

whose hard work and vision have helped make possible the tremendous achievements Israel has made in such a short time.

One such leader is the current President of Israel and head of state, Mr. Zalman Shazar, who is today marking his 80th birthday. I wish to join with members of the American Jewish community who are honoring President Shazar on this occasion.

Mr. Shazar became Israel's third President in 1963. His position is largely

ceremonial, since the Prime Minister is actually the chief executive of the Government. However, in Mr. Shazar's case the office of President came after an active and history-making role in the founding and development of the new state.

Mr. Shazar was born in Russia and came to Palestine in 1924. He became editor of a major newspaper in Tel Aviv and was active in the Mapai Party headed by David Ben-Gurion. He wrote the Declaration of Independence for Israel

in 1948, and became the first Minister of Education in the new Government. He is well known both as a crusader for women's rights in Israel and as the father of the Israel law making education compulsory. As an avocation he has been a devoted scholar of the Bible.

I wish to extend to President Shazar of Israel my warm greetings on his 80th birthday anniversary, and I salute the many accomplishments of this man who now occupies a revered position in the State of Israel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 12, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph M. Champlin, associate director, Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, Washington, D.C., and Syracuse, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O God, give these men the help they need.

Make them—

Courageous: Speaking when this entails a risk.

Patient: Bearing with those who misunderstand or unjustly accuse.

Noble: Placing the common good over personal gain.

Wise: Weighing the needs of constituents with the welfare of our Nation.

Healthy: Coping with frantic schedules and unending pressure.

Firm: Standing alone, if necessary, for what is right and true.

Open: Willing to listen, learn, and change.

Flexible: Accepting what is possible and better, instead of desirable and best.

Laugh: At themselves and with others, to ease tension, heal wounds, keep perspective.

With such gifts, Lord, they may lead us to be truly free at last; to become a country of justice, a people at peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 6, 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 bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14030. An act to amend section 358a(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments.

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

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12307. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13018. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12307) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13018) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 329. An act for the relief of Dr. Paolo (Paul) Genoese Zerbi;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeier;

S. 823. An act to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information;

S. 1442. An act to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to control of outdoor advertising along Federal-aid highways, in order to authorize one or more pilot programs for the purpose of such section;

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and sub-

sequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising;

S. 1786. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Luisa Gorostegui de Dourron;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Dr. Leonardo M. Cabanilla;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernard Weston March;

S. 2363. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Andre L. Knoppert;

S. 2426. An act for the relief of Dr. Delsa Evangelina Estrada de Ferran;

S. 2481. An act for the relief of Dr. Farid M. Fuleihan; and

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to welcome to the U.S. Olympic delegations authorized by the International Olympic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-321, appointed Mr. TOWER to the National Commission on Consumer Finance in lieu of Mr. BROOKE, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to 67 Stat. 328 and 70 Stat. 966, appointed Mr. PACKWOOD to the Senate Office Building Commission in lieu of Mr. DIRKSEN, deceased.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 7, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on November 6, 1969, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agree to the Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11271) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS, Clerk.
By BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, November 6, 1969, he did on Friday, November 7, 1969,

sign the following enrolled bill and joint resolution of the House and enrolled bill of the Senate.

H.R. 11271. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal year 1970 to \$610,000,000.

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

AIR TRANSPORTATION—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-190)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., November 6, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Air transportation is a rapidly growing and vital part of the national economy. It is essential that we keep our air transportation system safe, economic and efficient. I have stressed many times my determination to take the steps necessary to maintain the safety and improve the effectiveness of the nation's air traffic control system.

The airport and airway development bill now moving through Congress will provide the revenues and the means for assuring that the facilities which support air transportation will keep pace with its growth. I strongly urge that the Congress approve this legislation promptly. As soon as it is enacted, including the new user charges, I will propose the additional appropriations for new and expanded programs for airways facilities and airports so that we can begin to meet air transportation needs of the 1970s.

Meanwhile, I am now proposing that we take a step toward meeting and anticipating the needs for additional air traffic controllers. These men and women carry much of the responsibility for facilitating the efficient and rapid flow of air traffic, and for preventing mid-air collisions of aircraft. The system requires many controllers, and it takes up to two years to train a beginner until he reaches journeyman status.

Accordingly, at the recommendation of the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Volpe, I ask that the Congress approve the addition of 1,000 more controller positions in the current fiscal year. These are in addition to the 2,800 positions already included in the Department of Transportation's budget estimates now being considered by the Appropriations Committees. Supporting documentation for this proposal will be supplied to the Committees by the Department.

Since the continuing resolution has held the operation of the Department of Transportation so far in the fiscal year to the fiscal year 1969 level, no additional appropri-

ations beyond the pending 1970 budget request will be required to support these additional 1,000 traffic controller positions.

I urgently request that the Congress approve this proposal.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

FATHER JOSEPH M. CHAMPLIN

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today that my good friend and truly a dedicated servant to God could be with us for the purpose of the opening prayer.

Mr. Speaker, Father Joseph M. Champlin was formerly assistant pastor of the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception in my hometown, Syracuse, N.Y., and most recently with the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy here in Washington, D.C. Certainly his invocation was thought provoking and inspiring to all men.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL'S ACCUSATION OF POLITICAL DECEPTION BY THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, 100 Members—50 Democrats and 50 Republicans—introduced a bipartisan resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the President of the United States in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam.

Since that time, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported this resolution with a favorable recommendation to the House, and the original 100 Members as of this hour have grown to some 225 cosponsors.

As one who has been extremely active in this matter, and as one who earnestly believes in the great importance of demonstrating bipartisan support for the President in delicate international negotiations of this kind, whoever the President may be, I was considerably upset by the account in this morning's Washington Post which paraphrased Attorney General John N. Mitchell as having said last night in Milwaukee "that political deception by the Johnson administration is the reason why so many Americans distrust the Federal Government." This article purports to quote the Attorney General as saying that there is a national "disease of cynicism" and blaming this on the Johnson administration.

I earnestly hope that the Attorney General was misquoted. I want to believe that he was. Such comments not only are thoroughly untrue and distinctly unfair, but in very bad taste and hurtful to the present occupant of the White House in his attempts to achieve a broad bipartisan showing of support for the efforts of his adminis-

tration in Vietnam. I hope the Attorney General will make clear that he was incorrectly paraphrased in this morning's Washington Post.

Bipartisanship is a two-way street. In vital matters of foreign policy, I intend to travel it responsibly. Others—and particularly those in the administration—should be conscious of their obligation to do so as well.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas on the initiative, the help, and the leadership that the gentleman has given in seeking to secure maximum bipartisan support for the resolution which the gentleman originally sponsored.

As the gentleman knows, I have been working with him, and I can report that as of a few minutes ago we have approximately 160 Members on our side of the aisle who have agreed to jointly sponsor this resolution. I applaud the efforts of the gentleman to get the Members on his side of the aisle to join with the Members on our side of the aisle in this bipartisan resolution.

I want the gentleman to know, as former President Johnson knows, that I strongly supported the President's objectives in Vietnam. I had some differences on the way we should implement or execute those objectives, but I want the gentleman to know that, speaking for myself, and I believe the President of the United States, that there has to be a bipartisan solution if we are going to be successful in Vietnam.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H.R. 12785, Senate Joint Resolution 121, and Senate bill 2000.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 474, COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 91-613)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recom-

mend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the procurement of goods, services and facilities by and for the executive branch of the Federal Government by—

(1) establishing policies, procedures, and practices which will require the Government to acquire goods, services, and facilities of the requisite quality and within the time needed at the lowest reasonable cost, utilizing competitive bidding to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) improving the quality, efficiency, economy, and performance of Government procurement organizations and personnel;

(3) avoiding or eliminating unnecessary overlapping or duplication of procurement and related activities;

(4) avoiding or eliminating unnecessary or redundant requirements placed on contractor and Federal procurement officials;

(5) identifying gaps, omissions, or inconsistencies in procurement laws, regulations, and directives and in other laws, regulations, and directives, relating to or affecting procurement;

(6) achieving greater uniformity and simplicity whenever appropriate, in procurement procedures;

(7) coordinating procurement policies and programs of the several departments and agencies;

(8) conforming procurement policies and programs, whenever appropriate, to other established Government policies and programs;

(9) minimizing possible disruptive effects of Government procurement on particular industries, areas, or occupations;

(10) improving understanding of Government procurement laws and policies within the Government and by organizations and individuals doing business with the Government;

(11) promoting fair dealing and equitable relationships among the parties in Government contracting; and

(12) otherwise promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Government procurement organizations and operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 2. To accomplish the policy set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Procurement (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members, consisting of (1) three members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate (who shall not be members of the same political party), and one from outside the Federal Government, (2) three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives (who shall not be members of the same political party), and one from outside the Federal Government, (3) five members appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and three from outside the Federal Government, and (4) the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) Any vacancies in the Commission shall

not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and the organizations by which procurement is accomplished to determine to what extent these facilitate the policy set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) Within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make a final report to the Congress of its findings and of its recommendations for changes in statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures designed to carry out the policy stated in section 1 of this Act. In the event the Congress is not in session at the end of such two-year period, the final report shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. The Commission may also make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 5. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or who are officers or employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the Comptroller General, shall receive no compensation for their services as members of the Commission, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses (or in the alternative, mileage for use of privately owned vehicles and a per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed the rates prescribed in sections 5702 and 5704 of title 5, United States Code), and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I, chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, or section 5731 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The members of the Commission appointed from outside the Federal Government shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing subsection.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) (1) The Commission, or at its direction any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such subcommittee or member. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman.

(2) In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection by any person who resides, is found, or transacts business within the jurisdiction of any district court of the United States, such court, upon application made by the Attorney General of the United States, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee or member thereof, there to pro-

duce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry. Any failure of any such person to obey any such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) The Commission is authorized to acquire directly from the head of any Federal department or agency information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and such personnel may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but no individual shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum rate authorized by the General Schedule. In addition, the Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

(d) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private organizations and educational institutions to carry out such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission determines are necessary in order to carry out its duties.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES AUTHORIZED TO AID COMMISSION

Sec. 7. Any department or agency of the Government is authorized to provide for the Commission such services as the Commission requests on such basis, reimbursable or otherwise, as may be agreed between the department or agency and the Chairman or Vice Chairman. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. One hundred and twenty days after the submission of the final report provided for in section 4 of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHET HOLIFIELD,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in

conference are noted below except for clerical corrections and incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees.

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION

The House bill provided for a Commission of 14 members of whom four were to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and of different political parties, and two from outside the Federal Government; four were to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, two from the House and of different political parties, and two from outside the Federal Government; and six were to be appointed by the President, three from the executive branch and three from outside the Federal Government.

The Senate amendment provided for a Commission of nine members, of whom two were to be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate of different parties; two were to be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House of different parties; and five were to be appointed by the President from persons who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government.

In addition, both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that the Comptroller General of the United States or his designee would be an ex officio member of the Commission.

The conference substitute provides for a 12-member Commission consisting of the Comptroller General; three members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and of different parties, and one from outside the Federal Government; three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, two from the House and of different parties, and one from outside the Federal Government; and five members appointed by the President, two from the executive branch and three from outside the Federal Government. In conformity with this provision of the conference substitute, the substitute also provides that a quorum of the Commission is seven members.

SUBPENA POWER

The House bill authorized the Commission to hold hearings and take testimony, but did not confer on the Commission the power to issue subpoenas. The Senate amendment contained an additional provision empowering the Commission for purposes of carrying out the provisions of the bill, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents. Subpoenas could be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman or any duly designated member, and could be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member. In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey such a subpoena by any person within the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States, such court, upon application made by the Attorney General of the United States, would have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee or member thereof, to produce evidence or to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry. Failure to obey any such a court order would be punished as a contempt of the court.

The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate amendment with clarifying changes (1) assuring that a subpoena will be issued by a member or subcommittee of the Commission only at the direction of the Commission, and (2) requiring subpoenas to be signed by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

CHET HOLIFIELD,

FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN,

FRANK HORTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last night I saw a program on WTOP-TV concerning the nomination of Judge Haynsworth. One advocate of the nomination was Clark Mollenhoff, a special assistant to President Nixon. Mr. Mollenhoff pulled no punches in his descriptions of columns and TV comments by Tom Braden and Frank Mankiewicz. Mr. Mollenhoff was a perfect example of a man who is sick and tired of tactics used by liberal columnists to discredit the character of a man just because they do not approve of his political philosophy.

These two new reporters on the Washington scene have attempted to use the techniques of reporting half-truths, taking facts out of context, and casting suspicion on Judge Haynsworth. The only factual complaint Mr. Braden and Mr. Mankiewicz have against Judge Haynsworth is the fact that he is considered a conservative and he is from the South. But since these are not valid reasons for keeping a man off the High Court these reporters have resorted to tactics that are considered unfair in most circles. I, for one, applaud Mr. Mollenhoff for calling the hand of these two reporters on live television last night.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT IN HIS EFFORTS TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) pointed out to us the importance of the bipartisan effort now being made in this House to show support for the President of the United States as he and his assistants seek diligently to find a just peace in Vietnam. I certainly subscribe to what the gentleman said on that occasion and the remarks made by the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

If we are to provide those who are negotiating for us with maximum strength, we must let it be known that there is a great deal of unity in this country in support of the President's effort.

The Communist propagandists make much of the fact—often distorting the facts indeed—that there is a great divisiveness here upon the question of war and peace in Vietnam. To the extent that we show unity and singleness of purpose, a great deal of that propaganda will be negated, and thus facilitate the ending of the war.

OCTOBER PARITY

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

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has released parity figures for October 1969, showing average parity at 74 percent—the same figure as September. This figure is 2 percent higher than the January parity figure of 72 percent but 2 percent lower than the June figure of 76 percent.

In accordance with my practice, Mr. Speaker, of inserting the farm parity figures for October 1969, along with January and September figures for comparison:

PARITY, OCTOBER 1969

[In percent]

Commodity	January	September	October
Cotton.....	41	41	45
Wheat.....	47	45	46
Corn.....	65	67	65
Butterfat.....	74	75	75
Milk.....	83	81	81
Wool.....	44	43	42
Barley.....	65	60	61
Flax.....	67	60	62
Oats.....	69	58	60
Sorghum.....	64	71	68
Beef.....	78	83	81
Chicken.....	67	71	66
Eggs.....	83	75	75
Hogs.....	74	96	93
Lambs.....	85	88	90
Turkey.....	65	66	69
Soybeans.....	70	63	61
Average.....	72	74	74

NO TRENCHES FOR MONUMENT AREA

(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, the next 12 months will see the Nation's Capital take its greatest transportation strides with the first subway construction and implementation of its freeway plans. Encouraging progress has been made by the District of Columbia government following the City Council's September decisionmaking. Previously approved plans have been dusted off and brought up to date, and in some instances old studies are reconsidered.

However, recently suggested plans of the District Highway Department for a possible surface expressway in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument cause some concern. Such a route, even in a depressed trench, would be destructive of the precious environment of this national shrine area. This route has previously been studied and rejected. It should be accorded no further attention today as it would inject a discordant note in the plans to establish a balanced transportation system harmonious with our Nation's Capital and our metropolitan area.

FIRING OF ERNEST FITZGERALD

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, most of us have heard about my good friend Ernest Fitzgerald who has been fired by the Air Force for tell-

ing a congressional committee the truth about the cost of the C-5A airplane.

Some of us expected some changes when the new administration took over regarding the practice of economy. But indifference to cost is apparently so deeply ingrained in the Government bureaucracy now that it makes little difference what party is in control of the executive branch.

This case is just one more example of the Government's attitude toward economy. It seems that if Mr. Fitzgerald had been a militant, an anarchist; if he had threatened to burn the Pentagon down or start a riot, we probably would have a job for him in a hurry, or a promotion, or more likely a handout. We do it all the time. Billions are being spent right now to bribe those who threaten us. We are sowing the seeds of our own destruction, doing it with taxpayers' money, and there is no end in sight.

I am really concerned about this situation. We cannot continue indefinitely to ask our constituents to pay ever higher prices while we ignore waste and corruption. What we need is an Ernest Fitzgerald in every agency of this Government looking for waste, exposing it, and eliminating it. We promised the taxpayers we would do this last year, Mr. Speaker. We must keep that promise.

Mr. Speaker, how can we continue to hire, retain, and promote incompetents, malcontents, militants, and those who denounce our Government and openly threaten to disrupt it, and at the same time fire loyal, outstanding, honest, and sincere career public servants such as Ernest Fitzgerald. This is indeed a strange situation. I fear we may have cause to regret it.

"LIGHT OF PEACE" DEMONSTRATION

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled for this weekend a so-called march on Washington on behalf of peace. The leftwing sympathizers who are the prime movers in this march pose the danger of it becoming violent. I propose that the silent majority of the American people, those who know the Vietnam problem, who are patriotic and loyal Americans, give their answer to this rally by "lighting up for peace" on November 14.

By turning on their porchlights on the evening of this march they can show that they are behind President Nixon's efforts to establish a just and honorable peace in Vietnam, and that they are opposed to those who believe that violence in the name of peace is acceptable.

I propose that all Americans turn on their porchlights Friday from 7 to 10 p.m. in the "light for peace" demonstration of their own. The glow of millions of porchlights will be a symbol all across the land of the earnest desire for peace and of support for our President who is striving to bring peace to America and the world.

Alfred Lord Tennyson once asked:

Ab, when shall all men's good be each man's rule, and universal peace lie like a shaft of light across the land?

While universal peace may be a long way off, we in this country can show our desire for an honorable peace in Vietnam, and back our President from the heart of America—its family homes—by lighting our porchlights Friday night.

OPERATION SPEAKOUT

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, along with many other Members of the House, I received a telegram from Bob Hope asking support for a week of national unity. He requested a resolution be introduced urging the President to proclaim a week of national unity. I telegraphed my support and promised to introduce the resolution this morning.

I proposed a resolution but after a conversation with the Parliamentarian I find it must be referred to the Judiciary Committee. Now with the week half gone because we were not in session, to proceed now could be an unproductive effort.

I take this time to express the hope that the President may on his own announce a proclamation which will endorse the week of national unity.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night, Thursday, the 13th, a former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUBENBUSH) has reserved 1 hour under special orders. I have also reserved 1 hour. I make this announcement because I hope that all our colleagues who are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion, as well as any who may be of like mind will be on the floor at the conclusion of business to participate in what is called Operation Speakout. We will be on the floor at about the same time of the so-called death march. At a time when the misguided swell the ranks of the moratorium crowd I hope we may be able to say something positive for the silent majority—that we are proud of our country and we plan to make it plain the majority of Americans do not agree with the negative minded minority who advocate peace at any price.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1072, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JONES of Alabama submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-614)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to be available until expended, not to exceed \$1,900,000 for the two-fiscal year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed \$475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 103. (a) The second sentence of section 201(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of sections 106(a) and 118 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid highway funds, shall apply to the development highway system and the local access roads, and all other provisions of such title 23 that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply, respectively, to such system and roads."

(b) Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and \$170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 202(a)) is amended to read as follows: "In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the planning, construction, equipment, and operation of multi-county demonstration health, nutrition, and child care projects, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers and other facilities and services necessary for the purposes of this section."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section 202 is further amended by inserting immediately following the second sentence the following new sentences: "The Federal contribution may be provided entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal grant-in-aid programs for the operation of health related facilities and the pro-

vision of health services. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such other programs, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase Federal grants for operating components of a demonstration health project to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by this subsection."

(d) Subsection (e) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In order to provide for the further development of the Appalachian region's human resources, grants under this section shall give special emphasis to programs and research for the early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of occupational diseases arising from coal mining, such as black lung."

Sec. 105. (a) The first sentence of clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by striking out "in accordance with the" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out "and 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, 1970, and 1971".

Sec. 106. Subsection (e) of section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary is further authorized to provide, or contract with public or private organizations to provide, information, advice, and technical assistance with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, and operation by nonprofit organizations of housing for low or moderate income families in such areas of the region."

Sec. 107. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1967" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970", and by adding at the end of such subsection the following: "For the purpose of this section, any sewage treatment works constructed pursuant to section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without Federal grant-in-aid assistance under such section shall be regarded as if constructed with such assistance."

Sec. 108. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended by inserting before "a local" the following: "a State agency certified as".

Sec. 109. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act, of which amount not to exceed \$90,000,000 is authorized for section 202, \$15,000,000 for section 203, \$15,000,000 for section 205, \$3,000,000 for section 207, \$50,000,000 for section 211, \$82,500,000 for section 214, and \$13,000,000 for section 302."

Sec. 110. Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The President is authorized and directed to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State which are geographically part of the New England region or the Appalachian region and share the social and economic characteristics thereof should be included in either of such regions. He shall submit the results of such study together with his recommendations to Congress not later than June 30, 1970."

Sec. 111. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by inserting immediately after "Act" the following: ", other than section 201,".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. Section 501 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181) is amended by redesignating section 501 as section 501(a) and adding the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Upon resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Secretary is directed to study the advisability of altering the geographical area of any region designated under this section, in order to further the purpose of this Act."

SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The Secretary is authorized to provide to the commissions technical assistance which would be useful in aiding the commissions to carry out their functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such assistance shall include studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such region, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region, and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grant-in-aid to the commissions. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this paragraph and prescribes the terms and conditions in such repayment.

"(2) In carrying out their functions under this Act the commissions are authorized to engage in planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act and which have been approved by the Secretary. Such activities may be carried out by the commissions through the payment of funds to departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions under contracts entered into for such purposes or through grants-in-aid to agencies of State or local governments. In the case of demonstration projects and training programs, to the maximum extent possible, such projects and programs shall be carried out through departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government or of State or local governments."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the administrative expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds appropriated under authority of section 509(d) of this title for any fiscal year shall be expended in such fiscal year in car-

rying out subsection (a)(1) and subsection (b) of this section."

SEC. 204. Section 506 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3186) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 506." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The Federal cochairman shall establish and at all times maintain his headquarters office in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3189a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to enable the State and other entities within economic development regions established under this Act to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the Secretary shall, once a comprehensive long-range economic plan established pursuant to clause (2) of section 503 (a) is in effect, provide funds pursuant to specific recommendations, to each of the Federal cochairmen of the regional commissions heretofore or hereafter established under this title, to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. No program, or project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Regional Commission involved has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 504 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling. In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets all of the requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under titles of this Act other than this title, and under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on authorizations for appropriation in any other Act."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 509 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

(c) Subsection (d) of section 509 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30,

1971, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$255,000,000. After deducting such amounts as are authorized to carry out subsections (a) (1) and (b) of section 505, the Secretary shall apportion the remainder of the sums appropriated under this authorization for any fiscal year to the regional commissions, except that not less than 10 per centum nor more than 25 per centum of such remaining amount shall be allocated to any one regional commission. All amounts appropriated under this authorization for any fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Secretary to the regional commissions prior to the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated."

SEC. 206. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"COORDINATION

"SEC. 511. The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act with those of each of the Federal cochairmen in making grants under this title, and each Federal cochairman shall coordinate his activities in making grants under this title with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act.

"ALASKA

"SEC. 512. There is hereby authorized not to exceed \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska for the purpose of planning economic development programs and projects in Alaska in cooperation with the government of the State of Alaska. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska.

"REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

"SEC. 513 (a) The Secretary of Transportation, acting jointly with the regional commissions, is authorized to conduct and facilitate full and complete investigations and studies of the needs of the economic development regions established under this title for regional transportation systems which will further the purposes of this Act, and in connection therewith, to carry out such demonstration projects as he determines to be necessary to the conduct of such investigations and studies. The Secretary of Transportation shall report to Congress not later than January 10, 1971, the results of such investigations and studies together with his recommendations and those of each regional commission."

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$20,000,000 to carry out this section. Such amount shall be in addition to those sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 301. Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of section 101(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a grant to an Indian tribe, the Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum or may waive the non-Federal share."

(2) Section 105 is amended by striking "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

SEC. 302. Section 301 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3151) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, enter into contracts or otherwise provide funds for any demonstration project within a redevelopment area or areas which he determines is designed to foster regional

productivity and growth, prevent out-migration, and otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 303. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "1970," and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, and \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (a) of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended by striking out the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(6) those areas selected for assistance under part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and those areas which the Secretary determines meet the purposes of section 150 of part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and which otherwise meet the requirements of this Act, except that no redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirement of section 403(a) (1) (B) of this Act."

(b) Subsection (b) (3) of such section 401 is amended by inserting after "(a) (3)" the following: "or (a) (6)".

(c) Subsection (b) (4) of such section 401 is amended by striking out "and (a) (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(a) (4) and (a) (6)".

(d) The second sentence of subsection (d) of such section 401 is amended by inserting immediately after "any other subsection of this section" the following: "other than subsection (a) (6)".

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

ROBERT E. JONES,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
JIM WRIGHT,
ED EDMONDSON,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
W. B. SPONG,
HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
ROBERT DOLE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for minor technical, clerical, and clarifying changes.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Sections 101, 102, and 103(a) of the conference substitute are the same as sections 201, 202, and 203(a) of the House amendment, and are provisions relating to the short title, administrative expenses, and contract authority.

Appalachian development highway system

Section 103 of the Senate bill amends section 201(g) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 which provides the monetary authorization for the Appalachian Development Highway System, to authorize \$175 million per fiscal year for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 and \$170 million for fiscal year 1973. The Senate bill further authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed \$150 million of these funds for engineering work and advance right-of-way acquisition on sections of the highway system whose construction is not expected to be accomplished under the authorizations contained in the Appalachian Act.

Section 203(b) of the House amendment is a comparable provision which provides, however, only for a 1-year extension of the system through fiscal year 1972, thus reauthorizing the unexpended balance of the existing appropriation and limiting the obligation of such authorization to not more than \$195 million in any one fiscal year.

Section 103(b) of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment with the deletion, however, of the authorization of expenditure of up to \$150 million for engineering and advance right-of-way acquisition on sections of the system not expected to be constructed under the authorization.

Demonstration health projects

Section 104(a) of the Senate bill amends section 202(a) of the Appalachian Act to expand the grant authority for multicounty demonstration health projects to specifically include nutrition, and child care projects.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 104(a) of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

Section 104(b) of the Senate bill increases the Federal percentage payable in the case of operating grants for demonstration health projects from 50 to 75 percent for the third, fourth, and fifth years of operation.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 104(b) of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

Section 104(c) of the Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to a State not more than 60 percent of the non-Federal share of expenditures for furnishing services described in clauses (14) and (15) of section 402(a) of the Social Security Act.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 104(c) of the conference substitute amends section 202(c) of the Appalachian Act to provide that the Federal contribution in the way of grants for operating expenses for these multicounty demonstration health, nutrition, and child care projects (whether or not constructed with funds authorized by section 202) may be provided entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this section or in combination with funds appropriated to carry out other Federal grant-in-aid programs for the operation of health-related facilities and for providing health services, and further waives any limitation on the Federal share contained in such other program to permit funds appropriated to carry out this section to be used to increase the Federal grant for operating components of a demonstration health project to the maximum percentage authorized by this subsection.

Section 104(c) of the Senate bill also amends section 202(e) of the Appalachian Act to require that in making grants under that section special emphasis be given to programs and research for the early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of occupational diseases arising from coal mining such as black lung.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 104(d) of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill in this regard.

Mining area restoration

Section 105 of the conference substitute is the same as sections 105 of the Senate bill and 204 of the House amendment which were identical provisions.

Housing

Section 106 of the Senate bill amends section 207(e) of the Appalachian Act to authorize the Secretary to provide directly or by contract information, advice, and technical assistance relating to construction, rehabilitation, and operation by nonprofit organizations of housing for low- or moderate-income families in Appalachian region areas.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 106 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

Manpower development projects

Section 107 of the Senate bill amends the Appalachian Act to add a new section 206 authorizing 80-percent Federal grants for manpower development demonstration projects and authorizes \$10 million for this purpose.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

The conference substitute contains no provision relating to manpower development demonstration projects. However, the conferees agree that in the administration of section 302 of the Appalachian Act and the administration of the Manpower Development and Training Act and all other provisions of law authorizing grants for manpower training, retraining, and rehabilitation, there should be increased emphasis placed upon projects for training, retraining, and rehabilitating coal miners, particularly those in the rural areas of Appalachia.

Sewage treatment works

Section 108 of the Senate bill amends section 214(c) of the Appalachian Act to extend the definition of Federal grant-in-aid programs to those authorized on or before December 31, 1970.

Section 205 of the House amendment is identical and, therefore, section 107 of the conference substitute contains this provision.

Section 108 of the Senate bill also amends section 214(c) of the Appalachian Act to provide that for the purposes of that section which deals with supplements to Federal grant-in-aid programs any sewage treatment works constructed pursuant to section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without Federal grant-in-aid assistance under that section shall be regarded as if constructed with such assistance.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

The proposed conference substitute in section 107 is the same as the Senate bill in this regard.

Administrative expenses

Sections 110 of the Senate bill and 206 of the House amendment are identical, and this provision is found in section 108 of the conference substitute.

Authorizations

Section 111 of the Senate bill authorized \$294 million for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. This amount was broken down as follows:

Sec. 202. Demonstration health projects	\$95,000,000
Sec. 203. Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control	15,000,000
Sec. 205. Mining area restoration	15,000,000
Sec. 207. Housing assistance	3,000,000
Sec. 208. Manpower development	10,000,000
Sec. 211. Vocational education	50,000,000
Sec. 214. Supplemental grants	90,000,000
Sec. 215. Cultural programs	1,000,000
Sec. 302. Administrative expenses of local development districts and research	15,000,000

Section 207 of the House amendment authorized \$250 million for the same 2-fiscal-year period, broken down as follows:

Sec. 202. Demonstration health projects	\$85,000,000
Sec. 203. Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control	15,000,000
Sec. 205. Mining area restoration	15,000,000
Sec. 207. Housing assistance	2,000,000
Sec. 211. Vocational education	50,000,000
Sec. 214. Supplemental grants	75,000,000
Sec. 302. Administrative expenses of local development districts and research	8,000,000

Section 109 of the conference substitute authorizes not to exceed \$268,500,000 for this 2-fiscal-year period as follows:

Sec. 202. Demonstration health projects	\$90,000,000
Sec. 203. Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control	15,000,000
Sec. 205. Mining area restoration	15,000,000
Sec. 207. Housing assistance	3,000,000
Sec. 211. Vocational education	50,000,000
Sec. 214. Supplemental grants	82,500,000
Sec. 302. Administrative expenses of local development districts and research	13,000,000

New England study

Section 208 of the House amendment amends section 203 of the Appalachian Act to require the President to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine which are geographically part of the Appalachian region and share the characteristics thereof should be included in the Appalachian region. The results of this study are to be submitted to Congress not later than June 30, 1970.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

Section 110 of the conference substitute requires the President to make a study of the extent to which portions of upper New York State are geographically part of the New England region (established under title V of EDA) or the Appalachian region (established by the Appalachian Act) and share the characteristics of either of such regions, should be included in either of such regions and to report his recommendations to Congress not later than June 30, 1970.

Termination date

Sections 112 of the Senate bill and 209 of the House amendment both exempt from the termination date of the Appalachian Act, section 201 relating to the highway system. This is required as a result of the amendments made to such section in both the bill and the amendment.

This provision is found in section 111 of the conference substitute.

REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

Sections 201 of the Senate bill and 101 of the House amendment are identical, and this provision (relating to the short title) is found in section 201 of the conference substitute.

Establishment of region

Section 202 of the Senate bill amends section 501 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to add a new subsection (b) requiring the Secretary to study the feasibility of altering the geographical area of any economic development region, upon resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 202 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill in this regard.

Regional, technical, and planning assistance

Section 203(a) of the Senate bill amends section 505(a) of the Economic Development Act to require the Secretary to provide funds to each commission to enable it to carry out its functions and to develop recommendations and programs (including studies, investigations, planning, research, and demonstration projects and training programs), to be carried out on a reimbursable basis by departments or agencies of the United States or by contract with private individuals, agencies, or institutions, or by grants to State or local governments.

Section 102 of the House amendment amends section 505(a) of the Economic Development Act to authorize the Secretary to provide assistance to the commissions, including planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of the act.

Sections 203 (a) and (c) of the conference substitute are essentially the same as the House amendment with the following modifications:

First, the commissions are given independent authority to engage in planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects, and training programs which will further the purposes of the act if these planning activities, investigations, studies, projects, and programs have been first approved by the Secretary. These activities of the commission are to be carried out through the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government or by contracts for the employment of private individuals and institutions or through grants-in-aid to State or local governmental agencies. To the maximum extent possible, however, these programs and projects are to be carried out through public agencies.

Second, the Secretary is limited to the expenditure of not more than 10 percent of the appropriated funds under section 509(d) in any fiscal year for carrying out either the assistance he is authorized to provide by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 505 or in the expenditure of funds for administrative expenses under subsection (b) of section 505.

Subsection (b) of section 203 of the Senate bill and subsection (b) of section 102 of the House amendment are substantially the same and the provisions of the House amendment (relating to administrative expenses) are contained in section 203(b) of the conference substitute.

Administrative powers of regional commissions

Section 204 of the Senate bill amends section 506 of the Economic Development Act to require each Federal cochairman to establish and at all times maintain his headquarters office in the District of Columbia. In addition, the Federal cochairman is authorized to establish a field office or offices at other places within the region as the commission and the Secretary deem essential to carrying out the functions of the Federal cochairman under this act.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 204 of the conference substitute amends section 506 of the Economic Development Act to require each Federal cochairman to establish and at all times maintain his headquarters office in the District of Columbia.

Supplement to Federal grant-in-aid programs

Both section 205 of the Senate bill and section 103 of the House amendment amend subsection (a) of section 509 of the Economic Development Act in essentially the same manner to authorize funds to be used to make all or any portion of the basic Federal grant for any project or program authorized by an existing Federal grant-in-aid law in a case where funds are not available within the region from the national program

for that purpose. No such basic Federal grant could be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid act which authorizes the basic grant certifies that the program or project for which a basic grant is proposed under this act would meet all of the requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid act and could be approved for a Federal contribution under that act if funds were available under that act for that program or project. Thus in order to make such a certification the Federal official would be faced with but two questions. First: Does the project or program meet all the requirements of the law? Second: Could I approve this project for a Federal contribution if the money were available for that purpose? If the answers are yes in each instance the certification must be made. There is an additional requirement that the Commission can approve basic grants and supplemental grants only if it determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by section 509(a).

Section 205(a) of the conference substitute is the same as the provisions of section 103 (a) and (b) of the House amendment with the exception of the substitution for the last sentence of existing law of the requirement contained in the Senate bill that funds provided pursuant to the Economic Development Act shall be available without regard to limitation on authorization for appropriation in any other act.

Subsection (b) of section 205 of the Senate bill and subsection (c) of section 103 of the House amendment make identical amendments to 509(c) of the Economic Development Act in extending the definition of the term Federal grant-in-aid programs to all programs in existence on or before December 31, 1970.

This provision is found in section 205(b) of the conference substitute.

Authorizations for regional commissions

Section 206 of the Senate bill amends the Economic Development Act to add a new section 511 authorizing appropriations for the regional commissions for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, as follows: Not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the Ozarks Regional Commission; \$75,000,000 for the New England Regional Commission; \$45,000,000 for the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; \$45,000,000 for the Four Corners Regional Commission; \$60,000,000 for the Coastal Plains Regional Commission and \$10,000,000 for the Federal Field Committee for Alaska.

Section 103(d) of the House amendment provides for such authorizations by amending section 509(d) of the Economic Development Act to authorize for the same 2-fiscal-year period a total of not to exceed \$225 million, of which not less than 10 percent nor more than 30 percent of the amounts actually appropriated for any fiscal year shall be made available to any one regional commission.

Section 205(c) of the conference substitute amends section 509(d) of the Economic Development Act to authorize for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, not to exceed \$255 million. After deducting amounts authorized to carry out section 505(a)(1) (technical assistance) and 505(b) (administrative expenses) the Secretary shall apportion the remainder of amounts appropriated for any fiscal year to the regional commissions with the exception that not less than 10 percent nor more than 25 percent of such remaining amount shall be allocated to any one regional commission. While the Secretary may withhold amounts from the initial allocation, he is required to allocate all amounts appropriated to the regional commissions prior to the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

The conferees would expect that in making his allocations the Secretary would consider all relevant factors, including, but not limited to, those relied upon by the Senate in making the specific authorizations contained in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Coordination

Section 206 of the conference substitute is identical to section 104 of the House amendment and requires coordination of activities between the Secretary and the Federal chairmen.

Alaska

Section 206 of the Senate bill amends the Economic Development Act to add a new section 510 authorizing the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska and any successor organization to be treated as if it were a regional commission for the purposes of title V of the Economic Development Act and in section 511 the Senate bill authorizes \$10 million for such Committee.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 206 of the conference substitute adds a new section 512 to the Economic Development Act authorizing not to exceed \$500,000 for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska for planning programs and projects in Alaska in cooperation with the State, and further provides that nothing in such section 512 is to be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska.

Regional transportation systems

Section 206 of the Senate bill amends title V of the Economic Development Act to add a new section 512 authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to assist in planning and developing regional transportation system including construction of development highways, local access roads, airports, and urban mass transit facilities serving economic development regions established under this title. Such new section 512 contains detailed provisions relating to the establishment and implementation of such transportation systems and provides for up to \$20 million to be expended by each commission for these purposes.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 206 of the conference substitute amends title V of the Economic Development Act to add a new section 513 authorizing the Secretary of Transportation acting jointly with the regional commissions to conduct and facilitate investigations and studies of the needs of the regions for regional transportation systems and in connection therewith to carry out demonstration projects necessary for the conduct of these investigations and studies. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to report the results of these studies together with his recommendations and those of the regional commissions to Congress not later than January 10, 1971. There is an authorization of up to \$20 million to carry out this section in addition to any amounts otherwise authorized for title V of the Economic Development Act.

The conferees expect the Secretary and the commissions in carrying out these investigations and studies to consider all types and modes of transportation relevant to the needs of the region including, but not limited to, development highways, local access roads, airports, urban mass transit facilities and railroad commuter services. It is further the expectation of the conferees that the recommendations submitted to Congress will include the establishment of priorities for the development of these systems, together with, to the extent practicable, designations of highway corridor locations, and specific information on locations of facilities proposed to be constructed, such as airports, railroad

and mass transit projects. The conferees expect that the State members of the regional commissions will seek and obtain the recommendations of all interested departments and agencies of State governments with respect to the transportation facilities recommended in such report.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent advancing to construction any transportation project authorized by any other section of the Economic Development Act.

AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Grants for public works and development facilities

Section 301 of the Senate bill amends section 101(c) of the Economic Development Act to authorize the Secretary to reduce or waive the non-Federal share of a grant to an Indian tribe below the minimum 20 percent otherwise required and further authorizes \$500 million for title I grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 301 of the conference substitute is the same as the provisions of the Senate bill in this regard.

Technical assistance, research, and information

Section 302 of the Senate bill amends section 301 of the Economic Development Act to authorize the Secretary to make grants for any demonstration project which he determines is designed to foster regional productivity and growth, prevent outmigration, and otherwise carry out the purposes of this act.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 302 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill, limited, however, to grants for demonstration projects within a redevelopment area or areas.

Authorizations

Section 303 of the Senate bill amends section 302 of the Economic Development Act to increase the authorization for title III of that act for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1970, from \$25 million to \$50 million.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 303 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill in this regard.

Area eligibility

Section 304 of the Senate bill amends section 401(a) of the Economic Development Act to require the Secretary to designate as redevelopment areas those areas selected for assistance under part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This section of the Senate bill also amends section 401(b) of the Economic Development Act to exempt from the area and boundary limitations contained in paragraphs (3) and (4) of that subsection the areas selected for assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Section 304 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill in this regard with the following modifications:

(1) The Secretary would also be authorized to designate as redevelopment areas those areas which he determines meet the purpose of section 150 of part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and otherwise meet the requirements of the Economic Development Act. The purpose of section 150 of the OEO act is to establish special programs for the solution of critical problems in particular communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to eligible urban areas.

(2) The areas which the Secretary would be

authorized to so designate would also be exempt from the population and boundary limitations in section 401(b) (3) and (4) of the Economic Development Act.

(3) Areas selected for assistance under part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act or by the Secretary under the authority referred to in paragraph (1) would not be eligible to meet the requirements for establishing an economic development district in accordance with section 403(a) (1) (B) of the Economic Development Act and would not be considered a redevelopment area for the purposes of determining the continued eligibility of an area designated in accordance with section 401(d).

TITLE

The conference substitute would retain the title of the bill as it passed the Senate.

ROBERT E. JONES,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
JIM WRIGHT,
ED EDMONDSON,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 673) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 673

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Ninety-first Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency shall be comprised of thirty-six members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12307, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AP- PROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12307) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MARSH, PRYOR of Arkansas, MAHON, JONAS, WYMAN, TALCOTT, McDADE, and Bow.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 265]

Abbott	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Ashley	Gallagher	Ottenger
Barrett	Gialmo	Pollock
Betts	Goodling	Powell
Boland	Green, Oreg.	Price, Tex.
Bow	Green, Pa.	Rees
Brock	Gubser	Reid, Ill.
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Reifel
Cahill	Hammer-	Rhodes
Celler	schmidt	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Hawkins	Rosenthal
Clark	Hays	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Hebert	Roudebush
Don H.	Hosmer	Roybal
Clay	Howard	Sandman
Collier	Jarman	Sisk
Corbett	Jonas	Springer
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Staggers
Dawson	Karth	Thompson, N.J.
de la Garza	Kirwan	Tunney
Denney	Lipscomb	Utt
Dennis	Long, La.	Waldie
Dent	MacGregor	Watkins
Diggs	Martin	Whalley
Dwyer	Mathias	Winn
Flynt	May	Wylie
Ford,	Mollohan	Wyman
William D.	Morton	
Frelinghuysen	Nichols	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 346 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

MOVIE BOYCOTT

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks many requests have been made of myself and members of my staff regarding the so-called moratorium. Quite frankly, I have not been able to go along with many of them, but this morning a request was made that I can agree with. Paul Newman, Peter Fonda, Dennis Hopper, and Jon Voight, at a press conference, asked us to boycott the movies "Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid," "Easy Rider," and "Midnight Cowboy."

Mr. Speaker, I have not agreed with most of the things the promoters of the moratorium have done, but I certainly will agree that under no circumstances will I go to see those three movies.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AP- PROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. CEDERBERG reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13018, TO AUTHORIZE CER- TAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILI- TARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, FISHER, LENNON, LONG of Louisiana, WHITE, ARENDS, HALL, KING, and FOREMAN.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

NOVEMBER 12, 1969.

HON. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Public Works.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. OBEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 674) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 674

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: David R. Obey, of Wisconsin;

Committee on Banking and Currency: Michael J. Harrington, of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVI- LEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 611 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 611

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2777) 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 potato and potato products that are made available to the consumer, and all points of order against sections 8, 9, and 18 of said bill are hereby waived. 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 Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 2777, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1181 and to move to strike out all of the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 2777 as passed by the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes, pending which I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 611 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 2777 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 potato and potato products that are made available to the consumer. All points of order are waived against sections 8, 9, and 18 of the bill because sections 8 and 9 provide for the use of unappropriated funds and section 18 provides for a transfer of funds. The resolution further provides that, after passage of H.R. 2777, it shall be in order to take S. 1181 from the Speaker's table and amend it with the House-passed language.

H.R. 2777 provides for potato research and promotion in a manner similar to that provided in the Cotton Promotion Act. A National Potato Promotion Board would be established and the members of the Board would serve without compensation other than reasonable expenses.

The potato producers would propose the issuance of a potato research and promotion plan to the Secretary who, if he has reason to believe that a plan will effectuate the policy of the act, shall provide an opportunity for hearings upon the plan. If the hearings are favorable, the Secretary shall issue a plan, which would then be submitted to a referendum

of producers to be approved or disapproved. The plan would not be approved unless favored by two-thirds of the producers voting or by the producers of not less than two-thirds of potatoes produced during the representative period required for eligibility to vote and by not less than a majority of those voting.

The Board would enter into contracts or agreements to carry out programs or projects of promotion and advertising and it would recommend and submit to the Secretary a proposed budget and the assessments to be collected.

Upon approval of the programs by the Secretary, the Board would maintain books and records from which it would prepare and submit to the Secretary reports that may be prescribed for appropriate accounting showing completely the receipts and the disbursements of the assessment fund. A complete audit will be submitted to the Secretary at the end of each fiscal period.

The Board may have the authority to exempt potatoes used for nonfood purposes and to designate different handler payment and reporting schedules recognizing differences in marketing practices and procedures in the different production areas. Also, it might be empowered to accumulate reserves from the assessments to permit a continuous program but the total reserve could not exceed the amounts budgeted for 2 years operation.

Any potato grower who had paid an assessment and did not favor supporting the program could demand and receive a refund of his payments.

Growers of less than 5 acres of potatoes would be exempt from assessment and would be ineligible to vote in any referendum held under the act.

Any person subject to the plan might, upon written petition contending that the plan is not in accordance with law, seek modification or exemption therefrom and receive a hearing upon such petition.

The plan may be suspended or terminated upon a referendum held at the request of the Board or of 10 percent or more of the producers whenever a majority of those voting in the referendum and who produce more than 50 percent of a volume of the potatoes produced by the persons voting favor suspension or termination.

The assessment would be not more than 1 cent per 100 pounds of potatoes handled and would, of course, be used to provide research, development, advertising, and promotion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 611 in order that H.R. 2777 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) has ably stated, House Resolution 611 makes in order for consideration H.R. 2777 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the creation of a National Potato Promotion Board which shall be empowered to create and conduct a promotion and research program for potatoes.

Today there are over 300,000 potato

producers growing on about 1,500,000 acres. Estimated sales value of the crop is about \$560,000,000.

Producers want to expand their markets; this bill is viewed as a vehicle.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may give notice of hearings on a proposed plan when he believes it would further the purposes of the bill. After hearings, if the plan is acceptable, the Secretary shall issue the plan. A referendum shall be called at which producers will make their preferences known. Two-thirds of producers voting must approve the plan and these must grow at least two-thirds of the potato crop. If the plan is adopted, the Secretary will appoint a National Potato Promotion Board to administer the plan. Members shall be nominated by potato producers. Each grower covered will be assessed up to 1 cent per 100 pounds grown to support the program. General revenues will be used to cover the cost of the administration of the program. Any grower who does not approve of the plan may demand a refund of his assessments.

All growers of potatoes on fewer than 5 acres are exempt from the provisions of the bill. They would be ineligible to vote and could not be assessed.

The cost of conducting hearings and holding a referendum is estimated at \$325,000 by the Department of Agriculture. This could be reduced to \$180,000 if suitable mailing lists of potato growers were available. The annual costs of administration are estimated at about \$80,000.

It is estimated that the assessment on the growers for the research and promotion will return about \$2,000,000 annually to the Promotion Board.

Dissenting views, with which I am in complete agreement, were filed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McKNEALLY). These views state in part:

We oppose H.R. 2777 because it would establish a poor precedent, it would benefit only a small minority of potato growers, and it would cost the U.S. taxpayers a considerable sum.

POOR PRECEDENT

This bill would, if enacted, represent the first checkoff program for financing the competition of one food against other foods. There is of course a checkoff program for both cotton and wool. But these programs are for fibers, not foods, and they finance programs designed to increase consumption of crops which face competition from manmade or artificial substitutes.

Carried to its illogical conclusion, the precedent established by this bill can perhaps mean a bonanza for Madison Avenue, but it can only mean increased costs to the potato consumer, the potato producer, and the U.S. Treasury.

SMALL MINORITY BENEFITED

Based on the hearing record, it is obvious that the bill will benefit only a small minority of the potato growers in

the Nation. Since this bill—in section 3(e)—defines a producer as “any person raising 5 or more acres of potatoes,” it follows that those growing less than 5 acres are not subject to the legislation. Since there are 310,000 potato producers and only 17,000 produce 5 acres or more, it is obvious that only 6 percent of the growers will be subject to the assessment envisioned by the bill.

Yet how are potato handlers going to know whether the potatoes they have purchased have been grown by a farmer who had 4.9 acres or 5.1 acres? In our opinion the exclusion of 94 percent of the potato growers will very seriously complicate the administration of the program as brokers and market agencies grapple with an additional maze of paperwork and redtape.

COSTLY TO TAXPAYERS

In its report on the bill the Department of Agriculture stated that the cost of conducting a referendum and related items for initiating a program would be \$325,000. In addition, the annual cost for administration would run an estimated \$80,000 a year. The Department further explained that referendum costs could possibly be reduced to \$180,000 if suitable mailing lists for eligible potato growers could be obtained.

Under the provisions of H.R. 2777 all these costs are to be paid out of section 32 funds. In the course of considering the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) offered in subcommittee and in full committee an amendment to require the potato promotion board to pay the costs of initiating and administering this program. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) offered an amendment to require the board to at least reimburse the U.S. Government for its annual administrative expenses. It seemed to us that with an anticipated collection of \$2 million a year, the board could afford to reimburse the U.S. taxpayers the cost of setting up and administering this program. Unfortunately, these amendments were rejected. Subsequently the Department of Agriculture, in presenting its views on similar legislation dealing with honey, adopted as an official administration position our contention that the costs of these so-called self-help programs should, at the very least, be borne by those who seek this method of collecting funds for research and promotion activities.

SUMMARY

In summary, H.R. 2777 should not be approved by the House. It establishes a poor precedent, benefits only a tiny minority of potato growers, will cause a great deal of inconvenience and redtape, and will be costly to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill on a nonpartisan basis. This rule should be defeated and, if not, then the bill should not be approved by the House.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, points of order are waived

against sections 8, 9, and 18 of the bill for the reasons that these sections reappropriate or transfer money within the Department for the purpose of financing, in part, this proposal.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. QUILLEN. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. Why should not the House have the opportunity for a direct vote as to whether they want to transfer money within a department or reappropriate money within the department rather than doing it by indirection through the waiver of points of order? In other words, we accept or reject on final passage those provisions of the bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that he has made a very good point. I voted against the rule in the committee. I feel that this bill should not be passed. I am opposed to the rule. The gentleman has made a very good point.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his reply.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is quite clear that the rule as it comes in does give the House the opportunity of voting on any of these sections that it wants to. Without this rule it would be possible to strike these sections on a point of order without any action on the part of the House.

The gentleman from Iowa inquires as to why the House should not have the opportunity to make its own decision. I believe the answer is clear that the House does have that opportunity under this rule, and has the opportunity to amend any of these sections that it wants to, and that if we did not have this provision in here then the House would not have the opportunity.

The only opportunity then would be, for one who objected to one of the sections in question to raise a point of order—and for those who favor such section would never have an opportunity to express themselves or to submit the matter to the vote of the House as the gentleman from Iowa suggests is so vital.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, what the gentleman is doing by indirection is waiving points of order, an expeditious way, by which these sections in the bill could be knocked out. In other words, he is protecting what amounts to in part an appropriation bill by seeking and obtaining a rule waiving points of order and setting aside the proper legislative procedure.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield again?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield again to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to repeat again, the gentleman from Iowa protests that the House should have an opportunity to express itself and that this rule is cutting him off from that opportunity. I understood that to be the gentleman's objection.

Now what I am pointing out is that unless we have this rule waiving points of order, the House will never have that opportunity that he seeks to secure for the House. But with this rule, the House will have that opportunity.

Under this rule the gentleman can offer an amendment to any section of this bill. He can strike it out if he gets the votes. The fact that we protect certain sections from a point of order does not protect them from an amendment so the gentleman has the opportunity which he said he wanted the House to have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas, I am sure, wants to follow the normal and orderly procedure in the House and that is bringing bills to the House under a completely open rule. I am sure he will vote down the previous question on this rule so that I can offer an amendment to the rule to strike out the waiving of points of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If I may just reply to the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman's point, I would again repeat, was—and maybe it has changed—but it was when he got up here—that he wanted the House to have a right to vote; that is, for the House to make this decision. The point was not that he wanted the right for himself to kill a section, in spite of what the majority of the House wanted to do.

So if the gentleman is really interested in freedom of action for the House, this rule, as written, gives it to him. Apparently, the gentleman is now changing and wants the right for himself to deny to the House the opportunity to make this very decision.

Now the gentleman has a perfect right to insist that he should have the opportunity to kill something. But he cannot in one breath claim that he should have that right and in the other breath claim that this House should have an opportunity to make this decision. The gentleman is making a turnabout now from what he was stating when he first started making his remarks.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. All that I want to do is put the shoe or the foot on which it belongs. That is to say, it fits you who offered the affirmative resolution to make this something of an appropriation bill. That is all I am bringing out, instead of hiding behind waivers of points of order to accomplish your end.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas to make a reply.

Mr. POAGE. I would want to point out that I did not ask for this rule. I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will recognize that. I did not ask for this

waiver, but I think the House should understand what this waiver does do. Without this waiver, the amendments that he talks about and that he would like for us to offer would not be in order. Without this we could not offer any amendments. With this he can offer an amendment. He says he is bothered about who wears the shoe. But if we had no waiver there would be no way in which anyone could offer an amendment to achieve this result. With this rule the gentleman can offer an amendment to avoid this result, if he so desires.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who did ask for the waiver of points of order?

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman who brought the bill before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY). I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman will recall that at the time the matter was presented to the Rules Committee the question was raised concerning the use of funds from producer contributions.

Under the act the Secretary is authorized, under certain conditions, to submit a plan for ratification to the potato producers, and if they approve, they are charged 1 cent per hundredweight. Those funds are then allocated by the Board for advertising and promotion without appropriation by Congress.

Second, the administration cost comes from title 32 funds. Since there was a feeling that it might be subject to a point of order on the floor of the House, I requested a waiver of points of order on specific sections of the bill. As I recall, the sections are sections 8 and 9 and section 18.

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman is correct. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, we have quite properly been considering the technicalities of the rule. I would like to point out something to my colleagues. Whether the previous question is voted up or down, certainly this rule should be adopted. I think it is highly important to understand that this is not another farm subsidy bill out of the Committee on Agriculture. It happens that I personally oppose most of the general farm legislation which we bring before you. I am in support of this bill. This is a self-help program which people from the city areas certainly should favor. It is beyond me to understand how anyone from a farm area, interested in receiving subsidies on feed grains, cotton, tobacco, and so forth, could oppose this bill, which allows the potato industry, if it votes to do so, to adopt a self-help program at a cost to the Federal Government only of conducting the election and some \$80,000 a year to maintain the program thereafter in administrative costs.

So I hope the rule will be adopted and the bill will be acted upon favorably by the House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as you may be aware, I was privileged to introduce H.R. 4220, an identical bill to H.R. 2777, for which we are now considering a rule.

I sincerely feel that this measure can do a great deal to benefit the potato industry which, at the present time, is in dire need of assistance.

The potato growers in this Nation are subject to some fairly significant market price fluctuations. This legislation, which I also introduced in the last session of Congress, is, in my opinion, the best means by which the growers of a commodity can receive the help they need without significant cost to the taxpayer and with a minimum of interference on the part of the Federal Government.

The aspect of this proposal that most appeals to me is that the success of the whole plan depends upon the ingenuity of the growers themselves, the people who know the most about their industry and what is the best action which can be taken to solve their own problems.

Under the proposal, the function of the Secretary of Agriculture is restricted to one of monitoring the program to insure that it conforms to the enabling legislation. Thus, a very minimum of Federal control is involved and then only to the extent necessary to provide overall fairness, uniform administration and effectiveness.

Advances made through research on other commodities have shown what great possibilities there are for potatoes. In addition to improved potato products that may be found for the marketplace in the United States, this research can do much toward contributing solutions to the problem of the hungry poor, both here and abroad. I know this is one of the goals of the industry and I heartily endorse it.

In the area of promotion, there is also much that can be done. Competitive products have been waging an intensive campaign which in some cases has misrepresented the properties of potatoes. This legislation would give the industry the wherewithall to set the record straight and make American consumers aware of the wonderful qualities of potatoes.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize the strong support that this bill has from the potato growers throughout the United States. In my own Congressional District, the Red River Valley Potato Growers Association, which represents growers on both the North Dakota and Minnesota side of the valley, is squarely behind it; and I have received a great deal of individual indications of support from growers during my trips home.

I strongly endorse this legislation and urge that the House act favorably upon it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FOLEY. 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. 2777) 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 SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

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. 2777, with Mr. HENDERSON 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 Washington (Mr. FOLEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize a program by which the commercial potato growers of the United States can assess themselves an amount specified as not more than 1 cent per hundredweight to develop a program to encourage the research and promotion of potatoes and potato products.

Under the authorizing legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to hold hearings to determine whether a plan for research and promotion of potatoes should be implemented. After the hearing, if the Secretary is satisfied that such a plan should be implemented, he may submit a plan to a referendum of potato growers in the United States for their approval.

Under the terms of this bill, all potato growers who produce less than 5 acres of potatoes are exempt from the bill. There is a total of about 310,000 potato growers in the United States, but only a small fraction of this number are really commercial potato producers. The vast number produce less than 5 acres of potatoes.

The referendum could be conducted by one of two means, either a full referendum in which the individual potato growers would come to voting places and vote their approval or disapproval, or a referendum by mail. During testimony on the bill, it was stated with some assurance by the National Potato Council that they had mailing lists which would enable the referendum to be conducted by mail with accuracy; this would substantially reduce the effort and cost of such a referendum.

If the referendum is approved by two-thirds of the potato growers, then the plan would come into effect, and a National Potato Board would be established.

The Board would be authorized to assess the potato growers not more than 1 cent per hundredweight. These funds would then be used for promotion and advertising and research and development of markets here and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, any single producer under the bill—and we are not talking about the small producers who are immediately exempt—would have the opportunity to petition for a return of all the assessments against him, and that petition cannot be required sooner than 90 days after the assessment and shall be repaid within 60 days after receipt by the Government. No producer is required to stay in this program if he wishes to take himself out. There is an absolute requirement for the return of these assessments on simple application by the individual producer. The committee in its report states it is not the intention of the bill to make it difficult for any producer to obtain this refund, if he so chooses. In fact, the report indicates it is to be made easy and every effort is to be made by the Department to see that that intent is carried out.

So what this amounts to is a program of self-help which producers will voluntarily bring into being and which any individual producer may exempt himself from if he wishes to do so. All of us are familiar with farm legislation that means heavy costs to the Government. The programs that I and others have supported for commodities like wheat and feed grains and cotton are expensive programs. I believe they are necessary and desirable. This is another approach entirely. It is not a marketing order. It is not a support program. It is an authority for producers to help themselves, to develop their own markets, and to pay the great bulk of the cost themselves of engaging in this effort and initiative to improve their product and to improve the marketing of their product.

I should surely think that this committee and the House will recognize that as a valid and worthwhile endeavor and support this bill.

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

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

Mr. KYL. I wonder if the gentleman or the committee has given attention to a matter which I believe is very important. I believe it is important because of the experience we have had in other product areas.

Is there any mechanism in the bill which would make sure that the people who serve on this board are actually producers rather than processors or some other element of the industry? I am thinking, for instance, of the problem with which the gentleman is familiar in the case of lamb, where the lamb producers are having their will frequently subverted by processor representatives on such boards controlling the relations with and promotion of the industry.

Mr. FOLEY. The Secretary has to approve members of the Board. The clear intent of the law is that he would select those who have close connection with the potato producing industry. I will say to the gentleman, he is not limited specifically to appoint producers to the Board.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Is there anything in the legislation or in the legislative history, so far as the committee action is concerned, which suggests that the Secretary should or has to include on this Potato Board representatives of elements of the industry other than producers?

Mr. FOLEY. No. There is no such requirement.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I commend the gentleman from Washington for so clearly and succinctly explaining the bill and the fact that this is not another farm subsidy program. It is a self-help program.

We are not blazing new territory today. We authorized similar programs for 17 other agricultural commodities.

Once more I recommend highly to my colleagues that they support this bill.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 2777. I am very pleased to be one of the sponsors of this legislation.

The purpose of this program would be one of improvement; improving the quality of potatoes and potato products, improving consumer acceptance of these potato and potato products, improving the markets for potatoes and to improve the competitive position of those farmers who grow potatoes.

My interest in the program has been sparked by my friends in the potato industry. Two counties in my congressional district raise more than 90 percent of all the potatoes grown in the State of Virginia.

This legislation could be the turning point for the potato industry and it has received overwhelming support.

Some months ago I received an interesting and informative letter from Mr. Walter F. McCaleb, Jr., executive vice president of the Virginia Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, regarding the support for this program. He stated:

Out of curiosity, I counted up the number of potato producer organizations testifying in favor of this legislation at the three hearings mentioned. Amazingly, these totaled seventy-eight producers organizations testifying for the bill. In almost twenty years of working on potato legislation and various potato rules and regulations, I have never seen anything that even approached the unanimity of support behind this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the prompt passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first say, as a farmer I want to do everything possible to help the American farmer. Most of us know that he needs help.

I oppose this legislation because it establishes a bad precedent, is inequitable, would be difficult to administer, and is an unfair burden to the taxpayer.

Essentially, this bill would, as pointed out in the dissenting views of House Report No. 91-311, represent the first checkoff program for financing the competition of one farm food against another.

It should be remembered that there are checkoff programs in effect for both cotton and wool, but one very important thing must be remembered, and it is this: These products are fibers and not foods, and the pertinent checkoff programs are designed as an assist to help these fibers compete with synthetic substitutes. This bill before us would—by giving a special benefit to potatoes and, thereby, improving their competitive position—perform as an inducement for other commodity groups to seek the same privileges extended to potatoes under this legislation—it would invite a mad merry-go-round in the field of agricultural commodities. The committee already has similar legislation on honey, milk and olives.

Again referring to the pertinent report on this legislation and based on the hearing record on this legislation, it is obvious that only a small minority of the potato growers in this country would benefit from this bill. Under the legislation, a producer is defined as "any person raising 5 or more acres of potatoes." Inasmuch as there are 310,000 potato producers—and only 17,000 produce 5 acres or more—we arrive at a condition where only 6 percent of the growers of potatoes will be subject to the assessment envisioned by this legislation.

This raises the serious question of just how potato handlers are going to know whether the potatoes they buy were grown by a farmer who had just a little over 5 acres or a little under. Potato brokers will be utterly confused, trying to figure out whether to levy the assessment or not. Exclusion of 94 percent of the potato growers cannot help but have the effect of creating an administrative nightmare, with brokers and market agencies finding themselves smothered in paper and tangled up in red tape.

Over and above this, there is a heavy cost to the taxpayer involved. The Department of Agriculture reported—in its report on this legislation—that the cost of conducting a referendum and initiating the program would be in the vicinity of \$325,000. Furthermore, the annual cost for administration would run an estimated \$80,000 per year. All these costs would be paid out of section 32 funds, a regularly appropriated and, consequently, a taxpayer supported item.

Now, I have been told by various individuals that this would cost the taxpayer nothing simply because the funds would be taken from section 32 funds. Section 32 funds are derived from collections of import duties on goods brought into the United States. They are part of the funds raised by Government tariff.

When this legislation was before our

subcommittee, I offered an amendment to require the Potato Promotion Board to pay the costs of initiating and administering this program. I felt the Board—which would collect about \$2 million a year under the program—should reimburse the U.S. taxpayers the cost of setting up and administering the program. Unfortunately my amendment did not carry.

Mr. Chairman, it is a generally accepted rule of thumb that those who receive a benefit should pay the costs associated with such benefit. This potato bill before us deviates from that policy, for while it produces a prime benefit for the seller of potatoes, it passes some of the costs on to the taxpayer.

It would be different if some kind of public service were provided under this legislation, but it is not—the only ones who would benefit would be a minority of potato growers.

There are some agricultural services that bring a very obvious and definite benefit to the consumer, providing him with protection for his health and quality foods for his table. Services such as this are in the public interest and should, therefore, be paid for from the public purse. Meat inspection, for instance, is paid for by the Department of Agriculture, and well it should be. The consumer is given a reasonable guarantee that red meat and poultry products he buys at the meat counter will not be injurious to his health.

I think it is time that we cleared up this confusion as to what kind of agricultural programs should be supported by the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, a simple rule of thumb, could be one like this; where the service provides a public benefit, the cost should be borne by the Federal Government and where the service supplies predominantly reward and benefit for the seller of the agricultural commodity, the cost should be borne by that seller. Let us start then right here and now to implement this policy.

This legislation is a good place to begin.

One final point, Mr. Chairman, and one which deals with honey which I have already mentioned. It contains a provision similar to the checkoff provision contained in this bill which has been tabled by our Committee on Agriculture. It is also interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture took the official position in the case of the honey legislation that the cost of this self-help program should at the very least be borne by the benefactors of the program. In other words, what is good for honey should also be good for potatoes. Unless we act with some consistency here we are going to create a scrambled egg policy on checkoff programs for agricultural commodities.

Let us defeat H.R. 2777 or at the very least, in the interest of consistency and fair play, require producers of potatoes to pay for all the benefit that they will secure to themselves under this program.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why are the States of Alaska and Hawaii written out of this

bill? It deals with 48 contiguous States and I assume that those are the two States which have been written out of the bill.

Mr. GOODLING. I do not believe potatoes are produced in Alaska and Hawaii. That is, perhaps, why they are not contained in the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. In answer to the question which has been asked by the gentleman from Iowa, there was no specific reason that they were excluded except that there is a very small production of potatoes in those two States and there was no particular interest expressed on the part of those potato growers in this legislation at the time it was under consideration in the committee. That is the reason for this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, did they not try to raise potatoes in the Matanuska Valley years and years ago? What happened to their experiment in that direction?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am not familiar with that particular area. There has been potato production of a kind in Alaska and some in Hawaii on the island of Maui, but they are not commercially significant and that is the reason they are not included in the bill.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the sponsor of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), and in order to explain more fully to the gentleman the matter of appointments to the Board which question the gentleman raised. The relevant section of the bill is as follows:

Providing, That the Board shall be composed of representatives of producers selected by the Secretary from nominations 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.

I wish my earlier statement to be corrected.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of this proposed legislation to establish a potato research and promotion program.

The potato-producing industry has long played an important role in our national agricultural program. Production and marketing of potatoes is carried on in every State in the United States. Yet uncoordinated marketing habits have resulted in the failure of the potato industry to keep pace with the ever-changing trends in consumer buying. I

believe this bill will provide a vehicle whereby the industry can develop new markets, promote its product, and develop more effective marketing techniques.

I became a sponsor of this legislation at the request of the Maine Potato Council, a trade association which represents all potato growers in Maine—the Nation's second largest potato producer. I am satisfied that this bill has the unanimous support of potato growers in my State, and base this conclusion on reports from the Maine Potato Council and on my personal contacts with numerous growers. The potato producers of Maine have joined with their counterparts across the Nation in deciding it is time to act on a unified, industrywide basis in planning and carrying out more effective research and marketing programs.

This proposal is purely enabling legislation. If passed, it would enable the majority of the Nation's potato growers, if they so desire, to establish a self-help program at their own expense. The bill does not propose Government subsidies or price supports. It would be a truly self-help measure, allowing producers to tax themselves and use the proceeds to improve their product, develop new and better methods of handling potatoes, and promote increased consumption of their product. The legislation will benefit consumers by improving grading, packaging and other marketing and merchandising practices.

I strongly endorse this bill and urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2777 and hope to be able to answer some of the objections and the opposition which might be raised.

First, to those of you within this body who are apprehensive and against farm support prices, which we believe necessary to sustain an agricultural level, let me assure you that this is not any type of support legislation.

This is nothing more and nothing less than an effort on the part of an important portion of our agricultural economy to do something for themselves. This legislation was not conceived in the minds of any Member of this body or the Senate, but rather it came to my attention and to the attention of the members of this committee from the potato producers or growers themselves. It is the result of some 3 or 4 years of study and analysis as to what was in the best interest in a self-help approach to improve the sale and the use of the American Irish or white potato.

It is a product we have known for generations as a staple food. It is one of the least costly foods, and it is one that a majority of our citizens, particularly those in the lower economic levels, must rely upon to a great degree.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the 300,000 potato producers, and only 16,000 or 17,000 would be affected under this bill. This is true. The bill provides that anyone producing less than 5 acres of potatoes is not to be considered to be included under this coverage, and for the payment, if you will, of the assessment.

But certainly if this program—and I am convinced that it will—improves the quality of potatoes, increases the demand for potatoes, then those planting less than 5 acres cannot help but indirectly benefit. Those who plant less than 5 acres of potatoes are in the main the family garden type of producer, or perhaps they produce 1 or 2 acres and dispose of them at the local corner store, or locally. Certainly anything that would increase the demand for potatoes and improve the quality of potatoes would help these producers.

Something had been said about the great expense to the Department of Agriculture for conducting this referendum. The Department has supplied varying figures, and you can choose whichever one you would like. The latest and highest is \$325,000. But let me put it to you in this manner, there will be involved approximately 16,000 or 17,000 voters, and if it is going to cost the United States Department of Agriculture over \$20 per vote to conduct a mail ballot, then I venture we ought to investigate the Department of Agriculture as well as the U.S. Post Office system.

I cannot by any stretch of the imagination agree with this exorbitant figure. I believe a more realistic figure would be somewhere near \$3 or \$4 or possibly \$5 for each of the ballots to be prepared on the local level.

But in the event that I am wrong, let me ask you this: What was the Department of Agriculture created for if it was not to render service to all segments of the U.S. agriculture economy? And if it costs \$300,000, and if it did not improve the lot of this hard-pressed segment of our farm economy, after all, they pay taxes also, and I think they are entitled to assistance and cooperation from the United States on this very fine program.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat in closing that this is a bill that has been asked for by the people themselves who will pay the assessment of 1 cent per hundredweight. Admittedly, it will raise a large sum of money, but obviously it is necessary in order to improve the economy to have this type of money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of the House will vote favorably for this bill.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. I am absolutely certain that the gentleman in the well does not want to create any bad impression or make any misstatements. A letter from him reached my desk this morning and it says:

These projects would help the potato industry solve its own problems; and the cost would be borne by the industry.

That is not a statement of fact.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. The cost of carrying on the promotion program is carried by the industry.

Mr. GOODLING. That is not correct.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. The research and advertising are paid by the people in the industry.

Mr. GOODLING. You say also:

Such expenses incurred by USDA for promulgation, referendum, etc., would come from Section 32 funds.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. That is my impression, I think that is what the bill says.

Mr. GOODLING. I think we all have to admit that if we do it that way, we revert to backdoor spending and I know many are opposed to that kind of spending. This would be another case where it would occur. I wanted to correct the misstatement you made in your letter.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I apologize if I have misled the gentleman in any way, but in view of his brilliance and his knowledge of this bill, I am sure that is not possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE), a member of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleagues, and I want to make this point, that among the few things that we do not grow commercially in my district are potatoes and polar bears. We grow almost everything else. So I have no personal interest in this legislation.

Once more I do point out that it is obvious there is some dispute about this bill and there may be more opposition on this side than there is on the other side of the aisle. Personally, I favor this bill as I did a similar proposal having to do with the cotton industry some years ago.

This is not the usual farm subsidy legislation. This is a self-help program.

I probably will support the amendment which I understand will be offered to place the administrative costs on the industry rather than on the Federal taxpayers, otherwise I see no reason why this bill should not be adopted.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I find myself so often, in fact, almost always in agreement with the gentleman from California, but I do want to clarify one point. We were together on the committee when the cotton checkoff promotion bill was enacted and we had discussed at that time as to whether or not the producer could have an option instead of seeking a refund, simply to decline the assessment in advance.

I understand an amendment was considered by the committee on this point. I do have in mind offering such at the proper time today.

I just wonder if the gentleman had any comment on that point.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. No, I am not on the subcommittee which considered this legislation. Due to the illness of my wife, I was in California when the committee as a whole considered the bill. I will certainly listen to the gentleman's amendment and the arguments for it, and I make no commitment until that time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 2 at the top of the page, beginning on line 2, there is this language: "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."

That language to me carries the clear implication that the assessments made on all potatoes harvested for commercial use would be adequate to meet the expenses and carrying out the program as well as financing the advertising connected with it.

I wonder if anyone would respond on that point? Does it not seem to the gentleman from Washington that this language is a bit misleading, if in fact the assessments would not be adequate to cover the annual administrative expenses of the program.

Mr. FOLEY. There is an administrative cost to the operation of the board which would be borne by assessment. There is an \$80,000 estimated Department of Agriculture administrative cost in the overview responsibilities of the Secretary of Agriculture which would not be borne by assessment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Does the gentleman see any reason why the annual expense of the Department in this activity should not be fully reimbursed along with other expenses of the Board?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes. If the gentleman will yield further, I think it is a matter of principle. This is the normal kind of service that the Department of Agriculture renders. For example, there are over 60 marketing orders in the United States, each one of which has an annual estimated cost of administration of the Department which is borne by the Government, by public funds, and I see no reason why we should single out a self-help program, such as this one, and select it for a special charge of paying the cost of Government. The Government maintains all kinds of programs, as the gentleman knows, for the benefit of industry and for the benefit of various segments of the economy, which are not charged against the beneficiaries.

Mr. FINDLEY. One reason for bringing the matter up is that each year, for 4 or 5 years, I have pointed out the heavy investment in administrative expense that the taxpayers are required to bear in connection with Federal crop insurance activities. It varies between \$6, \$8, and \$12 million a year. I do not anticipate that the cost of the proposed program would get that high, but in effect, by that administrative funding, we are financing competition for private enterprise in the insurance business.

In somewhat the same way, by requiring the taxpayers to finance the administrative costs of a program which does create promotion for a given commodity, this does require in some degree that the producers of commodities which are sold without the benefit of a similar type of program be at a disadvantage. It would seem to me fair play to begin with this legislation by setting a new standard, if

indeed one is required, a new standard under which all the costs of the marketing order checkoff promotion programs would be borne by the producer of the commodity.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I would like to comment on that. I think the gentleman need have no concern that the administrative costs of this program will exceed \$80,000. In my own personal judgment, that is a very high estimate of the cost, since the responsibilities of the Secretary are limited under the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. If indeed it is a relatively insignificant amount, then would not this be the right time and place for us to set a good standard for all other marketing orders that may come in the future?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I think it is not an opportune time, and I would respectfully suggest that we have existing programs, marketing orders, promotion programs which the Department administers without cost to the producer. If we are going to suggest that the producer bear this administrative cost in the Department, then I think the proper way to do it is to continue to propose general legislation for that purpose and cover all commodities and not just single out this one.

Mr. FINDLEY. If there would be any chance that such legislation would be considered by the committee, I would certainly be in the forefront of those advocating it. Actually as a practical matter I believe the best way to get started on that reform is for us to start today.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCURE. I would like to ask this question with regard to funding the program. I do not see a great deal of distinction between the people who would benefit from this program paying their own costs and the recipients of loans from the SBA, the Federal Housing Administration, and those who benefit from rivers and harbors programs. These costs are borne by the Federal Government because there is a social benefit to the entire country in aiding a particular group of people. I cannot see why you would pick out a particular agricultural program, or agriculture as a whole, and say they must pay their own way and all other programs of the Government can pass the costs to the taxpayers.

Mr. FINDLEY. I believe this bill represents a slightly new departure in the field. The cotton program was intended to deal promotionwise with the threat of synthetics. Here we are financing a promotion of one commodity in competition with other commodities produced by farmers without marketing orders, and therefore I think this is in a class by itself. I believe it would be a good step for us to set a new standard for self-

financing on the part of these various agricultural programs.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCURE. Again I point out, the SBA is in competition with private enterprise; the Federal Housing Administration is the business of loans, and the recipients of the loans are the beneficiaries. They do not pay any administrative overhead.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman, I do not think the circumstances are exactly parallel, but I am intrigued with the idea of having the users pay the full cost of other Government services, so maybe that is well worth exploring.

I did want to raise one other question, which is in regard to the provisions on the referendum. As I read the language of the bill, 51 percent of the producers of potatoes could put into effect, conceivably, this checkoff system, so that theoretically if there were 1,000 commercial producers of potatoes altogether in the 48 States involved here, then 501 of the producers could require that the other 499, against their will, must pay the checkoff. Am I correct there?

Mr. FOLEY. It is an affirmative two-thirds.

Mr. FINDLEY. The language as I read it on page 16 leaves a different impression. It says "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" and it goes on to say "and by not less than a majority of the producers voting in such referendum." So I would take that to mean, assuming the potato producers are concentrated among a relatively few, and there are 1,000 commercial producers, then 501 of that 1,000 could require the other 499 to pay the checkoff.

Mr. FOLEY. If they produce two-thirds of the potatoes.

Mr. FINDLEY. If they produce two-thirds. This seems to me a rather sharp departure from the one-man, one-vote ideas that have been spawned so widely in recent years.

Mr. FOLEY. This provision requires more than a majority of producers. In the case where a majority of producers is sufficient, then they must produce two-thirds of the potatoes. I remind the gentleman again, each producer who produces less than 5 acres is exempt from the bill, and those who are covered who wish to receive a refund have a right to receive such a refund.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the suggestion which has been made by the gentleman from Illinois that all the costs of this program should be borne by the producers is really somewhat of an anomaly. We have in the field of agriculture and in the field of transportation and in many other fields in our national economy substantial inputs of Government funds. Now we have a program where the producers are going to assess themselves to pay for the cost of the

program, and it has been suggested that they should pay even the cost of Government.

The gentleman from Idaho made a sound observation when he commented that each department of Government conducts programs which are of benefit to some segment of our economy, but those segments are not assessed to pay for the costs.

Indeed, that is the reason the Government exists—to carry on public programs.

I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, if carried to a logical extreme, would result in charging against every citizen of the United States who benefits from some program, a pro rata share of the cost of that particular departmental program. Maybe the gentleman feels that is wise, but administratively it seems to me that suggestion is totally unfair to a group of producers who are trying to help themselves and who are paying for the great and overwhelming portion of the cost of this program.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Chairman, I think, as has been already pointed out, we are talking about an \$80,000 probable cost, which indicates it is not of such major importance to the program that we would like to see the program fail on the horns of this particular argument.

I believe we are talking about a principle here which is perhaps more important than the dollars involved.

I believe the majority of the potato growers in my State, while they would prefer not to have this amendment added, would accept the bill with the amendment if that is the price of getting the legislation passed.

Mr. FOLEY. I am not so concerned about the cost, either, but I am concerned very much about the principle. I suggest to the members of the committee that it is rather strange when producer groups come in and say, "Let us assess ourselves so that we can pay the costs of promotion and research and development," and we say to them, "Yes, but you also have to pay the incremental costs of Government associated with it." We appropriate funds of great magnitude for many other programs without asking anything by way of such contributions from their beneficiaries.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to ask a question with relation to page 7, which I raised with the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

This section permits a person—and I quote from the bill—"who is not in favor of supporting the research and promotion program as provided for under this Act" the right to demand and receive a refund of such assessment. It is the refund provision to which I direct the gentleman's attention.

If in fact this language is intended to

be a convenience to the person who does not want to go along, would it not be much better and more fair to permit him simply at the outset to decline to participate by a written notice to the ASCS Committee or whoever will administer the program.

Mr. FOLEY. I will answer the gentleman's question in this way: That particular suggestion was made to the subcommittee and was considered by the subcommittee. There are two problems associated with it.

One is an administrative problem. The bill calls for these funds to be collected by handlers.

Mr. FINDLEY. By whom?

Mr. FOLEY. By handlers.

Mr. FINDLEY. By the first handler?

Mr. FOLEY. By the first handler. It is impossible for the Department to know where a particular potato grower is going to take his potatoes. He might select any one of a number of handlers. So a written notice to the Department, that a producer does not want to participate, would have to be communicated to every handler in the United States. They would have great lists of those people exempting themselves by notice to the Department. It would be almost impossible to carry out that provision; and, I might add for those concerned about expense, very expensive.

Mr. FINDLEY. Could the producer not simply furnish a copy of his notice to the Department, at the time he markets the potatoes?

Mr. FOLEY. That would put a burden, we felt, unjustifiably on the handler. It would also create a tremendous accounting problem, because the handler is responsible for turning over the appropriate funds based on the amount of potatoes he handles.

If we provide an exemption with people presenting papers and taking themselves out, that would have to be deducted when the records were presented and the funds transferred. In addition it would require an immense amount of accounting to be sure the handlers were not violating the law by withholding the funds rather than turn them over to the Government.

For administrative simplicity it was much simpler to require that all assessments be made, and then provide for refunds.

I wish to answer the gentleman's question thoroughly and candidly. This program will not operate, in my judgment and in the judgment of the committee, if the assessments are not first collected, because as a matter of human nature we have found that when people are required to make the assessment and then subsequently to get a refund, however easy it is, most of them do not apply for it and thus support the program. We found that to be the case in the cotton program.

If you ask a man at the handler's door whether he wants to submit the money, some will say "No," and the program will fail as almost all voluntary programs have failed.

I have not heard of any such program voluntarily carried out in the country that has been very successful. That is the reason why we suggest this alternative.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is there because of the fear, mainly, that most of them would take the easy way to get out of the assessment.

Mr. FOLEY. For the two reasons; both for the administrative difficulty of following the gentleman's suggestion and then to make the program workable.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), a member of the committee.

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

The question has arisen this afternoon that we are singling out the potato industry here for different treatment than we have some other commodities. As a signer to the dissenting views, I want to make my position clear. I certainly support the general thrust of this legislation. I think any industry that wants to help itself through a checkoff, paying its own assessment to improve its own lot on the agricultural scene, should be encouraged, particularly at a time when American agriculture finds it most difficult to find a profit. However, I do not completely agree with some of the arguments this afternoon that we in this instance, who are asking that the administrative costs be paid from the funds collected, are singling this industry out. All of the others cited are those whose competition is from outside of agriculture.

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

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

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that there is a cotton research program?

Mr. MYERS. Against synthetics. Yes.

Mr. FOLEY. And the gentleman is also aware that there is a wool research program?

Mr. MYERS. Yes. Against synthetics.

Mr. FOLEY. And does the gentleman say that wool and cotton are not in competition with one another?

Mr. MYERS. They are somewhat competitive, yes; but the real thrust here is not of cotton against wool in this country, as the gentleman well knows. The general activity today in the usage of the fabric does not come from competition between wool versus cotton but comes from that outside which is not produced from American agriculture.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it not true that some synthetics use agricultural products such as the soybean?

Mr. MYERS. A very few do, but a lot of them use petroleum products, too. Will the gentleman concede that petroleum products are used in synthetics, and they are not produced on farms?

It was said by the gentleman from Idaho that the Small Business Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and some of the other agencies use Federal funds. That is quite true. But they do not collect funds from individuals for promotion of that particular industry against another industry. It is an entirely different analogy here. The question here is not that we are going to deny the potato industry access to all of the other facilities and services offered by the Department of Agriculture—not

at all—because the potato industry is going to continue to use the Research Department of the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and many other areas of the Department of Agriculture and of our Federal Government. However, this is an area where they are going to check off from producers a figure estimated to be about \$2 million a year, and it seems to me at a time when we have such a drain on our Treasury why should this not be the place to start to let an industry pay its own way. If they have \$2 million, then I think the \$80,000 you ask to charge to the taxpayers should be assessed back to the industry promoting itself with research to improve its industry competitively with other segments of agriculture.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to think out loud for a moment or two and then ask for some assistance in helping me to make up my mind as to how I should vote on this bill. Frankly at this point I do not know.

As to the matter that the gentleman from Indiana spoke of, competition is something of a concern. The bill speaks of placing the potato industry in a better competitive position. With what? The housewife, in using a substitute for potatoes, might use rice or spaghetti or other such products that are produced by other elements of the agriculture of the United States. If this is the kind of competition we mean, we help one farmer and hurt another. This is one concern.

There is a broader matter that concerns me. At the present time anyone interested in agriculture knows we have difficulty in getting a good loud voice for agriculture collectively. We already have bills before the committee as I understand to do something like we are proposing today in the field of pecan production, milk production, and honey production. If we continue to fragment agriculture ad infinitum, I wonder if in concentrating on particular segments of the industry, we do not actually help reduce the combined voice of the farmers in the United States.

Are we here actually making it a little easier for farmers to say, "No; I am not going to belong to this organization or to that organization which are general farm groups because I have my own specific producers organization which is taking care of me."

I do not want that to happen. I do not know that it would. But that is one of the things that concerns me here, as does this voluntary, but not voluntary situation we get ourselves into. The gentleman from Washington is right when he says the potato people would like to help their industry and they do not mind contributing if we have some kind of voluntary-compulsory system. But they are not going into it in the absence of some kind of compulsion, and the gentleman is right.

There is another argument about whether the Government should be reimbursed for its services.

Actually, we have a congressional policy on the books which says specifically that inasmuch as it is possible to do so

the Federal Government should collect from the people served the cost of the Government service provided for them. Let me make this distinction. When we do research in meat, in cotton, in wool, and anything else, we really are trying to provide a better product for the consumer at a reasonable cost as much as we are trying to help an individual producer of a product.

These are some of the things that bother me.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington or someone else for a response to these questions.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, touching on the last point the gentleman raised first, I would certainly agree that research activities conducted by the Government on agricultural products and processes which make it possible, among other things, to offer agricultural products to consumers at a cheaper cost. If this bill is passed funds will be put into research which I am sure will benefit consumers and at substantially lower cost to the Government than 100-percent financing of research activities.

I think it is possible that this bill could save the Government money in not requiring as much research to be conducted by the Government when there is an ongoing research program carried on by the producers themselves.

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KYL. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I think that in terms of assessing these costs, the costs are not excessive. They could be borne by this particular group of producers. But I am concerned that a program which is almost entirely self-help should be penalized by being made subject to repaying the Government for normal Government activity administrative cost. I think we ought to encourage producers to develop self-help programs. We should not discourage them by putting a penalty upon them.

Mr. KYL. Let me interject at that point. I am not as much worried about these costs as some of the other Members apparently are, because even in the case of price supports for such products as corn, for instance, I believe I can make a perfectly logical case that this subsidy has been for consumers rather than producers. My producers of corn are getting the same prices for corn as they were 10 years ago, and not as much as they were 20 years ago.

Mr. FOLEY. I can say the same thing for wheat.

Mr. KYL. But let us get to this other item about farm organizations and possible fragmentation.

Mr. FOLEY. I think on that too, that the committee has viewed each of these particular bills separately. We cannot establish one overall policy for all com-

modities. The gentleman knows that feed grains and corn are different from wheat, and we have specifically laid aside a honey bill because the committee was not convinced that this bill was in the proper shape.

But if we use the excuse that we are not going to give producers the opportunity to help themselves because it will fragment agriculture's voice, I think the result will be a further fragmentation, or a failure of agriculture to be heard.

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I again yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. But it gives a group of producers a chance to have a program which they tailor, which they design, which they largely finance. It seems to me that this is in the interest of the entire country, of agriculture, and of the Congress. And I do not argue that other farm programs are bad, I think they are good, but the gentleman and I know that they are all expensive. This program is not expensive and is self-financed. We are defeating self-help programs if we defeat this bill today.

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the gentleman a question? Would the gentleman rephrase his last statement? I understood the gentleman to say if we charge this administrative cost back to the potato industry you would defeat the self-help program? Does the gentleman mean they would not go along with it?

Mr. FOLEY. No; the gentleman misunderstands. I think we would be discouraging such programs from being developed. I think charging the cost of Government constitutes a kind of a penalty on these people for coming into a program of this sort. I said later that if the Committee and the House defeated the bill today we will be defeating self-help programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, first of all, in rising to support this bill I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) for the leadership which he has brought to the floor today.

I might point out also that the State of Idaho, which is the leading potato-producing State in the Nation has had some 30 years of experience with this kind of a potato research and promotion program. Back in 1939 the State of Idaho adopted a potato promotion and research program financed by an assessment on potatoes produced within the

State. The main difference between the program in Idaho and the one that is proposed here is that in Idaho there is no right to a refund of the assessments that are paid. But the program has worked successfully for the State of Idaho, and I believe that it can work successfully to help the potato industry across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out that this bill represents a new departure. I welcome a new departure. Make no mistake about it; the American farmer is in trouble. By any standards, the crisis in rural America is deeper and more serious than the urban crisis.

Until we come up with the answer to the problem of decreasing farm income, we cannot afford to overlook any kind of program that offers some hope. This program offers some hope for a solution.

There is no price support program for potatoes. None is asked for here. But they do ask for an opportunity to cooperate in the development of a program for the promotion and sale of their product.

The enactment of this bill will provide the Nation's potato industry with an important instrument of self-help. It will permit the establishment of a coordinated nationwide research and promotion program for potatoes to be financed by potato growers.

The need for the kind of a program that is anticipated by this bill is clear. Potatoes are among our most nutritious food products and have always been one of the consumer's best food bargains. Nevertheless, according to information furnished by the Department of Agriculture, per capita consumption of potatoes declined from 122 pounds 30 years ago to about 110 pounds where it has remained since the early 1950's. Per capita consumption of fresh potatoes has continued to decline during the past decade. This trend has reflected a growing preference for processed potato products.

The passage of this legislation will enable potato growers to help themselves develop programs that will help to overcome problems that confront the potato industry and marketing its products. The industry frequently faces a problem of imbalance of supply and demand. The grower must sell his potatoes in a market that is highly competitive and subject to rapid change. When there is a surplus of potatoes, the effect is often a depressed price that causes a sharp decline in the income of potato growers.

The proposed Potato Research and Promotion Act would provide potato growers with the means to develop a program designed to increase their income by expanding and stabilizing the market for potato products. Such a program could yield significant benefits to the potato producer.

The legislation will also benefit the consumer. Among the objectives of a potato research and promotion program will be the establishment and maintenance of quality standards, accurate information on the nutritional value of potatoes and the development of new potato products to meet consumer demands.

Mr. Chairman, my own State of Idaho

leads the Nation in the production of potatoes. The value of the 1968 potato crop in Idaho was estimated to be \$111,000,000 which is a little more than one-fifth of the total value of all potatoes produced in the Nation in 1968 which is estimated to be \$609,000,000. Total production in the Nation in 1968 was 305.4 million hundredweight. Of this amount, Idaho produced 59.5 million hundredweight. It is evident, therefore, that the potato industry is an important part of the economy of the State of Idaho.

Idaho has had long experience with programs of potato research and promotion. The Idaho Advertising Commission was created by the State legislature in 1939. The primary purpose of the commission was to promote the sale of Idaho potatoes under a program financed by an assessment made on all potatoes produced in the State. The name of the commission was later changed to the Idaho Potato and Onion Commission. Through its efforts to establish and maintain high standards of quality and to expand the market for Idaho potatoes, the commission has contributed greatly to the reputation Idaho now enjoys as the producer of the finest potatoes in America. The commission's work has been aided greatly by other organizations within the potato industry including the Potato Growers of Idaho, Inc., an organization of farmers who grow potatoes, the Potato Processors of Idaho, Inc., and the Idaho Grower-Shippers Association.

The same techniques that have worked for the Idaho potato industry can work for the Nation's potato industry. And, all potato-producing States, including Idaho, will benefit from any successful efforts to expand the market for potato products.

H.R. 2777 is supported by the Potato Growers of Idaho, Inc. At the hearings held earlier before the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Clarence Parr, immediate past president and current vice president of the organization, which represents most of Idaho's potato growers, presented testimony in support of this bill. I am satisfied that the great majority of potato growers in Idaho favor the passage of this legislation.

I should point out, however, that opinion in Idaho is not unanimously in support of H.R. 2777. Many growers and other industry representatives have written to me to express opposition to the bill or to certain provisions in the bill. Some who oppose the bill say they would rather use the money to promote the sale of Idaho potatoes. I believe, however, that if we continue to maintain high standards of quality and do an effective job of merchandising our products, Idaho can win a fair share of any expanded potato markets that result from the nationwide research and promotion program that would be permitted by the passage of this bill. I am happy, therefore, to give H.R. 2777 my full support.

The bill provides two important safeguards which I would call to the attention of those who have expressed some

misgiving about this legislation. First, section 14 of the bill provides that no plan issued pursuant to the act shall be effective unless it has been approved by a vote of the potato growers. Any plan must be approved by not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum or by the producers of not less than two-thirds of the potatoes produced by the producers voting, provided that at least the majority of the producers voting have approved the plan.

Second, section 8(g) provides that any potato producer from whom an assessment has been collected and who is not in favor of supporting the research and promotion program shall have the right to demand and receive a refund of any assessment paid.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today represents a promising step in the right direction. It will provide potato growers across the Nation with essential tools that will enable them to help themselves in a cooperative effort to stabilize and expand the market for potato products, raise farm income, and at the same time render a service of great value to the American consumer.

I urge your favorable vote.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest when the gentleman from Washington talked about the self-help programs. I want to assure him there is not anyone in this Congress who is more interested in self-help programs than I am. But let us make it a self-help program.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman from Washington and to the membership of this House that the Washington State Apple Commission has the finest promotion program of any commodity group in the entire United States, and it is done strictly by the commission. It has not come to the Federal Government and asked for one penny. It assesses members approximately 6 cents per bushel for every box of apples packed.

Just recently, a day or two ago, this came to my desk:

[From the Goodfruit Growers, Yakima, Wash., Oct. 15, 1969]

RESEARCH COMMISSION STARTS COLLECTION

Following a favorable growers' referendum in August, the Washington Tree Fruit Research Commission is collecting a 10 cents per ton assessment on Washington tree fruits. The 1969 assessments apply on peaches, prunes, pears and apples that were shipped fresh or processed commercially Aug. 12 or later. In 1970, the assessment will apply on all Washington deciduous tree fruits.

Assessments are paid by the growers. However, in most cases these funds are deducted by dealers or processors from their growers' accounts and then transmitted on to the Research Commission in the ways prescribed.

To minimize collection costs, the Washington State Apple Advertising Commission is collecting assessments on fresh apples for the Research Commission along with its own advertising funds (directly following shipment). Similarly, the Washington State Fruit Commission is collecting the research assessment along with its own soft fruit assessments on peaches, prunes, Bartlett pears, cherries and apricots. In addition, research assessments on processing apples and on fresh and processing winter pears will be

collected by the Research Commission through the Washington State Fruit Commission. The research assessment will apply on all fruit that is sold for commercial processing, but not on fruit that is culled out by a processor (such as when he pays the dealer for processing grade number 1 and 2 Bartlett pears and nothing for the culls).

Dealers and processors will report and pay both research and promotional assessments to the Washington State Fruit Commission by means of Shipper Reports and Processor Reports respectively. These report forms are distributed by the Fruit Commission as a way to report the packout or pack and determine the total assessments to be transmitted on a particular commodity. The forms are adaptable to listing both assessments.

All fruit buyers are legally responsible to withhold and pay a grower's assessments unless it is certain that the grower will remit directly himself (such as when he sells his fruit directly to a retailer).

Here again they are doing everything on their own.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the time remaining on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like in closing to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for this very kind reference to the Washington Apple Commission in my State. I agree with him wholeheartedly. They do a splendid job. They promote, of course, Washington apples. They do not promote Pennsylvania apples or Virginia apples or New York apples. Each State is entitled to set up these programs, and they are very useful.

The purpose of this program is to set up a national program for all potato producers throughout the United States and this is a much different undertaking than carrying on a promotion program for a particular product within the borders of a State.

I think the debate has covered fairly most of the issues here. I would just like to appeal to the members of the committee that what we do today will be observed very carefully throughout agricultural America.

If it appears that this House is not willing to endorse the efforts of this group of producers to assess themselves, to develop their own product and to promote it and to advertise it and to build stability and strength into their markets, then the result I think will be to discourage these self-help efforts.

It seems to me, and I must repeat this, because the amount of money is not large—it seems to me absurd that gentlemen would quibble about the administrative cost of a program so largely to be borne by the producers themselves.

As the gentleman says, about \$2 million would be assessed under this program by these people out of their pockets to carry on the advertising research and promotion which would be of benefit to the consumers as well as to themselves. That ought to be encouraged. It ought to be lauded and supported. We should not single out these producers for a particular and unusual assessment of Government costs in connection with the program which is not borne by any other comparable program that I know of. I think that would be unfortunate and undesirable.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman heard of the old adage that it is not always the first cost but the upkeep that really costs?

Mr. FOLEY. I have heard of the adage, but as I said to the gentleman from Illinois, I would be most surprised—and I assure the gentleman and I am very sincere in saying so—I would be most surprised if these costs actually reached \$80,000 a year.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. I believe the gentleman stated that no other industry paid its own way. How about rice?

Mr. FOLEY. There are inspection programs, but not programs of promotion and advertising; the latter do not pay for the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MYERS. Under the Perishable Commodities Act there is a checkoff provision by which they pay their own policing and administrative costs of the program, is that not correct?

Mr. FOLEY. That is an unusual program, the cost of which is borne by those who are members. That is correct. The Perishable Commodities Act is a program which has nothing to do with research and promotion. Here the Government is merely a part of the program, an overseer. In the situation the gentleman describes, the Government does a major investigation and enforcement job.

The two are not comparable.

Mr. MYERS. That is correct, but the industry, the producers of the commodity, pay their own way. If the gentleman will yield further, what food product has a program just like the one proposed? What food product has a checkoff for promotion and research which is just like this program?

Mr. FOLEY. I cannot give the gentleman the exact number, but I believe under about 17 marketing orders there is a checkoff for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. 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 this Act may be cited as the "Potato Research and Promotion Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the declared policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act 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 Act—

(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 forty-eight contiguous States of the United States.

(d) The term "handler" means any person who handles potatoes except a common or contract carrier of potatoes owned by another person.

(e) The term "handle" means to transport or sell potatoes or otherwise place potatoes in the current of commerce, except that the sale of unharvested potatoes and the transfer or delivery of potatoes from the farm on which they are produced to a temporary storage facility, packing shed or processing plant shall not be considered handling.

(f) The term "producer" means any person engaged in the growing of five or more acres of potatoes.

(g) The term "promotion" means any action taken by the National Potato Promotion Board, pursuant to this Act, 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 Act, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, 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 Act, and to authorize the use of such funds to provide research, development, advertising, and promotion of potatoes in a manner prescribed in this Act. Any order issued by the Secretary under this Act shall hereinafter in this Act be referred to as a "plan". Any such plan shall be applicable to potatoes produced in the forty-eight contiguous States of 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 Act, 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 or modifications thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act.

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 Act and the powers vested in him by this Act.

REQUIRED TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 8. Any plan issued pursuant to this Act 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 Act, any potato producer against whose potatoes any assessment is made and collected under authority of this Act and who is not in favor of supporting the research and promotion program as provided for under this Act 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 Act.

(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 appropriate 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 Act 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 Act.

(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 some 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 Act, to permit an effective and continuous coordinated program of research and development or 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 Act and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such plan.

ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) The first handler of potatoes shall be responsible, under the provisions of this Act and any plan issued pursuant to it, for payment to the board of any assessments 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, any 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.

(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 Act or of any plan or regulation issued pursuant to this Act.

(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 of 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 Act.

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 Act.

(b) Any handler who willfully violates any provisions of any plan issued by the Secretary under this Act, or who willfully fails or refuses to remit any assessment or fee duly required of him thereunder shall be subject to criminal prosecution and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$1,000 for each such offense which shall accrue to the United States and in addition shall be subject to civil suit brought by the United States to collect any unpaid assessments levied under this Act.

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 Act 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 Act, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued under this Act. For the purpose of any such investigation, the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena 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 subpoena 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 where of 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 subpoena of the Secretary, or in any cause or proceeding, criminal or otherwise, based upon, or growing out of any alleged violation of this Act, 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 Act 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 Act, 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 of or 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 the Act applicable to plans shall be applicable to amendments to plans.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act 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 Act: *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 Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 19. This Act shall take effect upon enactment.

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments may be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, lines 19 through 21, delete all of subsection 3(d) and substitute the following:

"(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 Act or in the rules and regulations issued thereunder."

Page 3, lines 3 through 8, delete all of subsection 3(e). Redesignate subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

Page 4, line 6, delete the period and add the following: "and as are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in potatoes or potato products."

Page 5, line 1, delete "or modifications".

Page 9, lines 21 and 23, delete "research and development or advertising and promotion" and substitute "research, development, advertising and promotion".

Page 10, line 12, delete "The first handler of potatoes shall be responsible, under the provisions of this Act and any plan issued pursuant to it, for payment to the board of any assessments levied on potatoes;" and substitute:

"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;"

Page 10, line 6, insert the following sentences at the end of section 10(a):

"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."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 16, line 18, strike the comma and all following language to and including the word "referendum" on line 22.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the language which permits a single majority of the potato producers subject to this act to invoke the provisions of the act.

If the amendment is accepted, the period would occur right after the word "referendum" on line 18, so the plan would take effect only if it is favored by not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in such a referendum.

There is ample precedent for this. In fact, the provisions of the bill as now before us represent the exception rather than the rule in the handling of referendums. The most familiar referendum perhaps to the country at large is the wheat referendum, which has a provision under which the terms cannot be invoked unless they are approved by two-thirds. The same is true in the case of the tobacco, rice, and cotton programs. It is true that in a few other programs there are some exceptions which have authority such as that set forth on this page which would permit a bare majority of the producers to invoke the provisions of the program.

The reason I feel it is entirely in the public interest to require at least two-thirds of the producers to approve is that in effect what we have before us today is a tax bill. It authorizes the imposition of a tax on potato producers. To be sure, it does have a cumbersome way out by which refunds can be secured, but the real effect of this bill is to authorize the imposition of a tax. Instead of placing in the hands of a simple majority of potato growers the right to impose a tax upon the minority that might not wish to go along with it, I think we ought to extend this to the customary two-thirds level.

As I pointed out earlier, the language as now written did permit just one over the one-half of the total producers to invoke this program. Let us assume, for example, the total number of commercial producers of potatoes comes to 1,000. This means that 501 of that 1,000, assuming all 1,000 were voting in the ref-

erendum, could invoke and impose a tax upon the other 499.

Under the provisions of my amendment, the requirement would be changed, instead of a simple majority, to a two-thirds majority. That is the effect of my amendment. I would be glad to answer any questions.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has called this a tax. If it is, it is a self-imposed tax, which is a rather unusual kind of tax. It is an assessment, but whatever we call it, I think the provisions of this bill require an unusual degree of interest on the part of the producers before the plan can come into existence.

First of all, the Secretary must convince himself that such a plan is desired.

Second, the Secretary holds hearings at which anyone can testify.

Third, if the Secretary makes a determination to present a plan for referendum, he does so.

Initially he decides whether to submit the plan for referendum. If he does not feel it is fair or desirable, he does not submit it. Then, when the referendum is before the producers, two-thirds of them have to agree or a majority producing two-thirds of the crop.

The gentleman suggests that these voting levels are inadequate. The gentleman is elected by a simple majority and sits in the House by a simple majority. The Congress of the United States by a simple majority can impose a tax on our citizens for which they are not able to obtain a refund.

So I think we have built into this bill great protection against any potato producers being dragged into a program which they do not favor.

I might also point out in the hearings we conducted in the subcommittee on April 17, not one single producer witness appeared in opposition to this bill—not one who was a potato producer.

There was an unusual degree of unanimity.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. If that is the case, then why does the gentleman oppose an amendment requiring two-thirds approval? If there is no objection in the country on the part of the potato producers, they will get 100-percent approval on the referendum. Why not raise it to the two-thirds level, which has been the common practice on all referendums ever carried out by the USDA?

Mr. FOLEY. Because we have a provision for any producer who wishes to obtain a refund. I believe we have taken full and complete care of that problem. Any producer can get out who does not want to participate.

The gentleman used the example of the wheat referendum. The wheat referendum used a two-thirds vote, but that was to set up a mandatory marketing quota, and no producer was entitled to remove himself from such a program, if approved.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will not the gentleman agree that as a practical matter it will be so cumbersome that very few of

those even with the greatest determination will go through the redtape to get a refund of the assessment?

Mr. FOLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman that it would be cumbersome or that there would be redtape. In fact, the committee has gone as far as it can go to make it very easy for such people to obtain refunds.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yet the gentleman just a little earlier today in arguing against my proposal that the producer have an option to refuse the assessment said that would make it too easy. So one must assume that the provision set forth in this bill is a more difficult procedure and would therefore discourage producers from utilizing it.

Mr. FOLEY. I said, with reference to being able to just say "No" at the gate, that would discourage participation. The problem with that is that it puts a burden on those who are more willing to contribute, and the others will just ride along.

There is a slight, minimum—very minimum inconvenience involved in applying for a refund. If a person wants a refund he ought to be able to go through that slight inconvenience.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCURE. Is it not correct—the gentleman in the well can perhaps tell us—that the usual provision under the 1937 act, the provision under which the various marketing orders have been made, was for this kind of a participatory and volume test?

Mr. FOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCURE. This is not the exception, but this is the rule.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman from Illinois used an example taken from a referendum—a mandatory program—the wheat referendum. This is not such a program.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is my understanding, however, that this truly is the exceptional type of language under marketing order authority, not the rule. I realize I cannot present the documentation at this moment, but I believe I am correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 266]

Abbott	Collier	Green, Pa.
Ashley	Conyers	Gubser
Barrett	Dawson	Halpern
Belcher	de la Garza	Hamilton
Brock	Delaney	Hammer-
Brown, Calif.	Denney	schmidt
Burleson, Tex.	Dennis	Hansen, Wash.
Bush	Diggs	Hawkins
Cahill	Dingell	Horton
Celler	Flynt	Hosmer
Chisholm	Frellinghuysen	Howard
Clark	Garmatz	Ichord
Clay	Gialmo	Jacobs

Jarman	Ottenger	Springer
Jones, Tenn.	Pollock	Stuckey
Kirwan	Powell	Teague, Tex.
Kuykendall	Price, Tex.	Thompson, N.J.
Lipscomb	Rees	Tunney
Long, La.	Reid, N.Y.	Utt
McCarthy	Rivers	Waldie
Maddison	Rooney, Pa.	Watkins
Mass.	Rostenkowski	Whalley
MacGregor	Roudebush	Wilson,
Martin	Roybal	Charles H.
Mathias	Sandman	Winn
May	Scheuer	Wyllie
Nichols	Sisk	Wyman
Nix	Smith, Calif.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HENDERSON, 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. 2777, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 351 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 18, line 15, change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the National Potato Promotion Board shall reimburse the United States Treasury for all expenses, except those incurred in conducting referendums pursuant to sections 14 and 15(b) of this Act, incurred by the Secretary in administering the provisions of this Act and all such reimbursements shall be deposited in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require the Potato Promotion Board to reimburse the Federal Government for its annual administrative expenses.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that these expenses would be approximately \$80,000 annually.

The Department has testified in favor of a similar proposition in respect to the pending honey promotion bill—see pages 11 and 12 of the printed hearings on H.R. 9655, serial K, June 10 and 11, 1969.

The amendment would not require reimbursement for the cost of any referendum.

This amendment was offered in the subcommittee, where it failed on a three-vote tie, and in the full committee, where it failed by a four-vote margin.

With anticipated income of \$2 million per year, the Potato Promotion Board could well afford in my opinion, to reimburse the Government for its administrative costs.

And now to show how inconsistent we are, let me quote from the committee hearings on honey promotion bills. Mr. Nicholson, Deputy Director, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture:

We recommend that the bill be amended to provide that any costs to the U.S. Department of Agriculture incurred in administering any program developed pursuant to this legislation shall be financed by assessments collected from handlers which handlers may deduct in settlement with domestic producers.

Thank you.

Mr. FOLEY. Thank you, Mr. Nicholson. My memory may be faulty but I do not recall that the Department recommended the recovery of costs in the recent report on the Potato Research and Promotion Act. Do you recall?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, I recall it, and I believe we did not. This was, I do not believe, mentioned in the testimony or the report. I think the bill itself provided that the funds should be obtained from section 32 funds and I think we left it that way.

Mr. FOLEY. Could you enlighten us as to why the Department has taken the position of recovering the funds from assessments on this legislation?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Only to the extent that this is the policy on this bill. That was my instruction, to so proceed.

Mr. FOLEY. I see.

Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. I would like to follow up Mr. Foley's question, Mr. Nicholson, because I think the question will be brought to us. I think we might appreciate if you would get a reading from the Department on why their policy on this is one way and they did not recommend it on the potato bill. If that would be possible in a letter from you representing them or someone down there at that level, because I am sure Mr. Foley and I and others on the committee will be asked this question.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, Am I correct that the effect of the amendment that the gentleman offered would be to require that the assessments against the commercial potato growers would be high enough not only to cover the cost of advertising but to cover approximately \$80,000 a year in ongoing administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture? Am I correct in that?

Mr. GOODLING. You are correct. I stated at one time during this debate that they anticipate a take of about \$2 million a year if this bill becomes law.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY for the amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 18, line 15, change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the National Potato Promotion Board shall reimburse the United States Treasury for all expenses, except those incurred in conducting referendums under which the decision is negative, pursuant to sections 14 and 15(b) of this Act, incurred by the Secretary in administering the provisions of this Act and all such reimbursements shall be deposited in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Clerk read incorrectly one of the words. The decision made is "negative" is a part of the amendment in the form of a substitute. In other words, it should read under which the decision is "negative." That is the language of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the language to which the gentleman refers follow the word "referendum"?

Mr. FINDLEY. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read it correctly.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the pending amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) would be to provide self-financing by commercial potato producers of the administrative expense of the program which is admittedly rather modest. It is certainly in the public interest for us to set a new precedent here for self-financing fees for users who are benefited by a program of this type. It is a good amendment.

The amendment which I offer in the nature of a substitute I believe is a better amendment because it would also recover by the same procedure through the assessments against the commercial potato producers the cost of a successful referendum. Now, of course, if a referendum is held and it has a negative outcome, it certainly would not be fair to assess the cost of a referendum against the potato producers. But assuming the outcome of the referendum is favorable and every indication is that it would be, then the Treasury would be reimbursed out of the assessments against potato producers. The effect on the U.S. Treasury would be considerable because the estimated cost of the referendum would be about \$300,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, this added to the annual administrative cost would mean that for the first year the assessments against the potato producers would be adequate to cover both the administrative cost and the cost of the referendum, about \$400,000, assuming the outcome of the referendum is affirmative. And, on subsequent years, assuming there are not subsequent referendums, then the cost spread by means of assessments would be \$80,000 a year.

There is a good precedent for this. We have self-financing user charges under the rice program, for meat grading fees and user fees which are required in many activities authorized by the Federal Government such as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. Earlier this year this Congress authorized a higher license fee under the PAC in order to cover adequately the administrative cost of that program.

This is an effort on my part to make a good amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) better.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, both of these amendments seem to tack on additional burdens of paying the cost of the Government administration of a program that is a self-help program.

For those members of the committee who were not in the Chamber during the course of the general debate on this bill, this bill proposes to permit potato growers to assess costs—to assess themselves—up to 1 cent per one hundred-weight in order to develop a fund to advertise and promote new research in potatoes.

It is one of the first bills—not the first

bill—to place an assessment upon an agricultural commodity to be paid by the producers themselves.

It seems ironic that such a program should be the occasion for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) to propose an amendment to recover the cost of the additional costs in the form of Government salaries—the salaries of the Department officials and supervisors, who would oversee the program otherwise privately financed.

We do not know whether this program is going to cost \$80,000. It is not an amount of money paid out of the Treasury, it just represents a share of the administrative budget of the Department.

If the logic of the gentleman were extended, every small business loan applicant would have to pay an additional amount of money to take care of the costs of the Small Business Administration.

The Government supports a variety of programs which benefit various areas of our economy. Most are completely Government financed. This is one, which is not mainly a Government program, will be mainly a privately financed program. I suggest that if we want to encourage the side of initiative and self-help that we should vote against the amendment and the substitute to the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment, and the amendment.

The analogies used this afternoon are not analogous at all because they are in entirely different areas. The various agencies of the Federal Government, as has been said earlier, of course provide service, but they provide service in most cases for people who are unable to help themselves; they are doing a service that the people are not able to do for themselves, but the very intent of this bill is to allow an industry to do for itself. I believe this, of course, is in the tradition of the American way, to allow industry to do for itself.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the substitute, as well as the original amendment, certainly deserve the support of this House.

Of course, it is quite true that there are not any exact precedents in other bills just like this, I grant that, but I also say the examples that have been given of cotton and wool—and these are the only two that have been mentioned by many this afternoon—are certainly not like this bill at all. So we are really blazing a new trail here, and I do not know what better opportunity we might have to start such a precedent than right now to pay its own way.

Mr. Chairman, there will be a motion to recommit if these amendments fail. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will offer that motion, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain the motion to recommit.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to point out to the Members of this House that my motion to recommit will contain the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY). This will give us a clear-cut vote on whether the House and this Congress want the taxpayers to pick

up the tab for a promotional program, or whether it wants the commodity group that is interested to pick up that tab.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing I just want to say that it is not a case this afternoon of anyone who votes for this motion to recommit and for these amendments, of being in opposition to the potato industry helping itself. This is not really the issue at all.

It would seem to me that the bill before us this afternoon is a bill to provide an opportunity for an industry to help itself, and it would seem to me that if an industry is going to help promote itself against other competition from agricultural products within agriculture itself that the only fair way to do that is to allow that industry, as has been said earlier, to pay its entire way, and the potato industry can do so on the basis of these amendments; let the industry really do for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I plan to support the motion to recommit. I shall vote for the bill if it contains either one of these amendments, but I cannot support the bill if it does not have either one of these amendments in it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to take a look at the bill and see what the Secretary is asked to do, for which the bill provides he will pay for from Department of Agriculture funds. The amendments require that the producers use the money raised to promote their products, to pay for the administrative costs of the Secretary.

In the bill the Secretary is asked to fix the assessment rate. Recommendations will be made by the Board to the Secretary, but he has to make the determination. This should be an independent judgment that he makes and not something that the Board or the supervisors pay the Secretary, because whoever pays the piper calls the tune.

The Secretary is also asked to authorize decisions of the Board, for research, development, advertising and promotion of potatoes and potato products.

The Secretary should make independent judgments himself.

Also, the Board submits to the Secretary for his approval any research, development, advertising or promotion programs or projects.

He should make that independent judgment himself. When we call on the Secretary to make that determination to protect the consumers of this country, then they ought at least pay for the cost of it.

You can go through 10 different places in the bill where the Secretary is asked to make judgments. They have to submit their books and records for the Secretary to look at to insure that they will be protected adequately.

It provides authority that the Board use funds collected, but the Board must have the approval of the Secretary for the development and expansion of the product production and sales.

In section 15(a) the Secretary has authority to declare that the plan is not

within the declared policy of the act and can terminate and suspend operation of the plan.

Under any of these, he ought to make his independent judgment.

The reason why he is asked to do it is because this is the service the Government provides for all the people of this country to make sure that the promotion is according to Hoyle and protect the producers who are asking for this self-help plan. The cotton and wool promotion programs require the same type of judgments and action by the Secretary of Agriculture financed by Department funds.

This may be a forerunner of some other promotional legislation. I hope the committee will bring one out on honey. I am all for that myself. But in the omnibus farm bill, there is one for dairy products as well. That proposal, as I understand it, provides for block voting. There is only individual voting in this bill.

The dairy provision also provides that there shall not be any refund. I believe in protecting the rights of those who disagree. This bill provides for a refund to those who do not want to go along with the promotion program. I think it is good that we set this precedent for any promotion program.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure that the gentleman will agree that none of these responsibilities and burdens upon the Secretary would exist were it not for the advertising and promotion by potato producers. Therefore, I think it quite proper that these producers bear the expense.

Mr. QUIE. The Secretary would not have the responsibility of all the other programs if they were not passed by the Congress. In fact, the budget of the Department of Agriculture would be pretty small if we did not give the Secretary any responsibility.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. Would the gentleman agree that a group of independent grocers' association known as the IGA, who are independent businessmen throughout the country, but get together collectively to advertise and to promote their industry—why should not the Federal Government pay the administrative costs for this organization or any similar organization of businessmen to promote their industry?

Mr. QUIE. We prohibit the use of brand advertising in this legislation and the IGA, surely, would not be advertising for their competitors.

What is happening here is the potato producers are advertising together and it does not make any difference, if the farmers compete with each other for the market—we are all in this together. If potato producers want to raise their own money to promote their own product without brand labeling, we should permit them to do so. The promotion and development of our agricultural resources is a benefit to the entire Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to

strike out the last word and rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment. I see no reason why the potato growers who might benefit from this legislation, if there is any benefit, should not pay the bill. In the first place, I have not heard this afternoon what the competition is to potatoes, why there needs to be a promotional campaign or a research campaign, with respect to the sale of potatoes. What is there in competition with potatoes?

My wife is not about to whip up a batch of cornstarch for me to adorn with pork chop or beef gravy. When I want potatoes and gravy, I want potatoes. So what is the substitute for potatoes?

This is not a question of butter against oleomargarine. There is no substitute for a good Irish potato. If so, some of you Irishmen tell me what it is.

Having read several articles recently about the rapidly expanding catfish farming, I can envision the day if this bill is approved, when we will be confronted with a catfish checkoff. I hope the catfish farmers will pay for their own promotional campaign, even though there is competition in the fish market. But I cannot think of a more luscious meal than catfish. Does the gentleman from Alabama know of anything more delectable than a good channel cat out of fresh water? Nothing better. Nothing better.

I can also see the day when we might have a chitlin checkoff coming up if we approve this bill to soak all of the taxpayers of the country to promote potatoes.

You had better believe that in this day of financial stress and strain in this country, the potato industry had better pay for its own promotional campaign. I certainly support the substitute amendment, and I would hope the bill would be defeated for I am not convinced legislation on this subject is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOLEY) there were—ayes 55, noes 35.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. FOLEY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 48.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), as amended by the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the gentleman from Washington with respect to a problem that occurs to me on page 11 of the bill. In the committee amendment that has been adopted, on page 11, line 9, it says:

No more than one such assessment shall be made on any potatoes.

I have looked through the bill and I do not find there any provision that protects against Federal preemption.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe it is the intention of the committee to accomplish this result, but I suggest the possibility, and I think it fair to pose the possibility that a court could so construe this language as to mean that any State program, such as in Idaho or Maine or Michigan, would be completely stricken from the books, because here we have a Federal law that says: "No more than one such assessment shall be made on any potatoes."

I can imagine in a program such as has been described with respect to Idaho, where there is absolutely no possibility of getting out from under it, the producer, once this became the law, could take the position he did not have to pay anything to Idaho, that he paid the Federal assessment, and then he could get the Federal assessment back.

Would the gentleman care to respond to that argument?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman I respectfully disagree with him that this creates a problem of preemption. The clear purpose of the statement on page 11 which refers to one assessment is to apply that to the assessment under this program. It does not refer to any State programs conducted under authority of any State law.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, then I submit as a matter of legislative history the gentleman will state that, in an attempt to make it clear, there is no intent anywhere in this bill to preempt any State programs.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have one further question, if the gentleman would answer me.

On page 7 of the bill there is set forth the machinery whereby a producer can get his money back if he disagrees with the program, and it says he shall have the right to make a personal demand. It says the "demand shall be made personally by such producer in accordance with regulations and on a form" and so forth.

Is this intended to be broad enough to include the administrator or executor of a producer?

Mr. FOLEY. The particular requirements to obtain a refund are to be spelled out in the plan approved by the Secretary and submitted to referendum by the producers.

I refer the gentleman to the committee report, on page 3, which indicates the right of a producer to demand and receive a refund of assessments paid by him. The report goes on to explain that such a demand, although being made in accordance with regulations described by the Board, must not be required early, not less than 90 days, and must be paid within 60 days.

The report goes on to say:

The applicable regulations and forms be so designed as to facilitate the refunding with a minimum of delay, inconvenience and expense. To this end, the regulations and forms should be so readily understandable

that the producer himself may comply with their terms and complete them without assistance from professionals or the employment of counsel.

I will say to the gentleman, the language does not prohibit the representational application by counsel or anyone else in behalf of the producers.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. But the language of the statute uses the word "personal".

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. May I suggest an interpretation which is I believe the interpretation the committee placed on this language. The requirement that it be made in person includes any personal representative, of course, such as the administrator or executor of an estate who represents the person of the deceased. He can make the application in behalf of the estate of the deceased. I believe, clearly, under general probate law, that includes the personal request of the applicant who made the payment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HENDERSON, 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. 2777), 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, pursuant to House Resolution 611, 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.

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. HALL. 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 171, nays 198, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—171

Adams	Galifianakis	Murphy, N.Y.
Albert	Gaydos	Myers
Alexander	Gettys	Nedzi
Anderson,	Gialmo	Obey
Calif.	Gonzalez	O'Hara
Andrews,	Goodling	O'Konski
N. Dak.	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Annunzio	Griffiths	O'Neal, Ga.
Aspinall	Hagan	O'Neill, Mass.
Belcher	Hamilton	Passman
Bell, Calif.	Hanley	Patman
Blester	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
Blanton	Hansen, Wash.	Philbin
Blatnik	Hathaway	Poage
Boland	Hays	Podell
Bolling	Henderson	Preyer, N.C.
Brademas	Hicks	Pryor, Ark.
Brasco	Holifield	Pucinski
Brooks	Hungate	Purcell
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Quile
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Pa.	Rivers
Burlison, Mo.	Jonas	Roberts
Burton, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Jones, N.C.	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Karth	Ruppe
Cabell	Kastenmeier	Ruth
Casey	Kazen	Saylor
Clark	Kee	Scheuer
Clausen,	Kleppe	Skubitz
Don H.	Kluczynski	Slack
Conte	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Corman	Kyl	Smith, N.Y.
Culver	Kyros	Staggers
Cunningham	Landrum	Stanton
Daddario	Langen	Steed
Daniels, N.J.	Leggett	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Stubblefield
Dickinson	Lloyd	Stuckey
Donohue	Lowenstein	Symington
Dorn	McCloskey	Taylor
Downing	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Dulski	McDade	Teague, Tex.
Eckhardt	McFall	Thompson, Ga.
Edmondson	McMillan	Tiernan
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Udall
Ellberg	Mailliard	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Evins, Tenn.	Mayne	Waggonner
Fallon	Meeds	Wampler
Findley	Melcher	Watson
Fisher	Mikva	White
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Wilson,
Foley	Miller, Ohio	Charles H.
Ford,	Mink	Yates
William D.	Mizell	Young
Fountain	Mollohan	Zablocki
Fraser	Moss	Zwach
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	

NAYS—198

Abernethy	Claawson, Del.	Goldwater
Adair	Cleveland	Gray
Addabbo	Cohelan	Griffin
Anderson, Ill.	Collins	Gross
Anderson,	Colmer	Grover
Tenn.	Conable	Gude
Andrews, Ala.	Conyers	Haley
Arends	Corbett	Hall
Ashbrook	Coughlin	Harrington
Ayres	Cowger	Harsha
Baring	Cramer	Harvey
Beall, Md.	Daniel, Va.	Hastings
Bennett	Davis, Wis.	Hébert
Berry	Delaney	Hechler, W. Va.
Betts	Dellenback	Heckler, Mass.
Bevill	Dent	Helstoski
Biaggi	Derwinski	Hogan
Blackburn	Devine	Horton
Boggs	Diggs	Hull
Bow	Dingell	Hunt
Bray	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Brinkley	Duncan	Ichord
Broomfield	Dwyer	Jarman
Brotzman	Edwards, Ala.	Keith
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, La.	King
Broyhill, Va.	Erlenborn	Koch
Buchanan	Esch	Landgrebe
Burke, Fla.	Eshleman	Latta
Burton, Utah	Farbstein	Long, Md.
Button	Fish	Lujan
Byrnes, Wis.	Flowers	Lukens
Caffery	Ford, Gerald R.	McClory
Camp	Foreman	McCulloch
Carey	Frey	McDonald,
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	Mich.
Cederberg	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen
Celler	Fuqua	McKneally
Chamberlain	Gallagher	Madden
Chappell	Gibbons	Mann
Ciancy	Gilbert	Marsh

Meskill	Randall	Stafford
Michel	Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.
Mills	Reid, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Minish	Reid, N.Y.	Stokes
Minshall	Reifel	Stratton
Mize	Rhodes	Taft
Monagan	Riegle	Talcott
Montgomery	Robison	Thomson, Wis.
Moorhead	Rodino	Vander Jagt
Morgan	Rogers, Fla.	Vanik
Morse	Rooney, N.Y.	Vigorito
Morton	Roth	Watts
Mosher	Ryan	Weicker
Natcher	St Germain	Whalen
Nelsen	St. Onge	Whitehurst
Ottinger	Satterfield	Whitten
Patten	Schadeberg	Whitall
Pelly	Scherle	Wiggins
Perkins	Schneebeli	Williams
Pettis	Schwengel	Wilson, Bob
Pickle	Scott	Wold
Pike	Sebelius	Wolff
Pirnie	Shirley	Wyatt
Poff	Shriver	Wyder
Price, Ill.	Sikes	Yatron
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Zion
Rallsback	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—62

Abbitt	Halpern	Price, Tex.
Ashley	Hammer-	Rees
Barrett	schmidt	Rooney, Pa.
Bingham	Hanna	Rostenkowski
Brock	Hawkins	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Hosmer	Roybal
Burleson, Tex.	Howard	Sandman
Cahill	Jones, Tenn.	Sisk
Chisholm	Kirwan	Springer
Clay	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Collier	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	McCarthy	Tunney
de la Garza	Macdonald,	Utt
Denney	Mass.	Waldie
Dennis	MacGregor	Watkins
Fascell	Martin	Whalley
Feighan	Mathias	Winn
Flynt	May	Wright
Frelinghuysen	Nichols	Wylie
Garmatz	Nix	Wyman
Green, Pa.	Pollock	
Gubser	Powell	

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Roybal against.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dennis against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Winn against.
Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Nichols against.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Wyman against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Powell.

Messrs. PASSMAN and DICKINSON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL BIOLOGICAL PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 603 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 603

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 589) expressing the support of the Congress and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program, and all points of order against section 2(b) of said joint resolution are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution 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 Science and Astronautics, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 603 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Joint Resolution 589 expressing the support of Congress and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program. The resolution also provides that all points of order are waived against section 2(b) of the joint resolution. The waiver was granted in order to authorize all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives related to the international biological program—IBP—to obligate or transfer money from appropriated funds and to provide such other support as may be appropriated to that effort. There is no new authorization or specific appropriation. It would assure that appropriate Federal agencies will be able to support the IBP as the Office of Science and Technology has requested without any question as to legality or congressional intent.

It expresses the support and endorsement of the Congress for the IBP and

declares that adequate financial and other support is a matter of first priority.

The international biological program is a 50-nation program which has been under development since 1959 and was voted into formal reality in July 1964 by the International Council of Scientific Unions. The United States elected to participate in the program in February 1965.

The IBP's specific objectives are: First, worldwide study of organic production on the land, in fresh water, and in the seas, so that adequate estimates may be made of the potential yield of new as well as existing natural resources; and, second, a worldwide study of human adaptability to the changing conditions of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 603 in order that House Joint Resolution 589 may be considered.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I am glad that in accordance with the new custom of the Committee on Rules he made the statement he did as to the waiver of all points of order against section 2(b). However, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object with all of the fervor and all of the heartfelt feeling I have, against this all-too-often custom of waiving points of order for open-ended transfers of funds or even the appropriation of funds in an authorizing bit of legislation. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I believe in the international biological program. I think time has been wasting for us to adequately study the effects of man in his efforts to destroy himself on this planet. I do not believe there is the slightest question but what we need more and more work in this area if we are to prevent simple ecological developments such as smog, the decimation of forests so that they do not have any oxygen regeneration, the erosion of the sea, and other efforts causing the demise of mankind in the face of the population explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I must object bitterly to a report that starts out by saying or inferring that it will cost no money, when the background is that it simply is a coordinating effort, and then in reading the rules which takes away all of our rights to amend or rights to object, we see that in section 2, paragraph (b), on page 3 of the bill itself, against which all points of order are waived, it says:

The Congress—

Having already supported these principles which I say I do believe in—

authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the international biological program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions.

I well realize the need for the rule if we are going to consider and pass this

bill. It is, in itself almost a "sacred cow." But this is open-ended spending at its worst! It is authorizing something that we will have to appropriate for later on, without the right of the amendment process. I object bitterly to the rule, regardless of the distinguished gentleman's explanation thereof.

Therefore, I am going to advocate voting down this rule unless section 2(b) can be taken out of the resolution and regular appropriations made for this very worthwhile program in the regular manner established by the Constitution and by past precepts and traditions of this House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution for which he is so eminently well qualified.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has ably stated, House Resolution 603 makes it possible to consider House Joint Resolution 589 under an open rule for 1 hour of general debate, waiving points of order against section 2(b).

The purpose of the joint resolution is to express congressional support and endorsement for the international biological program. It also authorizes all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives related to the international biological program to obligate or transfer money from appropriated funds and to provide such other support as may be useful to that effort.

The international biological program is a 50-nation effort, organized in 1965, whose broad objective is to provide insight and foresight about the changing relations between man and his environment. A three-stage program, over an 11-year period aims at: First, stimulating ideas and proposals, covering 3 years; second, a 5-year operational phase during which the research programs will be undertaken; and, third, a final 3-year period of synthesis and evaluation during which the results of different studies can be correlated and suitable applications implemented. Stage 1 of the program is about completed.

Some 11 Federal agencies and departments are presently involved in the international biological program either through support of ongoing related research or the development of integrated research proposals appropriate to the particular agency.

No funds are authorized by the resolution. None will be for support of the international biological program. All support funds from the U.S. departments and agencies will be made available from previously appropriated funds.

The resolution provides this by authorizing "all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to, those of the international biological program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions or objectives and provide such other support as may be appropriate."

The total amount to be made available by Federal agencies during fiscal 1970 is

unknown now. In 1969 about \$622,000 was made available by the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Interior, and Agriculture.

Letters of support are contained in the report from the National Science Foundation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of State.

There are no minority views.

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Did I understand the gentleman to say that there are 11 other departments and agencies of the Government involved in this same sort of work?

Mr. QUILLEN. They are involved to the point that they can give their support to this biological program if they desire to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, did the Rules Committee obtain any information as to how much money will be made available by the 11 other agencies and departments of Government?

Mr. QUILLEN. Yes, we did. The total amount to be made available by Federal agencies during 1970 is unknown now. In 1969 about \$622,000 was made available by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. QUILLEN. Yes, I would be happy to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If over one-half million dollars was made available to the international biological program by these departments and agencies, in heaven's name how much was made available by the other 11 groups that are interested in the same work or this particular enterprise?

Mr. QUILLEN. That was in 1969. Only the agencies that I mentioned made funds available that year. However, all of the 11 Federal agencies can make funds available in 1970.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, under the terms of this open end provision of section 2(b) I suppose any agency or department of Government can be construed to have an interest in the international biological program.

I doubt if there is a single agency or department of the Government that could not relate to this in some one way or another, so that the sky could be the limit, is that not right, in the matter of donations?

Mr. QUILLEN. I could say they could only make funds available out of their appropriated funds, and they could make, if they so desire—and the gentleman is correct in saying so—any amount of funds that they could reasonably make available in the interest of the program.

Mr. GROSS. It must be, then, that 11 other departments and agencies of the Government are overfunded if they have money to turn over to the IBP; they must be overfunded if they can just reach into the till and pull out a half million dollars and hand it over.

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman has made a very good point. On the other hand, departments and agencies have not made the funds available, and we do not know at this time whether those that I did not mention specifically by name will make any funds available.

Mr. GROSS. I must have misunderstood the gentleman from Tennessee. I thought the gentleman said that they did make available \$629,000, or approximately that amount, for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. QUILLEN. If the gentleman will allow me to continue, the Atomic Energy Commission, HEW, Interior, and Agriculture, these four agencies did, there are seven others which could contribute during the next year if they so desire to do so.

Mr. GROSS. That makes it even worse for the four agencies to put out a half million dollars for this purpose. That means that they were badly overfunded, if that is true.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I too would like to pursue this funding just a bit further.

As the gentleman from Tennessee has stated very clearly, the U.S. role in the international biological program has rested on three phases, as I understand it. The first was a 3-year development phase which included a study in regard to approaches to manpower, stimulation of ideas, and the actual initial funding. Now we are coming up on the end of that period, and actually we, the United States of America, are getting ready to fund it, and we are funding it through this approach that waives points of order on otherwise legislative business.

Then there is another 2- to 5-year operational phase, during which research will be done, and then phase three is a synthesis, evaluation, and application period. As I said in the beginning—and I appreciate the review that the gentleman has made in his colloquy about the past finding, but is it not true from the committee's own report that they estimate that there will be a \$12- to \$15-million requirement for the next year as a result of these studies that came out of their first 3-year period which found four gross defects in the international biological program today.

And if I can read correctly at the bottom of page 7 it says very clearly under "Current Financial Status," everything that the gentleman has stated plus the fact that it is estimated that, based upon plans for formation of integrated research proposals—and that is phase two of the program—\$12 to \$15 million would be required—that is annually—if the IBP were to be fully funded in fiscal 1970. We are working on the fiscal 1970 budget at this time. However, the com-

mittee approved a lesser request for \$5 million toward direct National Science Foundation support for the IBP. Then in addition they will have the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of HEW, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, NASA, the Military Services, and the total in the 11 agencies, I presume, to make up the \$12 or \$15 million.

Again, I have no particular objection to this. I think it is worthwhile and vital. But I do object to this technique of the backdoor raid on the Treasury.

I would like to ask the gentleman or the sponsor of the bill for the Committee on rules or for the committee which brings in the report, how much of this total international biological program is the United States underwriting? Are we underwriting the same amount that we do for the World Health Organization which is 30.02 percent? Or are we undertaking to underwrite the entire international biological program in this \$12 to \$15 million?

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman from Missouri has raised a very important question. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is not the kind of international program in which all countries get together and the United States ends up by picking up the whole tab for the overall activity. It refers only to that activity which the United States is doing itself. The United States spends no money for the assistance of any other country. This is purely a U.S. program through which the U.S. IBP research activities are related to those IBP activities going on in 50 other countries throughout the world.

There is no overall figure as yet because this program is still just getting underway in many of these countries.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. That is no answer to the question of what are the other 50 countries that made this international organization contributing in a like manner to the sum total required for the study of ecology and the effect on humankind.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding. If I may say, in answer to the gentleman, at the present time countries which are participating in the IBP are in about the same situation as we are. They are just beginning. There is no clear price tag that we can attribute to any of these activities, except to say that there is considerable financial involvement and investment in many of these countries. Our involvement is related purely to the U.S. expenditures. The United States does not in any way contribute to any of the other participating countries.

It is clear, however, that as our IBP program activities get underway, their activities will increase proportionately.

And I think that as we stimulate this growth of activity, we will be able to develop better the kind of information which will enable us to get a clearer picture of the international funding situation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I want to reaffirm that the study of ecology and its effect on human beings, the program of the IBP is important. I am not against it.

But I think the answer that the gentleman gives should at least recall history. We did the exact same thing with the United Nations and the World Health Organization including the Pan American Health Organization and their study of comparative anatomy and the study of biology and the study of malaria and everything else. We funded over 67 percent of that at the beginning. Then we reduced that funding finally, by negotiation through the United Nations and the General Assembly as other nations became more able, to something over 40 percent, and finally have it down to 30.02 percent.

If history means anything, and even Santa Ana years ago down across the border, said that "those who do not study history are destined to relive its errors," we should not go through exactly this same process even in this important program, and we certainly will, if we go ahead and initially fund this, and then expect every other sovereign country to follow suit.

I will say one thing and I will wager ten to one on this, I am sure there is no other parliament or sovereign nation in the world that is going along on this basis of open-ended funding and backdoor raid on their Treasury, or the funds of their Congress or Assembly or Chamber of Deputies or Parliament or anything else to give a carte blanche against the taxpayers of their own country or any sovereign nation, in order to start this program off.

I think the gentleman will agree with me. I am opposed to this rule. I oppose this method of funding. I am for the basic intent of the bill as presented by the distinguished gentleman of the committee.

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman from Missouri has made a fine contribution.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LUKENS).

Mr. LUKENS. I thank the gentleman. I would like to make an observation at this stage of the discussion for the information of the individual Members of this body. One of the most important things overlooked here is that these programs are already existing ongoing programs in these agencies of Government. What we are attempting to do is to make obvious to the world, the scientific agencies, and persons in the scientific field that we support their efforts in the IBP.

Furthermore, I believe we overlook the logical and the statutory restrictions contained in these authorizations for these

agencies already doing this work. We would provide a program under which the agencies could cross transfer agency funds as they see fit. Every scientific agency is fighting for existing scientific funds. The joint resolution would simply provide a greater degree of flexibility to transfer those funds among agencies for a program.

In response to the gentleman from Missouri, whose opinions I value highly, I believe he has raised a legitimate point. I do not think we have done a good job as we could have in the type of programs we have provided. But this is an initial effort. It is a beginning for these programs, and I believe in the future we will have regulated funding. This is a trial effort and as such deserves our support.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Where does the gentleman from Ohio think these funds that are available and that would be put into the IBP "kitty" come from if they do not come out of the taxpayers' pockets, and if the agencies are not overfunded in the first place; when we authorize the transfer of anything by any agency of the Government? Furthermore, we are giving the blessing of Congress by saying it is the "sense" of the Congress that we should participate and that all agencies should contribute.

Mr. LUKENS. If I might be allowed to disagree with the gentleman, the language is—"The Congress authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the IBP."

You cannot cause the transfer of funds merely to those that are related. I would respectfully submit to the gentleman that a mistake might have been made in funding the UN program, and I agree with the gentleman's implied criticism of that agency, but this is different. This is the IBP, with which we are all familiar, and from which mankind in general and our country in particular, benefits directly from these programs and the scientific advances made therein.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is not related if the definition is "for the benefit of mankind"? I take it that every agency and department of this Government is interested in the benefit of mankind. Now you tell me what would be the prohibition against unlimited appropriations?

Mr. LUKENS. Will the gentleman yield—

Mr. GROSS. In just a minute.

Mr. LUKENS. You are asking me a question that I would like to answer.

Mr. GROSS. Add to that this subsection (c) of section 1, whatever it is, of the bill:

(c) In view of the urgency of the problem, the Congress finds and declares that the provision by the United States of adequate financial and other support for the international biological program is a matter of first priority.

I emphasize "of first priority." The order of first priority should be to make some reduction in the Federal debt of this country so that we can reduce the \$18 billion annual interest payment on it, and stop inflation. That should be a first priority of this Government. How far out in wonderland can you go with this kind of language?

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LUKENS. The first question the gentleman asked is, What agency is not related to the benefit of mankind? I would suggest that the Department of Agriculture has to do with animals first and mankind second and indirectly. Next, you imply that I am without feeling for the need of tax deductions for the average taxpayer, for debt reduction of our national debt, which is important. Those are certainly first priorities. I suggest that our environment and our total ecology—I suggest that this international biological program is as important as anything that faces us. I say most humbly and sincerely that this is also a matter of first priority. It is a matter of life and existence itself.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, as ancient as I am, I do not expect to expire tomorrow or even next year.

Mr. LUKENS. I would hope that the gentleman would not expire tomorrow. You provide many moments of information and humor to this body.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 100, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—230

Addabbo	Brotzman	Corman
Albert	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Anderson,	Buchanan	Cowger
Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Anderson, Ill.	Burton, Utah	Daddario
Anderson,	Bush	Daniels, N.J.
Tenn.	Button	Davis, Ga.
Andrews,	Cabell	Derwinski
N. Dak.	Camp	Dickinson
Annunzio	Carey	Dingell
Aspinall	Casey	Donohue
Ayres	Celler	Dorn
Beall, Md.	Chamberlain	Downing
Bell, Calif.	Chappell	Dulski
Blaggi	Clark	Duncan
Blester	Clausen,	Dwyer
Blackburn	Don H.	Eckhardt
Blanton	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, Ala.
Blatnik	Colmer	Ellberg
Boland	Conable	Erlenborn
Brademas	Conte	Esch
Brasco	Conyers	Evans, Colo.
Brooks	Corbett	Farbstein

Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Grover
Gude
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harvey
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Langen
Latta
Lloyd

Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McClory
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
McKneally
Madden
Mailhard
Marsh
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nedzi
Nelsen
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Rallsback

NAYS—100

Abernethy
Alexander
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Caffery
Carter
Cederberg
Clancy
Cleveland
Collins
Cramer
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dent
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Eshleman
Fisher
Flowers
Foreman
Fountain

Fulton, Pa.
Gettys
Griffin
Gross
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Harsha
Hastings
Hébert
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
King
Kuykendall
Lennon
Lujan
Lukens
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Mahon
Mann
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mizell
Montgomery

Natcher
O'Konski
Passman
Poage
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Ruth
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Scott
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Watts
Wyatt
Wydler

NOT VOTING—101

Abbt
Adair
Adams
Arends
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Berry
Bingham
Boggs
Boiling
Brock

Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burlison, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Chisholm
Clay
Cohelan
Collier
Cunningham

Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Dennis
Devine
Diggs
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Flynt

Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Goldwater
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Halpern
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hays
Hosmer
Howard
Ichord
Jones, Tenn.
Kee
Kirwan
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lipscomb

Long, La.
McCarthy
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Martin
Mathias
May
Mikva
Morton
Nichols
Nix
Pepper
Pollock
Powell
Price, Tex.
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
St Germain

Sandman
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Springer
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Utt
Waldie
Watkins
Whalley
Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyllie
Wyman
Zion

So the previous question was ordered.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Wyllie.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McCarthy with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Barrett, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. May.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Brook.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Collier.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Adams with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Zion.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Denney.

Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 589) expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program.

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

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 589), with Mr. HENDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics on May 27, 1969, unanimously voted the House Joint Resolution before us today (H.J. Res. 589) which simply expresses the support of the Congress for the U.S. effort within the international biological program.

This resolution provides no new authorization or appropriation. It is designed simply to assure that appropriate Federal agencies will be able to support the IBP as the Office of Science and Technology has requested without any question as to legality or congressional intent.

It states that:

The Congress authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the International Biological Program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions or objectives and provide such other support as may be appropriate.

This provision appears to be necessary in view of the uncertainty of some of the departments and agencies concerning their present authority to aid the IBP through the Interagency Coordinating Committee for the IBP even though the amounts involved are relatively nominal.

Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify the questions which have been raised over section 2(b) of this resolution, I am prepared to offer an amendment to insert on page 3, line 8, after the word "objectives" the following: "which moneys were appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, or any prior fiscal year."

It has been the intention of our committee that the language as presently stated in the bill is only for the purpose of expressing congressional support for the IBP, and for those research activities of all Federal agencies that coincide with or are related to the overall objectives of the IBP. The IBP is just now fully getting underway, under the control and direction of the Interagency Coordinating Committee. Therefore, it has not been possible in the appropriations process to establish budget "line items" for specific programs and funds directly related to the IBP. In the future, we expect that this will occur.

Mr. Chairman, before I describe in further detail the IBP, let me explain why I believe this resolution, while relatively simple and straightforward, is especially significant at this time.

I do not have to dramatize for this body the facts about the ever-growing public concerns over environmental deterioration and pollution. These concerns are evident in the mail we receive daily; they are at the roots of many of our national domestic problems; they are coming to rival in importance even the two major public concerns over the war in Vietnam and inflation in the economy.

I believe that the Congress, in recent years, has been and is being responsive to these demands for a cleaner environment. At the same time, however, it must be realized that many of the solutions that have been proposed and even implemented are often only stop-gap measures, designed for a temporary alleviation of long-range, deep-seated problems. To treat only the symptoms of the problem—whether they be air or water pollution—is to overlook the much greater underlying causes.

If we are ever going to come to grips with this problem of environmental quality in its entirety, if we are going to develop the kind of ecological controls that will go beyond just the short-term impacts, we are going to have to seek the very principles that have been violated.

For the plain and uncomfortable fact is this: there are many subtle and complex laws and forces that govern nature, and we are a long way away from understanding them thoroughly.

And this is the goal of the international biological program—to provide the kind of insight and foresight about the changing relations between man and his environment that is so lacking at present. Its focus is upon establishing an ecological base for the management of our environment and for the prevention of the deterioration which is threatening our entire planet.

This resolution, then, by expressing the endorsement and support of the Congress for the IBP, will facilitate IBP support by Federal agencies and provide the executive branch with a clearer means for reviewing in a unified manner funding requirements of and program progress toward the national objectives of the IBP.

The background to this resolution reaches back to March 1967 when Chairman MILLER first introduced House Concurrent Resolution 273 at the request of the National Committee for the IBP. Since that time, three sets of hearings

have been held before our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development to review the status of the IBP and progress made toward its objectives.

During our most recent hearings held last May, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, reaffirmed OST's continued support for the IBP. He said, in part, that—

To the extent that the agencies involved may feel that they do not have congressional approval for supporting IBP activities . . . the resolution should help. In this sense, passage of the resolution could remove a stumbling block to the program. It clearly places the IBP in a position to compete on an equal footing with other programs which the agencies considered worthy of support.

A great deal has transpired over these 2½ years to justify our original enthusiasm for the IBP and to eliminate the reservations we had concerning its organization and management. The scope of the program has been focused on the most pressing problems, the national committee for the IBP has evolved into a decisionmaking body, and agreements on points of responsibility have been worked out with the National Science Foundation as the lead agency.

The U.S. effort is organized under two major components, environmental and human adaptability. Within each of these components, studies called integrated research programs have been developed as separate, but interlinking research efforts. Twelve IRP's have been endorsed by the U.S. National Committee for the IBP, and five more are under consideration.

Within the environmental component of the IBP, the grasslands ecosystem project has developed into a model project in systems ecology. This project provides the confidence we need for further developing our efforts and Federal participation in other ecosystem biomes, such as the deciduous and coniferous forests, tropical, and tundra biomes. Similar favorable progress has been made within the human adaptability component, and integrated research programs are in advanced planning stages relating to Eskimos, the American Indians, and high-altitude groups.

Mr. Chairman, the IBP is not merely a series of unrelated programs, tied loosely together. It aims, rather, at an entirely new concept, a concept of totality. Its programs are interrelated and the results will be synthesized into a whole. Its frame of reference is not focused solely upon one discipline. The IBP employs scientists from every discipline; sociologists, physicists, chemists, biologists, oceanographers, and others. It provides, in sum, the kind of integrated, interdisciplinary approach not possible in other programs in the past.

It is this pragmatic, problem-solving approach that has led ecological practitioners in the United States and in over 55 other countries to undertake the complex task of planning and designing the international biological program, which will produce the kind of manpower, knowledge, and experience that is essential to the effective management of our environmental resources.

The international biological program will not give us the solution to our en-

vironmental problems. What it will provide, however, is the kind of knowledge that will help us to attack these problems with wiser perspective and more confidence in the future. Thus, as I have stated before, the IBP may be one of the most crucial programs, in spite of its mild-sounding title, to evolve in our time.

Favorable response to the resolution before us today will mean that Federal agencies which conduct relevant scientific work will be expected to support the IBP to the extent that meets the needs of the U.S. projects under that program. This resolution also provides us with the opportunity of expressing our support not only for the objectives and program of the IBP, but for the efforts of American scientists and those of other nations, who have committed themselves to the difficult and complex task of restoring the quality to our environment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to suggest to the gentleman that I believe we could expedite passage of this resolution, or whatever the fate of it may be, if we could somehow come to an understanding with respect to the financing provision, and the paragraph dealing with priorities, but particularly the financing. The gentleman has said he is prepared to offer an amendment. I wonder if he would devote some attention to that. As a result of previous debate, we understand the remainder of the resolution and the purpose of it. Will the gentleman again explain the amendment he proposes to offer?

Mr. DADDARIO. The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that it is the intention of Congress to allow other agencies of Government to participate in the international biological program during this fiscal year with programs that are related to the objectives of the international biological program and which can be directed to that purpose through an interagency coordinating committee.

The funds which are available in the biological and ecological areas are naturally limited by the appropriating functions which have already taken place this year. In future years, these agencies should be directed to explain and defend their IBP-related research programs during the annual authorization and appropriation processes.

Mr. GROSS. So that after June 30, 1970, next year, there would be resort to the regular budgetary process for the fiscal years thereafter?

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And between now and June 30, the international biological program would be financed as it is presently being financed; is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct.

I should like to say to the gentleman that when we began work on this program as part of the total NSF fiscal year 1970 budget, the request was for over \$11 million. We have now authorized \$5 million for the IBP.

The recent appropriation action with regard to the National Science Foundation will, however, bring that down somewhat. The other agencies that are involved are naturally under the same financial restraint. I can see no danger of this program getting out of hand.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that is a reasonable solution to the dilemma that we were in a little while ago. I trust that the gentleman will offer his amendment and that it will be adopted.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Under the report it shows that \$622,000 was actually spent by agencies other than the NSF for the international biological program during the fiscal year 1969. Would it be satisfactory to have a limitation in the form of an amendment to the effect that at the end of the bill, on page 3, line 9, we strike the period and insert a comma, and add the following words "not to exceed \$622,000 in total amount."? All that this means is that you do not go over the 1969 expenditure for this fiscal year without having the regular budgetary process of authorizing and appropriating money. Why not hold it at this figure until we get started on the regular process during the next fiscal year?

Mr. DADDARIO. I would doubt sincerely that the amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania is now proposing would in fact do very much. The activity and support which is anticipated from these other Federal agencies may not, in my opinion, be much over that particular amount in this fiscal year.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If it cannot be over it, then why not just insure that transfers are not made before the appropriate time next year?

Mr. DADDARIO. In reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe we have already answered the questions with regard to the way in which these funds are being handled. If the gentleman insists on putting through his amendment, of course, the gentleman from Connecticut cannot stop him. However, I instruct him that it would not serve any useful purpose.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It puts a limit on the expenditure of \$622,000 during the fiscal year 1970, until the regular budgetary and appropriation processes are gone through and until they also go into effect in 1971. So it does have a useful purpose in that regard.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman has explained that that would be the purpose of his amendment. It would appear to me, considering the lateness of this fiscal year, that we would find ourselves most likely much under that particular figure.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 589, particularly with the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Connecticut, which expresses congressional support for the involvement of Federal departments and agencies in the international biological program—IBP.

Because the objectives of this program are so vital to our Nation's concerted efforts to restore quality to our environment, it is necessary that our departments and agencies have the flexibility required to support IBP-related research out of existing authorized and appropriated funds.

We have had more recognition of the complexity of problems of environment and ecology in the Congress this year than ever before.

Approaching these environmental and ecological problems from a worldwide perspective is why the IBP was established.

This program provides the opportunity for scientists to cooperate internationally in formulating plans to cope with our ever-changing world—a world in which fantastic population growth and technological revolution are changing the very essence of our environment.

The fact that the quality of all life depends upon the balance of the earth's ecological system cannot be overstated.

To ignore man's position in nature's ecological balance would be grossly negligent.

To ignore the necessity for international cooperation in understanding better this delicate relationship would be shortsighted.

And to ignore the critical importance of the potential contributions of our Federal agencies to the IBP would be most unfortunate.

The international biological program is already an ongoing effort with strong support from this administration.

We expect that the President's newly-created Environmental Quality Council will play a key role in support of the IBP.

Approval of this joint resolution will, therefore, assure that the appropriate Federal agencies can contribute to the IBP with a clear congressional mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to express my appreciation for the work done by the subcommittee that has carried this bill. I want to impress upon you the importance of this legislation. After all, we have heard a great deal about foul air, pollution, and the other things that disturb and limit the health of this country.

These problems are universal today. This is really an effort to draw into the fight against them the brains and the resources of other nations. I think this is a great resolution. I think we can look back upon the International Geophysical Year and the things that came out of it and take great satisfaction out of what was accomplished. I am sure the same will come out of this.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to ac-

knowledge the work of the subcommittee and the work of the staff of the subcommittee in bringing this legislation out.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), with reference to section (c) on page 2 under section 1 to which I have an amendment at the desk that, if adopted, would take that particular provision out of the joint resolution. That provision is this:

(c) In view of the urgency of the problem, the Congress finds and declares that the provision by the United States of adequate financial and other support for the international biological program is a matter of first priority.

To me it is of high priority. I really do not put this above defense and above many other programs. I think that this provision overemphasizes this program.

I, therefore, ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will accept the amendment and then we will go on to the next one. This program is of high priority.

Mr. BELL of California. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania direct his question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO)?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to do so. I do not believe this should be called a matter of first priority. I think it is of high priority.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is not being called a matter of first priority. It simply says it is a matter of first priority which makes it a matter of high priority. I think the gentleman is quibbling with words.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No, I believe it is of high priority. However, I think there are programs at home such as slum clearance, such as housing, such as urban renewal and such as the war in Vietnam as well as many other programs that are of high priority. I do not put this program as first, but high in priority.

Will the gentleman accept the amendment and then we can take it up with the other body and if they make it a question of higher priority we can go to conference on it.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I find it particularly difficult to agree with the gentleman because this language certainly does not make this the first priority over those items which you mentioned but, rather, it would be a matter of involving every one of the items that he mentioned as an important effort.

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

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman would like to change the word "first" to "high" perhaps that would be acceptable.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I, therefore, have an amendment to strike on page 2, line 21, the word "first" and insert "high" which has been accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have not as yet reached the amendment stage.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Also, at the end of the bill I propose to limit the amount that can be spent during the 1970 fiscal year to the same amount that was set up and was adequate in fiscal year 1969. That figure is \$622,000.

The gentleman from Connecticut who is chairman of the subcommittee has already said that he does not think the money to be used for the balance of fiscal year 1970 will exceed \$622,000.

In order that the Congress can have a limit so that we know what the amount for fiscal year 1970 would be.

Would the gentleman accept that amendment, putting on the same limit as the funds for fiscal year 1969, which seems to be a reasonable figure? Otherwise it is an open-end authorization, or appropriations. If these departments and agencies want to get a little fancy they can certainly do a lot of transferring without limit before the 1971 fiscal year.

This amendment prevents that kind of maneuvering.

Would the gentleman accept that kind of amendment?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that when the amending process comes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania offers that amendment, I will oppose the amendment.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares that the international biological program, which was established under the auspices of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Union of Biological Sciences and is sponsored in the United States by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, deals with one of the most crucial situations to face this or any other civilization—the immediate or near potential of mankind to damage, possibly beyond repair, the earth's ecological system on which all life depends. The Congress further finds and declares that the international biological program provides an immediate and effective means available of meeting this situation, through its stated objectives of increased study and research related to biological productivity and human welfare in a changing world environment.

(b) The Congress therefore commends and endorses the international biological program and expresses its support of the United States National Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Committee, which together have the responsibility for planning, coordinating, and carrying out the program in the United States.

(c) In view of the urgency of the problem,

the Congress finds and declares that the provision by the United States of adequate financial and other support for the international biological program is a matter of first priority.

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress calls upon all Federal departments and agencies and other persons and organizations, both public and private, to support and cooperate fully with the international biological program and the activities and goals of the United States National Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Committee.

(b) For this purpose, the Congress authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the international biological program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions or objectives and provide such other support as may be appropriate.

Mr. DADDARIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 21, after "matter of", strike out "first" and insert "high".

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, I have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: Page 3, line 8, after "objectives", insert the following: "which monies were appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, or any prior fiscal year."

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I touched on this point during the course of the general debate. It simply limits the funding from other agencies within this program to items not directly appropriated for uses only during this fiscal year and during the formation process of the international biological program.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment and accept it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to support this amendment, because this amendment likewise limits expenditure, just as the amendment I propose to put in would limit the amount to \$622,000 in fiscal year 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 3 line 9 strike the period, insert a comma and add "not to exceed \$622,000 in total amount for fiscal year 1970, without ordinary budgetary process and specific appropriation".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will explain simply what this amendment does. The amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut places this program in the ordinary budgetary process and appropriation in the fiscal year 1971. My amendment says that as we are still in the fiscal year 1970, then there should be no more spent for this program in the fiscal year 1970 than was spent in the fiscal year 1969—that is, \$622,000—without going through the ordinary budget procedure, and also specific appropriation.

If the agencies want to go above current 1969 expenditures—all right, then they have to go through the regular budgetary process and specific appropriation in the fiscal year 1970.

If we do not do this, then these agencies, knowing that the limit is going to be imposed in the fiscal year 1971, can do all the transferring they want in the fiscal year 1970, we are then having the Congress' wishes and intent set aside, or ignored.

The chairman of the subcommittee has said that \$622,000 is probably more than adequate for this program for fiscal year 1970. So, if it is more than adequate in the fiscal year 1970, I think it is wise for the Congress then to set that limit. Otherwise, if the authorization and appropriation are open-ended, these agencies can transfer any amount that they want during fiscal year 1970. This is not good efficient and economical government procedure.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the gentleman's amendment because it refers to "all Federal departments and agencies which have functions and objectives which coincide with or are related," and so forth.

It does, thereby, include the National Science Foundation, to which funds have already been authorized and appropriated in the vicinity of some \$5 million for this very purpose.

The amendment would be a limiting factor beyond the intention and direction, really, of the objectives of the Congress in approving the Foundation's 1970 budget.

I believe that there are sufficient safeguards, as I indicated in general debate, through both the National Science Foundation's authorization and through the Interagency Coordinating Committee which will suffice to assure the necessary final controls of this particular program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If \$622,000 is the amount

that would have supported this or that is supporting this organization for 1 fiscal year, is there any necessity for \$622,000 for the remainder of the current fiscal year, that is, until June 30, 1970?

Mr. DADDARIO. In answer to the gentleman, I would find it difficult to relate exactly the amounts of moneys that would be involved in any particular activity. That is being worked out at this time.

As I said earlier, however, I would seriously doubt that any non-Foundation funds during the balance of the year would much exceed this amount.

The problem is that the gentleman's amendment curtails not just the activities of these agencies but all of the international biological program activities. Because of this I object to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD) have assumed the chair, Mr. HENDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 589) expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program, pursuant to House Resolution 603, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 589.

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

There was no objection.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE GOES TO THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee has held the first of its series of grassroots hearings on economic problems.

The first meeting at the Federal Building in Newark, N.J., on Monday was highly successful. The subcommittee received a great deal of worthwhile testimony from all segments of the population in the Newark area.

During the day, we heard from 3 dozen witnesses, ranging from bankers to the poor. We heard from representatives of organized groups, housewives, savings and loan officials, small businessmen, neighborhood action organizations, homebuilders, homebuyers, and working people. The subcommittee gave everyone a chance to testify on the economic problems of the day.

Hearing testimony in addition to myself were Representative JOSEPH MINISH of Newark, Representative FRANK ANNUNZIO of Chicago, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, Representative PETER RODINO of Newark also sat in on the hearings and contributed greatly to their success.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee will go to Los Angeles on December 1 and 2, and to Atlanta on December 8 and 9 to hear testimony. Later we will be at cities in the Midwest, the Rocky Mountain area, the Southwest, and possibly other points.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD copies of news stories from the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Newark News, and the Newark Star-Ledger, about the committee hearings in Newark:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1969]

PATMAN UNIT CONVENES IN NEWARK

(By Jan Nugent)

NEWARK, November 10.—Economic policymaking took a giant step away from Washington today when congressmen came here to solicit grass-roots sentiment on financial issues directly affecting the people.

Probably only Rep. Wright Patman (D-Texas), Congress's resident populist, could have conceived such a notion. He convened a meeting of his House Banking and Currency Committee in Newark's city hall, with three other members present, to monitor a day-long parade of 34 witnesses.

Some of the statements were predictable. Labor union spokesmen called on business to absorb lower profits and pay workers more. Two officials from Newark's city government posed long series of complicated questions that they indicated could be solved with generous applications of one main ingredient: more federal money.

COST OF LIVING

The other witnesses arrived with much simpler queries to which neither they nor the congressmen could provide satisfactory answers.

Mostly they were concerned about the cost of living and why they couldn't afford to buy homes of their own.

The proceedings were in marked contrast to committee sessions held in the austere, marble chambers of the Rayburn Building, where celebrated witnesses customarily arrive trailed by coveys of public relations men dispatching mimeographed copies of their testimony.

"HYPOCRITICAL" POLITICIANS

At today's session, most of the witnesses displayed a refreshing lack of reverence for the panel.

Two had the effrontery to blame "hypocritical" politicians, who vote for housing

legislation which they refuse to fund, for the country's present housing crisis.

For the most part, the legislators bore it in unaccustomed equanimity and silence.

Hubert Boyd, a utility operator who makes \$3.64 an hour at a nearby General Motors plant, told of selecting a suitable \$23,000 home for his family. But the \$247 monthly mortgage payment was beyond his means and "every bank in Newark refused me credit," he said. "I need the house . . . I have three children and my wife is pregnant again," Boyd said.

Arthur Padula, a Newark homebuilder, blamed both Democratic and Republican politicians for present housing difficulty. He also denounced the Federal Housing Administration for devoting its major efforts in Newark to insuring home mortgages in the suburbs. "We don't need government guarantees where there is no risk," Padula contended.

HIGH RATES BLAMED

Helen Schnider wanted to know why her son, a builder specializing in restoration of substandard housing, "can't get money to build with?" She also criticized lending institutions such as banks and insurance companies, for requiring equity participation or "a piece of the action" before granting loans.

Patman, a long-time foe of big banks, identified the real problem as "high interest rates." On the conduct of money lenders generally, he noted: "Ever since Christ threw them out of the temple they've been trying to get on both sides of every transaction . . . now with credit cards they've made it."

Sources close to the committee said legislation could be forthcoming from the sessions, which will be held at several cities throughout the country in coming months.

Rep. Joseph Minish (D-N.J.) said today's proceedings should be "a message to economic policymakers that there is trouble in the country. These people can't come to Washington, so they were here telling their story in their way," he said.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1969]

ECONOMICS WOES HEARD BY PATMAN—"GRASS ROOTS" SESSION HELD IN NEWARK—MORE SET

(By Robert J. Cole)

NEWARK.—Representative Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas, opened the first of a nationwide series of "grass roots" meetings here today "to learn what the people are thinking on the key economic questions of the day."

Although the all-day meeting of the domestic finance subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee failed to bring to light any new issues, it did succeed in giving witnesses a chance to be heard on such key questions as the high cost of mortgages, the growing use of mortgage points, a growing tendency among lenders to seek a portion of builders' profits, the scarcity of building funds, the high cost of food, the scarcity of apartments and similar problems.

To give as many people as possible a chance to speak, Mr. Patman continued to hear testimony through the lunch hour, halting proceedings briefly at 2:05 P.M. to eat a sandwich and coffee at his seat.

Norman Schiff, a lawyer in Newark who represents a number of building groups, spoke of cases where as many as nine mortgage points were required to buy a house in New Jersey. Mr. Patman shook his head in agreement and noted that points, in some cases, seemed "almost like extortion to me."

Points are charges a lender makes to grant a loan. Seven points on \$20,000 are \$1,400, for example.

Arthur H. Padula, a widely known builder in the area, read into the record a recent letter he had received from the National Bank of North America. The letter, signed by George R. Hansen, a vice president in the West Hempstead, L.I., office, set forth such requirements for a commercial loan as a standby loan commitment of 2½ to 3 per

cent a year, an interest rate of 10½ per cent, a compensating balance to be left on deposit of 50 per cent and a personal guarantee of the loan by the builder and his wife.

"How can we allow this kind of hypocrisy to continue," Mr. Padula asked. "Well, we've had Captain Kidd's before," Mr. Patman replied.

BANKER CITES COST

Sidney Friedman, Chairman of the National Bank of North America, reached at his office in New York, replied: "If the implication in that remark is that we're charging a high interest rate, I would say that this must be considered in relation to what we're paying for money, which is approximately 11 per cent right now."

Again when Raymond L. Bramucci, manager of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Locals 148 and 162, in Union, N.J., spoke of the usury of money lenders, Mr. Patman responded, "Ever since Christ drove them out of the Temple, they've been trying to get on both sides of the transaction."

Mrs. Helen Schneider, of East Orange, N.J., told the committee that her son, a builder, had had difficulty getting funds from lenders without "giving a piece of the action" in the form of a share of the gross rentals for 10 years. Mr. Patman said he thought Mrs. Schneider had "a valid complaint" and one the committee would look into carefully.

Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio of Newark also heard testimony along with Mr. Rodino, Congressman Joseph G. Minish, Democrat of New Jersey and William B. Widnall, Republican of New Jersey.

The hearing will reconvene Dec. 1-2 in Los Angeles, Dec. 8-9 in Atlanta and during December and January in undesignated points in the Midwest, Rocky Mountain area and the Southwest. A report on the findings is expected to be presented to the Congress late in January.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Nov. 10, 1969]

PANEL HEARS COMPLAINTS ON INFLATION, PRODUCTS

(By Alexander Milch)

A congressional "grass roots" hearing on economic problems of the people in a time of inflation today heard a \$145-a-week automobile worker from a Newark slum area complain of his financial inability to buy a home in Irvington. A housewife told the committee of hidden fat in a prepackaged cut of roast meat.

Four members of the domestic finance subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, headed by Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., held the first of a series of hearings at the Federal Building in Newark.

The next sessions take place in Los Angeles Dec. 1 and 2, and in Atlanta, Ga., on Dec. 8. Several additional cities will be announced later.

LINDEN PLANT

Hubert Boyd of 132 Belmont Ave., Newark, who works as a utility operator at the General Motors assembly plant in Linden, said he had to move because the area is being cleared for urban redevelopment. He has a wife and three children, and is expecting a fourth child.

Boyd said he found a \$23,000 home in Irvington, mortgaging cost of which was finally fixed at \$5,000 down and \$200 a month—whereas the Veterans' Administration will only guarantee a mortgage of \$150 a month for him. He said he was still unable to get a mortgage and has figured out that at present interest rates that house will cost him \$90,000 over 30 years.

Mrs. Lucie Jacobson of South Orange who says she does comparison shopping in food

places to fight against erosion of the household dollar, besides telling the committee about fat in meat, showed members two chocolate bars of the same appearance but with different weights. She cited this as an example of sharp practices which victimize consumers.

PRICES CLIMB

Mrs. Jacobson, whose husband is Joel Jacobson, director of community relations for Region 9 of the United Automobile Workers, said that workers are forced to strike to get money to meet skyrocketing prices, and that prices do not go up because of workers' demands.

Jacobson, who also testified, said that New Jersey industrial workers in the past five years had had wage increases of almost \$25 a week on the average, but nevertheless, have less to spend than before because of inflation. Economically, he said, they are worse off.

A statement by Mayor Addonizio was read by P. Bernard Nortmann, city economist, in which augmentation of the powers of the Small Business Administration was urged so that greater help can be given to minority groups.

Sitting today with Patman are: Reps. Joseph Minish, D-11th Dist., Peter W. Rodino, D-10th Dist., William B. Widnall, R-7th Dist., all of New Jersey, and Frank Annunzio of Illinois.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Nov. 11, 1969]

HOUSE PANEL INTERVIEWS JERSEYANS—WHY IT'S TOUGH TO MAKE ENDS MEET

(By Lawrence Resnick)

A congressional subcommittee yesterday heard 36 witnesses identify the rising cost of living and soaring interest rates as their chief economic woes.

The panel, conducting the first of a series of nationwide hearings in the Federal Building in Newark, listened to housewives, wage earners, city officials, businessmen, builders and welfare clients.

All of them told virtually the same story of a constant struggle to make ends meet in the face of rising prices and frustrated efforts to obtain financing for redevelopment and housing construction.

Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee's panel on domestic finance, said at the conclusion of the hearings that the testimony reinforces his own long-held opinion that something must be done to control interest rates.

"I believe we got good results from the hearing," he said. "The testimony came straight from the heart."

Other hearings are scheduled this year in Atlanta and Los Angeles and more are planned next year.

"The testimony is certainly an indication of what the major problems are," commented Rep. Joseph T. Minish (D-11th Dist.) of West Orange and a ranking member of the banking committee.

Among those who testified was Norman Schiff, former Newark corporation counsel and a representative of several housing construction groups. Schiff complained that the practice of banks to charge as much as nine points over and above the mortgage interest rate is defeating federal programs designed to stimulate the growth of home ownership among black people.

Patman commented that in some cases the practice of charging points "almost looks like extortion to me."

A number of house and apartment builders complained that banks and insurance companies, besides charging better than 10 percent for corporate mortgages, "want a piece of the action."

Sam Herzog, president of the New Jersey

Home Builders Association, said that some financing institutions are asking for a percentage of the gross rents of apartment projects besides the interest for the life of the mortgage.

In addition, he said, they are demanding that the borrower keep a certain percentage of the loan on deposit at the institution.

Arthur Padula, builder of apartment houses, blamed the city's economic woes on the "hypocrisy" of Congress and the Federal Housing Administration.

He took Congress to task for failing to appropriate funds to implement the 1968 Federal Housing Act, designed to stimulate housing construction.

"And every time Congress has passed laws to spur housing construction, the Federal Housing Administration has adopted rules that negate the purposes of the law," he said.

MAYOR COMPLAINS

In a statement read in his behalf, Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio said that inflation, high interest rates and governmental indifference is crippling efforts to rebuild the city.

The committee also heard from a number of individual consumers. Mrs. Eileen Daly, an East Orange housewife, told the committee that her family wants to buy a house, "but we can't afford the necessary one-quarter to one-third down payments required for mortgages."

Turning to food prices and marketing, she said, "We have no way of checking the fat content of meat at supermarkets." "The meat looks wonderful under the bright lights, but when you step away, it doesn't look so good," she said.

She also attacked the practice of manufacturers of soap products for adding "gimmick" ingredients to their products and charging higher prices.

"QUALITY DOWN"

"As the prices go up, the quality seems to go down," commented a Newark housewife. Willie Wright, president of the United Afro-American Association, told of how his group has been frustrated by growing interest rates in its efforts to develop an apartment complex in the city.

"The tight-money situation hits black people very hard," he said.

Mrs. Maudie Nelson, president of the Day-ton Community Council in Newark, said Congress "hasn't been hitting the target" with its programs. "We haven't felt a thing," she said.

Robert Blakely, a Newark builder and businessman, said that the interest rate is not the leading problem, but the problem is lack of funds for loans, even at a 10 per cent rate.

BLAMES POLS

He blamed "the politicians" for manipulating behind the scenes and delaying much-needed urban development projects.

Mrs. Christine Jackson, home economist for the Welfare Department in Newark, said that "welfare mothers" desperately need increased monthly allotments. She said that the welfare recipients' money problems are forcing them into a "whirlwind of credit buying" at high interest rates.

Others who spoke were:

Paul Krebs, executive director of the New Jersey Office of Consumer Protection, who called for new consumer protection laws.

Rep. Peter W. Rodino (D-10th Dist.) who welcomed the panel to Newark and said Newark's problems are identical to the urban problems of all cities throughout the nation.

James H. Blair, director of the New Jersey Division on Civil Rights, who said that at the bottom of many complaints from minority citizens are economic inequities, such as inflation and tight money.

Rep. Williams B. Widnall (R-7th Dist.), a committee member, who summed up, "Everybody is trying to shortchange everyone else."

DDT: IS THE JIG UP?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago 20 Members of this House joined me in signing a letter to the President asking him to issue an Executive order or directive banning the use of DDT except in emergency situations. We did so because of our feeling that the implications for human health and environmental quality of its continued use could no longer be ignored.

In a November 4 reply to our letter, Mr. William Timmons, Deputy Assistant to the President, noted that our "comments concerning the possible hazards of DDT have been noted, and your recommendations will receive most careful consideration."

At the same time we wrote the President, but completely independent of our actions, a number of the most respected conservation groups in our Nation joined together to petition the Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford Hardin, requesting him to use the authority he has under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to ban the use of DDT. Among the groups joining in that petition are the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and the National Audubon Society.

That petition presents a well-documented and cogent case, and reaches the following conclusion:

The overwhelming scientific evidence establishes that DDT is a cancer-causing agent, is injurious to animal, bird, and fish populations, and is causing serious ecological damage. For these reasons, the continued use of DDT poses an imminent hazard to the public, threatening human health and environmental resources.

Mr. Speaker, in the 10 days since our letter was sent to the President, and the petition was placed before Secretary Hardin, I have received mail from persons throughout the country.

The concerns expressed by these citizens are similar to those expressed by many of us in Congress—that study after study indicates continued use of DDT is a potential detriment to our environment and to human health.

In April 1969, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch created a Commission on Pesticides to "reappraise the problem of persistent pesticides with special emphasis on DDT." It had been my understanding that some of the subcommittees of the Commission have reported to the parent committee, and indications were that DDT had not come through its examination with a very good bill of health.

Now, according to newspaper reports this morning, the Secretary's Commission has, indeed, reconfirmed earlier studies which show that, like cyclamates, DDT is a potential cancer-causing agent. Those reports go on to indicate that Secretary Finch has forwarded information to the White House indicating that DDT ought to be banned.

If this is true, this is one time when a Democrat can take great pleasure in praising a Republican Cabinet official.

I urge the President to act on this matter at the earliest possible moment. The potential harmful effects which DDT and some other persistent pesticides have for our environment and the human inhabitants on this earth are important—so important that a study which shows DDT detrimental to our health should not be allowed to collect dust on the shelf of a Government agency or the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the letter which we sent to the President last week, the answer of Mr. Timmons which we received from the President's Office, and the petition recently filed with the Secretary of Agriculture be printed below for the benefit of my colleagues.

I ask that those of you who are interested in this subject and have not yet contacted the President do so at the earliest possible date urging his action on this most important matter.

The material follows:

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

NOVEMBER 3, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: On April 21, 1969, Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch declared that "the health of our citizens is properly and first concern of this Department." Citing his "increasingly concerned" attitude toward pesticide pollution, the Secretary said, "It is time to question the continued use of persistent pesticides from our environment. . . ." At that time he appointed a Commission on Pesticides to study "environmental pollution and its consequent risks to the health of our citizens." This Commission was to make a report and submit suggestions for action within six months.

Last week concern for the health of our citizens prompted Secretary Finch to announce that cyclamates would henceforth be removed from the list of substances generally recognized as safe for use in foods. The Secretary's action was in response to findings that "the presence of malignant bladder tumors (were found in laboratory animals) after these animals had been subjected to strong dose levels of cyclamates for long periods."

We believe recent evidence makes it clear that persistent pesticides including DDT, are as potentially damaging to human health as cyclamates. In light of Secretary Finch's action last week and recognizing the fact that his Commission on Pesticides has not publicly come forth with any evidence to the contrary, we hereby urge you to ban the use of DDT except in cases where it may be absolutely necessary to protect the public health and safety.

Available scientific findings certainly suggest that DDT may have cancer-causing potential, and is, therefore, a potential risk to the public health. Some of these findings include the following:

1. As far back as 1947 a study by the Food and Drug Administration showed that when DDT was fed to rats there was an increased incidence of liver tumors.

2. Hungarian scientists recently examined more than 1,000 mice from five generations after adding three parts per million DDT to their diets. They found that 28% of the mice getting DDT developed tumors, while only 3.8% of the mice on clean food had tumors. Leukemia appeared in 12.4% of the DDT mice, but only 2.5% of the others.

3. On May 1, 1969, the National Cancer Institute reported that DDT added to the diet of mice quadrupled the frequency of tumors of the liver, lungs, and lymphoid organs. According to that report, DDT was one of

11 compounds "clearly tumorigenic for the strains of mice used at the high dose levels which were administered". Similar evidence was found by scientists at the Rowell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, New York. Certainly this is no less compelling evidence regarding the dangers of DDT than that which caused Secretary Finch to act against cyclamates.

4. In studies done at the University of Miami School of Medicine, it was found that the human victims of cancer had more than twice as much DDT in their fat as did victims of accidental death. We do not know if the increased amount of pesticides caused the cancer of these victims, or if there was any relationship between the two, but this is something which can be ignored only at our own risk.

5. Researchers at the University of Wisconsin, among other places, have found indications that pesticides are a genetic hazard to man, capable of producing mutations. And, as one scientist at the University of California recently stated: "No responsible persons could now get up here and say that this constant nibbling at our steroids (sex hormones) is without any physiological effect, it would be irresponsible."

6. We know that DDT is passed on to the human fetus via the mother's placenta. We know, too, that the situation has become so serious that the DDT concentration in mothers' milk has been found to be more than twice as great as the concentration permitted in cows milk which is sold for public consumption.

Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Denmark no longer allow the use of DDT. Arizona, California, and Michigan have banned its use. We believe it is time that DDT be banned in every state, consistent with measures which may be needed to protect the public health and safety.

Because a number of government agencies deal with DDT—including the Department of Agriculture, which registers it for use, the Food and Drug Administration which sets tolerance levels for food, the Interior Department, which conducts research on the hazards it has to fish and wildlife, and the Public Health Service, which does research on the hazards associated with the use of pesticides—it would be difficult for just one agency to act on this matter.

Therefore, we strongly urge that you issue an executive order or directive banning the use of DDT except in instances where it is absolutely required, and that all government agencies take whatever action is required to fulfill the intent of this order.

Sincerely yours,

David R. Obey, Marvin Esch, Daniel Button, Joseph Karth, Arnold Olsen, Don Edwards, Clarence Long, Jonathan Bingham, William Clay, Thomas Rees, George Brown, Jr., Jerome Waldie, James Kee, Edward Koch, Richard McCarthy, Abner Mikva, Benjamin Rosenthal, James Scheuer, Leonard Farbstein, Bertram Podell, William Barrett, Members of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, November 4, 1969.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OBEY: The President has asked me to thank you for your November 3 letter urging that he take steps to ban the use of DDT except in instances where it is absolutely required.

Your several comments concerning the possible hazards of DDT have been noted, and your recommendation will receive most careful consideration.

With cordial regard,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

[Before the U.S. Department of Agriculture]
**PETITION REQUESTING THE SUSPENSION AND
 CANCELLATION OF REGISTRATION OF ECO-
 NOMIC POISONS CONTAINING DDT**

Environmental Defense Fund, Incorporated;
 Sierra Club; West Michigan Environ-
 mental Action Council; and National
 Audubon Society, *Petitioners.*

To: Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary
 of Agriculture.
 (Appendices B through E not attached)

Petitioners request the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise his authority under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, 61 Stat. 163, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 135-135k, to take immediate action to ban the use of DDT. Scientific evidence which has been accumulating at an accelerating rate clearly establishes that DDT is causing irreparable damage to the environment, and present scientific information establishes that DDT is a cancer-causing agent. Many other jurisdictions, in this country and abroad, have banned or severely restricted the uses of DDT. The Federal Government, charged with responsibility for protecting the health and welfare of its citizens and the protection of the nation's natural resources, must take appropriate action to stop the use of DDT. The Department of Agriculture has the power to suspend the registration of DDT and economic poisons containing DDT. The Department should exercise that authority at once.

I. PETITIONERS

Petitioner Environmental Defense Fund, Incorporated (hereinafter "EDF"), is a non-profit, tax-exempt membership corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. EDF is made up of scientists and other citizens dedicated to the protection of man's environment, employing legal action where necessary. EDF has, through litigation, sought to protect the environment from various forms of pollution. Its Scientists Advisory Committee, with more than 200 members, including some of the world's foremost environmental scientists, assures that positions taken are thoroughly supported by scientific evidence. An extensive bibliography on DDT has been compiled by EDF. The articles on DDT which are cited in this petition are listed in Appendix A, attached hereto.¹ In its activities, EDF does not concern itself with the pecuniary interests of individuals; rather, it seeks to assure the preservation or restoration of environmental quality on behalf of the general public.

Petitioner Sierra Club is a non-profit membership corporation organized under the laws of the State of California with membership of 80,000. The Sierra Club has been in existence since 1892. Among its stated purposes is the preservation of scenic resources, forests, waters, wildlife and wilderness. In furtherance of its purposes, the Sierra Club engages in many educational activities, including an extensive publishing program and wilderness outing program. In addition, the Sierra Club has participated in several legal actions to preserve the environment and maintains staff offices and membership chapters in all regions of the country.

Petitioner National Audubon Society (hereinafter "Audubon") is a non-profit membership corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. Audubon has as its purposes the protection of wildlife and the natural environment, and the education of man regarding his relationship with and his place within the natural environment as an ecological system. Audubon has over 80,000 members and a history of 65 years

devoted to these purposes. Audubon owns and operates 40 wildlife refuges, five nature interpretation centers and three adult ecological summer camps, and maintains a lecture program that reaches 200 cities annually. Audubon supports important research on endangered species and publishes papers on ecological research.

Petitioner West Michigan Environmental Action Council (hereinafter "the Environmental Action Council") is an unincorporated association. Its membership consists of 25 civic organizations and 300 individual members, primarily in West Michigan. Among the Environmental Action Council's stated purposes is assisting and coordinating the efforts of individuals and organizations to protect and restore the quality of the environment and to take necessary and appropriate action in furtherance thereof, including the dissemination of information through newsletters, lectures, seminars, participation in official hearings, and preparing and promoting model legislation.

II. DEFINITIONS

"DDT," sometimes called dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, is a mixture of substances which has as its major ingredient the chemical compound 1,1,1-trichloro-2,2-bis-(p-chlorophenyl)ethane. DDT is widely used, in a variety of economic poisons, as a pesticide.

"DDT residues" include DDT; DDE, 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis-(p-chlorophenyl) ethylene; DDD, also known as TDE, 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis-(p-chlorophenyl)ethane; and several other closely related chemical compounds derived from DDT by conversion processes within the environment.

III. OTHER RELEVANT PROCEEDINGS

A. *Petition to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare requesting repeal of tolerances for DDT*

On October 7, 1969, a petition was filed by six individuals and EDF with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare requesting the repeal of the tolerances for DDT on raw agricultural commodities. The petition, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix B, was based upon evidence that DDT is a carcinogenic or cancer-causing agent. (See, *infra*, pp. 16-17) Five of the individual petitioners therein are nursing mothers or are expecting to give birth in the very near future. The petition has not been acted upon as of this date.

On this day, said six individuals and EDF have requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare immediately to repeal the existing tolerances for DDT on raw agricultural commodities and to set such tolerances at zero. In addition, Secretary Finch has been requested to take all further steps to protect the health and welfare of the nation by banning the use of DDT on the ground that it is a carcinogen or cancer-causing agent. A copy of this petition was attached to the request addressed to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A copy of the request to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is attached to this petition as Appendix C.

B. *Requests for information on DDT from the Department of Agriculture*

The petitioners have made diligent efforts to obtain from the Department of Agriculture documents relating to the registration of DDT and economic poisons containing DDT, and information in the Department's files relating to damage to the environment and to living man caused by DDT and such economic poisons.

On September 18, 1969, a request for access to such information was made by Petitioner Environmental Action Council. On October 14, 1969, Petitioner Environmental Action Council renewed its request of September 18, 1969, and sought some related information. On October 24, 1969, Petitioners EDF and

Sierra Club joined in the above request of Petitioner Environmental Action Council.

As of this date, the Department of Agriculture has failed to respond to any of these requests and has failed to give Petitioners Environmental Action Council, EDF, or Sierra Club access to any records of the Department of Agriculture. As a result, petitioners are unable to identify with particularity those economic poisons containing DDT that have been registered by the Department of Agriculture. As a further result, petitioners have been unable to determine the extent to which the matters presented herein have been considered by the Department of Agriculture.

C. *Recent actions by administrative agencies against carcinogenic substances and other substances posing substantial risks to public health*

1. Cyclamates

A recent precedent was set by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert Finch for immediate administrative action to protect the public where there is evidence that a substance on the market and in common use has carcinogenic qualities. On October 18, 1969, the Secretary acted to remove cyclamates from the market only five days after learning of scientific evidence of their carcinogenicity. His action was based on "recent experiments conducted on laboratory animals which disclosed the presence of malignant bladder tumors after these animals had been subjected to strong dosage levels of cyclamates for long periods." See statements of Secretary Robert H. Finch and Jesse L. Steinfeld, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, October 18, 1969, attached hereto as Appendix D.

Secretary Finch emphasized "in the strongest possible terms that we have no evidence at this point that cyclamates have indeed caused cancer in humans." However, he stated that he felt it "imperative to follow a prudent course in all matters concerning public health." Appendix D, Statement of Secretary Finch, p. 1.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Steinfeld added:

"We can in no way at this time extrapolate the new data from rat experiments to human beings. Nevertheless, we in this Department—whether from a legal or from a scientific point of view—cannot afford to ignore any possibility of the rat data being applicable to the human population. As long as this possibility exists, a prudent concern for the health of the public dictates that precautionary action taken." Appendix D, Statement of Deputy Assistant Secretary Steinfeld, p. 6.²

2. The Herbicide 2,4,5-T

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge announced this week that the Federal Government will shortly initiate a coordinated series of actions to restrict the use of the herbicide 2,4,5-T. Among other actions, he stated that the Department of Agriculture would cancel the registration of the herbicide for use on food crops unless a basis can be found for establishing a safe legal tolerance before January 1, 1970. Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Press Release, October 29, 1969.

² In an action in 1959, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming made it clear that the strong policy against permitting cancer-causing agents in the market applies to pesticides as well as other products. By administrative interpretation, he ordered the seizure of all cranberries found to have residues of the pesticide aminotriazole, which had been found to cause cancer in mice. See CCH, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law Repr., 54,109.03. See *Bell v. Goddard*, 366 F.2d 177, 181 (7th Cir. 1966) (use of food additive barred where it caused cancer in animals notwithstanding small quantities ingested by man).

¹ Also attached to the copy of the petition filed with the Secretary is a copy of the entire EDF bibliography, with reprints of the articles which are of special relevance.

The Department of Agriculture's cancellation of the registration was based on a finding that the herbicide caused deformities in rats and mice. The data relied upon did not establish that the herbicide would have deleterious effects in man. The measure was explained as having a prophylactic purpose: to "assure safety of the public while further evidence is being sought."³

D. Actions in other jurisdictions

The Michigan Agriculture Commission cancelled, effective June 27, 1969, the registrations of DDT except for control of bats, mice and head lice. Cancellation was based on the facts that DDT is injurious to vertebrates and that there are safer alternative modes of pest control; thus DDT violated § 22(2)(g) of the Michigan Economic Poisons Act, 12 Mich. Stat. Ann. § 352(2)(z)(2)(g). This standard is substantially identical to a parallel provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, 61 Stat. 163, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 135-135k (hereinafter "FIFRA").

On October 29, 1969, the Director of the California Department of Agriculture issued a regulation cancelling the registration of DDT for use in that State on 47 field crops.

On March 27, 1969, Sweden announced a moratorium on the use of DDT and several other chlorinated hydrocarbons.

In Canada, several of the provinces have taken action to ban DDT. Ontario, by Order-in-Council 3654-69, issued on September 24, 1969, banned all uses of DDT, effective January 1, 1970, with limited exceptions. Several other provinces have taken action regarding DDT or announced that action is impending. The Federal Government in Ottawa will shortly adopt stringent measures limiting the use of DDT.

IV. APPLICABLE LAW: FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

A. Economic poisons

The Secretary of Agriculture regulates economic poisons under FIFRA. "Economic poisons," as defined in FIFRA § 2a, 7 U.S.C. § 135(a), include the various mixtures which have DDT as their active ingredient and appear on the market under trade names.

B. Registration requirements

Section 4a of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135b(a), requires that:

"[E]very economic poison . . . which is shipped or delivered for shipment from any State, Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory or the District of Columbia, or which is received from any foreign country shall be registered with the Secretary [of Agriculture]."

C. Suspension of imminent hazards

Under § 4c of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135b(c), the Secretary of Agriculture has the duty to suspend by order the registration of an economic poison "when he finds that such action is necessary to prevent an imminent hazard to the public." See also 7 C.F.R. § 364.4(c), published at 34 Fed. Reg. 13822.

Either the fact that an economic poison is a cancer-causing agent or the fact that it is destructive of fish, wildlife and useful animals would be sufficient in itself to qualify it as an "imminent hazard to the public."

1. Carcinogenicity

Proof that an economic poison is a carcinogen is a prime example of the kind of showing which establishes that it poses "an imminent hazard." The rapid response of HEW in banning cyclamates and the announced actions against the herbicide 2,4,5-T by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture (see pp. 6-7 *supra*) confirm the Federal policy

of banning cancer-producing agents by immediate action.

Congress has evinced special concern about carcinogenic or cancer-causing agents, declaring in the Food Additives Amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. § 348(c)(3)(a):

"[N]o additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal . . ."

In 1960, Congress passed the Color Additives Amendments to that Act and included a similar anticancer clause, 21 U.S.C. § 376(b)(5)(B).

Arthur S. Flemming, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare at the time of the passage of the Color Additive Amendments, summarized the philosophy embodied in the anticancer provisions in testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"The preponderance of scientific evidence clearly dictates our position: Our advocacy of the anticancer provision in the proposed color additives amendment is based on the simple fact that no one knows how to set a safe tolerance for substances in human foods when those substances are known to cause cancer when added to the diet of animals. I should like to underline again one statement in particular which I read earlier from the summary of Dr. [G. Burroughs] Milder's review of the role of certain chemical and physical agents in relation to cancer. It is this:

"No one at this time can tell how much or how little of a carcinogen would be required to produce cancer in any human being, or how long it would take the cancer to develop."

"This is why we have no hesitancy in advocating the inclusion of the anticancer clause.

"Unless and until there is a sound scientific basis for the establishment of tolerances for carcinogens, I believe the Government has a duty to make clear—in law as well as in administrative policy—that it will do everything possible to put persons in a position where they will not unnecessarily be adding residues of carcinogens to their diet." (See House Rpt. No. 1761, June 7, 1960, 2 U.S.C. Cong. & Admin. News, 86th Cong., 2d Sess., 2887 (1960).) (Emphasis supplied)

2. Damage to Fish, Wildlife, and Useful Animals

Congress intended to include the hazard of destruction of fish, wildlife and useful animals as an "imminent hazard." The "imminent hazard" provision was added by the 1964 amendments to FIFRA (78 Stat. 190). The Senate Committee Report, in discussing the imminent hazard concept stated that damage to fish and wildlife should be given due consideration. See Senate Report No. 57 on S. 1605, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. (1963).

D. Cancellation of economic poisons not in compliance with FIFRA

In addition to immediate suspension of an economic poison as an imminent hazard, the Secretary of Agriculture has the duty to issue a notice of cancellation of the registration of an economic poison when it appears that the economic poison, its labeling, or other material do not comply with the provisions of FIFRA. FIFRA § 4c, 7 U.S.C. § 135b(c). Any economic poison which is "misbranded," as the term is defined, FIFRA § 22(2), 7 U.S.C. § 135(2)(z)(2), is not in compliance with the Act. The Section 22(2) definition of "misbranded" products states, in relevant part:

"The term 'misbranded' shall apply . . . (2) to any economic poison . . . (c) if the labeling accompanying it does not contain directions for use which are necessary and if complied with adequate for the protection of the public; (d) if the label does not con-

tain a warning or caution statement which may be necessary and if complied with adequate to prevent injury to living man and other vertebrate animals, vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals . . . (g) if in the case of an insecticide, nematocide, fungicide, or herbicide when used as directed or in accordance with commonly recognized practice, it shall be injurious to living man or other vertebrate animals, or vegetation, except weeds to which it is applied, or to the person applying such economic poison; . . ."

An economic poison is necessarily "misbranded" when it cannot be used in a manner which protects the public and prevents injury to man and animals. Where that is the case, a notice of cancellation should be issued.

The regulations of the Department of Agriculture reflect the above standards in several provisions. See, e.g., 7 C.F.R. §§ 362.6, 362.9, 362.10(k), 362.105(c), 362.105(h), 362.106(f)(4)(v), 362.108(c)(6), 362.121(g).

E. Burden of proof

The suspension and cancellation procedures of § 4c of FIFRA, discussed above, were added to FIFRA by amendment in 1964 (78 Stat. 190).

The purpose of the 1964 amendment was to give the Secretary full authority to remove hazardous and unlawful economic poisons from the market and to shift the burden of proving their safety to the registrant. House Report No. 1125 on H.R. 9739, 88th Cong., 2d Sess., 64 U.S.C. Cong. & Admin. News, 2166-2167.

V. THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY DDT TO MAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The Secretary must take account of the weight of scientific evidence which establishes that the continued use of DDT is inconsistent with the scheme of FIFRA. The Act presupposes that no economic poison will be registered, or where already registered that such registration will be suspended by the Secretary, if the economic poison poses an imminent hazard to the public or if it is injurious to man, animals or the environment. The hazards of DDT are now well documented and require immediate action.

In this section petitioners will describe the damage which DDT has caused to the environment and the threats it poses to human health. Because of the technical character of the issue and the numerous citations to scientific materials, petitioners have attached to this petition a list of leading authorities. The numbered references in this section correspond to numbers in the list of authorities. See Appendix A.

The Affidavit of Charles F. Wurster, attached to this petition as Appendix E, also provides support for the propositions set out in this section. Dr. Wurster, the Chairman of the Scientists Advisory Committee of petitioner EDF, is a leading environmental scientist.

DDT, a pesticide which has been in common use since World War II, performed a useful function at a time when alternative pesticides were unavailable. Alternative pesticides and procedures that are of equal effectiveness but cause less damage are now available. (267, Appendix E, ¶17). The time has come for the Federal Government to act against the use of DDT. Because it is an imminent hazard to the environment and to human health, such action should be taken immediately.

DDT combines in a single molecule the properties of broad biological activity, chemical stability, mobility, and solubility, characteristics (139) that cause it to be accumulated by living non-target organisms, thus presenting dangers that are unusual among major pollutants (268). DDT not only enters food chains from the inorganic environment, it is increasingly concentrated toward the top of food chains, thereby posing a particular threat to carnivores (90, 155, 156, 161, 208, 209, 214, 260).

³ It was also reported that research evidence showed that the herbicide increased the incidence of cancer. *Los Angeles Times*, October 30, 1969, part I, p. 11.

Because DDT residues are mobile, (4, 20, 21, 22, 41, 157, 181, 201), chemically stable (60, 137, 201), nearly insoluble in water (20) but quite soluble in lipid or fat-like materials (139), DDT cannot be used and released in the environment under any circumstances, whether or not in accord with any label or directions, without the eventual contamination of food chains, (86, 90, 106, 131, 155, 156, 161, 208, 209, 214, 252, 260), including human foods, and the tissues of non-target organisms, including man (50, 149, 223, 258).

The entire biosphere has, in fact, become contaminated with DDT residues, including such seemingly unlikely places as air (1, 2, 9, 157), rainwater (181, 205), birds living hundreds of miles at sea (155, 214), Arctic and Antarctic animals (71, 174, 182, 220, 225), and cosmetics, and human milk (148, 221). DDT residues are regular contaminants of human foods, including many foods never treated with the material, and contaminate the tissues of virtually all human beings (50, 149, 223, 258).

DDT residues retain their broad biological activity long enough to be hazardous to contaminated non-target organisms, most of which are far removed by both time and space from the original site of the DDT application. (Appendix E, ¶ 7.)

The relationships between DDT residues and hazards to bird populations, by both direct mortality and reproductive failure, have been particularly well documented. DDT causes carnivorous birds, including birds of prey, sea birds, and many other species, to lay eggs with abnormally thin shells (88, 150, 211, 233). These eggs break prematurely, resulting in sharply reduced reproductive success (105). Populations of these species have in many cases undergone catastrophic declines, in some cases approaching extinction (7, 87, 154, 214). The decline in eggshell thickness occurred shortly after the large scale introduction of DDT into the world environment in the late 1940's (88, 150). Controlled feeding experiments with DDT and its metabolites have established the causal relationship between DDT residues in the environment, the production of eggs with abnormally thin shells, and greatly reduced reproductive success (218, 232, 256).

DDT causes direct mortality of large numbers of birds. This has been especially true where attempts were made to control Dutch elm disease with DDT, but has also occurred under many other circumstances (89, 191, 213, 236).

DDT inhibits reproduction in fish, with abnormal mortality of the fry following the contamination of the adult fish and their eggs. This has occurred in several freshwater situations, with mortalities of 100 percent of the fry in some instances (28, 47, 235). Controlled experiments confirmed that DDT residues were the causative agents (244, 245). Many fish from other areas, including commercially important fish from marine waters, show concentrations of DDT residues in their tissues that approach those that caused this abnormal fry mortality (8, 156, 224, 241). Important freshwater and marine fisheries are seriously threatened by present and anticipated future concentrations of DDT residues in the tissues of the fish. DDT also causes the direct mortality of large numbers of fish, a phenomenon that has occurred under a variety of circumstances (46, 62, 198).

DDT residues do great damage to useful invertebrates of many species. Insect communities are frequently disrupted by the killing of beneficial predatory and parasitic insects, thereby frequently aggravating the insect pest problem DDT was intended to control (100, 267). It kills pollinating insects. It damages various crustaceans such as crabs and shrimp (77, 117, 168, 253). Even the base

of oceanic food chains, the phytoplankton, can have their photosynthetic activity reduced by a few parts per billion of DDT in the water (215).

By eliminating certain organisms, especially carnivorous organisms, from biotic communities, DDT residues are causing widespread ecological damage (208). Such ecosystem simplification contributes to population explosions of certain organisms lower in the food chain and normally controlled by the carnivores. Proliferation of herbivorous insect pests or herbivorous birds like blackbirds are examples of this phenomenon (267). The stability of ecosystems is thereby reduced by the disruptions caused by DDT.

DDT and its residues cause these serious environmental effects by virtue of the great variety of their biological activity within living systems. These residues are nerve toxins (49, 217), induce hydroxylating enzymes in the liver (42, 112, 145, 229), inhibit certain other enzymes, and interfere with the photosynthetic process (215). They also are known to induce estrogenic activity (17, 264).

DDT residues exhibit this broad range of biological activity within a great diversity of animals and even some plant species; their activity extends to all five classes of vertebrates—amphibians, reptiles, fish, birds, and mammals. With these non-target organisms serving as warning signals or monitors, showing the great and diverse biological activity of DDT within a broad range of animals, it is hardly surprising that DDT has now been shown to operate by yet another biological mechanism—it is a carcinogenic or cancer-causing agent. Appendix E, ¶ 12.

In a definitive study supported by the National Cancer Institute, DDT was added to the diet of mice and compared with both positive and negative control groups of mice (238). The frequency of tumors of the liver, lungs and lymphoid organs was four times greater in mice fed DDT than those in the negative control group. The carcinogenicity was clearly established because DDT caused cancer of the same kind and at approximately the same frequency as did known cancer-causing agents (the positive controls) (238).

The National Cancer Institute study confirmed earlier evidence indicating the carcinogenicity of DDT. As early as 1947, a study by the Food and Drug Administration showed that when DDT was fed to rats there was an increased incidence of liver tumors (226). Similar results were obtained using rainbow trout, where DDT in the food of the fish caused the formation of hepatomas (231). Other experiments with mice carried through five generations showed that the DDT mice had a substantially higher incidence of leukemia and of tumors than the non-DDT mice (262).

In studies done at the University of Miami School of Medicine, human victims of terminal cancer were found to contain more than twice the concentration of DDT residues in their fat as did victims of accidental death (223, 258). The accident victims carried 9.7 parts per million in their fat, about average for Americans, while the cancer victims contained 20 to 25 parts per million.

Evidence that DDT causes cancer in human beings is not conclusive, but DDT is clearly carcinogenic in test animals. The evidence on DDT is similar to the evidence of the carcinogenic activity of the cyclamates. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare promptly withdrew cyclamates from the market on the basis of such evidence. The Secretary of Agriculture should do no less with DDT.

Alternative integrated control techniques, including the use of chemical, biological, and other pest management procedures are available that are as effective as DDT (37, 65, 251, 267). Alternative techniques would not cause the injury to the environment nor pose

the threat to human health described above if substituted for all of DDT's uses. (Appendix E, ¶ 17). DDT is a highly disruptive material in the environment and causes outbreaks of mites, aphids, and scale insects by killing their natural enemies (267). It has been stated by a leading authority in the field that DDT has no place in an integrated pest control system (267).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The overwhelming scientific evidence establishes that DDT is a cancer-causing agent, is injurious to animal, bird and fish populations, and is causing serious ecological damage. For these reasons, the continued use of DDT poses an imminent hazard to the public, threatening human health and environmental resources. Petitioners have long been concerned with the interrelationship of a wholesome environment and human welfare. Further introduction of DDT into the environment is entirely inconsistent with the values which the Secretary of Agriculture is bound to preserve.

Specifically, petitioners have shown that DDT does not comply with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act in the following respects:

(1) DDT is an imminent hazard to the public under section 4c of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135b(c), and the registration statements of all economic poisons containing DDT should be immediately suspended.

(2) DDT does not comply with the provisions of section 2z(2)(d) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135(2)(z)(2)(d) since it is causing serious, permanent and irreparable injury to entire populations of non-target vertebrate and useful invertebrate animals. No warning or caution statement contained in any label is or would be adequate if complied with to prevent this injury. The injury is occurring under the commonly recognized practices for the use of DDT.

(3) DDT does not comply with Section 2z(2)(c) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135(2)(z)(2)(c), for the reasons that it is causing serious, permanent and irreparable damage to the public in that it is causing injury specified above in the preceding paragraph and that it (a) is causing serious, permanent and irreparable damage to the fish and wildlife resources of the United States; (b) is causing serious, permanent and irreparable ecological damage; (c) is a carcinogen, and (d) is causing serious, permanent and irreparable damage to large numbers of diverse non-target organisms essential or beneficial to the public. No directions contained in any written material would be adequate if complied with to prevent said damage. The damage is occurring under the commonly recognized practices for the use of DDT.

(4) DDT does not comply with Section 2(z)(2)(g) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 135(2)(z)(2)(g), since when used as directed or used in accordance with commonly recognized practice it is injurious to living man and other vertebrate animals to which it is applied and to persons applying such economic poison.

(5) Alternative integrated control techniques, including the use of chemical, biological, and other pest management procedures are available that are substantially as effective as DDT and that do not presently cause the injury and harm set forth above and would not cause such harm if substituted for substantially all of DDT's uses.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Petitioners request that the Secretary: By order, immediately, (1) suspend the registration of all economic poisons that contain DDT; and (2) issue Notices of Cancellation for all registered economic poisons that contain DDT, affording petitioners an opportunity to participate fully in any administrative proceedings held following the issuance of notices of cancellation including

the right to adduce evidence, to rebut and to cross-examine.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES W. MOORMAN,
CHARLES R. HALPERN,
Attorneys for Environmental Defense
Fund, Sierra Club, West Michigan En-
vironmental Action Council, and Na-
tional Audubon Society.

EDWARD BERLIN,
Attorney for Environmental Defense
Fund.

OCTOBER 31, 1969.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

(Reference numbers cited in section V of this petition correspond to the numbers in the more extensive bibliography, one copy of which was submitted to Secretary Hardin, entitled "A Bibliography on the Effects of DDT on Non-Target Organisms")

1. Abbott, D. C., R. B. Harrison, J. O'G. Tatton, J. Thomson, Organochlorine pesticides in the atmospheric environment, *Nature* 208, 1317-8 (1965).

2. Abbott, D. C., R. B. Harrison, J. O'G. Tatton, J. Thomson, Organochlorine pesticides in the atmosphere, *Nature* 211, 259-61 (1966).

4. Acree, F., M. Beroza, M. C. Bowman, Codistillation of DDT with water, *J. Agr. Food Chem.* 11, 278-80 (1963).

7. Ames, P. L., DDT residues in the eggs of the Osprey in the Northeastern United States and their relation to nesting success, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3 (Suppl.), 87-97 (1966).

8. Anderson, R. B., W. H. Everhart, Concentrations of DDT in land-locked salmon (*Salmo Salar*) at Sebago Lake, Maine, *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 95, 160-4 (1966).

9. Antomaria, P., MacCorn, L. DeMaio, Airborne particulates in Pittsburgh: Association with p,p'-DDT, *Science*, 150, 1476-7 (1965).

17. Bitman, J., H. C. Cecil, S. J. Harris, G. F. Fries, Estrogenic activity of o,p'-DDT in the mammalian uterus and avian oviduct, *Science* 162, 371-2 (1968).

20. Bowman, M. C., F. Acree, M. K. Corbett, Solubility of carbon-14 DDT in water, *J. Agr. Food Chem.* 8, 406-8 (1960).

21. Bowman, M. C., M. S. Schechter, R. L. Carter, Behavior of chlorinated insecticides in a broad spectrum of soil types, *J. Agr. Food Chem.* 13, 360-5 (1965).

22. Bowman, M. C., F. Acree, C. S. Lofgren, M. Beroza, Chlorinated insecticides: Fate in aqueous suspensions containing mosquito larvae, *Science*, 146, 1480-1 (1964).

28. Burdick, G. E., et al., The accumulation of DDT in lake trout and the effect on reproduction, *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 93, 127-36 (1964).

37. Chant, D. A., Integrated control systems, *Nat. Acad. Sci. Nat. Res. Council Publ.* 1402, 193-218 (1966).

41. Cole, H., D., Barry, D. E. H. Frear, A. Bradford, DDT levels in fish, streams, stream sediments, and soil before and after DDT aerial spray application for fall cankerworm in Northern Pennsylvania, *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 2, 127-46 (1967).

42. Conney, A. H., Pharmacological implications of microsomal enzyme induction, *Pharmacol. Rev.* 19, 317-66 (1967).

46. Crouter, R. A., E. H. Vernon, Effects of black-headed budworm control on salmon and trout in British Columbia, *Canadian Fish Culturist* 24 1-18 (1959).

47. Currier, J. P., J. A. Keith, E. Stone, Problems with DDT in fish culture operations, *Naturaliste Can.* 94, 315-20 (1967).

49. Dale, W. E., T. B. Gaines, W. J. Hayes, G. W. Pearce, Poisoning by DDT: Relation between clinical signs and concentration in rat brain, *Science* 142, 1474-6 (1963).

50. Dale, W. E., G. E. Quinby, Chlorinated insecticides in the body fat of people in the United States, *Science* 142, 593-5 (1963).

60. Edwards, C. A., Insecticide residues in soils, *Residue Reviews* 13, 83 (1966).

62. Elson, P. F., Effects on wild young salmon of spraying DDT over New Brunswick forests, *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada* 24, 731-67 (1967).

65. Fleming, W. E., Biological control of the Japanese beetle, *Technical Bull. No.* 1383, U.S. Dept. Agr.

71. George, J. L., D. E. H. Frear, Pesticides in the Antarctic, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3 (Suppl.), 155-67 (1966).

77. Grosch, D. S., Poisoning with DDT: Effect on reproductive performance of *Artemia*, *Science* 155, 592-3 (1967).

86. Herman, S. G., R. L. Garrett, R. L. Rudd, Pesticides and the western grabe, First Rochester Conf. Toxicity, Univ. of Rochester 4-6 June 1968.

87. Hickey, J. J. (Ed), Peregrine falcon populations: their biology and decline, Univ. of Wisconsin Press, Madison (1969).

88. Rickey, J. J., D. W. Anderson, Chlorinated hydrocarbons and egg-shell changes in raptorial and fish-eating birds, *Science* 162, 271-3 (1968).

89. Hickey, J. J., L. B. Hunt, Initial songbird mortality following a Dutch elm disease control program, *J. Wildlife Management* 24, 259-65 (1960).

90. Hickey, J. J., J. A. Keith, F. B. Coon, An exploration of pesticides in a Lake Michigan ecosystem, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3 (Suppl.), 141-54 (1966).

100. Ide, F. P., Effects of forest spraying with DDT on aquatic insects of salmon streams in New Brunswick, *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada* 24, 769-805 (1967).

105. Keith, J. A., Reproduction in a population of Herring Gulls (*Larus argentatus*) contaminated with DDT, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3 (Suppl.), 57-70 (1966).

106. Keith, J. O., E. G. Hunt, Levels of insecticide residues in fish and wildlife in California, *Trans. 31st North American Wild. Nat. Resources Conf.*, 150-77 (March 1966).

112. Kupfer, D., Effects of some pesticides and related compounds on steroid function and metabolism, *Residue Rev.* 19, 11-30 (1967).

117. Lowe, J. I., Chronic exposure of blue crabs, *Callinectes sapidus*, to sublethal concentrations of DDT, *Ecology* 46, 899-900 (1965).

131. Moore, N. W., J. O'G. Tatton, Organochlorine insecticide residues in the eggs of sea birds, *Nature* 207, 42-3 (1965).

137. Nash, R. G., E. A. Woolson, Persistence, of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides in soils, *Science* 157, 924-7 (1967).

139. O'Brien, R. D., Insecticides, Action and Metabolism, Academic Press, N.Y. (1967).

145. Peakall, D. B., Pesticide-induced enzyme breakdown of steroids in birds, *Nature* 216, 505-6 (1967).

148. Quinby, G. E., J. F. Armstrong, W. F. Durham, DDT in human milk, *Nature* 207, 726-8 (1965).

149. Quinby, G. E., W. J. Hayes, J. F. Armstrong, W. F. Durham, DDT storage in the U.S. Population, *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.* 191, 175-9 (1965).

150. Ratcliffe, D. A., Decrease in eggshell weight in certain birds of prey, *Nature* 215, 208-10 (1967).

154. Ratcliffe, D. A., The peregrine situation in Great Britain 1965-66, *Bird Study* 14, 238-46 (1967).

155. Risebrough, R. W., D. B. Menzel, D. J. Martin, H. S. Olcott, DDT residues in Pacific Sea birds: a persistent insecticide in marine food chains, *Nature* 216, 589-91 (1967).

156. Risebrough, R. W., Chlorinated hydrocarbons in marine ecosystems, First Rochester Conf. Toxicity, Univ. of Rochester, 4-6 June 1968.

157. Risebrough, R. W., R. J. Huggett, J. J. Griffin, E. D. Goldberg, Pesticides: trans-Atlantic movements in the northeast trades, *Science* 159, 1233-6 (1968).

161. Robinson, J., A. Richardson, A. N.

Crabtree, J. C. Coulson, G. R. Potts, Organochlorine residues in marine organisms, *Nature* 214, 1307-11 (1967).

168. Sanders, H. D., O. B. Cope, Toxicities of several pesticides to two species of Cladocerans, *Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc.* 95, 165-9 (1966).

174. Sladen, W. J. L., C. M. Menzle, W. L. Reichel, DDT residues in Adelle penguins and a crab-eater seal from Antarctica: Ecological implications, *Nature* 210, 670-3 (1966).

181. Tarrant, K. R., J. O'G. Tatton, Organochlorine pesticides in rainwater in the British Isles, *Nature* 219, 725-7 (1968).

182. Tatton, J. O'G., J. H. A. Ruzicka, Organochlorine pesticides in Antarctica, *Nature* 215, 346-8 (1967).

191. Wallace, G. J., Insecticides and birds, *Audubon Mag.* 61, 10-12 (1959).

198. Warner, K., O. C. Fenderson, Effects of DDT spraying for forest insects in Maine trout streams, *J. Wildlife Management* 26, 86-93 (1962).

201. Weaver, L., C. G. Gunnerson, A. W. Breidenbach, J. J. Lichtenberg, Chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides in major U.S. river basins, *Publ. Health Rpts.* 80, 481-93 (1965).

205. Wheatley, G. A., J. A. Hardman, Indications of the presence of organochlorine insecticides in rainwater in central England, *Nature* 207, 486-7 (1965).

207. Woodwell, G. M., Persistence of DDT in a forest soil, *Forest Sci.* 7, 194-6 (1961).

208. Woodwell, G. M., Toxic substances and ecological cycles, *Scientific American* 216, 24-31 (1967).

209. Woodwell, G. M., C. F. Wurster, P. A. Isaacson, DDT residues in an East Coast estuary: A case of biological concentration of a persistent insecticide, *Science* 156, 821-4 (1967).

211. Wurster, C. F., Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and avian reproduction: how are they related? First Rochester Conf. Toxicity, Univ. of Rochester, 4-6 June 1968.

213. Wurster, D. H., C. F. Wurster, W. N. Strickland, Bird mortality following DDT spray for Dutch elm disease, *Ecology* 46, 488-99 (1965).

214. Wurster, C. F., D. B. Wingate, DDT residues and declining reproduction in the Bermuda petrel, *Science* 159, 979-1 (1968).

215. Wurster, C. F., D. B. Wingate, DDT synthesis by marine phytoplankton, *Science* 159, 1474-5 (1968).

Bibliography supplement

217. Anderson, J., M. Peterson, DDT: Sublethal effects on brook trout nervous system, *Science* 164, 440-1 (1969).

218. Bitman, J., H. Cecil, S. Harris, G. Fries, DDT induces a decrease in eggshell calcium, *Nature* 224, 44-6 (1969).

220. Cade, T. J., C. M. White, J. R. Haugh, Peregrines and pesticides in Alaska, *Condor* 70, 170-78 (1968).

221. Curley, A., R. Kimbrough, Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides in plasma and milk of pregnant and lactating women, *Arch. Environ. Health* 18, 156-64 (1969).

223. Deichmann, W. B., J. L. Radomski, Retention of pesticides in human adipose tissue—preliminary report, *Ind. Med. Surgery* 37, 218-9 (1968).

224. Duffy, J. R., D. O'Connell, DDT residues and metabolites in Canadian Atlantic coast fish, *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada* 25, 189-95 (1968).

225. Emerson, J. H., D. D. Berger, Chlorinated hydrocarbon residues in peregrines and their prey species from northern Canada, *Condor* 70, 149-53 (1968).

226. Fitzhugh, O. G., A. Nelson, The chronic oral toxicity of DDT [2, 2-bis (p-chlorophenyl)-1, 1, 1-trichloroethane], *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Therap.* 89, 18-30 (1947).

229. Gillett, J. W., "No effect" level of DDT in induction of microsomal epoxidation, *J. Agr. Food Chem.* 16, 295-7 (1968).

231. Halver, J., Crystalline aflatoxin and other vectors for trout hepatoma, *Bur. Sport Fish. Wildl. Res. Rept.* 70, 78-102 (1967).

232. Heath, R. G., J. Spann, J. F. Kreitzer, Marked DDE impairment of Mallard reproduction in controlled studies, *Nature* 224, 47-8 (1969).

233. Hickey, J. J., DDT and birds: Wisconsin, 1968, *Atlantic Naturalist* 24, 86-92 (1969).

235. Hopkins, C. L., S. Solly, A. R. Ritchie, DDT in trout and its possible effect on reproduction failures, New Zealand J. Marine Freshwater Res. 3, 220-9 (1969).

236. Hunt, L. B., R. J. Sacho, Response of robins to DDT and methoxychlor, *J. Wildlife Management* 33, 336-45 (1969).

238. Innes, J. R. M., et al, Bioassay of pesticides and industrial chemicals for tumorigenicity in mice: A preliminary study, *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 42, 1101-14 (1969).

241. Jensen, S., et al, DDT and PCB in marine animals from Swedish waters, *Nature*, 224, 247-50 (1969).

244. Macek, K. J., Reproduction in brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) fed sublethal concentrations of DDT, *J. Fish Res. Bd. Canada* 25, 1787-96 (1968).

245. Macek, K. J., Growth and resistance to stress in brook trout fed sublethal levels of DDT, *J. Fish Res. Bd. Canada* 25, 2443-51 (1968).

251. Miller, H. C., S. B. Silverborg, R. J. Campana, Dutch elm disease: Relation of spread and intensification to control by sanitation in Syracuse, New York, *Plant Disease Reporter* 53, 551-5 (1969).

252. Modin, J. C., Residues in fish, wildlife and estuaries, *Pesticides Monitoring Journal* 3, 1-7 (1969).

253. Odum, W. S., G. M. Woodwell, C. F. Wurster, DDT residues absorbed from organic detritus by fiddler crabs, *Science* 164, 776-7 (1969).

256. Porter, R. D., S. N. Wiemeyer, Dieldrin and DDT: Effects on sparrow hawk eggshells and reproduction, *Science* 165, 199-200 (1969).

258. Radomski, J., W. B. Deichmann, E. E. Cilzer, Fd. Cosmet Toxicol. 6, 209-20 (1968), Pesticide concentrations in the liver, brain, and adipose tissue of terminal hospital patients.

260. Risebrough, R. W., et al, Polychlorinated biphenyls in the global ecosystem, *Nature* 220, 1098-1102 (1968).

262. Tarjan, R., T. Kemeny, Multigeneration studies on DDT in mice, *Fd. Cosmet Toxicol.* 7, 215-22 (1969).

264. Welch, R. M., W. Levin, A. H. Conney, Estrogenic action of DDT and its analogs, *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 14, 358-67 (1969).

267. Wurster, C. F., DDT goes to trial in Madison, *Bioscience* 19, 809-13 (1969).

268. Wurster, C. F., Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and the world ecosystem, *Biol. Cons.* 1, 123-9 (1969).

VETERANS EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1969

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we commemorated our veterans with symbolic praise and rhetoric. Today we can pay tribute to our veterans by action.

Yesterday we acknowledged their sacrifices, their victories, and thanked the veterans for their service in the name of the United States. Today we can illustrate our gratitude by passing needed legislation.

We have the opportunity to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 11959, the Veterans Education and Training Assistance Amendments Act of 1969.

The need for this legislation is clear. In fiscal 1969, approximately 216,200 of the enlisted separetees from the armed services were high school dropouts. Only 6.1 percent of the eligible high school dropouts are taking advantage of the educational program conducted by the Veterans' Administration.

There are two primary causes of the low rate of participation. The first cause is the unrealistically low level of allowance rates. The GI educational benefits have not risen to cover the skyrocketing costs of education. The second cause of low participation is the lack of knowledge, by those who need it the most, of the program under the GI bill.

Both of these causes are rectified by the Senate substitute amendments to H.R. 11959. A 46-percent increase in educational benefits will make the program economically attractive. At least, a veteran will be able to meet nearly all of the expenses of an education.

A second provision adopted by the Senate will expand the veterans outreach services program. This program aims at searching out recently discharged veterans, especially the educationally disadvantaged, and advising them of the benefits to which they are entitled. Finally, the expanded program will assist the veterans in obtaining their hard earned benefits.

I see no more fitting way to pay tribute to our veterans than by assisting them in getting better education and training and, thus, improving their earning capabilities.

SMOKING AND HEALTH

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

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, new evidence has just come to hand that casts grave additional doubt on the findings of the 1964 Report of the Surgeon General on Smoking and Health. It comes to light just 7 days after the introduction of my bill to create a Commission to review and assess all available data on the question. More importantly, it comes from a scientist who must be considered as the father of the hypothesis that cigarette smoking causes cancer: Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, vice president of the American Cancer Society for epidemiology and statistical research.

Dr. Hammond has just reported that a chemical found in cigarette smoke, benzo(a)pyrene, may have to be ruled out as a possible cause of lung cancer. Benzo(a)pyrene is no innocuous component of smoke. The 1964 Surgeon General's report labeled it "one of the most potent of all the carcinogens now known."

For years, this chemical has been a link in the indictment of cigarette smoking. For years, individual physicians, private health organizations, and Government officials have accepted presence of benzo(a)pyrene in cigarette smoke as evidence that cigarettes cause cancer, and that, if necessary, the tobacco industry may have to be liquidated.

But now a powerful link in the chain of evidence has snapped. Dr. Hammond of the American Cancer Society now reports that studies of nearly 6,000 roofers who are exposed to large doses of benzo(a)pyrene had no more lung cancer than the average man. He told a meeting of the American College of Chest Physicians that, "It is most unlikely that benzo(a)pyrene has anything to do with lung cancer in man."

The roofers, I should point out, work with pitch, and in an average day might inhale the amount of this carcinogen contained in 715 cigarettes, or more than 35 packs a day. If there was indeed a cause-and-effect relationship between benzo(a)pyrene and lung cancer, Dr. Hammond reported, these roofers would have had a two to three times higher death rate from the disease than the average.

Mr. Speaker, Congress does not now know enough about the relationship between smoking and health to make crucial policy determinations. I submit that science does not now have sufficient data. The existing data must be reviewed and assessed objectively by scientists, not crusaders. Furthermore there is a pressing need for original medical research and investigation.

The situation as it now exists is very much in line with Mark Twain's view that "it's not what we don't know that hurts us, it's what we do know that isn't so." Congress has before it the remedy to this situation. House Joint Resolution 969 would give us the means to get at the facts, to ask questions—and get answers—first before we "shoot" an industry.

Mr. Speaker I would like to insert an account of Dr. Hammond's "new evidence" as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune. I call particular attention to the headline "Cigaret Link to Cancer May Be in Error."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 31, 1969]
CIGARET LINK TO CANCER MAY BE IN ERROR
(By Ronald Kotulak)

A chemical found in cigaret smoke that has been implicated as a possible cause of lung cancer may have to be ruled out, a top official of the American Cancer society reported yesterday.

The chemical, which is called benzo [a]-pyrene, exists in extremely small amounts in cigaret smoke. When the chemical is painted on the skins of rats for long periods, it can produce skin cancers.

Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, A. C. S. vice president for epidemiology and statistical research, said that studies of nearly 6,000 roofers who are exposed to large doses of the chemical showed that they had no more lung cancer than the average rate for the population.

"It is most unlikely that benzo [a]-pyrene has anything to do with lung cancer in man," he reported at the meeting of the American College of Chest Physicians in the Palmer House.

The chemical is contained in the pitch used by the men and in an average day a worker might inhale the amount of benzo [a]-pyrene contained in 715 cigarets, he said.

LITTLE GROUP DIFFERENCE

If there was an association between the chemical and lung cancer, then this group of roofers would have had a death rate from cancer that was two to three times higher than average, Dr. Hammond said. Instead,

43 roofers in the group died of lung cancer compared to 36.6 that would have been expected from a similar age group, a difference that is statistically insignificant, he said.

In another report, two University of Louisville doctors reported that a study of 300 Kentucky coal miners showed that coal dust is not as bad a villain as many people expected.

The miners did not have any higher rate of chronic bronchitis, emphysema, heart disease, lung cancer, or high blood pressure than the general population.

TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that could result in substantial tax savings for the parents of college students.

My bill is nearly identical to a measure introduced in the Senate last month by Senator RIBICOFF, who for years has championed the cause of tax relief for persons bearing the increasingly heavy costs of higher education. Both proposals are designed primarily to assist middle and lower middle income families by awarding tax credits of up to \$325 for each student when gross adjusted income does not exceed \$15,000 a year.

Only today I received fresh evidence of the need for this relief, from a good friend who wrote that he must pay \$8,000 a year through 1972 to maintain just two children in college.

The credit authorized by the legislation would be computed on the basis of 100 percent of the first \$200 of qualifying expenditures for tuition, fees and books, 25 percent of the next \$300 and 5 percent of the subsequent \$1,000. No credit would be permitted, however, for living and other expenses not purely educational, or for allowable student costs in excess of \$1,500. Institutions for which the credits could be claimed would include colleges and junior colleges, universities, graduate schools, and vocational and business schools.

The ramifications of the bill would be felt in every part of the country. At San Diego State College, the largest institution of higher education serving my own district, California residents are not charged any tuition, as such. But the cost of required books and supplies is about \$180 a year, an amount that could be claimed in full as a credit under terms of the legislation I am offering. The degree of relief would, of course, be even greater for expenses incurred at institutions that charge tuition.

The bill is definitely not a rich man's measure. It would not open any loopholes in the ominous sense of that much bandied-about word. For a family paying the expenses of one child in college, the credit would gradually be phased out between the income levels of \$15,000 and \$25,000. If a family's income were greater than \$25,000, no credit at all would be allowed, unless two or more college level students were being supported.

The bill would give the most help to the family—or individual of modest means—the sort of people who might be

a bit too well off to qualify for conventional scholarships but are also desperately hard-pressed to pay the full costs of providing even one child with a college education at today's soaring price rates.

I hope this bill, which has drawn broad, bipartisan support, can be enacted with a minimum of delay.

BUSINESS TAXES ARE TOO HEAVY TODAY

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the plan today in Congress is to find ways to tax business more. What this country needs is lower taxes. We need to realize that business is the foundation of our prosperous economy. Business means jobs—and jobs are essential, as they keep people busy and in turn provide more taxable income.

Let me refer to you for study the tax analysis from this middle-sized factory in Pennsylvania. The 260 employees on their payroll are the base of their hometown economy. Wages from this factory provide jobs for grocery stores, gasoline stations, clothing stores, appliances, homebuilders, and general merchants.

Business needs more cash profits to help increase sales to offset inflation. Plants need more cash profits to buy more modern machinery so as to stay competitive in price and progressive in growth. This company needs more cash profits to encourage investors to stay in this stock.

In 1968, this company had sales of \$5,548,000 and made \$106,685 in net profit. At the same time, it collected and paid taxes for governments totaling \$715,949. Dividends to stockholders were \$25,000.

Corporate Taxes

Payroll taxes, employer (FICA and State and Federal unemployment)	\$31,735
Real estate taxes	17,373
Federal corporate income taxes	29,928
Pennsylvania State income taxes, corporate	7,783
California State income tax, corporate	1,800
New Jersey State franchise tax	480
California personal property tax	2,667
Pennsylvania capital stock tax	360
U.S. income tax employees withheld	255,051
F.D.C.A. tax withheld	73,010
Local wage taxes withheld	17,576
New York State income tax withheld	1,228
New Jersey State income tax withheld	118
New York City income tax withheld	83
Pennsylvania use taxes	437
Sales tax on purchases	11,320
Income tax, dividends	9,000
Estate taxes, stockholder	206,000
Total	715,949

During the year, old stockholders died and passed on their stock worth \$550,000. The estate consisted of land and stocks. The estate had to sell the stock to pay the \$206,000 estate tax on the stock. How can the person who bought the stock repay the loan or even maintain his bank loan with 8-percent interest. Dividends

were much lower than bank interest payable on the investment.

Let us encourage business to make money. When business is profitable, our country is prosperous.

LET US ENCOURAGE PRESIDENT NIXON IN HIS EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE PEACE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, November 3, the President embarked upon one of the hardest programs ever undertaken by an American Chief of State. He must hold the support and gain the understanding of the American people in reference to Vietnam. As you know, our involvement there has been the cause of the deepest division and broadest national confusion since the Civil War.

The President has explained the objectives and policies on Vietnam. In outlining his plans for the future, he made a straightforward appeal for national support particularly focusing upon the backing from "the great silent majority" of American citizens.

I join the President in soliciting the support of all the people who want a just peace and not just any peace in Vietnam. The President has categorically stated that he is working to end the war on two fronts.

First, he reiterated his peace proposals in great detail. He itemized his efforts since his election to make progress in the negotiations in Paris. Also, in an unprecedented move, he revealed to the public his secret initiatives for peace which were all blithely rejected by the inflexible leaders in North Vietnam. We have repeatedly made overtures to get the negotiations underway and yet they have fallen on apparently deaf ears. One must wonder who really wants peace.

Second, he disclosed a plan to bring the war to an end regardless of what happens on the negotiating front. He emphatically stated he has a withdrawal timetable, that it is known to the South Vietnamese leaders, that it would progressively lessen America's role in the war, and that the South Vietnamese are assuming a much greater responsibility in the protection of their people.

The President hopes enough Americans, although weary of the war, will support an orderly and viable peace to enable him to move along these broad lines. The success or failure of his hope depends upon how convinced the people remain that the war is being Vietnamized and that no peace initiatives are being neglected.

In light of his stand, I feel it would take a crass cynic to deny the fact the President is dedicated to resolving the conflict in Vietnam. Under his leadership over 50,000 troops have returned home and American casualties have dropped to the lowest levels in years. Granted, he rejected the simplistic and politically expedient course of an immediate American withdrawal. But how many people would be willing to accept the consequences of such a move? How

would the humanitarians who decried the bombing of North Vietnam feel about a reenactment of the bloodbath at Hue? How would those people who deplored the use of napalm react to the repeat of wholesale burning and slaughter that followed the French retreat from Vietnam in 1954? And what about our prisoners of war and the many refugees in the countryside who face annihilation if we were to leave? In making his decision the President realized that the precipitate withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam would be a disaster not only for South Vietnam but for the United States and for the cause of world peace.

The President recognized that some people, many of whom are honest and patriotic Americans, are disappointed by his actions. However, as Mr. Nixon eloquently stated:

I would be untrue to my oath of office if I allowed the policy of this nation to be dictated by the minority . . . who try to impose their will on the nation by mounting demonstrations in the street . . . If a vocal minority, however fervent its cause, prevails over reason and the will of the majority, this nation has no future as a free society.

I receive many letters from concerned citizens who want to be involved in solving our Nation's problems and who ask "What can I do?" If you believe, as I do, that the President has a plan for peace and you want to help him implement it, here is what you can do.

Contact the President and tell him you want the war to end and that you have confidence in him to achieve this goal. The President has acted in a positive manner, reversing the troop buildup which characterized the last two administrations. There are indications that all of our combat troops will be removed by the end of 1970. What the President needs now is a positive response from the American body politic. With strong public support, the President can proceed forthrightly and confidently with his efforts to achieve a just peace. For, as Mr. Nixon stated:

Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that.

It is now incumbent upon all of us to end this silence and acknowledge to our President that we encourage his efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam.

DOMINATION OF THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM ACTIVITIES BY EXTREMISTS OF THE LEFT

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, at the end of today's business, I have reserved a special order of 60 minutes to discuss certain information relating to the Vietnam moratorium activities planned for Washington later this week. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks in that special order and to include extraneous matter in it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning a column by Evans and Novak describing the domination of the moratorium planning by extremists of the left. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

LIBERALS CAPITULATE TO EXTREMISTS, REDS DOMINATE 'PEACE' MOVEMENT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The tens of thousands of well-meaning war protesters set to converge on Washington Saturday will be joining a demonstration planned since summer by advocates of violent revolution in the U.S. who openly support Communist forces in Vietnam.

Accordingly, whatever happens here Saturday, the Nov. 15 march on Washington will mark a postwar highwater mark for the American far left. Responsible liberals have been enlisted as foot soldiers in an operation mapped out mainly by extremists—testimony to the present ineffectiveness of nonviolent, liberal elements in the peace movement.

Moreover, heavy-handed Nixon administration reaction by Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst assures that any violence on Saturday will be blamed by liberals on the government, and the avoidance of violence will be credited by these same liberals to the self-restraint of the far left.

Although liberals belatedly spent this week in frantic eleventh-hour efforts to co-opt Saturday's march, they had plenty of advance warning. The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe), sponsors of the march, was formed last July in Cleveland with an executive committee dominated by supporters of the Trotskyite movement.

The executive committee is moderate when compared with the 60-member steering committee, studded with past and present Communist Party members (including veteran party functionary Arnold Johnson). Far more important than representation by the largely moribund American Communist Party, however, is inclusion on the steering committee of leaders in its newly invigorated Trotskyite movement.

The steering committee began eclipsing the executive committee in recent weeks under the leadership of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its fast growing youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers Party took over planning for a march calculated to end in violent confrontation.

Participating in planning sessions were elements even more violence-prone than the Trotskyites: extreme SDS factions calling themselves the revolutionary brigade. Wild scenarios for storming the White House, the Justice Department, and the South Vietnamese Embassy were prepared.

Furthermore, the New mobe was in closer contact with Communist Vietnamese official circles than is generally realized. Ron Young, a member of the New Mobe steering committee, journeyed to Stockholm Oct. 11-12 for a meeting attended by representatives of the North Vietnam government and the Vietcong. Reporting on plans for Nov. 15, Young urged a worldwide propaganda campaign to boost the demonstration.

The link between Hanoi and elements of the New Mobe was again demonstrated Oct. 14 when Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam sent greetings to American antiwar demonstrators. Halstead, the Trotskyite leader, drafted a friendly reply to Hanoi approved by a majority of the New Mobe's steering committee. Its transmission was blocked only by the intervention of Stewart

Meachem of the American Friends Service Committee, one of the New Mobe's moderates.

Thus far-left orientation of the New Mobe for weeks has worried liberal doves, including the youthful leaders of the peaceful Oct. 15 Moratorium. Sen. Charles Goodell of New York, emerging as a leading congressional foe of the war, attempted—without success—to reduce extremist influence inside the New Mobe and argued against including far leftists on the steering committee.

But the liberals, having forgotten the fate of popular front movements a generation ago and unwilling to repudiate any antiwar forces, would not actually break with the New Mobe. Any chance of that was eliminated by President Nixon's relatively hard-line speech Nov. 3 and government strategy laid down at the Justice Department by Kleindienst.

Goodell and Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota, after much deliberation, accepted invitations to address the demonstration in hopes of moderating it. Similarly, moratorium leaders this week have tried to insinuate themselves into control of the march. But the march remains essentially a project of the far left, constituting a tragic failure of leadership by liberal foes of the war.

Mr. TAFT. In my special order, I will discuss in detail a considerable amount of additional information sustaining that viewpoint, including an internationally circulated memorandum of the Stockholm Conference of October 12. That memorandum discloses the plans made at that time relating to the next few days in Washington. I do not believe this memorandum has been published previously in this country.

I invite all Members who are interested or who may have other information of this nature to join with me at that time.

CAN A DISORDERLY SOCIETY SURVIVE?

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, ever since radio broadcasters accepted the responsibility of becoming a vital and necessary voice in our democracy and began editorializing on a regular basis, several stations have proved to the public they not only exercise their right to editorialize, but also safeguard that right by doing so in a most responsible way.

Such is the case of WIBW in Topeka, Kans. Mr. Thad M. Sandstrom, general manager of WIBW, recently broadcast two editorials that are most timely and appropriate. The first raises the question, "Can a disorderly society survive?" This is most appropriate as we anticipate this week's activities protesting the war in Vietnam.

The second editorial involves an issue that is much less controversial—legislation that I have introduced regarding limiting daylight saving time to the 3 summer months.

Many informed and interested citizens of Kansas share my view that our State is fortunate to have such a responsible radio voice as we search for answers to our many pressing problems.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorials for inclusion in the RECORD:

[WIBW editorial, Oct. 12, 1969]

Former United States Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker, raises the question: "Can a disorderly society survive?" Justice Whittaker answers his own question this way: "In all recorded history, none ever has. On the contrary," he says, "History shows that the first evidence of each society's decay appeared in the toleration of disobedience of its laws."

Whittaker then relates this fact of history to certain groups in this country which hold that it is proper, indeed that they have the right, to violate those laws with which they do not agree. Of this, the former Justice says: "The great pity here is that these groups are actually eroding and destroying the legal processes which alone can ever assure to them, or permanently maintain for them, due process and equal protection of the laws, and that can, thus, protect them from discrimination and abuses by majorities."

Without the rule of law there can be no freedom. Any man has the right to protest any law and urge its repeal or change. But no man has the right to violate any law simply because he does not agree with it.

President Theodore Roosevelt, in a message 65 years ago, said:

"No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it."

[WIBW editorial, Oct. 5, 1969]

As the first touches of autumn dot the Kansas hills, we're reminded that summer is at an end. And as the days grow shorter, it seems that this part of the country is being forced to live by the rules of the big cities of the east. We don't object to Daylight Saving Time during the summer months. In fact, we found the long evenings when it doesn't get dark till nine o'clock or so to be right pleasant during the months of June, July and August.

But along about this time of year, we wonder about the wisdom of having Daylight Time extend from late April till late October. Already, it's pretty dark when some children are on their way to school. Many workers now go to work before sun up, while farmers . . . whose livestock knows no time table . . . find their way to the barn with a flashlight. With the amount of leisure time growing, it seems certain that Daylight Time during the summer will be with us for a long time to come. If you've visited in the big cities of the east during the summer, you can see why they want as much sunlight as possible after normal working hours. And we certainly recognize the need for a national time standard that is as uniform as practical.

But it does seem to us that six months is too long for Daylight Time to last. There are several proposals to revise the number of weeks of daylight time—including one introduced by western Kansas Congressman Keith Sebelius. His proposal deserves the support of the entire Kansas Congressional delegation . . . and in fact, Congressmen from throughout the Middle West.

In essence, we think it would be a good idea to have Daylight Time start on Memorial Day, late in May . . . and go through Labor Day, the first Monday in September. The extension of Daylight Time through the end of October is an example of taking a good thing too far.

SOCIAL SECURITY PRETENSES

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very meaningful article touching on

the administration's decision to request a 10-percent increase in social security benefits that will not require raising payroll taxes.

It would appear, according to the chief actuary for the Social Security Administration, that the social security trust fund is now overfinanced and could absorb the 10-percent increase in benefits that the administration will seek from Congress.

The chief actuary, Mr. Robert J. Myers, states that there will be enough in the trust fund to finance a 10-percent increase of social security benefits which is, according to that official, about the cost-of-living increase, although I personally believe it is much closer to 20 percent.

At present each worker and his employer pays 4.8 percent of the worker's first \$7,800 in income, or a maximum of \$374.40 each year toward social security. The tax rate will rise to 5.2 percent on January 1, 1971, under existing law. This tax is unduly burdensome.

Benefits now average \$99.69 a month, with a minimum of \$55 and a maximum of \$165.50 a month. These are picayune and inadequate in this day and age, and our inflated economy.

I am greatly concerned about these figures, because I do not believe that the payments constitute even half-decent support for human beings in this high-cost, inflationary period when prices of ordinary necessities of life, housing, food, clothing, and other indispensable items are skyrocketing above previous levels and causing untold hardship to people living on fixed incomes.

Time and again, I have urged the Committee on Ways and Means, which has jurisdiction over social security legislation, to conduct hearings and speed action on several bills, including one introduced by myself, to bring social security benefits up to current price and living cost levels. I hope these hearings will be held according to schedule.

Notwithstanding the hardship being experienced by very many worthy older people, who simply cannot exist tolerably and decently on current benefits, the social security trust fund has been richly replenished by high employee earnings, contributions, greater employment, and increased interest earned on the fund this year.

Whatever the cost, and I believe it will be high, the Congress must take urgent action to increase social security benefits, to provide some much needed relief for a great many social security beneficiaries, who are eking out a bare existence with totally inadequate income.

The time has long passed for action, and I urge our friend, the able distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and his great committee, to give this critical matter attention on a real crash basis, at the earliest possible time, so that substantial relief can be provided to those veterans of industry, agriculture, business, the professions, our American economy, who in their advanced years, in many instances, are living lonely, frugal lives on meager incomes that do not permit them to enjoy even the barest necessities of

life, but compel them all too often to eat the bitter bread of poverty.

The fact is that our affluent society has become an exploitative society where price gouging is rampant, where profits are skyrocketing, where some people are enjoying unimaginable luxuries, housing, and extravagant living, while other needy ones are almost without the bare means of keeping body and soul together. This is the real gap separating our people that must be closed.

This situation is doing much to bring bitter disillusionment and loss of confidence among the poor and the needy, and other people as well, in our vaunted, free-enterprise system, with its high and rich productivity that does not furnish the bare minimum necessities of life to millions of worthy Americans wending their way through the last years of their lives in poverty and hardship.

I hope this Congress will no longer delay in providing the relief that higher social security payments could readily furnish out of funds set aside in large part from the earnings of the people, or out of lush, national revenues.

It is the old story of which the English poet wrote years ago: "Ill fares the land to lingering ills a prey—where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Some in this country today are swollen with excessive profits, while others go hungry, helpless little children among them, while prices bound toward the monetary stratosphere, while exploiters are sated with a surfeit of gold and inflated prices, at a time when many languish in hunger on the streets, and others are gouged and rifled by incredible prices, excessive interest rates, while others blandly affix daily price increase tags on necessities of life and indispensable food people must buy or starve.

These things, and a senseless, ill-fated, frustrating war, are fragmenting the confidence of the American people and the outside world in the capacity of this Government to solve the problems of economic and social stability, freedom, equality in the Nation, and peace in the world.

These things are driving many of the people into the arms of the Marxists and other visionary zealots, who strive to convert this Nation into a dictatorial, collectivist police state. Are we going to stand by and let them do it? I think not. But we certainly must put the peace-freedom-prosperity show on the road. It is late.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram, Sept. 21, 1969]

HIKE SEEN IN THE WORKS FOR OLD-AGE PENSIONERS

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration is believed to be preparing a request for next week for a 10 per cent increase in Social Security benefits that will not require raising payroll taxes.

Robert J. Myers, chief actuary for the Social Security Administration said yesterday that the Social Security trust fund is now overfinanced and could absorb the 10 per cent boost in benefits that the President said Wednesday he would seek from Congress.

Nixon did not say how he planned to finance such an increase. But Myers, who makes cost estimates of social insurance and related programs, told UPI that Administra-

tion officials asked him whether the trust fund could cover the boost and that he replied it could.

"There will be enough there to finance a 10 per cent increase, and 10 per cent is about the cost-of-living increase," Myers said.

A worker and his employer each pays 4.8 per cent of the worker's first \$7,800 in income, or a maximum of \$374.40 each a year, toward Social Security. The tax rate will raise to 5.2 per cent on Jan. 1, 1971, under existing law.

Benefits now average \$99.69 a month, with a minimum of \$55 and a maximum of \$165.50 a month.

Some congressional leaders, notably Sen. Russell B. Long, D-La., chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, have called for even higher benefit increases. But Myers said "10 per cent is about right."

He said the 15 per cent boost proposed by some Democrats would be a "step in the expansionist direction." Expansionist is Myers' favorite word for those he says would greatly broaden Social Security coverage to the detriment of the program.

Myers attributed the system's financial health to higher employee earnings this year, greater employment and increased interest earnings on the trust funds.

REVERSION FAVORED BY OKINAWANS

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Eisaku Sato of Japan is scheduled to be here in Washington next week to confer with President Nixon on the primary issue of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan. It is hoped that the conference will result in the finalization of a mutually satisfactory agreement.

In the meantime, some concern has been expressed by certain Members of Congress as to whether or not the people of Okinawa themselves would prefer to remain in status quo. In this regard, the Mainichi Shinbun, one of the three leading newspapers in Japan, conducted a public opinion survey in Okinawa proper and published its findings on November 4, 1969.

The survey showed that 86 percent of the people responding to a questionnaire favored reversion, 8 percent opposed, and 6 percent were undecided. A total of 926 persons responded to the Mainichi inquiry.

The survey also showed that 91 percent of the men favored reversion, 6 percent opposed, and only 3 percent were undecided, as compared to 82 percent of the women who favored, 9 percent who opposed, and 9 percent who had no opinion.

Other polls conducted by the Okinawa Junior Chamber of Commerce and other interested organizations have shown about the same results.

There has been, and still is, some difference as to the time when the reversion of Okinawa to Japan should be effected. Three divisions are noticeably present: First, those who advocate immediate and unconditional reversion; second, those who prefer a 5-year or more delay; and third, those who support the government effort toward reversion in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, from all indications the

position which the Sato government has taken, that of revision sometime in 1972, represents a compromise which may in the final analysis be acceptable to the majority of the people of Okinawa. President Nixon no doubt will be guided by this thought as he considers Prime Minister Sato's proposal at their meeting next week.

Because the reversion issue is not only a political dynamite, but also an emotional powderkeg, I for one, as a student of East-West relations, hope that a firm date for reversion will be agreed to at the meeting between the leaders of the two great nations.

PATRIOTISM, LIKE DISSENT, MAY BE ABUSED

(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, today patriotism has become the all-purpose response used by some in authority to those who take issue with established Government policies. The implication is that those who do not support a given policy are at least unpatriotic and perhaps guilty of treason. Such feeble logic is as severe an abuse of the flag as burning it. Name calling instead of feasible alternatives is as flagrant an abuse of our tradition as demanding a Vietcong victory. Only the frightened with little faith in our beliefs and institutions demand simple solutions or hide behind catchwords. Only those who lack understanding of patriotism's real rationale seek to utilize it as a panacea or all-purpose cover.

America has never lacked for patriots; those who have been willing to sacrifice their well being and security for a cause they believe to be just. Their reasons were as diverse as the times they lived in and causes they espoused. Love of country is not always a slogan or a charge through the smoke of bloody battlefield. It can be found on the lips of a dissenter as often as upon those of a dying hero.

Only those who love their land will stand up for it. Only those who retain passionate faith in her ideals will sacrifice for her. And the greater a danger to a nation, the more is required of her true patriots. Only vibrant ideals and principles command fervent love of country. Any society worthy of such sacrifice prizes the rights of its dispossessed, placing its highest premium upon the privilege of dissent. Often it takes far more courage and patriotism to disagree than to conform. Many a society has clicked its collective heels in the name of patriotism and allowed its national soul to be betrayed.

Patriotism, Mr. Speaker, comes in many forms. In determination of a country to guarantee a fair trial. In determination of her citizens to defend such a right. Patriotism is to love your country enough so you will not shame her. Patriotism is to hold high office and respect it enough not to degrade it by slinging unbecoming language at dissenters. Patriotism is to have faith in the vitality and endurance of its ideas

and promise. Patriotism is to question doubtful values, wrong policies, and outdated institutions.

Patriotism is sacrificed for by many, yet understood by few. It is often a protective robe for reactionaries, who in the process degrade both the Nation and its priceless heritage. Slogans and marble statues are cold parents of such a warm word as patriotism. We must look elsewhere for its progenitors. We find it in a poor man raising his eyes to the heights of new opportunity. In an underpaid, exploited person daring to join a union. In a minority's desperate clutch for rights under our Constitution. In an outcry against that which pollutes our land, poisons our dream, and degrades our brothers. It is a belief in America causing people to seek redress of grievances within our system rather than trying to destroy it from without. Peaceful protest, then, can be patriotism, for it is also an affirmation of belief in our values.

Is it rational or patriotic, then, for a freely elected government to show little faith in ideals it is sworn to uphold and defend? To accuse dissenters of treason by implication or to deny them their rights? Take issue with them, by all means. But do not perpetrate the scoundrelly act of using Government power to suppress dissent and call it love of our country.

By British definition, our Founding Fathers were traitors. Confederate leaders were all placed in the same bag by their opponents. Joe McCarthy's foes were called traitors. Are they considered such today? One man's treason is another man's sublime sacrifice. One man's patriotism is another person's black-hearted betrayal.

One of America's prime assets is allowance of many definitions of what is patriotic and what is not. Government here has traditionally taken a mature view of disagreement, allowing divergent concepts to flourish. From such ferment effective alternatives have emerged, offering grounds for compromise on which were based policy changes and new directions. We are in danger of losing this atmosphere today.

When Government leaps into the streets, seeking political advantage by betraying and degrading its authority, there is no meaningful exchange, only polarization. Repression and tyranny are the offspring of such policies. Patriotism then can become the last refuge of scoundrels. It is unworthy of any American Government to behave so.

It is to be fervently hoped that this administration will abandon such a flimsy, unnecessary, and ignoble shield. If its policies are more right than wrong, they will be vindicated in spite of all dissent. If they are not, they will topple into the gutter no matter what effort is expended to save them. Therefore, let us have an end to accusations of treason now being bandied about by highest authority. Such activity does not aid our troops in the field. Instead, it erodes the foundations of our society's ideals. It weakens faith in our institutions, which already are under major assault. It erodes, instead of strengthening the patriotic tradition.

America has produced some noble sons

and daughters. Many have perished in one way or another for our land, often gladly. Many of them would turn in bitter disgust from such antics as our Government has indulged in in recent days.

A noble tradition need never fear weak ideas. Great principles do not need a mailed fist to protect them. License is as great an evil in the hands of authority as in the clutch of fools.

Mr. Speaker, far back in American history a premature "effete snob" stood up on the floor of the House of Representatives to protest another war, which he said was "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced." He referred to another President's speech on that war, asking for patience and allegiance, terming it lacking in substance or a date when the war would end. He continued, saying, "The President is wandering and indefinite." For sticking to his guns of protest, this Congressman was then branded a traitor to his country. Yet today his action is vindicated as altruism of the highest sort. He was criticizing President Polk over the Mexican War. He was a Whig Congressman from Illinois, now venerated as America's greatest patriot and founder of the party now utilizing tactics he then condemned. His name was Abraham Lincoln.

AID PROGRAM IN LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a little-known success story within our great alliance for progress program at the Agency for International Development.

As you know, we still have many problems in the Latin American nations—not the least of which is to help provide decent shelter for families in the developing countries. During the past decade, however, through one program at AID, the United States has been making tremendous strides in accomplishing that very task.

Working with private enterprise groups the State Department has been able to enlist the unselfish support of some of our most highly respected housing and home finance experts to travel to these nations and to help establish the concept of thrift and home financing in these areas which, until this program began, had no workable method of providing mortgage finance for their residents.

One of the most successful of the private enterprise groups working with the AID is the National League of Insured Savings Associations, and my good friend, Arthur H. Courshon, chairman of the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach, Fla., has just completed his term as president of this great trade association. The accomplishments of the National League and other similar trade groups in working to establish savings and loan associations in Latin America and elsewhere around the world are, in themselves, a major success story of the AID program.

President Nixon has recognized the National League's value in this program. He wrote to Mr. Courshon and, in speaking of the National League, stated:

I want to commend you on your exceptional work extending the savings and loan concept to the nations of Latin America and other parts of the world. In teaching the value of systematic savings and home ownerships, you are sowing the seeds of self help, and you are assisting others to build a more rewarding life. There is no surer way than this to advance peace in the world and prosperity for its people.

The President went on to extend his best wishes "for your sustained success in serving this Nation and all mankind."

Mr. Speaker, I echo President Nixon's comments. The National League is, indeed, responsible for helping to give people in developing nations a new lease on life—through the possibility of homeownership. Their record of achievement is a great one. I am honored to be able to take advantage of Mr. Courshon's completing his term in office to take note of some of the National League's accomplishments in this very important area of a national and international policy.

The National League is no newcomer to the international field.

It was providing technical competence and expertise in the developing countries for many years prior to entering into a formal contractual relationship with AID.

During these years savings and loan executives journey to Nicaragua, Peru, Guatemala, Panama, Chile, Ecuador, Brazil, Venezuela, El Salvador, Argentina, Colombia, and Jamaica, as well as to countries outside the Western Hemisphere to help set up local savings and loan systems.

Proof of their success lies in the fact that by the end of last year, over 800,000 savers in Latin America have accumulated net savings of over \$350 million—and this is money being saved to purchase a home.

In addition, over a half billion dollars of mortgages have been recorded in this period. Thus, tens of thousands of homes have been financed in countries where many felt people could not save.

In 1961, under the Foreign Assistance Act, Congress created a new program of housing investment guarantees. Since then, the original guarantee authority of \$10 million has been increased to a total of \$550 million through fiscal 1970.

As a result of this private investment program, 91 projects have been authorized throughout Latin America, which means 66,000 new housing units.

Since the guaranty program is backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government, it is essential that the interests of the United States be safeguarded.

Adequate management services must be provided in all areas. Preliminary proposals must be reviewed, as well as plans and specifications.

Construction and urbanization must be reviewed and inspected to insure compliance with the plans and specifications AID approved.

Local on-the-job inspectors must be properly supervised. Sales techniques and handling of funds connected with

each project must be carefully watched and appraised.

The National League was asked by AID to provide a team of construction-inspection specialists to carry out continuing on-the-spot reviews of these programs to safeguard the guarantee pledged by the U.S. Government.

The NLISA performs similar inspection services for housing guarantee projects in Africa, as well, continuously reviewing the financial mechanisms, construction, and urbanization on the projects. Although the African program is smaller than in Latin America, it will provide over 3,000 dwelling units in developing countries—and again, all this is being done with private funds.

The national league also performs valuable services for AID by publishing a monthly newsletter in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The league's domestic publications, including its monthly magazine—the National League Journal—contains articles on the league's activities in the international field and what is happening to the developing savings and loan systems around the world.

The national league provides valuable information to the public regarding the progress in housing being made overseas by introduction of the savings and loan concept.

Related to this type of activity is the league's recent study of the Pakistan Savings and Loan System. The league called on two of its members to study the Pakistan Savings and Loan System for a period of 2 months. The report they have developed as a result of their study is for the guidance and use of the Pakistan Government in attempting to solve its housing problems.

We are frequently told by the AID Administrators and others that the savings and loan industry has played a big role in the success story of the Alliance for Progress.

Arthur H. Courshon has been in the forefront of these efforts, both personally and as president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations. I wish to publicly congratulate him for his fine work in this area.

GALLAGHER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO PROTECT CONSUMER PRIVACY

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce into the House of Representatives a companion measure similar in almost all respects to the one which passed the Senate on November 6, 1969. This bill, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, is the result of a long series of investigations and hearings held by the Congress and I feel that the House must take prompt and forthright action.

The procedure leading to the introduction of this bill had its beginnings, in reality, when my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy held hearings into a proposed national data bank in 1966. We were able to stop the "running start" toward the immediate construc-

tion of such a compilation of all federally held information on Americans.

However, I frequently heard that in spite of our achievement in this area, there was a national data bank in private hands and totally outside Federal scrutiny or concern. This was the credit industry, which collects and exchanges information on virtually everyone in the Nation who has ever applied for credit, insurance, or employment.

Credit is vital to the American economy. Before my special subcommittee initiated congressional concern with the credit industry, I was worried that their procedures appeared frequently to be so outmoded that they represented a threat to the continuation of the free flow of credit and, thus, to the health of our economy. At the same time, I felt that if the Congress were to rush in with legislation severely restricting the exchange of credit information, we might do more harm than good.

Accordingly, on March 12, 1968, we began a series of investigative hearings into the credit industry. These hearings were favored by the informed testimony and criticism of the industry generally by Dr. Alan Westin, a leader in the struggle to preserve privacy in America. In addition, we heard from the representatives of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., a trade association speaking for over 2,200 credit bureaus and the president of Credit Data Corp., the pioneer in computerized credit bureaus.

On May 16, 1968, we heard from the president of the leading firm in the insurance reporting field, Retail Credit Co., of Atlanta, Ga. Until our hearings, Retail Credit Co. was frequently confused with retail credit bureaus and this dangerous illusion has continued to cloud some of the debate. One extremely practical result of our Retail Credit hearings was that we were able to draw the admission that Retail Credit makes approximately 31,000,000 reports a year, not the widely quoted figure of 35,000,000.

The Senate moved into this area when Senator HART's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee held hearings in December 1968. On May 19, 1969, Senator PROXMIRE's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions also directed its attention to the industry.

In response to a specific request at the conclusion of our hearings with the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., I was able to announce, on January 13, 1969, "The Credit Bureau Guidelines To Protect Consumer Privacy," which were voluntary and only applicable to member credit bureaus of the ACB. I hailed those guidelines as a promising first step, for it showed the willingness of the industry to move to meet altered times and social conditions, and it provided a basis for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today will basically extend those guidelines to cover insurance and employment investigative credit reporting agencies. Further, it will bear upon other orthodox credit bureaus which do not belong to the ACB. This is a vitally needed extension of social responsibility and legally enforceable procedures.

I will only make several brief comments on this legislation. First, it makes it possible for the individual to be guaranteed access to information which has been used to unjustly deny him deserved credit, insurance, or employment. This is probably the most important section of the bill, for no longer can any part of the credit industry operate as a "closed society." By letting the light and the fresh air of citizen participation into the compiling of a credit history, it will cleanse and sanitize what have been rather dank recesses in credit repositories.

For, Mr. Speaker, these provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act permit the individual to confront the record, if not to confront his accuser directly. I am convinced that it will make the entire credit reporting field much fairer and much more responsive. The time is long past, in my judgment when any group of men can vitally affect our citizens without taking serious and responsible note of the citizen's wishes. I will add, tangentially, that this is true for college professors, social scientists, Washington functionaries, agency personnel, and even Congressmen. The people are demanding the right to be heard, the right to know what is being said in a derogatory sense about them, and the right to alter and influence decisions. Certainly the credit industry has recognized this overwhelming social fact of our time and I believe the Congress must do the same by translating their guideline into law.

Second, I am delighted that outmoded information will no longer be allowed to be reported. I have long been concerned that one derogatory item could "damn a person to the grave," that an early mistake could haunt a man all throughout his adult life, and that redemption is in the process of being programed out of American society. This legislation forbids the reporting of any piece of information after 7 years, or the expiration of the relevant statute of limitations, whichever period is longer. The only exception, and a wise one in my opinion, is bankruptcies, which may be reported for 14 years.

The bill I am introducing today contains other excellent provisions—data gained in "investigative" reports for insurance or employment, may not be reported in a simple credit report; the consumer must be informed where he can go to have what he feels to be an inaccuracy corrected; when the consumer is disputing with a merchant over the quality of goods sold, he will be permitted to explain the dispute and not be merely reported as a nonpayer; and many other excellent provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the entire bill is filled with fair and effective procedures to protect the privacy of the consumer. Legislation coming down hard on the side of privacy is long overdue in America and it is for this reason particularly that I am delighted to introduce the Fair Credit Reporting Act. The general problems confronting privacy are now widely known and the response of the Congress to them has, in my judgment, been lagging behind. I would hope that we could promptly move to translate that approval

and the widespread concern over privacy and the credit industry into effective legislation. I believe the Fair Credit Reporting Act will do that and I urge my colleagues to consider favorably the legislation I am introducing today.

THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM: ITS IMPORTANCE TO TEXAS

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the mandatory oil import program, now under study by a special Cabinet task force, was implemented in March 1959 by President Eisenhower following a finding that imports had reached such volumes as to "threaten to impair the national security." Under the import program, imports of crude oil and light petroleum products have been limited to about 20 percent of domestic production, increasing, proportionately, as demand has increased.

In recent months, criticism of the program has intensified, based primarily on allegations that import controls result in a large "cost" to consumers. Critics argue that the consumer price of petroleum products, primarily motor fuels and home heating oils, could be sharply reduced by eliminating the import quota system.

Hypothetical savings estimated by various sources analyzing the impact of decontrol range from a low of \$2.2 billion to a high of \$8.3 billion. The wide variation in these estimates attest to the fact that they are, at best, highly speculative. Other sources have argued, contrary to those who attribute a high cost to the import program, that import controls may actually result in an overall lower cost to energy consumers. One study reaching this conclusion was released only recently by Stanford Research Institute.

The Stanford study concluded that the economic benefits flowing from the import program would, in fact, justify limitations on oil imports even without a national security need to maintain a viable domestic oil and gas producing industry. The facts which emerge in an objective economic analysis clearly support this conclusion. Based upon conservative impacts of import decontrol on State and local tax revenues, lease bonus, rental and royalty payments to State and Federal governments, royalties to private landowners, industry employment, purchases from petroleum suppliers and service companies, Federal income taxes, and our balance-of-payments position, the Independent Petroleum Association of America ascribed a "cost" to our economy of \$6.8 billion yearly within 5 years, should imports be decontrolled.

The IPAA study assumed an increase in total imports of about 4 million barrels daily, accompanied by a decline in domestic crude oil production of about 3 million barrels a day. Allocating to the State of Texas its present share—35 percent—of the domestic market, this would involve a reduction in Texas alone of 1,050,000 barrels daily in crude oil output.

Similarly, proportional costs to the

economy of Texas can be allocated from the various applicable categories contained in IPAA's study of the economic impact on the United States as a whole.

These "costs" to the United States and to the Texas economies from the assumed 4 million barrels increase in oil imports are as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	United States	Texas
1. Loss in local, State production taxes.....	350	120
2. Loss in bonuses, rentals, and royalties from Federal lands.....	450	(¹)
3. Loss in royalties to private landowners.....	700	250
4. Loss in wages to oil and gas production employees.....	500	175
5. Loss in Federal income taxes.....	200	(¹)
6. Loss in income to supply, service, and allied businesses.....	2,400	850
7. Adverse effect, balance of payments.....	2,200	(¹)
Total.....	6,800	1,395

¹ Not applicable.

From this example, assuming the 4,000,000 barrels daily rise in imports in the absence of controls, it becomes clear that a very large adverse impact on the economy and on State revenues in Texas would be inevitable. In total, this adverse impact on Texas would be on the order of \$1.4 billion a year, and this estimate is on the conservative side.

Petroleum production is Texas' No. 1 industry. The value of crude oil and natural gas produced last year was \$4.3 billion—exceeding by 50 percent the value of all Texas crops and livestock production. One of every 16 employed persons in the State worked in some phase of the petroleum industry. The industry payroll in Texas is \$1.5 billion yearly.

Taxes on the petroleum industry and its products are the largest single source of funds to support all public services provided by the State of Texas. Total petroleum taxes collected by the State in fiscal 1968 amounted to \$513,518,000, or 40.1 percent of total revenues which came to \$1,282,000,000. These tax collections did not include \$61,246,470 which the industry paid the State of Texas for lease rentals, bonuses and royalty payments.

It is clear that a \$1.4 billion adverse impact on the petroleum industry's income, employment, equipment purchases and tax payments would be tremendously harmful to the State's economy and to Texas' ability to provide public services. Not only would unemployment problems be severe; fewer jobholders would face the responsibility of paying larger tax payments to offset revenue losses resulting from declining production.

It is clear that displacing a significantly larger portion of the domestic petroleum industry with foreign oil would impose a very large cost on the domestic economy. This fact brings into serious question the validity of widely conflicting estimates of "savings" which critics of the import program claim could be made by decontrolling imports. It is also apparent that the State of Texas, the Nation's largest producer of oil and gas, would bear the brunt of the economic impact of decontrolling or radically loosening import levels.

CONGRESS AND THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today because of two significant developments affecting American education.

First, I understand that the other body is shortly to vote on appropriations for education programs.

Second, I have learned that yesterday the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., testified on behalf of the Nixon administration before the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am frankly puzzled. I had thought that the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education, the chief education official of the Federal Government—customarily spoke on behalf of American education.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Allen's distinguished predecessors, Francis Keppel and Harold Howe II, spoke out frequently and with eloquence for better schools and colleges and for improved educational opportunities for the American people. And Dr. Allen, for whose leadership in education I have long had great respect, has often spoken and acted eloquently and effectively in championing the need for greater support, financial and in other ways, of education in our country. As recently as July 8 of this year, for example, Dr. Allen, speaking in Denver, Colo., before the Education Commission of the States, declared:

The outstanding single fact today about Federal aid to education is its scarcity. There simply isn't enough of it . . . we must continue to press for full funding of present programs.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I am puzzled—and disappointed, as I am sure many other Americans must be who also feel strongly that we must press for full funding of programs of Federal aid to education. For yesterday, before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Allen testified against the interests of American education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Allen asked that the Senate cut \$1,161,242 from the funds voted by the House of Representatives this year by a two to one margin.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Members will recall the 293-120 vote by which the House voted for the so-called Joelson amendment on July 31, 1969—and I here observe, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of Members of the House of Representatives of both our great political parties voted for these additional funds—funds beyond the figures recommended by the Appropriations Committee and some \$1 billion above the figure recommended by President Nixon in his budget request for the current fiscal year.

A majority of the elected Representa-

tives of the American people in Congress of both political parties were going on record as saying that we believe education must have a much higher priority among our national investments.

And I would also recall, Mr. Speaker, that when, on October 28, the Members of the House were once more asked to vote on this same issue of funds for education programs for this year, once again, with strong support from both sides of the political aisle, the House spoke out for American education when we passed the so-called Cohelan amendment.

We were simply, Mr. Speaker, taking seriously the campaign promise Mr. Nixon, then a candidate for President, made approximately 1 year ago when he said:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either Federal, state or local—the one area we cannot shortchange is education.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that both the House and Senate will heed seriously the admonitions of Mr. Nixon in the campaign last year, of Dr. Allen in his Denver speech last summer, and that we will vote the funds our Nation needs for the education of the people of this country. As I have said, I have been both puzzled and disappointed by Dr. Allen's testimony yesterday. But if the U.S. Commissioner of Education will not speak up for American education—or, perhaps, is ordered not to—I hope that Congress will.

Mr. Speaker, following are the relevant excerpts from Dr. Allen's testimony yesterday, November 12, 1969, before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by the distinguished Senator from Washington, Senator MAGNUSON:

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY BY DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.

Senator MAGNUSON (Chairman). But looking at all of these figures, despite the fact that you wanted \$4.579 billion, it was your professional opinion that you want the Senate to cut out \$1,161,242,000 from the House-passed bill?

Dr. ALLEN. From the House allowance.

Senator MAGNUSON. Generally speaking, what will that cut out?

Dr. ALLEN. It cuts out most of the things dealing with the disadvantaged.

Senator BIBLE. The House completed action in what amount [for elementary and secondary education]?

Dr. ALLEN. \$1.761 [billion].

Senator BIBLE. In your appearance here today you are asking that that be cut back to the budget approved figure?

Dr. ALLEN. To \$1.406 [billion].

Senator BIBLE. Even less than the original budget allowances?

Dr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Dr. ALLEN. Of course, we all know that the needs of our education system are enormous today. We are presenting a budget based on priority set by the Administration to reduce inflation. . . . I think we would all say once we can do something about inflation, then the added dollars we would provide would bring a greater return.

Senator BIBLE. In the meantime, what do you do with the children starting out in elementary school?

Dr. ALLEN. There is no doubt there will be a squeeze.

DANGERS IN MORATORIUM DAY ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today because I feel it is my duty to discuss some of the apparent dangers of the next 3 days in Washington, and possibly elsewhere in the Nation, from the Vietnam moratorium activities, planned or unplanned.

It is not my purpose at this time to persuade anyone as to what is the right course or the wrong course in connection with the war, nor to try to dictate personal or public opinion in that regard. My own views, supporting the President's plan for orderly staged withdrawal and Vietnamization have been expressed many times.

Nor is it my intent to launch a witch hunt against those who constitute the leadership, steering committees, or membership of the organizations that appear to be directing the activities planned for Washington and elsewhere, regardless of their backgrounds.

Certain information has come to my attention, however, that gives reason to discourage participation in, and to caution those who would participate in, some or all of the activities planned.

This information has two areas of impact. The first lies in the very present danger of incitement to violence and injury to those who may be present. The second goes to judging the motives of some who have been involved in the promotion and planning of the events.

On the first point, because of inquiries and concern about safety of participants from my constituency and relatives of people I represent, I felt constrained to speak out yesterday afternoon through a press release, in order to give warning at a time early enough for those persuaded to abandon travel plans. Before doing so, I visited the New Mobilization Committee headquarters in Washington last week and consulted with representatives of MOBE and of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee. I also consulted with representatives of the Justice Department, and some of my information comes from its Interdivisional Investigation and Intelligence Unit.

My press release reads as follows:

I urge all who have planned to take part in this week's demonstrations and marches to reconsider before doing so.

I caution any who do take part. There is a very real danger that violence will be fomented by groups seeking to promote their causes by subjecting thousands of well-intentioned Americans to the great dangers risked by anyone involved in a riot.

The potential for violence shown in the New York bombings, in extremely well-guarded buildings, is a warning that we should heed.

I believe there is ample evidence to indicate that the Weatherman faction of the SDS that brought havoc to Chicago in August, 1968, and again on October 9th and 11th this year will be on the scene doing their thing. (Their thing is violence.)

I defend the right of each to exercise his constitutional rights of free speech and petition, but they should know that the parasites of violence have crept into this week's plans.

These fringe groups, whether or not part of the Viet Nam Moratorium Committee or the New Mobilization Committee, who are planning the marches, are ruthless professionals who can bring about violence even if opposed by those organizing the demonstration.

Such action might be wholly contrary to the plan and design. It may represent more the power struggle between the left wing groups, rather than any attempt to affect U.S. foreign policy.

Elaborating further upon the dangers I foresee in this connection, I want to call particular attention to some additional reports and material indicating the nature and extent of the danger. Admittedly, the proof of intentions of violence is so subjective as to be difficult if not impossible to state with any certainty, but the pattern of past violence is clear, especially in Chicago on October 9 and 11 this year. As to what happened there in part, I insert at this point two newspaper reports from the Washington Post of October 10 and October 13, and of the New York Times of October 14, 1969:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 9, 1969]

RAMPAGE FOLLOWS RALLY IN CHICAGO

(By William Chapman and Robert M. Krim)

CHICAGO, October 9.—A mob of about 300 young persons rampaged through Chicago's near North Side late tonight, breaking windows in automobiles and swank apartment buildings.

Chicago police responded with gunfire, tear gas and billy clubs to break up the mobs. Two persons were wounded by gunfire and an undetermined number of others were beaten. More than 30 persons were reported under arrest.

The melee—reminiscent of the 1968 Democratic National Convention violence here—erupted on the first of four days of marches, rallies, high school organizational drives and other antiwar activities planned by the radical Students for a Democratic Society.

The students left an SDS rally in Lincoln Park about 10:30 p.m. and raced shouting in and out of the side streets. They broke plate glass windows in stores and apartments and bashed in automobile windshields with bricks and rocks.

The students were shouting "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, NLF Is Going to Win" and one yelled "Let's get Hoffman," an apparent reference to Judge Julius J. Hoffman who is presiding over the trial of eight radicals on charges of conspiring to incite last year's Democratic convention disorders.

Police chased them on foot and in squad cars, trying unsuccessfully to bottle up the mob on small side streets.

On one street, police caught the tail end of a crowd and clubbed at least a dozen persons to the pavement. One girl's mouth was bleeding profusely. Police threw her comrades into a paddy wagon.

One officer ordered the press to stand back from the scene and said of the girl: "She fell against a car."

Police used tear gas to break up one crowd. Helmeted students had knocked one officer to the pavement.

As the students raced down Lake Shore Drive, squads of police leaped from automobiles toward them and several explosions, sounding like gunfire, were heard.

Two persons—a young man and a young

woman—lay wounded in a garage behind a swank apartment building. Details were lacking, but the girl said she had been hit twice by gunfire in the left leg.

The crowd had gathered earlier in Lincoln Park where SDS was holding a rally in memory of the death of Cuban leader Che Guevara. They had lighted two bonfires using wooden slats from park benches.

Police had been stationed nearby but had not intended to move on the students until 11 p.m. However, the students, waving banners and red flags, broke away from the rally 45 minutes before the curfew hour.

They raced down Clark Street and first smashed in large plate glass windows in a savings and loan building. Then they moved in and out of side streets flinging rocks and bottles and bashing in windows with sticks.

The four days of demonstrations were organized by an SDS faction known as the "Weathermen." Another faction, known as "RY-M2" or Revolutionary Youth Movement-2, joined the Black Panthers earlier in disassociating themselves from the Weathermen. A Black Panther leader, Fred Hampton, accused the Weathermen of "Custerism"—a futile battle against overwhelming odds similar to Gen. George Custer's last stand at the Little Big Horn.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 13, 1969]

ONE HUNDRED AND THREE ARRESTED AFTER CHICAGO RAMPAGE

(By William Chapman)

CHICAGO, October 11.—More than 250 young radicals raced through downtown Chicago this afternoon smashing windows and attacking police. One hundred and three persons were arrested.

They broke out of a peaceful march through the financial district and ran shrieking and throwing rocks for about a block before splintering into small groups.

In brief but bloody brawling, police beat several rioters with clubs, and pounded the heads of others against automobiles while an astonished crowd of afternoon shoppers watched or scurried for cover.

Twenty-three police officers, two city legal officers and an assistant state's attorney were injured. Police arrested 86 women and 17 men. They were charged with mob action, aggressive aggravated battery and lesser charges.

The young radicals used clubs, chains and pipes in the fracas.

The march was led by a radical faction of Students for a Democratic Society, whose national leader, Mark Rudd, was arrested earlier in a surprise move by plainclothes policemen.

Within a half hour, about 150 Illinois National Guardsmen were called out of their armories to patrol a section of Michigan Avenue.

It began as a legal protest parade of the "Weatherman" faction of SDS, whose members on Wednesday night had stormed through the city's Gold Coast residential section, breaking windows and damaging automobiles.

Led from Haymarket Square by helmeted SDS leaders, the march headed into the Loop about 1:30 p.m. with police lining the sidewalks and clearing the streets with motorcycles and a squad car. The city had granted a permit for the march.

Fifteen minutes later, at La Salle and Madison Streets, the leaders suddenly yelled a signal and raced eastward. Thrown rocks broke windows in an office building and at Maxim's Restaurant.

Police grabbed those in the back ranks and clubbed them to the pavement. Those in front fled down Madison or into alleys trying to escape capture. Many of them ran into police cordons stationed for blocks around.

Assistant Corporation Counsel Richard Elrod, the chief city prosecutor, was knocked to the sidewalk and lay moaning. "My arm . . . my arm." Hospital officials later reported that Elrod also suffered a possible broken neck and was paralyzed from neck down.

Police said Elrod's assailant was Brian D. Flanagan, 22, of Southampton, N.Y. They said Flanagan seized Elrod and pounded his head against the side of a building. He was charged with mob action and aggravated battery.

A plainclothes police officer, Lt. Joseph Healy, had a stream of blood trickling down the side of his head. He told reporters he was hit from behind with a club.

Several rioters were beaten to the ground and struck repeatedly with police clubs. One girl's head was pounded again and again against the trunk of a police car. Blood spots sprinkled the curb at several points.

A half-hour later, with the main body of the mob fragmented, police were still picking up suspects on the sidewalks. They arrested two boys and two girls who protested that they had not been in the march.

Meanwhile, a less militant faction of SDS—known as Revolutionary Youth Movement II—led a separate march north of the Loop in a peaceful protest rally. Joined by a Puerto Rican group known as the "Young Lords" and the Illinois Black Panthers, they drew a crowd of about 3,000, according to police estimates.

The RYM II faction and the Black Panthers have denounced such intentional street confrontations as those provoked this week by the "Weatherman" faction.

Early this morning, police staged a surprise raid on an Evanston Church where many SDS members had been housed this week.

At least 43 young radicals were arrested, and many of them were charged with mob action for participating in the brawl Wednesday night. Police said radicals were identified as rioters by an undercover agent.

Shortly before the "Weathermen" march started this afternoon, police arrested Rudd and four others seated at the foot of a police memorial statue that had been blown apart by a bomber last Monday night. About 10 police wearing rough, workmen's clothing sidled nonchalantly up to Rudd and his friends and jumped them without giving them an arrest order.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1969]

RADICALS DETECT GAIN IN CHICAGO STRIFE

(By John Kifner)

CHICAGO, October 13—By most standards of militant activism, the four days of demonstrations here by the Weatherman faction of Students for a Democratic Society seem less than a total success.

The turnout was far less than anticipated, the vast majority of the demonstrators were arrested, the attempted rampages were quickly snuffed out, two of the major planned confrontations—an attempt to stop the conspiracy trial of eight radicals for last summer's convention disorders and announced "jailbreaks" in the high schools—never happened, and the demonstrators appeared to cut themselves off from any sympathy and support.

But for the small, isolated, dedicated group of revolutionaries—many of whom said when they came to Chicago that they fully expected to be jailed or shot down in the streets—the standards do not seem to apply.

EXEMPLARY FORCE

Driven by frustration, they view themselves as an "exemplary force" that will trigger a revolution within the "mother country," primarily among disaffected youths of high school age.

The Weatherman faction takes its name from the line "You don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows," in Bob Dylan's song "Subterranean Homesick Blues."

The biggest force the Weathermen mustered on the streets here appeared to number about 300. This was the group, wearing white helmets and stiff new denim jackets with Vietcong flags sewn on the back, that smashed windows and battled with the police Wednesday night. Saturday's climactic attack in the Loop was carried out by 200 demonstrators.

REVEL IN COVERAGE

The police said this afternoon that there had been 290 arrests during the demonstrations. One hundred and three were arrested in Saturday's clash, 60 in Wednesday night's, 43 in a raid on a church in suburban Evanston and 12 during a "women's militia" action. The rest were picked up on the street at various times by "red squad" detectives from the police intelligence division.

The Weathermen reveled in local newspaper coverage depicting them as "hoodlums" and "mad dogs" on a brutal, ferocious rampage and in the seriousness of the charges lodged against them, taking this as an indication of how much they are hurting the state.

The Weatherman philosophy was first expounded in five and a half closely printed pages in the June 18 issue of the SDS New Left Notes. The faction gained control of the SDS's national office during last June's convention of the organization.

Briefly, the Weatherman position paper argues that a revolution is already in progress among what the faction regards as colonized "Third World" peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America and among blacks in this country.

In order to support a Third World revolution, the Weathermen contend a revolution must be waged at home and a potential revolutionary class lies in alienated, propertyless high school youths, most affected by the draft and "jail-like" schools. Workers are dismissed as hopelessly bigoted and college students as inherently middle class.

To win high school students to their cause, the Weathermen believe, they must fight to prove they are not timid, physically ineffectual intellectuals.

The tactic was developed by midwestern SDS's collectives during the summer and presented to other SDS's members at a conference over Labor Day weekend in Cleveland.

WHITE SKIN PRIVILEGE

During the summer, for instance, Detroit SDS's members would take a red flag to beaches frequented by white working class youths to provoke a fight. The SDS's members, who had been studying karate and working out daily, would battle the youths.

Then they would try to explain to the youths what they were fighting for.

Several SDS's members, including Mark Rudd, a national leader, have been severely beaten in attempting to spread their beliefs in this fashion, but their enthusiasm remains undimmed.

The Weathermen seemed almost religiously obsessed with turning themselves into true revolutionaries and in escaping their own middle-class backgrounds, which they scornfully term "white skin privilege."

After the Cleveland conference, the fighting technique—and particularly a tactic of charging into high schools shouting "jailbreak"—spread to other areas of the country.

One of the sets of heroes of the Weathermen is the Motor City Nine—nine women in Detroit who broke into a junior college during an examination, locked the doors and began speaking against the war and the ex-

ploitation of women. When two male students objected, they were felled with karate blows.

One measure of how isolated the Weathermen have become is the difficulty they are having in raising bail funds from previously sympathetic sources. There were still 150 demonstrators in the Cook County jail this afternoon, and the total bonds were expected to run over \$2-million.

One Weatherman sympathizer was unable to raise any money at all on the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois, where the local SDS's chapter has already dropped the SDS's name in reaction to the Weatherman action.

Many on the left view the Chicago demonstrations as a pathetic failure. But Friday night a Weatherman spokesman said:

"We think it's been a tremendous success, a total success. For the first time in this country white people are showing they're willing to fight against imperialism. Even when they raised the level of oppression against us, we raised the level of struggle against them."

Whether or not the reported tactics and activities of the police described in the articles were justifiable, planned violence is apparent. And members of the Weatherman faction are reported by the Associated Press to have announced they will be here for the November 15 march.

With the massive crowds of young people expected here, reported plans to break into the Department of Justice and the Vietnam Embassy, the New York bombings, and the reported continued rivalries of extremist factions within the SDS, the dangers are too great to ignore, and there is an obligation to warn those endangered. Already developed tactics of introducing such groups between innocent crowds and police to evoke indiscriminate police response seem extremely likely and very difficult to prevent.

While information as to what has been going on within the SDS must be protected as to source, certain developments should be reported. For instance, reports this month indicate that SDS members have been selling tickets on the campus of Columbia University in New York City for travel to Washington. SDS has been planning a shift in its policy in an attempt to unite all factions for participation in the Washington action.

SDS intends to use the 1968 Democratic Convention demonstrations and the October 1969 Chicago demonstrations as a model for its future tactics. While in Washington, D.C., elements of the SDS plan to get the liberals beaten up.

On November 14, 1969, the same forces in SDS will attempt to provoke the National Guard and the Washington Metropolitan Police Department into being as violent as possible. They intend to carry their activities beyond the rallies of the antiwar movement and go into the streets.

Recently members of the New York SDS Weatherman and Mad Dog factions attended a mobilization meeting in Washington, D.C. They tentatively decided to come to Washington, D.C., on November 14 and 15, to "do their thing." On November 14 they plan to assemble at Dupont Circle in preparation for a march to the Embassy of South Vietnam where they plan to "do their thing." On

November 15 they plan to demonstrate at the Department of Justice after dark. A representative of the violent extremist Weatherman faction has indicated the need for accommodations here for 800 members.

Moving from the danger of violence to the other area calling for consideration of those who plan to and those who do participate in the marches, granting the greatest measure of freedom of thought, conscience, and right to expression through peaceful assembly, many may not know the backgrounds of some of the company they keep and the possible motivations involved. It seems very likely that some of the active militant leadership is pledged to destroying the processes and the institutions of our Government.

Many Americans have been asked to participate in these demonstrations. Support for the plans of the New Mobilization Committee come from, at least in part, what might ordinarily be called highly respected and well-meaning sources.

But in my opinion, support of the planned demonstrations of the New Mobilization Committee is both naive and dangerous and will aid the Communist Hanoi government in furtherance of its objective to conquer all of South Vietnam by aggression and assassination.

Evidence exists that plans of the New Mobilization Committee for its "fall offensive" were made—not in Washington, or New York, or Chicago, or San Francisco but—in Stockholm, Sweden, at a meeting dominated by representatives of the Communist Hanoi government and supported by representatives of Communist Russia, Communist East Germany, Communist Yugoslavia, Communist Hungary and the Communist National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. The man who serves as project director and one of the cochairmen of the New Mobilization Committee was instrumental in laying the plans at the Stockholm meeting for the "fall offensive." Encouragement for the plan was brought to the Stockholm meeting by the Communist North Vietnam representative directly from Hanoi. It has been outlined recently in a newsletter circulated to select international contacts and I insert that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF NEWSLETTER NO. 5 FROM THE INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE OF THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM

NOVEMBER 15: Day of International Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam.

The American movement against the Vietnam war has launched a large, "Autumn Offensive" beginning 10 October at Chicago and ending with a demonstration on 15 November at the White House in Washington. This "Autumn Offensive" is the most encouraging enterprise undertaken in the United States for a long time. It is organized by the "New Mobilization Committee to End the Vietnam War" which groups the most active and powerful peace organizations which oppose the policy of war being undertaken by Mr. Nixon.

We call on all the organizations to support this campaign, which is the largest organized up to now against the Vietnam war, and the immediate retreat of all the American forces from Vietnam. It ought to find an echo in all the countries by means of demonstrations and all sorts of actions on 15 November and on the days close to this date in order to

show Mr. Nixon that all the peoples demand that he end American aggression in Vietnam. Calendar of the Autumn Offensive:

8-11 October: Actions organized in Chicago by the SDS on the theme "Make Known the Realities of the War in Vietnam."

15 October: "Moratorium for Vietnam." This action was launched by the students who worked in the electoral campaigns of Kennedy and McCarthy. During this day, normal daily activities will be abandoned and be replaced by education activity on the war in Vietnam. This moratorium will be repeated in November.

25 October: Actions at Chicago organized by the "New Mobilization" to support the eight leaders of peace movements who are accused of "conspiracy."

8-15 November: A week of local activities against the war and American imperialism.

The aim of these will be to form local organizations of a permanent character and to prepare the demonstrations at Washington and San Francisco on the 15th. These activities will be designed to appeal to broad local and political interests. They will be launched by the "Joe Hill Caucus (SDS)."

13-14 November: Preliminary dates for the Vietnam Moratorium of November.

14 November: Student strike launched by the "Committee for Student Mobilization."

14-15 November: "Commemorative march for the Dead" at Washington. A number of Americans corresponding to that of the numbers of Americans who died in Vietnam will march from the National Cemetery in Arlington to the front of the White House and on to the Capitol.

15 November: Mass march and meetings at Washington and San Francisco.

The program of activities of 14/15 November is divided into two parts: A silent march of 36 hours which will start 13 November. That will be the culmination of all the local, regional and national autumn activities. Since it is not practical to expect a large number of people to go from the Pacific coast to Washington, a march and a meeting will take place at San Francisco the same day.

At the head of the "New Mobilization" are six co-presidents (Sid Lens, Doug Dowd, Steward Meacham, Cora Weiss, Sid Peck and Dave Dellinger) who will assume the direction of the large demonstrations at Washington, Chicago and San Francisco. To elaborate its general political line, the "New Mobilization" formed a large national committee composed of nearly 100 persons who represent different regions and tendencies. The "New Mobilization" constitutes the decisive project to mobilize the American people against the war of aggression and counter-revolution in Vietnam. Its importance resides in its broad coalition character that reflects a majority movement and brings together to the greatest possible extent the new forces which oppose the Vietnam war. The task of the "New Mobilization" is to mobilize the political will of the American people to demand the immediate and unconditional retreat of all American forces and arms from Vietnam and, afterwards, to insist in the interior or the exterior of the United States, against the oppressed and exploited who claim their rights of self-determination and human liberation.

MARCH AGAINST DEATH

The demonstrations at Washington will be organized by a large alliance of groups which oppose the Vietnam war. The demonstrations will begin by a "March Against Death" to commemorate those who died in Vietnam. This will begin at midnight 13 November and will continue 36 hours until the morning of 15 November. This march will have the form of a silent, solemn parade with the participation of 43,000-45,000 persons (the number of persons coming from each state ought to correspond to the number of Americans from this state who died in Vietnam which will pass the White House).

Each participant in this march will carry a placard with the name of a dead American and, in passing in front of the White House, this name will be called out. In addition, they will carry and call out the names of the cities and villages of Vietnam destroyed by the United States and its allies—razed, bombed or burned down. This march will leave from the National Cemetery at Arlington for the Capitol where the placards with the names of the dead will be placed in baskets and then carried to the White House together with the list of demands of the "New Mobilization."

15 November: March and meeting to demand the immediate withdrawal of troops.

Sunday morning at 0900 hours the persons coming from all over the country will congregate on the mall to march to the White House. Before the departure there will be a brief commemorative service. At the White House a delegation will present the demands of the "New Mobilization" as well as the baskets containing the placards with the names of the dead American soldiers and the cities and villages destroyed. The march will end in a mass meeting.

At the center of the New Mobilization there is a special committee for the Vietnam Moratorium. This was formed by the forces which participated in the electoral campaigns of McCarthy and Robert Kennedy. It has called for a "Moratorium on Daily Activities" for 15 October. The students, the faculty members and the citizens politically engaged are invited to consecrate the entire day to carrying the discussion of peace in Vietnam to broad sectors of society. In its appeal signed by almost 200 presidents and editors of student organizations, the committee for the moratorium has called upon the university students, faculty to rally others so that an even larger and longer moratorium can be held in November. They are preparing to have a moratorium of two days in November, three days in December, etc., for as long as the war continues. The Vietnam Moratorium committee set itself the objective to contact businesses, homes, factories, high schools and other social centers and to call upon citizens to participate in the moratoriums in the months which will follow.

THE NEW MOBILIZATION DEFENDS THE CONSPIRATORS

At the origin of the Chicago demonstrations is the legal action against Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger, Tom Hayden, John Freines, Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Bobby Seale, and Lee Warner who are accused of "criminal conspiracy." These eight men took an active part in the demonstrations at the Democratic Convention in Chicago. They are the first to be prosecuted in connection with provision 18 of the 1968 civil rights law which stipulates that it is illegal to "travel between states . . . with the intention to incite, promote, encourage, join or continue violent protests". The eight refuse to let themselves be intimidated by the Government's label of "conspiracy". On the contrary, they have adopted the name of conspirators in order to confront one of the most serious attacks against political liberty since the epoch of Senator Joe McCarthy.

In support of this decisive act to defend the right political opposition, the New Mobilization will organize an action day in Chicago on 25 October centered on the questions of conspiracy and the war.

Among the activities will be a *guerrilla style march*, a tribunal where prominent persons will conduct a trial, and rock concert.

Begin now the preparations of 15 November.

This is only a brief summary of the activities prepared by the New Mobilization for October and November.

We all, in our respective organizations and countries, ought to act in support of this grand campaign.

Start now to prepare actions which will make 15 November the International Day of Mobilization Against the Vietnam War. The International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam will meet on 11-12 October in Stockholm to launch an appeal for action on 15 November in support of the American Autumn Offensive. We must strongly emphasize the decisive importance of these American activities and our support of them.

BERTIL SVAHNSTROEM.

A great deal of information has been disseminated and a great many pleas have been made that this will be a "non-violent" and "peaceful" expression by "average Americans," all of whom are simply interested in proving to the President their sincere interest in ending the war.

But let me tell you what some of the unannounced plans are.

A group which has held meetings in New York, Washington, and Chicago plans to turn the November 15 demonstration into another "Chicago disturbance." They have distributed leaflets telling their members how to block street traffic, break store windows, run against pedestrian traffic and harass business in the downtown area—all with the avowed purpose of doing as much damage as they possibly can and, of course, with the full knowledge that this will result in confrontation with police and result in personal injury and possibly death.

The plans include an attack on the Justice Department Building, including breaking of windows and the use of Molotov cocktails and an attempt to blow up the Vietnam Embassy.

And let no one tell you that some members of the steering committee are not fully and completely aware of the fact that violence is planned. On Wednesday, October 22, 1969, a rabbi in Philadelphia read a letter to his congregation from a responsible Jewish organization urging them not to attend the November 15, Washington, D.C., demonstrations because "there will be violence." Myrtle Feigenberg, a member of the steering committee of the New Mobilization Committee, was present in the congregation. She sent a message relaying the fact of the letter to Rev. Richard Fernandez through Fred Halsted, both members of the steering committee, with instructions to contact one O. Nathan Abramovitz of Washington, D.C., in order to "do something about this."

This information should come as no surprise as we look at the backgrounds of some of those who serve on the steering committee. Let me for just a moment give you a profile of some members of that committee.

Perhaps one of the best known members of the steering committee is Rennie Davis, presently on trial in Chicago as part of the "Conspiracy Eight." At 29, he brings a wealth of experience to the committee, having worked extensively in planning and participating in antiwar and radical movements since 1965. Among these were the Political Perspective Conference of the Young Socialists Club in East Lansing, Mich. in 1965; the anti-Rusk demonstration in Boston in 1967; the Militant Labor Forum in 1968; the National Draft Card Turn-in Day, also in 1968; and the Inauguration Day

demonstrations in 1969. He has also found time to become a "world traveler" in spite of his heavy domestic schedule. In 1967 he visited Czechoslovakia to meet with representatives of the Vietcong and Hanoi and then went on to Hanoi itself for 18 days to meet with officials of the North Vietnam Government. And 1969 saw Davis journey to Paris for additional meetings with the Hanoi delegation and then in July went to Toronto and Hanoi again for additional conferences with the North Vietnamese. His speeches are anti-United States and pro-North Vietnam, and he describes this country as a "police state" with dissent stifled by the "pigs"—that is, the police.

Another committee member on trial in Chicago as one of the Conspiracy of Eight is 54-year-old David Dellinger. He has not led a sheltered life. Beginning with World War II, he was jailed for 3 years for refusal to serve in the Armed Forces. His most recent plans for activity were outlined in a speech to the national antiwar conference in July, when he advocated, first, a confrontation with President Nixon in San Clemente; second, a massive, militant, and disobedient demonstration at Chicago in September; and, third, a demonstration in Washington on November 15. Dellinger's foreign travel is certainly on a par with many other committee members. As early as 1951 he was in France, Switzerland, Austria, and the Soviet zone of Germany with a group to distribute antiwar literature. He was in Cuba in 1964 at the invitation of Fidel Castro to attend the May Day festivities there. Two years later we find him in Japan addressing the Japanese-American Citizens' Congress and urging demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam. Then in October and November 1966 he made an unauthorized trip to North Vietnam and Communist China, for which the State Department revoked his passport.

After regaining his passport on the promise he would not engage in similar activity, he proceeded to make an unauthorized trip back to North Vietnam in May 1967. That was a rather hectic year for him for in June he was in Paris to meet with North Vietnamese representatives, in July and August he was in Cuba for the Latin American Solidarity Conference, in September in Czechoslovakia for the Bratislava Conference, and in December back to Paris for another meeting with the North Vietnamese before going on to Denmark for the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal. In both 1968 and 1969 he again made trips to Paris to meet with members of the French peace movement and representatives of the Vietcong.

Steering committee member Larry Seigle, at 24, is already a full-time employee with the national office of the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth arm of the Socialist Workers Party. This young Trotskyite serves as national organizational secretary for the YSA and is active in the senior party as well.

The New Left membership on the committee is also represented by John McAuliff, 27 years old. He serves as national chairman of the Committee of Returned Volunteers, a group engaged in protesting the "inequity of the Amer-

ican system." McAuliff is presently on bail awaiting trial for failing to report to his draft board for instructions concerning civilian work in lieu of military service. He had previously been arrested during the 1967 Pentagon demonstration. His other questionable activity includes two visits with the Cuban mission to the United Nations in 1968 and 1969.

Another member with longstanding credentials is Sidney Lens, who as early as 1946 was national secretary of the Revolutionary Workers League. In 1960 he appeared as a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. His travel covers the familiar circuit: Posnan, Poland, in 1956, Cuba in 1961, and Stockholm in 1967, to attend a conference on Vietnam and speak with representatives of the Communist NLF and Hanoi. His present activity with the New Mobilization Committee includes meeting with the Black United Front to discuss paying \$1 per head to them for demonstrators at the November 15 protest. Most recently, on November 1, he acted as moderator at a Chicago rally for the Conspiracy Eight.

Hard-core Communist representation on the committee is provided by Irving Sarnoff, who was active in the Southern California District Communist Party from 1944 to 1961. In 1966 he participated in a meeting of the Southern California Communist Party for persons active in the peace movement. In June of 1969 he attended the World Assembly for Peace in East Berlin, and then led a delegation on a trip to Tashkent, U.S.S.R., all expenses for both trips paid by the Soviet Union. Quite a number of other members of the MOBE steering committee have similar records. Many of these are detailed in the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. FANNIN, on October 13, 1969, to be found on pages 29581-29583 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in honest dissent, motivated by the pride of man's convictions and conducted in a lawful manner. It seems clear, however, the November 15 action that some plan for Washington, D.C., and other cities in this country will not be peaceful and lawful. On the contrary, some seem to intend planned violence, and if these hard-core agitators, anarchists, and revolutionaries are successful, Washington, D.C., could be a holocaust of death and destruction.

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

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like at this time to commend my distinguished colleague from the State of Ohio (Mr. TAFT) for bringing to the attention of this body a topic for discussion which is most timely and most needed.

The radicals of the New Left have marked another red letter day on the calendars—colored with the blood of 40,000 American men who have died in Vietnam.

Renewed preparations are underway now by questionable elements for demonstrations against the war in Vietnam beginning across the country on October

15. This so-called Vietnam Moratorium Committee—a front organization for the Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, is part of a nationwide student effort by radical groups such as SDS and other marxist-oriented groups to focus national attention on the Vietnam war.

The October 15 meeting was to be accompanied by student strikes and demonstrations across the country as the beginning of an attempt to arouse national criticism of President Nixon's Vietnam policies. The goal was to gain public support of an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of our troops. Other demonstrations are planned for 2 days in November and 3 days in December.

The November demonstrations will undoubtedly be given headlines when the sometime baby doctor, Benjamin Spock, leads a 36-hour "March Against Death" from Arlington National Cemetery to Capitol Hill. Dr. Spock, free to resume his anti-Vietnam activities after escaping a Federal charge of conspiring to violate the draft law, expects more dissidents than took part in "Resurrection City."

The efforts of the New Mobilization Committee to spur such demonstrations is an obvious effort to arouse students to a fever pitch in order to achieve further disorders—if they run true to form.

There is no doubt that there is some kind of tie-in with the present Chicago trial and the planned demonstrations. The interlocking directorate of the New Left calculates each move carefully and precisely.

Presently in Chicago, trial proceedings are underway for eight of the New Left who precipitated the disorders of the 1968 Democratic National Convention. They will go on trial for conspiracy to incite riots. The "Eight" are widely hailed in New Left media as martyred heroes and have formed a New York-based group called "The Conspiracy." One radical spokesman, Rene Davis, who helped draft the Chicago upheaval, is diligently working to launch the October 15 demonstration.

These individuals and groups admittedly oppose some of our country's most basic institutions and many are self-avowed Communists. The underlying motive of this demonstration is to undermine the morale of our troops in Vietnam and to impede the President in his earnest efforts to achieve an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam.

It is tragic that these demonstrators are directing their fire at the U.S. Government to end the war. A more appropriate focus of attention and petitions would be the Hanoi regime, the real aggressors. Of course, such demonstrations would not be permitted in Hanoi, for leaders would be eliminated as North Vietnam Communist leaders killed 50,000 in their climb to dictatorship. These demonstrations will only serve to aid and comfort the enemy. In an earlier day we would have called that treason.

QUESTIONABLE LEADERSHIP

The coordinating organ of this movement is the Vietnam Moratorium Committee—VMC. The principal leaders are avowed revolutionaries and draft evad-

ers, most notably, David Hawk, a former member of the National Student Association—NSA—who had gained notoriety for coordinating pledges from 250 college student leaders to refuse induction. It should be noted that NSA has a record of supporting Castro and calling for recognition of Red China and its admittance into the United Nations, among many other leftist and pro-Communist stands. Sam Brown, chief spokesman for the VMC, holds strong anti-American sentiments and has been quoted by the Presidential historian, Theodore White, as saying:

We have 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 in the world.

Though the VMC is not completely dominated by Communists and Communist sympathizers, it is a tactic being used by the Communists to obtain support from as many individuals as possible who are not Communists. The pro-Communist leanings and affiliations of the VMC have been played down in an attempt to place an aura of concerned citizens image about their organization's effort.

NEW MOBE

A closer look at the VMC reveals its relationship with the New Mobilization Committee which is referred to as "New Mobe," made up of many revolutionary and pro-Communist groups, is the outgrowth of the demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The New Mobe's steering committee is comprised of such notables as David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, both self-avowed Communists, who are presently being tried in Chicago on charges of conspiracy for their leadership in the violent demonstrations in Chicago. Fred Halstead, an admitted Trotskyite, is also a member. Robert Greenblatt, another member, went to Paris with a letter of introduction from Tom Hayden of the SDS to meet with the North Vietnamese. Hayden, a friend of the Communists, said in his letter of introduction that Greenblatt is a trusted friend and worker in the cause and ended his letter to the North Vietnamese with wishes for "Good fortune. Victory."

The interesting and direct tie is emphasized by the fact that David Hawke, who also sits on the steering committee of the New Mobe, is also one of the leaders of the VMC.

There is little doubt that there are further interlocking relationships with the World Peace Council and the World Peace Movement which, according to Senator PAUL FANNIN in his remarks in the September 30 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are international Communist-front organizations and are active tools for subversion and the spread of Marxist Communist principle.

There are more demonstrations or moratoriums planned by the VMC and New Mobe between October 15 and November 15. The word "moratorium" was substituted for the original word "strike" as the leaders felt strike connotated vio-

lence. Yet, past history, and already the number of people arrested in Chicago for their part in the disturbances and fighting the police, would certainly lead us to anticipate violence.

OHIO SCHOOLS INVOLVED

Senator FANNIN in his statement indicated that the organization of the Vietnam moratorium is going on in the Ohio colleges—namely: Antioch, Bowling Green State University, Capital University, Cleveland State University, College of Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, College of Steubenville, Denison University, Heidelberg College, Kenyon College, Miami University, Oberlin College, Ohio University, University of Cincinnati, University of Dayton, Wilberforce University, Wilmington College, and Youngstown State University.

It is especially alarming to see well-meaning religious organizations and private citizens getting involved with these Communist-related activities. Many of these same people, who claim to be pacifists do not hesitate to use violence in behalf of their causes, which is rather paradoxical. The revolutionaries, when the law is enforced, yell foul as they seem to fail to realize that the government is obligated to counteract revolution. These revolutionaries, who relish martyrdom, still wish to be fed to toothless lions.

SHADES OF FASCISM

In this regard, I stated on the floor of the House:

It is amazing to follow the perversion and illogic of their thought pattern. They can break the law; nobody else can. Only they are in a position of questioning authority, questioning law, questioning the system. . . nobody else, they infer. Only they can make the judgment as to which laws, at which time can be broken, yet, feeling that they should be at the same time immune from the established law's penalty.

I have no sympathy for these particular militants who would destroy everything but what they like and silence everyone but those who agree with them. If there were ever fascism, if there were ever Nazism, if there were ever dictatorship, it has arrived in the form of militant, wild, swinging and often brutal organizational people who come with the purpose of destroying the democratic process.

THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS

Hundreds of groups, service organizations, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, Undergraduates for a Stable American—founded by T. Harding Jones of Middletown at Princeton University—and the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism have formed to permit the silent majority to be heard. They call for:

First. All out support to Veterans Day ceremonies on November 11.

Second. Flying flags the entire week.

Third. Turning on headlights during daylight hours.

Fourth. Writing letters and sending telegrams to the President and other public office holders.

Fifth. Ringing of bells for a 5-minute period at 11 a.m., followed by 2 minutes of reverent silence.

I urge you to participate and demonstrate your support for our President's policy in Vietnam. Speak out.

COMMUNISTS IN PEACE MOVEMENTS

The Communist involvement is more and more apparent in the "peace demonstrations." This was indicated in my October 15 column which was criticized by the critics of the administration's Vietnam policies. At that time, names, and quotations of some of these individuals were revealed, along with their relationships to Communist organizations and Communist front organizations. The column also indicated interlocking relationships between national organizations and their coordinating activities.

The November 15 demonstration is coordinated by the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe. This present effort is infiltrated and directed by more Communists—all varieties—radicals and revolutionaries, than the October Vietnam moratorium.

THE NEW MOBE

The MOBE has a 3-year history involving violence and civil disobedience. MOBE sponsored the 1967 march to the Pentagon which ended in a bloody melee. The MOBE also joined and executed the disruption of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. This action was planned as a massive demonstration to oppose the war and indirectly attack the American political function.

In an effort to revive agitation, the MOBE group called an antiwar conference on July 4 and 5, 1969, at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland to broaden and unify the antiwar forces. Plans were made for the coordination of the national antiwar actions for the fall, or the fall offensive campaign. The steering committee of the conference was composed of these Communists:

Arnold Johnson: Public relations director for the Communist Party in the U.S.A.—a Communist for over 30 years and he has admitted that he has "no difference with Moscow on ideology or tactics."

Fred Halstead: 1968 presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers Party, a Trotskyite Communist organization.

David Dellinger: A self-proclaimed Communist.

Jack Spiegel: One-time Communist Party candidate for Congress in Illinois.

LeRoy Wolins: An identified Communist and a leader in the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam.

Phil Bart: Chairman of Ohio CPUSA.

Jay Schaffner: W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs—a Communist youth organization.

Gene Tournour: National secretary of the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs.

Of course, the balance of participants was made up largely of radical and revolutionary types. Needless to say, these activities have received loud proclamations of support by the Communist publication, the Worker and, of course, the North Vietnamese officials. We can go on and on and we can quote colorful biographies with names and dates. Many others have actually publicly stated they favor a Vietcong victory as did Sam Brown, coordinator of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium, in an interview with New York City's Metromedia television commentator, Dr. Martin Abend.

NEW MOBE GOALS

On the surface the call to the public to participate is based on the antiwar theme. "Protest the war," they say. "Bring home our boys." Yet, the printed goals of the New Mobe are far more sweeping:

First. Immediate and total withdrawal from Vietnam.

Second. Self-determination for Vietnam and black America.

Third. End ABM and all forms of militarism.

Fourth. End racism and poverty.

Fifth. Free speech for GI's.

Sixth. Self-government for Washington, D.C.

Seventh. Stop the repression—free all political prisoners.

Eighth. End the draft.

Ninth. End support to the Thieu-Ky regime.

Tenth. Priorities for social needs, not war.

It is an obvious manipulation by the Communists to take advantage of the antiwar sentiment to destroy our system of government.

Already many of these strong elements who supported the October 15 moratorium are turning out to be weak in their dedication to the November demonstrations. McCarthy men, Congressmen, and senatorial supporters and columnists who lent their earlier respectability to the demonstrations are now seeing the skin of the animal and are withdrawing their support.

THE HONORABLE DONALD JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, GIVES PRINCIPAL ADDRESS AT VETERANS DAY NATIONAL CEREMONY AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Donald Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, gave the principal address at the Veterans Day national ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery.

As most Members of the House know, Don Johnson is from West Branch, Iowa, which is in the First Congressional District of Iowa. He is doing an excellent job as VA Administrator. He has already proven himself to be an able and dedicated public servant.

On Veterans Day yesterday, Don Johnson gave an eloquent address. Representing President Nixon, he spoke of "Peace With Honor." Certainly, he expressed the hope and prayer of every American.

Mr. Speaker, Don Johnson's remarks should be read by every American.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DONALD E. JOHNSON

President Nixon has given me the high honor of representing him at this Veterans Day National Ceremony.

President Nixon's Veterans Day proclamation . . . and the separate Veterans Day message which he sent to all of our hospitalized veterans . . . bespeak more eloquently

than any words of mine his great esteem for America's veterans . . . his constant concern for their welfare . . . and his firm resolve that their government shall care for them and for their widow and their orphan.

I do not bring you President Nixon's message. And I do not presume to speak for him. However, I do know how dedicated he is to the task of achieving the theme of Veterans Day 1969 . . . peace with honor.

And we all know of his fervent hope for the understanding, the support, and the prayers of the American people.

Thus . . . as we pause today to remember . . . and to thank America's veterans of all wars for their service and sacrifice that all of us might live in freedom . . . let us ask ourselves:

What can we do . . . we citizens, Americans all . . . what can we do to help achieve peace with honor?

We can begin by recognizing the truth. No American can quarrel with the noble and eternal goal of peace with honor.

But some of our people disagree today over the means . . . the strategy, if you like . . . of achieving this goal in Vietnam.

To those who may think . . . or would have others think . . . that they alone understand and abhor the suffering and savagery of war . . . to them I say now that they do an injustice to America's 40 million veterans, living and dead.

And they deceive themselves.

For America's veterans . . . there has never been a "popular" war . . . nor a cause for which they eagerly sought to die.

Our honored war dead desired and deserved to live just as much as any citizen of our nation.

And our disabled veterans would welcome a moratorium in the pain and illness and injuries they now endure.

But they answered freedom's call because they understood freedom's cost.

In his inaugural address . . . President Nixon said that the greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker.

He is right.

However, on this day when we recognize and applaud honor and courage and duty . . . as exemplified by our veterans . . . on this day I would call the attention of all Americans to an inspiring inscription.

It is engraved on the Confederate War Memorial a short distance from this amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery.

Not for fame or reward

Not for place or for rank

Not lured by ambition

Or goaded by necessity

But in simple obedience to duty

As they understood it

These men suffered all

Sacrificed all

Dared all

And died.

We, the living, also have a duty.

A duty to unify America. A duty to bring together our great and good people.

The unity that has always been the bedrock of America needs expression today more than at any time in the past century.

Not as a facade . . . but as the firm foundation for the future of America of freedom and opportunity and justice which we must build for ourselves and for our posterity.

As we build this future . . . on a foundation of unity . . . not unanimity . . . in our land . . . our citizens, Americans all, can learn from the veterans we honor today.

In battle . . . our veterans freely admitted the toughness of their enemy.

But they summoned forth courage to attack him.

And they gained the confidence to defeat him.

We, too, need candor and courage and confidence.

Candor to admit the toughness of the problems we face at home and abroad.

Courage to do the difficult, to bear the costs . . . in understanding and fortitude as well as in money . . . demanded by these problems.

And confidence that peace will be won . . . and the wrongs that make us a less perfect union will be righted . . . if we but carry on.

It is precisely because America's veterans have demonstrated their love of our country . . . their understanding of the cost of freedom . . . and their leadership as responsible citizens . . . that we can use this day set aside to honor them to call for a new depth . . . a new era . . . of unity.

Unity to save the America for which they have sacrificed so much . . . and which they have served . . . and still serve . . . so well.

Our veterans need no spokesman. For nearly two centuries . . . their valor has been their valedictory.

But it is gratifying . . . indeed inspiring . . . to note that today . . . in Veterans Day ceremonies throughout our land . . . thousands of Americans are speaking up . . . proudly proclaiming their unashamed love of America . . . and urging the overwhelming silent majority of their fellow-Americans to join them in this declaration of love for . . . and faith in . . . our great country.

I believe sincerely that our honored war dead . . . to whom we pay special tribute today . . . would approve of this use of their "DAY."

The America they felt was worth fighting for is not a perfect America.

But only a united America can win the peace for which we all yearn . . . and for which we should all pray.

Only a united people will have the will and the strength and the determination to curb inflation . . . combat crime . . . cleanse our waters and our air . . . alleviate poverty . . . and discrimination . . . train the undereducated . . . provide meaningful work for the underemployed . . . and cure the other ills that beset us.

On this Veterans Day, then, let us pledge and let us act to make our beloved country . . . in fact as well as in name . . . the United States of America.

To succeed in this difficult but vital task will be to insure that no veteran shall have served in vain.

"OPEN DOOR" TO CHINA POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, the General Assembly of the United Nations rejected a resolution offered by Albania which would, if adopted, have ordered the expulsion of Nationalist China on the island of Formosa from membership or participation in any of the bodies of the United Nations, and in its place offered membership to Communist China. The United States voted against this resolution and wisely so. There was no justification for expelling from U.N. membership a nation of over 13 million people—a population more than most of the other U.N. members—and a nation which has been a member of the U.N. since its founding and has committed no act which would justify expulsion under the charter. I support the position taken by our Government upon the Albanian resolution. Red China should not be admitted if this requires the expulsion of the Republic of China.

At the same time, I am glad that the

United States is beginning to show a progressive attitude toward Red Chinese participation in the world community. It is most timely.

On September 18, President Nixon stated to the General Assembly of the U.N. that our country is ready to talk with the leaders of Communist China in a frank and serious spirit whenever they choose to abandon their self-imposed isolation. I was also glad to note that our colleague, Representative IRVING WHALLEY, who is a U.S. representative at the United Nations and who delivered the official U.S. statement of position on the Albanian resolution, did not at any point preclude future membership for China in the United Nations or place unreasonable restrictions upon such membership. Rather, he stated that the United States "shares the conviction that it is important for mainland China to return to the family of nations." And Representative WHALLEY reiterated Secretary of State Rogers' comment that "Communist China obviously has long been too isolated from world affairs."

While it is fair to describe China's isolation as self-imposed, it is also true that this isolation has been encouraged by U.S. policy. Our Government has but limited potential for influencing internal China policy, but at least we can discard our own outdated, self-defeating, and ineffective effort to isolate China.

The time is long past, if it ever existed, when Communist China can be isolated within her Asian borders merely by the fact that the United States pretends that politically and economically it does not exist. The time is past when this giant among nations can be ignored and relegated to the ranks of those either too weak or too muscle-bound to deserve attention. The time has gone, if it ever existed when simple bilateral power politics between the United States and the Soviet Union is sufficient to assure the security of the world—Eastern and Western alike. The time has gone when the United States can afford—either politically or economically—to stand idly by in the make believe of mythology while other countries adapt to the reality of the changing balance of power, the changing facts of life in Asia, and the changing relationships among Russia and the two Chinas.

It may be argued that there never was such a time; that only minor countries separated by huge geographical, economic and cultural expanses could afford to conduct their policies as if China did not exist. The Asian countries which rim China, while many have welcomed our support, have never for a moment felt that China was isolated. Rather, like Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, they have only hoped that Communist China could be "balanced" by Western support.

The balance was based upon the fact that while China was as close as next door to many of these countries, it had not yet achieved the status of world power. Thus, what the United States and other Western countries lacked in proximity and understanding of their Asian friends, we made up in military and political power.

This balanced situation no longer ex-

ists. While the geographical separation still exists between the East and the West, China has itself truly become a world power in the fullest sense of the term, and one to be reckoned with whenever major policy is formulated, whenever world security is discussed, whenever conditions of peace are sought.

The enormous power of this Asian giant has been demonstrated most convincingly within the Communist family of nations. China's behavior over the last decade and a half caused her great ally, the U.S.S.R., to withdraw all economic and military support, to cut off diplomatic and trade relations, and to begin making preparations for all-out war with Peking. Western intelligence shows a marked shifting of some Soviet nuclear-tipped missile installations into positions threatening China, not the West. In the early months of 1969, both sides reported bloody clashes between armed regulars of the two countries along the 4,575 miles of territory which form their common border. Western newsmen who have spoken with soldiers while traveling the trans-Siberian railway confirm these incidents and testify to the rapid and heavy buildup of armed material, tanks, troops, and other war supplies which could be used either defensively or offensively. And Soviet correspondent Victor Louis, who often operates at the behest of the Soviet officials, reported after one of these border incidents over islands in the Ussuri River that "the whole surface of the island was burned together with any Chinese troops and equipment there." Such "scorched earth" tactics at least suggest the possibility that tactical nuclear weapons may already have been employed by the Soviets in their hot and cold war with China.

Perhaps the most significant piece of news to come out of Moscow since the invasion of Czechoslovakia was the report that the U.S.S.R. was giving serious consideration to the possibility and consequences of mounting a surprise attack upon China, with the intention of knocking out China's nuclear facilities in Lop Nor and perhaps other industrial and population centers. This possibility of a preemptive first strike was apparently broached to member nations of the Warsaw Pact in preparation for any expanded conflict. Whether or not the Russians ever seriously contemplated such a conquest, no one can doubt that its satellites in Europe, still smarting from the invasion of Czechoslovakia, viewed the possibility as a very real one. The Brezhnev doctrine, which proclaims the right of socialist countries to intervene in each other's internal affairs, is surely as applicable to China as it was to Eastern Europe. Recognizing this, Peking leaders have consistently denounced the Czechoslovakia invasion and the man who promulgated the doctrine, referring to him as "Brezhnev & Co." and a "renegade."

This rising crescendo of mutual vilification between Moscow and Peking has abated somewhat since Premier Kosygin's visit with Chinese Premier Chou En-lai on September 11. However, Victor Louis' justification for Soviet intervention in China in terms of the Brezh-

nev doctrine came 1 week after the meeting in Peking. And on the evening the Sino-Soviet talks were to begin, Tass distributed a summary of an article describing "the adventurist and chauvinistic policy of the present leaders of the Chinese Communist Party."

Of course, Moscow's continued militance and threatening stance may be only a tactical position designed to gain the most advantageous bargaining position vis-a-vis the Chinese in the weeks and months ahead. But this does not lessen the importance of the conflict between these two giants of communism, nor does it lessen their impact upon world security and peace. Therefore, it is essential that the United States realistically evaluate its own position in such a controversy, and more broadly its attitude toward the emerging world power status of Red China.

What must be realized in making such a policy judgment is that with the rise of China to the status of world power—one of the three great powers—world diplomacy and power politics have become much more complex. At the same time, a world with three great powers instead of two also presents new opportunities for great national leaders.

The United States, as the only one of the three great powers committed to individual liberty, is fortunate to have as its President in this crucial, challenging, formative stage in world diplomacy a man willing to think anew and act anew. His actions thus far have, in my judgment, greatly added to the stability of peace and the stature of the United States in the eyes of all mankind.

For example, consider President Nixon's visit to Rumania just 6 months after taking office. To the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe is private property. Just how private was amply demonstrated by the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the "Brezhnev doctrine" which it spawned. The fact that an American President actually visited an Eastern European Communist nation at the invitation of its President speaks well of the future course of our relations with that part of the world. But more important is what that visit symbolizes to all Europeans—East and West alike.

When the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia, many in West Germany feared that troops from the Warsaw Pact would not stop at the German borders. Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania, members of the Eastern bloc who are to varying degrees independent, also felt the icy breath of Moscow upon them. Similarly, the message was not lost upon Red China. As a consequence, Peking issued a warning to the Soviets that intrusions upon the territorial integrity of its European allies would not be tolerated, and the Rumanians and Yugoslavs pledged their mutual support for each other and began organizing people's militias to protect their own independence.

Seizing upon these signs of defiance in the face of overwhelming Soviet military might, President Nixon decided to solidify the position of the United States on the side of national independence by visiting the Rumanians and talking with their President. The rest is history.

The Rumanians accorded him a tu-

multuous welcome, unprecedented even for their own national heroes. The President earned more good will for the American people than our national leadership had engendered in almost a decade. And in the international diplomatic game of "one-upmanship," the President had clearly won the first round.

Similarly, in the dispute between the Soviet Union and Red China—a dispute which often erupted into open conflict and into threats of total warfare—the Nixon administration adopted a stance which greatly contributed to the peace and security of the world while at the same time maximizing the stature of the United States.

He wisely rejected the forecast from some quarters that an all-out war between the two Communist giants would benefit the United States. While the resulting holocaust might well cripple both and perhaps demolish one of the Communist power centers, it could not possibly leave the United States unscathed.

The conflict might quickly spread to worldwide proportions, engaging the United States itself. Even if Soviet and Chinese military operations were aimed only at each other, its consequences inevitably would seriously endanger other nations.

For one thing, the possibility of massive nuclear fallout would present a grave danger to life and health in the Western Hemisphere. For another, peace, security, and stability would hardly be enhanced; the survivor in such an engagement would emerge as the unchallenged leader of the Communist world, a development certain to influence neutral nations and complicate U.S. policy problems.

In a carefully worded statement, Assistant Secretary of State Elliot Richardson announced the U.S. policy of non-alignment in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Stating that the conflict would not deter the United States from trying to improve relations with the Chinese, Richardson said:

President Nixon has concluded that our national security would in the long run be prejudiced by associating ourselves with either side against the other. Each is highly sensitive about American efforts to improve relations with the other. We intend, nevertheless, to pursue a long-term course of progressively developing better relations with both.

As intelligence and other evidence began to show that the Soviet Union was actually giving serious consideration to mounting a military offensive against the Chinese, the United States acted to make sure that the entire world was apprised of this possibility and to bring world opinion to bear on the Russians to forestall such action.

The surprise of the invasion of Czechoslovakia was still fresh in mind. This daring move by the Soviet Union had paid off handsomely, and its success might prompt an act of even greater daring against China. The world needed to be put on notice concerning the possibility of a Soviet invasion of China.

The positive acts by the United States may well have kept the Soviets from this adventure. They also served a valuable purpose in laying the foundation for additional peaceful initiatives.

Our administration now has the rare opportunity to facilitate an important advance in United States-Chinese relations. This is so because of the convergence of several major factors.

First, there is little likelihood that the U.S.S.R. and Red China will work out their differences sufficiently to permit any real cooperation between them to the detriment of the West. Present differences are long standing and will not be overridden in a few meetings. China adamantly maintains that Russia appropriated 100 million square miles of Chinese territory in unequal treaties imposed upon them in years past by the czars. While China does not presently demand its return, this disputed territory remains a sore point. Moreover, about 40,000 additional square miles of land are in active dispute between the two nations.

In addition, China is unlikely to forget being "stabbed in the back" by its Soviet allies in 1960, when Premier Khrushchev, spurred by the widening ideological gap between the two countries, suddenly withdrew all economic and military aid and support from China. This left the Chinese in an extremely sensitive and precarious position, with many industrial factories incomplete, and others unable to operate because of the lack of trained technicians. China was prematurely and summarily forced into a position of self-sufficiency, and it is unlikely that it will soon, if ever, put faith in the Soviet Union.

Second, China feels challenged by Russia in what it regards as its own legitimate sphere of influence in Southeast Asia. The heavy support given by Russia to Hanoi, Soviet gestures toward Chiang Kai-shek, and Russian proposals to hold an Asian collective defense meeting—all suggest Soviet intrusion.

The U.S. corollary of this is obvious. As we extricate ourselves from Vietnam, reduce forces in Thailand, and retire—at least politically—from Okinawa, our own effectiveness and bargaining position vis-a-vis the Chinese will be substantially improved.

Third, the traumatic cultural revolution in China seems to have finally wound itself out and the country is beginning to return to some degree of normalcy. China is expected soon to resume diplomatic relations with a number of countries with which it severed ties a few years ago. These developments would help China to shed its "backstreet" complex.

Fourth, China has given some indication it wants to become a member of the United Nations. Recently at a banquet in honor of Premier Alfred Raoul of the Congo, Chou En-lai thanked the Congo representative for his country's advocacy at the U.N. of the "restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations and the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique." This was "a great support and encouragement to the Chinese people," he said.

Fifth, China has stated that it will never attack another country unless it is itself attacked, and it has also set forth five basic principles for peace. They are "mutual respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual nonaggression, mutual noninterference in internal

affairs, equality and reciprocal advantages, and peaceful coexistence." In addition, China has also stated that it favors the elimination of nuclear weapons. These points could form the basis for fruitful discussions between Washington and Peking when a dialog finally begins.

Sixth, as China begins what may become a long series of talks with the U.S.S.R., it may see the advantage to some friendly diplomatic gestures toward the United States simply to improve its own bargaining power with the Russians.

Seventh, China has condemned U.S. policies which maintain an embargo on all trade between our countries. This may indicate a desire for some limited economic intercourse.

Eighth, as the United States continues to withdraw combat forces from Vietnam, China may well decide to use its own influence to wind down the war. This could be justified as a means of minimizing long-term Soviet influence in that area. Certainly, China could hardly be pleased with the prospect of a Hanoi regime subservient to Moscow. Nor could we. In the coming decade the United States will be better off dealing on an equal footing with two major Communist powers, rather than being forced to deal only with one.

Ninth, the climate of U.S. public opinion is favorable to initiatives toward China. To illustrate, early this year the administration announced two small but significant gestures. First, U.S. tourists could purchase up to \$100 in Chinese merchandise; this was the first modification since the Korean war of the total embargo on China trade the United States had imposed on itself. Second, the endorsement on U.S. passports prohibiting travel to China was modified to permit travel by journalists, Government officials, teachers, doctors, and students.

Public reaction was unexpectedly favorable. To my knowledge, no editorial or person of any prominence accused the administration of going soft on communism. To the contrary, comment was almost uniformly favorable.

The "China lobby" which for years urged that Chiang be "unleashed" no longer packs a wallop on Capitol Hill, mainly because the ritualistic claims by Taipei of political authority over mainland China are no longer considered seriously either in the United States or Formosa.

My own personal experience attests to a change in public opinion. When I first suggested a new "open door" policy toward China nearly 3 years ago, the reaction, while generally favorable, included some sharp attacks from some of my colleagues in Congress as well as elsewhere. As I have repeated similar suggestions periodically since then, reactions have become favorable, almost without exception.

The convergence of these nine factors presents to the United States the opportunity to undertake, with great advantage to its own security interests, additional initiatives looking toward better relations with China.

Therefore I propose a major change in our basic policy toward China—one seeking to place relations with Peking on exactly the same basis as Moscow.

I suggest that the United States announce publicly that in the future it will seek to treat the Soviets and the Chinese in exactly the same manner in matters of military, economic, trade, and diplomatic policies. No longer should we place primary emphasis on improved relations with Moscow. Rather, we should put an equal emphasis upon seeking ties with Peking in order to improve simultaneously our relations with both Communist capitals.

Removal of the present double-standard approach we have so obviously employed in recent years would give Russia a strong incentive to improve its own relations with the United States by reducing pressures in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. It would also be an essential first step on the long road to improved relations with Communist China.

To implement this basic policy of treating both major Communist powers equally, the United States should officially recognize the territorial integrity of Communist China, and profess our complete opposition to any violation of Red China's borders whether by the Soviet Union, Nationalist China on Formosa, or any other nation.

For more than 20 years our Government has pretended that Chiang Kai-shek's regime is the political authority over mainland China as well as the population of Formosa. Never before in our history has our Government lived with a total myth of such magnitude for so long.

At the same time that we drop this aged and pointless pretense, we should reaffirm our pledge to defend Formosa from attack.

We should also seek to initiate and expand diplomatic contact with Peking. A good start would be the designation of a special high-level emissary, with competence in Chinese affairs, who would stand ready to meet any time and any place with Red Chinese officials to discuss matters of mutual interest.

We should express our desire to have the agenda include arms control, nuclear testing, military security, economic and diplomatic intercourse between our countries, and the possibility of establishing a Washington-Peking "hot line," similar to that connecting Moscow and Washington.

We should announce that we will no longer oppose membership for Communist China in the United Nations, but we will oppose any seating arrangement which would deprive Nationalist China of a seat in the U.N. Although this would not likely bring China into the U.N. at an early date, it would nevertheless be a decided improvement. Our position on U.N. membership for China, up to now, has been uniformly negative, simply opposing Albania's resolutions and thus being unable to influence the course of those who do favor Red China's admission.

By giving lip service to the goal of enlarging Chinese participation in world affairs while at the same time persisting in a totally negative position on U.N. membership for the most populous nation in the world, the United States makes an unbecoming spectacle of itself.

A more progressive posture on the part

of the United States might be to encourage China to adopt a more responsible stance in its endeavors to win support among smaller nations.

We should permit trade with China. The present total prohibition, relieved only by the tourist exception, works no hardship on China, only upon our own citizens who are denied a valuable foreign market. In this regard, we should also act to eliminate requirements of special licensing, cargo preference and part cargo on grain shipments to Eastern Europe, as well as China. Each year millions of bushels of grain are sold to Red China by Canada, yet the United States, which exports more wheat to the rest of the world than any other country, does not send one bushel to this Asian giant. It is similar with other agricultural products. Yet, China has no difficulty securing what it needs elsewhere. Our trade embargo hurts only us, especially the American farmers.

The prohibition on travel to China, now stamped on most U.S. passports, should be removed entirely. Except for security restrictions, which apply to all countries, travel should be unlimited. Although actual travel is unlikely to develop very soon, due to the need for cooperation by China, this step would help to demonstrate the sincerity of our desire for better communication and understanding.

Taken together, these steps would show convincingly our desire to end the double standard which we have applied to relations with Peking and Moscow. The promulgation of a single standard would add substantially to our own security, as well as to our stature in the eyes of the world.

It would strengthen our position relative to the Soviet Union by lessening the likelihood of a future Moscow-Peking coalition against the United States. Indeed, it would make the Soviets anxious to curry favor with Washington in their own cold and hot war with China, and likely would cause the Soviet Union to ease tensions in Europe and the Middle East.

In recommending this new "open door" policy toward China, I do not wish to leave the impression that an era of good relations with China is about to begin, or that vigilance is no longer needed. Like the Soviet Union, China is ruled by a dictatorial, conspiratorial system that is characterized by hostility and suspicion toward the outside world.

Our own national security interests require that we accord to China the same consideration we have long extended to the Soviet Union. They also require that we keep our guard up.

LEGISLATION TO STOP THE CONTINUAL INCREASES IN BUS FARES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 14759, legislation to authorize the use of the highway trust fund to subsidize bus operations.

In New York City, passage of this legislation would mean the 20-cent fare could

be retained. For many low-income families, retention of the 20-cent fare makes the difference between bread on the table and no bread.

In other cities, it would function to stop the continuous spiraling of bus fare increases which have imposed an undue hardship upon low income families and have driven the more affluent to their cars and brought on the increasing traffic jams being experienced by our large metropolitan areas.

The last year has seen bus fares in Chicago increase from 25 to 40 cents, St. Louis from 30 to 40 cents, Pittsburgh to 35 cents and nearly every major line has gone up at least a nickel.

While it is easy to pinpoint the cause of these increases—increasing maintenance, capital and labor costs—very little is being done to prevent its continuation.

My bill would authorize Governors to use a portion of their State's highway trust fund for subsidizing and improving bus operations. New York received \$63 million through the trust fund this year. The New York Transit Authority's operating deficit for fiscal 1969 was \$79 million. This legislation would have a similar and tangible effect in other cities as well.

The Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Francis C. Turner, has called for the use of the trust fund for bus subsidization. He told a recent conference of the American Society of Civil Engineers that a bus occupies the pavement space of only two automobiles, but carries 50 or more persons. Subsidizing increased low-cost bus service would permit the most efficient use of freeways and other main roads to move traffic. It would have the same effect as widening the freeways over which they operate.

I believe this legislation is one segment of the practical solution to our urban transportation problem. I have introduced it in the hope that Administrator Turner will stand behind his position and the residents of our central cities. For if he does, this approach can have a tangible effect on urban transportation.

A Washington Post account of Turner's remarks and the text of H.R. 14759 follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1969]

ROAD CHIEF URGES CITY BUS SUBSIDY

Federal highway money should be used to subsidize bus operations in urban areas, including Washington, the nation's chief road builder declared yesterday.

Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner said subsidies of increased low-cost service would permit the most efficient use of freeways and other main roads to move commuters.

While government subsidies for capital costs of transit improvements, including the purchase of buses, have been provided since 1964, no serious consideration has been given to a federal subsidy of operating costs. Many cities, however, do provide such subsidies locally.

The Nixon administration's proposed \$10 billion mass transit program, which would be financed from general tax revenues, is limited to capital costs. Much of the money would go for rail rapid transit.

WIDER FREEWAYS

Turner, speaking to the Washington section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, said granting subsidies for buses would have the same effect as widening the freeways over which they would operate.

A bus, he said, occupies the pavement space of only two automobiles but carries 50 or more persons.

"I'm a great advocate of buses," Turner declared. "Strange as it may seem to people, I ride the darn things. I believe a lot of the rest of you should do likewise."

Turner, who lives in Arlington, made his statement in response to a question by Albert A. Grant, president of the local engineering group and transportation planning director of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

The proposal was applauded by George A. Avery, chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, who was seated next to Turner at the luncheon.

"I think it's great. It's music to my ears," said Avery, who has suggested to Congress that it grant a subsidy for Washington buses. Lacking one, the transit commission is now considering higher fares for D.C. Transit System.

Turner, talking to a reporter later, said his advocacy of a subsidy is personal and not official. But he said the idea is being explored within his agency, possibly for inclusion among proposals for an extension of the national highway program after the interstate freeway system is completed in the 1970s.

NO VIOLATION

He said subsidies for buses from the highway trust fund would not violate a commitment that the money be used for highway purposes. "Buses are highway users," he said.

The trust fund is composed of tax revenues mainly on gasoline, diesel fuel and tires. It amounts to \$4.6 billion per year.

Turner said he would not support a public subsidy for rail transit from either the highway fund or another source.

However, some political figures, among them Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D-N.Y.) and Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel have advocated the merger of the highway trust fund into an all-purpose transportation fund.

H.R. 14759

A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of improving motorbus transportation services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Motorbus Transportation Services Improvement Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Federal-aid highway system apportionment" means an apportionment for a fiscal year to a State under one of the five paragraphs of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code;

(2) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of a State;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico.

GRANTS

SEC. 3. The Governor of a State may elect to apply all or part of one or more of any Federal-aid highway system apportionment for such State for a fiscal year to making grants in that fiscal year for improving mass transit bus services. Grants may be made to State or local public bodies or agencies or to private mass transit bus operators for purposes including, but not limited to, the acquisition of buses and other operating equipment, the reimbursement of operating expenses, and the financing of terminal and other facilities provided for the comfort and convenience of the bus-riding public. Before any such grant may be made to a private mass transit bus operator, the Governor pro-

posing to make the grant shall first certify to the Secretary of Transportation in a form and manner prescribed by the Secretary, that the intended grantee operates on a financially sound basis and in an efficient manner and that the grant will not be used as reimbursement for wages paid pursuant to a labor contract not arrived at in true arm's length negotiation. The election authorized herein shall be made in such manner as the Secretary of Transportation shall by regulation prescribe, within sixty days after the Secretary of Transportation certifies to the Governor, pursuant to Title 23, United States Code, the sums apportioned to that State for a fiscal year.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 4. (a) Section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State highway department" the following: "and the Governor or chief executive officer of each State".

(b) Section 104(b)(5) of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Rules, regulations, and standards adopted by the Secretary for estimating the cost of completion of the Interstate System and taking into account all previous apportionments shall prescribe a consistent and equitable procedure for taking into account amounts of apportionments which the Governor of a State has elected to use to carry out section 3 of the Motorbus Transportation Services Improvement Act."

(c) Section 104 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No amount which the Governor has elected to use to carry out section 3 of the Motorbus Transportation Services Improvement Act in a fiscal year shall be available for expenditure for Federal-aid highways under this title."

(d) Section 118(a) of such title is amended by striking out "On and after" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sixty days after".

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT

SEC. 5. (a) Section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 is amended by inserting "(A)" before "making expenditures" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and (B) for the purposes of section 3 of the Motorbus Transportation Services Improvement Act."

(b) Section 209(g) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "An election by the Governor of a State under section 3 of the Motorbus Transportation Services Improvement Act to use funds to carry out such section 3 shall not be taken into account in making any adjustment under this section."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect upon the first certification of Federal-aid highway system apportionments under section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, following the date of enactment of this Act.

REV. ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J., 45TH PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY: INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Georgetown University is one of our country's great educational institutions. Founded in 1789, the same year when the U.S. Government under the Constitution was established under President Washington, its influence has become worldwide. Its faculty has included such notable figures

as Dr. James Brown Scott, William Franklin Sands, and the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S.J. Its graduates have served in virtually all agencies of our Government, including the field of foreign service.

On October 7, 1969, after a nationwide search, Georgetown University, in an impressive program attended by delegates of many institutions of higher education, inaugurated its 45th president, the Reverend Robert J. Henle, S.J.

Because of the breadth of Dr. Henle's record of experience, what he said in his inaugural address is of unusual interest not only to Georgetown University faculty, students, and alumni, but as well to other institutions of learning. A biographical sketch of Dr. Henle and his October 7 address follow:

ROBERT JOHN HENLE, S.J.

The Reverend Robert J. Henle, S.J., the new president of Georgetown University, was formerly academic vice-president of Saint Louis University, a Jesuit institution in St. Louis, Missouri. He is the 45th President in Georgetown's 180-year history.

Since coming to Georgetown June 16, Father Henle has written and spoken widely on such diverse topics as tax reform legislation and its possible effects on private universities; student unrest; methods of funding federally-financed research programs; the university's relationships with the inner-city; and ways of educating disadvantaged minority-group students.

Father Henle, 59, widely known as a writer and thinker about American Catholic higher education, was born Sept. 12, 1909, at Muscatine, Iowa, to Edward M. and Mary Ann (Hauber) Henle. He enrolled at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, in 1926 and entered the Society of Jesus in 1927. He received his A.B. degree in 1931, his A.M. degree in 1932, his Ph.L. (Licentiate in Philosophy) in 1935, his S.T.L. (Sacred Theology Licentiate) in 1941, all from Saint Louis University, and his Ph.D. degree in 1954 from the University of Toronto. Father Henle also studied theology at St. Mary's College (Kansas), and Saint Stanislaus Novitiate, Cleveland, Ohio. He was ordained a priest in 1940 at Saint Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kansas.

Father Henle began his teaching career at Saint Louis University High School, serving as an instructor in classics. He was named an instructor in philosophy at Saint Louis University in 1943, was promoted to assistant professor in 1947, to associate professor in 1954, and to full professor in 1958. He served as dean of its Graduate School from 1950-64 and also held deanships in the School of Philosophy and Letters and the School of Philosophy and Science. He was named acting vice-president in charge of academic administration in 1958, and vice-president in 1964.

Father Henle was instrumental in developing programs that extended Saint Louis University work into several Latin American countries under the Agency for International Development. He has visited Latin America yearly since 1960 and also traveled in Europe. At Saint Louis University, he also served as member of the Board of Trustees, of the Council of Regents and Deans, and as research administrator.

Father Henle has written several Latin textbooks and two works in philosophy, *Method in Metaphysics* and *Saint Thomas and Platonism*. He was editor of *The Modern Schoolman* from 1945-50. He has also written more than one hundred articles on such diverse subjects as graduate education, Thomism, the place of the Ph. D. degree in the American educational system, the role of the social philosopher in the Space Age, Jesuit aims in higher education, and the relation-

ship of science and the humanities. He has written and spoken widely about the accomplishments and problems of Catholic higher education.

Georgetown's new president has also been active nationally in academic, professional, and governmental organizations. He is a member of the advisory committee for administering Title IV of the National Defense Education Act. He has advised and has been a consultant to the U.S. Office of Education, the Bureau of Higher Education, and the U.S. Public Health Service.

UNIVERSITY REFORM: USA 1970

Rev. HENLE. Ladies and gentlemen: First of all I would like to thank my very good friends who have come to be on this panel with me today and discuss with us some of the deeper concerns of the university in the United States, and our concern about the future of the American university.

This university that we've been talking about is, of course, a product of history, of social experiment, and of human decisions. There is nothing eternal, nothing pre-ordained, about this institution. There have been societies, and highly-developed societies, that did not have a parallel institution to the American university.

It has been amply demonstrated and amply referred to in our discussions already, here, that this institution is now undergoing a great deal of change. As a matter of fact, certainly since the second World War changes have been instituted in the American university in its curriculum, its organization, its emphases.

This change has been in fact a rejection of some older models for a college or university, and has turned into a search—perhaps not always consciously—into a search for a new total model for a college and university in today's world.

The American college, whether it was a religious institution or not, for a long time, really, was based upon a sort of a family model. This was the origin of the *in loco parentis* doctrine which was the principle of discipline in the American college for many, many years.

The residential college, particularly, was looked upon as being an extension of the home; the staff an extension of the authority of the father and the mother.

This model has disappeared. I think it has disappeared for good. The principles that were involved in that are slowly passing away.

In the case of the Catholic college in the United States, there was a similar model at work; namely, the model of a religious community or a religious order. The Catholic college was very often the product of a group of religious women, religious men, or of priests, whose experience—educational experience, mature educational experience—has been that of the seminary. And it was very often impossible in the organization and direction of Catholic colleges to distinguish between a lay student's relationship with the authorities of the college, and the young seminarian's relationship—or the relationship of a religious to his superior. And this was complicated by the fact that frequently the president of a Catholic university was also the religious superior of the community in that particular university.

This model also is dissipating and disappearing, partially due to the things that Fr. Hesburgh has talked about. Also due to many changes in the internal model of religious communities themselves, which are now looking for a new model and may well be taking its model from the political state or the university, rather than from the older monastic traditions.

There are, of course, people who would like to see us introduce into the university something more of the model of a large business organization. Businessmen sometimes ask us why we can't run the university like Gen-

eral Motors. I've had members of boards of trustees refer to the internal structure of their own company as the ideal way that a president or a vice-president should be able to handle the university, and particularly to handle the faculty.

I think that there's not much danger that this model will take over the university. I think there is a serious danger that this model will influence certain parts of the operation of the university, and perhaps already has.

But I think there is such immediate resistance on the part of faculty, students and academicians generally—and that's academic administrators—to any thought of using the corporation model for universities, that there isn't any danger.

But the model to which we have referred already in this panel discussion, and which of course is more and more consciously recognized throughout the country, is the model of the political society. Some of its dangers have already been pointed out, and its difficulties.

I, for one, think that to conceptualize the structure of the university and to organize it along political lines is a deadly mistake. And if it were to become the permanent principle of operation and organization of universities, I think it would be the—really the end of the kind of institution that the university has been in our society, and the purposes it has served. I'm not sure that it could survive long as an educational institution under this kind of political structure.

Much of the change to which I referred, however, in the university, has not been due, really, to any scholarly examination of the university and its relationship to society. We have been very remiss in higher education in this country in developing anything like an overarching theory that would lead to the understanding of the university. Not that we haven't written our heads off about this, but I don't think we've been very successful in developing a guiding theory. And consequently, the changes have been ad hoc—we've tinkered with committees, and we've changed staff relationships; we've tried senates, and if the faculty were particularly demanding, we didn't put any administrators in it. If they were gracious and kind, we put some administrators in it.

The students want something, they'd push hard enough, finally we'd say, "Well, let's put them on these committees, and those committees."

And no real planning, as far as I can see, has gone into the shifting and changing that's been taking place in the American university.

One of the difficulties about this, of not having some kind of a general plan or a general understanding, or a general model, one of the difficulties of this is that we forget that a college—and particularly a modern, complex university—is a system of systems. It's not merely a system, it's a system of systems. And no one part of any system within this complex organization can be changed, modified, without automatically—at least in time—shifting the whole arrangement of the entire system.

This is basic to the very notion of a system in which every part is in some way a function of every other part.

And so if we change a committee here, or we shift a responsibility there, we're not just changing one position within this, or adding one new committee; we're making a subtle change throughout the entire system. And I think we've done this disastrously, without being aware of what we were doing and without really planning to do the things that resulted.

When the system begins to creak at some other point, then we go to that point and make another ad hoc decision as to how to handle it. We've not really, therefore, studied it as a system.

Mrs. Green has already referred to another serious factor that interferes with the development of an independent model of the university. Any institution has to fit into the society in which it operates. It bears the marks of that society. For example, however much we would like to think of the university as not being a business enterprise, or an economic entity, in our society no institution can exist unless it has a structure that fits it into the structure of our economy in general. No institution like the university can exist in the United States unless it has some kind of state incorporation.

In a clerical society of the middle ages it was possible for a university or other institution to exist simply by a Papal charter. It didn't need any civil organization. Most of us would be very happy if we could run parishes, dioceses, religious communities, hospitals, orphanages with no thought of the economic structure of our society. But we simply can't do it, and therefore there is a kind of a pressure on all our institutions to begin to think about themselves as part of an economic society.

And in the case of the university I submit that this is in basic conflict with what I think is the basic business of the university and its basic goals. But the presence of the Federal Government in the scene, of the state governments, of all kinds of organizations, the demands to which Mrs. Green has referred, all of these things are pushing in on the university. And while inside the university we do not have a clear vision of our own structure and our own future, all of these are inevitably, day by day, helping to shape the internal structure of the university, and determine its internal functions even.

I think that the university structure or organization and function is a unique thing. I don't think it's good to model it on a family or a state, a political government, or a business enterprise, or a church. It has a unique business.

And I'd like to suggest that we don't sit down and meditate and think enough about the basic business of the university. If we could identify what that business is in such a way that it doesn't tie us to any given structure, or any given time.

I have suggested that there have been societies, and highly-cultivated societies, that did not have institutions like the ones that exist in our society. So the institution may vary considerably, and has varied. But perhaps we can identify within the institution something that is unique about it, and that ties it to every other cultivated society and every other situation in which men interact in human life.

It is no new idea for me to say that I think the fundamental business of the university is learning. I'm not using learning now as a substantive for things learned, but basically for the process of learning.

I suggest that we would be well-advised to meditate on the basic process of human learning, to examine it. It's a complex concept. It's an operation, a human operation, a total human operation.

Learning, taken in its broadest sense, is the whole development of a human being. It is not merely the training in some individual skill, even if that skill be intellectual. A Berlitz school of languages may teach a language skill. It may teach 50 languages, or 100 languages. But by multiplying the languages or the levels of achievement, the Berlitz school never becomes a university. And so we can easily distinguish off technical training aspects in society.

But there is always this basic learning in which people seek to grow, to understand life, to understand human culture, to understand the universe, to understand themselves. Not only in a rationalistic way, but to understand themselves in a very humanistic way, an artistic way, in relation to values and goals and goods of human life.

In every society this kind of learning has

gone on under some kind of organized process. In a primitive society it may be instruction by the elders during a period prior to initiation rites. In India, the classical Indian scheme, people put themselves to school to great masters. In China, the relationship between a disciple and his master in this mutual learning process is one of the prized things of the culture.

It's a process in which an older learner assists a younger learner. It's a social process. It's not the business of a man going off quietly into a corner and learning by himself.

Society has always had a social learning process. And this means a very unique kind of relationship between the older learners and the younger learners. A unique relationship, in which a common life of learning is lived. In which there is a strong human bond of understanding and sympathy. In which there is a feeling of the importance of the activity in which they are engaging.

And when this is seen in its naked, human reality it is not thought of as being an economic commodity. We go to a technical school and we pay ten dollars and we learn a skill. This kind of learning that I'm talking about, which is a total human learning, this kind of human learning really cannot be translated into economic terms. We have to do it because that's the kind of society we're operating in.

But in fact, there is no correlation between money and this process. We read in the life of Justin Martyr, one of the first great Christian professors, academicians, that as a young man he longed for wisdom, for this kind of total understanding. And he tells us of his passage from philosopher to philosopher looking for a true teacher with whom he could learn, from whom he could learn about life. And he tells of going to one famous Aristotelian and talking to him about learning with him. And he remarks very briefly, "But when I found that this man, before talking about the philosophy which I was to study, insisted on settling his fee, I decided this was no philosopher, and went on my quest."

This basic human relationship of learning is the basic business of the university. It is the only place where at a high level this kind of learning goes on.

I'll reflect once again—this learning is a basic human development. Its knowledge, and its understanding; its values and its facts; its integration and its depth—taken together in a total human process of development. This is the way human beings grow into greater human beings. And this is the process.

It is not a collection of skills. And you can have a technical institute that taught all sorts of things—engineering and medicine, agriculture, typewriting, Swahili—and you wouldn't have this process necessarily. And business of the college and the university.

Now I feel very deeply that if we would take this view of the fundamental activity, then we would see the university in a new light. We've got so many fixed categories with which we talk about the university and with which we come to the university—we can't talk about the people in the university without talking about faculty, students, administration and staff.

Now I think if we took a look at the university from the standpoint of this deep educational process, that we'd get a different classification. If we were looking for the kinds of people in the university who are playing the role of the older learner of wisdom, of the older human developing person, we would find that some of what we now call faculty really do this, and some don't. And some of the people that we refuse to give faculty status do this much more than many of the people to whom we give faculty status.

I think we would begin to look not for a faculty organized around disciplines, but we would begin to look for a corps of what I

prefer to call educators—a corps of true teacher-learners. And these people, in my mind, are the people that are carrying on the work of the university, and the work that is fundamental to the university. The rest of it the university may have to do. They may have other things to do. But this is the relationship and the operation that we've got to protect.

Again, if we would take a look at this total learning process I think we would discover that in more recent years the university within the university, we've developed a dichotomy which is fatal to this concept of human growth. I refer to the highly-specialized separation between purely academic people and what we call variously "student personnel" people, "student development" people, student psychologists, and the rest of it. We've split—we've tried to split the human development of the student and the total living of the older learner into two pieces, and we've tried to keep the academician as pure of all the other concerns as possible, and then turn these concerns over to other people, to whom we deny the right to be academicians.

I think that this has been a fatal development in the university and college, and one of the reasons why the whole teaching and understanding of values has become such a desperate matter in most of our institutions—I think desperate to the point that in some of our universities and colleges the total university effort is now directed away from being involved in the students' values or motivation, that this is no business at all of the university or the college.

This is partially reinforced because people think that to teach values or work with people developing values, that you have to do it within the framework of an *in loco parentis* doctrine. And you don't, at all.

My point is, therefore, if we really try to think of the learning process in its total human dimension—this is what is important here, its total human dimension, which means a wisdom dimension, which means a human dimension, which means values and facts all growing together—then I think we would stop talking also about courses and curriculum as being the method of educating people.

I have tried to eliminate the word "curriculum" from my vocabulary. I find it is practically impossible to do. But I think we immediately—we talk about changing the educational pattern, what do we talk about? Curriculum reform. What is curriculum reform? Fiddling around with a bunch of courses—make a three-hour course four hours. Instead of requiring History I we'll give them an option of History I or Sociology I.

But we've made—in the curriculum in the United States in the, what I prefer to call the "total educational process" and the educational strategy of helping young people become more and more self-directive persons as well as self-directive learners, we have simply failed to do anything really drastic with our educational strategy.

I can foresee that if we really looked at this thing in this light, that in the '70's, with the tremendous new resources we have, all the new educational technology, the marvelous ways that we have of getting at information and getting—and transmitting information and even techniques and knowledge, so quickly and effectively, with all these new things coming in I think we have to develop a strategy that doesn't translate itself immediately into a certain number of contact class hours, or into a curriculum or into set snippets—or even into disciplinary divisions. Because again, if you look at the organization of the university from the standpoint of total human learning, you would have to say to yourself, "I think that there is something from the educational standpoint, there is something drastically wrong with departmental structures." Be-

cause the departmental structure is structured around a discipline, and not around an educational process. It is structured sometimes around pure professionalism, the production of a research biologist, and not around human development and human learning.

What, therefore, I'm suggesting is this: that we go back to the basic process of education, and when we reach the collegiate and university level, we reach a level of very mature, deep, development in the human being. And I repeat, this is knowing things. People can't develop totally and humanly without learning information and facts, and theories and understanding—I'm not saying that at all.

But you can understand disciplines without the total education process going on that I'm talking about.

Now, if we did this, and used this as a touchstone for the changes we're making in the university or for the present structure of the university, then I think perhaps we might gradually evolve a structure and a function and an order in the university that would be true to this basic function, and therefore would be unique. It would not be borrowed from politics and government. It would not be borrowed from ecclesiastical organizations. It would not be borrowed from any of the mundane organizations that exist in our society. It would be a unique organization, a unique structure, a unique functioning.

To restore it fundamentally, we have to restore the total self-vision of the educator, the older learner, the seeker-after-wisdom, as being the central person in the university community who is in contact with the younger members of the community in a kind of a spectrum. Because if you think of the learning process as being the important common denominator and basic business of the university, then the oldest learner who is still seeking the last bit of human wisdom is somewhere along the other side of the spectrum into which the youngest freshman has already entered. And there is a continuity, and not a polarization, and not a conflict of interests, and not hostility involved in this relationship.

And we will not have community—this is another word—people talk as though somehow you can create a structure and you've got community; or you throw people together, and "community" happens. We're not going to build community, we're not going to build human communities, we're not going to build a community of learners—until we restore the human view of the people involved in this process of learning, and until it becomes really a close, human relationship, a relationship that is described as master to pupil, as master to apprentice, as an older adult to a younger adult, a brotherly relationship—it's one of the great, unique human relationships in the world.

In India, the deepest debt that a man owed was to his master. And this has been true in many cultures, where the process of learning through human cooperation has not been obscured, and hidden, and lost in a maze of institutional organization. If we cannot restore this heart of the process that goes on in the university, the rest of our structures aren't worth anything.

Thank you very much.

SUPREME COURT TIPS ITS HAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the men presently occupying the chairs of the Supreme Court ruled against the working people of my State Monday. Apparently, the Court could not find any reasons for

its ruling. In such an important decision, affecting the lives of thousands, there was not even a written opinion.

The inference, by their silence, was that the Federal Judges approved destruction of freedom of choice in Louisiana by the fifth circuit. What they have actually accomplished is but to destroy public education.

The Supreme Court has simply ruled that only the children of wealthy and affluent parents retain freedom of choice in the school they would attend. Their parents have the means to take care of them and see to it that they receive a quality education. Knowledgeable Americans have known since 1954 that polarization of the classes as well as destruction of public education were the prime objectives of the racial agitation. The class war was sought and is now one step closer.

Affluent parents, who are the taxpayers and who have been funding our once proud public school system, cannot be expected to finance a dual school system—a superior private system and an inferior public system. Just as suburban parents in the North can no longer see the wisdom of voting for bond issues and paying taxes to support inferior public education in the cities, we will now find disillusioned southern parents rejecting judicially wrecked schools. Taxation without representation has a history of unpopularity in this country.

After 15 years the members of the U.S. Supreme Court, with some of the original judges still sitting, have now tipped their hand. Having made a political decision to destroy the Southern school system, to initiate their assault in the South, in 1954, they came up with a specious rationalization seeking to justify their ruling.

In the Brown case, pupil assignment by race according to State action or majority rule—branded by the news media as segregation—was declared repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. For 15 years, no one could assign any pupil to a public education institution because of his race. Both races, free to exercise their freedom of choice, did so. The result was, for the most part, a preferred voluntary segregation.

The Brown case has failed to destroy public education because of the perseverance of the Southern people and their desire to live together in peace. Having failed in its initial assault, the court has now unashamedly reversed its field. The same Constitution is now held to require pupil assignment based on race—with the fifth circuit court doing the assigning.

It is truly unfortunate that the men temporarily occupying the chairs of the Supreme Court would prostitute the law and betray their trust to give the color of legitimacy to tyranny. They set dangerous precedent.

But of this I am sure. Freedom is the law of the land so long as this is the United States. Tyranny such as sought to be imposed by the Supreme Court only brings the judges a step closer toward a direct confrontation with the true sovereign of this land—the American people.

Ultimately, the people—not judges—will hand down the final decision.

GRAS LIST REVIEW LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives that will provide for a review of substances on the generally regarded as safe list by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science.

This GRAS list contains an estimated 680 substances that are accepted by the Food and Drug Administration as generally safe, although many have never been tested.

In view of the widespread use of these substances, it is necessary that the safety of such food additives be proven and not merely assumed. The present Food and Drug Administration guidelines are inadequate, since they permit untested additives to be included on the so-called safe list.

Anyone wishing to market additives not on the list has to provide extensive safety studies to insure that such products are acceptable for public use. Yet additives presently listed as "safe," without conclusive proof of their safety, are not regarded as cautiously. In view of recent alarms sounded about substances on the list, ranging from MSG to modified starch, such practice should be altered.

We cannot take any risks with the public's health. The safety of food additives must be proven, and not merely assumed.

HEARINGS ON PRESCHOOL EDUCATION AND CHILD DAY-CARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee will begin public hearings next Tuesday, November 18, on preschool education and child day-care legislation.

My distinguished colleagues, Representatives PARSY MINK, Democrat of Hawaii, and OGDEN REIN, Republican of New York, both members of the subcommittee, and I are co-sponsors of the Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day Care Act of 1969—H.R. 13520—which the subcommittee will consider during hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that preschool education and child day-care services are potentially the most important area for Federal education legislation since the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

More and more authorities recognize that much of a child's mental and emotional development occurs before he reaches the age of 6.

President-elect Nixon's task force on education several months ago strongly recommended action in this area. The task force stated:

We believe that nothing happening in American education today can be regarded as

tragic the non-availability of these programs to some two-thirds of our children, including three-quarters of children from disadvantaged homes who so badly need them.

I am concerned, for example, that over 4 million working mothers lack adequate care for their preschool children while a million more mothers on welfare are daily tied to responsibilities of caring for young children under 6.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, present Federal programs in day care help fewer than 250,000 of the Nation's 24 million preschool children.

Our subcommittee plans to invite the foremost experts in the Nation on childhood education to testify on the needs, priorities and issues in this area.

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

Too often the needs of young children have been dealt with in a piece-meal rather than a comprehensive way. Childhood development programs should include physical and mental health services, nutritional and specialized social services as well as educational programs.

It seems to me that in addition to taking an overall approach to early childhood programs, we must explore the varying needs of different communities and children.

We plan therefore to hear the views of specialists advocating several approaches to early childhood education, and we shall also listen to teachers and administrators from local day-care and preschool centers who work daily with young children.

We want to hear from working mothers, as well as from those dependent on welfare, about the preschool challenge from their perspectives.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee hopes to examine firsthand some of the current efforts in preschool education across the country.

I am confident there will be strong support for early childhood legislation. A June 1969 Gallup poll indicates that 64 percent of the American people favor Federal funds for day-care centers for very young children, with only 30 percent opposed, and 6 percent of no opinion.

ISSUES IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, among the issues in preschool education which the subcommittee would consider are:

- Need for added facilities;
- Child development opportunities in day care;
- Health and social needs of the young child;
- Parent involvement; and
- Training of staff, including para-professionals.

The subcommittee will examine alternative methods of providing childhood services, such as:

- Public and private "mini" programs located in individual homes;
- Vouchers which parents may use to purchase a variety of preschool services;
- Programs developed in cooperation with private industry;
- Linked programs developed in conjunction with a followup for older children; and
- Parent-run cooperative day-care programs.

WITNESSES

Mr. Speaker, among the witnesses for the first week of hearings are:

Tuesday, November 18: Dr. Milton Akers, National Association for the Education of Young Children; and Dr. Jerome Kagan, Harvard University.

Thursday, November 20: Mrs. Leon Ginsberg, National Committee for Day Care of Children; and Dr. Sheldon White, Harvard University.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of H.R. 13520, the Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day-Care Act of 1969:

H.R. 13520

A bill to provide comprehensive preschool education programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day-Care Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs. Millions of preschool age children whose parents work have no opportunity to participate in these programs. It is the purpose of this Act to provide comprehensive preschool educational programs which will assist children of preschool age to attain their full potential. It is further the purpose of Congress in enacting this Act to enhance the ability of families affected to become or remain self-sufficient and to more fully participate in regular educational, employment, training, and other social and economic activities.

TITLE I

AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to provide grants to public and private agencies in carrying out comprehensive preschool educational and day-care programs including programs which are focused on the needs of economically disadvantaged children; (2) other early childhood programs focused on the needs of children three to five years old; (3) day-care programs to aid working mothers; and (4) combinations of such programs.

(b) Grants may be used, in accordance with applications approved for—

- (1) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of early childhood programs as described in paragraph (1) including pilot programs designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and
- (2) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs referred to in section 3(a), including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies, designed to provide a total preschool child development program for economically deprived children including but not limited to activities and services such as:

(i) comprehensive physical and mental health services for children needing such assistance in order to profit fully from their educational opportunities;

(ii) food and nutritional services, including family consultation to improve nutrition in the home environment;

(iii) specialized social services designed to improve the home environments of such children and to involve parents in the child's development;

(iv) a program of daily activities designed to develop fully each child's potential;

(v) other specially designed health, so-

cial, and educational programs for economically deprived children (including summer, weekend, and vacation programs) which meet the purposes of this title; and

(vi) direct participation in development, conduct and overall program direction by parents of the children benefited by programs assisted under this part, as well as participation in activities designed to assist parents in meeting their family responsibilities.

(3) the establishment, maintenance and operation of other early childhood programs including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies designed to provide or supplement programs for children not eligible for programs referred to in section 3(a) and section 3(b) as the Secretary shall determine by regulation to be appropriate or necessary for other children of preschool age.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 for carrying out the purposes of this Act such sums as Congress may deem necessary.

ALLOCATION TO STATES

SEC. 5 (a) From 50 per centum of the sums appropriated the Secretary shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio as the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in the State bears to the total number of such families in all the States.

(b) The number of children aged three to five, inclusive, and the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in a State, and in all the States, shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(c) From the remainder of sums appropriated he shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio as the number of children age three to five, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 6. Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this title shall:

(a) designate or create for that purpose a State agency (hereinafter referred to in this title as "State commission") the membership of which shall be broadly representative of public and private education including the State educational agency, community action agencies qualified under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (hereinafter referred to in this title as community action agencies), and public and private child welfare and health agencies in the State, except that not less than one-third of the membership of the State commission shall consist of parents appointed from time to time (not less often than annually) from nominees selected in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of parents of children in the State served under the program: *Provided*, That for the purpose of the initial designation or creation of a State commission such parent representatives may, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be chosen from nominees selected by the parents of children served under the Project Headstart program under section 222(a) (1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and parents of children enrolled in day-care programs financed under title IV of the Social Security Act.

(b) Submit to the Secretary through the State commission, in such detail as the Secretary deems necessary, a State plan which:

(1) provides that it shall be administered by or be under the direction of the State commission;

(2) provides for an allocation of funds between section 3(a) programs and other early childhood programs, provided that the allocation to section 3(a) programs shall be not less than the amount available to such programs in the year prior to approval of the State plan;

(3) with respect to both section 3(a) programs and other early childhood programs, sets forth objective standards and methods for determining the school attendance areas in the State having the highest concentration of economically deprived children, and a method for determining the highest priorities for programs among such areas;

(4) provides (i) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible programs submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part, except that exceptions to the priority system may be made in the refunding of headstart programs funded prior to July 1, 1969, under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and (ii) for approving and recommending to the Secretary, in order of such priority, applications covering such eligible programs;

(5) provides for affording to every applicant which has submitted a program to the State commission an opportunity for a hearing as to any determination of the State commission adversely affecting such applicant: *Provided*, That applicants shall have the right to seek a review from the Secretary;

(6) provides that in the case of a program to be carried out by a local educational agency, children in the area served by such program will in no case be denied the benefits of the program because of their attendance in nonpublic preschool programs or because of the intention of their parents to enroll them in nonpublic schools upon their attainment of school age;

(7) contains satisfactory assurances that the non-Federal share requirements specified in section 8(a) shall be met; and

(8) provides (i) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (ii) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his functions under this part.

(9) An application for a grant for a preschool program will be approved only if:

(1) the applicant meets the criteria prescribed;

(2) the application provides for (i) appropriate employment of nonprofessionals (including parents of children to be served), and (ii) the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers, in the program;

(3) sufficient personnel will be available in the conduct of the program covered by the application to assure attention to the needs of the individual child;

(4) no person will be denied employment in the program because of a State certification procedure specifically for early childhood programs; and

(5) the program (i) will provide opportunities for parents of children to be served to participate in activities developed under the program for parents to assist them in rearing their children and improving their home and neighborhood environments, and (ii) provides for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall direction of the program.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to expend not exceeding \$10,000,000 during each of the fiscal years of this program under this part in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part, including expenses which

he determines necessary for the preparation of such plans.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to designate a State commission as his agent for final approval of grants and payment of funds to grantees when he finds that:

(a) a State commission has operated successfully for at least two years; and

(b) the State commission possesses the competence necessary to act as such agent.

A designation may be revoked, after notice and hearing, if the Secretary finds that the State is failing to carry out the purposes of this Act.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Applications for grants under this part may be submitted by any (1) community action agency, (2) local educational agency or other public or nonprofit agency, with the approval of a community action agency, or (3) local educational agency or other public or nonprofit agency in an area where there is no community action agency. Any such application shall be made at such time or times and in such manner as may be required by or pursuant to regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary for the purpose of enabling him to make the determinations required by him under this part.

(b) The Secretary shall approve an application which:

(1) has been approved and recommended by the State commission;

(2) has been assigned, in accordance with the State plan, a priority that is higher than that of all other applications within such State (chargeable to the same allotment), which meets all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved; provided that the State may reduce the size of a requested allotment in accordance with its system of priorities;

(3) provides that the funds under this part will be administered by the applicant agency and that the agency or the State pool referred to in section 6(a) will make an appropriate non-Federal share contribution;

(4) sets forth a program for carrying out the uses and purposes as described in section 3 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(5) provides assurances that in the planning of such program there has been, and in the carrying out of such program there will be active participation of parents of economically deprived children in the areas to be served;

(6) provide satisfactory assurances that the programs will be carried out by public or nonprofit private agencies possessing the capabilities necessary to the success of the program;

(7) provides, with respect to any program carried out by a local educational agency, that adequate methods are employed to involve eligible children in the area served by such program who attend nonpublic schools, and that in no case shall economically deprived children in such area be denied the benefits of the program because of their attendance in nonpublic schools;

(8) provides assurances that State and local funding of early childhood programs shall not be reduced on account of the availability of funds under this act;

(9) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of any accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this Act; and

(10) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part and to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting the purposes of this part, and for keeping such records and affording

such access as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the verification of such reports.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

(d) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the Secretary may approve applications of eligible agencies in those States for which there is no approved State plan, providing that the application meets all the requirements of this Act except those relating to a State plan, and for any fiscal year thereafter the Secretary may in like manner approve applications in any State which has failed to designate or create a State commission, or to submit a satisfactory State plan.

(e) If, in the opinion of the Secretary, a State plan or implementation thereof fails, or will fail, to carry out the purposes of this Act because (1) State constitutional, legislative, policy, or administrative restrictions prevent full participation of qualified private agencies or organizations in the operation of programs under this Act, or (2) it does not meet the needs of eligible children without regard to race, color, sex or national origin, or (3) fails to give priority to the refunding of Headstart programs funded prior to July 1, 1969, under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which are operating in an adequate fashion, the Secretary shall withhold the allocation or a portion of the allocation provided for such State until he has assurance satisfactory to him that the State plan or implementation thereof has been corrected, and in the absence of a satisfactory plan or implementation the Secretary is authorized to make grants from such State allocation directly to eligible applicants within such State for the provision of programs.

NON-FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 8. (a) Funds granted under section 3(a) shall not exceed the proportions of costs specified in the schedule below:

(1) for programs pursuant to section 3 (A)—80 per centum;

(2) for other early childhood programs: (A) during the first two years of the operation of each program—70 per centum;

(B) during the subsequent two years of the operation of each program—60 per centum; and

(C) during succeeding years—50 per centum.

(b) The non-Federal share may be provided through public or private funds, and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities reasonably evaluated.

(c) The State commission may establish a pool arrangement whereby non-Federal contributions accruing to the benefit of any grantee and in excess of its needs may be reassigned to other grantees within the State.

(d) In programs combining children served, pursuant to section 3(a) and other children, the non-Federal share requirement shall be calculated according to the proportions of children involved from each group.

(e) Such fees as may be collected from parents for day care or other programs shall not be considered as non-Federal share.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 5 the Secretary shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this Act an amount (subject to the requirements of section 8) equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

(b) Payments under this part may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(c) The Secretary shall immediately cut

off funds to any applicant agency when he determines that such agency is not complying with the conditions for grant approval in section 7 and that compensating non-Federal funds are not available from the State pool authorized in paragraph (c) of section 8.

(d) Payments made under this part are to be considered and treated by the State commission and by each grantee as Federal funds and may be merged with other public or private funds only under joint funding agreements approved by the Secretary.

RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND TRAINING

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide for—

(a) research to improve child development programs;

(b) training programs to familiarize persons involved in child development programs with research findings and successful pilot and demonstration projects in child development;

(c) experimental, developmental, and pilot programs and projects designed to test the effectiveness of research findings in the field of child development;

(d) demonstration, evaluation, and dissemination projects in the field of child development;

(e) the development of new child development curricula; and

(f) projects for the development of new careers and occupations in the field of child development.

CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION OF FACILITIES

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance in the construction or renovation of facilities for the programs authorized by this Act when he finds that:

(1) there is a severe shortage of suitable facilities in a community; and

(2) suitable facilities cannot be rented or leased.

(b) Assistance may be provided only to public agencies or to private agencies which agree that the assisted facilities will be available for public purposes for at least ten years.

(c) Assistance may take the form, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, of grants, loans, loan guarantees, or subsidization of interest costs, provided that the total funds advanced by the Federal Government shall not exceed 25 per centum of the estimated costs of the facilities.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Programs, consisting of a chairman, and not more than fourteen members appointed without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Secretary may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 13. (a) As used in this Act—"Economically deprived children" means children of

families having an annual income (as determined by the State commission pursuant to criteria established by the Secretary) insufficient to provide a home environment conducive to learning, or who are recipients of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act.

(b) "Other early childhood programs" means programs focused on children age three to five without regard to economic status and meeting the requirements specified in section 3. Such programs may include for experimental purposes or to meet special needs not more than 15 per centum of children drawn from younger or older age groups.

(c) "Combined programs" are those which involve children eligible under both Head Start and early childhood criteria.

(d) "Programs" means part-day and full-day programs conducted in child development facilities. It includes kindergartens, nurseries and day care programs. It also includes other special arrangements under which early childhood programs may be provided.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 14. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Child Development which shall be the principal agency in that Department for programs and activities relating to child development.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 15. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 16. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under this jurisdiction which provide day care or child development services, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. In approving applications for assistance under this part, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(a) the extent to which applicants show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other child development programs in the areas which they will serve; and

(b) the extent to which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed, including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a statement by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK):

STATEMENT OF HON. PATSY T. MINK ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT HEARINGS, NOVEMBER 12, 1969

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join Congressman Brademas and the other members of the Select Subcommittee on Education in announcing hearings on pre-school education. I believe this is one of the most important proposals which will come before Congress this year.

Early childhood education and day care do not ordinarily make front-page headlines, but I believe that many of the headlines we do see can be attributed to the shortcomings in this field which have gone back for many years in our nation. The issue of early childhood education is directly related to the many social problems which afflict our society. The issue of day care is directly related to the welfare debate and the President's sweeping proposal in this regard.

All of these matters are affected by the "Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day-Care Act of 1969" which we have introduced. But let me issue a note of caution to members of the press who have the responsibility for reporting on and interpreting this proposal for the benefit of the public at large.

The bill, H.R. 13520, which I am cosponsoring with Congressman Brademas, the Chairman of the Subcommittee, and Mr. Reid of New York, is not limited to merely some groups within our society such as those in slums or disadvantaged neighborhoods. This bill is not intended as a panacea for social disorders or another measure to hand out welfare to those in need.

Rather, we have designed this legislation on a far broader and more comprehensive scope, benefiting our entire population. I firmly believe that parents all over the country can use this program, and enroll their children irrespective of whether they are working parents or not, and certainly regardless of whether they are rich or poor.

This bill introduces an entirely new concept into our educational system—extending the benefits of early childhood education, and not merely custodial care, to all pre-school children in our nation. We must be careful here to distinguish between mere babysitting, which is all too often what happens in existing day care systems, and true developmental education which is designed to help in the child's intellectual and personality growth as well as his incentive to learn. Between birth and age 4, half of all growth in human intelligence takes place; another 30% occurs between the ages of 4 and 8. We must reach our children early in life—even kindergarten is too late.

When I speak of educational opportunities for the pre-schooler, I mean the same type of opportunities as are found at other levels of education—a properly designed physical location, a group situation, an adequate program of instruction or activity, and trained personnel. I believe pre-school children have an innate curiosity about their surroundings which can be nurtured into a life pattern of initiative and learning.

Often, what is called "pre-school education" now is merely custodial care. The children are kept amused and fed, and put to bed. This is a tragic waste of time and money since during the period they are "captive" members of the group they could be exposed to learning which would help in their overall development. This is what H.R. 13520 is all about.

Our bill recognizes the existing Head Start program as the type of approach that we seek to expand and bring to all citizens. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to public and private agencies for carrying out comprehensive preschool educational and day-care programs in four areas: (1) those focused on the needs of economically disadvantaged children, which is the existing Head Start program; (2) other early childhood programs focused on the needs of children three to five years old, but not limited to those at least three; (3) day-care programs to aid working mothers; and (4) combinations of such programs.

In all cases the emphasis will be on as much developmental activity as possible. We do not specify the amount of funds authorized for this sweeping program since the extent of Federal participation will depend on the budgetary decisions made by Congress at the time of enactment. My other bill, to improve the educational services in public and private non-profit child day care centers, provides \$300 million per year for the program not including Head Start.

Grants would be made to the States through a State agency which is broadly representative of public and private education including the State educational agency with

at least one-third of the membership made up of parents. We include in H.R. 13520 \$10 million for aid to States in administering the plan.

One of the most important features of the bill is the provision of funds for research to improve child development programs, and training programs utilizing the results of research and successful pilot and demonstration projects. We also provide for experimental, developmental, and pilot programs and projects. What is envisioned is a massive Federal effort to upgrade and uplift the quality of the educational subject matter offered in these day-care and preschool centers. Priorities shall be given to centers with children in greatest need of such programs which best demonstrate that they can achieve the objectives of the act, while still leaving maximum flexibility for the development of the State plans and standards.

This to me is an exciting prospect and major challenge for our nation. I am looking forward to the opening of hearings so that we can explore the diverse viewpoints and attitudes concerning this need in all areas of our nation.

WHAT DO AMERICA'S AIRLINES REALLY SAY ABOUT THE SST?

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, nine of America's leading airlines have responded on whether or not they support America's development of a supersonic transport, and their voices are unanimous. Despite statements to the contrary, responses to the advisability of proceeding with an SST program are 100 percent in favor.

Mr. Speaker, to substantiate this statement, I include the statements of the presidents of nine U.S. airlines which were submitted to the House Transportation Subcommittee and the dates at this point in the RECORD:

AIRLINE RESPONSES—HOUSE TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE FISCAL YEAR 1970 HEARINGS

AMERICAN AIRLINES, OCTOBER 20, 1969

George A. Spater: In my judgment, the technical and development work thus far accomplished on the U.S. supersonic transport makes it desirable to fund the prototype phase. We believe prototype development and testing is required to assure adequate experience leading to eventual production of U.S. supersonic commercial aircraft and continued world leadership of the U.S. aviation industry. You may make my views available to the Congressional Committees.

BRANIFF INTERNATIONAL, OCTOBER 15, 1969

Harding L. Lawrence: Strongly urge you to give full support to SST prototype program. Engineering and development have proceeded to a point when little if any benefit can be obtained from further effort in this area. Only through the building and flight testing of prototype aircraft can we produce a safe, efficient, economic SST. Some of the delays in the program to date have been unavoidable but we have now a sound design and must get on with construction and testing of prototypes.

CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, OCTOBER 15, 1969

Robert F. Six: In response to your wire of 14 October, we offer our opinion relative to U.S. SST prototype construction. Now is the time to begin the prototype phase of the U.S. supersonic transport. I believe there is

nothing to be gained by additional paper exercises as the proposal state has been extended over a very long period. Only the construction of a flying prototype will prove the concepts and pinpoint areas needing additional engineering development. With the development of the SST as the next logical step in air transportation and the status of the Concorde and TU-144, we believe this program should move forward to maintain our country's position as the leader in air transportation.

DELTA AIR LINES, OCTOBER 15, 1969

C. H. Dolson: In response to your telegram of October 14, Delta Air Lines does believe that technical work accomplished to date indicates that it is now desirable to proceed with construction of a prototype of the U.S. supersonic aircraft. While it does not appear that the first generation of SST aircraft will be usable by Delta, whose route system is basically domestic in nature, and while we are thus not prepared to commit still additional corporate funds to the program at this time, nevertheless, we would anticipate that public demand and continued technological developments eventually will result in SST aircraft becoming operational over domestic as well as overseas routes. Further R&D efforts probably could be continued almost indefinitely, but we believe that the best interests of the United States call for our Government to now move toward overcoming the SST lead held by other countries, although at a reasonably deliberate pace and not as a crash program.

EASTERN AIRLINES, OCTOBER 16, 1969

F. D. Hall: The technical and development work on the SST has been proceeding in general accordance with the established plan. The results indicate that a successful competitive American SST can be built and placed into service late in the 1970's. While there has been little customer demand for supersonic flights just as there was little or no demand for the first jets, the competitive advantage of carriers having a foreign made SST would make it mandatory that United States airlines obtain similar equipment. If the United States is to avoid loss of leadership in air travel and the additional loss of leadership in producing and selling a major portion of airframes and engines throughout the world, it is essential that the prototype phase of the U.S. SST be undertaken now and completed as efficiently as possible. Further delay in developing the SST may involve substantial economic penalties to the U.S. airline and the airframe and engine industry.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES, OCTOBER 17, 1969

Donald W. Nyrop: In reply to your wire dated October 14, Northwest Airlines is in strong support of the budget amendment to begin construction of the prototype U.S. supersonic transport. We believe the technical and development work already accomplished points to the present time for proceeding with the prototype phase. We reiterated these views as expressed in our letter dated March 1, 1969, another copy of which is being mailed to you today.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, OCTOBER 16, 1969

N. E. Halaby: Response to your telegram of October 14 must be based on knowledge that there will always be a degree of risk in any technical development program. However, it is our judgment that such risk would not be substantially reduced by further studies and the prototype program should proceed. A considerable amount of prototype flying must be completed and evaluated before the production phase should be initiated. Further delay in the prototype phase would push production too far into the future for adequate competition with the Concorde and the TU-144. Even now it appears that the

production model of the U.S. SST will have to compete with the improved models of the Concorde and TU-144 which must be expected by then to be flying or on the order books and drawing boards. If the airlines of the world are ordering or are actually flying improved foreign/built SST's when the initial U.S. SST is offered our long time leadership as well as our balance of trade may be seriously jeopardized. You are free to make these views available to Congressional Committees.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, OCTOBER 16, 1969

F. C. Wiser: Your wire of this date solicited TWA's views on the ability of proceeding with the prototype phase of the U.S. SST program. TWA remains convinced that national interest considerations relating to the balance of payments and the competitive position of our aeronautics manufacturing industry would be best served by development and production of U.S. SST's at an early date. It is TWA's considered opinion that the U.S. supersonic transport program remains at a stage from which further progress can best be achieved by the construction and testing of experimental prototype aircraft. The prototype program should continue to be oriented toward achieving maximum design state of the art advances in structures propulsion, aerodynamics, and systems design. This program should enable production aircraft which follow to have the most operationally practical and best economic characteristics possible. We agree that definition of production aircraft should wait on prototype program experience, therefore, TWA considers that the technical and developmental work already accomplished make it desirable and timely for the continuation of the U.S. SST program in an uninterrupted and aggressive manner. The next essential step is the construction of experimental prototype aircraft. You may release this wire to interested Congressional Committees.

UNITED AIRLINES, OCTOBER 17, 1969

G. E. Keck: It is United Airlines' position that the United States continued leadership in commercial aviation requires continuation with the prototype phase of the Boeing supersonic project.

LOOKING AHEAD

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members of the House and those who read this RECORD will profit greatly by an able address entitled "Looking Ahead," made by one of my friends and associates, Arthur Courshon, as president of the National League of Insured Savings, delivered before the 26th annual meeting of the National League of Insured Savings Associations in Boston on October 13, 1969. Mr. Courshon, chairman of the board of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association, member of the Advisory Counsel to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, adviser to the United Nations on housing and to our Government on housing matters pertaining to Latin America, is one of the most knowledgeable men in the country in the savings and loan and the housing field. He deals with challenging problems which confront Congress and the country today in a very able manner. I include Mr. Courshon's outstanding address in the RECORD following these remarks:

LOOKING AHEAD

(By Arthur H. Courshon, president, National League of Insured Savings Associations, delivered to the 26th annual meeting of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, October 13, 1969, Boston, Mass.)

Fellow Members of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, I had the opportunity to address you one year ago in Hawaii upon the occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the League's existence and the beginning of my term of office as its President.

Since then our country has elected a new President from a party that has not been in control of the executive branch of our Government since 1960. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was completely changed with a new Chairman and two new members. The Board also received a new General Counsel, new Chief of Supervision—the Insurance Corporation a new General Manager. Thus we can see that a new crew mans the Ship of State nationally.

In October 1968 very few people could have foreseen that housing starts projected to the end of 1969 would in all probability be the lowest in the country's history since the end of World War II; that interest rates would be at the highest level of the country's experience in the past 100 years; that inflation would be creating havoc with our nation to the extent that money was actually in such scarce supply as to be unobtainable in certain markets at any cost.

I doubt that any saving and loan manager would have predicted that Congress would seriously be considering doubling the taxes of the savings and loan business at a time of extreme tight money and at a time when the need for housing was never greater. Yet all of this is the reality today.

We appear to be closing the decade of the 1960's having demonstrated to the world our ability to put a man on the moon but equally demonstrating our inability to properly house our citizens, insure their domestic tranquility, provide for their civil rights, and live at peace with our fellow man on this globe.

Having just about completed the privilege of serving you as President of this association, I would like to lift the veil covering the doorway to the decade of the '70's.

Our business, if it is to survive at all, must serve America more than it ever has before.

It must lead the way towards providing our country with the housing that it sorely needs for all of its citizens.

It must do a better job in seeing that the disadvantaged of our people are decently housed in order that they will feel that they live within our society rather than upon its fringes.

While we must devise means to financially survive during times of great competition from our competitors in the financial field, we nevertheless must remain basically long-term housing lenders.

Without maintaining this basic purpose, there is no real need for our existence.

The new members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board have thus far taken meaningful steps towards making the bank system more useful by providing credit to our business when it is at a disadvantage competing for funds. What can we, as an industry, do as we enter the decade of the '70's to insure that America will be better housed?

I suggest that we ask ourselves first whether or not we have done a proper job in insuring that the Congress of the United States really understands our function.

I submit that the Congress cannot possibly understand the savings and loan business and its function if it suggests, as it does, doubling the taxes of the industry at

a time when the industry is at a great competitive disadvantage in the money market.

I suggest that we have failed in properly acquainting the Congress of the United States with the special needs of our business, including our reserve requirements because of the nature of the loans we make.

I suggest we have failed to impress upon the Congress that higher taxes on our industry will increase the cost of housing and decrease the funds available for housing.

We need, therefore, to do a better job of educating the Congress as to the structure and function of the savings and loan business in America today.

We, as an industry, can stop talking about helping the disadvantaged and should in the '70's start building for the disadvantaged.

We can do this in a multitude of ways:

(1) By financing those builders who will take advantage of the Government's federally insured low cost housing or rent subsidy programs; (2) We can press for and receive, if we are diligent, added powers to insure that our industry can itself build such housing in those areas where private industry refuses to avail itself of the funds we are willing to lend it; (3) We can devise, by the issuance of our own debentures, within the limits of our present borrowing authority, more imaginative and competitive inducements to obtain money from the market for our institutions.

As we enter the '70's, it is my belief that we should reexamine the legal structure of the business itself. There are many who feel that the savings and loan industry would be further advanced if its regulatory body, whose primary function is to promote thrift and home ownership, were separated from the responsibilities of acting as insurance underwriter as well.

There are some who maintain that the Federal Home Loan Bank System would be a better credit mechanism serving the industry if it were not also indirectly burdened with the additional duties of supervision.

There are those who ask how it is realistically possible for the board of directors of a home loan bank to make the bank president responsive to their credit needs when he is also their individual institution's supervisory agent with tremendous powers affecting their personal careers.

The national banking system as it is structured, is serviced by an Insurance Corporation that is independent from its supervisor and has the resources of its central banking system, which central banking system is also not its supervisor.

The decade of the '70's should see a great debate concerning the structure of financial intermediaries. There are those that predict that in the end there will only be one type of financial intermediary which will perform the dual function of a bank and a savings and loan association, and likewise that there should only be one central supervisory department for this financial intermediary and one central reserve bank.

I suggest that competition must be maintained between financial intermediaries.

I suggest that the country needs banks whose main lending function should be to take care of the short-term credit needs of the country, and savings and loan associations whose main lending function should be to take care of the long-term housing credit needs of the country.

If 1969 has taught us anything, it has revealed that banks, at the time of a credit crunch, abandon long-term lending, as they should.

Savings and loan associations, on the other hand, structured primarily for long-term lending, continue to function lending on a long-term basis subject only to the limitation of the availability of funds.

In conclusion, it is my hope that as always the National League will face the '70's optimistically, dedicated to using its resourceful-

ness towards better housing America by continuing to realistically encourage thrift and actually creating housing for all of its citizens.

AN AMERICAN SST BUILT BY AMERICANS

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, before the successful supersonic flights of the French-British SST and the news that the Soviet Union is proceeding to develop their TU-144, a task force report of non-top-rank U.S. agency officials set forth some negative opinions as to the present urgency of the United States pushing its prototype SST program.

Now, of course, that report is obsolete and has no significance.

The facts are that all Americans who travel across the oceans a few years hence are going to fly at supersonic speeds.

The only issue is will they fly in a foreign-built SST or in an American-built SST. The question is do we want America to retain her supremacy in the air transport manufacturing field because if Congress decides not to continue support of the development of a prototype supersonic civilian plane, then all Americans are going to travel across the oceans in foreign-built SST's. They are going to do this in a few years if they travel at all, because no American airline or foreign airline will be able to compete unless they operate SST's.

Further, the issue for Members of Congress to decide is whether they support a policy which would contribute to the economy of Russia and the economy of Britain and France by turning down the U.S. SST program; or, rather, if they want to provide for many thousands of jobs in America for Americans in practically every State by supporting the program. This is the decision that is to be made with the vote on the supersonic transport.

If those who oppose the \$95.9 million asked by President Nixon think it is not important to build American industry and labor, of course that is their privilege. But, I hope my colleagues will bear in mind that certain Aeroflot officials in Russia recently announced that the Soviet TU-144 will be flying the commercial air routes of the world in 1973. That, Mr. Speaker, is just a little over 3 years from now.

And, in addition, Pan American World Airways says her 707's will not be able to compete with the TU-144, so Pan Am may be forced, because of the commercial competition to buy foreign-built SST's.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, there is only one choice. I want to continue the only advanced aeronautical program now going on in the United States. I want to support the SST because it will provide direct employment for a minimum of 50,000 skilled and unskilled American workers. I want to support these jobs also because they will be located throughout our land; located in most Members' States.

The policy set forth by the Congress years ago was to support and support financially if needed, fast, frequent, and low-cost air transportation.

Let us not discard that policy. Let us continue work on the SST and keep America in her hard-earned position as the world leader in the production of aircraft.

LEAD POISONING—THE SILENT EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN, Mr. Speaker, this morning over 100 people—Members of Congress, congressional staff members, representatives of Federal, State, and local government, health professionals, social workers, spokesmen for community and citizens' groups, and industry representatives—attended an informational breakfast on the problem of lead poisoning in children.

The breakfast, which took place in the Rayburn House Office Building, was conducted by the New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information, a nonprofit organization which has as its purpose providing the necessary information to citizens so that they may have a better understanding of the scientific aspects of public policy issues.

I sponsored the breakfast, which was cosponsored by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and 20 Members of the House.

The problem of lead poisoning in young children, caused by the ingestion of peeling paint and plaster, is one of the most extensive public health disasters in our country.

However, most of the children suffering from this totally preventable disease are undiagnosed and untreated. For this reason, the disease has rightfully been called the "silent epidemic."

The purpose of this morning's breakfast was to better inform Members of Congress about this problem: its causes, its effects, and its cures.

The panelists for the program were Dr. J. Julian Chisolm, Dr. Edmund O. Rothschild, and Dr. Joel Buxbaum. Glenn Paulson, cochairman of the Scientists' Committee for Public Information, served as moderator.

Dr. Chisolm, associate professor of pediatrics at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, discussed clinical observation and consequences of acute lead poisoning in children.

In the acute stage of lead poisoning, a child may die. If not, he will suffer permanent brain damage—mental retardation, epilepsy, or cerebral palsy.

Lack of environmental treatment permits a child, after he has been cured, to contract lead poisoning a second time. Oftentimes, this increases chances for permanent damage to the child's nervous system.

Dr. Chisolm also discussed treatment techniques. He stressed that, although it requires several days of hospitalization, the treatment for lead poisoning is highly effective. However, if the child is allowed

to return to the poisonous environment, the treatment is frustrated.

Dr. Chisolm said that it costs \$220,000 to put a severely retarded child in an institution. It costs over \$17,000 for a retarded child who needs special schooling. Hospitalization and treatment costs \$100 a day, and the child must be kept in the hospital for several days.

Dr. Chisolm compared this expense to the cost in the city of Baltimore of covering interior surfaces which have lead-based paint—\$250 to \$500. This initial cost would insure that the unit was protected for many years.

Dr. Edmund O. Rothschild of the Sloan Kettering Institute discussed the epidemiology of lead poisoning.

This is a disease which principally affects 1- to 5-year-olds in the ghettos. But it also is found in rural areas. There is no difference in incidence between boys and girls. Studies in several cities have shown that between 5 to 10 percent of the children between ages 1 and 6 have lead poisoning in urban areas with dilapidated housing.

Dr. Rothschild said that the Scientists' Committee for Public Information has made an estimate on the total incidence of lead poisoning based on housing and population data.

In New York, for example, it is estimated that between 9,000 to 18,000 children are lead poisoned. The New York City Health Department has estimated that this number is between 30,000 to 35,000.

The Scientists' Committee for Public Information conservatively estimates that between 225,000 to 400,000 children, in the Nation as a whole, are suffering from this disease.

There is no known study of incidence in rural areas.

Dr. Rothschild said that only the city of Chicago has an extensive screening program.

Dr. Joel Buxbaum, of the Albert Einstein School of Medicine, discussed the environmental aspects of lead poisoning.

There are many potential techniques for treatment of the environment in order to prevent lead poisoning, which Dr. Buxbaum feels must be tested. The National Academy of Sciences has listed such techniques in a report on the lead poisoning problem.

Dr. Buxbaum said that lead poisoning is a social disease; a disease which has been inflicted on defenseless members of society and which is totally preventable.

Mr. Paulson, cochairman of the scientists' committee and researcher in the department of biomedicine at Rockefeller University, raised another medical question. Children who have an increased lead level in their system, but not a high enough level to cause brain damage, retardation, or cerebral palsy, may be suffering other impairments such as IQ loss. Instead of a loss of 20 to 40 IQ points, which is suffered by acutely poisoned children, they may lose 5 to 15 IQ points.

The result is that 25 percent or more of each first grade class may be showing inability to perform not because of their cultural background but because of lead poisoning.

I have expressed my concern about the problem of lead poisoning many times in the past. I have introduced three bills, which have been reintroduced to include 19 of my colleagues as cosponsors: Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WOLFF.

These three bills—H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699—are aimed at attacking the problem of lead poisoning. They would aid identification and treatment of children afflicted with lead poisoning, detection of the presence of lead-based paints and require that local governments have an effective program for detecting and eliminating lead-based paint as a prerequisite to receiving Federal funds for housing code enforcement or rehabilitation.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, at the breakfast this morning, announced his intention to introduce similar bills in the Senate. Senator KENNEDY also expressed his intention to explore the possibility of administrative action through existing law. He said that environmental diseases must be given the same attention and concern as has been given to communicable disease.

I include at this point in the RECORD some of the materials which were included in the informational packet which was given to all those attending the breakfast: a synopsis of my lead poisoning legislation, the report of the National Conference on Lead Poisoning in Children held in March of 1969, several articles on lead from the April 1968 issue of Environment magazine, the findings of the Buildings Research Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences on the lead poisoning problem, an article from the July 1969 issue of Health News by Dr. Herbert Roffman and Dr. Laurence Finberg, and a September 18 article by Jack Newfield of the Village Voice.

I urge my colleagues to review this material, and to support efforts to combat this silent epidemic which needlessly kills and cripples American children.

The material referred to above, follows:

PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO COMBAT LEAD POISONING

Congressman William F. Ryan with 19 cosponsors has introduced three bills designed to alleviate, and hopefully, terminate lead poisoning in children:

H.R. 9191 (H.R. 13256 and 14736 with cosponsors).

This bill establishes a fund in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from which the Secretary could make grants to local governments to develop programs to identify and treat individuals afflicted by lead poisoning.

H.R. 9192 (H.R. 13254 and 14735 with cosponsors).

This bill is directed at the problem of slum housing itself, and the need to eliminate the causes of lead poisoning. It authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local governments to develop programs designed to detect the presence of lead-based paints and

to require that owners and landlords remove it from interior walls and surfaces.

H.R. 11699 (H.R. 13255 and 14734 with cosponsors).

This bill is a potentially effective tool to combat the spread of this disease. It would require that a local government submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning as a condition of receiving any federal funds for housing code enforcement or rehabilitation. It also requires that the plans be enforced.

Those cosponsoring this legislation with Congressman Ryan are: Mr. Brasco, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Button, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Horton, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Koch, Mr. Mikva, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Podell, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Scheuer, and Mr. Wolff.

CONFERENCE ON LEAD POISONING IN CHILDREN¹

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Lead poisoning is a major epidemic in most cities, particularly New York City. As many as 30,000 New York children between 18 months and six years are being poisoned. Among the survivors, brain damage occurs in at least 25% of the cases. Elimination of the hazard involves social, economic, legal and technological problems. But in the summarizing remarks of Conference Chairman, Rene Dubos:

"The problem is so well-defined, so neatly-packaged, with both causes and cures known, that if we don't eliminate this social crime, our society deserves all the disasters that have been forecast for it."

SPECIFIC PROBLEM AND ACTION-AREAS

1. Most lead-loaded houses will be used for many more years, probably a generation, and with thousands of children being raised in them now and in the future, these houses must be de-leaded, or the paint surfaces made unavailable to children. Replacing them with new housing which the conference recommended, will be very slow and gradual. In the interim protective measures must be instituted quickly.

2. De-leading a house or making the lead unavailable is not technically difficult, but improved methods of removal or covering must be sought. Manufacturers, trades unions, and technological groups must be brought into the crusade, and demonstration projects set up. Counsel and research was offered by the Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association (Daniel S. Ring at 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005) and the Buildings Research Advisory Board of the National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. (Robert M. Dillon, Executive Director.)

3. The development through private and public research of tough, self-adhering plastic films for covering walls, ceilings, sills and wainscoting might serve as temporary safeguards in some situations. Community and youth groups might be trained to apply the film or use other remedies in houses deemed dangerous. Cost in New York might be shared by landlord, City Housing and Development Administration and State Urban Development Corporation.

¹ Held March 25-26, 1969 at Rockefeller University, New York, under the sponsorship of The Health Research Council of the City of New York, The Department of Health of the City of New York, The Public Health Association of New York City, The New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information, Inc., and The Scientists' Institute for Public Information.

4. All housing 30 or more years old contains lead-bearing paint. The Health Department was urged to identify dangerous housing and publicly designate them as such. Mothers should be warned; bi-lingual posters might be placed on dangerous premises. Since dangerous amounts of flaking paint constitute a health hazard, the Health Department should force correction of the hazard, whether by removal, replastering, coverings, or by issuing "Emergency Vacate" orders.

5. Greater awareness of lead poisoning must be fostered among physicians, nurses and social workers. Public education must be stepped up, by personal warnings through health and social service, through posters, radio, TV, and other media.

6. Screening of children for abnormal increased lead exposure is deemed an immediate must. In the long-range view, blood lead determination must provide the basis of any screening program in children. Pending this, the urinary ALA test provides the best available screening technique. With minor technological improvements, currently available procedures can be made more reliable. It is suggested that for screening purposes, the value of 0.5 mgm % be taken as the upper limit of normal. Cost of large-scale screening programs in New York City was put at \$2 million and funds for ALA screening have not yet been allocated. The use of store-front stations and mobile units was suggested. Confirmation of ALA tests by lead level determination is the function of the Health Department's Laboratory, but shortages of funds for personnel equipment and facilities are a problem here.

7. Legal remedies suggested included: 1) Use of Article 78 proceedings to compel Health Department to enforce sanitary code, 2) Use of the so-called "rent strike" by one-third of the tenants of a building which would escrow rents until the paint hazard is abated, 3) Issuance by the Health Department of Emergency Vacate orders when dangerous paint conditions exist and where a child has been found to have elevated lead levels, 4) Court orders to permit rent withholding until danger is abated, 5) Revision of Health Code to mandate correction of the hazard, 6) Application for Federal funds for both screening and abatement.

8. At a final meeting, Thursday, March 27, by an ad hoc "Continuing Committees on Lead Poisoning" the following sub-committees were named to carry on efforts in various areas of action:

TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairman: Dr. Edmund Rothschild; Dr. Julian Chisolm, Dr. Bernard Davidow, Dr. Felicia Oliver-Smith.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Acting Chairman: Mr. Franklin E. Brill; Dr. Donald Dickson, Dr. Lawrence Finberg, Dr. Desmond Callan, Mr. Robert Light, Miss Loretta Fargo, Mrs. Clara Schiffer.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairman: Dr. Jonathan Lanman; Mr. Frederick S. Kent, Mr. Robert M. Dillon, Mr. Daniel S. Ring.

GOVERNMENT-COMMUNITY LIAISON SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr. Glenn L. Paulson; Dr. Donald Dickson, Dr. Joel Buxbaum.

CONTINUING EFFORT

It should be stressed that the two-day Conference was designed primarily to explore the problems involved; their solution in the months ahead will be the task of the sponsors of the conference and the sub-committees named above. For further information:

Scientists' Committee for Public Information, 30 East 68th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021, (212) AG-9-2886.

[From Environment magazine, April 1968]

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

(By David Elwyn)

In the last decade, 138 children have died of lead poisoning in Chicago; from 1954 through 1964 128 New York children were victims of this disease (see Table I). These are relatively small numbers when compared with those who died in the same period from bacterial or viral diseases, but they assume added significance when it is realized that lead poisoning, unlike the others, is virtually unknown in a natural environment. Lead poisoning is as much a product of modern society as auto accidents, but it can be prevented much more easily. Yet it continues, even today, to threaten thousands of children in cities across the nation.

Lead poisoning is a hangover from the recent past, and a deadly one. Lead is one of the oldest known minerals; it has been used in industry for hundreds of years, and its effects on the human body are not new to the medical profession or to the general public. The sources of lead contamination in the environment are well known, and the means to control them are readily available. In view of this widespread awareness, and in the absence of any pressing social necessity for risking the effects of lead poisoning, how can such a hazard continue to exist? Why do children die from a disease which can be eradicated now with the means at hand? The answers are disturbingly simple.

Lead poisoning is a man-made disease. Lead in assimilable form may be almost entirely absent from a "natural" environment. The use of lead and its derivatives was introduced early by civilized man, and with lead came lead poisoning. Today there is lead in our food, in our drinking water, and in the air we breathe. The body of an average adult in the U.S. contains about 200 milligrams of lead, as compared to a "natural" body content of about two milligrams.¹ The extent of biological damage from this "normal" lead exposure will be, for some time to come, difficult to assess. But beyond this "normal" exposure is the problem of high level chronic or acute exposure to lead: lead poisoning, a disease which has been widely studied and reasonably well defined. The two groups mainly affected by lead poisoning are workers in lead-using industries and small children; it is the latter who are the concern of this article.²⁻⁵

Childhood lead poisoning is almost entirely restricted to slum neighborhoods, where lead poisoning afflicts about one of every fifteen children between the ages of one and five. Most display no symptoms, but about three per cent of those afflicted develop the physical symptoms that indicate acute lead poisoning.

Besides being a major cause of death among young children, lead poisoning causes permanent injury to many survivors. A recent study⁶ of 425 Chicago children suffering from lead poisoning reports that thirty-nine per cent had neurological injury, mental retardation, and epileptic seizures. Cerebral palsy and optic atrophy were less frequent results.

The main cause of the disease is the eating of lead-bearing non-food objects by children. The main source of ingested lead is old paint peeling from walls and ceilings in slum dwellings. Until twenty years ago, most interior paints contained lead pigments, but these have now been replaced by titanium pigments. Walls and ceilings in good repair, even though containing lead, are not an important source of ingested lead.

For hundreds of years, men put lead into paint and paint into buildings, with no inkling of the hazard they created for themselves and for future generations. We know now of

Footnotes at end of article.

the effects of lead poisoning—retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, death—and we know now the cause: lead in paint flaking and peeling from deteriorated surfaces.

The victims of lead poisoning are the children of slums where paint, plaster and putty falling from walls, ceilings and window sills are available to those children who like to eat them. (Pica, as the eating of non-food objects is called, occurs in about twenty per cent of all children between the ages of one and five; it is prevalent in all economic classes. Pica is possibly related to emotional disorders, but is not related to physical hunger.)

Once inside the body, the lead borne by paint and plaster begins a deadly cycle that culminates, in severe cases, in organic and nervous tissue damage such as that demonstrated in the Chicago study cited above.

EFFECTS OF LEAD ON THE HUMAN BODY

When lead is absorbed by the body, it is distributed in soluble form throughout the soft tissues. It is subsequently precipitated in an insoluble form in the bones. It may be several months after he stops taking in lead before the precipitation is completed in a child's body.

The toxic effects of lead occur while it is in the soluble form, and the extent of damage is a function of the concentration of lead in the soft tissues and the length of time high concentrations remain. The relative concentration of lead in the soft tissues can be determined approximately by measuring the concentration of lead in the blood.

Concentrations of six parts per ten million or higher in the blood are considered abnormal and suggestive of lead poisoning.^{7,8} In its insoluble form in the bones, lead is presumed to be inert. However, under certain conditions, such as increased acidity, or during treatment for lead poisoning, the body can reverse the precipitation process, and release deposited bone lead into the blood stream. Bone lead is therefore a potential source of increased soluble lead. In children, the mobilization of bone lead is unpredictable and may cause severe lead poisoning even when lead is no longer being ingested.

While it is probable that lead has a damaging effect on all tissues, the effects on blood, kidneys, gastrointestinal tract and nervous system are most apparent.

The effects on blood are mainly related to interference with production of the hemoglobin of red blood cells, which is responsible for transport of oxygen to the tissue cells. Disorders include anemia, a stippled appearance of the red blood cells, and the excess production and excretion in the urine of coproporphyrin, a side product of hemoglobin production. One of the most sensitive and widely used tests for lead poisoning is the determination of the amount of coproporphyrin in the urine.¹⁰

Kidney damage may take the form of increased excretion of sugar or amino acids, or decreased urine output. An Australian report¹¹ indicates that childhood lead poisoning may result in severe chronic nephritis, a disease which can cause hypertension, kidney failure and death.

Vomiting, constipation, and stomach cramps are usually early symptoms of lead poisoning.

Nervous system disorders include behavioral problems, convulsions, and coma due to massive swelling of the brain. These may develop slowly or rapidly, and if not caught in time may lead to permanent mental retardation, seizures, cerebral palsy, and death.

DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT

Any or all of these symptoms may be absent in lead poisoning. Furthermore, all can be simulated by other diseases or conditions. Diagnosis of lead poisoning, therefore, is made only when the physician is looking for

it. As a result, the reported incidence of lead poisoning parallels public interest and education on the subject, and official figures on lead poisoning almost certainly underestimate the true incidence of the disease.

Lead poisoning may be divided into two overlapping categories, symptomatic and asymptomatic.

Symptomatic lead poisoning is normally diagnosed when the child is brought to the physician evidently ill with gastrointestinal or nervous system disorders. Lead poisoning may be suspected and can be confirmed by laboratory tests. These include microscopic examination of red blood cells, determination of coproporphyrin in the urine, blood and urinary lead determinations, X-ray of the abdomen for radio-opaque objects (paint and plaster), and X-ray of the long bones for evidence of lead deposition in the bones.

Asymptomatic lead poisoning is diagnosed from laboratory findings in the absence of other observed symptoms of lead poisoning. Usually two or more positive tests are considered necessary to confirm a diagnosis.

The most important treatment of lead poisoning is to administer a drug, edathamil, which forms a complex with lead and greatly increases its rate of excretion. One of the most sensitive measurements of the extent of lead poisoning is the urinary lead output on the first day after treatment with edathamil.

Extreme care is necessary with this treatment, however, for oral administration of edathamil also increases the rate of absorption of lead from the gastrointestinal tract; if lead-containing objects are present, it may kill the patient. All lead-containing objects must therefore be removed from the gastrointestinal tract before treatment, and the child must be completely removed from the lead-contaminated environment thereafter. Edathamil may also mobilize lead from the bones, thus increasing the concentration in soft tissues; this is a particular hazard in acute, severe cases.

COMBATING LEAD POISONING IN THE COMMUNITY

The reported incidence of symptomatic lead poisoning in New York and Chicago is shown in Table I. The figures show a steady rise in reported lead poisonings and a decrease in the case fatality rate. There is no reason to believe that the actual incidence of lead poisoning has increased since the 1950's and therefore the rise in reported cases reflects a growing awareness on the part of the medical community. The decrease in case fatality rates indicates that more cases are being discovered in the early stages. There is as yet no way of estimating how many cases are not properly diagnosed. It is possible that, despite growing awareness, the true incidence of lead poisoning is two or three times that reported.

At least two studies have been made of the occurrence of asymptomatic lead poisoning, one in Chicago,^{12,13} and one in Cleveland.¹⁴ The conduct and results of both studies show many similarities. Total sample groups ranged in number from 900 to 1500, and included persons from poor areas with dilapidated housing as well as from control areas where housing was new or in good condition. Urine samples were collected from children age one through five and tested for abnormal coproporphyrin or lead levels, or for both. Children with abnormal urines were given further laboratory tests to definitely establish the presence or absence of lead poisoning.

Incidence of asymptomatic lead poisoning (about seven per cent of those tested) is about twenty-five times that of symptomatic lead poisoning (about 0.3 per cent of those tested). On the basis of these studies, then, approximately 2,500 children in Chicago and 50,000 children throughout the country are victims of asymptomatic lead poisoning. It

is clear that these projections, based as they are on a very small sample, are quite inaccurate. They do, however, give a valid indication of the magnitude of the problem.

Current practice in treatment of lead poisoning usually requires hospitalization of the child for five days or more. The problems this raises in terms of the cost of adequate treatment are obvious. Hospitalization of an additional 2500 children for five days each summer in Chicago would require 200 additional hospital beds, and an estimated additional \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 per year for patient care alone.

Outpatient therapy for asymptomatic lead poisoning is currently being tried by a number of institutions. Intra-muscular injection of edathamil has proved safer than oral administration. Other drugs, such as penicillamine are being tried out. Although still at an experimental stage, carefully controlled outpatient therapy, combined with elimination of lead from the environment, probably holds the most promise for wide scale treatment.

Uncertainty as to the dangers associated with asymptomatic lead poisoning add to the difficulties of treatment. There have been no adequate studies made of the extent of associated organic damage. Such studies would take several years to perform, and action based on their results would be too late for many. One can presume that in many cases there has already been severe damage, since the subjects may have had symptoms in the past, including mental retardation, without a diagnosis of symptomatic lead poisoning. Almost certainly, future cases of diagnosed symptomatic lead poisoning will come largely from this group, since both the districts of high incidence and the underlying causes (pica associated with peeling paint) are the same for both categories of the disease. Until it is proven to the contrary, the only safe assumption is that all cases of asymptomatic lead poisoning are associated with continuing organic damage.

EDUCATIONAL AND CASE-FINDING PROGRAMS

Educational programs have been aimed both at the medical community and at the general population. With the former they have had a good deal of success. In many areas, pediatricians have a considerable awareness of lead poisoning, with the result that symptomatic lead poisoning is now diagnosed earlier and more frequently, and treated sooner, than was the case ten years ago. Educational programs directed to the public also have undoubtedly contributed to a greater awareness of lead poisoning, and since they have emphasized the role of pica and peeling paint, serve to some extent as a preventive measure with regard to both symptomatic and asymptomatic lead poisoning.

A second type of approach consists of case-finding, or locating asymptomatic subjects before they present themselves to the physician. The two epidemiological studies cited above are such studies, but on a very limited scale.

The New York City Department of Public Health has carried on an active case-finding program since 1955.⁹ Its child health stations follow over 200,000 children from birth to school entrance. Their most useful tools for locating asymptomatic lead poisoning have been blood lead determinations and histories of pica. In addition to case-finding, according to Jacobziner,⁹ they have followed up all lead poisoning cases with examination of the buildings where victims lived and have enforced repainting and replastering of apartments.

A direct result of this program, as shown in Table I and Figure 1 [Figure 1 is a graph and is not printed in the Record], is a marked increase in the number of reported cases and a marked decrease, particularly since 1960, in the case fatality rate.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—INCIDENCE OF LEAD POISONING IN CHILDREN IN NEW YORK AND CHICAGO

Year	Chicago ¹			New York ²		
	All accidental poisonings		Lead poisonings	Lead poisonings		Case fatality rate
	Total cases	Deaths	Case fatality rate ³	Total cases	Deaths	Case fatality rate
1954				80	12	15.0
1955				115	18	15.7
1956				99	9	9.1
1957	975	10	1.0	85	9	10.6
1958	2,397	8	.3	116	21	18.1
1959	3,156	20	.6	171	12	7.0
1960	3,254	32	1.0	146	18	12.3
1961	3,443	25	.7	181	6	3.3
1962	3,827	21	.5	198	9	4.5
1963	4,552	30	.7	338	7	2.1
1964	4,635	13	.3	509	7	1.4
1965	5,359	29	.5			
1966 ⁴				304	45	14.6
Total through 1965	31,598	188	.6	1,311	138	10.5
				2,038	128	6.3

¹ Figures for Chicago were obtained through the kind courtesy of Dr. William Fishbein and Dr. Herbert Slutsky of the Chicago Board of Health.

² Figures from New York taken from Jacobziner.

³ Deaths per 100 cases.

⁴ Estimated figures through November 1966.

By contrast, Chicago had not until 1966 conducted a case-finding program. Reported cases of lead poisoning had risen more slowly and the case fatality rate had decreased more slowly than in New York. In 1966, however, the Chicago Board of Health launched a major case-finding program. Over 40,000 children were tested for urinary coproporphyrin or blood lead, according to Drs. William Fishbein and Herbert Slutsky of the Board of Health. The figures for lead poisoning in 1966, though still preliminary, indicate a marked rise in cases reported and a sharp decrease in case fatality rate, consistent with the New York experience. There has also been a decline in the severity of symptoms associated with lead poisoning, according to Dr. Joseph Greengard, Chief of Pediatrics at Cook County Hospital.

The results of these programs show that active case-finding can significantly reduce death, mental retardation, and neurological disorders arising from lead poisoning. A well-informed public can take an active role in programs to reduce or eliminate lead poisoning. The effectiveness of such action by private citizens was illustrated by recent events in Chicago.

In the summer of 1965 as a result of several cases of lead poisoning, the Citizens' Committee to End Lead Poisoning was organized in the East Garfield Park district of Chicago. With the assistance of Project House of the American Friends Service Committee, they organized an educational and case-finding campaign described in the account by Ann Simon in this issue. The Board of Health and later the Medical Committee for Human Rights assisted with urinary coproporphyrin and lead testing. High school students were trained to collect urine samples and to perform lead tests on these samples. Several hundred urine samples were collected and more than twenty cases of lead poisoning were identified. Considerable publicity attended these efforts, and other community groups in the city instituted similar programs. Most important, these events led to the decision of the Chicago Board of Health to undertake the massive case-finding program described above, which has been accompanied by a reduction of seventy per cent in deaths from lead poisoning.

Whether lead poisoning will flourish much longer is a question that has yet to be answered, and the efforts of the medical profession alone have not been enough; they can deal only with the effects. Educational and case-finding programs are also inadequate to cope with the basic cause of childhood lead poisoning, which will continue as long as we permit peeling paint and plaster in slum dwellings. For the most part, city

building codes are adequate, if enforced, to eliminate peeling paint and plaster. However, such enforcement transcends the authority of Boards of Health and requires the active cooperation of other departments of city government.

The cost of lead poisoning is borne by the whole community in terms of wasted human resources, institutionalization of victims, and the resulting burdens on municipal health facilities and finances. The benefits accrue only to those owners of slum property who find it unprofitable to keep their properties in good repair.

Despite increasing attention, childhood lead poisoning remains a major public health problem. Although there are large gaps in our knowledge of the disease, enough is known to eliminate it. All that remains to be accomplished is the effective social utilization of this knowledge.

(NOTE.—David Elwyn, Ph.D., is Associate Director of Surgical Research at the Hektoen Institute for Medical Research, Cook County Hospital, Chicago. He is a biochemist whose research interests are the movement of amino acids between organs in the intact mammal and the metabolism of shock and trauma. Dr. Elwyn was a founder of the Chicago Science Information Speaker's Bureau in 1962.)

FOOTNOTES

¹ Patterson, Clair C. "Contaminated and Natural Lead Environments of Man," *Arch. Environ. Health*, 11:344, 1955.

² Byers, R. K. "Lead Poisoning—Review of the Literature and Report on 45 Cases," *Pediatrics*, 23:585, 1959.

³ Chisolm, J. J. "Pediatric Aspects of the Porphyrins, and disturbances in the Biosynthesis of Heme in Lead Intoxication," *J. Pediatrics*, 64:159, 175, 184.

⁴ Smith, H. D. "Pediatric Lead Poisoning," *Arch. Environ. Health* (Chicago), 8:256, 1964.

⁵ Greengard, J. "Lead Poisoning in Childhood: Signs, Symptoms, Current Therapy, Clinical Expressions," *Clin. Ped.*, 5:269, 1966.

⁶ Jacobziner, H. "Lead Poisoning in Childhood: Epidemiology, Manifestations and Prevention," *Clin. Ped.*, 5:277, 1966.

⁷ Berman, E. "The Biochemistry of Lead: Review of Body Distribution and Methods of Lead Determination," *Clin. Ped.*, 5:287, 1966.

⁸ Perlstein, M. A. and R. Attala. "Neurologic Sequelae of Plumbism in Children," *Clin. Ped.*, 5:293, 1966.

⁹ Chisolm, J. J. and H. E. Harrison. "Treatment of Acute Lead Encephalopathy in Children," *Pediatrics*, 19:2, 1957.

¹⁰ Benson, P. F. and J. J. Chisolm. "A Reliable Qualitative Urine Coproporphyrin Test for Lead Intoxication in Young Children," *J. Pediatrics*, 56-759, 1960.

¹¹ Henderson, D. A. "A Followup of Cures of Plumbism in Children," *Australian Ann. Med.*, 3:219, 1954.

¹² Christian, J. R., B. S. Celewycz, and S. L. Andelman. "A Three-Year Study of Lead Poisoning in Chicago, Part I: Epidemiology," *Am. J. Pub. Health*, 54:1241, 1964.

¹³ Christian, J. R., B. S. Celewycz, and S. L. Andelman. "A Three-Year Study of Lead Poisoning in Chicago, Part II: Case Finding in Asymptomatic Children Using Urinary Coproporphyrin as a Screening Test," *Am. J. Pub. Health*, 54:1245, 1964.

¹⁴ Griggs, R. C., I. Sunshine, V. A. Newill, B. W. Newton, S. Buchanan, and C. A. Rasch. "Environmental Factors in Childhood Lead Poisoning," *J.A.M.A.*, 187:703, 1964.

¹⁵ Moncrieff, A. A., O. P. Koumides, B. E. Clayton, A. D. Patrick, A. G. C. Renwich, and G. E. Roberts. "Lead Poisoning in Children," *Arch. Dis. Childh.*, 39:1, 1964.

CITIZENS VS. LEAD IN THREE COMMUNITIES

How common a problem is lead poisoning? Is it much of an issue in the United States? The answer seems to be, it depends on how hard you look. I must say very frankly that if you live in an American city with a slum population—and there are kids living there—and you don't have many cases of lead poisoning—then your health department isn't doing its job.

I make this statement because the communities that have looked at this problem—Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, and my own community of Rochester—have all found the same thing. If you look carefully into the slums of your own community—look where the paint is peeling—and if you test the kids between one and five for lead, you will find that something like five per cent of them are poisoned by lead.—Dr. Evan Charney, remarks at the SIPI Workshop, St. Louis, 1968.

1. CHICAGO

(By Ann Koppelman Simon)

From the late summer of 1965 to the spring of 1966, a small community organization on Chicago's West Side, under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee, carried out a campaign against lead poisoning which was to influence dramatically the preventive lead poisoning program of the Chicago Board of Health. The Citizens' Committee to End Lead Poisoning, basically concerned with severely inadequate housing conditions in the Negro slum community of East Garfield Park, focused on lead poisoning as one tragic result of the housing problem.

Sparked by the experience of one family, CCELP was born overnight through the joining of forces of a number of local organizations and teenagers. One August evening a young mother of two arrived at her block club meeting distraught with the news that both her children in recent weeks had become feverish and convulsive with what doctors reported as lead poisoning. What was this disease, she wanted to know, how did they get it, and what could be done about it? The block club president relayed the question to the local Project House of the AFSC's Urban Affairs Program, and an emergency information meeting was called for the following week.

Representatives from a number of block clubs, parents groups, social agencies, churches and other organizations heard a report from the mother and an explanation of lead poisoning and its causes—mainly peeling paint—from a pediatrician with the Medical Committee for Human Rights. It became clear to the group present that this disease was indeed caused by the living conditions of their slum community when the doctor mentioned that in his thirty years of suburban practice he had treated only one case of lead poisoning, while during the summer it is a daily occurrence at the clinic

of Cook County Hospital. So the group decided to become the permanent Citizens Committee to End Lead Poisoning with the goal of launching a large scale effort to alert the community to the dangers of lead poisoning and to try to prevent it.

Through representatives of the Mayor's Committee on Youth Welfare, CCELP learned that the Board of Health had termed the twelve lead poisoning deaths reported so far for 1965 "of epidemic proportions," and was also discussing plans for a preventive campaign. With its offer of volunteer manpower and extensive community contacts, CCELP was able to provide the Board of Health with a missing link in its existing program: systematic community canvassing for children's urine samples. An experimental project was established with CCELP collecting urine samples and the Board of Health testing them for urinary coproporphyrin (see "Childhood Lead Poisoning," p. 54). The Board of Health also conducted further testing and treatment when necessary, and reported to the city Building Commission the addresses of apartments in which lead poisoning cases were found.

A dedicated group of teenagers spent their weekends canvassing from September through November, and during that period close to 600 samples were tested and four children with definite signs of lead poisoning were identified and treated.

This arrangement enabled the Board of Health to experiment with the use of non-trained personnel doing field work. The availability of door-to-door canvassers also made it possible to conduct a systematic screening program for lead poisoning victims who had not yet displayed acute symptoms. In December the Board of Health announced plans to launch a similar city-wide testing program with canvassing to be carried out by local War on Poverty neighborhood workers. CCELP decided to continue its campaign in East Garfield Park (with the same group of teenagers performing a dithizone test for urinary lead) in order to continue to serve as a reminder to the city of the seriousness of community concern about lead poisoning and the need for a high quality preventive testing program.

Laboratory facilities were provided by a local small private hospital where testing was carried out several evenings a week from February through May. Seventy-three samples were tested and nine children were identified and taken by CCELP volunteers to hospitals for further testing.

CCELP ended its canvassing and testing program in April when the city program was operating full scale in East Garfield Park and doing a more extensive job than CCELP could attempt. Through September 1966, the Chicago Board of Health tested 30,000 urine specimens. In October they switched to a blood lead test, using an atomic absorption spectrometer. An additional 8,000 blood lead tests were performed. More than 700 children were treated for asymptomatic lead poisoning as a direct result of this screening program. While the greatest number were treated at Cook County Hospital, many private hospitals participated.

The city is continuing to screen by blood lead tests. In addition, a special center for diagnosis and treatment of childhood lead poisoning has been established by the Board of Health.

Despite this great advance in finding and treating lead poisoning, the work that CCELP set out to accomplish is not complete. A great deal of effort is needed to alert parents to the dangers of lead poisoning and to proper preventive measures.

Finally, it is clear that there will be no solution to childhood lead poisoning as long as there are thousands of slum apartments where peeling paint and plaster are constantly available to young children.

(NOTE.—Ann Simon has worked in civil

rights and community organizations for several years, and is now a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Teaching program at the University of Chicago. At the time the Citizens' Committee to End Lead Poisoning was formed, she was assistant director of the Urban Affairs Program of the American Friends Service Committee's Chicago Regional Office.)

2. ROCHESTER

(By David J. Wilson)

About a year ago three members of the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information—George Berg, Tom Fink, and I—attended a workshop of the Scientists' Institute for Public Information in New York City. We had gone to discuss our Rochester water pollution studies (see *Scientist and Citizen*, March, 1967). As is so often the case, we returned to Rochester with the feeling that we had gotten more from the meeting than we had brought to it. Since it had become apparent that in the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information we had an extremely effective instrument for attacking certain types of community problems, we had sought an entrance into the arena of the really big community problems. This arena is our urban slums. We were not interested in trying to compete with the Community Chest, the County Welfare Agency, or various other groups—we were looking for something on which we could bring to bear the experience and knowledge our Scientific Information group had developed during the water pollution operation.

At last year's symposium Dr. David Elwyn presented a summary of a Chicago group's work on lead poisoning in young slum children, and we realized instantly that this was our entrance. Rochester's slums, while not so extensive as those of Chicago, are older and at least as badly run-down. It seemed unlikely to us that a lead poisoning problem did not exist in Rochester.

George Berg, President of the RCSI, then did what is probably the single most important thing in carrying out a scientific information project. He appointed a chairman of our new lead poisoning subcommittee. His choice was Dr. J. D. Hare, Associate Professor of Microbiology at the University of Rochester Medical School. Hare was professionally qualified to quarterback the project, and he showed the patience, tenacity, and ability to deal with people which the job required.

We soon found that we had been beaten to the punch on lead poisoning. When Hare began to do his homework for the project, he learned that in the fall of 1964 Drs. Evan Charney and Arthur Kopelman had carried out a study of lead poisoning in Rochester. The RCSI's first report on lead poisoning was therefore a presentation to the general public of Charney's and Kopelman's findings. Their report, which they had submitted to the Monroe County Health Department, had not, to our knowledge, ever been made public, nor had the health department done anything to try to solve this serious health problem. The essence of the Charney-Kopelman report is as follows:

In September, 1964, five cases of lead poisoning were found in a group of twelve children living in an apartment house in Rochester. This stimulated Kopelman and Charney to attempt an estimate of the true prevalence of lead poisoning among children under five years of age in a slum area in Rochester's Third Ward, a part of the city's "Black Belt."

A screening test for lead poisoning, the urinary coproporphyrin determination, was carried out on urine samples from sixty out of sixty-five pre-school children in an area of about two city blocks. Eleven out of sixty showed a positive test and eight of the eleven were still positive on a repeat exam. This test is sometimes positive in certain other illnesses; therefore, to confirm the presence

of lead poisoning, they took blood samples from the eight children with positive repeat tests and analyzed the blood for lead. Three of the eight children were found to have elevated blood levels. A fourth child, who was not included in the original screening but was a sister of one of the children found to have lead poisoning, was tested for blood lead level and also found to be positive.

On this basis then, it was shown that four out of sixty-one children (6.6%) from a small slum area in Rochester were poisoned by lead. This figure coincides reasonably well with the incidence of lead poisoning among pre-school slum children in Chicago (8.8%), Baltimore (7.1%) and Cleveland (6.4%). The seriousness of the situation is accentuated since lead poisoning produces a variety of grim effects, including permanent brain damage and death.

The report noted that lead poisoning is a significant health menace among young children who swallow peeling, crumbling lead-containing paint and putty from the walls and woodwork of rundown, dilapidated dwellings in Rochester. Properly painted and repaired dwellings present less of a hazard, for lead-containing debris is removed or covered thoroughly. (Modern paints sold for indoor use do not contain lead.) It is clear, then, that this serious problem is directly related to the existence of inadequate and substandard housing.

The report made five recommendations:

- (1) Screening of children for lead poisoning by the County Health Department.
- (2) Establishment of a blood lead testing service by the Health Department.
- (3) Treatment of recognized cases and adequate testing of children exposed in the same manner or who lived in the same house.
- (4) Education of parents, doctors, and visiting nurses to the hazard of preschool children eating paint in slum buildings.
- (5) Slum clearance.

Despite the fact that the report had been submitted in the winter of 1964-65, we found that little had been done to implement these recommendations. In view of our previous experiences with the County Health Department on water pollution, this came as no surprise to us.

Our resurrection of the Charney-Kopelman report last fall produced a spate of publicity in the local press, with whom we enjoy a very cordial relationship, but did not seem to produce any activity on the part of the County Health Department or the City Building Bureau. Dr. Hare therefore prepared a report on recent cases of lead poisoning, and I began a study of the incidence of lead paint in slum dwellings. Hare contacted the Pediatric Department at the teaching hospital associated with the medical school. Through the help of house officers and the out-patient clinic staff, he was able to locate nine children ranging in age between two and six years who were being treated last fall at that hospital for clinically significant lead poisoning. He noted that there was no way of knowing how many more cases remained to be discovered.

The report continues, "It is significant that three children of one family and two children of another were poisoned. There were no deaths in the group and in general the indications are that all children will respond favorably to treatment. One child, for instance, came to the hospital in convulsions and delirium, and is now alert. However, at present, it is too early to predict whether there will be residual impairment of health. Residual effects do occur in many cases of lead poisoning..." The children lived in the Third and Seventh Wards, which are Rochester's slum wards. The report concluded that a serious menace to the health of pre-school children continues to exist in Rochester, and that this will only be eliminated by aggressive control over the conditions of the paint on the inner walls of dilapidated slum housing.

We were displeased but not particularly surprised that the fairly wide publicity given this second report in the local press failed to stir our city and county governments from their torpor. The County Health Department kept saying that the whole problem of poisoning in children was gargantuan in size, that they certainly couldn't go at it in a limited way, and that a program they were studying would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to implement.

Some weeks before the publication of our second report I had begun a study of the occurrence of lead paint in slum dwellings. At the advice of a Negro friend and colleague, Dr. Walter Cooper, I contacted Mr. David Anderson, deputy director of the Urban League of Rochester. We needed people to collect paint samples for us, a group that could reach people in the slums and warn them of this hazard to their children. The Urban League of Rochester, with a well-earned reputation for hard-nosed, rational militancy and carrying out boot-strap self-help projects in the slums, seemed a good representative of the people most in need of the information we had to offer.

I gave Anderson the information we had on the lead poisoning problem, explained what we wanted to do next and why, and asked for help. We got it. The Urban League people decided to interest a group of "Project Uplift" teen-agers in the problem of collecting paint samples. We had a briefing and organization meeting with these young people at the Urban League, where I gave them a rundown on the problem, demonstrated the methods of testing for lead in paint, and turned over to them envelopes and information sheets for their use in collecting samples. Anderson and his staff workers took complete charge of this phase of the project. My next visit to the Urban League office was to pick up 112 catalogued paint samples which the Project Uplift people had collected.

Let me quote now from the report we published jointly with the Urban League this January:

"Previous RCSI reports of August and December, 1967, have documented the occurrence of chronic lead poisoning in young children in the inner city. We considered it likely that these children were getting poisoned by eating peeling paint which contained lead pigments, as was found to be the case in Chicago. Other possible causes of lead poisoning (battery burning at automobile junkyards, contamination of foodstuffs with lead-containing insecticides, etc.) we thought would produce different patterns of poisoning (poisoning of adults as well as children, poisoning in a very localized area, etc.). Actually only young children seem to be poisoned; and, aside from the fact that they come nearly without exception from older homes in the inner city, there does not appear to be any geographical factor.

"If our suspicion that the children are poisoned by lead-based paint is correct, we should find such paint on the inside walls of homes in the city. The paint would probably be old, since modern indoor paints are not prepared with lead pigments. Further, the poisoning would be most likely to come from deteriorated walls, with paint peeling, flaking, and dropping within the reach of children."

A summary of the rest of the report is as follows: Of 112 samples of cracked and peeling paint collected in the north end of our Third Ward, twenty-seven were found to give positive tests for lead, demonstrating that ample opportunity exists for inner-city children to get lead poisoning by eating paint indoors. Of the fifty-nine households from which samples were taken, twenty-two yielded samples containing lead.

The teen-age collectors removed samples of peeling paint from the walls of rooms and sealed them in envelopes. Cataloging data were immediately recorded on each envelope

at the time the sample was taken—collector, name, address and phone number of occupant, room and color of paint, and whether or not young children live in the household.

The samples were tested qualitatively for lead by two means; by treatment with sodium sulfide solution, which turns lead-containing samples black by forming lead sulfide, and by ashing a sample and doing a benzidine spot test on the ash for lead. Only samples giving positive tests by both procedures were counted as positives—one sample giving a weak positive with benzidine and a negative with sulfide was counted as negative. Ten of the twenty-seven positive samples were then analyzed spectrographically by Dr. Luville Steadman of the Medical School and Mr. John Temmerman of the County Public Safety Laboratory. All ten samples were found to contain lead as a major constituent (of the order of ten per cent by weight), giving ironclad verification of our qualitative tests. Anderson and the Urban League were appalled at the results, as they were fully aware of their significance in terms of illness, brain damage, suffering, and death of children in the inner-city. They got mad. What followed was one of the more constructive applications of "Black Power" to our local governments. One of the results was that about three weeks ago Dr. Hare, our lead subcommittee chairman, was asked to supply the city building inspectors with instruction sheets for testing paint samples for the presence of lead. I wrote up a detailed description of our sodium sulfide procedure, and such testing will now be routinely carried out during the inspection of slum housing by the City Building Bureau. The Urban League has also launched a large-scale public education campaign to warn parents living in the slums of the hazard to their children of lead poisoning. The Visiting Nurses' Association has alerted its people to the problem. We are also collecting more paint samples. And Dr. Hare, a couple of medical students, and the Urban League are now doing urine tests on the kids living in the houses where we found lead paint, so that any of them that have been poisoned can be given treatment.

(NOTE.—David J. Wilson is professor of chemistry at the University of Rochester and vice president of the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information. This article was presented at the Scientists' Committee for Public Information Workshop on the Urban Environment, St. Louis, March 29-30, 1968.)

THE PRICE OF MISSING EARLY INDICATIONS OF LEAD POISONING

"By far the most important damage from lead poisoning is to the child's central nervous system. The exact mechanism isn't entirely clear yet, but certainly the increased lead burden is reflected in increasing cerebrospinal fluid pressure. The pressure around the brain increases, and as this continues, the child becomes irritable and lethargic—later come coma, convulsions, and death.

The symptoms of lead poisoning are very insidious. All too often we are not sensitive enough to detect them. Initially, when the child is presented at the clinic, he may be irritable or sleepy and a little bit cranky. He may have a little bit of diarrhea or he may be a little constipated. He may be a little pale due to anemia, and possibly due to some lead deposited in the skin.

The clustering of symptoms I just mentioned describes half of Rochester's kids in the summertime—so you can imagine why it is hard to identify lead poisoning unless you are really looking for it.

Unfortunately, the penalty for not identifying lead poisoning at that level is a harsh one. If the doctor doesn't diagnose the case early, and the child's lead-eating continues, the central nervous system symptoms will become prominent and ataxia will develop, and stupor, and then coma and convulsions.

Unfortunately, it's only then that the kids are brought to medical attention. When they

have a convulsion, they are brought to the emergency room of one hospital or another, but at that point it's often too late. The case fatality rate, once the child has a seizure is about twenty-five per cent.

So one out of four will die. Of those who recover, about half will suffer long-term residual damage. They will have continuing seizures, they will show evidence of mental retardation, of brain disorder, of behavior disorder. Half of them will have these problems for life. So the price of missing the early case is a tremendous one—for the child. . . . Dr. Evan Charney, remarks at the SIPI Workshop, St. Louis, 1968.

3. NEW YORK

The New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information has announced that it will assist a community action group in a case-finding study of lead poisoning in New York slums. *Scientist and Citizen* received this letter from SCPI:

The New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information has recently started to concern itself with the problem of lead poisoning in slum children. We have profited greatly in our early stages from the experiences of the Chicago and Rochester groups, which we learned about at the SIPI workshop in St. Louis earlier this spring, and also from later personal communications.

Now that we have the scientific information, we plan to use it in two ways. First, we will attempt to carry the information to the affected populations in ghetto areas in New York City. We started this process at a meeting held April 22. Over thirty people were present, including representatives of ten community action groups from Central and East Harlem, the South Bronx, the Lower East Side, and the East New York section of Brooklyn. At this meeting we described the problem of lead poisoning, and we in turn learned several interesting things about other ghetto phenomena. We foresee having more such meetings, as well as sending speakers to community groups in the areas.

Second, we hope to find a community group that will join with us to carry out a study on the actual incidence of lead poisoning in a slum area of New York. We plan to screen a large number of children during the summer months, identify the children needing treatment, and publicize the results of our study in all possible ways. So far we have not found a definite group to work with, but we have received some encouragement in our search.

"This program is a new departure for New York SCPI, involving as it does the necessity of forging a close link between the scientist and the citizen to approach a problem unique to the urban ghetto. Those of us involved are finding it an exceedingly challenging and stimulating task; we may, in fact, end by learning more than we teach.

GLENN L. PAULSON,
EDMUND O. ROTHCHILD,
JOEL BUXBAUM,

Scientists' Committee for Public Information.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

MEETING OF THE BUILDINGS RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, MAY 1969

This is a summary of a meeting assembled informally by the Buildings Research Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the New York City Health Research Council and the New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information. (Additional copies of this document are available from the Scientists' Committee, 30 East 68th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021.)

The meeting opened with a discussion of childhood lead poisoning which covered the following points: The disease occurs in children between the ages of one and six living in poorly maintained housing. They may come to the hospital ill with anemia, cramps,

kidney trouble or convulsions. A considerable number of these children develop permanent brain damage. An even larger number has less obvious evidence of excessive exposure and must be discovered by the use of various screening tests; the degree of nervous system damage in these children is unknown. 90-95% of lead poisoned children become intoxicated by eating lead contained in older paint which is readily accessible on deteriorating plaster walls and on doors and window sills.

Present-day indoor paint contains insignificant amounts of lead. However, most exterior paints continue to employ a lead base; therefore exposure to exterior surfaces continues to present a potential danger for children.

Children found to be poisoned must be hospitalized for de-leading with chelating agents, a procedure which is not totally without hazard. In addition, they cannot be returned to their former environments unless the home is de-leaded, or they run a great risk of becoming re-poisoned.

In acutely poisoned children the costs become obvious. 25% of these children may suffer overt permanent mental retardation. Each child hospitalized for diagnosis and treatment costs the City of New York \$100 per day. Those who suffer permanent damage and require institutionalization (or are unable to support themselves) will ultimately cost the State \$200,000-\$300,000 over a lifetime.

These are the established facts, but some questions remain. What are the effects of long-term subclinical increased body burden of lead? Studies must be carried out to determine how much this contributes to the incidence of mental retardation in poor urban children. At present there is little data available concerning the intellectual and psychosocial development of children with this kind of exposure to lead.

Is there a preferred topographic site from which children ingest the most lead? Information provided by the New York City Department of Health, after investigation of the homes of 680 lead poisoned children, revealed that 15% of woodwork samples and 23% of painted plaster samples tested contained more than 1% lead. These data were discussed particularly with respect to the relatively low incidence of positive results. Similar investigations in Baltimore yielded 90-95% positive households in cases of lead poisoning. Three areas of possible error were discussed. The methods of analysis were standard and reproducible and when tested against unknown specimens were found to be adequate.

The sampling procedures in this New York study were discussed at length. It was generally conceded that an insufficient number of samples were being obtained and/or samples were being taken from places unlikely to reflect the presence of lead, i.e. a peeling spot which had previously been replastered, or areas which may have been wallpapered in the past and covered with paint only in the last twenty years. The third area discussed was that of additional sources of exposure. The Department of Health indicated that only 2.5% of all water samples tested had any significant lead content, probably eliminating lead pipes as a consideration. However, outdoor fire escapes, window moulding and railings should not be ruled out. In addition, plaster ingestion in a friend's or relative's house would produce illness with negative samples from the patient's own home.

It was suggested that the environmental aspects of lead poisoning could be viewed as two basic problems. The first is detection. The second is prevention of the interaction between child and poison.

Detection seems to be a problem of manpower and methodology. Epidemiologic studies suggest that all apartments of a certain type under conditions of poor maintenance

represent a clear hazard. The present methods of detection in New York City involve the collection of three samples per apartment by a sanitarian, with subsequent analysis in a central laboratory. This approach was felt to be inadequate, because present manpower places an unsatisfactory limit on the number of samples obtained. In addition, too few apartments are investigated per unit time. Obviously, more sanitarians and more efficient use of the number presently available are needed. One approach presently being tested in New York City is a lead detector. The surface to be tested is illuminated with gamma rays from a Cobalt-57 source. If lead is present, it responds with its characteristic 74 KEV X-rays and can be monitored easily. In tests to date, it has been able to detect a layer of 5% lead paint under 15 coats of non-lead paint with a 15 second response time.

Questions were raised relative to X-ray scatter and the absorption of the X-rays by other materials which may overlay the bottom layers of lead-containing paint, particularly barium sulfate, a major component of lithopone paints which were in wide use from 1920-1950. One of the participants offered the investigators a supply of lithopone paint to perform the appropriate studies on this point. It was noted that the City hopes to start field trials of the instrument in July. It was suggested that Western Nuclear Research, a branch of the State University of New York, might be able to furnish further technical aid.

An approach to interference with the child-lead interaction in a realistic and humanistic way is a much more difficult problem and was viewed in terms of possible behavioral and environmental modification. Once a dwelling was found to have significant lead on its walls, several steps could be taken. The family could be moved to a lead-free apartment. At present this is difficult because of the limited number of dwelling units available and the reluctance of many of the involved families to move. Second, the affected rooms, apartments and buildings could be clearly labelled so that parents would be constantly reminded of the danger and attempt to keep their children from it. The psychosocial difficulties involved in this type of approach were discussed briefly. Thirdly, the question of lead free "playrooms" or "mini day-care centers" in each affected building was proposed. This was felt to be a good suggestion but not adequate to meet the total problem.

The proposed environmental solutions fell within three categories: The first suggested making the paint and plaster taste so vile that no child would want to eat it by applying a distasteful non-toxic substance in a highly permeable oil-base spray. The experience with this approach to nail-biting and thumb-sucking has not been notably successful, hence its application here will probably not be profitable. The second was the "inactivation of lead approach." One could overcoat the wall with chemicals (anions) which combine with lead to decrease its solubility under physiologic conditions so that ingested lead would not be absorbed. Borates and sulfates were proposed and discarded, since the former is too toxic and the latter too soluble.

The third and most extensively discussed was the application of an inert substance to the wall which, in effect, would isolate the lead-loaded wall from the child. The ideal materials would be strong, i.e., hard to puncture or scrape, vermin-proof, and fire resistant with a high ignition temperature. It would not release noxious vapors at high temperatures. It would place no additional strain on the existing structures of the building. It would have a reasonable installation cost (labor and materials) and have a low maintenance cost.

Such materials are presently available. The

major points of discussion were which materials, what cost is reasonable and what techniques should be applied? For flat surfaces the following were suggested and discussed:

1) Gypsum board—The installation of this material creates a new wall in front of the old. It has two main drawbacks. It costs 5 cents per square foot for materials, and installation is expensive and sophisticated, with a total cost of 40-50 cents per square foot.

2) Fiberglass wall—cover materials—These are made by Owens-Corning or Johns Manville for Sherwin-Williams. Loose paint and plaster must be removed prior to application. Some patching of the wall may be necessary. It is supplied in 40 inch wide sheets; an adhesive compound is applied with a roller over the sheets. This costs 10 cents per square foot for materials. In some buildings, with two coats of paint over it, this has lasted very well for ten years. The estimated total cost is 43 cents per square foot.

3) Paper wall-cover materials—These can be made strong, fire-retarding and attractive, and can be applied on an unsound wall in a horizontal fashion. The cost of materials runs about one cent per square foot. U.S. Plywood has used paper adherent to wood, then covered with a single coat of paint for up to 30-40 years with good durability. The manufacturers who might be helpful are St. Regis Paper, Union Camp, Kimberly-Clark and Crown Zellerbach.

4) Vinyl coat sheeting—This material must be applied with an industrial adhesive. It is the least combustible of the plastics, but does give off some hydrochloric acid fumes in fire. It has very low maintenance, can be tailored to order and has a cost (including adhesive, not labor) of 10 cents per square foot. The disadvantages of this material are possible surface tackiness under some conditions and brittleness at very low temperatures. It was felt that neither of these was a significant problem. Rigid vinyl board is available but sheeting seemed preferable to all participants largely because of labor factors. The actual costs of these materials can be obtained from Armstrong Cork, and it was further suggested that other companies to contact were Union Carbide, Diamond Alkali, Firestone Rubber, B.F. Goodrich, Grace Chemical and Borden Chemical Company.

Liquid surface coverings were then discussed. The general problems involved in the use of liquids include adequate strength (i.e. vinyl paints are not as strong as vinyl films), thickness control, adhesive problems with heavier films and the general need for some wall preparation (sanding, raking, cleaning, etc.). Urethane-base paint was mentioned as one possible method. A second suggestion was the use of pigmented masonry conditioner. This was felt to be an excellent substance if flaking, scaling paint could be removed from the underlying wall. It has a tung oil base which makes it penetrate very well. In drying, several coats add binding strength to the wall, and it can contain zinc oxide to prevent mildew. The only reservations concerned its strength of finish in the face of an aggressive child.

Technically, curved surfaces can be handled with the liquids described above; however, if sheeting is used on flat surfaces some other technique must be used for sills, moldings, etc. It was felt that where possible, surfaces should be scraped down to bare wood. Otherwise the use of vinyl chloride lacquer applied by spray was suggested. This requires masking of the surfaces not to be sprayed. There is some hazard during application but little or none afterwards. The film is quite tough, but not as strong as the wall films. It should be applied as a spray. Portable self-atomizing airless spray units can be used. Aerosol cans are quite expensive.

The consensus of the group was that wall-coating to a level of five feet seems adequate

no matter what method is used. The second point of agreement was that no single method would be appropriate in all affected dwelling units. A variety of methods must be available. In order to establish such an armamentarium, a demonstration project should be set up consisting of no less than twelve comparable apartments. These would be lead-proofed with a variety of methods using both union and indigenous labor. Time, materials, labor, costs of installation and maintenance and effectiveness would be analyzed and compared over a period of at least two years. It was felt that other approaches might be available from professional groups such as Union Carbide or National Starch and Adhesives; these might also be willing to donate materials and some service.

Once effective practical methods of correction are demonstrated, they must be tested for their ability to prevent children from being excessively exposed. This is a somewhat more difficult study but can be probably worked out by a multidisciplinary group including physicians, environmental engineers, social workers, housing experts and people from the involved industries and labor groups—perhaps under the auspices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There is a need to motivate industry to develop solutions. It would be helpful to industry's effort if concrete performance criteria were available and an adequate market could be offered. Otherwise research and development support might be underwritten by some federal or regional agency. Programs could be proposed which offered landlords or tenants financial incentives and professional aid for attempts at rehabilitation. Low interest loans could be made available for this kind of rehabilitation. Housing code violations must be handled more effectively and realistically. The imposition of financial penalties on landlords cannot be equated with the physical and mental penalties a lead-loaded environment imposes on its victims and society.

[From Health News, July 1969]

LEAD POISONING IN CHILDREN—A DISEASE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

(By Herbert Roffman, M.D. and Laurence Finberg, M.D.)

(NOTE.—Dr. Roffman is Chief Resident of the Pediatric Division, Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center, and Assistant Instructor, Albert Einstein College of Medicine. Dr. Finberg is Chief of the Pediatric Division, Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center and Professor of Pediatrics, Albert Einstein College of Medicine.)

In our contemporary urbanizing society, there are many defects which lie just below the surface, unseen and unheralded until the surface is scratched. Such is the nature of the problem of lead poisoning in the children of our cities, which, until the last two decades, went unnoticed as a public health problem of major magnitude. To the lay community and even to a major part of the medical community, this problem exists much as an iceberg, only a small part of its enormity visible on the surface. The core of the problem lies in the old, leaded paints which are flaking and falling from the walls and ceilings of the ghetto housing in our eastern and mid-western cities. Since lead poisoning, or plumbism, in our society is an entirely preventable disease, it is appropriate that the public and the medical community be aware of the problem.

MOST LIKELY VICTIMS

The "high risk" population for lead poisoning are the children of the slums and ghettos of the older cities where deteriorated housing is the rule. Also to be included in this "high risk" population are workers in lead-using industries. The children in the slum communities ingest the lead by eating

paint and plaster chips which flake off the walls and ceilings in poor repair. Until the mid-1940's, lead-based paints were commonly used in interiors. At that time, the development of cheaper, non-toxic titanium-based paints, and of lesser importance, belated legislation, made the use of toxic leaded paints in interiors not only unwise but also economically inappropriate. Therefore, it is our older cities, where the ghettos are synonymous with deteriorating housing, in which we find the major incidence of lead poisoning in children. In the newer western cities such as Los Angeles, the incidence of this disease is almost nil because the major part of the housing was built in the post World War Two era.

ABNORMAL APPETITE

Children between the ages of one and six are the usual victims. The great majority of those victims are children between the ages of one and three years. About one-half of all the deaths reported from lead poisoning are in two-year-olds. Pica, or abnormal appetite, is common to about 20-30 per cent of all children between the ages of one and six, which in part explains the high incidence of plumbism in children of this age range. Lead poisoning is probably the largest single cause of death by poisoning in children of the ages one to four. Estimates indicate that between five and 20 per cent of the children living in the ghettos of the old center-core cities suffer from asymptomatic lead poisoning. Every year, three to five per cent of these children develop symptoms of plumbism which may lead to death or severe neurological damage. It would be interesting to consider the fettering nature of the yet unknown biological damage caused by asymptomatic lead ingestion on a significant segment of the children of the slums, the very same population that we are trying so hard to make upwardly mobile in a socio-economic sense.

HISTORY OF PLUMBISM

Plumbism is a disease which has advanced hand-in-hand with the civilization of man. Lead has been used in an ever growing number of purposes by man since the dawn of the first "industry." Studies of snow taken from the Greenland Ice Sheet show a 200 per cent increase in the amount of lead per ton of snow between 800 B.C. and 1960 A.D. Lead is almost completely absent from a "virgin" environment in forms assimilable by man. However, the body of an average adult U.S. citizen contains about 100 times that of a "natural" body content of lead. There is even evidence to suggest that one of the factors in the decline of the Roman aristocracy, and therefore, in the fall of Rome, may have been lead poisoning. It is known that the Roman aristocracy had a great liking for pewter tableware, and pewter is a heavily leaded alloy. Major sources of present day contamination with lead, aside from deteriorating housing, include solder, food processing, gasoline engine exhaust, and industrial waste.

When flaking paint and painted plaster chips containing lead are eaten by children, lead is absorbed and distributed in soluble form through all the soft tissues. Later, it appears in the bones as an insoluble phosphate compound. The toxic effects of lead are produced by the soluble form, and therefore, the amount of damage done is a function of the lead in the soft tissues and the amount of time that high concentrations exist in the soft tissues, as well as the presence of any factors which may cause the mobilization of the insoluble form from the bones. Experience shows that from six weeks to four months of uninterrupted mild exposure results in soft tissue concentrations high enough to cause symptoms to appear. The precipitation of lead in the bones is a process which may vary in rate. Anything, such as

infection which interrupts bone mineralization, may cause a sudden rise in soft tissue lead concentration even though ingestion is constant. An approximation of the lead in the soft tissue can be made by determining the blood lead concentration. Concentrations up to 0.04mg/100ml are normally found in the general urban population and concentrations of up to 0.06mg/100ml are generally found in ghetto children. Concentrations of higher than 0.06mg/100ml are considered abnormal and diagnostic of an increased soft tissue lead burden. The precipitated phosphate compound in the bones is considered inactive, but can be mobilized and drastically increase the concentration of soluble lead in the soft tissues. This can occur during acidosis and even during treatment for lead poisoning. One interesting phenomenon in the study of the incidence of lead poisoning in children is its seasonal variation. Symptomatic lead poisoning is much more common in the spring and summer months than during the rest of the year. This is probably owing to the enhanced absorption of lead from the intestinal tract because of the vitamin D increase brought on by the effect of sunlight on the skin; lead being treated by the gut in much the same way as calcium. The epidemiology of lead poisoning is such that a very small part of the problem appears symptomatically on the surface and the great bulk, all children with precipitated lead in their bones and flakes of plaster and paint in their abdomens, remains unseen, waiting to appear.

EFFECTS OF LEAD

The most apparent and well known effects of lead are on the nervous system, the blood, the kidneys, and the gastrointestinal tract. It is very likely that lead also has damaging effects on other body organ systems, but these have not yet been clearly defined. Lead interferes with hemoglobin synthesis and causes a mild anemia where abnormal stippled red blood cells are present in the marrow and sometimes in the peripheral blood. Coproporphyrin, a metabolic product in hemoglobin synthesis, is produced and excreted in the urine in excess amounts. This coproporphyrin excretion provides the basis for one of the easiest and most widely used tests for plumbism. Similarly, another hemoglobin precursor, delta amino levulinic acid (ALA) also appears in the urine, a fact of considerable practical importance in present day screening of children.

The kidneys may be affected and excrete excess amounts of sugar and amino acids. It has also been reported that a long-term effect of lead ingestion in children may be a severe chronic nephritis. Plumbism in children commonly causes poor appetite, vomiting, and constipation; all are usually early symptoms.

COMMONEST SYMPTOM

Probably one of the earliest and most common central nervous system symptoms of lead poisoning is marked irritability. This is often described by the parent as "a change in personality" or simply as "crankiness." This symptom may be part-and-parcel of actual encephalopathy (brain disorder) or may precede convulsions, increased intracranial pressure, and encephalopathy. Lead poisoning in adults has been known to produce peripheral neuritis which can be cured. This is not usually seen in children who more frequently develop encephalopathy and are at greater risk for long term after-effects. All these effects may be produced slowly or very quickly and can lead to permanent retardation, seizure disorders, cerebral palsy, or death.

Unfortunately for both physician and patient, lead poisoning as a disease entity is not often obviously unique. All the previous mentioned symptoms may be absent, and all can be produced by other diseases. The diagnosis is more likely made when the community and the physicians are aware of its

submerged presence, and the reported incidence follows very closely the ebb and flow of public and professional interest.

DIAGNOSIS

Treatment of lead poisoning necessarily involves making the diagnosis first. When a symptomatic child is brought to a physician, the diagnosis can be confirmed by determinations for urinary coproporphyrins and ALA, blood and urine lead, morphologic examination of red cells, X-ray of the abdomen for the presence of radio-opaque plaster and paint chips, and long bone X-rays to reveal the presence of increased bone densities commonly known as "lead lines." Asymptomatic lead poisoning, a much more common occurrence, necessitates an awareness and suspicion on the part of the physician in order to be diagnosed. He may be tipped off by the child's apparent irritability, poor appetite, or chronic constipation. A positive response to questions about a history of pica in the child or the state of disrepair of the dwelling are also suggestive. A high urinary ALA and a high blood lead level are absolutely essential for diagnosis. However, an increased lead burden may be present without positive findings in these tests. It is again apparent that since the overwhelming majority of patients with toxic blood lead levels at any given time are asymptomatic, the degree of case finding will be sensitively dependent upon the inquisitiveness of the community physicians and the informed awareness of the public.

At present two compounds are in widespread use for the treatment of plumbism. These agents form a complex with the soluble lead, allowing for a much increased rate of excretion. Both may be toxic and require careful use.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

Since the incidence of lead poisoning reflects only four or five per cent of the actual incidence of toxic blood lead levels in the community, it is very easy to greatly underestimate the problem at a casual glance. In a city such as New York, conservative estimates of the occurrence of toxic blood lead levels in children extrapolated from statistics of known symptomatic cases, state that ten to 20 thousand children are affected. On a national level, there are probably several hundred thousand potential lead poisoning victims. In New York alone, the facilities necessary to detoxify these children during the summer months would be three to five hundred city hospital beds, a gigantic increase over the existing number of pediatric hospital beds in New York City. Plumbism is also a recurrent disease by the very nature of the social and economic conditions which foster its existence. As a disease entity, it is not necessarily limited to the ghetto. Older, affluent residential communities in the center-core cities, such as Park Avenue, Georgetown, and Cambridge, await deterioration and the creation of a slum in which lead poisoning prevails.

There are several levels at which action may be undertaken to eradicate this problem. Building codes in most cities are generally adequate. Walls and ceilings with undercoats of old leaded paints which are in good repair are not significant sources of lead for children. However, enforcement of these codes remains the major obstacle since this necessitates the cooperation of other city departments as well as the health department. In our large cities, very often interdepartmental programs become submerged in a bureaucratic morass. In some instances, it is financially expedient for the landlord to pay the fine or abandon the building because of the high cost of rehabilitation. New techniques of getting rid of the leaded paints and plaster are currently being evaluated. Present methods include covering the walls and ceilings with a plaster board, removing the old paint, and covering the old

flaking walls and ceilings with a tough plastic spray layer which can be painted.

MASS INVESTIGATION

One aid in successfully dealing with the problem is wide scale case-finding. This not only delineates the areas in which lead poisoning is most prevalent, but also brings the victims to the attention of the medical community before the disease produces its more telling effects. Screening tests such as urinary coproporphyrin levels and blood lead levels, as well as newer inexpensive techniques such as urinary ALA determinations, make massive investigation feasible. In cities where such programs have been begun, the reported incidence of lead poisoning has greatly increased, whereas the proportion of mortalities has greatly decreased: an obvious result of earlier detection. It seems appropriate that public health departments on both city and state level should have an incisive interest in a problem with such great health and social inferences.

An informed community also seems a rational deterrent to plumbism in children. Families made aware of the danger of peeling and flaking paint in deteriorating housing will bring their children to medical facilities for screening and will be more likely to report housing code violations to the proper authorities, putting more pressure on the offenders. Community education by means of public forum and news publicity helps ensure an informed public. In some cities, the community is already involved. In Rochester, New York, teen-agers of the Urban League's Project Uplift helped collect paint samples from the ghetto housing. In Chicago, high school students were trained to collect urine samples in the community for lead and coproporphyrin screening.

IT CAN BE PREVENTED

This summer, as in previous summers, children will again suffer the consequences of lead ingestion. Most of these children will live in older ghettos. Most will not come to the attention of the medical community. Of the many who are seen by physicians, about two out of five will suffer residual brain damage and about one out of 15 will die. Lead poisoning as it occurs in the children of our cities is, even now, a preventable disease. Its continued presence must be considered intolerable by an enlightened society.

[From the Village Voice, Sept. 18, 1969]

LEAD POISONING: SILENT EPIDEMIC IN THE SLUMS

(By Jack Newfield)

Except for its ironic name, Tiffany Street looks like a hundred other decaying streets in the Southeast Bronx. Mounds of uncollected garbage strewn all over. Idle young black and Puerto Rican men sitting on crumbling stoops. Many dogs looking through the garbage for scraps. Boarded up, burnt out houses flecked with graffiti.

At number 1051, on the fourth floor of a tenement whose dark halls stink from urine, Brenda Surry was sitting in her clean, neat apartment telling me how her 23-month-old daughter Janet had died of lead poisoning in April.

Brenda, 23, is pretty, street smart, and black. She writes informed and angry letters to President Nixon—and gets back impersonal form letters thanking her for interest in the "New Federalism." She has two other children, four- and five-year-old boys. Her husband works in the garment center, and Brenda had gone to the local Public school and discovered her five-year-old sitting in a third-grade class, and had to explain to the indifferent teacher that her child belonged in kindergarten.

"I used to live at 1113 Teller Avenue," she began quietly, but with a bittersweet edge to her voice. "Plaster from the walls started falling all over the place last November.

I asked the landlord a couple times to do something about it, but he never did. Then in April one morning my daughter wouldn't eat anything. She started trembling and couldn't breathe. I got scared and she started to change colors. A neighbor called a policeman and we took her to Morisannia Hospital. A doctor looked at her and told me to go home, that she would be okay. They didn't know what it was, but they sent me home. They asked me if Janet ever ate paint or plaster, and I told them yes. I went home but her temperature kept going up and down. After five days they gave her a blood test for lead poisoning. And then she died the next day. The day after she died, the blood test came back positive. . . . Later they sent me a death certificate that said Janet died of natural causes. The doctors did an autopsy, but I still haven't got the results. I called the administrative director of the hospital twice, and they still haven't sent it to me. The hospital doesn't want to say it was lead, I guess.

"I asked welfare if they would pay for Janet's funeral, but they made me fill out a bunch of forms. So I paid for the funeral with the rent money. Then I asked welfare to pay for the rent. They said I had to fill out some other papers and that it would take a while. Then I got an eviction notice. I went to the central welfare office with it, but they still wouldn't give me any money. So I borrowed some money and moved out because I didn't want that landlord to put me on the street."

Lead poisoning is a disease endemic to the slums. The victims are hungry, unsupervised children between the ages of one and six, who get it by eating pieces of paint and plaster from flaking walls. Lead in paint was outlawed 20 years ago, but the bottom layers of walls in 800,000 run-down dwelling units in New York City still contain poisonous lead.

The city estimates that about 30,000 children each year suffer lead poisoning, but only 600 cases were reported during each of the last three years. (There are probably 300,000 victims nationally.) The early symptoms are vague—nausea, lethargy, vomiting, crankiness—and doctors and nurses are not trained to look for it since they are told that lead has been outlawed as a paint ingredient. Ghetto parents are also ignorant of the disease. In three years, Harlem Hospital has not reported a single case of lead poisoning.

But surveys by researchers and activists keep discovering thousands of undiagnosed cases living in the ghettos; lead poisoning has been called "the silent epidemic" by microbiologist Dr. Rene Du Bos of Rockefeller University, a Pulitzer Prize winner last year.

According to doctors, five per cent of the children who eat lead die. Of those who survive, about 40 per cent suffer permanent brain damage, mental retardation, and deterioration of intelligence. A recent Chicago study of 425 children who had been treated for lead poisoning showed that 39 per cent had neurological disorders years later, and 22 per cent suffered from mental retardation as adults.

Two young, white, middle-class radicals have taken up the cause of lead poisoning, and for a year now have been waging a lonely crusade, bereft of money, manpower, or organizational support, to pressure the city and the health establishment, and to alert parents. One is red-haired, 30-year-old Paul Du Brul, the housing director of the University Settlement House on the Lower East Side. The other is bearded, 24-year-old Glenn Paulson, co-chairman of the Scientists' Committee for Public Information.

Du Brul met me for lunch two weeks ago. He was particularly frustrated that day over the media's failure to take an interest in lead poisoning. He had called the Post's Joe Kahn earlier that morning, and Kahn had apologized, but the city desk wasn't inter-

ested in a story without a hard news peg. The Times had printed a story a few months before, but it had been buried in the real estate section on a Sunday, "where only landlords would see it."

Mrs. Scurry had written a personal letter to the Times man who wrote the Sunday story, telling him of her experience with her landlord, the hospital, and the Welfare Department. And he wrote back a moving letter how he felt lead poisoning was a tragic problem, but there just wasn't a news story in her case because the hospital denied lead was the cause of her daughter's death.

And lead was a story hard to make visible or dramatic for the television networks. It didn't involve famous leaders, or exotic militants, or public violence. How do you show a process, how do you show indifference, how do you show invisible, institutionalized injustice, in two minutes on Huntley-Brinkley? How do you induce the news department of a television network to get outraged about nameless black babies eating tenement paint, when the public health professionals, school teachers, housing experts, scientists, the NAACP, and the politicians haven't given a damn?

Du Brul then began to explore some of the ramifications of this silent epidemic.

"Look," he said, "doctors say the effect of lead poisoning is to damage the nervous system. Kids can't concentrate. They become disruptive and lose points on I.Q. tests. So I think some of Jensen's findings (geneticist Arthur Jensen) about race and chromosomes might just be the effects of environmental conditions like lead poisoning. In the last ten years, 300,000 slum kids have been sent into the New York City public school system with lead poisoning. They're not culturally inferior; they're sick. What are now considered problems of remedial education might be doctor's problems, not teacher's problems."

Two nights later Du Brul and Paulson went to Judson Church on Washington Square to speak to a meeting of about 75 doctors, nurses, interns, and radical students sponsored by Health-PAC (Policy Advisory Center). Here the discussion focused on tactics, on how to fight the problems, how to make it visible.

Du Brul proposed a "fill the hospitals" strategy, coupled with the demand that every slum child between one and six receive a free laboratory test to determine if there is lead in his system. He said Chicago and Baltimore had been using a test that has proved 90 per cent effective, and the Lindsay Administration was holding back because of "bureaucratic bungling."

Some of the radical young doctors at the meeting disagreed. They said the hospitals would not, and could not, absorb the 30,000 walking cases in the city. They argued that such a tactic would collapse the already fragile hospital system. A few proposed rent strikes to force landlords to remove the paint or cover it up. Others suggested direct action at hospitals, particularly at Lincoln Hospital, which has lead on its own peeling walls. And still others urged a direct attack on the "slum system" as the root cause of lead poisoning. The meeting broke up at about 11 p.m., with even those few motivated on the issue divided over what to do first.

I spent the next few days working up an interior rage, trying to find out if anyone, with any responsibility, was doing anything about lead poisoning.

The NAACP had no program, nor any plans for any. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (the "good guys" in Nixonland) had no existing program and no funds allocated for any future program, but they did have a 21-page pamphlet. I could not find a copy of the pamphlet in any ghetto health office and had to acquire a copy from Glenn Paulson. The pamphlet turned out to be written in an opaque jargon that would

hardly enlighten a second-year medical student, much less a welfare mother. The following is the second sentence on the first page:

"Its etiology, pathogenesis, pathophysiology, and epidemiology are known."

Nineteen Congressmen, including William F. Ryan, have introduced a package of three bills to provide federal funds for a mass testing program in the slums. But the bills are given no chance of emerging from the limbo of committee, or even generating public hearings.

I also called the United Federation of Teachers to see if they were doing anything to detect cases in the schools, but no one called back.

Werner Kramarsky, Mayor Lindsay's staff man in the health field, advised me to call Health Commissioner Mary McLoughlin, to find out officially what the city was doing. When I called her, I was told the commissioner was not in, so I left a message. The next day the commissioner's press secretary called me and said I couldn't under any circumstances have a direct interview with the commissioner, but that he would answer any questions. I gave him a list of four.

After three days Dr. Felicia Oliver-Smith, the department's lead specialist, called back and reported that 1) the city had tested 7000 children last year, compared to 35,000 in Chicago; 2) the city "hoped to" have a mobile testing unit "within one year"; 3) there were 725 cases last year, and more than 7000 already so far this year; 4) "We have no legal authority to make a landlord remove lead-based paint from tenement walls."

The only politician in the city who seems genuinely involved in the issue is Carter Burden, the Democratic-Liberal candidate for City Council in the polyglot East Harlem-Silk Stocking district. Burden has written angry letters to Lindsay, called press conferences, talked up the problem, and tried to energize grass-roots groups.

"It's terribly frustrating," Burden said last week. "The press just isn't interested at all. When I held a press conference in March on lead poisoning, not one daily paper and not one television station showed up. Just yesterday I had lunch with one of the religious leaders in East Harlem, and I tried to turn him on about lead. But he told me it was a phony issue, that asthma was a bigger community problem. . . . Kramarsky promised us three months ago there would be a crash program of 40,000 tests in the slums, but it didn't happen. Now I hear the city is about to start, but the summer is over, and 80 per cent of the cases develop during the summer. There was no reason for the delay."

Burden also revealed that a private blood test for lead poisoning had just been conducted in his district—in the new, middle-income cooperative Franklin Plaza, which was completed after lead was banned from paint.

"That's a scandal," he said. "Of course there are no cases of lead poisoning in Franklin Plaza. But now they can release the results of the survey to prove lead is not a real problem in the slums." The survey was sponsored by Metropolitan Hospital and the American Cancer Society.

Some minimal testing program seems ready to be announced by the municipal bureaucracy. But it is not clear how the test will be distributed, or if it will reach the children who need it. And no one seems about to challenge the landlords to remove the deadly paint. And no one is doing anything about the hundreds of children now living in slum apartments with lead in the walls.

Today there is still lead in the walls of the apartment where Janet Scurry lived on Teller Avenue. There is lead in the two other tenements on the same block, owned by the same landlord who sent Mrs. Scurry the evic-

tion notice. There is still lead in the crumbling walls of Lincoln Hospital, where lead victims are sent. There are still thousands of undiagnosed, lead-poisoned children walking the streets, sitting in classrooms.

As Dr. Rene Du Bos said at a conference on lead poisoning earlier this year: "The problem is so well defined, so neatly packaged with both causes and cures known, that if we don't eliminate this social crime, our society deserves all the disasters that have been forecast for it."

THE CRIME WAR: PRISON REFORM IS A VITAL PART OF IT

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

Mr. GUDE, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's Washington Post discusses what I feel is the most important and most neglected effort in the war against crime: prison reform. The recent report of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training has confirmed what the statistics on recidivism have shown for a long time—that our prisons are almost uniformly failing to rehabilitate persons convicted of crime.

Reports indicate, for example, that 70 percent of convicted offenders have a prior record of juvenile offenses. Two years ago the District of Columbia Crime Commission reported that 40 percent of all District court offenders had a prior felony conviction. Indeed, Police Chief Wilson has remarked that convicted criminals are not rehabilitated; they just get too old to keep up the pace. I think it is time we all faced this fact. Court reform and swift justice are necessary to reduce crime, but we will never have safe streets so long as our prisons are nothing but warehouses for unfortunate and embittered men.

I look forward to studying the recommendations of the Joint Commission outlined in the Post editorial, and I am hopeful that they will provoke the public debate and legislative action required at all levels of government to make our correctional system worthy of the name.

The article referred to follows:

THE CRIME WAR: PRISON REFORM IS A VITAL PART OF IT

Almost three years ago, the President's Crime Commission made it plain enough that the national crime problem is not going to be solved by just passing new laws in random fashion or by just hiring new policemen or by tackling any one of the many elements that are involved in preventing crime and handling criminals—or all of them one at a time. The whole range of things, from bad homes and unemployment to prisons in which inmates learn how to commit more crimes, must be attacked simultaneously, the commission said, and in a comprehensive way.

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, created by Congress three years ago, has now underlined that finding. It has recommended, to sum up its conclusions in somewhat harsh language, that national and state leaders put their leadership and tax money where their mouths are. Its point is very simple: the number of men who make a career out of crime is not going to be reduced until the institutions of the correctional process (jails and prisons, parole and probation agencies) have the funds and the personnel to rehabilitate—rather than just confine or

harass—those convicted of crime. "The public and their legislators most understand," the report says, "that there can be no solution to the problem of recidivism as long as harsh laws, huge isolated prisons, token program resources, and discriminatory practices which deprive offenders of employment, education, and other opportunities are tolerated."

The commission points out that the ability of a man who has committed a crime to stay out of trouble once he is released is directly tied to his ability to get and hold a job. Yet the success of prisons in training convicts for jobs and their ability to get one in the field of that training has been notoriously low. Coupled with this has been the inability of the entire correctional process to get either the money or the staff to do the kind of work it ought to be doing. There are, of course, bright spots in the field of corrections, as we noted a few days ago, but not enough young people have been drawn to it as a career and not enough innovative work has been encouraged.

The response of Congress a year ago to the Crime Commission report was to establish and finance a federal program to help states improve their police forces and law enforcement agencies. Its response to this report ought to be to do the same thing for state and local correctional operations. Since less than 10 per cent of all such operations are in hands of federal agencies, this appears to be another area in which President Nixon's "creative federalism" could produce worth while results.

The Joint Commission, however, put its finger on the real problem. It addressed its report to the President, Congress, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and the 50 governors. For anything worth while to happen, it said, the people in the correctional field "about whom it is addressed—have to care." The results of a national poll show that 72 per cent of the public "cares"—or at least believes that the primary goal of correctional institutions is rehabilitation, while only 7 per cent thinks it is punishment. So the public support is there. It remains for national leaders to catch up to the public, to accept the vital importance of prison reform in the context of a comprehensive, across-the-board assault on crime, to begin, in short, to care.

HEROISM OF PATROLMAN COMER

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are many times every day when the police of our country are maligned, criticized, and attacked, verbally and physically. But far more often than not they are there when we need them, acting selflessly in line of duty.

Such a case occurred very recently in Decatur, Ga., when a patrolman, J. R. Comer, risked his life to save the lives of two 7-year-old girls.

A newspaper account of Patrolman Comer's heroism follows:

POLICEMAN SAVES PAIR FROM CAR
(By Sam Hopkins)

"Both of these little children would have been run over and maybe killed if that policeman hadn't acted so fast," the Decatur witness to an accident near Westchester Elementary School said Wednesday.

He was referring to the valor of Decatur Patrolman J. R. Comer, a 23-year veteran on the police force, who was struck down by an automobile about 8 a.m. Wednesday after he had quickly shoved two seven-year-old girls out of the path of the car.

Comer, who has two children of his own in Decatur High School, was taken to DeKalb General Hospital for X-rays. He had no broken bones but suffered a bruised hip and hand.

Comer, who became a hero in the eyes of the parents of the two children, school officials and his fellow officers, said later in the day he had raised his hand to stop traffic and had begun escorting the two second-grade school children across the street.

Suddenly the car swerved around to the right side of a stopped vehicle on Scott Boulevard, Comer said.

"He was bearing down on us pretty hard," the officer said. "It happened so quick I just didn't have time to think, I gave the children a shove over the curb and before I could get out of the way the car hit me on the right side."

The two children Comer saved are Virginia Geddes, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. P. A. Geddes of 222 Garden Lane, and Hamby Bryant, daughter of Mrs. Jack Bryant of 167 Garden Lane.

The two are good friends and often walk to school together.

"We've had calls all day from people who saw the accident and who wanted to praise Patrolman Comer," Police Chief Lee Cole said. "One lady told me she saw the car coming and was screaming and hollering but she couldn't do anything about it, and then she saw Comer suddenly push them."

"There's no doubt both children would have been hit," said Jack Sherwood, who had stopped his car and saw the accident.

Dr. Vee Simmons, principal of the Westchester school, said it was "wonderful the City of Decatur had a policeman on duty there. Usually we have a lady policeman there, but we're short one and have been unable to find another one." Two other women traffic officers are stationed at intersections near the school on Scott Boulevard.

"That was a great thing that officer did," said another witness, C. G. Townley. "The police have gotten so much criticism in the past I think something like this ought to be written about in the paper."

Police Chief Cole said the driver of the car which struck Comer was identified as William Wilson, 74, of 2526 Clifton Road NE, who was on the way to the Veterans Hospital for a physical checkup.

Cole said Wilson was charged with speeding in a school zone and failing to obey a police officer's signal. He said Wilson's car skidded 60 feet.

Patrolman Comer, although bruised and aching, left the hospital and returned to duty later in the day.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my congratulations to those Patrolman Comer has already received. Not only is he to be congratulated for his heroism, but he is to be thanked by a grateful society that it has men of his caliber protecting them.

IN HONOR OF VETERANS

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute, along with my colleagues in the Congress, to the many brave men who have fought for freedom and defended our great way of life. The 38 million American men and women who have served in the armed services represent the willingness to do whatever is necessary to insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Of the 38 million veterans, 27 million are alive today to be honored on this

Veterans Day. Their ranks are increasing at the rate of 70,000 each month.

On this date 51 years ago, most people of the world were told and made to believe that peace loving nations had in fact defeated the aggressive nations and war was an unnecessary instrument of solving international difficulties. That conclusion was wrong. War continues to plague our embattled world.

During the wars in which the United States has fought since my home State of Minnesota was admitted to the Union, men from my State have distinguished themselves under fire. Soldiers from Minnesota have received 27 Congressional Medals of Honor. Men of Minnesota fought in the Civil War while they fought the Indians on their frontiers. Minnesota soldiers were conspicuous in the war with Spain, both World Wars, and wars in Korea and now in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, may I tell two stories of outstanding military service from the history of Minnesota. The first involves the War Between the States and the second concerns the Second World War.

Minnesota's war veterans do not go back to the War of Independence; in fact, the first military activity in my State came in 1805, 2 years after the Louisiana Purchase, when Lt. Zebulon Pike was dispatched up the Mississippi to determine the source of the river. Pike met with the Sioux Indians and struck what was a pretty good transaction. Pike bought 155,520 acres of land for 60 gallons of whisky and about \$200 worth of trinkets or roughly 1¼ cents an acre. Work on Fort Snelling was begun in 1820.

Aside from occasionally chasing the Sioux or the Chippewa Indians away from a French trading post or an American settlement, there was no military activity in Minnesota until the Civil War. Minnesota was the first State to answer President Lincoln's call for 75,000 men. Minnesota Governor, Alexander Ramsey, offered Secretary of War, Simon Cameron, 1,000 troops. Considering the population of the State, that offer was a little optimistic.

In April 1861, the 1st Minnesota Infantry was commissioned in the Union Army and began training. There were great dinners and festivals and the men the State of Minnesota had promised were ready to march. Historical accounts of the first weeks of the 1st Minnesota indicate that the prospect of war appealed to the frontiersmen and they went about their training with considerable excitement. The troops were generally equipped and fed through private contributions.

Continuing to enjoy the whole idea of war, the 1st Minnesota received temporary orders to defend the frontier and then permanent orders to go to Washington. Under the command of Col. Willis A. Gorman, the 1st Minnesota traveled by luxury steamboat down the Mississippi to the railroad connection.

As the *Northern Belle* and the *War Eagle* would approach a town, soldiers would disembark, march through the city and reboard their boats all to the delight of townsfolk. The regiment then traveled by first-class railway car to Harrisburg. Cattle cars took them to

Baltimore where the crowds were more hostile.

The 1st Minnesota, which had seen no action, was joined with the Army of the Potomac and in 3 weeks was in the thick of the fighting. Their first battle was at Bull Run where during half an hour of fighting, 42 were killed, 108 were wounded, and 30 were listed as missing.

For 2 years, the First Minnesota fought battles with familiar names in Maryland and Virginia. The Union was not doing well. The Minnesota regiment was down from nearly 1,000 men to 262 soldiers.

Communications were bad as the 262 men sat on a ridge awaiting orders in Pennsylvania. It was July 2, 1863. Union troops were retreating on both sides of the First Minnesota but it stayed put.

In order to protect the Union retreat, the First Minnesota was ordered to charge—it did. Col. William Colvill, in charge at the time, led his 262 men against the Confederates at Gettysburg. They charged without firing a shot even though the enemy 20 times as strong fired repeatedly. The First Minnesota, with bayonets only, broke the first two ranks of the Confederate lines.

That night, 57 men were left; 215 were dead or wounded. It was not over. Those who could walk were put in the front of the Union lines because of their experience. At 1 in the afternoon, 15,000 Confederate troops started across the field in Pickett's charge. The First Minnesota was the first unit to engage the enemy. And 17 more were killed or wounded. General Lee began his retreat.

Two Minnesota men were accorded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Three other Minnesotans were also given the Nation's highest honor for action during the Civil War in other engagements.

Minnesota contributed 22,000 troops to the Civil War while it was, at the same time, putting down the Sioux Uprising in 1862. And Minnesota had a population of less than 200,000 people. Over 2,000 men were killed or died while in service.

Men from Minnesota continued to serve with distinction through the Indian wars, the war with Spain, the First and Second World Wars, and the wars in Korea and Vietnam. There are now 476,000 veterans in Minnesota. Each of them a proud man of whom we are proud.

Mr. Speaker, in the Second World War, it was again the men from Minnesota who were at the front. Minnesota naval militiamen were aboard the U.S.S. *Ward* when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. While the American base was caught virtually unprepared to defend itself, the men of the *Ward* were ready. The first shot fired in that attack was by the Americans from Minnesota and they sunk a Japanese submarine before the attack. The men of the *Ward* were almost entirely from Minnesota and they were the ones who scored a direct hit a full hour before the first bombs fell on the harbor.

I salute the veterans of Minnesota for the service they have rendered. We have a great Nation and I am eternally grateful to the men who have defended it. Freedom will be preserved by men from

all States like the ones from my State who were willing to pay whatever price was asked in the defense of liberty.

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, although a cosponsor of House Resolution 612—and therefore its supporter—I nevertheless strongly feel it should be improved by amendment when it reaches the House floor.

It is fine as far as it goes, presenting a commendable bipartisan expression of support for the President's diplomatic initiatives for a just settlement in Vietnam. Certainly, these initiatives deserve united support. Indeed, what American opposes them? Unfortunately the outlook is grim. In his November 3 statement, Mr. Nixon summed up with these words:

No progress whatever has been made except agreement on the shape of the bargaining table.

In all candor, the impact of House Resolution 612 on our bargaining position will be limited at best.

The resolution is totally silent on "another front" which the President described as "more encouraging." That "front" is the scheduled withdrawal of all our ground combat forces, which represents a fundamental change in basic policy. Here an expression of united support from the House could have significant impact. It would serve to remove any doubt—if such exists—that the American people support the ground combat troop reductions already directed by the President and his plan to remove the remaining such forces. It would encourage the President to go forward with this courageous, practical means of dealing with one of the most complex problems that has ever confronted our Nation.

Troop withdrawal was the heart of the plan which the President said "will bring the war to an end regardless of what happens on the negotiating front."

He said:

We have adopted a plan which we have worked out in cooperation with the South Vietnamese for the complete withdrawal of all U.S. ground combat forces and their replacement by South Vietnamese forces on an orderly scheduled timetable.

Several months ago, in cooperation with my colleagues, Representatives VERNON W. THOMPSON of Wisconsin, WILLIAM L. HUNGATE of Missouri, and THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., of Massachusetts, I drafted a resolution—House Resolution 564—on this very point. It now has 128 cosponsors. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the substantial reductions in United States ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date.

When the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported House Resolution 612, I

sought to amend it by combining with it the language of House Resolution 564. The amendment I proposed—shown below in italics—would have changed House Resolution 612 to read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives affirms its support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, expresses the earnest hope of the people of the United States for such a peace, calls attention to the numerous peaceful overtures which the United States has made in good faith toward the Government of North Vietnam, *expresses its sense that the substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in our national interest*, approves and supports the principles enunciated by the President that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free elections open to all South Vietnamese and supervised by an impartial international body, and the United States is willing to abide by the results of such elections, supports the President in his call upon the Government of North Vietnam to announce its willingness to honor such elections and to abide by such results, to allow the issues in controversy to be peacefully so resolved in order that the war may be ended and peace may be restored at last in Southwest Asia, *and supports the President's expressed determination to withdraw our remaining ground combat forces at the earliest practicable date.*

The amendment was rejected on a close vote. When House Resolution 612 reaches the House floor I will seek recognition for the purpose of offering the same amendment.

I hope that many others will join the 128 original sponsors of House Resolution 564 in supporting my amendment. A strong affirmative vote would give our President the congressional support he deserves in the fulfillment of "this plan which will bring the war to an end regardless of what happens on the negotiating front."

Clearly, the House of Representatives has a duty to formulate a position on basic Vietnam policy, and I would hope it will endorse the policy being pursued by the President. This will be the first time the House has spoken on this subject since 1964 when it passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Since that time many things have changed. The Vietnam war is altogether different than 5 years ago. Our new Commander in Chief deserves a vote of confidence in the fundamental policy change he has initiated.

The Constitution delegates to the House a responsibility in the formulation of foreign policy. Too often we have shirked it. We have shrunk from judgments and decisions which seemed difficult because of their complexity and the uncertainty of their outcome. Nevertheless, this neglect did not absolve us from the responsibility. Rather, it denied the President—and the Nation—the galvanizing support of public opinion formulated and hammered out on this great anvil of democracy.

If we fail to speak up in support as the President pursues his announced policy of "withdrawal of all United States combat ground forces and their replacement by South Vietnamese forces on an orderly scheduled timetable," we will once again deprive our country of a vital service which only we can render.

HASTE MAKES WASTE

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have not been a firm supporter of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I admit that the Commission does endeavor to follow a very detailed plan of preparation before detonating any underground nuclear blast. Ultimately abandoning a proposed project in Alaska, which was part of its "Flowshare" program, the AEC studied for over 2 years the physical land, the biotic systems and the bioenvironment of the land, before even approving the underground blast.

Now consider the activities of the major oil companies in bringing to market the oil discovery in Prudhoe Bay. The Alaskan oil rush is on and Congress is being pressured to acquiesce—overnight—to policies that would affect the economy, ecology, and environment of Alaska for generations to come. And yet, the officials of Interior itself have acknowledged that scientific studies to determine the impact of the construction of the oil pipeline on even the tundra of the land have never been done by their Department.

What is the rush? The oil has been there untold millions of years and I assume it will still be there next year and the year after that. "Haste" in granting permission to construct the trans-Alaska pipeline system could lead to "waste" of the environment of Alaska. Calm deliberation is the proper course for Congress and the Department of the Interior at this time. In line with such deliberation, our colleagues will appreciate the editorial remarks on the subject in the New York Times on Monday, November 10. The article follows:

SLOW DOWN THE OIL RUSH

Governor Keith Miller of Alaska is reported to be indignant over the Federal Government's hesitation in approving construction of the giant pipeline to bring out the wealth of the fabulous oil strikes on the Alaskan North Slope. Refusal of the appropriate Congressional committees to be rushed into giving Secretary of the Interior Hickel a green light is regarded by the Governor as "illegal" and "an unwarranted interference in the affairs of the sovereign state of Alaska."

The indignation is misdirected. It should be addressed, instead, to the Atlantic Richfield Company, the Humble Oil Company and the British Petroleum Company for the greedy haste with which they are prepared to endanger a vast territory—the land, its people and its wildlife—for the sake of a quick and enormously profitable return on their investment. A measure of their over-readiness to risk what is not theirs to gamble with is the fact that pipe for the project has already been brought in—and there is good reason to believe that preliminary work on the right of way has been started, without benefit of permit or of law.

Governor Miller and the oil companies need to be reminded of a few simple facts which may have been overlooked in the hurry to cash in on the treasure of the fields near Prudhoe Bay. Almost the entire length of the projected 800-mile pipeline to Valdez is over public lands belonging to all the people of the United States. Alaska will in time resume its right, under the act that gave it statehood, to acquire more Federal lands, but not

before Congress has had a chance to deal with the claims of the native Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians to whom it owes the solemn obligations to see that they do not go the tragic way of the American Indian.

While that land is still Federal property it is the plain duty of the United States Government to make as sure as it is humanly possible that this vast region is not exploited, polluted or otherwise ruined for the profit of the oil companies or even for the sake of the short-run revenues that will accrue to the Alaskan state treasury.

To date there is not the least assurance that oil can be piped over such a distance, across land that can be scarred for a quarter-century by the track of a bulldozer, without causing irremediable destruction. In this tundra a 48-inch pipeline filled with hot oil could produce rapid and disastrous erosion in the underlying permafrost. Taking gravel from the river bottoms to lay a foundation over the tundra for roads, camps and airstrips would destroy spawning grounds, and running the pipe above ground would create a barrier to migrating caribou and other wildlife—all necessary to the ecological balance of the region.

Beyond these dangers, the risk of leaks in the line, or outright breaks, is extremely grave. Last year there were more than 500 such leaks in the United States, not to mention the devastation off Santa Barbara. The Alaskan line would pose a far greater hazard, being four times as wide as most—a half-million gallons of oil for every mile of pipe—and traversing an area notoriously prone to earthquakes. In the slow-healing permafrost of the Arctic a huge oil slick would last for decades, perhaps for centuries, killing all the wildlife in its way, with unforseeable damage to the total environment.

To his credit, Secretary Hickel has drawn up an impressive list of stipulations for the builders of the pipeline in the event they are allowed to go ahead, including constant inspection and plans for emergencies. But so far neither of the Congressional committees has been convinced that the Interior Department has the resources or the manpower to enforce the Secretary's proposed regulations. A handful of low-salaried inspectors stationed great distances apart is hardly the force to cope with the enormous pressure of companies bent on quick completion and of state officials understandably eager for a lift to the economy.

Like the Congressional committees, we cannot see the case for swift action now, with the chance of infinite regret later. On the side of haste is money; on the side of study, of careful and coherent planning, is the life of a state and its people.

REPEAL OF SECTION 5(a)2 OF THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services, acting in accordance with the proposal submitted by President Nixon, agreed to H.R. 14001, which would repeal section 5(a)2 of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

I think that we can also agree that some sort of selection system is necessary at this time to maintain our military posture.

To this end, the House of Representatives recently passed H.R. 14001, legislation to modify the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces. This legislation, whereby all young men would know by the end of

their 19th year whether they would be required to do military service, is most important. It is essential that these young men be given some opportunity to plan their future course of action without feeling themselves vulnerable for a period of 7 years.

The change in the Selective Service System proposed by the President and passed by the House is now awaiting action in the other body. The change is fair and equitable. It should be acted upon immediately.

SEATING COMMUNIST CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the United Nations debate on the question of seating the Communist Chinese in the United Nations, former Congressman Walter Judd and the Committee of 1 Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, of which he is chairman, have released a white paper analyzing recent Communist Chinese history and its qualifications for membership in the U.N.

It is an authentic and accurate history in brief and sets forth in far clearer terms than I could compose the reasons why the admission of Communist China is out of the question. I am pleased to see that the Nixon administration has reiterated our opposition to the seating of the Communists and I commend the President for so doing.

This report is well worth the time and attention of every Member, and I hope they will read it as I have.

The report follows:

COMMUNIST CHINA: AN ASSESSMENT

(NOTE.—Twenty years have elapsed since Mao Tse-tung and his Communist followers completed the subversion and conquest of the China mainland.

(For the estimated 650 to 700 million Chinese people the past two decades have been marked by a turbulence and tyranny seldom, if ever, paralleled in 4,000 years of recorded Chinese history.

(It is both timely and proper that an assessment be made of Red China today. This report will attempt, as briefly as possible, to provide such an assessment.)

On April 1, 1969, 1,512 delegates, hand-picked by the supporters of Mao Tse-tung after repeated delays and much difficulty, convened the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in Peking's "People's Hall."

Though the Party Constitution adopted by the Eighth Congress in 1956 ordered that a session of the National Party Congress be held annually, none had been called since the end of the second session of the 8th Congress in May, 1958—a span of 11 years.

Why?

Largely because Mao Tse-tung embarked on programs that were to send mainland China into severe convulsions during those eleven years, beginning with his Great Leap Forward and ending with his Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The principal result of the great Leap was to set back China's economy by uprooting its agricultural plant through the institution of rural communes and by dislocating the small but promising industrial plant the Reds had captured from the Chiang Kai-Shek period.

The principal result of the Cultural Revolution has been to unravel the entire fabric of traditional Chinese life, close down its schools, create near-anarchy in cities, towns and countryside and submit an entire nation to the stifling memorization of the Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung, the wisdom of Mao Tse-tung, the omniscience of Mao Tse-tung and the idolatry of Mao Tse-tung.

Between what amounted to a Great Leap Backward and a Revolution Against Culture, the most heavily populated nation in the world has been placed in limbo, literally going nowhere fast in a century when social, economic and political progress are mankind's most urgent business.

According to testimony from the endless procession of refugees from Communist China and by the admission of some of Mao's ardent Western supporters who have been permitted to visit Red China in recent years, most of Mao's much heralded "agrarian reform" programs have been failures. Food grain production alone dropped by five million tons in 1968.

China's industry is still woefully miniscule for a nation with such a vast labor pool. It is particularly retarded in providing consumer goods that would be considered commonplace in any other land—even in other Communist countries.

The simple hoe is still the primary agricultural tool. The bicycle is the most cherished and popular available mode of transportation. Not a single mile of sorely needed new railroad track has been built in the past ten years. Matches, soap, most meats, many vegetables, tobacco and other everyday consumer goods are strictly rationed. Cloth is so hard to obtain that relatives living outside Communist China are urged by their loved ones within to send pieces of yard-goods rather than money in order to provide new patches for worn out clothing.

Even in the field of education where the Communists initially continued the great strides made before the Japanese invasion in reducing illiteracy and expanding the number of schools and teachers in China, Mao's personal campaigns of "leaps" and "anti-culture" have slowed development to a virtual standstill.

During the "cultural revolution," largely as a means of making available large numbers of young people for the Red Guards and the resultant riots and demonstrations, Peking ordered schools closed, colleges and universities shut down, and faculties purged.

It is estimated that since 1966 the stifling effect of limiting all reading, discussion and thinking to the "thoughts" and "works" of Mao Tse-tung, coupled with the closing of schools and the sending of 160,000 competent teachers to work in the countryside in order to learn the "wisdom of the peasants," may have set mainland China's future back more than a decade.

Even the People's Liberation Army newspaper "Red Flag" recently had the courage to admit that the young people of Communist China were becoming bored with reading nothing but Mao's words and suggested, editorially, that perhaps it would be healthier if Red China's youth was exposed to outside writings even though these might, of course, convey "dangerous" ideas.

Only in the field of nuclear weapons where Peking has fanatically concentrated its economic and scientific resources has Communism managed to produce any significant advancements.

By ignoring the needs of the Chinese people, Mao Tse-tung's followers have been able to saturate vast reaches of the world with propaganda, subversion and—in the case of Southeast Asia—outright promotion of terrorism and violent revolution in the name of so-called wars of national liberation.

It is little wonder, therefore, that it took so long to call a Party Congress, particularly after Mao's costly "leaps" and "revolution"

led to sharp schisms within the Party hierarchy and forced him to turn to the mob rule of the youthful Red Guards in order to stay in power at all.

Like everything else Mao has tried in China, the Red Guards got completely out of hand. Today Peking rules uneasily over a strife-torn, anti-Maoist and increasingly anti-Communist population of restive peasants, workers and intellectuals only by virtue of the PLA—the misnamed People's Liberation Army.

To keep that army on his side, Mao has paid a tremendous price. He forced the Ninth Party Congress to officially designate his trusted comrade, Defense Minister Lin Piao, as his successor. He gave PLA commanders a disproportionate share of the seats in the Party Central Committee. He has also turned over control of key regions and provinces of mainland China to Lin's generals. Although a dedicated Marxist-Leninist whose famous "thoughts" include an admonition that the Party must always be master of the army—never the reverse—Mao now relies almost entirely on the military to maintain his dictatorship over the Chinese masses.

Aside from Mao and Lin, who runs China today?

First, consider the composition of the new Central Committee elected by the Ninth Congress.

Of the 170 full members, 58 are Communist revolutionary cadres including Mao himself. Seventy-three are PLA military chiefs, including Lin Piao. Thirty-nine appear to represent so-called organizations of the masses—peasant unions, workers groups, etc.

The Ninth Congress was in secret session for 24 days—the longest meeting of a Chinese Communist Party Congress in history. This tends to confirm reports that even with hand-picked delegates Mao and his closest aides had difficulty in arranging their new Constitution and the composition of the Central Committee.

On April 28, the Committee elected a new Politburo chaired by Mao with Lin Piao as Vice Chairman. The Standing Committee of the Politburo, which formerly consisted of eleven members, was reduced to five to give Mao absolute control the decision-making process. Aside from Mao and Lin, the others are Chou En-lai, Mao's long-time Premier, Chen Po-Ta and Kang Sheng, both of whom are old-line regulars in Mao's camp.

Of the 21 Politburo members—including the five on the Standing Committee—eleven are from the army—assuring the PLA control of Red China's political affairs in the future.

Since the Ninth Party Congress, two important internal developments have occurred. One is that official Peking publications are suddenly listing Mao—for the first time since he gained control of the mainland in October, 1949—as a co-equal commander with Lin Piao of the People's Liberation Army. This is being interpreted by Hong Kong observers as an indication that Lin's health may be sufficiently in doubt to force Mao to assume a title he so long frowned upon simply to protect the continuity of his grip on the army.

The other development is the emergence of Finance Minister Li Hsien-nien as acting (if not actual) Foreign Minister amid strong indications that he may become Premier if another strong indication becomes a fact: Premier Chou En-lai may be named the figurehead President of the Chinese People's Republic. Peking has become sensitive to the fact that since the purge of President Liu Shao-chi no one has replaced him. When Chou led the delegation to the funeral of North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, Cambodian Premier Sihanouk noted that no head of state except himself paid homage to the deceased dictator of Hanoi—not even a "President of the Chinese People's Republic."

In the eyes of Asians—even Communist Asians—this is almost unforgivable.

Such is the hierarchy which rules China today.

Since it is obvious the military now governs Communist China, what is its strength and composition?

At the present time, Communist China presents an overall picture of military weakness rather than strength. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) can, of course, draw upon an enormous population base, amounting to perhaps 150 million men of military age. The Chinese Communists themselves claimed in 1958 that there were 170 million people in the "People's Militia." But it is obvious that the economic and technological base of mainland China is capable of supporting only a fraction of such numbers in terms of all-important equipment and logistics. Fighting on their own territory, the Chinese masses would constitute a formidable problem to any invader. But in terms of offensive capability, Peking is still in no position to take on any first class military power.

The numerical strength of the PLA is estimated to have been between 2,150,000 and 2,540,000 before the outbreak of the Cultural Revolution in 1966. It may be slightly higher at the present time. Most of the estimated 110 to 130 divisions still consist of lightly equipped infantry. There are only seven or eight completely motorized divisions. Tanks number about 3,500 and artillery pieces 6,500. Modernization of heavy equipment is lagging, but there has been a thorough modernization of light weapons since the early 1960's, so that by now nearly all units of the army should have received new rifles and light machine guns.

During the early and middle Fifties, the Chinese Communists received a great deal of assistance from the Soviet Union in building an Air Force. In 1958 the numerical strength of the Air Force reached 3,332 aircraft, including 2,614 jets. The development of the Sino-Soviet dispute, however, brought an end to Soviet aid and throughout much of the 1960's both the quantity and the quality of the Chinese air forces has declined. In December, 1966, the overall strength of the Air Force had dropped to 2,792 aircraft, according to intelligence sources. This figure included 2,354 jets, of which, 1,844 were fighters. Only 290 of these had been manufactured after 1960, and nearly 1,200 were more than 8 years old.

The Chinese Communist Navy is still the weakest part of Peking's military establishment, although the adaptability of missiles to small surface ships and submarines may soon increase its effectiveness.

The Navy is designed primarily for coastal defense. In addition to an assortment of old destroyers, frigates, escorts and minesweepers, the Chinese surface navy is built primarily around high speed patrol boats of the Osa and Komar classes, which are armed with short-range surface-to-surface missiles. The effectiveness of such vessels—designed by the Russians—was demonstrated in 1967 when one was used to sink the Israeli destroyer *Eilat*. The Chinese are continuing to build these types of ships as well as gunboats and torpedo boats.

The Chinese have perhaps 40 to 50 submarines—all of them diesel-powered. Secretary of Defense Laird reported in May, 1969, that the Chinese Communists do have one Soviet-type diesel-powered G-class missile-launching submarine, although there was at that time no evidence that they had as yet developed a missile for it.

Red China's major military threat to the United States (or the Soviet Union) will come into being when, and if, she develops an ICBM capability. Through September 30, 1969, Red China has detonated nine nuclear devices, including six with thermonuclear materials. It is probable that she now has a limited stockpile of nuclear bombs, and her nuclear capabilities can be expected to grow gradually over the next few years.

The ICBM development program has not, however, progressed as rapidly as had been estimated. The first flight test was expected

before the end of 1967, but has not been confirmed. And although tests have been conducted with medium range ballistic missiles (MRBM), no actual deployment has as yet been discovered. Inasmuch as this deployment is now two years behind schedule, either technical or political problems must be the cause of the delay. In any event, testing is continuing, according to Secretary Laird, up to ranges of about 1,000 miles. The intelligence community continues to believe that the Chinese intend to deploy a MRBM system. But even if they were to do so soon they could not have an operational MRBM force until late in 1970. By the mid-1970's they could have a force of 80-100 operational MRBMs, which would pose a direct threat to Red China's Asian neighbors.

A serious military weakness of Communist China is that purely military training has often been sacrificed at the expense of political indoctrination.

Until the Cultural Revolution showdown and the Red Guards convulsion, the military avoided direct intervention in what was developing into a civil war between pro- and anti-Mao factions. When Mao finally ordered the army to support him with force if necessary, many of the local military commanders sided with the anti-Maoists. Consequently, there is considerable speculation that PLA morale is currently at a low ebb.

The current Sino-Soviet dispute dates from about 1956-57. Peking reacted negatively to Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" speech in 1956, while the Soviets opposed the economic misadventures of the Great Leap Forward. At the 12-nation conference of Communist parties in November, 1957, the Chinese Communists challenged the thesis that there could be a "peaceful transition" to socialism in the capitalist world. A further sharp conflict erupted at the World Communist Conference in November, 1960. Relations were also exacerbated by the Soviet failure to support Communist China militarily during the Quemoy Crisis of 1958, and by what the Chinese called Soviet "capitulationism" at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962.

During 1964-65, Communist China sought to organize an Afro-Asian Conference which would exclude all whites, including the Soviet Union, which it branded a "colonial power" in Asia. The attempt to ban the U.S.S.R. failed, and the Conference had to be abandoned.

This and other Chinese foreign policy reversals almost certainly played a part in the initiation of the Great Cultural Revolution in 1966. The Cultural Revolution adopted an extremely virulent anti-Soviet tone, resulting in the purging of all those elements in Communist China which might be at all favorable to the Soviet Union. For example, there is some evidence that the purged military Chief of Staff, Lo Jui-ching, wished rapprochement with Moscow for the purpose of making common cause in the Vietnam war. And such Party opposition leaders as Liu Shao-shi and Ten Hsiao-ping may have wished better relations with the U.S.S.R. for the purpose of achieving economic assistance for China's internal development.

The Sino-Soviet conflict approached the explosion point in the summer of 1969, following military clashes along their border which were probably provoked by the Chinese. The ostensible reason for the border trouble was Peking's claim to territories which were seized by Tsarist Russia a century ago. The leaders of both Communist giants have now formally warned their peoples of the danger of war with the other.

In July and August of this year the Soviet Union substantially increased its military forces along the Chinese border and conducted a series of military maneuvers. Rumors have been circulated concerning a possible preemptive Soviet strike against China. It was in this charged climate that Soviet Premier Kosygin met with China's Chou En-lai in early September, following the death of

North Vietnam's Ho Chi-Minh. Since then Peking has agreed to further talks and a Soviet delegation arrived in Peking for preliminary discussions in October.

Communist China's Ninth Party Congress was shrouded in mystery. Only three official releases were distributed and the number of delegates present fell far short of the original plan of the Maoists which called for a "mass rally of 10,000 people" with seven to eight thousand delegates and about 2,000 foreign guests.

Unlike previous meetings of the Party high command, the Congress came forth with more theory than practical planning although they did reaffirm their devotion to Mao and his "thoughts."

Lin Piao's political report received the most attention and the Congress adopted the new constitution. The constitution also gave co-equal status to the Soviet Union and the United States as Red China's number one enemies: the first because of alleged revisionism, "social imperialism" and opposition to Mao, the second because Peking views the U.S. as the leader of capitalist imperialism.

Lin's speech was significant because it amplified Mao's famous statement of October, 1968, in which he declared:

"Therefore, we cannot speak of final victory, not even for decades. We must not lose our vigilance. The final victory of a socialist country not only requires the efforts of the proletariat and the great masses of the people at home but also depends on the victory of the world revolution and the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man over the whole world. . . ."

Mao also stated at that time, and Lin repeated it during the Congress:

"With regard to the question of world war, there are but two possibilities. One is that the war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent the war."

Lin's political report sounded forth most strongly on two fronts. First, he denounced foes of Mao Tse-tung as "heretics" who must be obliterated from the China scene. He insisted that Mao is both the founder and leader of the international Communist movement following Marx and Lenin. (In the 24,000 words of his message to the Congress, Lin mentioned "Chairman Mao" and "Mao Tse-tung's thought" a total of 148 times.)

Second, Lin discussed revolution at home and abroad. Internally, he declared that the Cultural Revolution must continue to weed out class opponents of Mao. He admitted there are deep divisions within mainland China that make the so-called class struggle between "the socialist road and the capitalist road" so touch-and-go that Communist China is faced with "the danger of capitalist restoration."

Lin asserted that the only hope for Mao's regime is to "exercise all-around dictatorship of the proletariat in the superstructure including all spheres of culture, and strengthen and consolidate the economic base of socialism."

With respect to the outside world, Lin added that Maoists are convinced that the only way to preserve and consolidate political power is to strengthen their rule by internal violence and speed up the export of external revolution.

Lin also quoted Mao as saying that the PLA is "the main component of the state" which must do all in its power "to engage in all types of revolution around the globe."

He specified—in no uncertain terms—that winning the war in Vietnam by forcing America's withdrawal is of prime concern to Peking and that Red China intends to step up its efforts to promote "revolutionary struggle" in Laos, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, Palestine and regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

He hailed the "just struggle" of the "proletariat, students and youth, and the masses

of black people of the United States" and "all the just struggles of resistance against aggression and oppression by U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism."

He even called for a revolution in the Soviet Union but he said after Vietnam, Mao and he would direct their attention to the export of violent revolution throughout southeast Asia.

It is because of this virtual declaration of war against what remains of free Asia by Lin Piao—and Communist China's aggressions against Tibet, India, South Korea, etc.—that so many free Asian leaders are now speaking openly of their fears for the future of their countries.

Finally, Lin reminded his audience at the Ninth Congress of his September, 1965, declaration in favor of so-called "People's Wars." He likened the less developed regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America to the "countryside" in which Communist revolutionaries could launch violence, terrorism and subversion on so many fronts that eventually they would encircle and engulf the advanced countries of Western Europe, North America and Japan, which he described as the "cities." It is just this strategy that succeeded in the conquest of China itself and which has been applied to Communism's aggressive subversion in Vietnam.

Thus, it is appropriate to recall a speech delivered by North Vietnamese General Nguyen Van Vinh in 1966 to the fourth Vietcong Supreme Headquarters Congress:

"China holds that conditions for negotiations are not yet ripe, nor until a few years from now, and—even possibly—seven years from now. In the meantime, we should continue fighting to bog down the enemy, and should wait until a number of socialist countries acquire adequate conditions for strengthening their main force troops to launch a strong, all-out, and rapid offensive, using all types of weapons and heeding no borders. What we should do in the South (Vietnam) today is try to restrain the enemy and make him bog down, waiting until China has built strong forces to launch an all-out offensive."

There is nothing in either the words or the actions of the Mao-Lin groups to suggest that any moderation of past policies is in store. The Peking regime indicated at the Ninth Party Congress this year that it feels free to pursue its external revolutionary goals with even greater diligence and virulence.

Behind this conclusion is the Mao-Lin hierarchy's stated objective of "leading" the international Communist movement while spreading the gospel of Mao to the far corners of the world.

Unstated is Peking's undoubted aim of distracting the restless, rebellious populace at home by embarking on "foreign adventures" that may also hold some appeal for China's jingoists.

Regardless of motivation, as the Prime Minister of Malaysia stated so clearly in a recent interview, it is clear that Communist China is dedicated to the subversion of "first, southeast Asia . . . then all of Asia," and thus free Asian leaders approach the future with fear and uncertainty.

In the light of its record and stated objectives, does Red China qualify for membership in the United Nations? Would its admission make the United Nations more united—and more effective? Or less united—and less effective?

A LONG AND TOUGH ASSIGNMENT ENDS

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as both an investigative and legislative commit-

tee, the old House Committee on Un-American Activities—HCUA—recently renamed the House Committee on Internal Security, has figured prominently in matters involving national and internal security since the 1940's. Whether delving into the subversive activities of the Communist Party USA or exposing the Ku Klux Klan's onslaught against basic civil rights, the committee's work has necessitated confrontation with various types of extremists individuals, organizations and ideologies alien to our way of life. Not too many other congressional committees have had their public hearings disrupted by radical elements or have entertained witnesses who owed their allegiance to a foreign totalitarian power. From hearings on Communist infiltration of the radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California at Berkeley to the operations of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania or the District of Columbia, HCUA assignments covered the widest range of subjects and areas in dealing with subversive activities in the field of internal security. Needless to say, those of the HCUA staff labored under grave responsibilities in collecting and evaluating information in these highly sensitive areas.

One HCUA staff member who perhaps is more knowledgeable concerning the history and operation of the committee is Donald T. Appell who joined HCUA in 1947 and who has recently retired. Shortly after joining HCUA, Don received his baptism of fire in the celebrated Alger Hiss case. The Hiss case was an excellent example of the painstaking care and hard work required of those investigating subversive activities. The monumental KKK hearings of 1965-66 provides yet another example of the difficulty and, at times, danger of carrying out HCUA assignments. This has been the sum and substance of most of Don Appell's adult life, and I am sure there were times when he wearied of the responsibilities of his unusual and exacting profession.

When one reads about the flag-burners, the anarchists and America-haters who make headlines today in our midst, one appreciates even more the loyalty and devotion to country which has characterized Don's long and difficult tour of duty in defense of this Nation's security.

The Chicago Tribune of November 9, carried an excellent article by veteran newsman Willard Edwards on Donald T. Appell's eventful career with the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

EX-PROBER FOR NIXON IN HISS CASE ENDS
HIS CAREER IN HOUSE
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, November 8.—Richard M. Nixon, a young California congressman newly arrived in Washington in 1947, had a good eye for talent.

He had just been appointed to the House committee on un-American activities and was aware that its staff needed qualified investigators, diligent in the digging out of information about the communist conspiracy, accurate, and scrupulous in the assessment of evidence.

Nixon happened upon a report by a staff worker which appeared to disclose these

qualities. His recommendation put Donald T. Appell on the un-American activities investigative staff, introducing him to a spectacular career which ended in his retirement this week.

PROVED GOOD DETECTIVE

Appell was 23 when he came to Capitol Hill in 1939 and began working for the House claims committee. His duties were administrative and nobody suspected that he had the instincts of a good detective until, after he had shifted to the un-American activities committee in 1947, he was pressed into service for an inquiry in North Carolina.

Nobody expected the 31-year-old novice, with no investigative experience, to come up with more than routine findings when he was assigned to explore the operations of the Food and Agriculture Workers union in the southern state.

But Appell, patiently interviewing prospective witnesses, eventually located a young woman who had just been expelled from the Communist party for having an illegitimate child by a nonparty member. He succeeded in gaining her confidence and when she finished talking, 19 members of the union board had been identified as Communist party members. The evidence stood up at hearings, resulting in a memorable exposure.

TAKES PRIVATE LESSONS

It was this achievement which called him to Nixon's attention and resulted in his appointment as an investigator and two decades of service in which he frequently served as chief of staff and counsel. He had only a high school education but he took private lessons in law to school himself in the technicalities demanded of his post.

Within a year after Nixon sponsored Appell, both were thrust into central roles in what remains as the greatest spy story of the 20th century—the Alger Hiss case.

Appell was one of the two committee investigators [the other, William Wheeler, has retired] who accompanied Whittaker Chambers, an admitted ex-soviet agent, to his farm in Westminster, Md., on a frosty fall night in 1948.

CHAMBERS NAMES HISS

Chambers had named Hiss and other former government officials as spies for Russia, precipitating a storm which convulsed the nation at the time. Hiss, a former state department official, denied the charges and sued Chambers for \$75,000 in a libel action.

Chambers produced documents at pre-trial hearings to support his charges. These papers were impounded by the court. With President Truman raging that the House committee was politically motivated and the case against Hiss "a red herring," there were reports that the evidence would never be disclosed.

At this point, Chambers told the House committee that he had "held something back." Served with a subpoena, he took the two investigators to his farm and walked to a patch where a number of pumpkins were still attached to their vines.

HIDDEN IN PUMPKIN

Appell will never forget the scene. He recalls his own moments of incredulity as Chambers stooped over, picked up a pumpkin, removed the top, and took out three rolls of developed film and four canisters of undeveloped film from the hollowed-out interior.

"I think this is what you're looking for," said Chambers mildly.

Two days later, the nation was talking about "The Pumpkin Papers." There was a good deal of ridicule but the developed film revealed clearly that Hiss had stolen secret state department papers. Eventually, after two trials, Hiss was convicted of perjury to conceal espionage. He served three years and eight months of a 5-year prison sentence.

"I don't believe Chambers would ever have

given us the film if Hiss had not sued for libel," Appell said. "It's a classic example of a man pushing his bluff of innocence too far."

BROKE KLAN POWER

It would take a book to detail all of Appell's exploits. He is proud of a 14-month investigation in 1965-66 in which he exposed the Ku Klux Klan's operations. The job almost undermined his health. He acted both as chief investigator and counsel in the hearings which followed. The result—complete destruction of the Klan as an operating force in the United States.

Talking of the work of the committee, now called the House Internal Security committee, Appell said that it has been under increasing attack since its creation more than 30 years ago. The most popular charge is that it has destroyed the careers of men and women summoned for interrogation.

"In all the years I have served with the committee," he remarked, "I do not know of one investigation which resulted in a hearing at which the committee could not prove the witness had knowledge in the communist area."

RETIREES RELUCTANTLY

"To my knowledge, no innocent man has ever been subpoenaed for questioning."

Appell is going into retirement reluctantly. He will have a comfortable pension, based on more than 30 years of legislative service, but he is only 53 and has four youngsters to put thru college.

His old sponsor is now President, but Appell's applications for employment in some government security agency have presumably never reached his attention. There are too many holdover officials in the Nixon administration who have little interest in hiring an expert on subversive activities.

LIBERALS CAPITULATE TO EXTREMISTS, REDS DOMINATE "PEACE" MOVEMENT

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Evans-Novak column appearing in today's Washington Post deals with an important aspect of the upcoming anti-Vietnam protest demonstrations which has been either overlooked or ignored by some segments of the press; namely, the radical nature of the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe. Just 2 days ago I emphasized this theme in a press release which was disseminated widely. The text of the release follows:

PRESS FAILS TO DEFINE CHARACTERS AND VIOLENT HISTORY OF PROTEST LEADERS

The ranking Republican on the House Internal Security Committee today charged that much of the press—especially the liberal press—has not accurately portrayed the true character of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe) or its leaders, sponsors of the November 13-15 Vietnam demonstrations.

Rep. John M. Ashbrook (17th Ohio) said in a statement issued today, "Some elements of the press are doing a grave disservice to sincere objectors to the war in Vietnam by ignoring the violent history of the New Mobe Committee, the successor to the National Mobilization Committee."

"The present leaders of New Mobe—this vast assortment of extremists, communists, radicals, and militant leftists—engineered National Mobe efforts which led to the most violent planned confrontation of the decade, the Chicago convention riots. Two of the National Mobe leaders, Dave Dellinger and

Rennie Davis, also leaders in New Mobe, now stand trial in Chicago on charges of conspiring to incite riots.

"Chicago leaders produced some 10,000 demonstrators who were well organized for disruptions which resulted in some 650 arrests, 200 injured policemen and an estimated 900 other injuries.

"National Mobe sponsored the demonstration in Washington on October 20-22, 1967, the goal of which was to confront the war-makers and to 'shut down the Pentagon.' They forced their way into the Pentagon but were promptly removed. The demonstration was marked by a scandalous display of obscenity and immoral behavior and more than 600 arrests resulted.

"National Mobe was again active during President Nixon's inauguration and planned a counter inaugural. Although small, there were still disorderly demonstrations, mutilation of the U.S. flag, and 119 arrests.

"Of the 48 sponsors of New Mobilization, at least 30 of them were leaders, sponsors, or officials of the violence-prone National Mobe.

"Those who would participate in the protests should be advised that a calm protest is the exception, not the rule. Many people were surprised that the October demonstrations did not break down into violence. Most people will be amazed if the November phase does not. A spokesman for the riot-prone Weatherman faction of SDS recently told the press that they would join with 'other explosive elements.' Moreover, Yippies also plan to do their 'thing.'

"Tragically, the press has emphasized primarily the 'bright' side of the demonstrations and avoided the character, the background, the history of the rioters who are in the lead. The evidence is available. For example, the remarks of Attorney General Mitchell, of FBI Director Hoover, the study I inserted in the Congressional Record (October 16, 1969, page 30477), and the study prepared by Rep. Richard Ichord, and many other reports of the Congress, including Vietnam Week, 1967, reports of the Democratic Convention Riots, and reports on the New Left.

"Some news media are attempting to present a complete picture, but for the most part the liberal press, especially such well-known papers as the Washington Post and the New York Times, are tragically misleading major segments of the population."

As pointed out in the release, there is ample public information available on the extremist character and history of many of those who are calling the shots for New Mobe. Yet readers of some major newspapers have been saturated with every detail concerning the operations of New Mobe and its November protest activities with the conspicuous exception of who the New Mobe people are, what they have done in the past, and the radical bent of their leftist ideologies.

Essentially the same objection has been raised by the Press Ethics Committee here in Washington which on November 9 issued the following release:

Dave Dellinger met at Bratislava in Czechoslovakia with Viet Cong Agents just before launching the "peace march" against the Pentagon.

Dave Dellinger met with agents in Communist Rumania just before triggering the violent demonstrations in Chicago at the time of the Democratic National Convention.

Dave Dellinger is now a key sponsor of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Viet Nam which is planning demonstrations in Washington, D.C., November 14-15.

Why are not television and other elements of our news media informing the American people of his record and that of others on the letterhead of the New Mobilization who have similar or worse records?

Why are the major television networks instead trying to make it appear that these demonstrations are led by loyal Americans instead of by leaders whose actions have helped our enemies?

Why does the *Washington Post* confine itself to reporting on the front page that the New Mobilization "is an umbrella for diverse anti-war groups" instead of revealing that the hard-core leadership of the New Mobilization has little relationship to any sincere U.S. peace elements?

The attack upon Vice President Agnew who far understated the case against such leadership instead of upon those whose actions can harm this country is but one of many signs pointing to possible misreporting of a dangerous sort in connection with the upcoming demonstrations.

Television was severely criticized by independent commissions, officials and by many individuals, for actually inciting violence in Chicago by irresponsible reporting of the demonstrations there.

The New Mobilization's November 14-15 demonstrations offer an opportunity for responsible, objective and full reporting of the facts instead of compounding past errors by dangerously misleading and overemotional reporting. It should be kept in mind that the White House itself is involved in the plans of the New Mobilization's questionable leadership.

The Press Ethics Committee, headed by writer and author Chairman Frank, lists among its members veteran columnist Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune, Pulitzer Prize-winner Edgar Ansell Mowrer, and syndicated Washington correspondent Sarah McClendon.

The Evans-Novak column entitled "Liberals Capitulate to Extremists, Reds Dominate 'Peace' Movement" gives in capsule form important information for sincere, peace-seeking citizens who are in danger of being duped and used by New Mobe to further its radical ends. I insert at this point in the RECORD the above-mentioned column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak as additional background material on the demonstrations which are scheduled to begin here in Washington tomorrow:

LIBERALS CAPITULATE TO EXTREMISTS, REDS DOMINATE "PEACE" MOVEMENT

The tens of thousands of well-meaning war protesters set to converge on Washington Saturday will be joining a demonstration planned since summer by advocates of violent revolution in the U.S. who openly support Communist forces in Vietnam.

Accordingly, whatever happens here Saturday, the Nov. 15 march on Washington will mark a postwar highwater mark for the American far left. Responsible liberals have been enlisted as foot soldiers in an operation mapped out mainly by extremists—a testimony to the present ineffectiveness of nonviolent, liberal elements in the peace movement.

Moreover, heavy-handed Nixon administration reaction by Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst assures that any violence on Saturday will be blamed by liberals on the government, and the avoidance of violence will be credited by these same liberals to the self-restraint of the far left.

Although liberals belatedly spent this week in frantic eleventh-hour efforts to co-opt Saturday's march, they had plenty of advance warning. The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe), sponsors of the march, was formed last July in Cleveland with an executive committee dominated by supporters of the Vietcong.

The executive committee is moderate when compared with the 60-member steering committee, studded with past and present Com-

munist Party members (including veteran party functionary Arnold Johnson). Far more important than representation by the largely moribund American Communist Party, however, is inclusion on the steering committee of leaders in its newly invigorated Trotskyite movement.

The steering committee began eclipsing the executive committee in recent weeks under the leadership of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its fast growing youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers' Party took over planning for a march calculated to end in violent confrontation.

Participating in planning sessions were elements even more violence-prone than the Trotskyites: extreme SDS factions calling themselves the revolutionary brigade. Wild scenarios for storming the White House, the Justice Department, and the South Vietnamese Embassy, were prepared.

Furthermore, the New Mobe was in closer contact with Communist Vietnamese official circles than is generally realized. Ron Young, a member of the New Mobe steering committee, journeyed to Stockholm Oct. 11-12 for a meeting attended by representatives of the North Vietnam government and the Vietcong. Reporting on plans for Nov. 15, Young urged a worldwide propaganda campaign to boost the demonstration.

The link between Hanoi and elements of the New Mobe was again demonstrated Oct. 14 when Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam sent greetings to American antiwar demonstrators. Halstead, the Trotskyite leader, drafted a friendly reply to Hanoi approved by a majority of the New Mobe's steering committee. Its transmission was blocked only by the intervention of Stewart Meachem of the American Friends Service Committee, one of the New Mobe's moderates.

Thus far-left orientation of the New Mobe for weeks has worried liberal doves, including the youthful leaders of the peaceful Oct. 15 Moratorium. Sen. Charles Goodell of New York, emerging as a leading congressional foe of the war, attempted—without success—to reduce extremist influence inside the New Mobe and argued against including far leftists on the steering committee.

But the liberals, having forgotten the fate of popular front movements a generation ago and unwilling to repudiate any antiwar forces, would not actually break with the New Mobe. Any chance of that was eliminated by President Nixon's relatively hard-line speech Nov. 3 and government strategy laid down at the Justice Department by Kleindienst.

Goodell and Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota, after much deliberation, accepted invitations to address the demonstration in hopes of moderating it. Similarly, moratorium leaders this week have tried to insinuate themselves into control of the march. But the march remains essentially a project of the far left, constituting a tragic failure of leadership by liberal foes of the war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HICKS, for Thursday, November 13, and the balance of the week on account of business in his district.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 12 through November 20, on account of official business as a representative of the Agricultural Attaché Conference in Bonn, Germany.

Mr. DENNEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of recurring knee injury.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for November 12 through November 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. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, November 18; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, November 20; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BROTZMAN, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, November 19.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, on November 18.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MINISH, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MESKILL.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. McKNEALLY in two instances.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. RUPPE in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. HORTON in three instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in six instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BRINKLEY in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MOORHEAD in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. YATES.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Dr. Paolo (Paul) Genoesse Zerbi; to the Committee on Judiciary.

S. 614. An act for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeyer; to the committee on Judiciary.

S. 823. An act to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1442. An act to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to control of outdoor advertising along Federal-aid highways, in order to authorize one or more pilot programs for the purpose of such section; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as enacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1786. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin; to the Committee on Judiciary.

S. 2339. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Luisa Gorostegui de Dourron; to the Committee on Judiciary.

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Dr. Leonardo M. Cabanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernard Weston March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2363. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Lance Cpl. Andre L. Knoppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2426. An act for the relief of Dr. Delsa Evangelina Estrada de Ferran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2481. An act for the relief of Dr. Farid M. Fuleihan; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to welcome to the United States Olympic delegations authorized by the International Olympic Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11271. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14030. An act to amend section 358(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; and

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal year 1970 to \$610,000,000.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 13, 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:

1325. A communication from the President of the United States, requesting approval of an additional 1,000 air traffic controllers under the budget for the Department of Transportation (H. Doc. 91-190); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1326. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report of the audit of financial statements of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1968, Department of Transportation (H. Doc. 91-191); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1327. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements signed under Public Law 480 in October for foreign currencies, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1328. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operation of section 401 of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969, limiting fiscal year 1970 budget outlays, through October 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1329. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes all periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers when serving as officers of employee organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1330. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, St. Louis and St. Louis County, Mo., Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1331. A letter from the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs to advise the President with regard to all matters affecting the interests of consumers, to have central responsibility for coordinating all Federal programs and activities affecting consumers, and to assure that the interests of consumers are considered by Federal agencies; to establish a Consumer Advisory Council to advise the Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs on matters relating to the consumer interest; and to establish a Consumer Protection Division within the Department of Justice to represent the interest of consumers in administrative and judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1332. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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:

(Pursuant to the order of the House on Nov. 6, 1969 the following report was filed on Nov. 10, 1969.)

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14705. A bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program (Rept. No. 91-612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted Nov. 12, 1969]

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 474 (Rept. No. 91-613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee of

Conference. Conference report on S. 1072 (Rept. No. 91-614). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 675. Providing for agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the bill H.R. 12829 (Rept. No. 91-615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 676. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 14705, a bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program (Rept. No. 91-630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2751. A bill to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10124. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the time for filing tort actions by persons under the age of 21, or insane or mentally ill, or imprisoned on a criminal charge; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12785. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Southern Ute Tribe approximately 213.37 acres of land, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Environmental dangers of open-air testing of lethal chemicals (Rept. No. 91-633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 677. Warning points of order against H.R. 14751 (Rept. No. 91-634). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14751. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2000. An act to establish the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. SMITH of New York: Committee on Judiciary. S. 476. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Zuck; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Jack Brown; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 2241. A bill for the relief of John T. Anderson; with an amendment (Rept. No.

91-618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Commander John W. McCord; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Janis Zalc. anis, Gertrude Jansons, Lorena Jansons Murphy, and Asja Jansons Lidars; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Doctor Emil Bruno; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7830. A bill for the relief of James Howard Griffin; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8100. A bill for the relief of the Burrows Manufacturing Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9092. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10662. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Parker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Russell L. Chandler; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 14740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction with respect to the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 14741. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to revise the next due date for the cost estimate for the Interstate System to amend chapter 4 relating to highway safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 14742. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations under which air carriers will be required to reserve a section of each passenger-carrying aircraft for passengers who desire to smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 14743. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for additional nominations by Members of Congress of persons for appointment to the service academies by the Secretaries of the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 14744. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended.

and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14745. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase OASDI benefits and raise the earnings base, with subsequent adjustments as the cost of living rises, to increase widows' and widowers' benefits, and to liberalize eligibility for disability benefits; to make disabled beneficiaries eligible for medicare without regard to age, to finance the medical insurance program entirely from general revenues, and to cover prescription drugs; and to provide for a study of child health care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 14746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14747. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft within the United States until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds and reports that such flights will not have detrimental physiological or psychological effects on persons on the ground; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 14748. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 14749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 14750. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 14751. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 14752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to set standards to assure safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women; to assist and encourage States to participate in efforts to assure such working conditions; to provide for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 14753. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14754. A bill to create marine sanctuaries from leasing pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in areas off the coast of California adjacent to State-owned submerged lands when such State suspends leasing of such submerged lands for mineral purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14755. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge in California and/or adjacent Western States for the preservation of the California tule

elk; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 14756. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 14757. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FINDLEY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 14758. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs to advise the President with regard to all matters affecting the interests of consumers, to have central responsibility for coordinating all Federal programs and activities affecting consumers, and to assure that the interests of consumers are considered by the Federal agencies; to establish a Consumer Advisory Council to advise the Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs on matters relating to the consumer interest; and to establish a Consumer Protection Division within the Department of Justice to represent the interests of consumers in administrative and judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 14759. A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of improving motor-vehicle transportation services; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 14760. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 14761. A bill to stimulate the development, production, and distribution in interstate commerce of low-emission motor vehicles in order to provide the public increased protection against the hazards of vehicular exhaust emission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14762. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14763. A bill to provide additional mortgage credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14764. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority to limit the rates of interest or dividends payable on certain deposits and accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 14765. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. LENNON, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 14766. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes

effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 14767. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14768. A bill to provide for a review by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences of the safety of substances that have not been regulated under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as food additives because they are generally recognized as safe for their intended food use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 14769. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish an equitable survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 14770. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of the interests of consumers, to coordinate Federal programs and activities, affecting consumers, to assure that the interests of consumers are timely presented and considered by Federal agencies, to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies, and to serve as a clearinghouse for consumer information; to establish a Consumer Advisory Council to oversee and evaluate Federal activities relating to consumers; to authorize the National Bureau of Standards, at the request of businesses, to conduct product standard tests; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14771. A bill to provide a pension for veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14772. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pensions shall be increased by 10 per centum where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. BURTON of California):

H.R. 14773. A bill to provide for a comprehensive income maintenance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 14774. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14775. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 981. 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. BURTON of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 444. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 445. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North Vietnam and its allies complying with the requirements of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COWGER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H. Res. 678. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROVER (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PRINIE, Mr. POFF, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. RUTH, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H. Res. 679. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. CABELL, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, and Mr. PASSMAN):

H. Res. 680. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT and Mrs. DWYER):

H. Res. 681. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON (for himself, Mr. COLMER, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MONAGAN,

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. LENNON):

H. Res. 682. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ZION, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. ESCH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. HALL, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. GUDE):

H. Res. 683. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. HICKS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, and Mr. STUCKEY):

H. Res. 684. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H. Res. 685. Resolution commending the American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 686. Resolution providing for reimbursement of certain travel expenses incurred by employees in the offices of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 687. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should actively participate in the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself and Mr. RIEGLE):

H. Res. 688. Resolution toward peace with

justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 689. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. Res. 690. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 14776. A bill for the relief of Italo Vittorio Maricchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 14777. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Libera Scrocca de Girolamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 14778. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14779. A bill for the relief of Murray Swartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 14780. A bill for the relief of James P. Cook; 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:

327. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to legislation clarifying the operation of the 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

328. Also, petition of Walter M. Seiter, Aurora, Colo., relative to pensions for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE—Wednesday, November 12, 1969

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Sovereign God of the nations, we earnestly pray that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection. Incline the hearts of all citizens to cultivate a spirit of reconciliation and unity. Bring the people to a firm consensus for peace with freedom and give us resolution to obtain it for ourselves and for all men.

Bless all who serve Thee in this place that they may have the higher wisdom of Thy spirit, exercise brotherly affection for one another, and in all things demean themselves with the charity and humility of Thy Son who went about doing good.

In whose name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington D.C., November 12, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 6, 1969:

S. 210. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the Pueblo of Laguna; and

S. 1689. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes.

On November 10, 1969:

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 11, 1969, be dispensed with.

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