past six months to a year," Withington said.

Discussing higher load factors expected during the early years of SST operation, beginning in 1978, Withington noted that subsonic jets captured about 90 per cent of the North Atlantic market within three years after entering service.

This was because of their tremendous passenger appeal, including their great speed advance over piston-engine transports and their comfort and quietness in the cabin.

Load factors or percentage of seats occupied in the subsonic jets began to level off after the first three years of service, as expected, with more jets flying and travelers taking jet speed and comfort for granted.

In the case of the SST, however, the 1,800-mile-an-hour delta-wing plane is expected to have five years of greater benefit from its great passenger appeal and the much larger market, Withington said.

The higher load factors expected during this period will offset the slightly higher seat-mile costs of the SST, compared with an advanced-technology subsonic jet, such as the Boeing 747, he added.

Then the SST will be more inflation-resistant than subsonic jets, he explained. The Boeing economic study assumed that inflation would continue as it has in the past five years.

"The SST is less people-sensitive than a subsonic jet," Withington said.

He meant the greater productivity of the SST would resist higher costs in flight-crew and ground-personnel salaries and wages better than subsonic jets. Costs of fuel and materials are escalating less rapidly than salaries and wages, he said.

Fuel costs actually decreased between 1955 and 1965 and then leveled out and began to climb at the present rate ½ of 1 per cent a year. Why did airlines show financial gains with jets during the latter part of that decade?

"The conclusion is increased productivity of the subsonic jets and airline personnel," Withington explained. "Both people and equipment productivity went up." As time went on, however, airline costs outstripped even the great productivity of the subsonic jets, so fares began to go up.

The Boeing SST will be four times as productive as the Boeing 707, which means the faster-than-sound airliner will be more inflation-resistant than today's subsonic jets, Withington continued. The great productivity of the SST thus would offset the steady increase in labor costs, which will affect operating expenses of the subsonic jet transport more than it will affect the SST's operating cost, he said.

Historically, with the passage of time, labor costs steadily increase because of inflation, wage increases and other factors. Because the SST is more productive for each hour of labor, it is less sensitive to wage-escalation pressures than subsonic jets, Withington said.

"By 1988, the total operating cost of the SST and the 747 will be essentially comparable," Withington said.

"Boeing studies of load factors expected for the SST were based on extremely conservative assumptions," Withington said. These include a free-world traffic growth rate of 10 per cent a year and a stringent sonic-boom assumption, with no SST flights figured over land south of the Arctic Circle.

Taking out short-haul flights from the forecast of revenue passenger miles expected to be flown in 1980, the studies show supersonic transports such as the Anglo-French Concorde and the Boeing plane will have about 200 billion revenue passenger miles available over such SST routes as the North Atlantic.

A revenue passenger mile is one passenger flown one mile. Withington said the 200 billion figure which would be available to SST's in 1980 is about the total free-world revenue-passenger-mile figure of a couple of years ago.

SST market penetration, of course, depends on the number of planes delivered and placed in service. Withington said the Boeing studies were based on expected Concorde and Boeing SST manufacturing rates, about three a month for the Concorde and five a month for the Seattle-built plane."

"By the summer of 1979, about 15 months after the United States SST enters service, the Boeing SST and the Concorde would provide 30 per cent of the total potential SST market in that time period," Withington said.

That percentage would climb as more SSTs are delivered and SST flights are expanded throughout the free world's over-water routes, Withington said.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, to provide the schoolchildren of this Nation with a chance to start the school-day with a voluntary prayer, we have been offering five prayers weekly for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These prayers can be recited from the RECORD without interference from the Supreme Court which has approved the distribution of pornographic and obscene literature, but sought to halt prayer and Bible reading by American schoolchildren.

The prayers offered for this week include:

I

For blue of stream
and blue of sky,
Father, we thank Thee;
For pleasant shade
of branches high,
Father we thank Thee;
For fragrant air
and cooling breeze,
For beauty of
the blooming trees,
Father in heaven,
we thank Thee.

II

God made the little flowers bloom,
And made each rustling tree;
He made each bird and blade of grass,
And then He thought of me.
Thank you,
Dear God, for making the flowers,
And touching each rustling tree;
For making birds and a blade of grass,
And thank You for making me.

III

A great gray elephant,
A little yellow bee,
A tiny purple violet,
A tall green tree,
A red and white sailboat
On a blue sea . . .
All these things
You gave to me,
When you made
My eyes to see . . .
Thank You, God!

IV

We offer Thee thanks for
the moon in the night;
And thanks for the rain and
the sun's golden light;
And thanks for the wind and
bright, falling leaves;
And thanks, too, for flowers
and deep-rooted trees.

V

Here a little child I stand,
Heaving up my either hand;
Cold as paddocks though they be,
Here I lift them up to Thee,
For a benison to fall
On our meat and on us all.

SMUT PEDDLERS USE MASS MAILING LISTS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 12, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, a distinguished journalist, authored a column which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on the subject of obscenity and the use of mailing lists to push pornographic material into American homes through the family mail box.

Her article was outstanding because it sums up the case against pandering advertising based on hearings taking place before my Subcommittee on Postal Operations. We will have additional hearings on this subject. Our next hearing date is October 22, in the Cannon House Office Building. We will hold a day long hearing in Philadelphia on November 1 in the U.S. courthouse.

I want to express my appreciation to Edith Kermit Roosevelt publicly for her article.

I believe that freedom of expression is threatened to a far greater extent by the contempt for the ideal of freedom of expression as a right inspired by massive distribution of pornography than by mild regulation which protects the privacy of families from the intrusion of pornographic junk mail advertising.

The article entitled "Smut Peddlers Use Mass Mailing Lists" is hereby submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SMUT PEDDLERS USE MASS MAILING LISTS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The right of privacy as a distinct and separate American law is winning expanded interpretations. One reason for this is easy to see. As the means of communications bring us closer together, it becomes easier for those who pander to commercialism, to intrude upon the intimacies of our lives.

An area of privacy which is of increasing public concern is the right of a person to be protected in his home from receiving pandering advertisements which may be sexually provocative or distasteful to him or his family. The number of complaints received by the Post Office Department alone have soared to more than one-half million in the past three years. A Gallup Poll released three months ago reveals that 85 out of 100 adults interviewed said they favor stricter laws dealing with obscene literature sent through the mails.

MASS MAILINGS

The major source of outrage among our citizens is the unsolicited mass mailing of advertisements by some 15 to 20 large firms. These operators generally send out computerized first-class mailings to rake in profits amounting to as much as $10 million a year in a market that runs into billions of dollars.

Many smut merchants operate by means of mailing lists, which contain the names of pre-teen children. These names are gathered through the purchase of pre-teen mailing lists compiled originally by other businesses who sell to children by mail, such as stamp clubs and record clubs.

The greatest cause of public concern is the fear that sexually perverted material will endanger the ethical, mental and moral health of children. Rep. Robert N. C. Nix, Philadelphia Democratic congressman who is chairman of the Postal Operations subcommittee, is in charge of the current hearings on smut peddlers.

He says "such mailings have the effect of undermining parents in their attempt to educate their children as to the meaning and purpose of sex. Pornography undermines the family because by its nature, it preaches that men and women are sexual objects to be exploited for personal pleasure."

CHANCE TO OPEN MAIL

Do children actually get their hands on this material?

Consider these figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The highest labor force among women of all ages in March, 1967, was that of married women with children from ages 6 to 17. This group represented 45 percent of the entire women's labor force and totaled more than 6 million.

From this, we might properly infer that several millions of children who have arrived at a crucial, inquisitive time of life have an unsupervised opportunity to open the mail before their working parents return home even if it is not addressed to the youngsters personally.

Is exposure of children to pornographic material harmful?

Many persuasive statements by responsible experts reinforce the common sense judgments of most parents concerning the harmful effects of salacious literature on juvenile behavior. Dr. Benjamin Karpman, while chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeth's Hospital here, told the Congress that you can take a perfectly healthy boy or girl and by exposing them to abnormalities you can virtually crystalize and settle their habits for the rest of their lives.

BURDEN OF RESPONSIBILITY

Why then has not this flagrant misuse of the mails been halted?

In 1967, the Congress established a procedure which has proved to be inadequate. A citizen, once he determines that mail he has received is "erotically arousing or sexually provocative," can file wtih his post office a judicial enforceable order prohibiting the sender of that pornography from directing any further mail to his home. There are at least two weaknesses in this procedure:

First, the individual has to receive at least one pornographic mailing before he can initiate the procedure for having his name removed from the sender's mailing list.

Second, the Government's directive to have a smut peddler remove an individual's name from his mailing list does not always work. This is because some smut peddlers put out successive mailings under a different company name, usually with different company officers listed. The Government's directive applies to the old company, not to the new one which more often than not is operated by the same people.

A number of new measures have been introduced in the Congress designed to close the loopholes and to strengthen the smut laws in accordance with President Nixon's proposals. Certainly, any legislation that is passed should place the burden of responsibility on the senders of the pornographic material and not on the protesting householders.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM: ENOUGH

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 15, 1969, has been set aside by many Americans as a day of dedication to peace and of demonstration against U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam.

As an American and a Member of this most distinguished House of Representatives, I hope that all Americans will observe it as a day of prayer, rededication, and respect: prayer for those lost in the conflict in Vietnam and their families, rededication to those principles of freedom and equality on which we have always prided ourselves, and respect for the sacrifices made for those principles by our men in Vietnam and throughout the world.

There are those who charge that participants in the demontrations against the war are less than patriotic and that their dissent is un-American. How much further from the truth can they be? The great majority of those involved are protesting precisely because they feel it is their responsibility as Americans to do so.

Indeed, 160 years ago one of our Nation's founders, Thomas Jefferson spoke out on this subject at his first inauguration. Viewing the spectrum of dissent and disagreement over basic principles then prevalent, Jefferson stated that in our country "every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle." Indeed sir, our Nation is not so different than it was in Jefferson's day. We are still "a rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with rich

production of our industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye." I fear, sir, that while we have felt power, we have forgotten the right. The right of American boys to live full lives in peace, and the right of the Vietnamese people to choose a government that is truly representative of their own will. The will of the people must in the end prevail.

While moratorium day will be a day of national protest and demonstration against the war and its evils, it will also be another type of demonstration—of democracy in action. The entire world shall be witness to the true greatness of the American system of self-government.

From the banks of the Yalu River in Communist China to the wall of silence in East Berlin, from Johannesburg in racially divided South Africa to the shores of the island of perpetual terror in our own hemisphere, Haiti, the greatness of our democracy will be in evidence. That evidence will lie in our freedom of expression, of peaceful protest, of respected disagreement—even over government policies—permitted every citizen. For the many millions in this world who live under totalitarian regimes, or worse, who have no say in the shaping of their own destinies, this peaceful demonstration tomorrow will be a beacon of hope, that somewhere it is possible to be a free man, speak your mind, and remain a free man.

I have long opposed the war and have doubted the righteousness of our commitment. Supposedly we became involved in the war in order to defend in the Far East the principles of democracy and freedom which we ourselves enjoy. I do not see though, that a country which imposes strict press censorship, jails political opponents and has no civilians in its topmost government posts can represent these principles. And I do not see how we can, in good conscience, continue to defend with our lives and treasure a dictatorship or a tyranny.

Putting aside the thought that we should never have become involved in the Vietnamese war in the first place, there is little doubt that we should have removed ourselves from it long ago. But, as a result of faulty advice and information, we find ourselves still embroiled in this senseless conflict.

Earlier this year I called for removal of half our troops from Vietnam by the end of this year and the swiftest possible withdrawal of the remainder. I see no added benefits accruing from a delayed withdrawal which we would not have from an immediate withdrawal—except an added loss of life and an added burden of sorrow for our country.

This most cruel and destructive war has lacerated our country. It has slashed into the very heart of this Nation by cutting into the hearts of those mothers and fathers whose sons will not be coming home again. While the casualty figures of the war exceed 45,000 men, the real casualty rate is infinitely higher. For, how many families have been buried with their sons, buried by the mantle of unending grief? What of the mothers whose eyes gleamed with their sons' reflection, who loved their sons more than themselves? What of the fathers who worked their hands to the bone so that their sons could have more time to enjoy their young lives, who watched their sons growing into manhood and then were informed that death had snuffed out this manhood in a far-off land?

Mr. Speaker, from Appalachia to Death Valley, from the factories of Detroit to the waters of the Rio Grande, all along this great country I hear America cry. It is a silent cry, but in its silence it rings in the ears of the Nation. It is the yearning of a mother for her son, a young wife for her husband, children for their father. We not only hear it, but we can see it in their leaden eyes. The vacuum left by death can never be really filled. How much longer shall we allow this to continue? No one has the right to expect us to become like stone, to become deaf like the very stone slabs on the graves of our sons.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward with great anticipation to the time when this war will no longer plague our Nation. There is much that needs to be done here at home, and it must be a united effort.

The scars of this war will be evident long after the hostilities end. While the American people are passionate and outspoken when they feel a basic principle has been violated, they have an unshakable faith in the ideals that form the pillars on which this Nation is founded.

In this time of protest, faith in the American ideal still remains strong and unwavering. The words of Abraham Lincoln over 100 years ago apply so well to the America of today and the future:

> Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the union when again touched, as surely they will be by the better angels of our nature.

VIETNAM

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the House will now adjourn without giving all who so desire the opportunity to participate in the debate relative to our policy in Vietnam.

The gallery is filled with Americans, both young and old, who are dignified in their demeanor and deeply desirous of obtaining congressional direction in this most critical problem. It is, I believe, a mistake to turn concerned Americans out into the street with the feeling that this great Chamber, whose tradition is steeped with the richness of debate on major issues, refuses to give more than a couple of hours to a discussion which has divided our people as it has indeed caused cleavages amidst our community of nations.

I also find it regrettable that the President saw fit to stifle the dissent through the release of a letter from the Premier of North Vietnam, allegedly supporting the Vietnam moratorium. To intimate that Americans who disagree with administration policy may be unpatriotic does a disservice to all Americans who have died on farflung battlefields to preserve the right to dissent, to all Americans who believe in our democracy, and certainly to the high office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs Americans most is that they perceive what the administration does not—namely, that we cannot expect either South Vietnam or North Vietnam to help us out of our dilemma. Certainly the South does not want America to withdraw her troops. It is a known fact that their regime could not last without our support, and they will never attempt much-needed reforms, or discuss the formation of a broad-based government as long as they know we are prepared to stay in their country indefinitely, and as long as they have a veto power over American military policy. Also, we can be assured that the North is prepared to stall at the negotiating table while casualties continue to increase.

The administration places emphasis on an appropriate response from Hanoi in determining our timetable for disengagement. The North could withdraw all its forces from the South immediately; then what would be our response? I suppose the answer would be to withdraw all of our military personnel. I submit that once we are gone, North Vietnam could, if they so desired, renew the conflict. What then would our answer be?

Mr. Speaker, as you can readily see, this would be like chasing one's own tail. The American people see and understand this, and cannot understand why our administration does not. Therefore, what Americans are asking is that the President make a determination based not on what either North or South Vietnam wants, but on what is best for America. They want to save the lives of American boys, and want to begin to expend our great resources to combat the domestic crises which already threaten to destroy us from within. Is that unpatriotic?

Is it unpatriotic for Americans to petition their President to readjust our priorities and set up a timetable to bring our troops home as soon as possible, while continuing our efforts to strengthen the Government of South Vietnam so that they can assume full responsibility for the war?

Mr. Speaker, is it unpatriotic for Americans to be concerned about the excessive war expenditures which cut deep into the pockets of taxpayers, lay bare the backs of the needy, and allow critical domestic needs to go unattended? Are these motives sinister? Should they be misinterpreted? I say emphatically, "No."

Mr. Speaker, most Americans want to support their President, but they want his support in return. They want peace, and they want it now.

CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT INVITES ATTENTION TO NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the progress of our American business women in the economic phase of our national life has been nothing less than phenomenal. Over the past 50 years American women have taken an ever increasing part in the business life of our Nation.

Consequently, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the week of October 19–25 is being observed by the business and professional women's clubs all over the United States as National Business Women's Week.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is an organization representing millions of our American women in making their influence for good and for progress a telling force in the United States. I wish to join them in saluting the achievements of all business and professional women in the thousands of communities across the country. More than 3,800 of these clubs have organized into a federation which each year promulgates and publishes a legislative program approved by our American women. At this time I offer a copy of that legislative program for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I congratulate the Federation on its excellent program which reads as follows:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION JULY 20–24, 1969, ST. LOUIS, MO.

ACTION ITEMS

Item 1. Constitutional Amendment. Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2. Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4. Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5. Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

POLICY ITEM

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

Special note is called to the United Nations Convention pending before the United States Senate on the political rights of women and to the longstanding support for ratification of this convention by the Federation.

BEST POVERTY PROJECT: GREEN THUMB PROGRAM

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there is one program funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and administered by the U.S. Department of Labor, the Green Thumb program, which I wholeheartedly endorse in Estill County, Ky.

The Green Thumb project is directed by Mr. Charles Bishop with assistance of the local county agent, Clarence Bayes. This program involves retired carpenters, welders, brick layers, painters, farmers, and members of other trades in this county.

This group of retirees has been active in roadside beautification, historic cemetery restoration, and the establishment of recreational areas. The members, though possibly they may work more slowly, have proven themselves extremely capable.

I include an article from the Lexington Leader of September 19, 1969, for the perusal of the Members:

BEST POVERTY PROJECT? COUNTY AGENT SAYS IT'S THE GREEN THUMB PROGRAM

(By Nevyle Shackelford)

IRVINE, KY.—"They may be old and slow but when it comes to getting the job done, I'll match them against any equal number of young men any day."

This was how foreman Charles Bishop described his crew of what he called "oldsters" who are participants in the Kentucky Green Thumb Program here in Estill County.

"And more than that," Bishop—an oldster himself—added, "we can do just about anything. You name any job within reason and we can do it."

In total agreement with Bishop, County Extension Agent Clarence Bayes said the Green Thumb Project was the best of the so-called "poverty programs" in the county.

On one job alone, Bayes said, the Green Thumbers saved the Estill County Fair Board hundreds of dollars by completely refurbishing the local fairgrounds and facilities.

These men, he said, rebuilt and repainted the grandstands, repaired buildings, and did a lot of other improvement work that the Fair Board otherwise might not have done.

One of the reasons Charles Bishop was so confident in the ability of his men to do any job within reason is that the group is made up of retired carpenters, welders, bricklayers, painters, farmers and members of several other trades. Also, always used to working, it is no trouble to get them to work. As a matter of fact, Bishop said, he has to watch to see that they don't work too hard.

In their enthusiasm at again being given a chance to do something useful, these men often forget they "ain't as glib as they used to be" and overdo the job by scaling ladders, climbing trees and attempting other feats that might endanger their safety. One of Bishop's duties is to see that his men do not do "any such stuff."

Projects completed in Estill County by Green Thumbers include highway parks, roadside beautification, historic cemetery restoration and the establishment of recreation areas. This group was mainly responsible for the Cottage Furnace Recreation Area, which was opened for picnicking this year in the Daniel Boone National Forest. They now are renovating the Estill County jail and restoring the historic Civil War Cemetery at Chestnut Stand.

A product of the U.S. Department of Labor, the Green Thumb Program was set up to give employment to senior citizens in the lower income group in rural areas. To become a member of the work crew, a man must be 55 years of age or older. Preference, however, is given to those over 65.

The program mainly concerns itself with conservation and beautification projects, but under certain circumstances can work on jobs like improving public facilities or renovating public buildings. They can do this if there are sponsoring agencies such as fiscal courts or city councils and if these agencies provide all necessary materials. The Green Thumbers cannot work on private projects.

Green Thumb members work three days a week and are allowed to earn up to $1,500 annually on the job. But there are other benefits.

According to Charles Bishop, who is 68, it gives a man who has been placed on the shelf a new lease on life.

"To enter again in the mainstream of life," he said, "gives a man a greater incentive for living and improves the health and morale. It gives him that good feeling of being useful again and adds years to his life."

Of one thing there is little doubt: Green Thumbers—in Estill County at least—take great pride in their work and are as enthusiastic about their jobs as schoolboys about swimmin' holes. As Langley Reed said as he swung a briar hook, "it makes us feel young in spirit and gives us a good appetite." If all this is so, it may indeed be as Clarence Bayes observed the best of the poverty programs."

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN PROVIDE INITIATIVE

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed, and continue to believe, in a private enterprise approach to the problems facing us.

Business is, in fact, the forward thrust in our economy. This is very different from other economies where government is the forward thrust.

The fact that business is the forward thrust rather than government is the real genius of our system, for business can and should react faster than government to the needs and desires of people. Government can only and should only be the leavening element to control abuses.

Creative enterprise, encouraged by government, knows few limits. It can create an industrial revolution or shoot for the moon.

Recognizing this, our job in government is to make our problems into our profit centers. By the same token, business must move into our problem areas if it is to avoid further expansion of government.

American enterprise is fast coming to the realization that the future depends to a large extent upon how the business community responds to the many formidable problems facing the country.

Today, I would particularly like to comment on the insurance industry.

I see men and companies developing creative insurance against the hazards of illness, casualty and loss of life—insurance available to people in all walks of life.

I see insurance adapted to encouraging social goals, such as nonsmoking and safe driving. I see insurance marketed in such a way that it is available to more people.

Security is a fair desire of all people—security in old age, in illness, in disaster. To the extent private enterprise can help solve these problems through insurance, to that extent government interference is avoided.

To the extent government can help by encouraging private enterprise to do this, to that extent we will help people both as individuals and as taxpayers.

WILLIE WHITE OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., THWARTS YOUNG MUGGER; COURAGEOUS EXAMPLE OF RESPONSIBLE CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear about victims of muggers, rapists, and robberies whose screams and shouts for help went unanswered. The tragic reply seems to be, "Well, I just did not want to get involved."

I would like to share with my colleagues the story of one man who did get involved. Willie White, Jr., of Rochester, N.Y., stopped early one morning to change a flat tire. Nearby a 61-year-old woman walking to catch her bus was suddenly attacked by a young man. Without hesitation Mr. White came to her help.

This takes courage. But responsible persons have always had courage to do what they have to do.

There is a sad side of this story, Mr. Speaker. And it speaks ill for society today. Mr. White's actions are the exception to the rule. Until this situation is reversed, we are getting nowhere in our fight against crime in the streets.

Every citizen must take the responsibility. We must stop looking the other way when others break the law. Every one of us must strive for that day when the act of violence is the exception and not the act of mercy.

I commend the efforts of Mr. White, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the other Members of the body will do when they read the following article from the Rochester Times Union, and an editorial from the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle:

[From the Rochester Times Union, Oct. 6, 1969]

AIDED WIDOW—WILLIE WHITE GOT INVOLVED

(By Dick Cooper)

"I don't like to see things like that happen. I can't understand why no one else came to her aid," said Willie White Jr., 45, of 475 Cottage St.

White was talking about the woman he saved from an assailant on Genesee Street.

The woman, Mrs. Charlotte T. Eichler, a 61-year-old widow, was walking to catch a 6:30 a.m. bus to work last Wednesday when a man came up from behind and grabbed her purse and lunch bag.

Mrs. Eichler hung on to the purse and the assailant dragged her, screaming, along the sidewalk.

At that point White looked up from his car where he was changing a tire. He called to the man to let the woman alone.

"The woman yelled 'Help. Help. Won't somebody help!' " White said.

"I ran over carrying a flashlight," he said. "The man, about 25 years-old, took off carrying the woman's bag."

"I chased him about a block and hit him with the flashlight," he said.

He said the assailant was stunned by the blow, dropped the bag but ran on.

White, a mechanic for the Monroe County Water Authority, is married and has four children. He said he was not scared during the chase but was quite shaken when he returned to help Mrs. Eichler to her feet.

"Thinking back," White said, "I don't know what I would have done if I caught the fellow, but I didn't think of that at the time."

"I just don't like to see things like that happen."

White said he couldn't understand why none of the motorists passing the scene stopped to assist.

"One young fellow came by in a car and saw me chasing the guy and all he did was speed on by," White said.

Deputy Police Chief Harry Griswold said the case would be reviewed and White's name would be submitted to a board of judges to recommend him for a commendation during next year's Police Week.

[From the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, Oct. 10, 1969]

GET INVOLVED ON THE LAW'S SIDE

On a recent day Rochesterians read about a New York City policeman who pleaded in vain for passersby to notify police that he needed help in arresting three prisoners whom he held at gun point.

They also read of a heart-warming local incident that shows not everyone is unresponsive. That was the purse and lunch bag snatching assault upon a Genesee Street widow in which motorist Willie White Jr., 475 Cottage Street, pursued the assailant and retrieved the stolen articles.

This doesn't balance the books. Too many citizens are timid beyond reason in coming to the aid of their fellow men. In New York City the policeman asked six pedestrians to call police; there was no physical risk involved; only when a police patrol car showed up was the off-duty officer able to book and jail his prisoners, who had tried to rob him.

Rochesterian White put the question of chronic non-involvement cogently: "I can't understand why no one else came to her aid." None of the motorists who saw what was happening bothered to stop.

It is not only the apathetic witnesses of these two events who are, in a sense, on trial. Every Rochester resident, through the Police Bureau's recent city-wide mailing, has been invited—admonished might be a better word—to report any actions that indicate a crime is about to be committed. He should do so by calling 232-3311, the police emergency number. Is this too much to ask?

As new as the project is, police already can cite instances in which burglars have been caught as the result of alerts by neighbors. Getting adequately involved on the law's side can give us a safer city.

A LESSON IN CIVICS FOR MAYOR LINDSAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in today's edition of the Chicago Tribune discusses some aspects of the so-called Vietnam moratorium day and its application to the city of New York. The editorial says it all and there is no need for further comment from me. I commend it to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

A LESSON IN CIVICS FOR MAYOR LINDSAY

Hanoi may be grateful to its "Dear American Friends" for the so-called Viet Nam Moratorium day demonstrations yesterday but they must have been a sad disappointment for New York's Mayor John Lindsay, who had called for a civic protest against the war. The response in New York was a civic repudiation of Mayor Lindsay. This should be a lesson to Hanoi, as well as the mayor for if there is a center of anti-war sentiment in this country it is "Fun City."

Lindsay draped New York's city hall in mourning and ordered all flags on municipal buildings to be flown at half-staff. The police and fire departments openly defied the mayor. All police and fire company stations proudly flew their flags at full-staff. The Uniformed Firefighters association issued a statement saying it would take no part in "this day of national disgrace." The Patrolmen's Benevolent association adopted a resolution denouncing "organized public attacks on the foreign policy of the United States" and expressing "full confidence" in President Nixon's conduct of the war.

As additional evidence of their repudiation of the mayor, all New York police patrol cars kept their lights on in daylight. Sen. Hugh Scott (R., Pa.), minority leader of the Senate, had suggested this sign of contempt for the enemy-inspired, communist-organized anti-war demonstrations. New York taxi drivers and many bus drivers also kept their lights on.

The mayor had requested that all public schools be closed. Altho attendance was somewhat below normal, the schools stayed open. Acting Supt. Nathan Brown pointedly remarked that school children in poverty areas, for whom Lindsay professes such loving solicitude, would be deprived of their usual free lunches if the schools were closed.

Lindsay had requested all churches in New York to toll their bells for the dead in Viet Nam. Only 15 of the city's thousands of churches agreed to toll their bells, and our New York correspondent said none could be heard in the Times Square area. He said he saw only one black arm band in the same area.

When the commissioner of baseball ordered the flag at Shea stadium to be flown at half-staff for the World Series game, in compliance with the mayor's request, the army and marine corps bands said they would not play the national anthem. The commissioner ordered the flag raised.

New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller expressed his well-known disdain for Lindsay, a fellow Republican "liberal," by flying the flag over his New York City headquarters at full-staff. The American Legion had declared that lowering the flag on such a day could not be considered as honoring the dead but would be a "capitulation to the enemy."

Lindsay was supported, however, by elements who are described collectively as "limousine liberals" by City Controller Mario Procaccino, one of the mayor's two oppo-

nents in his campaign for reelection. At an all-day service in Trinity church, in the Wall street district, names of the dead in Viet Nam were read by bankers, brokers, and industrialists. Other supporters of the mayor included the nude show, "Oh, Calcutta," which ran an ad in the New York Times saying "Viet Nam is obscene," and the cast of "Hair," a show which combines nudity with blasphemy and desecration of the flag. The "Hair" company participated in demonstrations in Hammarskjod square [the United Nations] and Bryant park.

On the whole New York gave a fitting response to Lindsay's contemptible attempt to exploit anti-war sentiment for political advantage by calling for a day of protest that would have given the enemy immense aid and comfort if it had been more successful. New York demonstrated that Americans may be against the war but are not un-American. In the words of Fred Hampton, Illinois chairman of the Black Panther party, Lindsay's fiasco was "anarchistic, opportunistic, and Custeristic."

TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, tabulation of my annual questionnaire reveals that the great majority of my constituents who responded are in favor of President Nixon's major proposals in the field of postal and welfare reform, revenue sharing and providing food for needy Americans.

Given five possible policies in Vietnam, the largest number, more than one-third, approve of the Vietnamization of the war.

A surprisingly large percentage, 72.8 percent, would remove all earnings limitations upon the social security beneficiary and the cost-of-living proposal for keeping social security abreast of the cost of living has strong support.

As a supporter and friend of the President for many years, I take particular pleasure in the fact that 14.5 percent of the respondents believe he is doing an excellent job, 42.7 percent rate him "good," 32.7 percent "fair," and only 10.1 percent disapprove of his conduct of the office.

Approximately 10,000 individual questionnaires were returned to me, almost all of which contained the views of more than one member of a family so that I believe the response represents the opinion of at least 17,000 residents of the 16th Congressional District.

The tabulation of the poll is as follows:

RESULTS OF FRANK T. BOW'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a Federal tax-sharing program under which the Federal Government would share a portion of its revenues with the States giving them broad discretion in the expenditure of the money	81.3	18.7
2. From what you have read about the tax reform bill passed by the House of Representatives this month do you believe that most of the so-called tax loopholes have been closed	15.3	84.7
3. Do you favor the bill soon to be debated in the House to abolish the electoral college and choose our President by direct popular vote	84.9	15.1
4. Should Federal scholarship and loan funds be withheld from students who participate in criminal, destructive, or disruptive behavior at the institutions they attend	94.6	5.4
5. Do you favor President Nixon's program of selecting postmasters and rural letter carriers on the basis of merit rather than that of political appointment	95.8	4.2
6. Do you favor removing the limitations on earnings of those who receive social security retirement or disability payments	72.8	27.2
7. In his proposals, the President would lower the cost of food stamps for the poor; the very poor could get them free. The amount of food the stamps could buy would be increased. The authorizations for the relief of hunger in the United States would be increased by $1,000,000,000 from the present $1,500,000,000. Do you favor these proposals	69.5	30.5
8. Would you support a complete overhaul of the welfare system which included these features: (1) uniform national standard of payments to provide minimum necessary income for the aged, disabled, children without parents; (2) an annual minimum income guarantee for families which include a potentially able-bodied worker with provisions for job training and incentives to make the family become self-sustaining	85.5	14.5
9. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic-missile program	62.9	37.1
10. Do you favor establishing the territorial limits of the United States (now 3 miles out at sea) with respect to the ships of any other country at the same distance as the territorial limits claimed by that country	88.7	11.3
11. Do you support President Nixon's proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a self-supporting Government-owned corporation	78.0	22.0

In the following questions, please indicate the alternative that most closely represents your opinion:	In percent
1. With regard to the Middle East, the United States should—	
(a) Give maximum support to Israel including military equipment	10.3
(b) Give maximum support to the Arab nations including military equipment	.5
(c) Work with the Soviet Union, England, and France to effect a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute	52.6
(d) Adopt a hands-off policy	36
2. With regard to Vietnam, the United States should (check 2 if necessary)—	
(a) Continue withdrawal of American troops regardless of consequences	26.5
(b) Continue withdrawal as quickly as South Vietnam troops can take over the military responsibility	35.0
(c) Make additional concessions at the Paris peace talks	6.8
(d) Increase military pressure on North Vietnam in an effort to bring about concessions from that nation and the Vietcong	13.3
(e) Resume bombing in an effort to win military victory	18.4
3. With regard to social security benefits, we should—	
(a) Enact the Bow bill for automatic cost-of-living increases (about 7 percent if enacted effective this month)	87.0
(b) Enact a 15-percent benefit increase even though this might require additional payroll taxes	13.0
4. With regard to the Selective Service System do you believe Congress should—	
(a) Modify the basic rule for selective service, selecting by lot first from the youngest in the prime age group, ages 19 to 26, and work up, rather than from the oldest and work down, and also permit graduate students who are selected after undergraduate deferment to finish an academic year if already started	41.7
(b) Abandon the Selective Service System for a voluntary military manpower procurement system to provide for meeting the manpower needs of the Armed Forces through a completely voluntary system of enlistments except in times of declared war	58.3
5. With the completion of the successful Apollo 11 moon landing, do you believe that the United States should now—	
(a) Continue to increase its space budget with a new goal of landing a man on Mars and/or other planets by the end of this century	22.2
(b) Scale down our space budget and concentrate on domestic human needs	77.8

6. Would you rate President Nixon's performance to date as (circle 1)—	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
	14.5	42.7	32.7	10.1

PEACE MORATORIUM

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, probably no event has been more overpromoted by the news media than the so-called "Peace Moratorium"—not World War II, no U.S. Government bond sale, no call for help after any disaster.

In spite of this extraordinary promotion, in spite of the distortion of the premises and of the goals of the moratorium, in spite of the enormous bias of the press favoring the opponents of President Nixon's efforts to achieve a lasting peace, it should be noted by someone that the overwhelming majority of this House and the overwhelming majority of the American people support the President and sincerely believe that he is doing everything he can, that he is making the correct moves, to achieve peace as quickly as possible.

As one who voted not to cut off any so-called debate in the House, as one who sat through most of the session, as one who did not vote to adjourn, I can say I heard nothing new—the same old weary statements, few facts, some inappropriate poetry—but nothing constructive toward achieving peace. I heard and saw documented confirmation of what we all knew, namely, that the government in Hanoi applauded and abetted the moratorium, even though some of the moratorium proponents and assisters disclaimed any allegiance in fact, finance or spirit.

The debate in the House could be described as gentlemanly—with a few infractions—because this is the venerable custom of the House. The galleries were full much of the time, but gallery passes were promoted by only a few Members. The speakers pleaded for nonviolence on the morrow, in a manner designed to excuse themselves from any culpability if violent or obnoxious behavior resulted.

In spite of this extraordinary promotion, the overwhelming majority of this House supports the President in his efforts, however excruciating, to extricate us from this miserable war, even though we tolerated the series of monologues last night.

Sometimes our tolerance can be mistaken for approval. Sometimes our tolerance can embolden the enemies of our Government here and abroad. Sometimes our tolerance can lead to an apathy which will usher in a modification of our representative parliamentary system by a chaotic system of settling societal problems by demonstrations in the streets and revolution.

I believe that most of the persons who participated in the moratorium actually supported the President's efforts and objectives. Only the headcore leaders ac-

tually proposed immediate unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam. It is not so easy to identify those who want peace at any price.

The moratorium did not appear to prove much other than most people want to end the war in Vietnam. It was, however, extremely successful—as a training program and proving ground for future demonstrations against the Government during the deescalation of hostilities and after the war is ended.

In the future, U.S. citizens should be more careful and discriminating about the objectives for which they march—otherwise they are likely to be joining with persons with whom they conscientiously disagree.

CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding address by Maritime Administrator A. E. Gibson before the American Merchant Marine Conference on October 15, 1969:

CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

(By A. E. Gibson)

One hundred and fifty years ago the city of Savannah saw the dawn of the age of the steamship. There is no more appropriate place in which to greet the coming of a new day for the U.S. Merchant Marine.

So I hope you will permit me the prerogative of a keynote speaker to transpose my composition into a major rather than a minor key. Instead of talking about the U.S. Merchant Marine—A National Crisis, I would like to talk about the U.S. Merchant Marine—A National Opportunity.

That the crisis is real, I cannot deny. We have steadily lost ground to foreign competitors in commercial service until we now carry less of our own trade than ever before in our history. Two-thirds of our merchant fleet is already at the vanishing point, and it is too late to prevent a further decline in our maritime capability in some very important areas. We must all fervently hope that there will be no national emergency within the next few years that would call for the ships we will no longer have.

President Nixon's new maritime policy will give us the opportunity to make a new start. It will reaffirm the intent of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—to provide and maintain a fleet built and operated under U.S. flag, capable of carrying our domestic and a substantial part of our foreign waterborne trade, and of serving as a naval auxiliary in a national emergency.

Under the new program we shall be able to provide incentives for increased efficiency in ship operations, with less need for government aid and intervention.

It will enable both shipbuilders and operators to increase their share of commercial trade.

And finally it will increase our research and development efforts to narrow the cost margin between U.S. and foreign shipbuilding and operation.

With the advent of the President's new maritime policy, we shall have passed the crisis and shall be on our way to recovery Our ailing Merchant Marine will still have some bad days to go through, but at last the prognosis is favorable.

The United States is engaged in nearly one-third of the world's trade and provides much of the defense capability of the free world. How can we afford anything less than a modern and efficient merchant fleet? Yet government policy in the past has failed to achieve the valid objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, not simply because of poor programs, but because of lack of consistent support, lack of flexibility in meeting changing conditions, and lack of adequate funding. The new maritime program is planned to overcome these deficiencies and to strengthen our government's commitment to a strong merchant marine.

In the past the government has not only failed to make a total commitment, but the piecemeal and uncoordinated way in which various programs have been administered by both the Maritime Administration and the Navy has not encouraged efficient shipbuilding.

Much of the great productivity and low cost of Japanese shipbuilding is a result of the very large orders for similar types of ships which have enabled the Japanese to take advantage of the economies of mass production which they have so skillfully learned from us. There is not a Japanese yard today that would compete with an American yard in complexity and variety of ships built—tankers, containerships, complicated naval vessels, nuclear and conventionally powered ships. Yet, this very variety and complexity is expensive and time-consuming When ordered in small lots of two or three, such ships are bound to cost more and take longer to build.

This system runs counter to all the American mass production techniques that have given many of our other industries their economic strength and competitiveness in foreign markets. It is of interest to note that the larger portion of U.S. shipbuilding costs are attributable not to labor but to material. One efficient U.S. shipbuilder estimates material costs at about 65%, as compared with labor and overhead costs of 35%. This means that U.S. material costs alone are greater than the cost of the whole ship built in a low cost foreign yard.

This differential is clearly seen in the prices recently quoted by one U.S. yard for building two containerships. The price was about $1,000,000 less for comparable unsubsidized construction when certain machinery components were purchased from foreign suppliers, compared to the cost for a nearly identical ship which, because it involved an application for construction-differential subsidy, would require all components to be of U.S. manufacture. I believe we should identify more clearly the reason for some of the additional cost of U.S.-built ships.

The fact that several of our American yards have already undertaken to modernize their facilities and even to build totally new and highly productive yards is a tribute to their optimism and their business acumen. The prospect of building tankers of 200,000 deadweight tons and over for transportation of Alaskan oil has spurred plans for facilities capable of building such ships. When there is a reasonable prospect of orders, I have every confidence that U.S. shipyards will be ready to handle them.

The Maritime Administration has sought to encourage more efficient contracting procedures by instituting a design competition for a series of basic ship designs that may comprise our merchant fleet in the next decade. The initial response is imaginative and exciting. This gives the shipyards, naval architects, and owners an opportunity to combine their talents to design ships which lend themselves to efficient shipbuilding and operating practices. We have clear evidence in recent multiple ship orders that very substantial price reductions are achievable by concentrating on a single standard design.

By using more productive and profitable ships and by adopting new management techniques, more of our shipping lines may be able to operate without government help. As you know, several containership operators have already demonstrated that these highly efficient ships can compete internationally without operating subsidy.

Probably we shall not see the day soon when all differentials can be removed. But with the more capital-intensive type of operations now being employed, seamen's wages become a relatively less significant part of total costs. The development of the total system concept—the coordination of land and sea transportation to provide direct producer-to-consumer service—requires the kind of large-scale organizational capability in which Americans have traditionally excelled. As in other U.S. industries which are able to compete internationally, we shall be doing what we can do best.

The new program will be designed to make private investment in our Merchant Marine more attractive by minimizing the bureaucratic control and overseeing which has been winding the industry in a cocoon of red tape.

With the development of a modern, privately owned fleet in active service, it will no longer be necessary to keep large numbers of reserve fleet ships idle against emergency needs.

In return for greater flexibility and support by the government, I believe we have a right to ask for greater initiative and effort on the part of shipbuilders and their supplier industries and ship operators to improve their competitive position in relation to foreign yards and operators.

I am concerned at the apparent growing dependence, particularly of some subsidized lines, on military cargo. This is not a healthy situation. The service provided by U.S. flag berth liners and tramp ships in Vietnam over the last four years has been essential to conduct of our military operations there. Response of our commercial shipping to military requirements has been in the national interest and in the best tradition of our Merchant Marine.

But a continuation of substantial dependence on military cargo when no longer required as an emergency measure cannot be justified. The emphasis on the declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is on support of our trades at all times, with military support only in time of war or national emergency.

Although U.S. liners are carrying about 24% of U.S. liner cargoes, this can hardly be viewed as a substantial portion of such trade. Steps should be taken promptly to concentrate their sales efforts to a much greater extent on commercial cargoes.

U.S. shipbuilding also depends heavily on military orders. Well over half of the total number of employees in commercial shipyards are engaged in naval work. As I have pointed out, these are highly complex ships, often of new designs, ordered, at least originally, in small lots. They require a completely different type of production set-up from that required for series production of comparatively simple, standardized merchant ships.

To the extent that commercial yards are deterred by dependence on naval work from automating their facilities and actively seeking to design and produce merchant ships at lower cost, they will be failing to seize the opportunity that will be offered by the new maritime program to regain their place of preeminence in merchant shipbuilding.

In the new maritime program, we expect to have the opportunity to use government research and development, in conjunction with industry research efforts, to help in the search for continued and improved competitiveness in the U.S. merchant fleet. Government research is particularly appropriate in

areas beyond immediate commercial feasibility.

One such field is of course the planning for the development of advanced nuclear ships. In building and operating the NS *Savannah*, we have demonstrated not just the possibility of nuclear ship propulsion, which naval shipbuilding had already shown, but its eventual commercial feasibility, by opening many of the ports of the free world to nuclear shipping. The Germans and the Japanese will be reaping the advantages of this effort as they send their own nuclear ships into service, especially as the Japanese nuclear ship is intended to transport fissionable materials.

I think it would be as short-sighted as the Government's failure to pursue the promise of the SS *Savannah* in 1819, if we failed now to carry out the additional research and development required to produce a nuclear ship that is completely competitive with conventionally powered vessels. The advent of very large fast containers and the huge ice-breaking tankers forecast by the successful passage of the *Manhattan* through the Arctic ice fields demands some such propulsion.

One of the most important elements in any new maritime program is one seeking to encourage the development of procedures to resolve labor-management or interunion disputes without work stoppages. It has been my belief that, as with the obsolescence of our ships and shipyards, the unsatisfactory state of our maritime labor relations has been in large measure attributable to a vacillating, inadequate government maritime policy. I am hopeful that with the assurance of the government's commitment to a rational long-range program, both maritime labor and management will recognize the importance of resolving their differences without disruption to service. Reliability of service is even more important than new ships to exporters and importers.

A new maritime program is bound to cost something. But the cost of our indecision, indifference, and neglect in the past has already been high and may, if not promptly paid, be the price of our nation's security, and certainly of its economic preeminence.

The crisis of our Merchant Marine offers us the opportunity for a new beginning. Let us rededicate ourselves to the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the development and maintenance of a fleet that will be fully capable of carrying our trade and of meeting our defense needs. Let us seize with vigor and determination the chance to build the strongest and soundest Merchant Marine this country has ever had.

This, then, is the keynote that I would like to strike for your conference. Let it not be a mourning note for a sorry state of affairs that results from the sins of commission and omission of the past. With the assurance of President Nixon's backing for a new maritime policy, let us determine to restore our American Merchant Marine to its rightful place of leadership in furthering our national policy. Let our keynote be one of hope and optimism for the future.

NATIONAL BUSINESSWOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that next week is National Businesswomen's Week. Since I have been a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club most of my adult life and have had the great joy of participating in their activities and in trying to reflect their aims and goals, I am taking this opportunity to place in the RECORD at this point the legislative platform adopted at the B. & P.W. national convention during July at St. Louis. This speaks eloquently of some of the major goals of the organization:

Item 1: Constitutional Amendment—Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2: Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3: Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment opportunity, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4: Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5: Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

In addition, this week can be a time for women to rededicate themselves to increased public service either in elective office or public participation.

It is strange and singularly tragic that in the United States while there are 202 million Americans with 102,291,000 of them women, yet in the House of Representatives with 435 Members there are only 10 women; and in the U.S. Senate of 100 Members, there is the single distinguished Senator from Maine, the great lady of America, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, beloved by women everywhere.

Interestingly enough, only this week I had the pleasure of an hour-long visit with Senora Nelly Turbey de Munoz from Bogotá, Colombia, who informed me that in Colombia where they have had the vote for women only 12 years and where there are 200 members of the House of Representatives, 10 are women and of their 100-member senate, five are women. Therefore, it would seem to me that American women need to involve themselves in all areas of our public life from school board to the Senate, from participatory town meeting discussions to the Cabinet, and to represent those great fundamental principles American women stand for—justice, equality, a better nation for all our citizens, and an increasing awareness of our sense of values and standards. American women through organizations such as the Business and Professional Women have a magnificent contribution to make to our Government.

We can no longer ignore the responsibilities of citizenship. They are not a luxury nor a privilege; they are a necessity and a responsibility. It is only dedication to service and building the kind of world we want for ourselves and our fellow human beings that will bring about the kind of changes necessary to meet the stormy tides of today's life.

I congratulate the Business and Professional Women upon their long service. I am proud to be a member and I am proud to be a woman who has had an opportunity to try and implement the ideals of our organization.

FASCELL SUPPORTS ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I joined with our colleague from New York in sponsoring an important proposal to establish the Presidential Commission on Marihuana.

The commission, a nine-man team to be appointed by the President, will be charged with examining all of the questions relating to the use and abuse of marihuana. It will conduct a study including, but not limited to, the following areas:

First, the extent of use of marihuana in the United States to include number of users, number of arrests, number of convictions, amount of marihuana seized, type of user, nature of use;

Second, an evaluation of the efficacy of existing marihuana laws;

Third, a study of the pharmacology of marihuana and its immediate and long-term effects, both physiological and psychological;

Fourth, the relationship of marihuana use to aggressive behavior and crimes; and

Fifth, the relationship between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

An indepth study of this nature is long overdue. It is particularly important that we have an authoritative and scientific answer to the third, fourth, and fifth questions. Reports have been made in the past, but each seems to refute the other and, therefore, leaves considerable doubt.

I wholeheartedly concur with the Miami Herald's editorial, "A Study of Marihuana Would Serve the Nation," which I hereby call to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 22, 1969]

A STUDY OF MARIJUANA WOULD SERVE THE NATION

President Nixon, following a border meeting with Mexico President Diaz Ordaz, announced a crackdown on marijuana that will be the largest search-and-seizure operation ever conducted by this nation's civilian authorities.

That the use of marijuana has become widespread and a major problem is apparent. But the nature of the problem is not so clear.

For example, the President's new health chief at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, says marijuana should be placed in a different category from other drugs. He says present laws on marijuana are punitive and "completely out of proportion" to the dangers.

Former President Johnson's National Crime

Commission reported two years ago: "Marijuana is equated in law with the opiates, but the abuse characteristics of the two have nothing in common . . . The desired dose of opiates tends to increase over time, but this is not true of marijuana."

Last year, a British Advisory Commission on Drug Dependence found no evidence that marijuana-smoking led to violence or serious dependence.

Yet these findings are directly contradicted by law enforcement officers who encounter the problem every day. Most contend that introduction to marijuana can be the beginning of abnormal behavior that has wide range, and frequently that the dabbling in marijuana leads to experiments with heroin or other harder drugs. It is a psychological matter of seeking greater kicks, the officers say.

The Presidential study group which recommended the marijuana crackdown said that some 60 per cent of college students use marijuana, or pot, as it is popularly called. At a recent rock music festival in New York, reports indicated that some 300,000 or more students attending almost all used pot. In Dade County and Florida, officials say the use of marijuana has become widespread even at the public school level.

In Florida, it is a felony to possess marijuana. Federal law provides a mandatory minimum sentence of two years for possession and for selling it a felony conviction with a minimum sentence of five years.

If marijuana is harmful to the health, and leads to use of harder drugs, the U.S. student population appears headed for disaster. If it is not, laws providing severe penalties for its use seem out of order.

The nation needs a clearer picture of what marijuana is and what its use can cause. Without it the demand for the drug and the supply of it seem near impossible to curb.

U.S. Attorney General John N. Mitchell warns that youths by the thousands are turning to marijuana and describes laws and scientific ignorance on the subject a "never-never land." He wants new laws that will be tougher on peddlers, more lenient with youthful experimenters and that distinguish between hard narcotics and marijuana.

Voices are being raised everywhere on the subject. U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper thinks the U.S. surgeon general ought to provide a study of marijuana similar to the one that pointed up dangers in cigaret smoking.

A New York congressman has proposed a Presidential commission, on the scale of the Warren or Kerner commissions, to define authoritatively what problem the use of marijuana constitutes for this country. We endorse the idea.

A. L. BETHEL

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. L. Bethel, general manager, Marine Division, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., will today deliver a most interesting paper at the Shipbuilders Council of America Panel at the 1969 Propeller Club convention and American Merchant Marine conference.

As one who has long been concerned over the future of the U.S. Navy and the Merchant Marine, I feel Mr. Bethel's remarks about the future of shipbuilding in the United States are most significant, and I am pleased to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUPPORTING INDUSTRY LOOKS AT SHIPBUILDING IN THE 1970'S

I appreciate the opportunity of meeting here with you today. Since the Division of my company that I represent exists primarily to serve in the manufacture and development of propulsion machinery for both naval and maritime industries, our interest in this question is a longstanding one. Unfortunately, no subject since World War II has been talked about more, with less action, than the plight of the U.S. merchant marine and our rapidly obsolescing Navy. It is difficult for me to understand how this problem could receive such low national priority in view of the widespread agreement that urgent action is required to save the U.S. merchant marine and modernize our aging Navy.

In spite of the long history of many promises with little action, I still feel optimistic for the future. Future bright predictions are often quite difficult to make, especially when the extrapolations are made from the atmosphere of the not-so-bright present. Fortunately, there are some very stimulating signs afoot which lead me to view the next decade in shipbuilding with some excitement.

The first fact facing us is that as the population grows, so does the need for world transport. The need for sea transport will go up in the world and not down. Air transport, while on the increase, does not change this fact. Even behemoths like the C5A airplane can carry only 100 tons of freight compared to container ships now contemplated, which may carry upwards of 15,000 tons of cargo. The issue is not how the goods will be carried, but what share the United States will capture of this world sea transport market.

It is also inconceivable to me, with a continually rising gross national product, which indicates a need for even a greater foreign exchange base, that we can continue depending on foreign flag ships for 95 percent of our shipments and foreign building for such a large fraction of our ships and their machinery. The very essence of the strength and development of this country originated with and was sustained by its aggressive merchant marine. Even the Soviet Union, which is primarily a huge land-mass nation, has come to recognize the high seas as a growing instrument for expanding its influence and its power both militarily and commercially. Thus, while the United States naval might is succumbing to obsolescence and the U.S. maritime strength is dwindling to insignificance, the Soviets have steadily and intensively built up both their navy and their merchant marine.

My optimism for the future stems from the fact that the needs of world shipping are increasing and that more and more people are becoming convinced that the U.S. maritime problem has reached such a serious stage that national action must be taken now.

I am encouraged by the positive attitude and actions of the new Maritime Administrator. The recent Woods Hole Conference on Maritime Research and Development is a good indication that we may now start getting some action. Here, however, I must inject a note of caution. An aggressive R&D program is fine, provided it complements aggressive ship construction, but it is not desirable to make it a prerequisite to an expanded construction program. Technology exists now to revitalize the merchant marine and to modernize the Navy. We must be careful that the R&D program is not held out, or accepted, as a sedative for our ailments. The only cure that will work is to build ships, and build them now.

Another basis for my optimism is that I sense a great technical awakening of an industry that has long been accused of being a dead, unimaginative one. There is real progress in all aspects of ship development, ship propulsion, and cargo handling. The era of the 15 to 17 knot ship is passing. The 25 to 30 knot container ship has arrived to take its place and, as you know, action is being taken now to build even larger container ships powered with 120,000 SHP plants, with sustained speeds of 30 knots or more. The day of fast sea transport is upon us. These new highspeed ships are having a profound technical impact on the naval architect, the marine engineer, and the cargo handler. These ships will not only require ingenuity in powering but also in hull form and hull strength. They give us the opportunity to exercise fully all of our skills in the ship design and ship construction fields.

I have been most encouraged by the comments and actions by the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Gibson, regarding the use of nuclear power for merchant ships. I am confident that in the years to come our high speed, highly productive ships will be powered by this remarkable fuel. My company is one of the leaders in the manufacture of nuclear generating equipment for land based or utility use. We have designed most of the nuclear systems now powering the nuclear Navy. With some positive interest from the operators and the appropriate government agencies, we are prepared to extend this vast experience to the marine industry. Our foreign competitors are currently building ships utilizing nuclear power plants. It would be a virtual catastrophe should we fail to move ahead with a technology peculiarly American in development. We must not let this occur.

Any conversation with people in the marine industry ultimately turns to tankers and their spectacular development in the past decade. I believe we have not yet seen the full impact that these large ships will have on the world sea transport thinking in the decade ahead. Yet, we have to recognize that credit for the emergence of the 200-300,000 deadweight ton giants must go to foreign yards.

Speaking of tankers, I, like all of you here, am eagerly awaiting the evaluation of the ice breaking tanker experiment in the voyage of the *Manhattan* through the Northwest Passage to Prudhoe Bay. Irrespective of the outcome of the ice breaking mission itself, the stirring story of the conversion of the ship, with the vast amount of engineering and construction effort, involving a cooperative venture of four shipyards, in a time frame of only eight months, shows what this industry can do when properly motivated and turned on. As a tribute, I suggest that the official drink for this convention be—Manhattan on crushed ice!

The prospect of larger, faster, high-powered, quick turn-around ships, with fast freight handling shows that the U.S. marine industry can be creative and face up to new needs and threats from foreign competition. We must now marry our technical skills with a corresponding national determination to carry us into a brighter future.

Some of the antagonists of an expanded and viable maritime program state that there is inadequate shipbuilding and manufacturing capacity in the United States to meet an expanded program. They cite delays that have been encountered in the existing limited programs as evidence for lack of capacity. It would be foolish to deny such delays. But many of these stem from the piecemeal shipbuilding programs of the past, which provided little opportunity for intelligent planning and programing. But I think the memories of the antagonists are short, for no country has ever produced the tonnage or variety of ship designs in so short a period of time as the United States did in World War II. And there is no doubt in my

mind that given a clearly-stated, long-term national objective, accompanied by a substantively expanded construction program, American industry will rise to the occasion and provide the labor base, and expanded shipbuilding and manufacturing facilities to meet whatever size shipbuilding program the country determines is reasonable. We must all debunk the proposition that the Nation does not have the ability to take on an expanded shipbuilding program.

At this point, I would like to bring up an old thought for new consideration. Looking to the future, I would hope that in a push toward an expanded merchant marine, new emphasis will be given to standardization. More standardization is essential to reducing prices and meeting foreign competition and I understand that foreign supply is likely to be a near term consideration. While we do have the engineering flexibility and the technical know-how to design propelling machinery for almost any configuration of ship or horsepower, we must recognize that there is little payoff from building ships or their machinery in quantities of one and two, with a multitude of design variations.

In summary, my view of the '70s rests largely on the fact that the need for sea transport is increasing not decreasing; that the words of the '50s and the '60s deploring the state of our aging Navy and merchant marine will be replaced by actions of the '70s; that American industry is ready, willing and able to provide the skills, manpower, and facilities to meet an expanded naval and maritime program; that the industry, desiring a greater share of the world market, will discard old practices and mores and engage in far more standardization than has ever been the case in the past; and that the shipbuilding and shipping industries will continue to develop exciting and imaginative forms of transport that are already beginning to set the pace on the worldwide scene. The direction we have to take is obvious, and paraphrasing a recent historic message—we only have to take a small step to create a giant leap forward. All we have to do nationally is to say—Go!

THREE CALIFORNIA CITIES JOIN SMOG CASE CRITICS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, three more California cities have expressed their support of efforts now underway to call for a full open trial in the antitrust suit pending against automobile manufacturers accused of a 15-year conspiracy to retard development of air pollution controls.

I commend the leaders of my hometown Monterey Park, Desert Hot Springs, and Corona for their interest in this vital matter, and I now insert in the RECORD the respective resolutions passed by these cities pertaining to the smog antitrust case:

RESOLUTION 7387

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Monterey Park authorizing the Federal Department of Justice to file certain litigation on behalf of the City of Monterey Park relating to a civil antitrust suit against certain automobile manufacturers

The city council of the city of Monterey Park does resolve:

Whereas, the City Council of the City of Monterey Park endorses and supports the Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 113 relating to uniting in a common interest against violators of the Sherman Antitrust Act, including concrete and steel pipe manufacturers and electrical equipment manufacturers, resulting in refunds from overcharges from price fixing and the imprisonment of presidents of several companies for law violations; and

Whereas, the County of Los Angeles has been fighting all forms of air pollution since 1953 and, because the automobile industry is the major contributor to air pollution, has repeatedly urged and warned the presidents of certain automobile manufacturers to equip motor vehicles with smog control devices; and

Whereas, a Federal Grand Jury was impaneled in 1966 and after meeting for eighteen months in secret session forwarded its findings to the Attorney General who brought suit against the major automobile manufacturers for conspiring, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, to restrain and delay the development and installation of smog control devices; and

Whereas, since the Department of Justice has petitioned to settle the case out of court, the County of Los Angeles has petitioned to intervene in the suit against the automobile manufacturers, asking $100,000,000 damages for injuries to public health and welfare and the cost of Air Pollution Control.

Now, therefore, be it further resolved:

Section 1. That the City Council of the City of Monterey Park urges the governing bodies of the major cities and counties of the United States to endorse the County Counsel of Los Angeles, John Maharg, by filing similar petitions to intervene in the suit.

Section 2. That the governing bodies be invited to send representatives to observe the hearing on the intervention action by Los Angeles County which is scheduled to take place in the Federal Court at Los Angeles on October 13, 1969.

Section 3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to Judge Jesse W. Curtis, United States District Court, Central District of California; State Senator Alfred H. Song, 28th District; Assemblyman Walter Karabian, 45th District; Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, and Supervisor Ernest E. Debs, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, by the City Clerk.

Section 4. That the City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

Approved and adopted this 6th day of October, 1969.

KENNY GRIBBLE,
Mayor of the City of Monterey Park, Calif.

Attest:

LAURA LEE MCMILLEN,
City Clerk.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Monterey Park at a regular adjourned meeting held on the 6th day of October, 1969, by the following vote of the Council:

Ayes: Councilmen: Karnos, Kreger, Lewis and Gribble.

Noes: Councilmen: None.

Absent: Councilmen: Erambert.

LAURA LEE MCMILLEN,
City Clerk of the City of Monterey Park, Calif.

RESOLUTION

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs urging the Justice Department of the U.S. Government to vigorously pursue its action against the big four auto makers for entering unlawful agreements that delayed development and installation of antipollution devices for motor vehicles

The City Coucil of the City of Desert Hot Springs does hereby resolve as follows:

Whereas, the residents of the City of Desert Hot Springs, the State of California, and the United States of America are vitally concerned with the pollution of our environment; and

Whereas, it has been conclusively shown that the major cause of air pollution is the internal combustion engine; and

Whereas, there is apparently significant evidence to indicate that the four major automobile producers and their trade association entered into unlawful agreements that delayed development and installation of anti-pollution devices for motor vehicles; and

Whereas, this City Council believes that it would be in the best interests of the American public for this matter to be brought before the public eyes for its scrutiny; and

Whereas, the Justice Department of tne United States Government has, in a suit brought by it against the four major automobile manufacturers and its trade association, agreed to a consent judgment thus precluding a fair and open trial on the matter;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs does hereby respectfully request that the Justice Department of the United States Government reverse its position with regard to said consent decree and vigorously pursue this action against the auto makers to its completion;

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the City Clerk to the Honorable John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States.

Passed and adopted this 17th day of September, 1969.

Attest:

STONE WRIGHT,
Mayor.

WILLIAM D. WILLIAMS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION 3677

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Corona, State of California, protesting the U.S. Department of Justice's proposed out-of-court settlement of United States of America *v.* Automobile Manufacturing, Inc., et al., U.S. district court for the central district of the State of California, 69–75–JWC and authorizing the city's attorney to file therein objections by the city to the proposed consent judgment

Whereas, cities, counties and other units of government have in the past, united in common interest against violators of the Sherman Antitrust Act, including concrete and steel pipe manufacturers and electrical equipment manufacturers, resulting in refunds from overcharges from price fixing and the imprisonment of presidents of several companies for law violations; and

Whereas, the City of Corona for many years has been fighting all forms of air pollution; and

Whereas, a federal grand jury was impaneled in 1966 and after meeting for eighteen months in secret session forwarded its findings to the Attorney General, who brought suit against the major automobile manufacturers for conspiring, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, to restrain and delay the development and installation of smog control devices; and

Whereas, the Department of Justice has petitioned to settle the case out of court; and

Whereas, such a settlement will preclude an open trial of the issues of said suit and possibly leave the City of Corona without sufficient legal grounds to institute damage actions against the defendants for air pollution caused by motor vehicle exhaust emissions; and

Whereas, the proposed settlement will for the aforesaid reasons and many others be extremely detrimental to the public health

and safety of the citizens of the City of Corona;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Corona, in special session assembled this 3rd day of October, 1969, as follows:

1. It hereby protests the U.S. Department of Justice's proposed out of court settlement of United States of America v. Automobile Manufacturing, Inc. et al, U.S. Dist. Ct. for Central District of Southern California 69–75–JWC.

2. It hereby authorizes its City Attorney to file in said suit this City's Objections to the Proposed Consent Judgement.

Be it further resolved, that a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the following governmental officials: United States Attorney General John N. Mitchell; Senators George Murphy and Alan Cranston; Congressman George Brown; and Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, Second District, County of Los Angeles.

Adopted on this 3rd day of October, 1969.

TONY BOLLERO,
Mayor of the City of Corona, Calif.

Attest:

BLENDA M. NEUENDORF,
City Clerk.

I, Blenda M. Neuendorf, City Clerk of the City of Corona, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was regularly introduced and adopted by the City Council of the City of Corona, California, at a special meeting thereof held on October 3, 1969, by the following vote of the Council:

Ayes: Councilmen Blandi, Bollero, Hart, Parker, Rust.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Corona, California, this 3rd day of October, 1969.

BLENDA M. NEUENDORF,
City Clerk of the City of Corona, Calif.

CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Baton Rouge, La., has forwarded to me an editorial carried in the September 5, 1969, issue of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate in support of the recent effort to secure full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act. So that my colleagues may be aware of the views expressed by the Morning Advocate, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MURKY OUTLOOK FOR CLEAN WATER

"Water, water, everywhere,
Nor any drop to drink."

With these words the poet Coleridge depicted the plight of a marined becalmed in a windless sea and perishing of thirst. On every hand and to the farthest horizon he sees nothing but water, in inexhaustible supply. But it is all polluted, with salt, and to drink it would mean death.

The average land-going American of today may be in little danger of so painful a fate. But what will be the lot of his children or his grandchildren may be another question.

Already some major rivers have become so polluted by industrial and municipal wastes and from other sources that their water is suited for very few uses, even industrial, without expensive purification. One of the Great Lakes is believed by some experts to be lost and on the way to conversion into a huge slough as a direct consequence of pollution.

The American people have become concerned over this situation and the danger to our water supply, one of our two greatest and most indispensable resources, the other being air, also seriously polluted.

Congress also is concerned, to the point of passing the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and authorizing the expenditure of $1 billion for assistance to local governments in sewage treatment plant construction and improvement—a basic project in water pollution control. But Congressional interest has a way of becoming very intermittent and Congress now seems inclined to go along with an administration proposal to actually appropriate only $214 million, less than a fourth of what has been authorized.

To bring about funding of the full amount of $1 billion and to support other pollution control measures is the goal of the recently formed "Citizens Crusade for Clean Water." Member groups in the crusade include the League of Women Voters, the AFL–CIO, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of State Governors, the Izaak Walton League, and about 30 others, plus many individual citizens. But as the League of Women Voters points out, even this respectable backing will not be enough unless the Congressmen themselves see that the public is truly interested in the clean water campaign and unless they hear from their constituents to that effect. Time is growing short for action at this session.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 will require specified degrees of treatment for both municipal and industrial wastes by 1972. To meet the deadline will require a pooling of resources by the federal government, the states and the cities, with full participation by private industry. If any member of this partnership lags, the others may lag also and the situation may be worse in 1972 instead of better.

OPPRESSED WITH TWO WEAK EVILS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, over 400 years ago, Shakespeare called "two weak evils, age and hunger." One of these evils should have disappeared by now. You would think that after a man has lived a full and productive life, old age could be enjoyed without the penalty of hunger. But that is not the case.

All over the country, in every State, in every county, in every congressional district, even my own, there are older Americans who do not enjoy their old age. Instead of a reflective period of wisdom and security, old age is still a time of struggle. Never mind the luxuries, it is simply a struggle to live.

This is inexcusable in our time. Every benefit that we can provide elderly citizens should be, and not only should, but has to be provided.

Mr. Speaker, we have in effect today the Food Stamp Act, designed to relieve some of the hunger around us. I am pleased to cosponsor today a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act to allay the emptiness of the elderly. This legislation will allow older people to exchange food stamps for meals prepared and served by private, nonprofit organizations.

Recently, our colleagues in the Senate recognized the need and passed such a bill.

There are so many elderly people who are physically unable to shop for or prepare food. Under the present law, people who otherwise meet age, residency, and income requirements are not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their homes. I see no reason why the elderly, often the most isolated and deprived, should be denied the benefits of food stamps.

The legislation I am cosponsoring allows nonprofit, charitable organizations to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to designate authentic nonprofit organizations which could accept the food stamps.

This legislation follows the concept of utilizing private initiative for solutions to our problems. The redemption of the stamps would assist the specific church or nonprofit organization to purchase food. Possibly, this would encourage more church groups and charitable organizations to undertake the needed work of bringing a hot meal to our elderly.

I urge my colleagues to consider the debt we owe our senior citizens, and then to fully support this measure.

WEDNESDAY'S MORATORIUM

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives was seen at its best and, regrettably, at its worst, on the evening of Tuesday, October 14.

On the one hand, as those present know and as the press has reported, the 2 hours of debate conducted under special orders on this Nation's involvement in Vietnam were thought provoking, illuminating, in good taste and dignified, and marked by mutual respect.

Here was a demonstration that there is nothing to fear from the frank, open exchange of differing opinions and views. Here, if you will, was an example of democracy at work—an example of freedom of expression we like to tell the world to take as a pattern in forming their own governments.

And, though it was short lived, the exchange should serve as a pattern not only for the free world but, I submit, for the Members of this body.

But there was an irony in the forced conclusion of our discussion Tuesday evening.

There was irony in the fact that a quorum could not be found to keep the House in session, yet a subsequent vote on adjournment produced a quorum.

There was irony in the fact that those who argued, conscience bound, to defend with arms another people's right to freedom of expression voted to silence the equally concerned and sincere voice of

the elected representatives of approximately 25 percent of this Nation.

There was irony in the fact that those who argued that a coalition government cannot succeed in South Vietnam knocked another block from the foundation on which our democracy was built. Mr. Speaker, those who voted to silence Members of the House who were prepared to defend the right of thousands of our citizens to express their conscience and their concern peacefully only called attention to a primary reason why more and more citizens are taking their concern to the streets.

Some argue that Wednesday's moratorium was "shameful." I argue, Mr. Speaker, that there is a degree of shame in the fact that this was the first exchange of this sort in the House of Representatives despite the fact that 6 years and more than 40,000 American lives have been spent in Vietnam. I hasten to add that I have served in the House during those 6 years and I do not hold myself without fault.

The will of the American people will be heard one way or another. If it is not heard by the Government, it will be heard in spite of it. A cursory analysis of election results in the last year and a half illustrate what I mean. How many who have campaigned on a platform to escalate or even continue our involvement in Vietnam have been defeated?

The will of America's young people will be heard. If it is not heard by elected representatives who today discount the value of their counsel, it will be heard in 1970. It will be heard in 1972. As I left the House floor Tuesday evening I overheard one representative of the news media discount the significance of the overflowing galleries that evening because "they were a bunch of kids 18, 19, and 20." Their day will come and it is not far off. The fact that a debate took place in the House at all Tuesday evening indicates their voice is already being heard.

Many charges have been leveled at today's generation of young people, but it has been several years since I have heard our youngsters as a group charged with apathy. They are concerned; they are involved; they are not phony; they have principles and consciences; they are eager to, and will, participate actively in government.

Yes, there were a lot of young people in the galleries the other evening and, without exception, they were well-behaved, courteous, and orderly. There were no disruptions or boos—no catcalls when opposing views were expressed.

Let us be wary of writing off the import of our gallery visitors because of their age. Let us take note of their courtesy and concern and applaud them for both.

Mr. Speaker, there is a message for all of us in the Gallup poll results reported in the last week. On Sunday, Gallup reported poll results indicating that 57 percent of the American people favor complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam by the end of 1970. This morning Gallup reported results of a poll indicating an identical 57 percent approval of President Nixon's leadership. It is significant that results of the first poll were reported in terms of an upward trend; the second poll in terms of a downward trend. I am absolutely convinced that the question of whether or not these two percentages will ever meet again depends on one thing alone: the success of the President in implementing his announced plan to disengage from Vietnam and transfer the responsibility of that war to the South Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of more than 20 Members of this body who remained unheard when the House voted by a vote of 112 to 110 to adjourn Tuesday evening. I include the statement which I prepared for presentation at that time at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MR. OLSEN

In the last several years I have registered my misgivings and my personal recommendations on Vietnam policies to high ranking individuals in the Administration and I have joined in introducing legislation in the Congress which called for greater effort on the part of our government to place this issue before the United Nations.

I have never issued public statements regarding the conduct of the war unless I sincerely believed specific action on the part of our government was in the interest of the peaceful goal all of us seek.

However, after years of frustrated involvement in Vietnam, I believe there comes a time in foreign affairs, as in domestic, when the "people" must be heard. The mounting tension in American democracy between the "people" and their chosen representatives has reached the point where policies directing this Nation's efforts in South Vietnam fail to command respect in the conscience of the American people. When government policies no longer express the will of the people those laws lose their natural legitimacy and such is the case in Vietnam.

A 1967 Congressional poll indicated that 80.2% of the people in the Western District of Montana wanted to continue the then course of the war or escalate with 63% of these in favor of an all out military effort to win. Only 12.8% were in favor of withdrawal. One year later in 1968 another Congressional polling of the same area showed that those in favor of maintaining the status quo or stepping up our military effort had slipped to 55% and that those in favor of de-escalation had risen to 45%. A private poll of the Northwestern states, including Montana, which was completed in August of this year indicated that 52% of those asked were in favor of withdrawal of American Troops and turning the fighting to the South Vietnamese. Another 22% recommended immediate withdrawal. Results of the most recent Gallup Poll show that the percent of Americans favoring complete withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1970 to be 57%.

All of these polls results and the mail I received daily in my office have convinced me a significant trend has developed. It is a trend that must be reckoned with and the leaders of this nation should not turn a deaf ear.

President Nixon, in a letter to a Georgetown University student this week drew a distinction between "public opinion" and "public demonstrations" vowing government policy would not be "made in the streets." White House sources further pointed out that his reply to the student was directed not at the "shouters" but to the "concerned majority" of Americans who have remained silent. The results of the Polls I have cited, which polled not only people in the streets, but also the "silent Americans" or the "concerned majority" to which President Nixon was referring, has indicated their "will" overwhelmingly in favor of withdrawal of American troops.

The President is free to decide to pay no attention to the thousands of persons participating in the moratorium, but can he ignore the will of a growing majority (currently 57%) of the people as reflected in the trusted public opinion polls. When President Nixon took office last January, I didn't detect any lack of willingness to accept the will of just 43.4% of the voting public.

Administrations past and present have been guided by military leaders who have shown many blatant and obvious cases of misjudgment: the tragic loss of 74 lives when a navy destroyer on routine maneuvers off the Philippines was sliced in two when it turned into the path of the Australian carrier: the navy sending the underarmed and tiny electronic spy ship, Pueblo, and 82 men into North Korean waters despite a high level intelligence warning of danger. Not long after the Pueblo and its crew were captured, an unprotected electronic "snooper" plane was shot down as it passed over the shores of North Korea with the loss of 30 lives: the Pentagon also authorized a secret contingency arrangement with Thailand, which, if mutually invoked, would have placed U.S. troops under Thai command: the testing of poisonous gas, resulting in the death of 640 sheep in Utah and the storage on Okinawa of gases which sent 26 men to the hospital not to mention the additional strains placed on Japanese and United States relations.

I say this series of bumblings, including the mishandling of our effort in Vietnam, has led the majority of the people in this country either to apathy or to outright opposition, in varying degrees, across the country.

A very important point that is often overlooked is that the South Vietnamese have to take over the operation and defense of their own country—whether now, or one to ten years from now. Are we to leave more than a half million men in Vietnam while we wait for Saigon and Hanoi to come to some political settlement? I believe *that* is not our obligation.

Since the beginning of the cold war we have intervened on an average of once every 18 months in some foreign country. We have often looked at these interventions as our duty bound response to moral imperatives. We have somehow convinced ourselves and are telling the world that our interference in the affairs of other nations grows out of our determination for justice, self-determination, and freedom for all men. I am not saying these ambitions are wrong but that they are clearly not the major reasons for our interventions. It has been on the basis of cold war fears and our anti-communist diplomacy that we have continued to become involved in these crises.

Following the second World War we were cast as the protector of freedom. It is a role we took unwillingly but are now afraid to relinquish.

Ronald Steel made a similar observation in his outstanding book, *Pax Americana*, when he wrote "where a communist problem exists, as in Vietnam, we have found the defense of freedom to be an unshirkable obligation, even if performed on behalf of a regime which may be as indifferent to freedom as the communist one it opposes. When we decide to honor our moral duty, the label that the oppressor wears is exceedingly important."

The United States waded into Vietnam for no other reason than to prevent domination of the South by the Viet Cong. Surely we have alway realized that we cannot *be* South Vietnam. We cannot govern South Vietnam. We cannot accept full responsibility for the war. Our commitment is limited. The outcome of that struggle depends now, as it always has, on the ability of the people of South Viet Nam.

There have been many disappointments in our relations with the South Vietnamese and the government of South Vietnam. We had hoped that we could help the South Vietnamese to help themselves to build a na-

tion and a government that could attract the support of its own people and to achieve a political victory over the Viet Cong.

Time and time again our hopes have been dashed by the corruption of our South Vietnam ally—a government, as Senator Kennedy said, that "has consistently proved incapable or unwilling to meet the demands of its own people, a government that has demanded ever more money, ever more American lives to be poured into the swamp of their failure."

The casualties are still coming home and the thought of more dead, more bombed villages, more children maimed and made homeless is increasingly repugnant.

From January 1961 to date, the war has taken 45,598 American lives and left 254,274 of our troops wounded. It has cost the taxpayers of this nation a total of more than 81 billion dollars with an additional 25.3 billion dollars to be spent in Viet Nam in fiscal year 1970.

In Montana alone 202 deaths have already resulted from our defense of the South Vietnamese. Their names are:

Anderson, David Anthony.
Barber, David Lynn.
Barnum, Wayne Alan.
Burkhardt, Larry James.
Burns, James Lynn.
Byington, Steven L.
Carroll, Robert Hugh.
Deitchler, Russell Floyd.
Derenburger, Ronald Hal.
Dean, Lester Allan.
Dorris, David Walter.
Edden, George Edward.
Fish, Glenn Charles.
Fuhrman, James Francis.
Gallagher, Raymond Leroy.
Grayson, Reid Ernest, Jr.
Han, Charles William.
Hinther, Gary Rodger.
Johnson, Lester Wesley, Jr.
Kriskovich, Raymond George.
Lockwood, Harold Spencer.
Martin, Ronald Steven.
Moe, Ronald John.
Murphy, Jon Michael.
Murphy, Steven Patrick.
Nathe, Michael Leo.
Osterloth, James Allan.
Peters, George Edward, Jr.
Picard, Michael W.
Pickle, Jimmy Dee.
Rollins, Dale Franklin.
Rowland, Zack Oscar.
Sullivan, David Patrick.
Tillotson, Robert Virtus.
Uhren, Bernard Jeffrey.
Wear, Dennis William.
Welch, Robert Edward.
Wiest, John Robin.
Williams, Ralph Leroy.
Woods, Albert Clarence, Jr.
Zahn, Florian J.
Allen, Robert Christian.
Anderson, David George.
Archer, Sanford Kim.
Boyer, Charles Goodhue.
Chavez, Paul Edward.
Crase, Lionell Russell.
Doane, Michael Leo.
Healy, Louis Glenn.
Hendrickson, Michael Franc.
Howard, Walter John, Jr.
Johnson, William Michael.
Kendall, George Percy, Jr.
Light, Glee Roy.
Loyd, Harold Ivan.
Nelson, Louis Howard.
Padilla, Michael David.
Schwarz, Larry Edward.
Sonsteng, Dennis Wayne.
Stockburger, Arthur Lee.
Wood, Alvy Eugene.
Zerbst, Gilbert Leroy.
Cawley, Robert William.
Clifford, Gregory Allen.
Hagl, Edward Allen.
Helsley, Gregory Phillip.
Lawrence, Delmar Leon.
Beary, Dan Warren.
Birkland, Wiley Cole.
Byford, Gary D.
Chopper, Franklin Delano.
Clark, Richard Dewyatt, B.
Cyr, William Louis.
Derheim, Kenneth Lee.
Eckstein, Rodger Dean.
Frank, Edward Roy.
Haakensen, David Arnold.
Hinkle, Mark Gordon.
Hoerner, Raymond Dale.
Kern, Douglas Duane.
Kleiv, Manford Lloyd.
Knudson, Kenneth Max.
Locher, Walter Norvel.
Miller, Bernhardt William.
Mooer, Gary Owen.
Murrey, Tracy Henry.
Naasz, Larry Duane.
Nelson, Ray La Grande.
Parker, Joseph E., Jr.
Pokerjim, Joseph Louis.
Polk, Preston Wayne.
Reece, Weston Henry.
Salyer, Stanley William.
Swensgard, William Elling.
Urban, John Robert.
Vandenacre, Howard.
Wandler, Louis John.
Whetham, Vernon E.
Dudley, Charles Glendon.
Richardson, Roger Paul.
Sampson, Leslie Verne.
Anderson, Jack Herbert.
Babich, Ronald Gregory.
Backeberg, Bruce Burton.
Casey, Dennis Lee.
Fleming, Patrick Jay.
Fried, Douglas Lawrence.
Garcia, Frank, Jr.
Havranek, Michael William.
Johnson, Lyle Albert.
Jordet, Ronald George.
Juel, Darryl Richard.
Klemencic, Joseph Gordon.
Lehuta, Donald Alexander.
Mayes, Richard Le Otis.
Nelson, Stephen Carl.
Schultz, Danny Carl.
Stephens, James Williams.
Street, Douglas Gerald.
Green, Robert William.
Prather, Christopher. D.
Hobbs, Charles M.
Joyce, John G.
Veale, Ralph D.
Bois, Richard J.
Lameiras, Richard A.
Lamieux, Walter J.
Fowler, Donald L.
Richardson, Robin W.
Hudson, Joseph W.
White, Gordon G.
Ferguson, Ronald Bruce.
Habets, Gregory Lee
Hood, Roger William
O'Neill, Daniel John
Dunbar, Doyle Daniel
Greiner, Gary James
Griffin, Gary O'Neal
McCarvel, Stephen Lewis
Thomas, Roy Stephen
Barton, Jim Albert
Pickett, Richard Dale.
Summers, Jon Ray.
Westervelt, Johnnie Bowen.
Bristal, Clarence Frank.
Kilyine, Richard James.
Plamaray, Alexander P.
Webster, Christopher C.
Grasser, Arthur.
Henderson, Hal Kent.
Langaunet, Bruce Magnus.
Stenbridge, Wayland D.
Sib, Ervin Rinal, Jr.
Hamilton, Don David.
Biberdorf, Dennis Floyd.

In addition to the tragic loss of lives, that is yet to follow, there is also the loss of the 2.1 billion dollars being spent each month in Vietnam which could provide, if used domestically, public libraries for 12 million of Americans who have no library facilities; eliminate the backlog of need for: 169,000 school teachers; 125,000 nurses; and some 50,000 doctors by providing four years medical or teacher training for 344,000 young people and give a college education to the 100,000 young people who were not able to go on to college this year because of the lack of funds.

The cost of all housing and urban affairs programs of the federal government, including slum clearance and other efforts to make the nation's cities safer and more satisfying places of human habitation represent only 6 weeks of the cost of the Vietnamese war. Our entire contribution to the United Nations organizations comes to 80 hours or 3 days of war expenditures in Vietnam.

Our children may well wonder at the sense of values of a nation which spends $52,000 to kill one guerrilla on the other side of the world.

The United States began some time ago to take steps to persuade the South Vietnamese to take eventual complete control of the War. But despite the fact that never before in history has a nation done for another what we have done for South Vietnam, it has been to little avail. It seems to me that with our generous contribution of resources—human, monetary and material—South Vietnam should have triumphed long ago if it had a government with the desire or capability to meet the needs of its people.

Perhaps we have performed a disservice to those we would help by holding onto the initiative of that conflict: by permitting them to depend too much upon the United States: and by looking the other way and sometimes contributing to the corruption of the South Vietnamese government.

It would appear a mistake to continue our present policy which allows things to drift on in the wild hope that some solution will be found. The time has come for the Congress to act within the limits of its power and recommend continuous and orderly withdrawal of United States forces as expeditiously as possible until all American forces are removed, the pace of withdrawal to be limited only by steps to insure the safety of our forces.

MARIHUANA STUDY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the public's concern about the growing use of marihuana is coupled with some confusion about legal and medical aspects of the matter.

In light of the hearings before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3 on the problem of drugs, I thought that the following editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of September 19 would be of interest to my colleagues:

FOR A MARIHUANA STUDY

The Nixon administration, concerned about the growing use of drugs, has offered a new control bill to Congress that seems hastily conceived.

The heavy increase in the use of marihuana has given law enforcement officials a special problem. An entire generation is emerging that sees no more harm in marihuana than in alcohol or tobacco. The recent gathering of some 300,000 youths in Bethel, N.Y., many of whom were pot-smokers, demonstrated that when enough persons ignore a law, as Americans did during prohibition, it is unenforceable.

While Atty. Gen. Mitchell conceded that authorities are operating in a "never-never land" of insufficient information about marihuana, his bill put it in the same category as heroin and LSD. Possession of any of them would be punishable by prison sentences, although Mitchell said in some cases rehabilitation programs would be advisable and leniency might be extended toward youthful drug experimenters. Nevertheless, the entire resources of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics would be devoted to stamping out marihuana and other dugs that have no recognized medical use.

To make them more effective, Mitchell would give narcotics agents the right to "no-knock" drug raids. The constitutionality of such raids is dubious. In "The American Constitution," Prof. C. Herman Pritchett says, "Whether armed with a warrant or not, officers cannot break down a door to effect a lawful arrest and the seizure of incriminating evidence unless they are refused admission after giving clear notice of their authority and purpose." (*Miller vs. The U.S., 1958*).

Before the nation embarks on the monumental task of stopping marihuana smoking and college campuses are infiltrated with narcotics agents, the subject should be removed from its "never-never land." A high level commission should be appointed to report definitely on the effects of marihuana.

Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) suggests the U.S. surgeon general make a study of marihuana as he did of cigarette smoking. This is surely in order.

The war on hard drugs must go on and the salvation of narcotics addicts should be a government goal. But a great deal more should be known about marihuana before the government attempts what could be a "noble experiment" such as prohibition, which bred contempt for the law and worse evils.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Americans have traditionally honored men who excel in fields of exploration, particularly those whose feats of courage and imagination have led to the opening of vast new worlds.

The birthday of Christopher Columbus is a time for celebrating the most significant feat of exploration for our Nation. As we honor Columbus for his achievement of 477 years ago, we realize the overwhelming importance of his deed by looking at Columbus and his voyage in light of the space exploration activities of 1969.

The new world of freedom made possible by Christopher Columbus is still embarked on its mission of discovering still newer worlds. As our children and our grandchildren look back to the beginning of the space age, they will also look further back in history to the miracle of 1492 as the time when it all started.

The Congress has assured the appropriate place in history for Columbus by designating Columbus Day an official national holiday beginning in 1971. This will serve not only to remind us of a hero who braved the unknown to discover a new land but also to teach us to strive for new and better worlds, never taking freedom for granted or accepting our society as the end-all. We have to improve our society or perish and to succeed we need the courage and determination of men like Christopher Columbus.

MR. DIAMOND REMEMBERED HIS START

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a native son of the First District of Georgia has died—Mr. B. F. "Barney" Diamond—and he will be sadly mourned by all of us who have had the good fortune to have known him.

"Barney" Diamond's outstanding rise from orphan to one of Savannah, Ga.'s biggest industrialists is in the very spirit and tradition of our great country. His work, his interests, and his remarkable concern about people, and his disassociation with titles, offices, and personal recognition will be remembered and admired for many years to come.

I feel that the following story about this amazing individual—B. F. Diamond—from the October 13 edition of the Savannah Evening Press merits your attention:

HE WENT ON TO SUCCESS AND REMEMBERED START

(By Ann Marshall)

Savannah industralist B. F. "Barney" Diamond was born in Bulloch County and grew up here at Bethesda Home for Boys.

Despite worldwide success and recognition, Bethesda remained the center of his interest and charities.

When Diamond died yesterday, his construction firm was completing work on a bridge across Shipyard Creek at the very site where he lived on the Bethesda marshes.

The roadway which will open Skidaway to development as an oceanographic center and will add thousands of homesites to the growth of Chatham County and the whole state, is considered one of the major construction projects of the times.

Land for the approaches to the causeways was obtained from the Union Society at the edge of the Bethesda property.

He refused time and again to take the presidency of the Union Society, which runs Bethesda, and of the Bethesda Alumni Assn. Both were continuing beneficiaries of the Bernard F. Diamond Foundation and of his private gifts.

From large financial grants to priceless bushes from his extensive private gardens, from jobs for Bethesda alumni to inspiration for Bethesda boys, through the more than 40 years since his own time there, Diamond remained a devoted alumnus.

He died about 7:30 p.m. yesterday at St. Joseph's Hospital after a short illness. He would have been 68 tomorrow.

He was president of the B. F. Diamond Construction Co. and was a resident of 18 South Rockwell Ave. in Vernonburg.

Chatham County Commission Chairman Robert F. Lovett expressed regret at the "great loss to the community," and said, "He'll be missed. He was a wonderful fellow."

Mayor J. Curtis Lewis said he was "distressed" to learn of the death.

"Mr. Diamond was a remarkable man. He was a self-made man who deserved a tremendous amount of credit for his accomplishments," the mayor said.

Mr. Diamond shunned personal acclaim, turning down posts such as the presidency of the Union Society.

The president of the society, Wade Layton, expressed the sorrow of the group, of which Diamond was a board member.

"I know I express the regret of every member of the Union Society," Layton said. "We tried to get him to take the presidency over and over, and again this year, but he never would do it."

W. Lee Mingledorff, Jr., chairman of the Savannah Port Authority, called him "a staunch member of SPA."

INTERESTED IN WATERFRONT

"He showed a great deal of interest in the Savannah riverfront and will be missed very much by the authority in its efforts on behalf of the community," Mingledorff said.

The B. F. Diamond Construction Co., which Diamond founded in 1930, has its headquarters on the riverfront here. Diamond had acquired his technical knowledge through correspondence courses when he began as a steel-erection contractor in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Md.

He also was owner of Marine Construction and Engineering Co. Ltd. of Freeport, Grand Bahama Island, and owned a 1,200-acre cattle farm near Savannah.

His various enterprises included construction of the new Bull River Bridge for the State Highway Dept., construction of the second Elizabeth River Tunnel between Portsmouth and Norfolk, Va., in 1962 and the rebuilding of the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge over the Potomac River in 1943 without interrupting traffic.

During World War I, he went to sea in the merchant marine, and in World War II his company completed many projects for the Navy. He was given the Navy "E" award for these.

The highest honor given in the construction industry, the Moles award for "outstanding achievement," was given to Diamond in 1967.

The Diamond firm specializes in heavy and marine construction, manufacture of many types of marine equipment and steel fabrication, and general construction in Freeport.

He was a member of the Oglethorpe Club, the Savannah Golf Club and the board of stewards of the Savannah Yacht and Country Club. He had been a member of the "Geechee" syndicate which won the 1966 Miami-to-Nassau sailing race.

With Frank S. Jackson, Charles S. Sanford and Julian F. Corish, he had founded the Bernard F. Diamond Foundation Inc. in 1952 to support the Union Society and other charitable organizations.

NAMED DIRECTOR

He had been named a director of the Liberty National Bank and Trust Co. in 1967, and also was appointed that year to the SPA by Mayor Lewis.

Funeral services will be held Wednesday at 11 a.m. at Sipple's Mortuary. Burial will be in Hillcrest Abbey.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Delores Austin Diamond; a son, John A. Diamond; two stepdaughters, Miss Pamela Alkazin and Miss Cheryl Thompson; a brother, Raleigh B. Diamond of St. Augustine, Fla., and three grandchildren.

PENNSYLVANIA A LOW TAX STATE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Shafer administration said that a new report by the U.S. Census Bureau proves that Pennsylvania is a low tax State.

The census report, which was published in this week's U.S. News & World Report, shows that Pennsylvania ranks

45th among the 50 States and the District of Columbia in the amount of State and local taxes paid by individual citizens.

In a statement, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer said:

This report further supports the statements I have been making throughout this year that Pennsylvania, by comparison to other states, is not overtaxing her people for the kind of services they are getting at the State and local level.

I hope that those people who constantly complain that they pay the highest taxes in the Nation in Pennsylvania will study the report so they can better understand the truth.

Too often, the emotions of raising new revenues cover over the facts—and if we are to solve our current crisis, every citizen has the responsibility of at least making an attempt to learn the facts. I hope that this report will help all Pennsylvanians in that attempt.

The new report shows that Pennsylvania taxpayers pay $113.38 in State and local taxes for every $1,000 earned. The national average is $134.51. The highest State and local taxes are in North Dakota where a citizen pays $190.96 for every $1,000 earned.

In the two industrial States that are larger than Pennsylvania, which ranks third in population, the State and local taxes are: California, $160.84; New York, $158.21.

EFFORT TO CORRECT INEQUITY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the retired military men who reside in my district I am today introducing a bill to correct a grave injustice to retired members of our uniformed services.

For a hundred years prior to 1958 the statutes clearly guaranteed that retired pay was to be passed upon a percentage of active duty base pay, the multiplier being determined by the number of years service up to a total of 30 years, after which no additional benefits accrued.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that persons who entered the service under that rule have every moral right to expect the Government to make good on its guarantee.

Today the Department of Defense and the Congress are embarked upon a campaign to make military service more attractive. I approve of that effort. One thing that is proposed is to make military pay comparable to that of civil service employees and of workers in private industry. But military retirees of today, especially the older ones, will not receive the benefits of that campaign. Instead, they received low pay in anticipation of an attractive retirement pay system, now arbitrarily denied to them.

As a result, older retirees now receive substantially smaller retired paychecks than younger retirees of the same grade and number of years of service with the difference in some cases exceeding 50 percent. This discrepancy which comes about entirely because of a breach of faith with them on the part of the Government will continue to increase with each future pay raise for the Active Forces.

In 1966 the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems proposed a far-reaching code of standards relating to Federal retirements of all kinds. Prominent among the proposals was one which would insure that—

Whenever a staff retirement system is changed, provision shall be made to protect the equities of any individuals who would be adversely affected by such change.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would simply apply that principle to persons who had served or were serving prior to the abolishment of the statutory guarantee for continuing computation of pay based upon the rates in effect for active duty personnel. That action took place on June 1, 1958, and my bill is limited in its application to those persons who entered the service prior to that time. It provides that the retired pay of such persons be recomputed on the new active duty rates in effect at the time those rates were changed.

I believe that the Government can do no less than live up to its word. I urge my colleagues to support the proposal which I am introducing.

BLACKLISTED BY MEN WEARING WHITE HATS

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, blacklisting of scientists for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's advisory committees is a practice which has been going on since at least 1953. It has become encrusted on the bureaucratic keel, and I am convinced that it does not represent evil men at work. I think it is simply too inconvenient for those now making the decisions to do the hard work necessary to come up with new methods.

An editorial in the Washington Post of October 11, 1969, makes this point very succinctly. "Blacklisting for the Fun of It" is close to being correct for I believe that those who do it are not vicious unprincipled men, but merely those who find a precedent for their actions which is always easier than making a decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly no fun for those who have been blacklisted. One of the central points of my continuing privacy studies within the House Committee on Government Operations has been that a man should be informed of the range of charges against him. He must have the right to confront the record, if not to confront his accuser directly.

For example, during hearings on Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta, Ga., in May of 1968, I bore down heavily on the following phrase in their basic agreement for services:

All reports, whether oral or written, will be kept strictly confidential. Except as required by law, no information from reports nor your identity as the reporting agency will be revealed to the person reported on . . .

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that Retail Credit's new contract, dated June 1968, had removed the words "nor your identity as the reporting agency." The removal from the basic contract of those words I regard as a small step toward decency.

The individuals who have been injured by that practice of Retail Credit Co. were denied insurance and employment opportunities with no chance to find out who was generating the information which occasionally was in error. Qualified scientists are now being denied the opportunity to gain the academic prestige which comes from membership on such advisory panels and, worst of all, our Government and our Nation are being denied the insights and experience they could bring to bear on solving our problems.

Mr. Speaker, two points should be made. First, the vast majority, I believe in almost every single case, the advisory panels do not deal with classified information. Press reports even state that some who are alleged to have been blacklisted for HEW actually have clearance to participate in top-secret Department of Defense advisory panels.

The second important point is that opposing blacklisting does not mean that all standards must be abolished. I certainly recognize that some people may be unsuitable for a number of quite legitimate reasons which have nothing to do with their supposed loyalty to America or their support for the war in Vietnam.

The central question in this is why the practice has been allowed to continue for this length of time. I hope that the review of Secretary Finch will move HEW to a more reasonable position and perhaps a broader focus should be brought to bear on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I insert the editorial from the Washington Post:

BLACKLISTING FOR THE FUN OF IT

Blacklisting is always an abomination. It is peculiarly so when it is practiced by the government of a people guaranteed equality of opportunity. It is at its very worst when the blacklisting carries with it a stigma of untrustworthiness and disloyalty. For more than 20 years the United States government—ever since the inauguration of the so-called loyalty-security program in the Truman administration—has been compiling blacklists, stigmatizing employees or applicants for government employment as "security risks" and doing so on the flimsiest of foundations, the unverified allegations of faceless informers unknown not only to their victims but unknown even to those who must make judgments on the basis of what they whisper. Selection of government employees by lot would constitute a safer system.

This blacklisting procedure, excoriated when it was viciously exploited by the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy, has been brought to light again just recently by scientists who complained that it is being applied with particular rigidity and folly by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in regard to Public Health Service appointments and to the selection of scientists for part-time advisory posts. Science, the magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, published two searching articles by Bryce Nelson last summer exposing these practices. And this newspaper itself carried an extensive article by staff writer William Greider on June 30 elaborating on the ways in which the HEW security system barred certain scientists from advisory panels.

One high-ranking health official in the Johnson administration, George A. Silver, then deputy assistant secretary of HEW, decried this process of blacklisting as totally needless in regard to the commissioning of Public Health Service doctors. "What possible security problems would they represent?" he asked. The procedures followed, he said, "sharply limit the opportunity to get creative people with an innovative viewpoint" in the Public Health Service.

Investigation of the cases of some of these blacklisted persons shows unmistakably that nonconformity of any sort tends to be penalized as evidence of unsuitability. Mere opposition to official policy on the war in Vietnam has been used to put a job applicant on a blacklist. Sen. Edward Brooke, outraged by the treatment of one of his constituents, said concerning the procedures: "There are certainly grave questions about the desirability and constitutionality of governmental practices by which anonymous officials use secret information and undisclosed criteria to deny someone a job in a nondefense-related field."

Most victims of the blacklistings never know their names are there—and so can do nothing to clear or redeem themselves. No one, indeed, can know what doors may have been closed to him by a vilification muttered behind the hand of an unidentified character assassin. It is as senseless as it is unjust. And it is an absurd myth that these blacklists are kept confidential or inviolable; there are leaks about them all the time, destroying reputations, wrecking careers. They inflict wanton injury at once upon the individuals involved and upon the Government of the United States.

Queried by Science last June, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said he was "looking into" the matter of blacklists. How does he like what he sees? Does it make any sense? Is it honorable? Does it comport with the American concept of freedom?

HOUSING NEEDS AND THE MARYLAND MORTGAGE CRISIS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, shortage of mortgage money for the housing market in the State of Maryland has reached near crisis proportions. The Maryland Governor has been urged to call a special sesson of the General Assembly to resolve the problems. These issues were well presented by my distinguished Maryland colleague, Mr. HOGAN, in an address delivered before the Maryland Association of Real Estate Boards. I commend these remarks, as follows, to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE J. HOGAN BEFORE THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS, INC., ANNAPOLIS, MD., OCTOBER 10, 1969

The Realtors' theme of the day is the same, I am sure, as it has been for the past several months—Help! Today I want to discuss with you the role the Federal Government can be expected to play in providing the needed assistance.

Of course there is no need for me to relate in detail the problems presently facing real estate all over the country, and particularly in Maryland, as you are certainy more aware of them than I. Quite simply, the latest increase in the interest rate has resulted in the unavailability of funds for mortgage lending as well as more expensive housing, which combined have either priced the middle and low income families entirely out of the market or made funds totally unavailable to them. With the interest rate on the open market at the highest level since the mid 1800s, the major investors in mortgage loans, the thrift institutions, are unable to attract savings, resulting in a curtailment or complete halt in some areas, of their mortgage lending operations.

In addition, statutory ceilings imposed on the interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages, have worked a major difficulty in obtaining funds for these loans. Some lenders are simply withdrawing from the market and investing their funds in other outlets rather than accept the low interest rate permissible on FHA–VA loans or incure adverse publicity from increasing the yield on such loans through charging points.

To get quickly to the main subject of your concern—our Maryland problem—you may be sure that I fully realize the desperate conditions presently existing in the Maryland market as a result of the state usury limit of 8% as well as a limitation on the points which may be charged. If it is any solace, several other states—13, I believe—also find themselves in this same predicament. These low usury ceilings have led to the withdrawal of private investment funds from the mortgage market and finally the withdrawal of FNMA, resulting in a "no loan" situation.

Many real estate agents have stopped sales completely. Others have been forced to close down their business offices. Sellers cannot sell homes. Buyers of moderate and low incomes cannot get loans to buy. Returning veterans from Vietnam are unable to take advantage of the benefits which Congress has given then under the VA mortgage provisions because lenders will not finance homes in Maryland.

Although the national market conditions have had their effect on your business, I am sure your primary concern at the moment is what can be done to relieve the situation here in Maryland, and your first question is "What can Congressman Hogan do in this regard."

It has been suggested that I and other similarly concerned Representatives and Senators amend VA and FHA bills currently being considered to exempt VA and FHA-insured loans from state usury ceilings. On the surface this sounds like a simple solution. Unfortunately, it is an impractical solution, as the suggestion of such an effort arouses the ire of every states rights defender in the House and Senate who promptly rise to their feet in oratory.

During the recent House debate on a bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of the VA to set interest rates on mortgage loans. Representative Joel Broyhill, my colleague from northern Virginia, offered an amendment to exempt VA-insured loans from the District of Columbia's usury statute. I will add that this amendment was passed, but not without protest. The issue of states rights did not enter in here, however, as Congress has the specific charge of legislating for the District and such action was entirely appropriate and considered necessary under the present conditions.

At that time I spoke with Members about the possibility of having this amendment extended to exampt VA-insured loans nationwide, and received the reactions. . . . "This is not a problem for Congress, but for the state legislatures." . . . "Since only 13 states are involved, why should those of us who represent the other 37 states get involved." . . . "It's a problem for the legislatures of those 13 states."

With all due respect for the rights of each state to legislate for itself, I feel the national interests involved in the making of FHA and VA loans provide a substantial case for Congressional consideration of such exemption. Since this problem in Maryland has reached crisis proportions and our Governor refuses to call a special session of the state legislature to relieve the situation, at the time Rep. Broyhill offered his amendment I called upon the Members of the Veterans Affairs Committee to give prompt consideration to such an exemption for VA loans and I requested the Banking and Currency Committee to consider a similar exemption for FHA loans.

My requesting Federal action in this regard and my personal support for a Federal law exempting VA and FHA loans from the state usury laws should not be construed to indicate that I in any way relieve Governor Mandel of his responsibility to assist the Maryland legislature in achieving the earliest possible passage of corrective legislation. If the Governor and the state legislature cannot be depended upon by the people of Maryland to act in their best interests at a time like this, they are not really concerned about their responsibilities. I plead with them to remember the low and middle-income homebuyers who are being hurt the most by their inaction. Yet the effects will not be felt by individuals only. Mortgage bankers will simply move out of Maryland. thus cutting off funds for community development and industry also. Low rates on municipal and school bonds will drastically cut back sales. It is doubtful that we will know for months to come the total extent of the effect this will have on the economy of Maryland.

Again, I urge the legislature to fulfill its responsibility promptly upon being called into session and not prolong this worsening situation.

Well, I have cited the primary avenue open to the state legislature to help solve the problem. Hopefully, no later than early January this will be done. After that time, however, we will still have with us the problems of inflation and high interest rates, shortage of mortgage funds on a nationwide scale, and further solutions will have to be found, for the most part by the Federal Government.

What can the Federal Government do? Well, two major and obvious answers come to mind—curtail inflation through reduction in Government spending, and redirect Federal funds into housing. To assist in accomplishing the latter, we are fortunate in having the recently published results of a study by the Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates, which the 90th Congress authorized to analyze the problem of increasing interest rates. I consider this to be a very valuable report in that it realistically and fully lays the problem before us, and I am hopeful that the recommendations of the Commission will be given serious and prompt consideration. It appears there is no magic formula. Resolution of the problem will require the combined efforts of the President and the leaders of Congress through executive order and legislation to redirect various Government assets into the housing sector.

As some of you may not be familiar with the recommendations of the Commission, I would like to briefly present some of them to you as well as legislative response to the same:

The Commission recommended that legislation be enacted to increase the Federal Home Loan Bank System's authority to borrow from the Treasury an amount necessary to provide an emergency backstop for the credit lines given to member associations. In response, Senator Proxmire has introduced S. 2572 to increase the System's borrowing authority from $1 billion to $2 billion.

The Commission recommended the Federal Reserve make a meaningful effort to improve the market for Federal Agency securities by buying and selling such issues in the open market on an outright basis as well as under re-purchase agreements, while some members of the Commission, including Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, wanted to go beyond

this and *require* the Federal Reserve to support housing-oriented Federal agencies directly. Chairman Patman thereafter introduced H.R. 13939 directing the Federal Reserve Board to purchase FNMA obligations to assure that it has adequate funds to support the secondary conventional market as well as its existing function in Government-backed mortgages. Also, Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, introduced S. 2958 to give the FNMA the authority to provide a secondary market for conventional mortgages, much as it does in the FHA–VA market.

The Commission calls our attention to pension and mutual funds, noting that while such funds had total financial assets of about $200 billion at the end of 1968, their total mortgage portfolio amounted to only about $10 billion, a mere 5 per cent of their assets. The Commission's report specifically notes that the Federal Government's own pension and trust fund accounts are the worst offenders in ignoring the mortgage market, with nearly all of their assets held in U.S. Government bonds. Private pension funds only held about 4 per cent of total assets in mortgages while state-managed pension funds held nearly 15½ per cent of their assets in mortgages in mid-1967. In partial response to this observation, Chairman Olin Teague of the House Veterans' Committee has introduced H.R. 9476 to make up to $5 billion in reserves in the National Service Life Insurance Fund available for purchase of VA guaranteed mortgages, thus providing more credit for this market and insuring a high return to the Fund.

I would like to comment here that I feel that private pension funds and mutual funds should be encouraged to invest heavily in mortgages.

The Commission, though not unanimously, recommended that the abolition of the statutory 6% ceiling on the interest rates on FHA–VA mortgages and enactment of legislation to establish a dual market system for a three-year trial period, which will permit much greater flexibility than administratively established ceilings of the past have permitted. During the three-year trial period of the Commission's dual market approach, under one part, loans would be made under a "free" rate with no discount in the primary market. Under the other part, the market would continue to operate much as it does now with ceilings regularly reviewed and changed to keep in line with market rates and minimize discounts.

Under the Housing Act of 1968 the Congress authorized the establishment of the Government National Mortgage Association to guarantee bonds issued by FNMA or other approved issuers based on and backed by a pool of Federally-insured or guaranteed mortgages. It was expected this mechanism would improve the efficiency of the mortgage market and enable the housing sector to compete more effectively for funds in the over capital market than ever before. Also, the sale of these mortgage-backed securities would increase the potential liquidity of the portfolios of mortgage institutions, and would provide an attractive investment alternative for investors who heretofore have not invested funds in mortgages for various reasons. Although these objectives can be accomplished with a minimum extension of Government activities, the President has not as yet issued any regulations regarding guarantees on marketable securities, depriving FNMA and other private institutions of an important vehicle for attracting funds. I join the Commission in urging the President to implement this legislation without delay.

Legislation to exempt interest or dividends received on savings in institutions which invest the bulk of their funds in residential mortgages has been suggested as an approach by other sources. Although the House has already acted upon tax reform and any such measure introduced in the House at this point would receive no consideration, it would be timely for the Senate to give attention to such an exemption in its review of tax reform proposals.

I present these to you in order that you may see and know some of the possible approaches of action available to the Congress and the President and be aware of those which will be receiving consideration.

In closing, I wish to assure you that I am at present thoroughly reviewing the pros and cons of these and other proposals and will make every effort to assist the leaders of Congress in taking the appropriate corrective action to redirect funds into the housing market.

Once again, I urge the President, Members of Congress, the Governor and the Maryland State Legislature to do everything within their respective capacities to deal with this situation which has reached crisis proportions in the State of Maryland.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a negotiated settlement in Vietnam does not now appear likely. What then, should we do?

We could make an all-out effort to win the war, which means pouring in more troops and greater casualties. The American public has overwhelmingly rejected this solution.

We could withdraw immediately. I believe our people reject this equally extreme solution.

Instead, we have adopted the policy of gradual withdrawal. To work, this policy must make it clear to Saigon that there is a limit of time to our participation there and that Saigon will therefore have to shape up if it wants to survive and also find some way to negotiate a settlement with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. The time limit should be announced to Saigon—but not to the world.

How long a period of time should this be? The withdrawal must be sufficiently slow and steady, so that we do not seem to be pulling the rug out from underneath Saigon. If the time limit were very short, if out of frustration we suddenly withdraw, then the whole world would think that we went back on our commitments and would doubt our maturity and stability. It might lead to the deaths of many South Vietnamese. The American public would be revolted by this. Therefore, there must be a period in which we gradually shift from participation to retirement from the war. This gives Saigon a chance. If during this period Saigon could not shape up, it would prove that Saigon could never stand on its own feet. Nobody would blame us for not trying to prop them up forever. We would not be "bugging out." We would have acquitted ourselves with honor.

During this period, everything possible must be done to reduce the level of fighting and the number of casualties. Firm order to that effect should be issued by the President.

How long should this period of time be, then? Clark Clifford—with the partial endorsement of the President—has suggested that all troops be withdrawn by the end of 1970; former Ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reichauer, has suggested the end of 1971. This is a question of judgment. What is important is that some definite time be set and be firmly communicated to Saigon, and the level of fighting be reduced as much as possible in anticipation of this. In my judgment, to carry out this policy it is necessary for President Nixon to begin announcing further withdrawals on a much larger scale than he has so far. It takes a considerable period of time to get out; it is a big logistic move. And larger troop withdrawals may be the only way to make it clear to Saigon that there is a definite limit of time to our participation there.

Finally, we must enunciate a new Asian policy, a policy of less military commitment. We must learn some good lessons from this tragic Vietnam war. The President has suggested the outlines of this new policy. It is a policy that says we are not going to say out of involvement in the internal instabilities of the nations of Asia because we have shown in Vietnam that we cannot do much about internal instabilities. In fact, our presence seems to make matters worse rather than helping. At the same time, the President is trying to reassure Asians that we will remain concerned in their future, in a part of the world that has more than half of the world's population, and that we will do our best on the economic side and maintain an option on the military side in the event there is some type of situation—such as blatant aggression—that we might be able to do something about. But we are going to be less committed militarily. In short—no more Vietnams.

HOPEFUL SIGNS IN FIGHT ON CRIME

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, although the crime situation in the United States continues to be a major problem, basic steps are being taken by the Attorney General's office to correct the unreal approach to law enforcement which has been characteristic in past years. The issue of wiretapping is an excellent example.

In the last administration the use of wiretaps was restricted to the area of national security alone. The present Attorney General, John Mitchell, made it quite clear in January that the use of this device would be made "carefully and effectively" against organized crime and other major crimes as well. As a result of this commonsense approach, progress is being made. The Attorney General, in a speech on September 29 in Miami Beach, stated:

> While we have had only limited experience with judicially approved wiretapping authorizations, this experience has proved to be very successful in combating organized racketeers, especially in the field of narcotics.

In New York City, 124 pounds of heroin was seized as a result of a wiretap. In Washington, 41 persons involved in an alleged narcotics trafficking ring were apprehended as the result of one wiretap. Some of them reportedly had organized crime connections. In Ohio, a wiretap led to the seizure of $100,000 in counterfeit bills and the arrest of seven persons; and in Buffalo, 23 persons were arrested on a charge of being involved in a United States-Canadian gambling organization.

The above are some of the results of the "new look" at the Department of Justice. Ironically, the changes of policy in the Department are merely a returning to the basic functions for which the Justice Department was created. The Attorney General stated the case bluntly and briefly in the above-mentioned speech:

There has been a tendency to ignore the law enforcement community in favor of the social scientists who can explain the motivations of the criminal, but who can do little to protect the innocent against the mugger or armed robber.

Let me tell you that, as Attorney General, I am first and foremost a law enforcement officer. I believe the Department of Justice is a law enforcement agency. I think that persons who break the law ought to be promptly arrested and tried *today*.

While I sympathize with physical conditions and emotional problems which may cause persons to commit crimes, I cannot sympathize with those who seek only to excuse criminals.

In the Miami Beach speech Attorney General Mitchell outlined various measures which have been proposed by his department to counter the crime wave. The attack on this monumental problem, the program of the Nation's chief law-enforcement officer, should be of interest to all concerned citizens. For this reason I include the above-mentioned speech by Attorney General Mitchell in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, HOTEL FONTAINBLEAU, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., SEPTEMBER 29, 1969

I. INTRODUCTION

1. It is a pleasure to address the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

I understand that I am a last minute substitute for Prseident Nixon. Unfortunately, the President is unable to be with you today. I know that he wanted to be here to assure you of his support of your efforts in the field of law enforcement.

During the past eight months, I have been in close communication with the IACP, especially with your most able Executive Director, Quinn Tamm.

Several months ago, I participated in your working seminars held in Washington. A major portion of these discussions concerned student violence and civil disorders. What particularly impressed me was the awareness, by the participating police officials, of the necessity for preventive law enforcement. These seminars emphasized that law enforcement is not merely the application of force. Enlightened police officials recognize that careful pre-planning, communication and negotiation can frequently avoid serious confrontations.

I was pleased that the IACP stressed that law enforcement officials should be flexible in order to solve new law enforcement problems within the currently prevailing social and legal philosophies of the nation. The American law enforcement community would do well to look to your leadership.

Your high standards of professionalism, your openness to new ideas, your desire to bridge the gap between law enforcement officials and certain alienated parts of our citizenry, have made you leaders in the administration of justice at the state and local level.

We, at the Justice Department, have called on you in the past for your help and advice. We will continue to call on you in the coming years.

We will continue to support this organization and its more than 7,000 members in every way possible, especially through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant program. We hope that you will seek our counsel when you have problems to be solved.

2. I have come to Miami Beach today to speak to you about the single most pressing problem that I face as Attorney General and that you face as concerned and responsible police officials—crime in America.

The latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports show that in 1968 there were 4.5 million serious crimes committed in the United States, a 17 percent increase over 1967.

There was a 30 percent increase in armed robbery; a 15 percent increase in rape; a 13 percent increase in murder and an 11 percent increase in aggravated assault.

From 1960 to 1968, the volume of serious crime has risen 122 percent, while the population has increased only 11 percent. The citizen risk of becoming a victim of a crime has nearly doubled from 1960 to 1968.

In February 1967, the President's Crime Commission reported: "There is much crime in America, more than ever is reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the nation. Every American knows that. Every American is, in a sense, a victim of crime . . . The most understandable mood into which many Americans have been plunged by crime is one of frustration and bewilderment."

Despite the Presidential report and the ever increasing crime rate, there has been a tendency in the past to shrug our shoulders and to hope that if we talk about crime it will eventually disappear.

There has been a tendency to ignore the law enforcement community in favor of the social scientists who can explain the motivations of the criminal, but who can do little to protect the innocent against the mugger or armed robber.

Let me tell you that, as Attorney General, I am first and foremost a law enforcement officer. I believe the Department of Justice is a law enforcement agency. I think that persons who berak the law ought to be promptly arrested and tried *today*.

While I sympathize with physical conditions and emotional problems which may cause persons to commit crimes, I cannot sympathize with thos? who seek only to excuse criminals.

When this Administration took office eight months ago, we decided that the time had come to stop talking to stop offering excuses and to start acting *now*. And we did act—we have put forward a carefully-planned, well-financed, and aggressive action program to combat crime *now*.

Of course, we recognize the need for and we strongly support research and development projects which may help us solve crime tomorrow—sometime in the future.

But tomorrow is too late for the ghetto housewife who is many times more likely to be mugged than the suburban housewife. Tomorrow is too late for the small store owner who is killed in a holdup by a narcotics addict.

Indeed, tomorrow may be too late for all of us. That is why we have launched a comprehensive anticrime campaign as a first priority in our domestic program.

As President Nixon has said: "The public climate with regard to law is a function of national leadership."

The leadership of this nation believes that any effective anticrime campaign must rely primarily on law enforcement officials. The police are the first line of defense, and they must be given every reasonable tool if they are to meet the challenge of crime in an increasingly complex society. For this reason, the Administration's executive, legislative and budgetary proposals to combat crime concentrate strongly on the law enforcement function.

I think that you will find that this Administration is sympathetic to law enforcement and that, in areas of doubt, we tend to put our faith in the good intentions of the police, rather than to rely on the bad intentions of criminals.

Let me give you some examples of how we have exercised our federal leadership—how we have resolved areas of doubt in favor of law enforcement:

The previous Administration refused to use Congressional authority—Title III of the Omnibus Crime Bill—to wiretap except in national security cases. We have reversed that policy. We have authorized wiretapping for organized crime and narcotics crimes on a highly selective basis. So far, we have found court-approved wiretapping to be extremely productive and a major aid to law enforcement.

The prior Administration failed to suggest any method for detaining criminal suspects prior to their trial even if these suspects showed a substantial likelihood of committing another crime. We have proposed a pretrial detention bill which would, on a rational basis, deny freedom to those who appear likely to commit another crime pending their trial.

The prior Administration declined to utilize Congressional authorization in Title II of the Omnibus Crime Bill for the admission of voluntary confessions which did not strictly adhere to the *Miranda* warning requirements. We have reversed that policy.

While we still require federal law enforcement officers to give the complete *Miranda* warning, we will not automatically concede a case if, by inadvertence, the complete warning has not been given in obtaining a voluntary confession.

We hope that these actions will aid our federal efforts against crime. We also hope that these actions will say to state and local law enforcement officers: "The Justice Department is with you. We want to help you whenever and wherever possible."

As further evidence of our commitment to law enforcement, I would like to outline for you briefly some highlights of the federal government's anticrime program in terms of Executive action, legislative proposals and fiscal appropriation requests.

II. WASHINGTON MODEL PROGRAM

By far the most serious aspect of crime we face as a nation is crime in the streets. I have told you of the latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports which show a 17 percent increase in serious crime.

What the FBI reports do not show is the increase in fear and national anxiety. For every law-abiding citizen who is the victim of a crime, there are dozens of friends, relatives, business associates and neighbors, who fear that they may be next.

Basically, the federal government has very limited jurisdiction over street crime. We can set the tone for leadership. We can initiate pilot projects. We can offer financial and technical assistance. But the primary responsibility is still with the state and local governments.

One place where the federal government does have substantial jurisdiction over

street crime is in the District of Columbia. In the first six months of this year, the District of Columbia crime rate increase has exceeded the national average.

In many ways Washington is a microcosm of the national crime problem. It has had a major racial disorder. It has a high welfare and unemployment rate. Some of its downtown area suffers from economic blight. Many of its citizens are afraid to walk alone in the evening.

Very early in his Administration, on January 31st, President Nixon launched an ambitious program to combat crime in the District of Columbia. It was generally designed to be a model program for other cities.

As the President said: "By searching for new ways of applying the resources of the federal government in the war against crime here (in Washington), we may discover new ways of advancing the war against crime elsewhere."

A critical part of the model anticrime program for Washington is massive aids to law enforcement.

We believe that the well-trained beat patrolman is our most effective single weapon against the street criminal.

Therefore, we asked for the addition of 1,000 policemen to the authorized force and for more effective recruiting methods to fill the existing vacancies.

As a result, the Metropolitan Police Department is now recruiting about 115 officers per month as opposed to 18 per month in 1967. We have agreed with the Department of Defense to participate in a pilot project which would permit a six-month early release from military service of individuals who qualify and agree to become police officers.

Our plan also calls for improved management and manpower utilization. For example, we have asked for an increase in police cadet and civilian positions which will hopefully release professional policemen for patrol and law enforcement functions.

We have asked for an expansion of the police Legal Advisor Officer. These Legal Advisors are available to advise police officers on the street about complex legal requirements which arise during investigations.

We have proposed or supported legislation which would aid the police in apprehending criminals—by authorizing police to wiretap under judicial supervision, by making it illegal to resist an unlawful arrest, by permitting police to stop and frisk criminal suspects and by eliminating the "no-knock" bar to searches where the evidence is in danger of being destroyed.

As part of the model District of Columbia plan, we have also placed great emphasis on criminal trial and court procedure. We have proposed a complete reorganization of the local court system where, unfortunately at present, the median time from indictment to disposition of a criminal case is now 10 months.

We have asked for more judges so that the guilty may be convicted quickly and the innocent may be cleared.

We have asked for more prosecutors in the United States Attorney's office. We have established a Major Crimes Unit which will handle serious criminal problems such as professional narcotics traffickers and organized gangsters. We have set up two and three-man Crime Teams who will be able to devote enough time to difficult and important prosecutions.

We have proposed legislation which would correct some of the technical barriers that now unnecessarily tie up criminal trials and exclude otherwise reliable evidence of guilt.

Justice must be evenhanded to be effective. Therefore, we have proposed legislation which would establish a full-fledged Public Defender Service, capable of offering free lawyers for about 60 percent of the indigent persons who appear in most criminal, juvenile and civil commitment proceedings.

We have also supported legislation which would increase payments to private lawyers who represent indigents and which would permit these payments in a wide variety of cases in Washington and in other federal jurisdictions.

We have proposed legislation which would expand the District of Columbia Bail Agency to permit more effective investigation of the background and personality of an arrested suspect in order to determine whether he should be released pending his trial.

We have made special provisions for the juvenile who now accounts for 38 percent of our crime index arrests.

We are asking for the establishment of a combined Juvenile-Family Court which can more sensibly handle many of the problems of juvenile offenders and intra-family offenses. We have asked for an expansion of a juvenile group rehabilitation project and for a well-staffed psychiatric-care residential facility for delinquents.

We have also requested major reforms in the local corrections system with new physical facilities, more use of halfway houses and expanded rehabilitation counseling. About 46 percent of arrested suspects have previously been in prison.

This is just a brief summary of our model anticrime package. The federal government and the District of Columbia government have implemented much of the Washington plan by Executive action.

But the Congress has not approved a single legislative proposal. Nor has the Congress approved a single dollar of the $22 million in additional monies which was requested for fiscal 1970, which commenced on July 1, 1969. Without the money, the District of Columbia anticrime program will be paralyzed. Without court reorganization and the other legislation we have requested, our anticrime efforts may fail.

Crime continues to rise in the District of Columbia.

The citizens of Washington—and the people of this country who look to Congress for leadership—should not be forced to wait longer.

III. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The other major area where the federal government can lead the way to combat street crime is through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. The LEAA is the federal government's major commitment to help states and local communities improve their police and criminal justice systems.

In its first year of operation in 1968–1969, it expended most of its $63 million budget—$19 million in planning grants to states and local communities; $29 million in action grants, including special funds for 11 major cities; $3 million for research and development into crime problems; and perhaps most promising was $6.5 million to finance college studies for law enforcement personnel.

For the current fiscal year, we have asked for $296 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. If appropriated, $250 million of this is scheduled to go to the states for action programs.

The greatest single emphasis in the LEAA program has been the funding of police efforts to decrease street crime.

For example, one large midwestern state received $1.3 million last year. Of this amount $236 thousand was awarded for police civilian disorder control; $120 thousand for the development of police training programs; $30 thousand for a study of how to use civilians in police departments; $48 thousand for a special program to train promising young police officers; $180 thousand for management studies of the efficiency of local police departments; and $60 thousand to establish model community relations units.

In other states, we have funded experiments in using helicopter patrols, in setting up new electronic alarm systems in high burglary rate areas; in establishing special teams to deal with youth gangs; and in funding statewide criminal teletype networks.

Our studies of plans submitted by all 50 states show a most promising and continued emphasis on law enforcement, with 77 percent of the funds going to the police and to anti-street crime programs. The larger breakdowns show 18 percent for police training, salary increases and career development; 22 percent for police civil disorder control programs, and 11 percent for detection and apprehension techniques.

Unfortunately, I must tell you that not only has the Congress failed to pass this $296 million appropriation request, but it appears to be headed toward a substantial decrease.

Law enforcement agencies all over the nation will suffer if the *full* appropriation is not passed promptly.

IV. NARCOTICS

Another area in which the federal government has substantial jurisdiction involving street crime is the battle against illegal narcotics and dangerous drugs. Between 1967 and 1968, there was a 64 percent increase in arrests for narcotics and marihuana. Half of those now being arrested for drug abuse are under 21 years of age.

The battle against narcotics is an integral part of the Administration's anti-street crime program. A narcotics addict may need $70 or $80 a day to satisfy his habit. Thus, he turns to robbery, mugging and burglary in order to obtain money. It was recently estimated that in New York City alone $2 billion a year is stolen by narcotics addicts and that about 11 percent of those arrested for violent crimes have a history of narcotics addiction.

Last July 14, President Nixon delivered a statement on the problem of drug abuse and promised that action would be taken by this Administration now. The President said: "A national awareness of the gravity of the situation is needed; a new urgency and concerted national policy is needed at the federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace. . . "

One of the most significant parts of the program so far has been a landmark proposal called the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969. It would consolidate and reorganize all the existing drug laws—some of which date back to 1914. It would substantially expand federal law enforcement authority to control narcotics, barbiturates, amphetamines and marihuana.

For example, it would authorize agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to arrest persons for violations of any federal law and not just for violations of the federal narcotics statute. It would permit agents to break into suspected premises without knocking and would also permit them to conduct administrative searches for illegal drugs and marihuana.

I know there is a great deal of controversy surrounding the use of marihuana. But marihuana is an illegal substance. Most medical authorities have stated that it is at least a hallucinogenic with no known medical purpose. If used excessively, it can be dangerous. Furthermore, current statistics indicate that many hard narcotics users started off on marihuana.

Under these circumstances, we decided to stop closing our eyes to the marihuana problem in this country. Two weeks ago, we launched the first major search and seizure border operation history aimed at stopping the importation of illegal drugs from Mexico.

It is estimated that the Mexican border traffic accounts for 80 percent of the illegal marihuana in this country, 20 percent of the heroin and large amounts of barbiturates, amphetamines and other dangerous drugs.

By utilizing the resources of the Department of Justice, Bureau of Customs, the Department of Defense, and other agencies, we have started a coordinated and intensive land, sea and air operation against border smuggling.

We realize that the wide publicity given to this operation will probably deter many smugglers and may not result in large scale seizures. But if we can keep marihuana and other drugs out of the United States by whatever means possible, then I think we will have succeeded. Our goal is not the occasional user. It is the large scale professional trafficker who makes a living out of smuggling illegal narcotics.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Department of Justice is our main agency concerned with the enforcement of federal drug laws. We have asked for an increase in its appropriations from $17 million in fiscal 1969 to $25 million in fiscal 1970, and an increase in its personnel from about 1300 to almost 1500.

These increased appropriations and manpower will permit the Bureau to step up its enforcement program in our cities, to implement its plan to train 22,000 state and local law enforcement officers and to expand its international operations.

Our goal is not long jail sentences for the average narcotics addict who must sell a bag or two of heroin in order to sustain himself. He should be the object of research and rehabilitation. I am interested in prosecuting those who make their living by dealing in substances which ruin men's mental and physical health, and which poses a danger to our general welfare.

V. ORGANIZED CRIME

Another aspect of crime where the federal government has broad jurisdiction is organized crime.

Relying on the hopelessness of ghetto residents, organized criminals sell heroin and cocaine; playing on insecure credit, they loanshark the honest working man; recognizing elector indifference, they corrupt labor unions and political leaders.

Here again, President Nixon proposed an aggressive program to combat this interstate network of criminal syndicates. He said that "the moral and legal subversion of our society is a life-long and lucrative profession" for the organized racketeer.

The core of the federal effort against organized crime has been to reorganize the Strike Forces. They are interagency teams designed to throw a whole net of federal law enforcement over an organized crime family in a particular city. We have expanded these teams from four to seven, and we plan to reach 20 by the end of fiscal 1971.

In addition, we have set up a federal-state racket squad in New York City. If this joint venture proves to be successful, we plan to organize others in an effort to cooperate with state and local authorites in our Strike Force assault.

The LEAA has also made several initial grants to states and cities to aid them in establishing organized crime units. If their appropriation is approved, we hope that more localities will apply for funds to combat organized crime.

We have also asked for additional legislation to help us in the battle against the organized gangster. Among the bills we have proposed or supported are a general witness immunity law which would have a broad scope for many potential witnesses against organized crime; an amendment to the Wagering Tax Act which would expand our current ability to prosecute gambling; and a law designed to make it a federal crime to corrupt local police and other public officials.

While we have had only limited experience with judicially approved wiretapping authorizations, this experience has proved to be very sucessful in combating organized racketeers, especially in the field of narcotics.

In New York City, 124 pounds of heroin was seized as a result of a wiretap. In Washington, 41 persons involved in an alleged narcotics trafficking ring were apprehended as the result of one wiretap. Some of them reportedly had organized crime connections. In Ohio, a wiretap led to the seizure of $100,000 in counterfeit bills and the arrest of seven persons; and in Buffalo, 23 persons were arrested on a charge of being involved in a United States-Canadian gambling organization.

In order to mount this broad attack on organized crime, the Administration has asked for a $25 million increase in funds for all government agencies involved in this effort—a 40 percent increase over the previous Administration request. About $16 million of this will go for more FBI and IRS personnel, to work with the Strike Forces. Almost $3 million will go to the Criminal Division of the Justice Department and the remainder of the money will be spread among the Secret Service, the Department of Labor, and other government agencies.

The result of our activities so far has been promising. In fiscal 1969, 44 indictments were returned against 59 suspected organized crime figures (38 more than in 1968) and 29 suspected organized crime figures were convicted. In total, 71 organized crime figures were either indicted or convicted in this fiscal year as compared with only 48 the previous year.

Furthermore, we have arrested a number of crime figures who are members of the ruling commission of the organized crime syndicate in Buffalo, in Newark, in New Orleans, in Rhode Island and in Chicago. We think that this new assault shows great hope of success against this difficult problem.

VI. CONCLUSION

A model program for the District of Columbia, direct federal grants to states and local communities, and aggressive new programs against narcotics crimes and organized crime—these are some of the highlights of this Administration's action plan to reverse the flood of crime now.

In each one of these programs, there has been special emphasis on law enforcement. I want criminals off the streets and there is no better way to get them off the streets than by relying upon you—the law enforcement community in this country.

You can be sure that this Administration will, to the best of its abilities, marshall all of its moral, political and economic power to support law enforcement officers in our battle to defeat crime.

We all know that with your help we will succeed and without your help we will only face a national disaster.

MAO'S CHINA ASSESSED AT WEAK, DIVIDED AND CHAOTIC

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, for those interested in obtaining a concise survey of the military, political, and economic events in China since Mao Tse-tung assumed power in 1949, I heartily recommend an excellent booklet put out by the Committee of One Million entitled "Twenty Years of Tyranny."

Openly against the admission of Red China to the United Nations, the Committee of One Million has enlisted the able assistance of three distinguished experts on Communist China, Dr. Jurgen Domes, of the Free University of West Berlin; Dr. James T. Myers, of the University of South Carolina; and John F. Lewis, American journalist and editor.

Together they conclude that 20 years under Mao and Communism has left China "weak, divided, and chaotic, teetering on the brink of anarchism."

On the 20th anniversary of Mao's ascent to power, "Twenty Years of Tyranny" reveals China as a "record of squandered human resources and political resources of support, both within the party and without, which if not unprecedented, must still be recorded as gross political ineptitude or outright stupidity.

In conclusion the authors feel that China still needs today, as she needed in 1949, political leaders who are able to bring internal peace, stability and a measure of prosperity to this vast and potentially great nation.

AMERICAN BANKER EDITORIAL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the American Banker is especially appropriate in view of the recently concluded meetings of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund:

PROFESSIONALS ON THE JOB

A feeling of justified confidence in the work that has already been done, creating a climate for constructive adjustment to the needs of the future, characterizes the international financial community as its leaders gather for the annual meetings of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

The shocks and tremors of the international financial community during the past year, and the difficulties and disappointments over the slow pace of development among the poor nations are not a cause for alarm, for the systems have worked through the problems which they were designed to handle, and on balance, on almost all fronts, have finished the year stronger than when they started it.

Nor, though, is survival being taken as the basis for complacency. Sound theoretical work and analysis has been done, and new machinery set in place to handle the well-discerned problems of the future; and as these sensible approaches are put into practical use, the whole structure is strengthened and the way made clear to develop techniques for further advances, to deal with the next great series of problems.

The 112 member nations of the IMF have done great creative work during the past year in bringing into final form the concept of Special Drawing Rights, to meet the needs of the non-Communist trading world for additional international liquidity. And even as they will be taking the final procedural steps at this meeting to make SDRs a reality, they will be turning their full attention to problems of the adjustment mechanism. There has already been much thoughtful discussion about the need to make international exchange rates more flexible, and such specific concepts as crawling pegs and wider bands. Now it will advance from the theoretical to the practical and political, subject to hard, selfish, sensible questioning on behalf of national interests and mutual goals.

On the World Bank side, firm direction markers have emerged at the end of Robert McNamara's first full year. The Bank is bringing both its soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Administration, and its catalytic agent for private investment, the International Finance Corp., into

much closer coordination for the achievement of policy objectives. It is demonstrating a willingness to take a more vigorous role in encouraging governments to create the conditions which will support development efforts. It is bringing cool, precise and detailed analysis to the problems it confronts, as a basis for the most effective allocation of its resources. Parenthetically, it can be noted that this reflects the personal style for which Mr. McNamara drew world attention when he ran the U.S. Defense Establishment; it has become manifest once again in the way he is running the World Bank.

But it is not just the institutional personalities that impart strength to these organizations. The individual members, tough, experienced, and realistic, know where they have been, and know where they are going as they convene in the 25th of these annual meetings since the Bank and Fund were founded at Bretton Woods. They do not diminish for a moment the dimensions and crucial importance of the problems they face; but they share a sense of accomplishment in having dealt reasonably successfully with problems in the past which appeared to pose even greater threats; a realization that it will require new ideas and high morale to deal with the problems of the present and the future; and a quiet conviction that, as seasoned professionals, they will be able to do the job.

DAY OF RETROSPECT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Ron Loewen, of Wichita, Kans., is serving this semester as president of the student body at Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia. Mr. Loewen has suggested to his fellow students and to the faculty and administration on his campus that a "day of retrospect" be initiated to allow students and faculty to spend a normal class day discussing curriculum. His leadership and initiative have been recognized not only on campus but by the editorial writers of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle. Ron Loewen has made a constructive and positive suggestion which could lead to better communication not only on the campus at Emporia, but other higher education institutions throughout the Nation.

Of course, I am pleased and proud to take note of Mr. Loewen's idea because he demonstrated the same kind of interest, responsibility, and initiative while serving as a congressional intern in my Washington office during the past summer.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita Eagle:

DAY OF RETROSPECT

The president of the student body at Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, appears to be a young man with good sense.

He has called for a "day of retrospect" on the KSTC campus.

Outlined in his "State of the College" message, Ron Loewen's plan is for faculty and students in each department to meet during a normal class day to discuss curriculum.

Students would have an opportunity to offer suggestions on curriculum improvement or relevancy and to seek justification for some of the courses being taught and to request some that are not offered.

The faculty then could talk openly with the students and explain obstacles in the way of requests and to explain the rationale of the curriculum offerings.

Loewen's approach beats mindless obstruction and rioting which accomplishes nothing.

He proposes bridging the gap in communications and putting the students and faculty in a face-to-face situation where wrongs can be righted.

Why should students be saddled with courses they see no need for? Why shouldn't they be consulted on courses that ought to be added?

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the moratorium yesterday millions of words were spoken across the Nation. Out of the welter of speeches, most provocative and a few thoughtful, the remarks of our colleague, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON at Princeton University were outstanding for their clarity, depth, and vision. I believe that my colleagues will be impressed by his thoughts which follow:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT OF NEW JERSEY, FOR DELIVERY AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY IN OBSERVANCE OF THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM, OCTOBER 15, 1969

Thank you for inviting me to be here in Princeton with you today. I am grateful to share this solemn day with you. I assure you that I am more comfortable here than I would be in Washington.

This is not the first time Americans have gathered to call for an end to the killing in Vietnam. Nor is it unusual to see organized dissent from our policies. We have been at it for a long time. Some things have changed, however; for now we are no longer a voice in the wilderness nor even a disgruntled minority. Make no mistake about it—a clear majority of Americans now recognize our policies as ill-advised and want now an end to this divisive and foolish conflict.

Along the way, we have learned some terrible lessons.

First, we have learned that it is senseless to send American troops to save a government that is opposed by its own people. We went into Vietnam, presumably, to protect that country's right to determine its own future. Let us resolve today that what we mean by assisting a nation in "self-determination" is not the perpetuation of a military dictatorship.

Second, we have learned that it is superficial and ultimately self-defeating to judge national security solely in terms of numbers of troops, bombs, ships, and missiles. In Vietnam, we the strongest of nations, face one of the weakest. Yet their resolve to stand against outside force has thwarted the quick "victory" so many have promised us. We also have been denied progress at home. In our country, the true measures of national security—domestic tranquility and the quality of life—and the true reasons for caring about national security—justice, equality, and freedom—are in a real sense casualties of the war. While we are destroying one country in order to save it, we are tearing our own country apart in order to protect it.

We have learned further that the American people will not long follow leaders who talk nonsense to them. Nor will they long tolerate those who fail to respond to the popular will. Richard Nixon said of today's moratorium, "As far as this kind of activity is concerned . . . under no circumstances will I be affected whatever by it." George McGovern has provided a good answer . . . "American foreign policy cannot be formed in defiance of American idealism and conscience." I think that message is fair warning to those who think that they can keep the lid on for another two or three years. Let's have no more talk about an acceptable minimum of casualties—I guess that means acceptable to everyone but those included in the minimum. If there is a reason to continue the war—and I do not think there is—it is certainly not by buying time from the American people at the cost of some acceptable minimum of American lives.

Now perhaps not all of us have learned these lessons. I recognize that there are sincere men among us who would like to end the war but dare not; or perhaps fear that the terms are not yet good enough. Most of these even admit that probably it was a mistake to become involved at all. But now they say, having committed our prestige and sacrificed many lives, we cannot simply "cop out." I understand their anguish. No one likes to lose face. No one likes to suggest that the only true heroes of this war—the Americans and Vietnamese who have fought and died in it—were sacrified in vain. But I think we must measure the loss of face against the failure of courage. And the loss of lives against the loss of still more. It does this country no credit and it honors those who have died not at all for us to admit an error and then fail to act on that admission. It is an admirable thing to admit guilt, but redemption lies only in acting to right whatever wrongs we have done. And I believe that many have been wronged in this conflict.

Our military forces have been asked to do a job for which they are ill-suited, a job which can never be done by outsiders anyway. Our people have been asked to tolerate injustice at home because we need the money for foreign ventures. And the Vietnamese have been promised a solution to their problems—a solution now best expressed by the American major who explained, "It became necessary to destroy the town in order to save it."

I say let's make an end of it. Therein lies honor and patriotism. For what is the real standard of men who care about their country? It is, I think, that they are willing to call it to a higher standard. That's what thousands of Americans are doing today.

The fact that we are ready to do so should give all of us hope for the future. It's true that as a people our problems have never appeared more difficult. Some even have turned away from the struggle—an understandable reaction to frustration and failure. But I think that those who take the relative lull of the last nine months as a sign that the old ways will still work are tragically mistaken. This country, both on days of massive dissent like this one and during weeks of quiet brooding, is moving right out from under its old leaders. This country is changing and I think for the better. Change is often accompanied by uncertainty, and it usually springs from a period of frustration. We are on the edge, though, not of an abyss, but of a national rebirth. For you represent a generation that is truly committed to the ideals so long taught in our schools and voiced by our leaders. I don't believe that you're going to forget all that. You can turn this country around, not through violence and revolution, but through your idealism and energy.

So I urge you to stay in the struggle. You are making a difference. And we are making a difference today. The unfinished agenda in this country is long, but it begins with putting an end to the war. Only then can we turn with some hope of unity and a major commitment of resources to the great tasks at home.

I do not believe, however, that the conclusion of the war will lead to speedy solu-

tions to all our problems. We will need to be watchful that the fruits of peace are not stolen from us. The President has already suggested that there will be no peace dividend. But that need not be so. Money now being spent in Vietnam can be channeled to domestic problems if the President and Congress have the will. And they will have the will if you make your voices heard. There are many who see the 30 billion dollars now being expended annually on the war as a future source of funds for more engines of war. Let us who see in this war's end the hope of feeding the hungry and housing the poor contest this distorted sense of American priorities.

John F. Kennedy began this decade by summoning the nation anew to greatness. The least we can do to honor that legacy is to end the decade by putting an end to the killing in Vietnam and finding a way to peace at home.

Let us go on then from this October 15th to Peace.

Let us go on to find new hope for this country. Let us find a way to redeem our time with a better vision of the future.

CONDEMN HANOI'S TREATMENT OF OUR SOLDIERS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic aspects of the war in Vietnam is the plight of American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam. These men have sacrificed their freedom, their health, and the peace of mind of their families. Hundreds of these prissoners, unprotected by the Geneva Convention of 1949, barely survive in Vietcong jungle camps and Vietnamese prisons. From those few prisoners who have been released have come glaring evidence of mistreatment—bad food, solitary confinement, looting of mail, and even torture.

The families that remain behind also are severely affected by these practices. Living in a perpetual state of uncertainty, they have no way of knowing whether their loved ones are alive or dead. Mrs. Richard Cooper, a sister of a Vietnamese prisoner of war from Amherst, N.Y., states better than I the frustration that the anxious families feel. In a letter dated September, 22, she said:

AMHERST, N.Y.,
September 22, 1969.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: As the sister of a prisoner of war in North Vietnam, I beg you to speak out against the inhumane treatment of these prisoners by the North Vietnamese. No matter what one's views are on the war in Vietnam, one cannot tolerate this flagrant violation of the four basic tenets of the Geneva Convention: the free flow of mail, impartial inspection of camps, the release of the sick and wounded and, above all, the release of a list of the prisoners. The information we've received from the two Navy prisoners recently released is grim and shocking.

Any public statement by you on this matter will be greatly appreciated by the families and friends of these men.

Very truly yours,

ELLEN T. COOPER.

At this time I would like to join with all my colleagues who have called for the public condemnation of Hanoi's treatment of our soldiers. I am, therefore, introducing a resolution that urges that the North Vietnamese comply with the tenets of the Geneva Convention and immediately remove those conditions that are threatening the lives of our captured soldiers.

This issue cannot be looked upon as a partisan issue. Rather it is one that concerns every single Member here. I urge, therefore, that all those gentlemen who have not yet done so join in this attempt to secure better treatment of our POW's.

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL MORATORIUM PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the nationwide Vietnam moratorium, I had the privilege of participating in a frank discussion of the war in a program put on by the students of Jefferson High School in Annandale, Va. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to the students, faculty, and administration of Jefferson for inviting me to present my views concerning Vietnam and to commend them for encouraging free and constructive discussion on what is probably the most pressing issue of our time.

Joining me on the program was Mr. Dolph Droge, an officer of the Agency for International Development's Vietnam Bureau. Each of us presented a statement containing our appraisal of the Vietnam situation and then answered questions submitted by the student body. Since it can safely be stated that almost all Americans want peace, the differences in point of view between Mr. Droge and myself centered around the question of what the most effective course to pursue to achieve that peace would be. The student body itself seemed to have fairly mixed feelings on what approach the United States should follow in Vietnam. Our dialog, I feel, provided them with facts not previously presented and stimulated the submission of approximately 250 questions directed to Mr. Droge and myself. I think that everyone who attended came away with more information than they had upon entering and that is a good thing. Peaceful discussion of opposing or variant points of view can only serve to make the decisionmaking process of legislators more accurate and responsive to the will of the people.

Finally, I wish to praise Mr. Jordan, principal of Jefferson High School and Mrs. Krist, the faculty member who recruited me, Mr. Sane, adviser to the student cooperation association, and Brian Lewis, president of the SCA and moderator of the program. All these people worked very hard to make the program a success. But most of all, I wish to congratulate the students of Jefferson High who were responsible for the entire program. They conceived it, organized it, and ran it. And they did all the above with professional-like efficiency accompanied by a sincere desire to learn more about the conflict in Vietnam and the different proposals for peace. Unlike the situations encountered at some other schools in the area, schools whose administrators did not have the foresight to provide for free discussions, the students of Jefferson had the opportunity to voluntarily participate in the Vietnam moratorium day special assembly periods. All in all, I think it was a most worthwhile endeavor.

HONORS MEMORY OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1969, my distinguished colleague and good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JAMES A. BYRNE, delivered a most eloquent speech on Christopher Columbus to the Columbus Square Civic Association in Philadelphia.

Mr. BYRNE is well informed on Columbus and his speech shows a fascination with the great Italian explorer that we both share.

I am happy to commend his speech, which follows, to my colleagues:

HONORS MEMORY OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

(By Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE)

I take it as a great personal honor that you have invited me here tonight to participate in this affair honoring the memory and achievements of a great man—and without this man, we would not be here tonight; neither you nor I, nor the 200 million Americans of our beloved nation, nor the millions more who inhabit the mainland and the islands from the northern tier of Canada to Cape Horne to the south.

I am, frankly, very unmoved by theories advanced in recent years that Christopher Columbus was not the first European to sight the land of the Western Hemisphere.

Even if these so-called theories have a grain of truth—and I am not persuaded they do—I don't believe for an instant that they detract one bit from the glory and honor due to Christopher Columbus.

For the important fact is that Christopher Columbus and no one else was responsible for opening these great continents to colonization, providing for the homeless, the hungry, the ambitious and the adventurous from Europe's teeming shores, a new land with new opportunity, where all would one day be equal, with this equality limited only by each man's qualifications and ability and not based on what rank his father held.

If, indeed, there were precursors of Columbus who touched upon these shores, then let me say they had a great opportunity but did not follow through the way Columbus did.

They left no maps for the Genoan navigator to follow. As Columbus himself put it, he found these shores through prophesy and not maps.

If indeed Columbus was preceded by other mariners, then we must remember that this land lay fallow for another 500 years before Columbus opened the Americas for colonization and civilization.

Even the most complex proposal seems simple after one has showed the way, and it was Christopher Columbus who showed the way, despite the doubters and the ob-

structionists. After him came many; but he was first to show the way.

In his own words, he stated, "They all made fun of my plan then; now even tailors wish to discover."

Of course, many legends, some sure to be apocryphal, have grown about a man as famous as Columbus. I think his accomplishments were great enough not to require that we add to his luster accomplishments he did not claim himself.

Christopher Columbus was *not* the first man to believe that the Earth was round and he was not the first to propose that the rich lands of the east could be reached by sailing west.

History tells us that this latter suggestion was first promulgated by another Italian, the Florentine cosmographer Paolo Toscanelli, and Toscanelli's papers were indeed utilized by Columbus in drawing up *his* proposals for discovery.

Some people are quick to paint a portrait of a great man in stark white and blacks. Of course, this is unfair, unfair to history and unfair to the individual. Columbus was a complex individual straightforward in purpose but embittered by the tribulations of life.

Physically, he was a tall man of dignified carriage, with pale skin and red hair. When angered, he was known to acquire a red face; and he was often angry. This was his entitlement, considering the frustrations he suffered at the hands of those not as confident and not as brave.

The school books do not give sufficient credit to what he accomplished *despite* the fruitless, frustrating, years of waiting followed by years of hardship; and then followed by years of fighting for the honor, wealth and credit which he believed was his due.

There is no question that these frustrations contributed to his failing health, which resulted in his subsequent death—alone and bitter.

We know very little of the early years of this mystical, determined sailor, not even the date of his birth—there was no Bureau of Vital Statistics in those days.

We *do* know he was born in Genoa in 1451, the son of Domenico Colombo, a weaver, and his wife, the former Suzanna Fontanarossa. His childhood is clouded, but at the age of 14 he first went to sea and fought in many battles, finally being shipwrecked off the Portuguese coast on Aug. 13, 1476.

But the hunger for adventure and discovery was strong within him and he sailed to Iceland and the South Atlantic. In the waters of the South Atlantic, he often came upon pine tree trunks and wrought wood. This strengthened his belief in the lands to the west.

The king of Portugal rejected his proposals in 1484 and he went to Spain to try his luck there. His arguments took *eight long years* before the Spanish monarchs granted him the ships and the crews for this prophetic journey.

When we say ships, we must qualify that statement; they were hardly more than boats: the Santa Maria about 117 feet long and the Pinta and Nina each about 50 feet long.

Oh yes, we can say that much smaller vessels have crossed the Atlantic and even circumnavigated the globe in recent years. But the thing to remember was that Columbus did it without any knowledge of what lay before him; without maps; with only a dream.

On Aug. 3, 1492, the small fleet sailed from the harbor of Palos, arriving at the Canary Islands on Aug. 12. From there they left on Sept. 6, sailing into the unknown and foreboding western ocean, where none had gone before.

Actually, in a matter of time, the voyage was not very long—a month and six days. But these were 36 days of fear, of rebellion, of privation.

On Oct. 12, 1492, the fleet reached land—an island of the Bahamas which Columbus called San Salvador. He believed these were the Indies off the shore of the continent of Asia. How was he to think otherwise? To this point, no one knew that these vast lands even existed.

During his cruises of the islands, the Santa Maria went aground and was a complete loss. After establishing a colony on Hispaniola, Columbus set sail for a return to Spain in the two tiny caravels.

Three more times, Columbus set sail from the old world to the new, carrying colonists and establishing colonies. But Columbus was a better admiral than he was a politician; he just wasn't in the same league as the members of the Spanish court who poisoned his reputation at home and in the new world.

The Spanish crown broke the agreements made with Columbus. On May 19, 1506, still a relatively young man, he died at Valladolid, Spain, a frustrated man.

Actually, Columbus did not accomplish what he set out to do. He did not find a route to the rich lands of Asia; he did not find the vast quantity of jewels and gold he had set as his aim.

But if Columbus today could see the results of his voyages and explorations, I think he would be satisfied. We—all of us—owe a debt to him which can never be repaid.

COMMENDING THE PEACEFUL APPROACH TO VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Vietnam now rests with the people. It is only a matter of time before the people who want this war stopped now overcome the belligerency of an administration which states its premeditated reluctance to listen to the crowds in the streets.

Yesterday's moratorium on war produced a sincere and peaceful effort of American citizens to secure redress for their grievances from their Government. I will continue—so long as the war drags on, hanging in limbo—with no specific policy for getting out.

We cannot tolerate any further the lack of specific stated objectives for ending our involvement. It was precisely such a lack of specific and meaningful objectives which produced the tragedy of Vietnam.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues two editorials from WCBS News Radio 88, New York City. I am pleased to point out the evidence that WCBS does incorporate a concern for diverse views within its editorial policy. The first editorial, "Vietnam—VI" is a station editorial. The second is a reply to a previous WCBS editorial. Fredric Carlin, vice president of the Organization for Urban Responsibility wrote the reply.

These comments are worthy of note. Like the participants in the moratorium on war and its purpose, these views deserve attention.

The editorials follow:

VIETNAM—VI

Vice President Spiro Agnew has done it again. This time, one of his utterances concerns the forthcoming Vietnam Moratorium. It seems destined to join the declaration "if you've seen one ghetto, you've seen them all" as another classic example of insensitivity.

Seventeen United States Senators and 47 members of the House have endorsed the planned non-violent protest by students opposed to the Vietnam war. Leaders of all religious faiths, including Cardinal Richard Cushing, have given the demonstration their blessing. So have the trustees of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Senate of Columbia University and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University.

Yet—Vice President Agnew has dismissed the student protest set for Wednesday as "ironic and absurd". Previously, in discussing the Vietnam Moratorium, President Nixon had assured a White House news conference: "Under no circumstances whatever, will I be affected by it."

Both statements apparently proceed from the same tunnel vision that afflicted the previous Administration concerning American involvement in Vietnam. They reflect contempt for a substantial body of public opinion which cuts across age and party.

Informed national policy demands that leaders listen carefully to dissent, from whatever quarter it comes and however unwelcome. It is precisely the conviction that theirs are voices in the wilderness, dismissed as of no political consequence, that has brought a great many thoughtful students to the point of desperation and alienation.

The peaceful demonstration of opposition which has been planned is an essentially constructive and moral action. It is intended to bear public witness to the belief of millions of Americans that President Nixon must take the initiative in ending, speedily, this disastrous and divisive war. It is a war which has for too long ravaged the spirit and the resources of this nation.

VIETNAM

WCBS radio recently broadcast an editorial urging that President Nixon fulfill this campaign promise of "new ideas, new men" to end the war in Vietnam. However, the editorial opposed Senator Charles Goodell's bill calling for withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam by December of 1970 on the grounds that it goes too far. Here now, replying to the editorial, is Fredric Carlin, vice president of the Organization for Urban Responsibility.)

In its latest editorial on the deplorable war in Vietnam, WCBS accurately pointed out that the present South Vietnamese regime "freely countenances wholesale corruption . . ." and "has done little to initiate much-needed reforms to which the United States has pledged its support."

Senator Charles Goodell's thoughtful new approach provides a positive method of ending this quagmire in Southeast Asia. It provides a new direction to the unending war, leading to a specific end by December, 1970. It provides for a change of American priorities so that our actions as a nation can be directed not toward projects for war but to programs for peace and progress here at home.

It is apparent that the South Vietnamese government is more interested in perpetuating its own continuity in office than in making concessions that might end this war and not take this horrible and horrendous war as seriously as does our government. Their interests and American interests are no longer parallel.

As Mayor Lindsay has so accurately pointed out, America's essential interest as we enter the 1970's is the future of our cities. Our obligation is to act—now—to redevelop the inner city, to create new housing, to build new schools, promote new industry, to alleviate poverty, to assure effective health care services and to guarantee protection for our citizens in the subways and in the streets.

We can no longer afford the useless and futile luxury of pouring nine billion dollars

into a meaningless war while programs such as Model Cities are cut for lack of funds and vital efforts such as Head Start are unable to expand.

Senator Goodell has demonstrated, by his courage and by his understanding, that the Congress can initiate action to change America's misdirected and outdated courses of action, and act for our urban priorities now.

SYRIA'S CREDENTIALS FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to President Richard M. Nixon with all the sincerity and depth of feeling I can command to use the full effect of the highest position in the world in combating the efforts of the Syrian Arab Republic to be elected as a member of the Security Council. Can any decent human being be other than appalled at the prospect of this bandit-country becoming a member of the Security Council? Were this to happen, the United Nations surely would suffer a greater loss of respect. Recognizing that the U.S. Government is only one among the member nations and has carefully tried to avoid dominating the United Nations, nevertheless, certainly this is an issue which calls for the use of our full influence.

Documentation of the case against Syria appears in the following policy background released by the Embassy of Israel in Washington, D.C., on October 13, 1969:

SYRIA'S CREDENTIALS FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

1. Article 23 of the United Nations Charter specifies:

"The General Assembly shall elect six Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, *due regard being specially paid, in the first instance, to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization.*"

On October 20, 1969, the Syrian Arab Republic will present itself for election as a member of the Security Council to take up the seat vacated by Pakistan. It is an amazing prospect.

2. For the sake of the UN's own integrity and credibility, there will be members of the General Assembly who will want to look into the credentials of the Syrian Arab Republic before casting their votes, as the Charter specifies. The accident of geographic location is of itself not sufficient qualification for membership in the body charged by the Charter with "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Assuming the UN Charter is the guide and the General Assembly no mere international rubber stamp, the credential check will bar the Syrian Arab Republic from election to the Security Council. For what are the credentials which the Syrian Arab Republic offers in respect of international peace and the other purposes for which the United Nations stands?

The Syrian Arab Republic defied the United Nations in 1948 by launching an unprovoked war of aggression against a neighboring State. The Israeli villages captured were razed to the ground and when the Syrian army withdrew in 1949 it left behind a wasteland of destruction.

The Syrian Arab Republic has declared ever since that it will persist in waging war against Israel despite the Charter of the United Nations and despite its own international obligations.

The Syrian Arab Republic renounced its armistice agreement with Israel and repeatedly exploited the strategic Golan Heights to shell and launch terror raids against vulnerable farm villages in Israel's northern lowlands.

The Syrian Arab Republic was the first to organize terror bands against Israel. El Fatah was originally organized in Syria as an arm of the Syrian army's Deuxieme Bureau. Israel brought complaints to the Security Council on Syria's role in initiating warfare by terror as far back as 1965 and 1966. Syria has since been implicated in organizing terror warfare against Ethiopia.

The Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the UN Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967 and has refused even to receive the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General.

The Syrian Arab Republic has throughout conducted a campaign of persecution against its Jewish community, subjecting the Jews to arbitrary imprisonment, loss of civil rights, confiscation of property and curfew. To compound the felony, Jews are not permitted to leave Syria.

Christians in Syria, too, have been the victims of discriminatory measures, their schools closed and their freedom of worship inhibited.

The Syrian Arab Republic sent raiders to kidnap Israeli farmers and fishermen from Israeli territory, incarcerating them in the prisons of Damascus and Palmyra where they were subjected to the most inhuman physical and mental torture. For years, while they were lingering in these jails, the Damascus authorities denied even that they were being held in Syria. No appeals, no interventions from the United Nations, from the International Red Cross, from the Vatican, from third Governments helped. When, after more than twelve years, Syria finally admitted to holding these persons and agreed to return them, those who came back to Israel alive were wrecks of human beings, all but one of whom had to be confined in mental hospitals.

And, most recently, and most notoriously: The Syrian Arab Republic has, for more than a month, held in detention two Israeli civilians hijacked by Arab terrorists to Damascus in an American civil aircraft on an international flight. The continued forcible detention of these innocent civilians, who were brought to Syria by violence, is an act of piracy for which the Syrian Arab Republic is accountable before international law. All the efforts of the civil airline authorities, of the U.S. Government, and of other Governments and international agencies to secure their release have met, thus far, with failure.

3. These are the credentials which the Syrian Arab Republic brings before the members of the UN General Assembly. If they are ignored and Syria is indeed elected to the Security Council, it will serve only to broaden the gap between the UN Charter principles and the UN as an instrument of international justice and peace.

THE METS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker—

We've seen the mighty rise and fall
The Yankees, Dodgers came and went
But who could have imagined all
The glory coming to the Mets!
The Series' heroes beat the odds
We say, do wonders never cease?
To their shining standard, nod.
If they can do it, so can "Peace."

A QUESTION FOR THE LIBERALS ON THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM AND FORTHCOMING PROTESTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been approached many times in the past few weeks by people who ask whether I am for the organized Vietnam protests. My answer is a flat "no." This leads immediately to, "Why not? Don't you want peace?"

This is the compelling question thrust at some of us who do not support these protests by the Vietnam moratorium and the New Mobilization Committees. This is the question that is supposed to separate the peace lovers from the warmongers. Sadly, this is the way many people—usually left of center—view the war and its ancillary protests and demonstrations. If you want peace you must be for the demonstrations and if you are against the demonstrations you must be a warmonger. Of course, the logic is absurd but that does not make it any less common.

If the good, honorable, and sincere people who oppose the war were not so naive they would not tie up with the worst revolutionary elements in the country. This is one thing I have never been able to understand about the American left. Why did not the good liberals say, "You nuts go ahead and have your demonstrations on October 15 and November 15. Thanks, but we will have our protest on November 1 or some other time."

The truth of the matter is that the organizers of the October 15 moratorium and forthcoming protests represent a galaxy of who is who in radical life today. The draft evaders, draft card burners, flag burners, rioters, Communists, and anarchists with all their obscenity and hate-filled propaganda get the ball rolling and good, sincere American liberals follow behind their banner. That banner, for the most part, is down-the-line anti-Americanism and propaganda.

The organization leading the protests is called New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe or NMC, for short. Over the last few years several of these groups have operated in the anti-Vietnam effort. As soon as one group was demonstrated to be heavily Communist dominated and Communist influenced, it would be dissolved and another would appear in its place. For example, NMC springs from the National Mobilization Committee which succeeded the Spring Mobilization Committee, which committee was found to be dominated by Communists of various factions by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Of 48 initial leaders of NMC's steering committee, at least 30 of them were leaders, sponsors, or offi-

cials of the National Mobilization. Fully three-fourths of the 48 were either connected with a previous radically oriented committee, known Communists, or extreme leftist radicals. This list of 48 includes some new names, but it also includes a number of identified Communists of long standing such as Arnold Johnson, Irving Sarnoff, and the Trotskyite Fred Halstead. I think you can see from this why I find it difficult to understand how sincere liberals can support this type of organization. If they want to protest, I suggest they set up their own organization free of these influences.

The thing that impressed me the most about our marathon session on October 14 which was set up by Congressmen who oppose the war, was that they had little in common with those who had organized the October 15 moratorium. As pointed out in the House debate on October 14, a leader of the moratorium stated that the objective of the moratorium was to support complete, immediate, and unilateral withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. He further stated that "we want out now, and this is not contingent on anything that Hanoi or the Vietcong might do." Presumably, this means that if thousands of Communist troops streamed down through the DMZ tomorrow and into South Vietnam, this would not stop us from withdrawing our troops completely and immediately. I am sure not too many Members of the House would support this policy.

I reject the idea of guilt by association but a person ought to use some commonsense to keep from being used by groups which are the antithesis of his own beliefs and standards. Herein we see a strange double standard, too. It is all right for the liberals to get on platforms and programs with the anarchists, Communists, or leftist extremists but think of what would be said if those on the American right were to do the same thing.

If I supported a rally of the Ku Klux Klan, or endorsed the efforts of the American Nazi Party, would you not be appalled, and would you not throw the verbal book at me, and endorse candidates to run against me, and try to throw me out of office? Of course, and you would be right in doing so. These are totalitarian, terrorist groups some would place on the very far right and they have no place in our future. Do extremists on the left deserve different? Of course not, but those who support these October 15 protests are readily willing to associate with, support, condone, encourage, finance, laud, and lend near allegiance to the totalitarian counterparts of the left. Like it or not, the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the SDS, and others are doing a great deal of the leading and organizing, yet many Americans blissfully join in. What is worse, they feel justified in criticizing others who do not follow along.

How any American can join with protestors who carry the Vietcong flag is beyond my understanding. You will recall these same anti-Vietnam people burned an American flag in New York City at their April 1967 protest. Their Pentagon protest in October 1967 brought a mire of filth.

Valid protest can bring about valid changes of American policy and I would under no circumstances attempt to curtail these efforts. But any protest must be responsible. Protestors must realize the ends which they are trying to produce cannot be achieved by improper means. As staged, the protestors call for immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. Both moratorium and new mobilization committees have flatly stated this as their immediate objective. But this means death for tens of thousands of South Vietnamese people, not life and freedom; it means the destruction of their culture, their so recently taken steps toward sound government; their varied religions; the growing industrial, agricultural, and educational achievements; it means that another 15 million people will be ground into slavery by the tanks and tortures of communism.

This administration has moved as far in the direction of peace as anyone can realistically expect until some response is received from the enemy. So, to the protestors I suggest they protest, long and loud, but I think they should redirect their voices and, to use the popular phrase, "Tell it to Hanoi."

Like it or not, those who joined in the October 15 moratorium have supported one of the initial actions of the fall offensive. The following information might be of use to them in deciding whether they wish to continue.

THE FALL OFFENSIVE

The September 27 issue of the Guardian, a Communist newspaper, carried this invitation: "Join the Fall Offensive Against the War."

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—SMC—controlled by the Trotskyite Communists, has as a heading for one of its recent pamphlets: "Join the Fall Antiwar Offensive."

The New Mobilizer, the publication of the radical New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—NMC—in its September 25 issue states: "Fall Offensive Skyrockets."

A letter of September 29, 1969, addressed to antiwar GI newspaper editors by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee—VMC—the sponsor of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium demonstrations, begins by saying:

> By now you are probably aware of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and its part in the "Fall Offensive" against the war in Vietnam. . . .

What is the fall offensive?

It is a series of demonstrations, mostly in October and November, in which the above-mentioned organizations, SMC, NMC, and VMC—and also SDS—conduct various forms of protest against the war in Vietnam. Despite pious references to "peace," the main objective of the drive is to pull all American troops out of Vietnam now, regardless of the degree of preparedness of South Vietnam to defend itself from a Communist takeover and its people from further Communist atrocities. The schedule of demonstrations, including two actions by Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—were listed in the New Mobilizer as follows:

FALL CALENDAR OF NATIONAL ACTIONS

Sept. 24: *Conspiracy Trial* opens in Chicago. Mass rally at Federal Building, endorsed by NMC.

Oct. 8–11: *SDS Actions* in Chicago: "Bring the War Home."

Oct. 15: Vietnam Moratorium: effort to "stop business as usual" for one day & engage in community ed. against the war. Moratorium will be extended to 2 days in Nov. if war is not ended.

Oct. 25: *New Mobilization* actions in Chicago, relating to "Conspiracy" trials and the war. Guerilla theater march down State St., tribunal on war & repression and rock concert are planned.

Nov. 8–15: *Week of local activities* around war & U.S. imperialism relating to several constituencies and political styles. Plans: Joe Hill caucus, SDS.

Nov. 13–14: Possible dates for November Moratorium.

Nov. 13: *Washington Action* (sponsored by NMC). March Against Death: A Vietnam Memorial begins at Arlington Cemetery, Wash., D.C. at midnight. Single file procession from cemetery past White House to Capitol, with candles. Names of U.S. war dead & Viet towns & villages destroyed will be called out as line passes White House; names put in casket at Capitol.

Nov. 14: *Student Strike,* called by Student Mobe, endorsed by NMC.

Nov. 15: *Washington Action* (sponsored by NMC):

9 a.m. March on Washington. Assembly begins at The Mall (between 3d & 6th sts. NW).

10 a.m. March Against Death. Concludes with a brief memorial at Mall.

11 a.m. Mass March to White House begins. Special contingent of GIs and Death Marchers will lead march and a delegation will present political demands & caskets with war dead names at White House.

2 p.m. Rally at Ellipse. Speakers & rock concert.

8 p.m. Meetings by various groups to discuss strategy for next few days.

Nov. 15: *San Francisco Action* (sponsored by NMC). Mass March and Rally.

Nov. 16: *National Workshop on the Draft.* Sessions on draft resistance, counseling, possible repeal of draft laws and discussion of ways of working with GIs.

The riotous, violence-packed "Bring the War Home" SDS "demonstrations" in Chicago last week, the October 8 through 11 phase of the offensive, could be a foretaste of other things to come before the fall offensive is over.

In view of the inadequate coverage given by the press to the nature of the NMC, SMC, and VMC it would be helpful to provide some background information for future reference.

NEW MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The July 18, 1969, issue of the Militant, the Trotskyite Communist newspaper, reported on a meeting of "antiwar activists" in Cleveland on July 4 and 5 of this year as follows:

> A broadly representative gathering of antiwar activists meeting here July 4–5 initiated plans for a massive fall offensive against the Vietnam war culminating with a giant Washington demonstration Nov. 15 for the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam.

As a result of the conference the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam was formed to succeed the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. The September 5 issue of New Mobilizer, the publication of NMC, stated:

To carry forward the work of the old National Mobilization Committee to End the War In Vietnam in a time when the forces against the war now constitute a clear political majority, a new anti-war coalition was formed to effect the inclusion of a wider social base among GIs, high school students, labor, clergy and third world communities. The new anti-war coalition is aptly called the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

What was the "old National Mobilization Committee?"

This was the group that played the key role in organizing the violent confrontations and disruptions during the 1968 Democratic National Convention, and whose leaders are now on trial in Chicago for conspiring to incite the Chicago riots. It also staged the violent Pentagon "confrontation" of October 1967.

Earlier, under a different name, the "Spring Mobilization Committee," this organization had staged Vietnam Week, April 1967.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in an official House report, found that Communists were playing "dominant" roles in the Spring Mobilization Committee. Not long after HCUA issued its report, "Spring" Mobilization changed its name to "National" Mobilization, but even the Daily Worker pointed out that it was the same old committee with no more than a change in the first word of its name.

Basically, the New Mobilization Committee which is playing a major role in the fall offensive is the same old National Mobilization Committee. Following are some of the NMC steering committee members who were also active in the National Mobe:

Arnold Johnson, the public relations director of the Communist Party: Irving Sarnoff, identified as a member of the CP who took the fifth amendment when asked if he was a member; Sylvia Kushner, who has long participated in leftist causes, is the wife of Sam Kushner, a member of the CP; Otto Nathan, charged by the State Department with having been a Communist in Germany in the 1930's and who refused to tell HCUA in June 1956 if he had ever been a Communist; Rennie Davis and Dave Dellinger, both now on trial in Chicago for the Democratic Convention disruptions; Sidney Lens, who made two trips to Cuba and conferred with Fidel Castro and "Che" Guevara and who allowed his name to be used, and spoke at meetings of, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which committee, according to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1961, had from its inception been subsidized by the Cuban Government.

A quick check of the 48 persons listed as members of the steering committee of New Mobe reveals that at least 30 were officials, sponsors, or organizers of National Mobe. The 30 are:

Stewart Meacham, served as National Mobe sponsor.

Katherine Camp, National Mobe sponsor.

Richard Fernandes, National Mobe sponsor.

Barbara Bick, sponsor.

Norma Becker, sponsor.

John McAuliff, sponsor.

Dave Dellinger, sponsor and National Mobe's national chairman, and a self-described Communist.

Rennie Davis, sponsor and spokesman for National Mobe, and advocate of the cause of North Vietnam.

Sidney Lens, sponsor.

Sidney Peck, sponsor.

John Wilson, sponsor and official of SNCC.

Robert Greenblatt, sponsor and former national coordinator of National Mobe.

Arnold Johnson, organizer of National Mobe, admitted Communist and party's legislative representative.

Fred Halstead, organizer of National Mobe, admitted Communist and SWP candidate for Vice President.

Irving Beinin, organizer of National Mobe, and writer for the Guardian.

Irwin Bock, organizer.

Donald Kalish, organizer.

Sylvia Kushner, organizer.

Max Primack, National Mobe organizer.

Larry Seigle, organizer of National Mobe and national chairman of YSA.

Abe Bloom, organizer.

Ron Young, organizer.

Arthur Waskow, organizer.

Allan Brick, organizer.

Jerry Gordon, Cleveland affiliate of National Mobe.

Cora Weiss, organizer of National Mobe.

Carol Lipman, organizer of National Mobe and member of YSA.

Allan Myers, organizer.

Al Evanoff, organizer.

Brad Lyttle, organizer.

Some 70 percent of those persons listed on the steering committee are either old hands from the National Mobilization Committee or identified Communists and far leftists. There is no coincidence here, but there is planning. Thirty of the 48 persons can be directly traced to National Mobe where they served in various capacities including positions as national chairman, national coordinator, and major spokesman.

In addition, New Mobe has among its leaders: Harry Ring and Gus Horowitz, both long-time members of the Socialist Worker's Party; Joe Miles, a member of Young Socialist Alliance, and Bob Green, long-time associate of many SWP front groups.

At this point I believe we should think back to the Democratic Convention riots which I noted a few minutes ago. It was here that the leaders stated that any violence would be "initiated by the police," the "police would be responsible." The demonstrators were attempting to set the police up as the scapegoats and to make the world believe that the demonstrators were all for peace. In the same manner, protesters now are decrying violence, yet, can we expect the same thing?

It should be remembered that the "peaceful" demonstrators organized by National Mobe to go to Chicago went there with football and motorcycle helmets, metal crotch protectors, and wearing heavy hiking and work shoes. Some of them carried knives. They hurled practice golf balls with 3-inch nails projecting out of them at police.

What happened in Chicago was primarily the responsibility of the National Mobilization Committee. With the same people, by and large, now at work for New Mobe we can only wonder whether the outcome of "New" Mobe demonstrations will be the same.

THE STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—SMC—is, by self-description "the national organization of all high school and college students who are united in uncompromising struggle against the war in Vietnam." In addition to supporting the Vietnam Moratorium Committee's October 15 function, SMC is sponsoring a national student strike against the war on November 14.

The origin of SMC dates back to a 1966 conference to call a national student strike against the war in that year. The strike and conference were proposed by Bettina Aptheker, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party and daughter of Herbert Aptheker, a longtime CP functionary. SMC was Communist dominated from its inception. There were Communists from both the CP and Socialist Workers Party—SWP—a Trotskyite Communist organization, in SMC until June 1968. Trotskyites are now in control and have declared their intention to keep it a single-issue organization—demonstrating and agitating solely against the war in Vietnam. The SWP, cited by the Attorney General as a subversive organization, has as its youth organization the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA.

Two individuals who are serving on both NMC and SMC are Carol Lipman and Allan Myers. Both are members of the YSA, with Carol Lipman, a member of the staff of the Young Socialist, the national magazine of YSA, and in addition the executive secretary of SMC. Allan Myers is the editor of the GI Press Service, a service which recently published a listing of GI antiwar newspapers and their locations at the various military bases.

An article from the Washington Post of September 30 reported that on the previous day SMC announced a "No Peace for Nixon Campaign." According to a national organizer of SMC, Don Gurewitz, SMC plans student demonstrations across the country at every public appearance of the President. Let us take a look at some of SMC's demonstrations in the past, as told by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI in his Appropriations testimony earlier this year:

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which is controlled by members of the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth group of the Socialist Workers Party, sponsored anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in various cities throughout the United States from April 4 to 6, 1969. Many antiwar protest groups participated in the demonstrations which had two main themes—namely, to bring servicemen home from Vietnam and to achieve free speech for servicemen advocating antiwar sentiments. The principal demonstrations were conducted at New York City; Chicago, Ill.; and San Francisco, Calif. At New York City, 30,000 individuals participated in a march and rally. Among the demonstrators were members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party and its youth group, and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). At Chicago, approximately 10,000 individuals participated in a march and rally.

One of the principal speakers at the rally was an official of the Black Panther Party. At San Francisco an estimated 10,000 demonstrators marched through San Francisco to the Presidio, a military base. Several arrests were made by the San Francisco Police Department and several military policemen were injured when the marchers attempted to force their way into the Presidio.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM COMMITTEE

As is well known by now, the prime movers of the VMC, which is sponsoring the October 15 moratorium as part of the fall offensive, are Sam Brown and David Hawk. The purpose of the VMC's demonstration is to bring a halt to "business as usual" on that day on the Nation's campuses, in businesses, and factories. If successful, the moratorium would be extended to 2 days in November, 3 in December, 4 in January, and so forth, and it would end only when all U.S. troops are withdrawn immediately and unilaterally from Vietnam. Peaceful and nonviolent means are stressed by the VMC.

The October 11 issue of Human Events, the Washington news weekly, reported on a visit of one of its reporters to the VMC office:

While the VMC is not Communist-controlled, it nevertheless is working hand-in-glove with "New Mobe" whose steering committee is rife with Communists and pro-Communists. The VMC, for instance, is using the suite of rooms just below the suite being used by "New Mobe" and the traffic between the two floors is extensive. Members of both VMC and the "New Mobe" acknowledge close cooperation and the ironically named David Hawk, a leader in the VMC, appears on the steering committee of "New Mobe."

These observations are borne out by the October 13 issue of the National Observer which quoted Sam Brown on VMC's relationship with NMC or "New Mobe":

The New Committee's (NMC or "New Mobe") headquarters is just one floor above the moratorium committee's here. Mr. Brown says his group has "very friendly, co-operative relationships" with it and that "I expect we'll be able to support" the Nov. 15 march.

The VMC is also cooperating with SMC, if the Militant of July 18, the publication of the Socialist Workers Party, is stating the case factually:

SMC will also help build the nationwide moratorium against the war, planned by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee for October 15; the leaders of SMC and the Moratorium Committee agreed to cooperate in getting the participation of hundreds of thousands of students."

A member of the staff of U.S. News & World Report in its October 13 issue also appraised the relationships among the three anti-Vietnam groups. He quotes a Government official as saying he has "no reason to believe this whole movement is Communist activated, although it is obviously an enormous boost to their side in Vietnam." He further observed: "The three committees in charge of these plans are separate organizations, with separate leaders, but some 'interlocking directorships.'"

Those who have endorsed the October 15 demonstrations might also do well to consider this statement by Sam Brown as quoted by Theodore White on page 87 of his book, "The Making of the President—1968":

Think of what we've grown up with. We've recognized the true nature of the United States. We saw the United States attack Cuba, it attacked the Dominican Republic, it attacked South Vietnam. The Communists are now a fragmented force; *the United States is now the great imperialist-aggressor nation of the world.* (Emphasis added.)

This charge might require some tall explaining on the part of some churches, businesses, schools, and individuals who endorsed the October 15 demonstrations in the face of Ho Chi Minh's butchery of South Vietnamese civilians over the years or the Soviet Union's 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In addition, the supporters of the October 15 affair could well be hard pressed to explain to their constituents, congregations, and clients who believe in supporting our Government by the purchase of savings bonds their position on a VMC directive to GI newspaper editors: "Cancel those ——— savings bonds."

Sam Brown, along with Marge Sklencar of the VMC Washington office, participated in Vietnam summer, a 1967 radical-left, anti-Vietnam protest project which attracted extremists from various segments of the left movement. Some of the prime movers in this project were Mike Ansara of the SDS at Harvard; Lee Webb, a former national secretary of SDS; and Richard Fernandez, a member of the steering committee of NMC. Fernandez was a sponsor of spring mobilization committee and treasurer of November 8 mobilization committee, "spring's" predecessor.

David Hawk played a key role, according to the press, in obtaining signatures to a pledge made public earlier this year in which almost 200 college leaders—editors of campus newspapers and heads of student bodies—said they would refuse to be drafted to fight in Vietnam. He has, in other words, organized what some people would consider the cream of our campus youth to defy the laws of the United States. Living up to the pledge he signed, he himself has refused to be drafted and is awaiting trial in Scranton, Pa., for refusing induction into the Army.

The VMC makes no bones about the fact—and actually publicizes—that Hawk was a SNCC worker in 1964 and 1966 in the South at the very time Stokely Carmichael and other members of the group were fomenting riots and were generally engaged in highly inflamatory racial agitation.

In fairness to the VMC leaders it should be pointed out that they have said they reject SDS tactics and want no part of any SDS violence which may occur.

It is important to note, however, that David Hawk is on the steering committee of NMC, which under its former name was the prime organizer of the 1968 Chicago convention violence. This group—under President Johnson as well as recently—has probably done more to undercut U.S. policy in Vietnam than any other organization in the Nation.

THE PARTY LINE

On September 10, 1965, the national organizing department of the Communist Party of the United States sent a communication "to all districts" suggesting slogans to "strengthen the campaign to end the war in Vietnam." The first four of nine suggested slogans were:

1. End the War in Vietnam!
2. Stop U.S. Aggression Against Vietnam!
3. Bring Our Boys Home!
4. Withdraw All U.S. Troops!

Over 4 years later, the party line is still the same, but how the orchestration has crescendoed for a unilateral and immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. The VMC, according to a news release of October 8, expects to enjoy its greatest initial success on the campuses, with growing support coming from among the clergy, professional people, businessmen, Government employees, Members of Congress and the public at large.

THE FALL OFFENSIVE AND SOME COMMUNIST REACTIONS

Reactions from Communist quarters are understandably favorable. The Chicago Tribune of October 10 carried an article from Paris with headlines stating: "Reds Applaud U.S. War Foes; Blast Nixon." The news item explained that the National Liberation Front's "foreign minister" said in Paris that "the Vietnamese people warmly acclaim this movement" and that the movement "tightens the solidarity betwen the Vietnamese people and the progressive people in the United States."

The Communists are taking full advantage of propaganda value in the protests and the Communist press-in-residence in the United States, the Daily World, noted on October 9 in an editorial:

Popular support for the October 15 Moratorium against the war in Vietnam is mushrooming, with the turnout on that day expected to exceed anything so far produced by the U.S. peace movement.

This newspaper urges an all-out turnout.

No less enthusiastic in their support were broadcasters from Hanoi who beamed a message to various parts of the world. It included these remarks addressed specifically to NMC and the Communist newspaper, the Guardian:

We [North Vietnam's leaders] are very elated to learn that you will launch a big fall campaign against the Nixon Administration's war policy, urging it to put an end to the war in Vietnam and to bring all U.S. troops home immediately.

We warmly welcome your initiative and highly appreciate your great efforts to coordinate actions in the campaign.

We wish you great success in the fall campaign . . . We would like to convey to you our sincere thanks and best regards.

THE "UNITED FRONT" OPERATION

What we see in the fall offensive is a near perfect example of a Communist united front operation. The Student Mobilization Committee, although Trotskyite-Communist controlled, has other types of Communists in it and, also, of course, many non-Communist radicals, leftists, pacifists, and idealists.

The New Mobilization Committee is itself a united front or umbrella-type operation. Working together in it are Moscow-type Communists, Trotskyite Communists, Castro Communists and others, and also a broad assortment of fellow travelers, leftists, radical pacifists, and some gullible idealists.

SDS, as is well known, is infiltrated by both CPers and members of the Peking-oriented Communist organization, the Progressive Labor Party, although the bulk of its membership is apparently made up of more or less native radical youths.

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee has the support of all of these groups—and of the CP itself—in its program for protest. In turn, it has won the cooperation of numerous non-Communists and even anti-Communists who would not normally aid any SDS, SMC, or NMC project. But this is the method of the "united front." Through their united front tactic the Communists are working for one of their major goals and—by one means or another—they are winning the cooperation of some people and organizations from the left, the right, and the center.

VMC is not Communist. I am not implying that it is, but its skirts are not clean on the question of cooperating with Communists. David Hawk, we should remember, is on the NMC steering committee. Also, VMC proclaims in its literature that it has the endorsement of the New Mobilization Committee as well as the acknowledged endorsement of such Communist-infiltrated groups as Women's Strike for Peace. Although its leaders say they have no tie with the Student Mobilization Committee, as long ago as last July a spokesman for SMC in announcing the fall offensive, included VMC's moratorium as a part of it.

To the best of my knowledge, the leaders of the Vietnam moratorium have at no time made a clear-cut statement excluding themselves from the SDS–SMC–NMC cooperative operation. At no time have they said that they do not want these groups to support or participate in the moratorium.

Thus, we have the "united front" operation. VMC leaders, I believe, must certainly be aware of the nature of SDS, NMC, and SMC. They are not ignorant. They are not being duped, yet they are willingly cooperating with these groups

Let us stop and think again for a minute of the announced goal of the people behind the moratorium. In an October 8 release the Vietnam Moratorium Committee stated that its goal is an "immediate and final end to American involvement in the Vietnam war."

What does this mean?

Let us forget for a moment about Communist strategy and tactics here in this country, about the pros and cons of various elements of our Vietnam policy, and think about people, about human beings—millions of them. Let us think for a while, as all good Americans should, about fellow humans. Let us think realistically, as the VMC people say we should, about killing, injury, death, agony, and blood. We know South Vietnam is not now able to defend itself from the combined power of the VC and North Vietnam, supported by the colossi of communism, the U.S.S.R. and Red China. What will happen if we do what the VMC wants us to do; that is, pull out of Vietnam?

The late Dr. Tom Dooley, who we would all agree was one of the greatest humanitarians of our era, has given us an idea of what will happen in his book, "Deliver Us From Evil," in which he recounted his experiences as a naval medical officer at Haiphong, then a staging area for those refugees who chose to leave North Vietnam as guaranteed by the Geneva agreement of 1954. One example cited by Dr. Dooley will suffice:

> Now two Viet Minh guards went to each child and one of them firmly grasped the head between his hands. The other then rammed a wooden chopped chopstick into each ear. He jammed it in with all his force. The stick split the ear canal wide and tore the ear drum. The shrieking of the children was heard all over the village.

So appalling were Tom Dooley's experiences at Haiphong among victims of Communist terror that he felt compelled to devote one full chapter to the brutality inflicted on these innocent people. Dr. Dooley stated:

> The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of oriental tortures. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

Dr. Dooley was not the only one who has pointed up what will happen if unprotected people are left to the mercy of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese Communists. The November 1968 issue of the Reader's Digest featured an article, "The Blood-Red Hands of Ho Chi Minh," by John G. Hubbell, which provides further evidence of what an immediate U.S. pullout would mean to many thousands of women and children, as well as men, in Vietnam. Author Hubbell describes the unbelievable brutality of Dak Son where mostly women and children were killed with flamethrowers by the Vietcong. Another case of Communist genocide was that of Hue in which 1,000 civilians were slaughtered by the Communists.

A later article on the same Hue massacre placed the number of dead at 2,200, exhumed from 25 different locations; 800 persons are still unaccounted for. The later account of the massacre by James Cary in the June 19, 1969, issue of the Copley News Service, gives a chilling idea of what would happen if an immediate U.S. withdrawal left the Vietnamese people without adequate protection:

> Nationality, occupation or political background was no protection. Scores of Buddhists in Hue's strong, anti-government resistance movement were slaughtered. So too were American and German civilians, French priests, South Vietnamese Government officials, anyone with relatives in the South Vietnamese army, village chiefs, political leaders, anyone who worked for the Americans, and particularly anyone who was known for his opposition to the Viet Cong.

It is not unreasonable to ask at this point whether the exponents of immediate withdrawal would be willing to assume some degree of responsibility if repetitions of the Hue massacre followed an immediate pullout.

Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt of the U.S. Marine Corps who commanded I Corps area of South Vietnam in 1966 and 1967 commented on the above-mentioned article by John Hubbell of the Reader's Digest. Stated General Walt:

> This article accurately depicts the true nature of the enemy in South Vietnam. I saw the little boy with his hands cut off. I have seen heads impaled on stakes, and disemboweled bodies.
>
> I learned early in my two years of duty in South Vietnam, fighting and working alongside the South Vietnamese forces, that the communist terrorism described in this article is no mere accident of war but a program of systematic butchery. This deliberate and brutal assault against the grassroots citizenry is one reason why we who have responded to South Vietnam's call for assistance believe devoutly that our efforts to save this nation are worthwhile, necessary and important.

After reading this article, I for one could not see how any Member of this House, of the Congress, or any American citizen worthy of the name, could knowingly and consciously support a complete and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam. I insert the article. "The Blood-Red Hands of Ho Chi Minh," by John G. Hubbell, at this point in the RECORD:

THE BLOOD-RED HANDS OF HO CHI MINH

(By John G. Hubbell)

The village chief and his wife were distraught. One of their children, a seven-year-old boy, had been missing for four days. They were terrified, they explained to Marine Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, because they believed he had been captured by the Vietcong.

Suddenly, the boy came out of the jungle and ran across the rice paddies toward the village. He was crying. His mother ran to him and swept him up in her arms. Both of his hands had been cut off, and there was a sign around his neck, a message to his father: if he or anyone else in the village dared go to the polls during the upcoming elections, something worse would happen to the rest of his children.

The V.C. delivered a similar warning to the residents of a hamlet not far from Danang. All were herded before the home of their chief. While they and the chief's pregnant wife and four children were forced to look on, the chief's tongue was cut out. Then his genital organs were sliced off and sewn inside his bloody mouth. As he died, the V.C. went to work on his wife, slashing open her womb. Then, the nine-year-old son: a bamboo lance was rammed through one ear and out the other. Two more of the chief's children were murdered the same way. The V.C. did not harm the five-year-old daughter—not physically: they simply left her crying, holding her dead mother's hand.

General Walt tells of his arrival at a district headquarters the day after it had been overrun by V.C. and North Vietnamese army troops. Those South Vietnamese soldiers not killed in the battle had been tied up and shot through their mouths or the backs of their heads. Then their wives and children, including a number of two- and three-year-olds, had been brought into the street, disrobed, tortured and finally executed: their throats were cut; they were shot, beheaded, disemboweled. The mutilated bodies were draped on fences and hung with signs telling the rest of the community that if they continued to support the Saigon government and allied forces, they could look forward to the same fate.

These atrocities are not isolated cases; they are typical. For this is the enemy's way of warfare, clearly expressed in his combat policy in Vietnam. While the naïve and anti-American throughout the world, cued by communist propaganda, have trumpeted against American "immorality" in the Vietnam war—aerial bombing, the use of napalm, the inevitable (but relatively few) civilian casualties caused by American combat action—daily and nightly for years, the communists have systematically authored history's grisliest catalogue of barbarism. By the end of 1967, they had committed at least

100,000 acts of terror against the South Vietnamese people. The record is an endless litany of tortures, mutilations and murders that would have been instructive even to such as Adolf Hitler.

Perhaps because until recently the terrorism has been waged mainly in remote places, this aspect of the war has received scant attention from the press. Hence the enemy has largely succeeded in casting himself in the role of noble revolutionary. It is long past time for Americans, who are sick and tired of being vilified for trying to help South Vietnam stay free, to take a hard look at the nature of this enemy.

BLOOD-BATH DISCIPLINE

The terror had its real beginning when Red dictator Ho Chi Minh consolidated his power in the North. More than a year before his 1954 victory over the French, he launched a savage campaign against his own people. In virtually every North Vietnamese village, strong-arm squads assembled the populace to witness the "confessions" of landowners. As time went on, businessmen, intellectuals, schoolteachers, civic leaders—all who represented a potential source of future opposition—were also rounded up and forced to "confess" to "errors of thought." There followed public "trials," conviction and, in many cases, execution. People were shot, beheaded, beaten to death; some were tied up, thrown into open graves and covered with stones until they were crushed to death.

Ho has renewed his terror in North Vietnam periodically. Between 50,000 and 100,000 are believed to have died in these blood-baths—in a coldly calculated effort to discipline the party and the masses. To be sure, few who escape Ho's terror now seem likely to tempt his wrath. During the 1950s, however, he had to quell some sizable uprisings in North Vietnam—most notably one that occurred in early November 1956, in Nghe An province, which included Ho's birthplace village of Nam Dan. So heavily had he taxed the region that the inhabitants finally banded together and refused to meet his price. Ho sent troops to collect, and then sent in an army division, shooting. About 6000 unarmed villagers were killed. The survivors scattered, some escaping to the South. The slaughter went largely unnoticed by a world then preoccupied with the Soviet Union's rape of Hungary.

With North Vietnam tightly in hand, the central committee of the North Vietnamese communist party met in Hanoi on March 13, 1959, and decided it was time to move against South Vietnam. Soon, large numbers of Ho's guerrillas were infiltrating to join cadres that had remained there after the French defeat in 1954. Their mission: to eliminate South Vietnam's leadership, including elected officials, "natural" leaders, anyone and everyone to whom people might turn for advice. Also to be liquidated were any South Vietnamese who had relatives in their country's armed forces, civil services or police; any who failed to pay communist taxes promptly; any with five or more years of education.

A captured V.C. guerrilla explained how his eight-man team moved against a particular target village: "The first time we entered the village, we arrested and executed on the spot four men who had been pointed out to us by the party's district headquarters as our most dangerous opponents. One, who had fought in the war against the French, was now a known supporter of the South Vietnamese government. Another had been seen fraternizing with government troops. These two were shot. The others, the village's principal landowners, were beheaded."

General Walt tells of the "revolutionary purity" of Vietcong who came home to two other villages. In one case, a 15-year-old girl who had given Walt's Marines information on V.C. activities was taken into the jungle and tortured for hours, then beheaded. As a warning to other villagers, her head was placed on a pole in front of her home. Her murderers were *her brother* and two of his V.C. comrades. In the other case, when a V.C. learned that his wife and two young children had cooperated with Marines who had befriended them, he himself cut out their tongues.

Genocide. In such fashion did the storm of terror break over South Vietnam. In 1960, some 1500 South Vietnamese civilians were killed and 700 abducted. By early 1965, the communists' Radio Hanoi and Radio Liberation were able to boast that the V.C. had destroyed 7559 South Vietnamese hamlets. By the end of last year, 15,138 South Vietnamese civilians had been killed, 45,929 kidnapped. Few of the kidnapped are ever seen again.

Ho's assault on South Vietnam's leadership class has, in fact, been a form of genocide—and all too efficient. Thus, if South Vietnam survives in freedom, it will take the country a generation to fully replace this vital element of its society. But the grand design of terror involves other objectives, too. It hopes to force the attacked government into excessively repressive anti-terrorist actions, which tend to earn the government the contempt and hatred of the people. It also seeks valuable propaganda in the form of well-publicized counter-atrocities certain to occur at the individual level—for South Vietnamese soldiers whose families have suffered at communists' hands are not likely to deal gently with captured V.C. and North Vietnamese troops.

Dr. A. W. Wylie, an Australian physician serving in a Mekong Delta hospital, points out that a hamlet or village need not cooperate with the Saigon government or allied forces to mark itself for butchery; it need only be neutral, a political condition not acceptable to the communists. After a place has been worked over, its people of responsibility are always identifiable by the particularly hideous nature of their wounds. He cites some cases he has seen:

When the V.C. finished with one pregnant woman, both of her legs were dangling by ribbons of flesh and had to be amputated. Her husband, a hamlet chief, had just been strangled before her eyes, and she also had seen her three-year-old child machine-gunned to death. Four hours after her legs were amputated, she aborted the child she was carrying. But perhaps the worst thing that happened to her that day was that she survived.

A village policeman was held in place while a V.C. gunman shot off his nose and fired bullets through his cheekbones so close to his eyes that they were reduced to bloody shreds. He later died from uncontrollable hemorrhages.

A 20-year-old schoolteacher had knelt in a corner trying to protect herself with her arms while a V.C. flailed at her with a machete. She had been unsuccessful; the back of her head was cut so deeply that the brain was exposed. She died from brain damage and loss of blood.

Flamethrowers at Work. Last December 5, communists perpetrated what must rank among history's most monstrous blasphemies at Dak Son, a central highlands village of some 2000 Montagnards—a tribe of gentle but fiercely independent mountain people. They had moved away from their old village in V.C.-controlled territory, ignored several V.C. orders to return and refused to furnish male recruits to the V.C.

Two V.C. battalions struck in the earliest hours, when the village was asleep. Quickly killing the sentries, the communists swarmed among the rows of tidy, thatch-roofed homes, putting the torch to them. The first knowledge that many of the villagers had of the attack was when V.C. troops turned flamethrowers on them in their beds. Some families awoke in time to escape into nearby jungle. Some men stood and fought, giving their wives and children time to crawl into trenches dug beneath their homes as protection against mortar and rifle fire. But when every building was ablaze, the communists took their flamethrowers to the mouth of each trench and poured in a long, searing hell of fire—and, for good measure, tossed grenades into many. Methodical and thorough, they stayed at it until daybreak, then left in the direction of the Cambodian border.

Morning revealed a scene of unbelievable horror. The village now was only a smoldering, corpse-littered patch on the lush green countryside. The bodies of 252 people, mostly mothers and children, lay blistered, charred, burned to the bone. Survivors, many of them horribly burned, wandered aimlessly about or stayed close to the incinerated bodies of loved ones, crying. Some 500 were missing; scores were later found in the jungle, dead of burns and other wounds; many have not been found.

The massacre at Dak Son was a warning to other Montagnard settlements to cooperate. But many of the tribesmen now fight with the allies.

MUTILATION ON THE SCHOOL BUS

If the communists' "persuasion" techniques spawn deep and enduring hatred, Ho could not care less; the first necessity is the utter subjugation of the people. Ho was disturbed by the rapid expansion of South Vietnam's educational system: between 1954 and 1959, the number of schools had tripled and the number of students had quadrupled. An educated populace, especially one educated to democratic ideals, does not fit into the communist scheme. Hence, the country's school system was one of Ho's first targets. So efficiently did he move against it that the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession soon sent a commission, chaired by India's Shri S. Natarajan, to investigate.

Typical of the commission's findings is what happened in the jungle province of An Xuyen. During the 1954–55 academic year, 3096 children attended 32 schools in the province; by the end of the 1960–61 school year, 27,953 were attending 189 schools. Then the communists moved in. Parents were advised not to send their children to school. Teachers were warned to stop providing civic education, and to stop teaching children to honor their country, flag and president. Teachers who failed to comply were shot or beheaded or had their throats cut, and the reasons for the executions were pinned or nailed to their bodies.

The Natarajan commission reported how the V.C. stopped one school bus and told the children not to attend school anymore. When the children continued for another week, the communists stopped the bus again, selected a six-year-old passenger and cut off her fingers. The other children were told, "This is what will happen to you if you continue to go to that school." The school closed.

In one year, in An Xuyen province alone, Ho's agents closed 150 schools, killed or kidnapped more than five dozen teachers, and cut school enrollment by nearly 20,000. By the end of the 1961–62 school year, 636 South Vietnamese schools were closed, and enrollment had decreased by nearly 80,000.

But, in the face of this attack, South Vietnam's education system has staged a strong comeback. Schools destroyed by the communists have been rebuilt, destroyed, and rebuilt again. Many teachers have given up their own homes and move each night into a different student's home so the communists can't find them, or commute from nearby cities, where they leave their families.

Against such determination, the size of Ho's failure can be measured: in 1954, there were approximately 400,000 pupils in school in North and South Vietnam together; today South Vietnam alone has some two million in school. About 35,000—four times as many as in 1962—now attend five South Vietnamese universities, while 42,000 more attend night college.

A South Vietnamese government official explains: "A war shatters many traditional values. But the idea of education has an absolute hold on our people's imagination."

BAR OF JUSTICE

The pitch of communist terrorism keeps rising. After the Tet carnage at Hue early this year, 19 mass graves yielded more than 1000 bodies, mostly civilians—old men and women, young girls, schoolboys, priests, nuns, doctors (including three Germans who had been medical-school faculty members at Hue University). About half had been buried alive, and many were found bound together with barbed wire, with dirt or cloth stuffed into their mouths and throats, and their eyes wide open. The communists came to Hue with a long list of names for liquidation—people who worked for the South Vietnamese or for the U.S. government, or who had relatives who did. But as their military situation grew increasingly desperate, they began grabbing people at random, out of their homes and off the streets, condemned them at drumhead courts as "reactionaries" or for "opposing the revolution" and killed them.

"The Tet offensive represented a drastic change in tactics," says General Walt. "This is a war to take over the South Vietnamese people. Ho launched the Tet offensive because he knew he was losing the people. But his troops didn't know it; they were told that they didn't need any withdrawal plan because the people would rise and fight with them to drive out the Americans. What happened was just the opposite. Many fought against them like tigers." Some of the Tet offensive's explosion of atrocities probably can be attributed to sheer, vengeful frustration on the part of Ho's terror squads—which Ho may well have foreseen, and counted on.

The full record of communist barbarism in Vietnam would fill volumes. If South Vietnam falls to the communists, millions more are certain to die, large numbers of them at the hands of Ho's imaginative torturers. That is a primary reason why, at election times, more than 80 percent of eligible South Vietnamese defy every communist threat and go to the polls, and why, after mortar attacks, voting lines always form anew. It is why the South Vietnamese pray that their allies will stick the fight through with them. It is why the vast majority of American troops in Vietnam are convinced that the war is worth fighting. It is why those who prance about—even in our own country—waving Vietcong flags and decrying our "unjust" and "immoral" war should be paid the contempt they deserve.

Finally, it is why the communists should be driven once and for all from South Vietnam—and why, if possible, the monsters who presently rule North Vietnam should be brought before the bar of justice.

MEMORIAL TO THE VIETNAM WAR DEAD

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, to date over 38,864 American boys have died in the Vietnam War. Most of these men felt they were dying for a cause—the protection of freedom and democracy throughout the world and the ultimate protection of their loved ones here at home.

One group has seen fit to recognize these war dead through dedication of a memorial. I wish to congratulate the Vietnam War Dead Memorial Committee of Ocala and Marion County for this deeply felt and humane consideration of fellow Americans who have died in battle for them. The memorial has been built in the shape of a map of Vietnam with the American flag staff standing tall above it. Listed on the monument are the names of the war dead from Marion County. This memorial will be dedicated in Belleview, Fla., on November 9, 1969.

At a time when many are demonstrating against the war, let us pause to remember these dead and to acknowledge this group of dedicated Americans for building the first memorial in the Nation to the Vietnam war dead.

SERVICEMEN'S HONOR ROLL BOARD IN NEW RICHMOND, OHIO

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, since our Nation's proud birth in 1776, American men and women have been honored to serve our country, dedicating their "lives, fortunes, and their sacred honor." Such men founded our Nation, and have always defended it against threat both foreign and domestic with such diligence that the United States of America became known around the world as the land of the free, and the home of the brave.

Now, in the last few years, we have witnessed a new phenomenon. Cowardice and disloyalty have for some become virtues, and love of country has been termed "square."

I am extremely proud that these views are those of a small, but vocal minority. Here in Ohio, a part of what Dwight Eisenhower called America's heartland, Americans still deem it an honor to serve their Nation, and they are in turn honored by a grateful community. This is the real America. This is the America of Washington, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt, and this is why America will pass safely through its present crisis. It will remember and be grateful to its sons and daughters who serve it in our generation, as it does those who have served it in times before. Because, as one of history's greatest philosophers has said:

A man's love of his country is the noblest emotion of all.

In the town of New Richmond, in Clermont County, Ohio, American Legion Post No. 550—John Farina—and the Servicemen's Mothers Club of Clermont County have erected a servicemen's honor roll board. This board will honor the men and women of New Richmond who have served their country in the armed services since 1964. The honor roll board will be dedicated on October 26, 1969.

I wish to commend the citizens of New Richmond and Clermont County for honoring their servicemen. In these times when misguided youths and even adults publicly disgrace our Nation by praising our enemies, it is heartening and reassuring to be reminded that America's heartland is still firm, and the same spark of patriotism that was first struck at Lexington and Concord still kindles a flame in all true Americans.

Y'KNOW

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal in recent months about the communications gap. Symptomatic of this phenomenon is the line from a recent Paul Newman movie—"What we have here, is a failure to communicate."

All around us people cannot seem to talk to each other—parents cannot talk with their children, students with their teachers, oldsters with youngsters, and so on and on.

A recent editorial in the Boston Globe, written by David B. Wilson, suggests one of the inputs into this whole communication problem. It is, in his words, "the maddening repetition of 'y'know,' a once delicately meaningful phrase and its simultaneous decline in communicative content." Mr. Wilson calls this one of the "minor annoyances of the age."

I think it is a major catastrophe. How many of us have had even short conversations where the expression "y'know" cropped up five, 10, or more times, with no special relationship to the subject being discussed—with no function in the sentence other than to punctuate it occasionally with this meaningless phrase.

I commend Mr. Wilson's editorial to my colleagues' attention. Y'know, with a little attention to this problem, we might just help save the language.

I include Mr. Wilson's article in the RECORD as follows:

Y'KNOW

(By David B. Wilson)

"Y'know," they say. Y'know?

Maddening repetition of this once delicately meaningful phrase and its simultaneous decline in communicative content are among the minor annoyances of the age.

Sentences begin and end with it, and it surrounds "buts" and "ands" the way "er" and "uh" and "well" once did. Parents are reduced to incoherent mutterings as their young conduct discourse of about one-third "Y'know" and the rest "groovy," "cool" or "blast."

You used to be able to say quite a bit with the phrase, before the hips and kids debased it.

"YOU know" meant "You, Fred, possessed of superior intelligence, know what others do not know."

It could be "You KNOW," meaning, "Don't give me that malarkey, you really agree with me."

Then there was the slower, "Y-o-u-k-n-o-w," with a slight rising inflection, which meant, "You don't know, but I had a terrific idea which I am about to tell you about."

There was the falling, confidential inflection of the "You Know . . ." that meant something like "We both know what she was

up to last Summer with Wilma's husband when she went to her mother's, but we both are too nice to discuss it."

Closer to contemporary usage was the "You know," often delivered with a shrug, which meant, "We both know but the matter is far too tedious and complicated and boring to discuss further.

A young person of my acquaintance, mulling the matter for a mini-moment between telephone calls consisting almost entirely of "Y'knows," guessed she said it a lot in order to reassure herself that somebody was paying attention to what she was saying.

Similarly, according to a friend who once worked in a brass factory in New Haven, the girls on the screw machines there used it in a subconscious attempt to check on whether they were being properly understood. "Y' know" tended to break out where language failed.

Atrophy of the cerebral cortex, inflicted by the mindless din of media, is probably responsible. Defensively, with sanity maintenance our intention, we tune out (turn off, if you will) most of what we physically are required to hear, straining sound of thoughtful content to preserve the integrity of our own thoughts and dreams.

After some two decades of the television set's one-way communication with us, we are unused to answering back. Debate is somewhat out of style in the schools. Students feel they're mostly talked at. The tube dominates conversation.

How many times recently have you been interrupted because you were intruding on someone else's relationship with a television set?

"Y'know" is symptomatic of the dissolution of intellect wrought in our technosphere, of the savagery that awaits when the Word is heard no longer.

To speak in sentences, complete and composed, taking thought for meaning, thrust and overtones, is to be polite and concerned, to respect one's auditor, to care enough about people, ideas, things and, indeed, life, to call them by their right names. "Y'know" evades and abdicates the burden of having a brain.

The phrase used to have a confidential and conspiratorial quality, and, in that sense, was not unaffectionate, assuming that the person addressed did, in fact, know. This sense is almost lost.

Now it is "Nixon, y'know," "the blacks (Jews, WASPs, Irish, Arabs), y'know" or the government, the Church, lawyers, the Army or whatever, the only meaning being an often frustrated hope of mutual understanding that the speaker wishes to convey a negative and almost tropistic response to the subject at hand.

This way lies ultimate meaninglessness and the exhaustion of understanding. There may, however, be a solution.

Next time somebody flashes a vacuous "Y-know" at you, interrupt and explain, politely, that you do not, in fact, know but are interested in finding out. This interest will puzzle the habitual "Y'know" user and require him to ask himself just what it was he did mean. It just might save the language.

LEAGUE'S 50TH YEAR

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant anniversaries to occur this year is certainly the 50th anniversary of the League of Women Voters. In my district, and undoubtedly in many others, this organization has long been a leader in the task of educating the public on issues of the day. On many issues I find myself in agreement with the league's stands; and even when I do not, I am impressed with their reasoning and their activity. They serve a much-needed function in this Nation, and I am pleased to offer my congratulations to them on this, their 50th anniversary.

At this time I am introducing into the RECORD an editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, which notes and praises this worthwhile organization:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Triumphant in their drive to win the vote, suffragettes gathered in Chicago for a "Victory Convention" 50 years ago.

Mrs. Carrie Catt, president of the American Suffrage Association, exhorted the membership to battle society's ills: "Arise, women voters of East and West, of South and North, in this, your first union together. Strong of faith, fearless of spirit, let the nation hear you pledge all that you have and all that you are to a new crusade."

Thus the League of Women Voters was born. Fifty years after Mrs. Catt's militant address, the League flourishes, one of the most commendable of all public-minded organizations. Through the years, the League has provided forums for political candidates, launched voter registration drives, initiated governmental reforms, and educated more voters than any other group.

Non-profit and non-partisan, the League is undertaking an $11-million fund drive to modernize and continue its work. We urge support of this fund drive. The League's services to the nation, to Massachusetts and to this community have been significant.

SENIOR CITIZENS MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, today a group of my colleagues and I are introducing a measure to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to enable eligible elderly persons to exchange food stamps for meals prepared and served to them by private nonprofit organizations.

This bill is designed to assist elderly persons who would otherwise be eligible for food stamp aid when measured by age, residency, and income requirements, but who are considered ineligible because they do not have cooking facilities in their households. The beneficiaries of this measure, the crippled and infirm, are physically unable to cook for themselves. Very often, the chronically ill and aged cannot shop or prepare food. Under present law, they are denied the use of food stamps. They are most needful of the benefit extended to them by this measure.

The legislation that I am sponsoring, in concert with some of my colleagues, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate specific church and other nonprofit organizations to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of the stamps could be made by the charitable organization, the stamps would be issued initially to the eligible individual.

The elderly require proper care and close attention. We certainly cannot permit them to go hungry, and I believe that the measure that I am cosponsoring would minimize such a possibility. I hope that the House of Representatives responds by enacting this legislation.

LET IT BEGIN WITH YOU

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many millions of words have been written and spoken concerning the October 15 moratorium. All of the noted commentators and columnists have had their say. However, after having read and listened to a good number of these statements, I find that one that particularly impressed me was an editorial appearing in the Town Crier of Stockbridge, Mich. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and believe it fully deserves to be included as part of the record relating to this event. I insert in the RECORD the editorial, "Let It Begin With You," which appeared in the October 15 issue of one of the fine weekly newspapers serving Michigan's Sixth Congressional District:

LET IT BEGIN WITH YOU

Many thousands of college students, university faculty members, and even some government officials are supporting today's "Moratorium for Peace" at various types of meetings all over the country.

Some groups hope to fill huge football stadiums with war protesters while others will be satisfied to distribute leaflets in the community.

Students throughout the country are joining in a national movement to demonstrate their support for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam. However most college and university officials have said there will be "classes as usual" today.

Many Stockbridge residents agree that the war in Vietnam should be ended as soon as possible. But many also stated that they are not certain that mass demonstrations are the answer.

We would agree that what took years for a former administration to do cannot be undone in a few short months by a new administration.

The war in Vietnam is an unpopular one. It has damaged America's prestige more than any other single action in all history. But, as President Nixon recently stated, "It cannot be settled in the streets."

We agree. We also feel that widespread, and often violent, demonstrations, hurt our chances for success at the Paris peace talks. The demonstrations in the streets of our country only serve to convince the North Vietnamese that Americans are not behind their president.

Peace must come. We are behind that one hundred percent. We believe however that the solution must be left up to those persons who were delegated by the President to handle the job. Mass demonstrations in the streets and on the campuses of our universities will only compound the difficulties faced by our negotiators.

We elected a new President last November. We hope and pray that he has the best interests of this country at heart, and is doing everything in his power to settle the war in Vietnam as quickly as possible. We hope

it can be done so that those who lost their lives there will not have died in vain, and that those whom we have been defending from Communism will not be left helpless against a ruthless aggressor.

Peace, so desperately wanted by the people of this country, actually is not a normal state of life. Have we not had more war than peace throughout all of history?

Many of those who have demonstrated for peace have been guilty of reviling law enforcement officials and anyone else who stood in their way. They have claimed to be for peace, yet they have shown hate for their own countrymen.

Only when all mankind comes to love his neighbor, without regard to race, color or creed, will lasting peace ever be achieved.

Where, and with whom, shall peace have its real beginning? Why not let it begin with you.

TASK FORCE HEARS DR. EGEBERG

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, heard testimony last week from Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Egeberg had some very positive remarks about the need for increased family planning services and better health service delivery systems. The Secretary's comments were very encouraging indeed. His understanding of the organizational problems left a feeling of optimism among the Task Force members.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the highlights of this hearing for the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, OCTOBER 9, 1969

(By Dr. Roger O. Egeberg)

Dr. Egeberg stated that if he were starting from scratch, he would have to list population as the most important health problem of today. However, since we have to start with the operational program that is ongoing, we must consider delivery of health services as the number one problem, population second, and environmental quality number three.

A Population Institute of some very visible structure must be our ultimate goal. However, this can not happen over night. Dr. Egeberg stressed this point several times during the discussion. He felt that for starters we we needed more basic research within NIH. We need increased education throughout our institutions on the whole range of family planning, fertility, maternal care, and infant care. Also, Dr. Egeberg feels that there should be a Deputy Assistant Secretary to oversee the entire family planning effort.

Dr. Egeberg feels that the biggest job right now is to give the program visibility. The Secretary has legislation of this effect over at the Bureau of the Budget for approval.

However, without a good service delivery system, these programs will not succeed. More cooperation with volunteer organizations is need. It is time for a rallying point.

There are five million women who want family planning services. We must reach these women. The middle class can be depended upon to take care of itself. This it is doing on an expanded basis. But, among the poor, we just have not had the money or the facilities to really campaign on this. A good first goal would be to satisfy those who want it and do not know how to go about getting the help.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN DIGNITY AND PATRIOTISM

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the turmoil, dissent, protest, disruption, and civil disobedience of the past years, few persons have addressed themselves to the true meaning of patriotism and its ability to help us understand our dreams and ideals and to realize what this Nation stands for. Last month, Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., outlined to Rockford students his understanding of the relationship between human dignity and patriotism. On Thursday, October 9, the Christian Science Monitor carried excerpts from his remarks. I take pleasure in enclosing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hopes that it will provide some understanding of ourselves, our dreams, and our future:

A man without aspirations is not a whole man. A society without a shared and cherished vision of what might be is a desolate society, one lacking in vitality and cohesiveness.

In the Godkin Lectures at Harvard University last March, John W. Gardner asserted, "A high level of morale is essential if a society is to succeed in the arduous tasks of renewal." A high level of morale is exactly what we do not have in the United States.

Some times back, an African student attending Rockford College spoke to a group on our campus. In the question period which followed, he was asked about his long-range plans. He replied that he wanted to get the best possible education so he could return to serve his people and his country. He said this with vigor and pride and conviction. A glance around the room showed admiration and approval on the part of everyone who heard this testimonial of commitment.

Compare, if you will, the probable reaction that the academic community would give to an American student who asserted that his great life's hope was one of patriotism, that he wanted to devote himself to serving his country and his people. I suspect that a large portion of intellectual America would be at the very least, embarrassed by such an outburst of patriotic sentiment, if not actually frightened by the fervor of such "unenlightened insularity." Love of country, that is our country, is now passé, or gauche, or intolerable in much of academia.

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

What is this? A double standard? Why is patriotism a glory when it operates in a developing nation which may be plagued with gross inequities and bloody struggles for power, and patriotism in an advanced nation a source of indifference, scorn or alarm?

First, I believe this is not an independent phenomenon, but rather one facet of a pervasive cynicism that has infected every aspect of our own culture. James B. Reston writes of the "new pessimism." He quotes Dr. Arthur F. Burns, a top adviser to President Nixon, as saying, "What worries me more than all these financial questions—I think a great sickness has gripped our society. I think a great many citizens have lost faith in our institutions."

In an essay in the Saturday Review several months ago, Archibald MacLeish writes of the loss of belief in man and his dignity.

The arts have deadened the soul, or rather they reflect a deadened soul, says Mr. MacLeish.

In times gone by, there were those who thought that great art should enable or exalt. Now, many prize that art which "tells it like it is," not like it could be. We are raising whole nations of young people whose steady musical diet has been the complaints and the protest and the focus on physical gratification of rock music and never even exposed to the exhilaration of Beethoven, or the tranquility of Mendelssohn, or the sheer joy of Mozart.

But philosophy, too, has contributed to what Mr. MacLeish sees as the flatness of life, the loss of a dimension in the world. Thomas Molnar's recent book entitled "Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time" provides a keenly perceptive analysis of this most influential philosophical writer. Mr. Molnar points to the basic Sartrian concept of "a morally neutral world where good and evil have been absorbed and made irrelevant."

Philosophy used to aspire to provide understanding so that man could climb toward the heights. Some large portion of current philosophers, having rejected the concepts of good and evil, of heights and depths, simply assert the flatness of life and analyze man's permanent state of nausea or despair, or else have abandoned the concern for man altogether and have wandered off into semantics.

With no hopes, no dreams, no vision of what could be, man becomes petty and quarrelsome and ruthless.

I think we have some choice in this matter. Man can free himself from this bondage if he chooses to. Our preoccupations are those which we permit to prevail.

As I have indicated, my central concern in this talk is the subject of patriotism. It is a challenge for a speaker to knock on this door in the house of intellect, for the mere word, patriotism, is sufficient to cause many scholars to slam the bolt and fix the latch chain. (And such a reaction is, itself, a sorry commentary on the family that dwells in the home of the open mind.)

Patriotism is not just blind love for a piece of property. Nor is it simply a mutual defense pact that remains in force only as long as there is an external threat. Patriotism, true patriotism, is an eternal and legitimate love affair with a set of principles, with a common vision of the good life.

Listen to the words of Mary Antin from her book "The Promised Land":

"So at last I was going to America! Really, really going at last! The boundaries burst. The arch of heaven soared."

And later in the same book:

"Spirit of all childhood! Forgive me for so lightly betraying a child's dream-secrets. I that smile so scoffingly today at the unsophisticated child that was myself, have I found any nobler thing in life than my own longing to be noble? Would I not rather be consumed by ambitions than live in stupid acceptance of my neighbor's opinion of me?"

Immortal aspirations were what attracted the floods of immigrants to this land, for they saw this land as a place where by public commitment, each person was assumed to have worth and granted equal rights under the law, and where differences of faith and opinion were welcomed.

Having grown up with these concepts as the conditions of our living, we cannot comprehend, we cannot register upon how revolutionary they were when first proclaimed,

nor do we realize how they contrast with what exists in the police-state nations, nor how they differ from contemporary democracies that carry still the deep-rooted psychological mind-set of their monarchical heritage.

The existence of a House of Lords and a House of Commons maintains the message that the common man, even risen to the highest position, remains a commoner. Through much of continental Europe, the peasant, whatever his talents and accomplishments, remains a peasant in his own eyes and in the mind of the people.

The centuries-deep acceptance of class and station continues to mock the concept of true dignity for each man. By contrast, in our country, with our inheritance of assumptions, the phrase "second-class citizen" very rightly stirs indignation, for with us, it is a contradiction in terms.

The most obvious and pervasive disillusionment with our country stems from the war in Vietnam. Here again, I suppose it is only fools who rush in, or even pussyfoot into this subject, since many academic folk have made up their minds on this matter and are far more interested in telling the other fellow than in listening to any other thoughts about this issue. Still, there are some aspects of this grief-bearing chapter that need further probing.

REASONS LACK PERSUASION

Has it occurred to you that there are scarcely four presidents in our history who were more dissimilar in their cultural, vocational, emotional, intellectual, and political attributes than Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon? And yet each of them when faced with the responsibilities of the presidency, and when made aware of the full range of information available to that office, has held to the course of supporting the South Vietnamese in their defense against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

On the other hand, there can be no question that all four administrations have grievously failed in a very important obligation. Although our presidents have seen fit to maintain our participation in this conflict, they have not conveyed to our people persuasive reasons to do so.

The vacuum created by this absence of public and persuasive justification has been filled by conjectures and claims and counterconjectures and counterclaims which have intensified to the point of hysteria, to the point that reason gives way before shrill nonthought.

The novel, "Catch-22," offers an illustration of what I consider shrill, polemical nonthought. This book has had a great vogue and has been one of the most powerful influences in persuading youth that war must be rejected above all. The protagonist of the book, an American airman named Youssarian serving in World War II, equates his commanding officer with the enemy, because, he says, they both want to get him killed. Since U.S. officers must send their troops on dangerous missions, Youssarian considers his superior officer as an effective enemy.

This is distorting history and misreading motives with a vengeance. The sad facts are that while conscientious leaders of France and England were trying every conceivable means to negotiate a reasonable peace with Hitler, his blitzkreigs were capturing the peoples of Czechoslovakia, Austria, and other lands. Finally, it was recognized that it was impossible to negotiate with Adolf Hitler. The only options were to fight or surrender.

And a great many people fought in that war in the belief that they were engaged in trying to prevent a fate worse than death. As the stories have been pieced together about such places as Belsen, Buchenwald, and Dachau, it is clear that to be the captives of a power that could conceive and operate such inhuman compounds was, indeed, a fate worse than death.

Next, some brief observations on the blacks and the whites. The black-power movement, as its name implies, is founded in a philosophy that perceives the central factor in human relationships to be that of who controls whom, of how much force—political force, economic force, armed force, force by fear—can be exerted by one man or one group upon another. This attitude, it seems to me, is analogous to the philosophical foundations of the governments which ours was established to counteract.

All governments of the past operated in circumstances where the people were permanently split between the privileged governors and the less privileged governed. And their political systems were drawn to exercise power to maintain this situation.

Power was the glue that kept the society together. Some had it, and nothing short of the assemblage of a greater counterpower could change that circumstance. The wars of succession down through the ages provide rueful and ever recurrent proof that governments which are organized upon the assumption that some are to have more power than others will always be subject to internal strife and bloodshed.

In the almost two centuries of the history of our nation, the only massive instance of citizens killing citizens was, of course, occasioned by this same question: Shall one group of people, with governmental cooperation, be maintained in a position superior to another group of people? This was the issue of the Civil War and it also is what has been at issue on all of the civil-rights questions ever since.

BOLD DECLARATION

The American Revolution was a bold and incredibly perceptive declaration of the nature and the rights of man and it launched an experimental government painstakingly designed to minimize the principal threats to those rights. One of the foremost threats was perceived to be the instinctive thrust of men to obtain and exercise power over other people. An elaborate mechanism was therefore established to disperse the powers of government. The separation of executive, legislative and judicial branches was instituted precisely for this reason.

Now I want to propose just one more large category of concept and activity which, I believe, is contributing to an attitude of hostility toward the American dream. It is the spreading preoccupation, particularly among the youth, with one's own comfort, one's own physical gratification, one's right to do whatever he pleases as long as he doesn't significantly harm someone else.

The government inaugurated in 1789 was committed to maximizing the dignity of all citizens. However, in attending to all aspects of maximizing human dignity, the whole structure of the government was posited upon the requirement that the citizens, every citizen, would have to make some very great sacrifices.

Against this necessity for sacrifice, the current insistence upon exercising one's own whims with a disregard for the sensitivities of others, the quickening readiness to pronounce one's own particular objectives as uniquely moral and therefore beyond the purview of publicly established limits—all of these attitudes and actions stand in hostility to what this country is all about, and contribute to the disenchantment with America.

We must, I think, recognize that there are two basic ways of conceiving of human life. In one view man is merely an animal of superior gifts and intelligence with no meaning to his existence beyond his own enjoyment, and his only obligation is to get everything he can for himself and let the chips fall where they may.

Given that view of life, there is no hope for peace anywhere, since each person is a predator preying upon everyone else with whatever wiles, strategems or force he can bring to bear. If one perceives man in this fashion, it will follow that groups will band together observing common limits when it works to their own advantage to do so, but all outsiders are fair game for any cruelties, deceptions or pilfering which can be devised.

The other view of man perceives a dignity—that is, a basic worthiness—in each person and perceives a transcendence in life that gives value to the sacrifices one makes that will benefit others, either now or in the future. Only in this view of life does the term, ideal, take on any meaning.

Of course, each man has his own vested interests, and each group its own vested interests, as does each nation and each philosophy. There will be the pushing and shoving and insults and crime, because man is human. But man also has a sublime spark which stirs the sacrifices of one for another, which gives rise to compassion and considerateness and friendship and rejoicing in another's good fortune.

HOPE IN HUMAN DIGNITY

To the extent that such consideration can take precedence over the most damaging aggressions of self-interest, man can inch forward in the centuries-long journey toward peace and brotherhood. There will not be any instant answers. International and national and personal cruelties cannot be banished at once by any means.

It seems to me that the long-range hope is to enlist all of mankind in pledging allegiance to human dignity and in devising the ground rules which will enable and encourage each man to express himself and seek his own goals [within the context of] the common good.

And that objective is exactly what the great American experiment is all about. It was and is a commitment, such as no other people has ever made, to devise a means of living together which would most greatly enhance the worth and most greatly involve the participation of each citizen. It was and is a reaching out for the stars.

For those who conceive man as having a soul, a dimension superior to and beyond his own gratification, truly the sky is the limit in the relevance and satisfactions of seeking to find how men can live together in greater justice and harmony and of trying to devote one's life to that end.

AMERICA'S VIEW OF INDIA AND NORTH VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Government of India is considering extending full diplomatic recognition to North Vietnam. This news disturbs me greatly.

While I would not presume to interfere in the internal policy decisions of the Indian Government, I can, I believe, offer some advice about how such a decision would be greeted by the American people.

As every Member of this body is aware, the war in Vietnam is an extremely sensitive issue, very much on the minds of most Americans. Its early resolution is something we all earnestly desire. I believe the American people would take a decidedly dim view of any neutral na-

tion which extends a hand to North Vietnam at this crucial time. Once this tragic war is concluded, such intense feeling almost certainly will subside.

Timing, in a very immediate sense, is also a consideration that should not be overlooked. Over the years the United States has sent some $9 billion in aid to India, and although some critics might disagree, most fair-minded observers hold that India has used it well.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is now involved in drafting the 1970 foreign aid request, I cannot help but be aware of the growing mood of disenchantment in Congress toward aid programs generally.

The emergence of a peaceful and stable India, in my view, is vital to the future of Asia and the world. The United States can and must assist in seeing that India achieves that goal. Recognition of North Vietnam by India at this time could only add further obstacles for those of us seeking to follow that path.

JERRY KOOSMAN—AN INSPIRATION TO YOUTH

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there was a big surprise party in Baltimore and in New York these past few days when the once lowly New York Mets of the National League defeated the highly regarded Baltimore Orioles of the American League for the baseball world series title.

While normally a fan of the American League, where our Minnesota Twins were the western division champions, I was pulling for the National League in this series because one of my constituents plays with the New York Mets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a small tribute to that constituent, a strong boy off one of our Sixth Congressional District farms, Jerry Koosman, fastball pitcher for the New York Mets and a two-game winner in the series.

A native of Appleton, Minn., where his family still farms, Jerry now spends the off season in Morris where he has his home.

Jerry Koosman is a typical Minnesota farm boy. Between his chores on the farm, he managed to find time to become a pretty fair country baseball player. He played high school and American Legion ball and then went into the Armed Forces.

His career with the New York Mets has been phenomenal. He was an instant success, a winner in his rookie year.

Although he won only 17 games this year, a slightly poorer record than in his rookie year, he came through with two big victories in the series and, for a .048 average hitter, did the almost impossible of hitting a two bagger in the final series game.

Mr. Speaker, this countryside boy is now the toast of our Nation's largest city. Where, but in America, is a success story such as this possible?

I salute Jerry Koosman. May he be an inspiration to every young man who aspires to a career in our great national pastime.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT—CRUCIAL ITEM ON THE NATION'S AGENDA

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, technology is often considered synonymous with progress. And, in fact, our rapid progress during the 20th century has been directly attributable to the technological advancements of this period.

There must come a time to assess the impact of such developments on society as a whole. Anyone who drives an automobile in Washington, D.C., must realize that traffic jams and air pollution are the byproducts of our transportation evolution. We hurry and hurry to produce more effective and efficient conveniences and conveyances, yet little or no thought is given to the effect of our "progress" on our environment.

However, there are a few farsighted individuals who have become concerned with the future impact of today's technology. One of these is the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO of Connecticut, who I am proud to say is a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am chairman. In a recent article by William Leavitt, "Technology Assessment—Crucial Item on the Nation's Agenda," which appears in the Air Force and Space Digest, great credit is given to Representative DADDARIO for his outstanding efforts in focusing attention on the need to assess the effect of our technological progress. He deserves a great deal of credit for his tenacity and farsightedness.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leavitt's article on this subject is most timely and thought provoking. I, therefore, commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT—CRUCIAL ITEM ON THE NATION'S AGENDA

(By William Leavitt)

America the beautiful? By now thoughtful citizens across the land, bombarded daily with newspaper stories and television programs lamenting the deterioration of our air and water and the approaching paralysis of our cities by auto traffic and the frequent collapse of public services we once took for granted, are asking how much longer we can utter that phrase with any degree of confidence.

The villain, an increasing number of social critics assert, is the technology that has brought higher standards of living to the majority of Americans and has provided mobility, instant communications, convenience foods, stylish ready-to-wear clothes, fancier medical care, and the host of other amenities that mark America in the last third of the twentieth century and that are, in one form or another, aspired to by less-developed cultures around the world.

To blame technology for the threat to the environment may seem unfair and even silly to the casual observer. It is fair to ask the antitechnologists if they would be willing to go back to the "good old days" of travel by horseback, of kerosene lamps, and deadly epidemics against which medicine was virtually powerless.

But dismissing the critics so lightly is no answer. There *are* increasing threats to our environment. The air *is* bad in our cities. The mobility that is so dear to us *has* begun to strangle our cities and has contributed to an unbelievable sprawl. And there is increasing and terrifying scientific evidence that the ecological cycle on which all of us must depend for our sustenance *is* being disturbed, perhaps irreversibly in some cases.

What is clearly needed is a new set of approaches to the utilization of technology, without which we cannot survive as a modern society but the *consequences* of which must be examined much more carefully than ever before. Happily, there are people in important positions facing up to this issue. And if they can make some headway in their campaign for new institutions to analyze the consequences of the utilization of technology, it is at least possible that, at long last, both the private and public sectors can be imbued with a new sense of responsibility in the employment of technology.

One man who nearly single-handedly, as a member of Congress, has been leading a quiet campaign for a number of years to develop such new institutions for what in the jargon is called "technology assessment," is Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat of Connecticut. He is a member of the House space committee and is the chairman of the space committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

Congressman Daddario, in his years as chairman of the subcommittee, has managed to spark the creation of an effective partnership between Congress and the scientific and engineering community. In tandem with Mr. Daddario, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering have been working at analyzing the implications of technology for society. In public seminars and by means of special studies of science and technology and their impact on public policy, the savants have finally begun to get some congressional and public attention. This is no mean achievement in a political environment in which the executive branch has for so long had primacy by virtue of its army of "experts" and the natural unity of the executive as compared to the pluralism of a Congress, made up of several hundred individuals of varying views, competences, and susceptibility to pressures.

The latest achievement of the Daddario subcommittee has been the enlistment of a distinguished panel of scientists and engineers, under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences and chaired by Harvey Brooks, Dean of Engineering at Harvard University. The panel has prepared a wide-ranging report (*Technology: Processes of Assessment and Choice*, available for 75¢ from the Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402) on possible approaches to the creation of some kind of mechanism or mechanisms within the federal government that would have the job of analyzing *in advance* the implications to society of implementing currently available technology or of proceeding along technological paths which seem tempting now but which, if they were examined closely in terms of potentially harmful effects, might seem far less desirable.

In 150-odd pages, the authors of the report trace, philosophically and by way of specific example, the mistakes of the past—the era we have already lived through—during which commercial advantage and often an uncaring fascination with technology for its own sake have ruled policymaking or, put another way, made for virtually no policy. As an example of failures of imagination and the difficulty of long-term prediction of social and environmental effects of proliferative technology, the panel notes, on the sub-

ject of the ubiquitous automobile, that "to predict that such vehicles would chemically pollute the atmosphere more than vehicles driven by steam or electricity would have been simple, [but] to predict that the automobile (of which there were four in the United States in 1895 and some 80,000,000 in 1968) would become the chief source of urban air pollution would have been far more difficult."

As to important peripheral effects, who would have guessed, the panel asks, even twenty-five years ago that one of the main causes of the logjam in our courts would be the enormous number of damage suits by one citizen against another, all growing out of auto accidents?

And the auto is not the only villain. Any number of other kinds of hardware and their supporting systems, the panel points out, have proliferated to awe-inspiring proportions, as have their societal side effects. For that matter, how many people twenty-five years ago could have predicted the pervasiveness of television and the frequent "mind-pollution" of the medium? In its way, TV may be even more dangerous than auto fumes.

The National Academy panel acknowledges but is at least a little hopeful about the commercial-political problems of technological assessment. "Comprehensive efforts to assess the consequences of a technology can often be effective," the panelists note, "even if they are delayed until the initial stages of research and development have been completed and the technology is at the threshold of commercial introduction. So long as one does not wait until very substantial interests have vested in a particular mode of application, one still has a reasonable opportunity to influence the eventual outcome by a careful examination of alternative possibilities and their implications. Recent withdrawals of defective cars by automobile manufacturers demonstrate how public opinion and the threat of possible regulation or legal liability can modify corporate behavior far beyond the early stages of development."

The panelists, throughout their report, dwell on the crucial need for better technology-assessment mechanisms within government on the one hand, while at the same time examining the built-in conflicts of interest created by the present system. They cite the problems posed by the existence of federal agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Department of Transportation, among others, where the prime purpose is necessarily the promotion of a particular set of technologies. Clearly, there are limitations to the degree of detachment such agencies can exercise in their analysis of the social implications of their own technologies. In a different way, the regulatory agencies of government suffer from limitations in that they are often overly sympathetic to the industries they regulate or in other situations unimaginatively rigid in their regulation. This latter fact sometimes prevents the introduction of new technology that might serve the public not only more economically but also with less deleterious effects. The problems are endless.

But, the panel declares, the fact that they are endless and so complex does not obviate the need for the new technology-assessment institutions.

Such new institutions, watchdogs, and analyzers "should operate," the panel urges, "at a strategic level in the political process, close to both the legislative and executive branches, in order to attract the most competent and imaginative personnel available and to enhance the quality of governmental response to the problems and opportunities of technological development."

These are more than words. What the Academy panelists are saying is that wherever in the federal government such new institutions or agencies might be located—and there are strong arguments for having parallel structures in both the executive and legislative branches—they should have real prestige and influence across the government spectrum. They should most certainly have access to and the support of the President, whose role as chief decision-maker is so crucial to the tone of his entire administration and its technological commitments.

"The primary effort [of any new technology-assessment mechanism or set of mechanisms] would be," the Academy panel suggests, "to project social and environmental effects in the most comprehensive terms possible, with particular attention to dimensions of impact and options for policy that other assessments of the [technological] area have failed to explore fully."

A crucial role of such a new outfit or outfits would be to provide a focus for hitherto unrepresented citizens or citizen groups who up to now have been factored out of technologically oriented decisions, either because they have not known what was up in time to object to, or, conversely, to argue in favor of particular technological proposals. In too many cases, people or groups who ought to be heard have simply not had the money to organize themselves into effective lobbies. There needs to be a place for ombudsmanship or public advocacy for citizens and groups with legitimate gripes about public policy in the field of technology.

The Academy panelists offer a long list of assignments for the new watchdog outfit or outfits: the kind of ombudsmanship alluded to in the previous paragraph; the sponsorship of basic research on technology assessment itself; the review of technology assessment being performed by other government agencies; and the maintenance of an information center on technology assessment "which would in time become a primary source of critical data with respect to pertinent activities carried on in government, in the universities, and in other organizations."

The Academy panel also proposes that the new technology-assessment organization or organizations issue an annual report that would summarize its efforts and "seek to develop a framework for public discussion of . . . issues and . . . seek to publicize matters relevant to technology assessment that seem unlikely to receive adequate public attention through other channels."

Perhaps the most important function of such a public report would be to suggest priorities "as to the most pressing (technological) problems and the most promising opportunities in technological assessment."

Priorities would reflect such factors as urgency of technological issues with respect to the degree to which irreversible consequences could be expected from postponement of decisions or the imminence of large commitments of monies and resources to particular technological proposals.

Also, because of the importance of congressional and presidential understanding of and attention to technological policy issues, a major function of the new mechanism or mechanisms would be, in the view of the Academy panelists, to prepare in-house policy papers "recommending specific actions to the Congress, the President, executive agencies, (and) administrative bodies."

The Academy panel explores a number of ways such new technology-assessment institutions could be organized, ranging from a special staff to be added to the existing presidential Office of Science and Technology to a new and well-staffed Joint Committee of Congress on Technology Assessment. The panel even considered something along the lines of the quasi-independent Federal Reserve Board. Each approach has its promise and its pitfalls.

But, withal, the question is not so much exactly where in the government such a new organization or organizations should be located as it is of making sure that the new institutions have competence, detachment, and significant influence on the decisionmakers. The military is not left out. The panel acknowledges the need for security and military strength. But at the same time the panel urges that in order for military-based technology to be properly introduced into the civilian environment, some reasonable extension of the "need-to-know" concept be made so that more useful and reasoned criticism can be fed in from the outside when military-technology questions are being decided upon.

"Our study," the Academy panelists report, "has revealed that existing mechanisms, whether they involve government agencies, private industries, or professional groups, possess intrinsic limitations, some structural and others psychological, that leave serious gaps in the spectrum of processes that assess and direct the development of technology in our society.

"In the formulation of issues for assessment and in the attributions of value to alternative outcomes, those processes too often ignore the broader social and environmental contexts in which their effects are felt. In the calculation of costs and benefits, they ascribe too little significance to the preservation of future options. They give too little attention and support to research and monitoring programs calculated to minimize technological surprise and to deal more rationally with the burdens of uncertainty. They frequently reflect the views, interests, enthusiasms, and biases of unduly narrow constituencies and create insufficient opportunities for meaningful public participation in choices having major consequences."

A collection of all-powerful wise men of science to decide what technological choices we should make as a nation is not at all what the Academy panel has in mind.

"We do not contemplate or forsee in the future a highly centralized process of technological evaluation, even for the areas of technology that are largely dependent on federal programs and policies," the panelists assert. "Such centralization would be not only unworkable but unwise, politically, unacceptable, and extremely dangerous."

The panel urges, rather, the creation of "a constellation of organizations, with components located strategically within both [legislative and executive] branches, that can create a focus and a forum for responsible technology-assessment activities throughout government and the private sector."

Such organizations, it is advanced, should be clearly separated from "any responsibility for promoting or regulating technological applications," so that detachment and ombudsmanship roles can be played effectively.

The urgency of the requirement for such new institutions is underscored by the Academy panel report's final words:

"The future of technology holds great promise for mankind if greater thought and effort are devoted to its development. [But,] if society persists in its present course, the future holds great peril, whether from the uncontrolled effects of technology itself or from an unreasoned political reaction against all technological innovation."

As we prepare for a second manned landing on the moon, what the Academy is trying to tell Congress about affairs on earth is something the rest of us should be thinking about.

PFC. NATHANIEL BUSH DIES IN WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Nathaniel Bush, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in

Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PFC. NATHANIEL BUSH DIES IN WAR; WAS DUNBAR ATHLETE

Another Baltimore soldier has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Pentagon reported yesterday.

Army PFC Nathaniel Bush, 22, of 5119 Queensberry avenue, was killed October 2 when his combat patrol was ambushed in the city of Tay Ninh, 70 miles northwest of Saigon.

Drafted last December, Private Bush was sent to Vietnam four months ago as an infantryman with the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile).

A native of Baltimore, he graduated from Dunbar High School in 1966. Private Bush was on the Dunbar basketball and tennis teams and in his spare time worked on old cars.

Private Bush was buried yesterday in National Cemetery after a ceremony at the Waters A.M.E. Church.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Gladys C. Bush; two brothers, Hollis, L. Bush and Bradley L. Bush; and two sisters, Mrs. Lillie M. Watkins, and Mrs. Carol L. Cofield, all of Baltimore.

FROM HERE TO OBLIVION?

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the October 1969 issue of Field & Stream carried an excellent article by Michael Frome, entitled "From Here to Oblivion?" So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of Mr. Frome's provocative views, I insert the text of his article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FROM HERE TO OBLIVION?

The question before the house, and not only the House but the Senate as well, and the President and his Cabinet too, is how to get the reins on a headstrong, runaway national environment and turn it in the right direction before it goes completely, everlastingly, irreversibly haywire.

The answer may be difficult to come by, but the facts of the case are now clearly known. I hear them stated again and again in sundry Washington quarters. The nation is always catching up with crises after the damage is done, they say, whether from pesticides, pollution, oil slicks, or other abuses of the once beautiful earth God bestowed upon us. Unless we can get out front, with long-range plans, including firm restraints and disciplines over industrial production, resource use, and human population growth, then the country will prove unworthy of its natural blessings; it will pass the point of no return on the course of ecological disaster before we know it.

There is no doubt of a growing sense of awareness and concern. One gets the feeling of it in contacts with some quarters of the Nixon Administration. An appreciable number of Congressmen of both parties, especially among the young members, are eager to get going with constructive legislative action. Even spokesmen of large corporations in Washington are reporting on the establishment of "environmental control committees" within their firms. These signs are all to the good.

Unfortunately, we are still falling behind in the race with the environment. The clean air and clear water calamities are worsening, not easing, because of the niggardly appropriation of funds and weakness of Federal regulations. Congress as a whole persists in weighing the desires of the special economic interests above the needs of the people, and of survival. It is little wonder that we are about to permit the unleashing of a whole new generation of supertankers on the spurious grounds of "economy" without reckoning the ultimate cost to society of potential superdisasters many times larger than the *Torrey Canyon* or Santa Barbara.

Besides which, no force on earth can command the whole Federal Government to "Go save the environment," and expect it to be done. At least eleven executive departments and sixteen independent agencies are involved in environmental programs, but too many are self-propelled and inbred, working at bureaucratic cross-purposes with each other, tied to powerful economic constituencies which lobby for expanding budgets. At best, personnel are limited in perspective by the tunnel vision of their specialized training. As Ralph McMullan, the Director of Natural Resources in Michigan and an outstanding state leader, declared in recent testimony before a Congressional Committee, "The air pollution specialist who thinks that replacing the soot-throwing, fossil-fueled electric generating plant with a nuclear-powered monster is going to eliminate environmental contamination has his head in the sand. He is forgetting that thousands of cubic feet per minute of hot water discharge isn't exactly a minor environmental problem."

Nevertheless, the President has taken promising steps toward charting a unified new course. His establishment of an Environmental Quality Council, composed of himself, the Vice President, and six Cabinet members, marks a milestone in Federal attitudes toward natural resources. For the first time, at the highest level, the executive departments will have the means for developing and coordinating a comprehensive and continuing effort. Certainly the President's participation as chairman adds a new dimension and sharpens the focus of his Cabinet members on the issues.

Functions assigned to the Council in the President's executive order include the assessment of new and changing technologies for their potential effects on the environment; encouragement of timely public disclosure by all levels of Government and by private parties of plans that would affect the quality of environment, and stimulation of public and private participation in programs and activities to protect against pollution of the nation's air, water and land, and its living resources.

Mr. Nixon has a long way to go to prove himself a conservation President. He must back these words with strong medicine on specific issues and go to Congress for money to fund critical programs like the Clean Water Restoration Act, even though it may mean cutting another billion dollars of fat from the Pentagon budget. He must ask members of the Environmental Quality Council: "Shall we look back at what we have accomplished, or at what we have talked about?"

Still, the Administration gives reason for hope. For example, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe came through by establishing a new office in his department to coordinate environmental problems, headed by the former mayor of Seattle, J. D. Braman; and, better yet, by backing its recommendation to deny Federal funds for the proposed New Orleans expressway because it would impair the quality of the historic French Quarter. This is the more remarkable considering Mr. Volpe's background in private contracting, serving then as a tried and proven member of the highway lobby, and that he is surrounded now by a crowd in the Bureau of Public Roads used to having its way. But his decision opened the path for rescuing parklands threatened by roads in Memphis, San Antonio, in the middle of the Potomac River outside of the nation's capital, and for yet aborting the Everglades jetport in Florida before that ugly monster is born.

The President himself came through in his message to Congress on July 18 in which he recommended establishing a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future specifically to avert an over-impact on natural resources and the quality environment. "Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself," Mr. Nixon declared. "Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered. The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population."

These momentous issues are much before both houses of Congress. If I am not mistaken, more than forty bills were introduced early in this session to create a national environmental council in one form or another, and one bill alone carried the names of forty sponsors. I believe a lot of this action was triggered by the persistence of Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, who came to Washington a few years ago as a proven conservation governor of Wisconsin with new ideas about the need of ecological research and surveys. Then last year Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington State, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, took the lead by conducting an earnest discussion program involving Cabinet members, Congressmen and chosen outsiders, which led to his "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

The Jackson Bill has already been approved by the Senate; it varies in some ways with those bills in the House, but essentially they would all require Congress and every Federal agency to fully demonstrate ecological responsibility and would also establish a board of environmental advisers to evaluate and criticize the work of the agencies and to advise the President. "In both Federal and state governments, we have often indulged ourselves in the illusion that we are doing a grand job, but the facts don't support it," Senator Jackson told his colleagues. "Our responses have been too narrow, too limited, and too specialized. We have established programs without clear enough perception of objectives and goals."

During the recent summer, two progressive subcommittees of the House conducted hearings on environmental bills, providing a forum for warnings by scientists, citizen organizations, and public officials on the current ecological collision course. Representative John Dingell, of Michigan, noted that the basic jurisdiction of the subcommittee over which he presides relates to fisheries and wildlife. "However," he declared, "we can no longer hide from the fact that fish and wildlife are affected adversely by many other factors, including air pollution, water pollution, and the increasing misuse of pesticides. We must consider the interrelationships of these problems in formulating legislative policy." On this basis he introduced an amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act that would establish a Council on Environmental Quality in the office of the President, and then fought hard to get action on it.

The other environmental hearings were held on a bill before the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, a group that has not hesitated to tackle tough and broad-gauged issues. Representative Henry S. Reuss, the chairman, and his colleagues have also conducted hearings on the dangers of open-air testing of chemical poisons and on pollution and extensive fill-

ing of San Francisco Bay (as part of an intensive investigation into destruction of estuaries and waterways), and the last time I looked they were readying for new hearings on population problems. They courageously blocked a smelly landfill scheme on the Potomac River; criticized the Navy as the worst pesticide polluter in the Potomac Basin; and succeeded in getting the Interior Department to deny intrusive rights-of-way across Indian lands. The Democratic chairman has been blessed with the bipartisan cooperation of three energetic young Republicans—Gilbert Gude, of Maryland, Guy Vander Jagt, of Michigan, and Paul McCloskey, of California—all of whom have been pushing worthy conservation projects of their own. The latter, in fact, had fifteen interns in Washington during the summer studying national land-use policy and population problems.

The Republicans in the House have a Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, and the Democratic Study Group (an informal alliance of the young-in-spirit) has a Task Force on Natural Resources and the Environment. Representative Richard Ottinger, of New York, has gone further by forming an Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment, composed of 119 members of both houses; through the nongovernmental offices of the Environmental Clearinghouse, they exchange communications with leading scientists and conservationists.

But not all of Congress is tuned in. Although young members are ready for action, the leadership of both parties, in both houses, skirts the issues and continues to miss the big picture. The little done for the conservation cause in recent years is like a bone thrown to the dogs; it demonstrates the scope of the backlog of inaction piled up by Congresses, Democratic and Republican alike, for thirty years.

This is illustrated in the recent House Appropriations Committee report on the budget of the Interior Department and related agencies. After lamenting that inadequate attention is being given to conservation of natural resources, the committee proceeded to allocate less than one and a half percent of the total Federal budget for this purpose and sought to place the blame on the executive department. It specifically deleted funds for the President's Environmental Quality for Council, charging it to be a patchwork approach, "little better than nothing"—which is precisely how one might interpret the Appropriations Committee's actions and attitude on these issues.

The day of lip service is done. The people must have an accounting of the management of our little biosphere. No Federal agency can be exempt from scrutiny, for the opportunity to wreak lasting damage is now much too great. I fear the course of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is scheduled this fall to explode a massive "calibration shot" in the Aleutians as the prelude to bigger and better things, climaxing in the "full yield final device." Not only here but in other operations AEC is playing a dangerous game. There is no time to lose in getting a firm public fix on H-bombs, germ warfare, pesticides, and the rest of the deadly threats to the environment. Or the question of saving it will become purely academic.

LET US NOT DESTROY THE PRESIDENCY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there is so much discussion taking place on the issue of the war in Vietnam, I think the following editorial that appeared in the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita, Kans., on October 13, 1969, is of great significance:

ACHESON MAKES SENSE ON THE PRESIDENCY

Perhaps it's too much to expect that the United States of 1969 or 1970 will have the patience and intelligence to follow the advice of Dean Acheson, who was Secretary of State under President Truman.

Mr. Acheson wishes the country would stop trying to destroy its presidents. He pointed to the viciousness of attacks on President Nixon, which repeat the pattern of criticism of Lyndon B. Johnson.

"I think we're going to have a major constitutional crisis if we make a habit of destroying presidents," said Acheson. "We'll have the situation we had after the Civil War when the presidency practically disappeared—from Andrew Jackson to McKinley."

This country must have a chief executive who will make decisions and carry them out. Otherwise it will dissolve into anarchy. Many Americans don't understand this basic fact of life. No President can possibly please everybody. And Americans increasingly are prone to turn upon the hapless chief executive and try to tear him to pieces the minute he doesn't please.

This does no good. It hampers the man in his work. Either he becomes more obstinate in pursuing his own course because he can see that much of the criticism reaches the point of irrationality; or he becomes so confused by the whirlwind of criticism that he cannot make good decisions.

Anti-authoritarianism has always been a facet of American character, but it wasn't until the administration of Lyndon Johnson that anti-presidential criticism reached such heights that the President no longer could appear in public. If criticism of Nixon continues, he'll be in the same sorry predicament.

No executive—be it college president, mayor, or the father in the home—can keep things running smoothly when subjected to constant irrational and vindictive opposition and criticism.

It's time America learned to quit destroying its presidents. Many a country which fell into such vicious anti-authoritarianism has ended with the worst authoritarian of all—a dictator, for only a dictator can rule an unruly mob.

THE NEED FOR A MARITIME PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you have often heard me speak of our need for a new, efficient maritime program. Again, I will remind my colleagues of the complete lack of order and innovation in shipbuilding and transporting.

No nation has ever stayed a world power without a competent, productive merchant marine. Yet, we are almost totally dependent on other countries for our ocean transport. This not only loses billions of dollars for the United States every year in payment for freight carried, wages lost to American citizens, and taxes lost from large corporations that own the ships, but also endangers American cargoes and crews since many foreign builders do not comply with our safety standards. What is worse, we are insuring that the future will be the same, since we are not encouraging skilled manpower in this field.

In relatively peaceful times, the inconvenience of not having a strong merchant marine of our own may not be obvious. However, in emergencies, it is evident that our supply of ships and needed cargoes will be dominated by the whims of other countries. This, of course, could cut us off from many desired products.

The first step to remedy this situation would be to improve our shipbuilding efforts. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, before a summer seminar on shipbuilding at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, stated that our shipyards have the ability to produce the needed ships, but the inconsistencies and fluctuations in our national policy stops all improvements in this field. There is a definite lack of order and aim in our present program. It seems as if no one in the administration is certain of what should be done. This uncertainty leads to confusion, and, thus, nothing is being accomplished. While we, Americans, are dropping behind in this field, other countries, realizing the importance, are forging ahead and have more than caught up to our once "first rate" sea program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Hood's remarks to my colleagues:

THE NEED FOR A MARITIME PROGRAM

(By Edwin M. Hood)

It is a pleasure to be among such a gathering of experts on shipbuilding and related disciplines. You know far better than I that the technology of ship construction has been steadily advancing throughout the world. You know as well as I that from a purely technical standpoint, the opportunities for further advancement are infinite. In the years ahead, you and your counterparts elsewhere will have a substantial role in the application of technology to the construction of needed ships at lowest possible costs and in keeping with reasonable delivery schedules.

The technological advances, to which I refer, are found and will be found, in shipyards large and small—old and new. They are not limited by geographical boundaries; no one has a monopoly on ideas or ingenuity, and few, if any, technological leads are ever held for long. But, it seems to me that the potentials for continually expanding gains in shipbuilding technology can be circumscribed by one very definite consideration—national purpose. This comment, I am sure, has meaning to all in this audience whether they come from the United States or abroad.

The affairs of government affect technology just as do the influences of the market place. It can be argued which takes precedence—government or economics—but, in this country, shipbuilding is, and has been, very much a pawn on the chessboard of governmental policy making. Ups and downs, starts and stops, backing and filling, in the past two decades, can be traced to the vagaries of national policy pertaining to U.S. sufficiency on the oceans.

Levels of ship construction, in that period, have failed to offset the impediments of age which have plagued our naval fleet and merchant marine simultaneously. This situation results from the continued reliance on vessels built during World War II: nearly two-thirds of the active naval fleet and three-quarters of the active American-flag merchant marine are today composed of ships 20 years of age or older.

Because of these deficiencies, it has variously concluded that the strategic, foreign policy and merchantile interests of the

United States have been inhibited: not fully exploited. Statistics pertaining to the relative balance of ocean strength between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as those portraying the steady decline, by volume, in the carriage of U.S. commerce in American flag bottoms, lend credibility to such a conclusion.

With a transfer in the reins of government such as has taken place in Washington during the past seven months, there is expectation that a change—something different from the past—will develop. President Nixon has appointed experienced and competent people to high posts which bear, either directly or indirectly, on the shaping of national purpose and the formulation of national policy affecting shipbuilding. Among these should most surely be included Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee, Under Secretary of Commerce Rocco C. Siciliano, Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson, Helen Delich Bentley as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, and others. At The White House, too, unlike in days gone by, there are those who are genuinely interested in the improving posture and strength of the United States on the oceans.

But, to bring order out of what has heretofore been a vast array of disorder, these officials in the Executive Agencies—and the Congress as well—have no easy task. Since shipbuilding has long been regarded as the "nub" of the nation's sea power problem, the present frame of mind of the shipbuilding industry illustrates my point.

The principal shipyards of the United States remain confident and optimistic about their ability to produce needed ships—both naval and merchant—to assure a continuity of U.S. sea power. They are, however, concerned by the lingering absence of a national policy to encourage stability in the industry and to produce the kind of procurement environment necessary to marshal the combined capabilities of American shipyards effectively and efficiently. This situation derives from factors and influences beyond the control of the shipbuilding industry.

It is becoming increasingly evident that if the nation's shipyard capabilities, resources and potentials are to be utilized in an optimum manner, uncertainty and confusion must be quickly replaced, to the maximum degree possible, by rational direction and reasonable order.

At this very moment, there is uncertainty as to the dimensions of the naval shipbuilding program next year and in succeeding years.

There is uncertainty as to the dimensions of the Nixon Administration's much-awaited maritime program for the next five to eight years.

There is uncertainty as to whether the funds needed to correct the high degree of physical obsolescence in the U.S. Navy and the American Merchant Marine will survive present budgetary stringencies.

There is uncertainty as to whether new appropriations for merchant shipbuilding under Federal auspices in the present Fiscal Year will be zero, $15.9 million, $145 million or $200 million.

There is uncertainty as to whether 100,000 dwt., 250,000 dwt. or some other size tankers—smaller or larger—will be required in the 1970–1975 period to transport oil from the North Slope of Alaska to U.S. refineries, the location or locations of which have yet to be decided.

There is uncertainty as to whether these new tanker routes will involve 20, 40 or more tankers, and as to when construction contracts will be placed with the shipyards.

There is further uncertainty as to whether a pipeline or oceangoing tankers will, in the final analysis, be employed to move oil from Alaska to the "lower 48" states.

There is uncertainty as to whether one, three or more shipyards will share in the construction of "more than 30" advanced design destroyers (DD–963 formerly DX) for the U.S. Navy; meanwhile at least three shipyards are tentatively reserving their capabilities pending award of a production contract (or contracts) in November—4 months hence—at the earliest.

There is uncertainty as to the reality and scope of various shipbuilding efforts now under consideration by commercial shipping lines.

There is uncertainty as to the availability of skilled manpower.

There is uncertainty as to whether cost-additive contract conditions and specifications will at long last be eliminated as a step toward the creation of a more effective procurement environment.

There is uncertainty as to whether naval and merchant shipbuilding requirements—both of substantial magnitude—will be considered and treated on a coordinated basis so that the nation's productive capacity will be used efficiently and strengthened for the future.

Separately and jointly, consciously or subconsciously, these uncertain circumstances are constraining actions of individual shipyards. Confusion has surely been compounded. Restoration of order lies not so much in the existing or latent capabilities of the industry to construct ships or to respond to particular requests for bids but in the urgency of a prompt and concise statement of purpose and policy by the Nixon Administration.

It might therefore be useful and timely to attempt to define national purpose in the context of shipbuilding.

By his 1968 campaign statements, President Nixon has indicated that the United States should, and must, be a first-rate sea power with a naval fleet second to none and a modern maritime fleet capable of carrying 30 percent of U.S. exports and imports by volume, instead of approximately 6 percent as at present. Presumably, the national purpose in terms of ocean strength for the next four years—or possibly the next eight years—will be dedicated to the assurance of the availability of naval and merchant ships in adequate numbers and appropriate quality for commerce, a favorable balance of payments, and support of our country's overseas interests and commitments.

That ships are essential to our national security and our commercial interests is a proven historical fact. That our Navy must be adequate to our global commitments should be self-evident. That our merchant marine must be adequate to our standing as the world's most powerful and leading trading nation should be self-evident. That our shipyards must be among the best in the world there should be little question.

However, the President's statements leave unclear the national purpose with respect to modern, efficient shipbuilding and ship repairing facilities as a basic foundation block of first-rate sea power. A similar void persisted in the enunciation of priorities by previous Administrations.

From a purely military standpoint, the Department of Defense has consistently held that a shipbuilding capability is essential to the national interest. In like manner, the military establishment has consistently supported the concept that a combined government-owned and commercially-owned ship repairing capability is essential to maintain the naval fleet in a constant state of readiness. These justifications derive from the valid—and time-proven—postulates that, in times of emergency, in an ever-changing geopolitical world, shipyard facilities on foreign soil will not necessarily be available. These justifications have thus gained virtually absolute acceptance.

As to a shipyard capability to support merchant shipping, a controversy has frequently developed. The Congress, the labor movement, and others, have held that the criteria for justification should be no less than for naval ships. Shipbuilders and shipowners alike have argued, with the logic of past experience favoring them, that a ship repairing capability is not possible without a shipbuilding capability. Generally speaking, the latter precedes the former.

The relationship of shipyards, especially those geared to the construction of merchant vessels, to the national interest has an even more exacting significance when viewed from the perspective of contributions to the nation's economic strength.

For example, many merchant ships are today registered under the flags of Panama, Honduras and Liberia, but it could never be claimed that these countries are maritime powers, let alone sea powers, for they lack a supporting maritime industrial base, including shipyards. Though providing accommodations to international economics to citizens of other countries at minimal fees, these small nations leave to other powers the function of providing world order.

It is highly improbable that the Pan-Hon-Lib countries would ever come within the traditional definition of sea power:

. . . the ships nominally identified with them have no intimate association to their internal well-being,

. . . they have no particular economic strength to project into the oceans in times of peace, and no defense mobility to project in times of emergency, and

. . . shipyards, for them, are thus unnecessary.

On the other hand, any fair assessment of history leads to a conclusion that a balanced industrial maritime base is no less important an element of effective sea power than the naval and merchant fleets themselves. History also illustrates that the nation which builds the ships, carries the cargoes, and collects the revenues therefrom has generally been internationally powerful and economically affluent.

Japan has long held to the policy that programs to expand domestic shipping resources as well as export opportunities should be pursued for the specific purpose of promoting domestic shipbuilding as a function of national affluence. This policy has been formulated and executed with a degree of cooperation between government and shipyards which does not now exist on the same scale elsewhere in the world.

Accordingly, shipbuilding has become a substantial factor in Japan's national economy and balance of trade. Shipbuilding in Japan is regarded as a prestige industry. It is considered essential to the public good. The marketing of shipbuilding capabilities with considerable governmental stimulus, encouragement and support has been effectively developed to the point that Japanese shipyards today lead the balance of the world in the construction of merchant ships.

The Japanese cannot be totally wrong in their policies of emphasis on shipping and shipbuilding. Judging from their records of success, it would appear that they are very much on the right course. They are clearly assigning a high priority to this effort. They clearly possess the will to preserve and expand their own national and mercantile interests, as well as their own shipyards.

It is likewise clear that the Japanese understand another historical truth: a merchant marine and a maritime industrial base are the parents—not the offspring—of effective sea power.

Moreover, the national policy of Japan envisions that while capturing a steadily increasing share of the world shipbuilding market, all ships for the Japanese flag merchant marine will be constructed in Japanese shipyards. Over the last decade, not a single vessel for Japanese registry has been built outside of that country. This national purpose is in sharp contrast to the call for foreign construction of certain U.S. mer-

chant ships which has been voiced from time to time by government officials and others in the United States.

These same persons have frequently cited Russia's sometime practice of procuring merchant ships from shipyards of other countries as a justification for their position. But, in so doing, they have ignored or minimized a basic fact: the Soviet Union has been obliged to rely on alien shipyards because of insufficient domestic shipbuilding capacity to fulfill the demands of a 5-year merchant ship buildup.

More recently, however, Soviet leaders have revealed that this practice is to be reversed and soon discontinued. Three reasons are given:

To avoid the excessive commitments of foreign exchange which are involved.

Russian shipyards have been modernized and expanded, and must be operated at the greatest possible utilization, and

A high level of reliance on foreign yards is incompatible with the elevation of the Soviet Union to the status of a world maritime power.

The Soviets thus seem to recognize—and properly so—that a modern, efficient maritime industrial base, properly coordinated, is a fundamental ingredient of effective sea power.

It should be noted that the relative balance between U.S. and Russian strength at sea has altered significantly since the end of World War II. In the short span of 10 years, the Russians have perceptibly narrowed the margin of U.S. sea power superiority. The Soviet Navy is today second only to that of the United States, and the Soviet merchant marine will shortly be larger than the American maritime fleet in both numbers and tonnage.

All evidence points to a conclusion that Soviet Russia is mounting at sea a new challenge with which the United States will have to deal long after American troops are withdrawn from Vietnam. It would seem clear that the Russians have grasped the full meaning of sea power: the judicious allocation of production and financial resources to produce naval and merchant ships for the exploitation of economic, psychological and political objectives. By contrast, the Japanese, with strictures on the magnitude of their self-defense forces resulting from post World War II agreements, use the oceans exclusively for economic purposes.

The fixed national purpose with respect to shipbuilding which the Japanese and the Russians have seen fit to adopt and pursue in their own national interest might well serve to remind the United States of the basic truths of sea power. No similar national purpose, or declaration of national intentions, has been voiced in this country since the World War II days.

The function and adequacy of U.S. shipbuilding will therefore in large measure be determined by a variety of factors: (1) the ability of the Nixon Administration to establish and articulate a conceptual unity of purpose toward restoration of the United States as a first-rate sea power, (2) the ability of the Nixon Administration to dissipate lingering and momentary uncertainties, (3) the ability of the Nixon Administration to coordinate the substantial requirements for naval and merchant shipbulding so that the productive resources of the country will be effectively employed, and (4) the ability of the shipyard industry to respond to these substantial requirements. On the final point, I harbor no doubts or reservations. On the other three, only time will tell, but I for one stand optimistic.

HIGH AIR POLLUTION—HIGHER DEATH RATES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the declining quality of our environment constitutes a problem which merits the continuing attention of my colleagues.

While industrial and bacterial waste poisons our rivers, lakes, and streams, the pall of air pollution hangs heavy over city and countryside alike. The urban centers, however, have been most drastically tainted by the scourge of air-born pollutants.

Because of my distress about air contamination in our Nation's cities, I invite my colleagues' attention to a recent article which describes the probability that high air pollution areas of Chicago also have higher death rates than areas with lower pollution. The article by Donald M. Schwartz, which appeared in the September 17, 1969, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, follows:

DEATH RATE, AIR POLLUTION LINKED

(By Donald M. Schwartz)

A Stritch School of Medicine researcher has found that high air-pollution areas of Chicago have higher death rates than areas with lower pollution.

Prof. Julius Goldberg, in a report he will make to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, found, for example, that deaths of white males in high pollution areas averaged 1,949 per 100,000, while deaths among a comparable group in low pollution areas was 1,389 per 100,000.

Goldberg, in his work at the Stritch school, which is part of Loyola University, put together air pollution data collected at 20 stations around the city, census information on persons living in the affected areas and Board of Health death reports.

Goldberg is cautious about drawing conclusions from the results, but he observed: "When we look over deaths from all causes, there is a very decided decline in favor of low-pollution areas."

He said his findings parallel those in other cities.

Goldberg was interviewed in his office at the Stritch school, 2160 S. 1st, Maywood.

The first results, on death, are part of a continuing series of studies. Goldberg has embarked on an investigation of pollution and illness, for which he is trying to get the cooperation of families, of children attending nursery schools and day-care centers.

For the study already completed, 29 different causes of death are included, plus a 30th catch-all category.

The statistics for pneumonia show that for the moderate socio-economic group, deaths per 100,000 averaged 95 in the high pollution areas and roughly half that rate—or 46—in low pollution areas.

Goldberg said death totals are annual averages for the 1960–1962 period.

The Loyola professor noted that in many of the cause-of-death categories the decline in mortality rates from high to low pollution areas was more consistent in the moderate socio-economic group than in the high or low socio-economic groups.

Statistics for the low group are more erratic, Goldberg said, and the high socio-economic group appears to be much less affected by differing pollution exposures than the other two groups.

Goldberg observed, however, that simply living in the area of high or low pollution may not be the whole story—the affluent, for example may spend more time in air-conditioned rooms protected from surrounding pollution.

That is one reason why Goldberg wants to make further studies of social factors in the health effects of pollution.

The fact that the well-to-do are exposed to high pollution is shown graphically by a map on Goldberg's office wall. The map indicates that the highest of 20 pollution areas in the city begins at about Navy Pier and runs north to about Fullerton, covering N. Lake Shore, the Near North Side and Old Town.

A pollution area for purposes of the study was a circle with a radius extending 1¼ miles from a city air pollution collection station.

Pollution statistics were limited to particles suspended in the air, but Goldberg said figures for compounds of sulphur, such as sulphur dioxide, probably would be similar.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, October 20, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The fruit of the spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.—Ephesians 5: 9.

Our Father, who art in heaven, we wait upon Thee with receptive minds and responsive hearts that the uplift of Thy spirit can be ours as we face the beginning of a new week. May we take up the work of these days with courage and confidence knowing Thou art with us and believing Thou art endeavoring to lead us in great and good ways. Grant that what we do may fulfill Thy purposes for us, for our Nation, and for our world.

Deepen the minds of men in truth and justice and mercy that order may prevail, laws be obeyed, good will be followed and people learn to live together with reverence before Thee, with respect for each other, and with a real faith in our beloved country.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 16, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of hearings on Science and Strategies for National Security in the late 1970's by the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, and of additional copies thereof.

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