

### CONSULTATION WITH SENATE ASKED ON STRATEGIC ARMS LIM- ITATION TALKS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there seems to me a contradiction between the action of the White House of yesterday, preventing the Committee on Foreign Relations from being consulted or briefed concerning the Helsinki Strategic Arms Limitation talks, and the President's statement to us of today that he intends to set up a procedure to consult with the Senate concerning the conclusion of international agreements.

I would hope today's view would prevail and steps would be taken to insure that the Senate is consulted and briefed concerning SALT.

In this connection, it certainly seems incongruous that 14 NATO nations are to be briefed tomorrow by our negotiators, although we in the Senate, who will eventually have the responsibility of consenting to whatever may be the eventual treaty, are not being briefed.

### NEW MOBILIZATION MARCH IN WASHINGTON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the Vietnam moratorium last month, millions of Americans took part in peaceful, orderly rallies and meetings to express their strong desire for an early end to the war in Vietnam.

I supported the goals of the October moratorium, and I support now the goals of the moratorium activities planned for today and tomorrow. If the activities planned for this week by the Vietnam moratorium committee are conducted in

the same responsible and orderly manner, they can contribute much to the national dialog on this vital issue.

I must say, however, that I am concerned over the plans announced by a new and separate organization, the New Mobilization To End the War in Vietnam, for a massive march in Washington on November 15. I am concerned because this march, I believe, poses a greater risk of violent confrontation, and because the New Mobilization includes some of the more radical and militant organizations and individuals, such as the Young Trotskyites and the radical faction of the Students for a Democratic Society, who have in the past sought or welcomed physical confrontations as a tactic.

I am concerned, too, over the possible results of such a massive march in Washington, with participation by these more radical groups, particularly in the atmosphere of polarization of opinion that has developed since the recent speeches by the Vice President and the President.

In the interests of the peace we all seek, I earnestly hope there will be no violence and no disorder. I would also emphasize that not only do I oppose the use of force or violence in these rallies and meetings, but I believe that if any violence develops, it will seriously damage the ability of those who seek an early end to the war, to influence and guide American public opinion.

I say this as one who has long opposed the war in Vietnam and who believes its basic premises are incorrect. And I speak as one who has submitted, with the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) a resolution calling for the withdrawal of our combat troops by the end of next year,

for the termination of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, and for cooperative international efforts to provide asylum for South Vietnamese citizens whose lives might be placed in jeopardy by withdrawal of our troops.

During the moratorium period, I shall be attending to my Senate duties in Washington, and shall be more than happy to receive any of our Rhode Island citizens who may be here in connection with moratorium activities.

(This marks the end of the proceedings which, by order of the Senate, were conducted as in legislative session.)

### ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in executive session, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 14, 1969, at 10 o'clock a.m.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 13, 1969:

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

George M. Low, of Texas, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, vice Thomas O. Paine, elevated.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, November 13, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*The salvation of the righteous is of the Lord: He is their strength in the time of trouble.—Psalm 37: 39.*

O God and Father of us all, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle in our hearts and in the hearts of all men a true love for peace. Guide with Thy wisdom all who are leading our Nation in these critical days, that justice may be our rule, good will our spirit, peace our aim, and liberty our very life. Breathe upon us, Breath of God, revealing Thy way and giving us courage to walk in it.

We pray for those in the Armed Forces of our country and for our veterans everywhere. Particularly do we pray for our prisoners of war. In their loneliness make them aware of Thy presence, in their suffering give them to realize Thou art their refuge and strength, in their hopelessness may they find hope in Thee. With all our hearts we pray that ere long they may be released and find joy in a reunited family life and in living again in a free land.

In the spirit of the Master we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 30, 1969:

H.R. 2768. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities; and

H.R. 3130. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for non-service-connected disability to any war veteran who has total disability from a service-connected disability.

On October 31, 1969:

H.R. 12982. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On November 4, 1969:

H.R. 9857. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities

Act, 1930, to authorize an increase in license fee, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11609. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smokey Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

On November 6, 1969:

H.R. 5968. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962;

H.R. 9946. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a subordination agreement with respect to certain lands in Lee County, S.C.;

H.J. Res. 910. Joint resolution to declare a national day of prayer and concern for American servicemen being held prisoner in North Vietnam.

On November 10, 1969:

H.R. 337. An act to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14159. An act making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14159) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2864) entitled "An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. BROOKE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 474) entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Government Procurement."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISIT TO THE HOUSE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the membership that the President of the United States will be in the Capitol this afternoon; that he will visit the House of Representatives; and that we will be very happy to receive him in the House.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. 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. 269]

Abbott	Ford,	Morse
Ashbrook	William D.	Morton
Barrett	Frey	Murphy, N.Y.
Brademas	Fuqua	Nichols
Brock	Garmatz	Nix
Brooks	Gaydos	Pepper
Brown, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Powell
Buchanan	Hanna	Rees
Cahill	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Hicks	Sandman
Clancy	Hosmer	Scheuer
Clark	Howard	Shipley
Clausen,	Ichord	Springer
Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Stuckey
Clay	Kirwan	Thompson, N.J.
Cohelan	Lipscomb	Tunney
Culver	McKneally	Utt
Dawson	Macdonald,	Waldie
de la Garza	Mass.	Watkins
Denney	MacGregor	Wilson,
Dingell	Martin	Charles H.
Eshleman	Mathias	Wylie
Flowers	May	Wyman
Flynt	Mikva	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### TWENTIETH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Twentieth Semiannual Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1968.

This account encompasses the tenth anniversary of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and includes space flight activities through the pioneering flight of Apollo 8. During this decade, we have successfully met many challenges and have achieved significant progress in our ability to utilize space for practical applications, scientific exploration, and expansion of man's frontiers.

We have subsequently landed astronauts upon the Moon, explored its surface, and returned these men to Earth. This historic event was made possible because of the solid foundation of a broad range of earlier activities, and through the skill and dedication of the many contributors to our space program.

I am pleased to forward this report to the Congress as part of the continuing record of our progress in space.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 13, 1969.

#### COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT INTO THE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber.

#### VISIT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

At 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m. the President of the United States, preceded by the Doorkeeper (Hon. William M. Miller) and accompanied by the committee of escort, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. My distinguished colleagues of the House of Representatives, to the 80th Congress from a congressional district in California there came to the membership of this body a Member who served with distinction, who served as a Member of the other body, as Vice President of the United States, and is now the Chief Executive of our country. I assume that we will be able to read his mind that his heart is in the House.

We are honored in the House of Representatives to receive you, Mr. President.

It is a great honor and a high privilege, my colleagues, to present to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The PRESIDENT of the United States. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I do feel very much at home in this House. My heart is truly in this House, because, as the Speaker has so very generously indicated, my first service in Government was here 22 years ago.

I have come here today for an unusual purpose, perhaps an unprecedented purpose. If it is, and can be expressed quite briefly, I want to express appreciation to the Members of this House, the Members of both sides of the aisle, for their support of a just peace in Vietnam.

Yesterday I was informed by a bipartisan group from the House of Representatives that over 300 Members of the House had joined in sponsoring a resolution for a just peace in Vietnam along the lines of the proposal that I made in a speech on November 3.

As I saw that resolution, I realized its great significance, its great significance from an historical standpoint and its great significance in terms of the effect it might—and I believe could—have in hastening the day that that just peace may come.

First, from an historical standpoint, if I could be permitted to reminisce for a moment, 22 years ago in this House, the breakdown on the Democratic and Republican side was approximately the opposite of what it is today. In the 80th Congress, it was 3-to-2 Republican, and today in this Congress it is 3-to-2 Democrat.

I remember in that period immediately after World War II, there were those

who thought that with the President being a Democrat—Harry Truman—and the Congress being Republican, that this would mean that the United States in the critical areas of foreign policy, when it was vitally important to have a consistent foreign policy, would not speak with one voice to the world. And even one critic, a Member of the other body, suggested that President Truman should resign so that there could be a Republican President working with a Republican Congress.

Those predictions of division on the great issues of national security and foreign policy proved to be wrong. They proved to be wrong, and those of you who were in the House then will remember that on those great initiatives which were recommended to the country and to this House and to the other body by President Truman—the Greek-Turkish aid program, the Marshall plan, NATO—received the support not only of the majority of Democrats, but of the majority of Republicans.

As a result, America adopted policies then that, in my opinion, have been the primary factor in stopping the aggression that could have taken place, particularly through Europe in that period, and in avoiding a world war over these past 22 years.

And now today, we face a different situation, a situation of a Republican President and a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. And the question arose at the beginning of this administration as to whether or not this could be the kind of Government, the kind of leadership, that the Nation needed in a period of very great problems abroad as well as at home.

I want to be quite candid with regard to the relationship of the President with the House of Representatives and with the Senate when it is under the control of the other party. As one who has been a Member of both bodies, I understand and I respect differences of opinion in both foreign and domestic policy.

As one who has been a Member of both bodies, I understand and respect the fact that particularly in domestic policy, there will be occasions when the administration will not be able to get perhaps the support for its programs that it might get if it controlled the majority of its own party on this side of the aisle.

But I also know this—and this goes back to that 22 years ago—I do know that when the security of America is involved, when peace for America and for the world is involved, when the lives of our young men are involved, we are not Democrats, we are not Republicans, we are Americans.

I do not suggest by that remark that there should be no criticism and no division with regard to foreign policy, because we need the constant discussion which produces superior ideas that come from debate and from constructive suggestions.

But I do know that when the great issues are involved, that in this House, that what happened yesterday with that announcement on the part of Members of both sides of the aisle of well over a

majority supporting the policy of the President of the United States, I realize that that was in the great tradition of this country.

Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted just one closing and personal note, one in reminiscence and one with regard to the present, I look over this House and I see some older Members, a few who were here then. I see many younger Members. I can imagine that some of the younger Members perhaps are frustrated by their committee assignments and are wondering when they are going to get the positions of leadership.

To give you some encouragement, I recall that when I came to the House I was assigned to the Committee on Education and Labor, and there were a number of new Members on both the Republican and Democratic side assigned in that 80th Congress to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The new Members drew straws to see what positions they would have in the seniority. On the Republican side I drew the last straw. I was the 15th member of the committee. On the Democratic side, a young Congressman, a war veteran from World War II from Massachusetts, drew the last straw, John F. Kennedy.

I can only suggest to those who think sometimes that the luck of the draw is not with them, that we both did rather well politically.

But more important, the record will show that John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon—on those great issues in that 80th Congress and in the 81st Congress, involving security of the Nation, involving foreign policy—voted together.

Now, a personal word with regard to the present. I realize that Members of this House receive great numbers of letters on the great issues of the day. Some of them are quite partisan and some of them are stimulated and some of them come from the hearts of the people who write them. There are two, very briefly, that I would read to you that express the sentiments that I was trying to express on November 3, and I think express the sentiments of most of the Members of the House.

One is from Pittsburgh, Pa.:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A brave man, a splendid son, a devoted husband and father, Warrant Officer Robert Satterfield, was killed in Vietnam, April 16, 1969. His parents strongly support your plan to Vietnamize the war. One of Bob's taped messages to his family from Vietnam said: "We are not here to quarrel as to whether or not we should have entered the war, as only history may disclose the validity. We do have a purpose of keeping a nation of people free from aggression and we work with the trust that our children will remain free."

"Monday evening you echoed Bob's wishes and we urge you to maintain your commitment and be as flexible as need be, that our son's life and that of others was not in vain."

The other letter comes from Colorado. It reads:

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: As a registered Democrat who did not vote for you in 1968, and a father with a son in Vietnam, I want you to know that I am in back of you 100 percent in your stand on this crisis. I feel like you are acting like an American and you can count on me telling other people that I feel this way.

So to my colleagues in the House I say: History will look back on this period in the House of Representatives and it will judge us and judge those of us in the executive branch as to our leadership. In a way the problem that you confront was more difficult than that we confronted in the 80th Congress 22 years ago, because then the lines were more clearly drawn.

Today we have a war that is difficult, that is controversial. But in the pursuit for peace, we can act and I believe we should and will continue to act, with a majority of Americans supporting a just peace. I can say as I stand here today, I believe that we will achieve a just peace in Vietnam. I cannot tell you the time or the date, but I do know this: That when that peace comes, that it will come because of the support that we have received, not just from Republicans, but from Democrats, from Americans in this House and in the other body and throughout this Nation.

And history will record that the United States of America, in a period of crisis, in a period of controversy, met the challenge of greatness and that the representatives of the people thought of themselves as Americans, put their country first rather than their party first in the great tradition of this House.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 14741, FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1969, UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill H.R. 14741, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1969.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON URBAN GROWTH TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year 1970.

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

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS TO SIT FOR 1 HOUR DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON**

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate for 1 hour.

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

There was no objection.

**NATIONAL PLEBISCITE RECOMMENDED**

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, since all points of view regarding war and peace in Vietnam are claiming for themselves, the title of "silent majority," I believe that there is only one certain way for determining what the American people really want.

Therefore, today I have introduced a "sense of Congress" resolution which asks that a national plebiscite be conducted in which all voters eligible to vote in a presidential election would participate. In addition the resolution would allow for the participation of the 18- to 21-year-olds who have such a great stake in the conduct of this war.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while the President has one assumption about public opinion, while many of us here in the Congress have a different assumption, and while the polls are truly inconclusive, there is only one way we can settle this issue. Let it be the "sense of Congress" that a national plebiscite be conducted on the question of this war at the earliest possible moment.

**IN MEMORY OF CAPT. LOUIS SUSTERSIC, A GREAT AMERICAN**

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at 2 o'clock, in the rolling hills of eastern Ohio, will be buried a boy whom I appointed to West Point. Of the 21 boys whom I have appointed, this is the only one whom I have known since he was a little boy, all of his life, a neighbor.

He was a captain in the Army. I called his brother this morning, his twin brother, and I said, "Ed, I am sorry I appointed him."

He said, "Don't be sorry. He wanted it. It was his life. He loved it. He had been in Vietnam 8 months. He wrote in his letters to us that he was doing his job, and that it was a job that needed to be done."

His name is Capt. Louis Sustersic—a great American.

**THE BIPARTISAN RESOLUTION**

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan resolution which 100 of us introduced last week expressing support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, now has more than 300 cosponsors in the House.

This represents, of course, more than two-thirds of the membership of the House. Among them, these 300 Congressmen represent some 140 million Americans for whom we are their chosen spokesmen.

As of today, a majority of the Democratic Members and a majority of the Republican Members are cosponsors of this resolution.

Taken simply as an expression of this many duly elected Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the resolution is already a commanding and persuasive statement of the firm, undergirding spirit of unity which truly exists in this country despite the loud and clamorous protests which give a superficial appearance of disunity.

The need for such an expression was brought home to me by an editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on October 17. The editorial, written by my good personal friend, Editor Jack Butler, called for "national leadership in some effort to give visible strength" to the position and convictions which unquestionably are held by a majority of the American people. Under the unanimous consent request, I am including a copy of that editorial for printing at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**NIXON SUPPORTERS NEED ORGANIZATION**

"I read your editorial ('Pullout Opponents Should Speak Now')," the voice on the phone said. "What do you suggest we do?"

It is a quandary in which many of us who back the President find ourselves. We suspect that most of the American people strongly oppose the things that are happening which seem to undermine us in Paris and on the battlefield. We suspect that we who are with Mr. Nixon are not as vocal and therefore less visible on the national scene. But we really don't quite know what to do.

A story in the Star-Telegram a few days ago told of the well-financed organization behind the moratorium. Money has been available for long-distance telephone calls, for clerical help, for printing, for all the things a well-run campaign needs to give it a national character.

We must also admit that behind the movement was the enthusiasm of many bright young people who so bitterly object to the horror of Vietnam.

Actually, all of us want out—and surely if there is a person in the country who wants out more than all the rest of us, it must be President Nixon. His hopes for his administration and his political future hang on get-

ting out. President Johnson's administration was wrecked on the same rock.

But both of these men have had to face up to the truth that if we walk away we condemn thousands, perhaps millions, who trusted us to a reign of terror. They have had to face the fact that a victory by our ideological enemies always means that the next step is immediately taken, and that little by little the perimeter of freedom shrinks. The alternative is to take a stand—and stand there.

There are those who answer that by saying that monolithic international communism—if ever it was actual—now is certainly a myth, and decry the domino theory as false. But if this is true, it would be hard to convince the people of Cuba, of South Vietnam, of Laos, of Czechoslovakia.

All of this doesn't answer the question: What can we do to show our support of the President?

The answer seems to be that we need national leadership in some effort to give visible strength to our position. The President is to make a speech Nov. 3 to show his position on Vietnam. Perhaps this is the time he should suggest to us how we might rally around his position.

Perhaps Fort Worth could be the starting point. Perhaps those who supported Mr. Nixon and Senator Tower and Representative Wright could get together and call on them to suggest an organized way. We would be asking leadership from our leaders.

A small sidelight in the moratorium might suggest something to us. A few men—perhaps 15—in one unit in Vietnam went out on patrol wearing black armbands to show their support of the movement. In no other unit was there such a demonstration. Obviously, then, someone in that unit who cared enough organized it.

Does it suggest something to you, President Nixon? Does it suggest something to you, Senator Tower? Does it suggest something to you, Congressman Wright? Does it suggest something to you, voters of Fort Worth?

It should.

**PRESIDENT NIXON**

(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, in his remarks just concluded, the President of the United States made reference to certain historical incidents.

I think we can properly say that today was another such historical incident. In his quite informal appearance before this body, the President came to express his appreciation for something that was done here, and as he pointed out, cooperatively by Members of both sides of the aisle. I am sure that I express the appreciation of all for the fact that the President did take the time to come here and address us as he did today.

**CLEVELAND BACKS PRESIDENT**

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it was good to welcome the President in this Chamber today. It was good to hear him reaffirm that great American doctrine: politics stops at the shoreline; we stand as one people where the defense of our country and the pursuit of peace are concerned.

As one of the original 100 cosponsors of the resolution supporting the President's efforts to win peace in Vietnam, I am proud to give him my warm support. With his Nation united behind him, the President will be able to lead us to peace with justice.

The resolution should be passed speedily to stand as a symbol for all the world to see, particularly our adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity also to salute the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) who is the prime mover behind the resolution. He is a great legislator who has contributed to the welfare of his country through this resolution at a very critical point in history. I am proud to be associated with him in this totally bipartisan, wholly American effort to win peace with justice.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE TO THE HOUSE, NOVEMBER 13

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House was privileged this afternoon to witness the exercise of Presidential leadership at its best. In an unannounced but highly appropriate visit to the Chamber where he sat as a freshman Representative 22 years ago, President Richard Nixon gave symbolic and literal emphasis to the initiative he took in his nationally televised address of November 3, in rallying bipartisan support for our Government's Vietnam policy. He reaffirmed the great lesson Americans learned in the days of the Truman administration after World War II—that when the great issues of war and peace are involved, we are neither Republicans nor Democrats but Americans. The standing ovations which he received bore eloquent testimony to the feelings of this House, and I would go further, I would say that if the American people had been able to watch this speech live on their television sets, there would have been standing ovations in living rooms across the land.

Once again the President made clear that a just and lasting peace will not be easily or automatically achieved, that there remain ahead of us days and months of uncertainty in the search for an honorable end to the Vietnam conflict. But he made the point that this endeavor cannot succeed if it is to be a Republican effort, a partisan effort, and I personally am very glad that the House responded with such unity and feeling on this critical question. We must not and we do not seek to avoid discussion, to silence dissent, but we have reaffirmed that this discussion will be conducted in good faith that the purpose of our Government on this question is clear, and its end honorable. I thank the House for this expression of support for the spirit of a bipartisan approach to peace.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States honored us by his presence here this afternoon. I think I speak for more than one when I express the hope

that we might honor the spirit he invoked as we continue our deliberations on these great issues of war and peace.

#### ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I arrived in the Chamber a few moments ago too late to answer to my name, but not too late to hear the historic impromptu address of the President of the United States. Mr. Nixon not only makes me proud to be a Republican, but deeply proud to be an American citizen. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly clear that there is, indeed, a silent majority in support of the President's policy of peace with honor in Vietnam. We, the people, salute our President, and are deeply grateful for his leadership in this troubled time.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States literally "came back home" today, in a visit to the House of Representatives which he loves and respects. He did not read a speech. There was no written text before him. He spoke personally, directly, and sincerely about the search for peace, and the need for unity in our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many considerations which have divided and frustrated this Nation. The President, in a calm, deliberative manner has tried to put out the fires and quiet the fears. He is accomplishing the task, not by limiting dissent, but by emphasizing areas of agreement, not by shutting off the engines, but by steering the ship of state to quieter, more productive directions.

The President's remarks today go far beyond foreign policy. He knows that unreasonable confrontation on Vietnam contributes to unrest which makes it impossible to move forward in solving America's domestic problems. The physical law of action and reaction applies to human nature. In human affairs we call the reaction "backlash." Somewhere in between is the harmony, without which we cannot achieve our national goals.

In its own reaction to the short address today, the House has told the President that we are behind him, and with him in his goals for peace, and for a better America.

#### SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for all Americans to unite in support of our President in his quest of a just and honorable resolution of the conflict in Vietnam.

Since the opening days of his campaign, President Nixon has clearly stated that the first priority of his administration is to bring an honorable peace to Southeast Asia. He has gone to extraordinary lengths to convince Hanoi and the world of the sincerity of our desires to settle the war on reasonable terms.

The great silent majority of Americans that support the President's course are beginning to be heard and seen. The Veterans Day observances were noteworthy examples of patriotic displays of support for our fighting men and the President's policies. The resolution originally introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), reflects the feelings of most Americans, and I am honored to be included on the list of cosponsors that now totals over 300.

Since the President's talk to the Nation on November 3, the mail from our constituents is overwhelming in support of his policies for peace. Our responsibility in the Congress is to represent these people without making it necessary for them to resort to mob action and verbal attacks on our governmental leaders.

There are some who will take to the streets in opposition to the President's policy and demand an immediate withdrawal of all our troops regardless of the consequences. This group even has the effrontery to carry the names of those who have died serving their country in this difficult war. I must lodge my own protest against the "protesters" who use these names without the permission of their families, and in some cases over the specific objections of the families of these brave men.

Many of our finest youth have already died for the cause of freedom and justice. We cannot turn our backs on them and disregard the sacrifices already made for these goals.

The surest way to end the war in a manner to secure peace and freedom for Southeast Asia and the rest of the World will be for the American people to heed the President's plea for unity and to display their united support for his peace efforts.

#### WE ARE AMERICANS FIRST

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the President today has not only made me proud of being an American, but also, I am proud to be a Republican.

This body has overwhelmingly endorsed the efforts of the President to find a lasting peace in Vietnam. He not only has the support of this body, but he also has the overwhelming support of the people of the silent majority in the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. In the light of the support of this body and the silent majority of Americans, I think it would be a tragic mistake for the enemy to consider the demonstrations and activities planned by dissident groups for this weekend to be the voice of America speaking for the majority of Americans.

I agree with the President that when it comes to the security of our country, we are neither Democrats nor Republicans—but we are Americans first.

#### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the membership of the House appreciates the President taking the time to come here today to say "thank you." It was a very fine gesture by one who has the responsibility of the Presidency of a nation of 200 million people.

I am one of the 300 Members of this body who has joined in the resolution supporting the efforts of the President to bring about a just peace in Vietnam. In my opinion, many of those who propose to participate this weekend in the demonstrations in Washington are loyal American citizens, but misguided. Their activities can accomplish little but bring aid and comfort to the enemies of this country and encourage others to believe that our Nation is seriously divided. The reception given our President today is an indication of the falseness of this assumption.

Let us hope that when this weekend is over, those participating in the demonstrations will join more responsible citizens in working toward a just peace and perfecting our Government through constitutional processes.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us who were present in the House a few moments ago when President Nixon, a former Member of this body, addressed us have been privileged to take part in one of those rare historical events which will echo in this Chamber in future generations.

We thrilled to the depth of the sincerity with which the President spoke his appreciation to those of us in this body who have indicated our support for his efforts to achieve peace through the responsible exercise of his office.

Each of us as a Member of the House has a direct responsibility and obligation to represent here his 400,000 or 500,000 constituents who remain at home working in their daily responsibilities, paying their taxes honestly, and fighting for their Nation's principles as citizen-soldiers when called upon.

In offering our support to President Nixon in his forthright efforts to find an honorable peace and an end to this tragic war in Vietnam, we speak our own convictions in behalf of that silent majority and do so without reference to party or faction in the great challenge our Nation faces. During these difficult days it is comforting to know that we have a President who understands the lessons of his-

tory, the traditions of representative government, and the weighty responsibilities of high office. Your words, too, Mr. Speaker, were eloquent and moving. It has been one of the high moments of the House of Representatives and of this Republic.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the remarks by the President in the Chamber a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### HALIBUT IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the first of the week the lead item on the Capitol Restaurant menu was a "slenderizer's special," halibut.

I checked with the superintendent of the restaurant and learned this halibut was the high-protein, tasty domestic fish and it, incidentally, came from my district in Seattle.

For those of us trying to watch our weight, this was a welcome addition to the menu. Dieting, with all its problems, was greatly aided the day of the "slenderizer's special," and we should be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I recently discovered that the General Services Administration, which is responsible for the operation of 41 different Government cafeterias in the Washington, D.C., area, has been serving the foreign-import, fatty and inferior flatfish, turbot. Since my protest, I have been assured that true American halibut is being added to their menu so that more people can enjoy the flavor of halibut.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see halibut on the menu in the House Restaurant, and I hope it will become a regular choice to upgrade the quality of food served on Capitol Hill.

#### I AGAIN WARN THE PEOPLE OF THIS AREA OF THE SHODDY PRACTICES OF THE WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. AND ESPECIALLY THE BADLY ENGINEERED FURNACE AND AIR-CONDITIONING UNITS OF THE BRYANT CO.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I took the floor to criticize what I believe to be collusion between the Washington Gas Light Co. and the installers to whom they contract their work. I have introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of their practices and I am hopeful that the Investigations Subcommittee of the Interstate and

Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, will carry through such an investigation.

I purchased a central air-conditioning-heating unit for our residence in northern Virginia through the Washington Gas Light Co., who farmed it out to an installer, and I have had nothing but trouble with the unit ever since it was purchased at considerable cost a little over 3 years ago. The workmanship of the Bryant furnace- and air-conditioning unit is deplorable and I would advise all people to not purchase any such Bryant equipment. Out of some three dozen or more calls for corrections in the installation, four of them were for correction of the Aprilaire unit, which malfunctioned. Not too long after the original installation I was required to buy a part, which was part of the pump used in humidifying or dehumidifying the air. A short time later I was still having trouble with the humidifier and was required to purchase an entirely new pump, at my expense.

I called the Washington Gas Light Co. several weeks ago because the Aprilaire unit was not working and it took them 4 days to respond to my call. They said they could see nothing wrong with it, but it has not worked since.

There are many other items of poor workmanship that I will enumerate on the floor of the House of Representatives for the benefit of those who might be considering installing through the Washington Gas Light Co. any Bryant units. In this day of trying to protect the consumer, I think those interested in consumer protection should become interested in the experiences I have had.

#### RESOLUTION REQUIRING INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I entered the Chamber less than an hour ago with an idea—a resolution that would require the Internal Security Committee to make an investigation of the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, including its sources of income and leadership.

I have asked a couple of people to co-sponsor this, and I have the front cover of it nearly covered with signatures already.

I am more than grateful for the enthusiastic support I have received for this document.

There are a number of other people who have expressed the desire to become a cosponsor of this resolution.

This resolution is not intended to be offensive to anyone. It is not intended to be a witch hunt. It is intended to be a sober, dedicated effort to demand that these people come before the committee, and testify as to their allegiances, leadership, and sources of financial support.

I invite the names of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this resolution.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 677

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14751), making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 677 provides that during the consideration of H.R. 14751, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, all points of order against the bill are waived.

The rule was granted due to the fact that the authorization bill, which passed the House on August 5 of this year, has not yet been signed into law. It is presently in conference.

At the time the rule was requested, the Committee on Rules was advised that the appropriations bill is in line with the authorization as it passed the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 677 so that no point of order may be raised during the consideration of H.R. 14751.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). My understanding is that there is nothing in this bill which was not in the authorization bill, with the exception of possibly one item which was added after that time by reason of an emergency. Any other items not in the bill will have to be considered at a subsequent time. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I think it is very wrong on a matter of this importance—an appropriation of \$1.4 billion, including a number of very controversial items, including some \$14 million in new appropriations and \$97 million in total appropriations on the very controversial anti-ballistic-missile system—that we should be asked to act on it without an opportunity to consider the hearings or the report on the bill.

It was not until yesterday morning that we were able to obtain from the committee hearings that are almost a foot high, that constitute twelve hundred pages of testimony with respect to this bill. It was not until this morning that we were able to get from the committee a copy of the report on the bill, or the bill itself.

We have in the House rules a very sensible and important provision—rule 21 (6), saying:

No general appropriation bill shall be considered in the House until printed committee hearings and a committee report thereon have been available for the Members of the House for at least three calendar days.

The rule which is presented to us here today by the Rules Committee waives that rule and effectively deprives the House of the opportunity for study and for careful consideration of the measure that the rule was intended to provide.

I am fully appreciative of the fact we are behind in consideration of appropriations measures. We are subject to some criticism for being behind despite the fact that this is the fault of the authorization system rather than the Appropriations Committee, and also it is the fault of the administration in not presenting bills with adequate rapidity. I don't think the pressures to catch up are adequate justification, however, for rushing through such an important measure without opportunity for the members to study it, particularly since the delay involved would only be a few days.

I, therefore, hope the House will defeat this rule so that this matter can come up under our usual rules for orderly consideration. The very least the Members should have is the minimum of 3 days which the rules provide to consider this bill.

I do not think the House ever ought to be a rubber stamp on an important matter that concerns the security of this Nation and the expenditure of such large sums of money. If we are handed the bill and the report on the same morning we are asked to consider them, obviously no one in this House can give them proper consideration. That makes a mockery of the consideration by the House. If this is the procedure we are to follow, we might as well not have a House, but just have an Appropriations Committee, because we cannot act on appropriations intelligently with just a few hours to study the bill and the report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to this rule. I would like to make it clear I am not opposed to the bill on the merits of the bill. I do not associate myself with the general point of view of the gentleman from New York who just spoke, but I am opposed to this procedure.

I may or may not ever again be a Member of this assembly, but I just do not think the people who sent me down here sent me to vote on a \$1,450,000,000 appropriation bill without even a chance to look at the report from the committee. I think it is wrong, and I am not going to support the rule for those reasons.

I do not criticize anybody. I know the difficulties the committee has labored under, but I just cannot bring myself to go along with that type of procedure, which I think is wrong in principle, and therefore I oppose the rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 min-

utes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, let me call to the attention of the House that there has been notice for a week that today's action would be proposed. On Wednesday, November 5, I made the following request:

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any day next week after Wednesday to consider the military construction appropriation bill for 1970.

The Speaker put the question. There was no objection. So there has been more than usual notice to the membership.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the comments of the gentleman from New York, who wishes to postpone action on the military construction appropriation bill. The gentleman may want to spend Christmas in Washington, but I do not. I should like to see the House move along with its work. As a matter of fact, I want to be at home with my constituents in Florida come Christmas. If the gentleman just does not want to go back to New York, I will be glad to have him come to Florida, and I extend him an invitation. But, Mr. Speaker, approval of his motion would help keep us here until Christmas.

The gentleman objects to the speed with which we are moving. Most people think it is high time that the Congress moved faster.

If the gentleman followed the action of the House early in August when the military construction authorization bill was passed and sent to the Senate, he need have no concern about the contents of the bill which is now before the House. It contains no new line items, nothing that was not a part of the House authorization bill, no new language. As a matter of fact, the committee considers that proper procedure which keeps faith with the House, requires that we submit this appropriation bill on the basis of the House passed authorization bill. There is not an authorization in law.

That means, of course, adjustments are going to have to be made in conference, after the authorization bill becomes law. This will add to the work of the committee. We simply are trying to expedite the work of the House.

I want to stress the fact that we have gone into very considerable detail in our hearings. The gentleman said they were a foot high. Well, they are voluminous. We try to be detailed. But they are about 6 inches high, not a foot high. I am sure he wants to be accurate.

I must call to the gentleman's attention the fact that volume 1, which I hold in my hand, was available to Members on September 29. Volume 2 was available October 13. Volume 3 was available November 6. Now, even a slow reader could have kept pace with the work of the committee had he been so inclined.

I regret to state this, but I find no evidence that the gentleman from New York has made any requests to any member of the Appropriations Committee staff or to me or to any other member of the subcommittee for information on the bill or the hearings.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I and my staff have made repeated requests to the committee staff for copies of the hearings and were told until yesterday, just shortly before noon, that they were not available. I also made requests of the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) and the gentleman from Illinois and (Mr. YATES), to see if they had copies of these hearings, and they said so far as they knew the hearings were not available. I do not think I can properly be accused of lacking diligence.

Mr. SIKES. I have just read to the committee the official release dates, when the hearings were given to the press and made available to Members. If the gentleman was unable to get one, I am very sorry that was the case, but they were available and there was no effort to keep them out of circulation.

Mr. Speaker, let me go one step further. The gentleman's circular letter indicates this is a \$2 billion bill. Frankly, I wish it were, because I believe there is a need for what much and more military construction funds. But the first page of the report and the news releases of yesterday bring out the fact that this bill contains \$1,450,000,000, not \$2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the House has been roundly criticized for the delays which we have encountered in completing our year's work. Now we have reached the point that we can begin to move. The gentleman's motion would simply add to the difficulty of salvaging as much as we can of the reputation of the House as a deliberative assembly which recognizes its responsibilities and attempts to carry on the work entrusted to it.

I trust the House will support the efforts to move this bill to the floor and to complete House action on it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York has made reference to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN), I think I should say in their behalf that they are experienced members of the Committee on Appropriations and they have been aware of the hearings which have been available for quite some time on this bill, some portions for several weeks. I am, after all, the chairman of the committee, and if any request had been made of me, I would have had no difficulty in getting copies of the hearings that have been published and are available to Members of the Congress and the public.

I would like to say further that if there is any question in regard to the bill that the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Indiana would like answered, I think that the answers could be given or at least the questions could be commented upon.

This bill is a minimum effort to meet our construction requirements for the defense of the country.

I want to thank the Committee on Rules for bringing in this rule. I want to

point out, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) did, that an announcement was made last week that the bill would be called up this week. There will be ample time for debate and for interrogation of those who will speak on the bill.

Of course, I rise in support of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OTTINGER. 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 326, nays 43, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—326

Abernethy	Collier	Griffin
Adair	Collins	Grover
Adams	Colmer	Gubser
Addabbo	Conable	Gude
Albert	Conte	Hagan
Alexander	Corbett	Haley
Anderson,	Corman	Hall
Calif.	Coughlin	Hamilton
Anderson, III.	Cowger	Hammer-
Anderson,	Cramer	schmidt
Tenn.	Culver	Hanley
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Hansen, Idaho
Andrews,	Daddario	Hansen, Wash.
N. Dak.	Daniel, Va.	Harsha
Annunzio	Daniels, N.J.	Harvey
Arends	Davis, Ga.	Hastings
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Hays
Ayres	Delaney	Hébert
Baring	Dellenback	Henderson
Beall, Md.	Dent	Hogan
Belcher	Devine	Holfield
Bell, Calif.	Dickinson	Horton
Bennett	Dingell	Hull
Berry	Donohue	Hungate
Betts	Dorn	Hunt
Bevill	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Blaggi	Downing	Ichord
Biester	Dulski	Jarman
Blackburn	Duncan	Johnson, Calif.
Blanton	Dwyer	Johnson, Pa.
Blatnik	Edmondson	Jonas
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Boland	Edwards, La.	Jones, N.C.
Bolling	Eilberg	Kazen
Bow	Erlenborn	Kee
Bray	Evans, Colo.	Keith
Brinkley	Fallon	King
Broomfield	Fascell	Kleppe
Brotzman	Feighan	Kluczynski
Brown, Mich.	Findley	Kuykendall
Brown, Ohio	Fish	Kyl
Broyhill, N.C.	Fisher	Kyros
Broyhill, Va.	Flood	Landgrebe
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Landrum
Burke, Fla.	Ford,	Langen
Burke, Mass.	William D.	Latta
Burleson, Tex.	Foreman	Leggett
Burlison, Mo.	Fountain	Lennon
Bush	Frelinghuysen	Lloyd
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Long, La.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Pa.	Long, Md.
Cabell	Fulton, Tenn.	Lukens
Caffery	Fuqua	McClory
Camp	Galifianakis	McCloskey
Carter	Gallagher	McClure
Casey	Gaydos	McDade
Cederberg	Gettys	McDonald,
Celler	Glaimo	Mich.
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McEwen
Chappell	Gilbert	McFall
Clark	Goldwater	McMillan
Clausen,	Gonzalez	Madden
Don H.	Goodling	Mahon
Clawson, Del	Gray	Mailliard
Cleveland	Green, Oreg.	Mann

Marsh	Purcell	Stanton
Matsunaga	Quile	Steed
Mayne	Quillen	Steiger, Ariz.
Meeds	Railsback	Steiger, Wis.
Melcher	Randall	Stephens
Meskill	Rarick	Stratton
Michel	Reid, Ill.	Stubblefield
Miller, Calif.	Reifel	Sullivan
Mills	Reuss	Symington
Minish	Rhodes	Taft
Mink	Riegle	Talcott
Minshall	Rivers	Taylor
Mize	Roberts	Teague, Calif.
Mizell	Robison	Teague, Tex.
Mollohan	Rodino	Thompson, Ga.
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wis.
Montgomery	Rogers, Fla.	Tierman
Moorhead	Rooney, N.Y.	Udall
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Ullman
Murphy, Ill.	Rostenkowski	Van Deerin
Myers	Roth	Vander Jagt
Natcher	Roudebush	Vanik
Nedzi	Ruppe	Vigorito
Nelsen	Ruth	Waggonner
Obey	St Germain	Wampler
O'Hara	St. Onge	Watson
O'Konski	Satterfield	Watts
Olsen	Saylor	Weicker
O'Neal, Ga.	Schadeberg	Whalen
Passman	Scherle	Whalley
Patman	Schneebeil	White
Patten	Schwengel	Whitehurst
Pelly	Scott	Whitten
Perkins	Sebelius	Widnall
Pettis	Shiple	Wiggins
Philbin	Shriver	Williams
Pickle	Sikes	Wolf
Pirnie	Sisk	Wolf
Poage	Skubitz	Wright
Poff	Slack	Wyatt
Pollock	Smith, Calif.	Wydler
Preyer, N.C.	Smith, Iowa	Yates
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Yatron
Price, Tex.	Snyder	Zablocki
Pryor, Ark.	Stafford	Zion
Pucinski	Staggers	Zwach

NAYS—43

Ashley	Gross	Morse
Bingham	Halpern	Mosher
Brasco	Harrington	Moss
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Nix
Button	Hawkins	O'Neill, Mass.
Carey	Hechler, W. Va.	Ottinger
Clay	Heckler, Mass.	Pike
Conyers	Helstoski	Podell
Dennis	Karth	Reid, N.Y.
Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Edwards, Calif.	Koch	Ryan
Esch	Lowenstein	Scheuer
Farbstein	Lujan	Stokes
Foley	McCarthy	
Fraser	Miller, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—62

Abbitt	Garmatz	Nichols
Ashbrook	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Barrett	Griffiths	Powell
Brademas	Hanna	Rees
Brock	Hicks	Roybal
Brooks	Hosmer	Sandman
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Springer
Burton, Utah	Jacobs	Stuckey
Cahill	Jones, Tenn.	Thompson, N.J.
Chisholm	Kirwan	Tunney
Clancy	Lipscomb	Utt
Cohelan	McCulloch	Waldie
Dawson	McKneally	Watkins
de la Garza	Macdonald,	Wilson, Bob
Demney	Mass.	Wilson,
Diggs	MacGregor	Charles H.
Eckhardt	Martin	Winn
Eshleman	Mathias	Wylie
Evins, Tenn.	May	Wyman
Flowers	Mikva	Young
Flynt	Morton	
Frey	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. MacGregor.  
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Lipscomb.  
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McKneally.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Clancy.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Morton.  
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Brock.  
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.  
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McCulloch.  
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Denney.  
 Mr. Garmatz with Mrs. May.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Martin.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Watkins.  
 Mr. Young with Mr. Burton of Utah.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Mathias.  
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Eshleman.  
 Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Utt.  
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Hosmer.  
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Winn.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Frey.  
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Springer.  
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Dawson.  
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Sandman.  
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Powell.  
 Mr. Rees with Mrs. Chisholm.  
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Wylie.  
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Wyman.  
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Jacobs.  
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. CAREY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SIKES. 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. 14751) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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. 14751, with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, let me express appreciation for the support and cooperation of my subcommittee members. We have achieved a fine degree of coordination and unity in which everyone contributes significantly to the writing of a bill. Mr. McFALL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. LONG, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. JONAS, Mr. TALCOTT, together make up a very able and very fine team.

I must also comment on the really fine efforts of Bob Nicholas in his first year as

subcommittee staff member. He had valuable training under Frank Sanders and this provided valuable experience. Now on his own responsibility, he has proved himself capable and served the committee well. I predict a very fine career for him in the important work of this committee. In this connection, I do not want to overlook Gary Michalak who has assisted Bob Nicholas and who also has shown promise, ability, and dedication.

In brief, we bring to you a bill under very adverse circumstances. We have had to seek a rule because there is no authorization bill. The Senate committee did not report the authorization until Monday, although it passed the House months ago. The bill was passed by the Senate on Tuesday, November 11. Therefore, we patterned the appropriations bill after the House authorization bill and undoubtedly we shall have to make adjustments in conference after the authorization is finally a law. The House leadership, and I am glad to say the House authorizing committee, support this committee's action today.

Then there is the problem of freeze and deferments. This is a most unfortunate situation. On September 4, the President directed all agencies of the Government to put into effect immediately 75-percent reduction in new contracts for construction. Secretary Laird on September 6 suspended further awards of construction contracts for military construction and family housing in the United States. On September 18, the stop order was rescinded and the military departments and defense agencies were authorized to proceed with that portion of their respective construction programs which were qualified under criteria and limitations established by the Bureau of the Budget. This reduction in obligations for new contracts or projects in fiscal 1970 would total more than \$800 million if carried through the fiscal year. The Department of Defense was unable to specify the administration's plans in hearings before this subcommittee on resuming a normal program of construction, but it is anticipated construction will be resumed within 6 months.

Now let me quote to you from past history. The following comments were made in the report on the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968:

The Committee is seriously disturbed about the numerous contradictory actions taken by the Department of Defense in the past several years in the implementation of the Military Construction Program. It realizes that national defense is a dynamic business, but constant changes which contradict testimony and assurances given to Congressional Committees have been far too typical of this program. \* \* \*

The report goes on to recite, among others, the following actions taken by the Department of Defense:

On October 22, 1965, Secretary of Defense deferred construction of 8,500 units of family housing authorized and funded as part of the military construction program for fiscal year 1966.

On December 20, 1965, the Secretary of Defense announced that additional projects in the amount of \$459,815,000 had been temporarily deferred. This brought the total

amount deferred from the approved fiscal year 1966 program to \$620 million.

On October 5, 1967, the Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum which stated, in part: "Effective October 9, 1967, no new invitations for bids shall be issued except for those projects clearly associated with new weapons systems or in direct support of Southeast Asia \* \* \*."

This resulted in another delay in the long-range construction program. The most recent construction deferral has already been discussed.

Deferrals, of course, provide a very serious delay in the availability of needed structures which have been budgeted and justified to the committees of Congress by Administration spokesmen.

The Committee is constrained to comment that the serious deficiencies in facilities at military installations largely are due to a combination of low military construction budgets and periodic large-scale deferments of just this type.

Another problem which will increase the harmful effects of the construction deferral is the acceleration of the upward trend in construction costs. Construction costs are increasing at about the rate of 10 percent per year. Judging from experience with past construction deferrals, it will be found that deferments simply will require a cutback in scope of projects or funding for additional costs.

Let me repeat, regardless of the motives, the effect of the freeze and deferments has been to increase cost of construction when the work finally is accomplished. As a result in the present instance as in previous years, it will very probably be necessary to cut back on scope of projects or to incur deficiencies. An example of rapidly mounting costs actually is shown in the current bill where an additional \$23.7 million is funded for additional costs on previously authorized and funded line items. The situation will almost certainly worsen rather than improve in the months ahead, for Government construction is not the controlling item in the field of construction costs.

In view of this uncertain situation, this question naturally arises—why appropriate additional funds unless we know more about the administration's plans for using those funds? Why not wait until there is a clarification? This subcommittee believes we would simply be adding to chaos if we were to follow such a policy. The facilities are undoubtedly needed. As a matter of fact, the need is much greater than the current bill would provide. It is a small program. Modernization of training and other facilities is far behind schedule. Housing of all types on many bases is inadequate or substandard. The services now are required to make do with many inadequate facilities or facilities which were not designed for present-day purposes. Some are temporary World War II structures which have long outlived their usefulness. Maintenance is increasingly costly as facilities grow older. This situation can scarcely be said to improve morale and encourage retention. The object of the military construction program is to provide adequate training, living, working, and storage facilities for permanent military bases. However, the level of requested appropriations is never more than half the amount required for

a realistic program of replacement and modernization, and is usually much less. We know we have a responsibility to improve this picture. We would be derelict in the discharge of our duties if we were not to do our part of the job. Congress should support the action of the committee.

The original budget recommendation for fiscal year 1970 of the Johnson administration was \$2,558,450,000. The revised Nixon administration budget was \$1,917,000,000. This in itself is a reduction of about 25 percent and is a very drastic cut from what would have been considered a moderate program. The authorizing committee made the most drastic cuts in my recollection—another \$337 million. They recommended and the House approved an authorization of \$1,580,000,000. This is a cut of about 20 percent below the revised budget. The Senate has recommended restoration of only \$72 million. The final authorization figure cannot be determined, of course, until the conference action has been completed.

This subcommittee recommends new budget authority of \$1,450,000,000 and in this action recommends the construction of 4,800 units of family housing. This is a reduction of \$130 million below the House authorization. The reduction is achieved by line item reductions, some of which were volunteered by the services as a result of the cutback in military programs, and through a 5-percent cut in available funds. The committee consulted at length with Secretary Shillito and the departmental staffs to determine the full impact of the military cutbacks and all of their recommendations are incorporated in this bill. The 5-percent cut to which I referred applies both to the unobligated balance and to the new budget authority. It totals \$82.5 million. This cut was imposed because the committee simply does not believe the money can be spent in the fiscal year.

In an effort to tighten control of large unobligated balances which inevitably result from present OSD stop-and-go policies on military construction, the committee has instructed the Department of Defense to inform the committee in advance of—

First, any major changes in the list of projects with which the Department of Defense proposes to proceed in fiscal year 1970 while the reduction in new contracts for construction remains in effect. This list was supplied to the committee on October 31, 1969, and may be found beginning on page 1246, part 3, of the hearings.

Second, any limitations on construction contracting after June 30, 1970.

Third, any actions to terminate the reduction in construction, including a description of the changes in the economic picture in the construction industry, locally or nationally, which lead to these actions.

The committee has attempted to determine policies with reference to the use of nonappropriated funds for construction. As far as I can determine, this is something that has been overlooked in the past and has never been thoroughly studied either at congressional level or at

the departmental level. In any event, it is an area over which Congress has exercised no control and for which no guidelines for operational procedures have been established by OSD. Yet this is a sizable account which totaled \$151 million in the past 5 years. The committee is asking that auditing procedures be established and directs that listings of projects so constructed be provided to the committee. We shall expect OSD to coordinate a plan for supervision and direction of expenditures of nonappropriated funds for construction expenditures.

The committee is not at all pleased with the progress, or lack of progress, of housing for dependents of military personnel. It has been established that a goal of 12,500 units per year is about the minimum which is required to provide a reasonable picture of housing for military dependents. I do not recall a single year in which this goal has been achieved. Last year we funded only 2,000 units. This year the budget request was for 4,800 units and this is the figure which is contained in today's bill.

The situation is particularly aggravated overseas. The departments have tried to rely on rental guarantee housing, a program which has produced only a handful of units. Now a new approach has been suggested in which the contractor assumes responsibility for construction and operation of housing on military reservations. It is known as installment purchase contracting. The entire subject is dealt with in detail in the report beginning on page 29, and there are exhaustive hearings. The committee feels that a bolder approach is required if the problem ever is to be solved. It encourages attempts to develop new concepts in an effort to overcome the deficiencies.

For a number of years, the committee has attempted to bring about a more definitive and productive planning program for military construction. Military construction in family housing planning, programing, and execution are extremely complex, particularly in the fiscal environment today. The committee has, in the past, insisted upon adequate and realistic long-range planning. Now I am glad to report there is evidence of improvement in the long-range planning procedures. This is dealt with in your report on page 5 under the heading, "General Statement." I recommend it for your consideration.

Now, a brief comment on construction in Vietnam. No additional funds are requested for construction in fiscal 1970 budget. The committee has carefully reviewed the use of funds previously appropriated and this also is treated in detail in your report on page 8 under the heading, "Progress of Construction in Vietnam." In summation, let me say that on August 31, 1969, there remained \$213.7 million available for new construction projects in Vietnam. This amount is not as great as the cost of new construction needs remaining in Vietnam, as identified by the Department of Defense. However, it is estimated that the amount would be sufficient to meet construction requirements until fiscal 1971 funds are available. The program now consists primarily of providing facilities for Vietnamese Armed Forces at

an accelerated rate to facilitate the Vietnamization of the war. The withdrawal of U.S. forces itself necessitates certain types of facilities, particularly port repair. There will also be some requirement for restoration and replacement as a result of battle damage or rocket attacks.

On the Safeguard program, the committee has approved new obligational authority of \$14.1 million for research and development facilities and planning at Kwajalein Missile Range. The only item to be built for Safeguard in the United States under fiscal 1970 funds is a \$2.5 million item which is a part of the program for improvements to the NORAD Cheyenne Mountain complex. It will provide space for Safeguard command and control facilities.

We bring you then a bill which provides minimum appropriations to apply on a very large undertaking. New defense systems which necessarily are constantly being incorporated into the Defense Establishment require new facilities or costly modernization, or they are largely ineffective. The needs for facilities at overseas bases cannot be interpreted in light of possible diplomatic agreements some time in the future, nor on campaign statements by foreign officials who may say one thing when they are seeking office and another when they appraise the hard facts of mutual defense and the economic importance of the American presence in their countries. Troop strengths at these bases are relatively fixed and constant for mutual security.

The budget request for fiscal year 1970 provides a very modest improvement in the facilities, family housing, and housing for bachelor enlisted and officer personnel at U.S. military bases. It emphasizes in moderate degree the modernization or replacement of the obsolescent and inefficient structures which represent a large part of the military services' physical plant. There are increases for reserve forces, water and air pollution control, and research and development. It is a small program which does not fully cope with needs, particularly in housing. The committee's hearings indicate that, with few exceptions, the projects allowed in this bill for the fiscal year 1970 program are to meet programmed long-range requirements at permanent military bases. On that basis, we request the support by the House.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, the bill will have the overwhelming support of the House.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the magnificent cooperation that he and his committee have given to the Committee on Armed Services, the authorizing committee. We on the Armed Services Committee enjoy a fine association with every member of the great and excellent committee of which the gentleman is a member and which has given us such splendid help.

I notice that the gentleman, among other things, is now explaining the matter of private construction overseas to

provide much-needed housing. It is the feeling of the committee that we have not provided adequate housing overseas. I have in mind particularly the Philippines. At the present time the Philippines have done anything but give us their full cooperation, and our dependents in the Philippines are at the mercy of gangsters and are the victims of a lack of law enforcement. What we want to do is to see the dependents of our military housed in proper, decent and respectable housing.

Is this what the gentleman is referring to, among the other things, when he says that the committee underwrites the concept that a private contractor construct housing at his own risk?

Mr. SIKES. Yes I am talking about the very serious housing problem overseas and the need for bold new action to improve the situation.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish the gentleman would amplify that point a little further.

Mr. SIKES. Let me reiterate that the situation on housing for military dependents overseas is particularly serious. There is a great dearth of available, satisfactory housing at many overseas bases, and that is true in Europe as well as in the Pacific.

Mr. RIVERS. Particularly in the Pacific.

Mr. SIKES. That is true. The distinguished gentleman and his great committee have made outstanding contributions toward a stronger defense organization. They have done much to help those who wear the uniform and their dependents. This committee, the Appropriations Committee, has shown the same interest. We want to do all that we can. But the fact remains that, particularly in the field of housing, little progress has been made. We feel that bolder action must be taken, and we insist that those in authority assume the responsibility of finding a proper way in which to accomplish that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, all this does is to tell the Defense Department to get busy and get some private contractors to provide portable housing which would be satisfactory for those of our military dependents overseas for whom they have not provided housing.

Mr. SIKES. I think the Department of Defense should do all that is necessary in an effort to find answers to the problem, rather than delay, delay, delay; rather than coming here year after year with programs which produce only a handful of houses.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with the gentleman. I thank the gentleman for another thing. He has kept faith with our committee, in reporting out the bill. He has done so by keeping with the authorization that the House has passed. His action demonstrates the fine honor of his committee and himself. I thank the gentleman. I admire your committee. It is a real pleasure to work with you and your committee.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is very kind in his comments.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to

the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PATTEN. While we are talking about housing, I would like to be on record as strenuously opposing the policy of the Pentagon or the administration in not building more houses. I think it is a crime not to give decent housing to the fine young men we have, enlisted men and others. I think it is one of our most critical problems, from the comments and testimony I have heard. I thank the committee, and the chairman in particular, for emphasizing this and telling the Pentagon time and time again that this committee wants a better job done on housing for the people in the armed services.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the comment of my distinguished colleague, just as I appreciate his fine cooperation and able assistance throughout the year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I direct the gentleman's attention to page 9 of his own report where the following language appears:

The hearings before the Committee indicated that the audit of non-appropriated funds is delegated to the central audit organization of each service; that is, the Army Audit Agency, Auditor General of the Navy, and the Auditor General of the Air Force. Technical assistance is subject to review and evaluation by the Office, Comptroller of Defense. However, only the Air Force has retained audit responsibility at the departmental level, while the other services have delegated responsibility to local command levels.

The reason I direct the gentleman's attention to that language is that we have pending in the Judiciary Committee the question of giving the courts jurisdiction to entertain suits that may be instituted against these people for breach of contract and things of that nature.

Mr. SIKES. That matter was not called to the attention of the committee. If it would be of help to the distinguished gentleman in the deliberations of his own committee, we will be glad to assist in directing suitable inquiries to the Department of Defense.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Florida. We have been considering it in our subcommittee, and we anticipate going into it in much more detail.

Mr. SIKES. We will be glad to cooperate with the distinguished gentleman's committee, as with all the legislative committees of the House.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I notice the allowance for Perrin Air Force Base has been reduced by roughly \$1 million. This, I take it, was the result of certain actions by the Air Force?

Mr. SIKES. That is exactly the situation. I assure the gentleman that I recognize the value of Perrin as a base. I recognize his own outstanding efforts in behalf of Perrin and of the fine people

who serve and work there. There is to be change in the projected mission of the base which has resulted in withdrawal by the Air Force of some of the proposed facilities. The reduction in facilities shown in our report was done at the request of Air Force and Department of Defense officials who stated there would not now be a requirement for the facilities.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and his committee.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask if this bill takes into account in terms of savings, in terms of lesser appropriations, the rather substantial number of bases that have been closed in the past few months?

Mr. SIKES. Let me state to the distinguished gentleman, that subject was very carefully taken into consideration. Just a few days before the bill was reported we had a hearing on this matter with Secretary Shillito, Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics, and departmental staffs, at which we had a full accounting of the effect of the base closures. Every item which they said was no longer required as a result of the base closure action has been taken out of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Were those base closings reflected in the 1970 budget figures?

Mr. SIKES. Not in the budget figures, because the budget figures were placed before us long ago; but they were taken into consideration in the amount contained in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman address himself briefly to the line items for debt payment to be found at the top of page 6 of the bill? The debt payment item is \$31,648,000 in one instance and there is another item for debt payment of \$87,880,000. I assume this is in part due to housing, or mortgages on housing.

Mr. SIKES. Yes, that is correct. I will read from the report.

If the gentleman will turn to page 35 of the committee report, which is before him, he will find, under "debt payment" this language:

The funds approved by the Committee for debt payment provide for the payments of principal, interest, mortgage insurance premiums, and other expenses which result from the assumption by the government of mortgages on Capehart and Wherry housing as well as the payment of premiums due mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration for mortgages assumed by active military personnel for housing purchased by them. The approved program also includes repayment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for remaining indebtedness for housing constructed in foreign countries with foreign currencies derived from the sale of surplus commodities

In other words, there are a number of provisions of public law which must be honored by payment of these obligations, and that is what the debt payment item in this bill incorporates.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his answer. If he will indulge me one final, quick question, does the gentleman

anticipate we will get, later this year—perhaps not this year but early next year—a supplemental appropriation to expand the spending that otherwise might have been carried out under this bill had it not been reduced?

Mr. SIKES. There have been no indications whatever, if I may respond to the gentleman, that there will be a supplemental budget request for military construction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose not to take very much time. The distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), has covered all of the spending details; and any that he may not have covered in detail in the report.

I should like to take these few minutes, however, to emphasize my concern with regard to what is happening to military construction for our armed services.

We are faced with what I believe to be over a period of time an intolerable condition. As the distinguished chairman of the committee said, the original budget submitted by President Johnson was in the area of \$2.5 billion. We are presenting to you a bill providing \$1.45 billion. That is a \$1 billion reduction from the \$2.4 billion budget request. This ought to please a lot of people who are unduly concerned about defense expenditures. I hope we will not have any amendments to cut this bill further, because we just cannot afford to do so. Construction costs are going up and the appropriation of dollars is going down. When we find ourselves in a condition such as that, you will see that you are not getting the amount of construction necessary to provide for our military. We have been hearing much discussion from many sources—and I am all for it—that we ought to have a volunteer Army. I have some personal reservations as to how practical that is, but I think that the goal is a good one. You had better be realistic about it, though. If you are going to try to induce young people to make the military a career, you had better be sure that we start straightening out the housing situation for our military—the quarters, the bachelor officers quarters, and other facilities. I think it is a little foolhardy to talk about having a military service on a volunteer basis if we do not start, right now, planning for that time and providing the facilities that will be an inducement for men to join the service. These are facts we had better consider in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, military construction is not something that can remain static. There are new concepts in defense. Every time we change a concept, such as the design of an aircraft, it requires modifications and changes and new construction to satisfy the operational requirements of the new weapon system. These have to be provided for every year. So, as we tackle the problem of military facilities, I only hope we will recognize that there is no shortcut to providing the military construction needed.

I think every member of our commit-

tee recognizes we are not totally satisfied by any means with the methods by which construction is sometimes carried out. I am looking at my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). He pointed out, in our hearings, that we in the subcommittee, as well as the Committee on Armed Services do have a responsibility to try to get the services to use new techniques of construction so that we can get the most for the dollars we spend. There are some new concepts in housing, for example, the Turnkey project, which is going on in Colorado, as well as research going on at George Air Force Base in California. It may be that over a period of time we can work out a way to provide this housing at a cheaper cost. I happen to be one who believes that maybe we are not getting as much as we should for the dollars we spend, but it is hard for a committee of the Congress to police all of these things.

So, all in all, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I do not see how we can cut this bill any further. I might also say I understand that our distinguished friend from Illinois, my very dear friend (Mr. YATES), is going to propose an amendment regarding Safeguard. And he has made the amendment available. The amendment goes to last year's funds and says none of the prior year funds can be expended.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have pretty well debated the Safeguard issue and a decision has been made both here and in the other body. I hope we will recognize such has been done and that we will dispense with this bill as quickly as we possibly can.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of the necessity for spending in the military—and this does not apply alone to construction—it seems to me that the day ought to dawn soon when what some are pleased to call foreign policy should dictate that we pull our long noses out of every country around the world—the policing, the financing—stop making so many commitments that require expenditures to the extent that we have seen them in years gone by and are still faced with today.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the gentleman from Iowa misses the point. I am not so sure that this is going to save a lot of money, but it is something that ought to be debated. I know what the gentleman is referring to and it is a subject worthy of our consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how else can you reduce expenditures for the military; how do you get them down to manageable proportions in terms of revenue and everything else in this country unless we stop the business of trying to run the rest of the world?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not sure we will save money by moving all of our troops overseas back to the United States and build facilities for them here. That is going to cost you money.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman

will agree that it costs more to maintain troops abroad than it does in this country?

Mr. CEDERBERG. In some instances, yes.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to concur with what the gentleman from Michigan is saying. For example, in Europe in NATO it costs less to maintain our troops over there because the NATO organization furnishes quarters and all of the infrastructures for which we only pay 25 percent. If we had them back here, we would have to pay 100 percent.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would like to see the figures that form the basis for the 25 percent.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, actually it is 24.2 percent which is our share of the infrastructure of NATO. It might be somewhat higher in other areas.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I feel that the question of foreign commitments is a subject worthy of discussion by the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Committee on Armed Services. I am not so sure that the Appropriations Committee has a free hand here. But I can say that if we moved all of our troops back to the United States and built the necessary facilities for them here in the next few years, we would have to undertake a massive and costly construction program. I am not debating the worthiness of them staying over there because that is another subject.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

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

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is commonly known as the military construction appropriations bill. This is an inaccurate description. It should be more accurately called the military construction and reconstruction appropriations bill. Much of the proposed construction is for replacement, rehabilitation, renovation, modernization, and reconstruction. Some of our military camps are 200 years old. Many of the facilities for personnel throughout the system are outdated, substandard, not modern. The whole of the physical plant of all of the armed services is depreciating and deteriorating. Maintenance and repair are not keeping pace with wear and tear. No businessman or property manager would permit the deterioration of his properties as we Americans are permitting, even forcing, the deterioration of our defense plants and facilities.

The accelerating deterioration of the physical plant of our armed services is a wasteful extravagance which jeopardizes

our defense readiness and our national security. The deterioration may become so massive and pervasive that rehabilitation becomes impossible.

While our military plant and physical facilities are deteriorating, our military system cannot perform satisfactorily. While our military plant is deteriorating, the military personnel and their families are required to live and work under substandard conditions—which is unfair and inefficient.

Every Member of the Congress, every U.S. taxpayer should know what is happening. We have an enormous investment in our Department of Defense and its properties and facilities. We should keep these assets in a good condition of repair and maintenance or they should be relinquished for other higher and better uses. Actually, some of the bases were established decades, even a century ago, and probably no longer serve their intended purpose well. A thorough review of our defense plant and facilities is long overdue.

There are many ways to confirm what I am saying. Most businessmen and industrialists who operate large plants or facilities have formulas which they can apply to determine how much or what percentage of the original cost or replacement value needs to be spent in order to keep pace with deterioration. Under any accepted formula, we are not spending sufficient amounts to keep our military plants and facilities in an acceptable condition of repair and maintenance. Our spending program for military construction during each of the last 8 years has been inadequate—and, therefore, the deterioration continues to compound itself.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics testified that the three services estimate a \$19.6 billion deficiency in military construction. The budget request was for only \$1.917 billion, less than one-tenth the need.

The Defense Department claims that \$8.2 billion is needed for modernization of physical plant, but requested only \$380 million. It is also estimated that 121,600 additional units of family housing will be required by 1974. The budget request was for only 4,800 units. At this pace we can only regress.

An understanding of complicated cost-benefit formulas pertaining to expenditures for repair and maintenance of physical plant and facilities is not necessary to know that our military facilities are deteriorating.

Anyone can visit a military, naval, or Air Force base and see the conditions first hand. Every Member should visit several military bases and observe for himself. I strongly suggest that Members compare military buildings, facilities and equipment with comparable assets of other governmental agencies—State, local, or Federal. Compare a military base with a NASA base—the former is old, rundown; the latter is modern, new. Compare any military administration building with the administration building of any Federal or State agency. Compare military hospitals with private hospitals. Few military hospitals can match the condition of private hospitals.

Many facilities, in every service, need almost complete rehabilitation. Many facilities which have been rehabilitated and patched up over the years require extensive modernization. Many buildings which are used to house military personnel and their families would have been demolished years ago if military bases could qualify as part of civilian urban renewal projects.

Many social planners and urban redevelopers deplore the ghettos, the residential blight and the de facto segregation of our cities—but the ghetto situations, the housing deterioration and the enforced segregation of our military personnel on many military bases is much more deplorable. Military personnel, who are ordered to report to certain military bases, often find it impossible to find any housing for their families. More often service families have no choice but to live in housing whose standards are considerably below standards prescribed in the minimum building and zoning codes of even slum sections of metropolitan areas. In my own district, young families of military men have lived in their automobiles for weeks.

Family housing without privacy, without adequate storage, without adequate laundry facilities, without adequate floor space, with no toilet facilities on the first floor, and in a condition or process of deterioration are commonplace in all branches of the service.

This is not primarily the fault of the services. The Congress has simply refused and neglected in the past to appropriate sufficient funds to provide adequate housing for military personnel and their families.

Without adequate funds, the services cannot possibly provide the quantity or quality of housing to which military personnel are entitled.

It seems incongruous and incredible that men will be drafted into the service, moved from base to base at someone else's will, and not provided adequate housing for themselves or their families—but this is the case. This deterioration will accelerate with the inadequate appropriation which we are proposing today.

During the last 8 years the Defense Department has been so engrossed in the fighting of a war in Vietnam and maintaining our NATO and nuclear defenses, that it has been unable to pay sufficient attention to the maintenance and modernization of our national defense system. The war has demanded the talents and energies of our best military planners and researchers. The war has demanded enormous slices of our resources. The balance of the funds, of course, had to come from the other Defense Department needs. Thereby the military plant and facilities elsewhere were drained down and permitted to deteriorate; needed rehabilitation and modernization was postponed; needed new construction of family housing, hospitals, bachelor housing, and schools were deferred; essential research and planning was scratched.

We cannot permit our servicemen, a large segment of our fellow citizens, or our defense system to bear the burden of the war.

Our defense system must keep abreast of change. No segment of our society should be more responsive to progress and innovation or to the sensitivity of our citizenry. As the size of our Military Establishment decreases we ought to insist that quality and effectiveness increase.

We cannot do this without providing more funds for military construction.

We must understand that we cannot expect the morale or retention of the armed services to improve if military personnel and their families are forced to live in substandard housing on isolated ghettoized military bases.

Today the young, stable, intelligent, competent, and dedicated servicemen whom we want to attract and to retain in the defense services care about their families and especially the education of their children. Today's service family understands that the education of their children is their most important mission after survival. Not yet, especially under this military construction budget, can we provide adequate classrooms and educational facilities for dependents of military personnel.

In our debates on other authorization and appropriation bills for education and housing, we declaim loudly and passionately for more funds for education and housing for the civilian poor, and I join you. But I remind you that many of our military families qualify for all of the poverty programs, yet we continually ignore their needs and we are, in this appropriation bill, treating the military families shabbily.

The budget requests for these requirements were patently inadequate. Of course the administration is confronted with enormous pressures to reduce spending—and the military construction budget is an easy place to cut because only the military personnel will directly suffer and their numbers are small, dispersed and apolitical. But this predicament does not reduce the dire need nor relieve us of the responsibility which should be commensurate with the need.

Military construction appropriations provide the wherewithal to support personnel. Personnel is the most precious and essential ingredient of our defense forces.

Certainly we need the weapons systems, we need the munitions, we need the vehicles—planes, ships and trucks—we need the research and development programs and the other items included in the Defense appropriations bill which we will consider later this session.

But the weapons systems, the munitions, the vehicles, the research are useless without the personnel. To organize a superior defense force with which to guarantee our national security, we need to recruit and maintain the most competent and dedicated persons possible.

Morale and retention are two of the most critical problems facing the Department of Defense. We in the Congress share the responsibility of providing the Defense Department with the tools and the wherewithal to maintain high morale and the retention of competent and dedicated service personnel. Salaries are low, working conditions are onerous and often dangerous, the risks to life and

personal safety are high, families are separated often with little notice and at most inconvenient times, assignments are uncertain. Because of the many unavoidable disadvantages of military service, we have some extraordinary responsibilities for providing other benefits and inducements. We also have the responsibility for providing the optimum training for all personnel.

The acquisition, construction and installation of public works, buildings and facilities for the three major military services and other defense agencies is the responsibility of our committee and the Congress.

The construction and maintenance of all housing for all military personnel, for all training facilities, for all warehousing of all materials and equipment, and for all installations to administer the Department of Defense are included in this bill.

The sites and housing for our land based weapons systems are included in this bill.

Construction and reconstruction in this country and abroad is included in this bill.

So, I cannot emphasize enough the enormity of the scope of our military construction requirements.

I cannot emphasize enough the great significance of the military construction projects to the morale and efficiency of our military personnel.

Personnel perform better with proper facilities. Housing is as critical to the performance of a serviceman or woman as to a civilian. Good working conditions are just as important to service personnel as to civilian personnel.

Unfortunately, weapons systems, planes, ships and munitions receive top priorities under the pressures of war—by military leaders and by the Congress.

Too often we have neglected our physical establishment. Too often we permit good facilities to deteriorate. Too often we overcrowd and overload facilities during a war. This diminishes efficiency and effectiveness. This increases the costs.

Too often we tell ourselves we are "getting by" with old, out-of-date, inefficient, deteriorating facilities when we are not "getting by" at all, but are actually permitting valuable and necessary facilities to deteriorate and we are inexorably permitting the degradation of our defense facilities. Too often deferments are not economy measures at all—but foolish, uneconomic judgments which simply increase costs and deprive us of facilities needed now.

The wear and tear on facilities accelerates during the increased mobilization required by war.

Overextended and massive use of buildings, housing, ports, airfields and training facilities can quickly escalate deterioration.

Wartime should require more military construction projects and larger appropriations, but your committee, because of the critical fiscal condition of the Federal Government, is recommending a reduced appropriation.

I commend the subcommittee and the full committee for appropriating as much as they did. I commend both for their concern about the military infrastructure, but we have not done enough on the

basis of sound business and property management or on the basis of sound personnel management.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes. The Committee on Appropriations has filed a very detailed report as to what transpired in the committee and what is contained in the bill, listing the items that were stricken by the Committee on Armed Services, and the items that were eliminated by the Department of Defense from the requests of the different services. Beginning on page 24 of the report and running to the end thereof, there is a breakdown of installations funded in this bill, State by State and service by service.

It has already been stated in the course of the debate so far that this bill has been cut three different times. The first cut was the cut brought about by reason of the revision of the budget by the Nixon administration. That amounted to a half a billion dollar cut. The second cut, I guess it would be proper to refer to it as the Rivers cut. Although the gentleman from South Carolina is not usually credited with making a lot of cuts, and on the contrary he is usually credited with increasing bills. But here is a case in which his committee made a substantial cut in the request of the administration, about \$300 million.

Then the last cut, I guess, could be referred to as the Sikes cut; that is the cut of our own subcommittee, and with all of those cuts we are about \$1 billion under the originally prepared budget.

Frankly, that is about all I think the services can stand in the way of cuts. As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) stated in the course of his remarks, these substantial cuts should please many Members of the House who think we are spending too much money on defense.

I admit we are spending a great deal of money on defense, but am one of those who believes that whatever you spend on the defense of your country, or preserving your country's security is not money wasted but money well spent.

The subcommittee has made a careful analysis of the items that were authorized, and of the requirements, and I am inclined to believe that there is more danger in the long run that we have erred on the side of too much economy than to the contrary.

We, of course, are in a fiscal situation that calls for restraint, but there is a point beyond which economies in maintaining facilities are self-defeating. You know out of your own experience, with your own house, if you let it go for years without providing any maintenance money, that one of these days you will have a major repair or rehabilitation program confronting you.

So, as I say, I think we have made all the cuts that were proper in this bill. It is a good bill. It represents the best thinking of the subcommittee, and I would suspect that as many members of the subcommittee feel that it does not provide enough money as those who feel that it provides too much, so that there is a sort of a balancing off there of viewpoints within the subcommittee.

I support the bill, and I join my col-

leagues, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), in urging that it be approved by the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

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

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I can testify to the accuracy of the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) that this is a barebones bill. Everything in my district has been cut out of the military construction bill.

Mr. JONAS. I did not realize that everything had been cut, but I can vouch for the fact that it was pretty hard hit.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to add that the one base in the Third District of Iowa has been closed and I am not complaining, but I notice that in half a dozen States they are really doing all right in terms of this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Since we are on this subject, I am pleased to report to my friend from Iowa that he will not find any money in this bill for the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina either.

Now, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN) if he would like to ask some questions or direct some questions to the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN).

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire regarding the item which was in the authorization and was taken out; \$950,000 for reserve components at Camp Drum.

Mr. SIKES. I understand his interest and I know the matter of which he is speaking. If he wishes, I will respond at this time.

Mr. McEWEN. Yes, if you would, Mr. Chairman, and I am referring to the item in the committee report on pages 28 and 29.

Mr. SIKES. Let me say to the gentleman, I appreciate his efforts and commend him for his interest and for his desire to see that Reserve components have their needs funded properly.

This particular item is not a budgeted item. The committee went very carefully into nonbudgeted add-ons, and this is one of those.

The testimony to the committee about a week ago stated:

The Guard Bureau for the army did not request these items to be added.

Presumably, it was intended that they would come before the Congress in a later year.

"If there is a serious need for these projects, why were they not included in the regular fiscal 1970 budget?"

The response was, that "This was a matter of funding limitations. We had originally requested more money than we were authorized in the President's budget, and the high priority items had to be considered first."

Again I sympathize with the gentleman, but the committee has to draw the line somewhere on nonbudgeted items and items which are requested by the administration.

Second, however, I should state to the gentleman the fact that Reserve Forces facilities are not spelled out as line items in the committee's action. Funds were not specifically provided for it. This does not necessarily prevent the project from being funded from available funds if the Department determines it has a higher priority than those which were identified during the course of the hearings.

Mr. McEWEN. If I may say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this was not budgeted. It was added by the committee to the authorization bill. But I find it a little confusing in view of the statement of the testimony that you read from the hearings. I was looking at part 3, of your hearings, pages 1101 and 1102, where you, Mr. Chairman, were questioning General Wilson on this and it concludes on page 1102 with you asking General Wilson: "You do need funds for Drum?"

And General Wilson replied: "That is correct, sir."

Mr. SIKES. I do not think there is any inconsistency there because undoubtedly they do need funds at a great many installations which could not be included within the funding limitation imposed by the administration and by the Bureau of the Budget.

If the gentleman will think back on what I said a moment ago, he will realize that the testimony I quoted was given just prior to the markup of the bill and that this item was not considered to be of as high a priority as the other items which were listed within the funds requested.

Again, I am sympathetic to the gentleman's interest. But you have to draw the line somewhere. The committee feels that it cannot, in good conscience, go beyond the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations except in very limited instances where a very strong case is made by the services for a particular facility.

Mr. McEWEN. I thank the gentleman for this information.

I would like to say now to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that I would indeed welcome it, if the gentleman from Florida and the members of this subcommittee might visit Camp Drum. As the gentleman knows, it is the major training facility for the First Army for the Eastern United States, and to which tens of thousands of National Guard and Reserve members come for their summer training.

I would say to the gentleman, if you personally had the opportunity to see this facility and see the use that is being made of it, the needs that it serves and the inadequacy of so much of the facilities there, I would indeed welcome it. If you and the members of this distinguished subcommittee might, next summer I would suggest, visit Camp Drum and the Thousand Islands of northern New York during that very beautiful season of the year, you would see this facility at the peak of its use and see the obsolescence that is plaguing the command at this post.

I do wish to add, Mr. Chairman, that there has been recognition given by your committee. I appreciate some of the things that have been done. But there are desperate needs, I feel, and I would like very much if you gentlemen might be able to see this firsthand. I know there are many installations to see, but I think it would be very worthwhile if you would visit this particular one.

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

Mr. McEWEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. It would not be possible, I guess, that there is any fishing in the area?

Mr. McEWEN. I am happy to respond to the gentleman from North Carolina on that. We claim the world's record muskellunge, out of the St. Lawrence River, almost adjacent to Camp Drum. Also there are even some ponds on the reservation, I am told, that have excellent bass fishing, but if you come during the training season, they are in the impact area on the artillery range, and the commanding officer might not think it appropriate to go out there in that season.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois such time as he may consume.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee could give me some information in relation to a situation we have in my district involving a defense installation. We have a Defense Contract Administration center in my district at O'Hare Field. The employees there work in a very old building. They eat their lunches at their desks because there is no lunchroom facility. It is cold in the winter and hot in the summer. The General Services Administration has been trying to negotiate rental of new quarters for this agency. But I am told that the Defense Department has a fixed maximum amount of rent that can be paid. I believe the figure is somewhere around \$5 a square foot, or somewhere in that area. In a big rental market like Chicago, it is absolutely out of the question to obtain any kind of rental for that kind of money. Has the committee given any consideration to providing some flexibility, or is there flexibility now to deal with a problem like that? They do not want to build a building; they want to rent one. What is the policy of the Defense Department on matters such as that? Is there a possibility that higher rental fees can be allowed?

Mr. SIKES. The policy of the Department of Defense ordinarily is to provide

those facilities that are sufficiently merited and can be fitted within the scope of the available funds contained in the appropriation request. There is never enough money for all needed items. The item to which the gentleman refers is not one that was listed in the budget request. It is not one that was before the committee. Frankly, I know very little about it. I am interested because of the interest of the distinguished gentleman. If he will bring the matter to my attention and to that of the committee staff, we will be glad to explore the situation and determine if there are ways in which relief can be obtained.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman, as usual, is most kind, and I appreciate his good advice and his invitation. I thank him.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), the ranking majority member of the committee.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of the bill presented to the House by the committee, and to also express my appreciation to the chairman of our subcommittee for the remarkably good job that he has done and to the members of the subcommittee for the care and diligence with which they have approached the subject of military construction, so important to the security of our country. There is no partisanship in this committee. The ability of this committee in approaching these problems is certainly shown by the kind of bill that we have presented to the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania such time as he may consume.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman I am glad to compliment the subcommittee on the good work it has done. I believe the saving of \$1 billion in the 1970 budget for U.S. military construction is right in line with what our American taxpayers want. I am glad to hear this billion-dollar cut will not interfere with the efficiency of our U.S. military organization and U.S. military capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I make a policy recommendation regarding joint use by U.S. military planes of the U.S. metropolitan airports that are serving the tremendous passenger jets, with greater jets to come, consisting of the international airport types. I believe that our U.S. policy should be to work to separate the military operations and regionalize them, away from the large metropolitan passenger airports as these two kinds of traffic are incompatible and the mixture is dangerous.

I hope some progress can be made on that kind of a program to insure greater air traffic control and safety for both the scheduled airlines and private planes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the antidefense hysteria in this country has produced an entirely new breed of bird. The doves have not been content to merely pick at our Defense Establish-

ment on the Vietnam issue. They have recruited a new breed of bird, an amphibious ostrich, who would stick his head under the sea while Soviet submarine commanders gaze through their periscopes at the tempting target of the amphibious ostrich's rear end—big, fat, and exposed.

Let me make one thing clear. I must confess that I am an antiwar agitator. But the way that I feel we should agitate against war is to build a Defense Establishment so superior that it will deter aggression. The way to prevent war is to prepare for it. They way to encourage war and aggression is to unilaterally disarm, to ignore the enemy's buildup, and to disparage all those who would equip us to deal with a determined enemy.

The amphibious ostrich becomes infuriated and flaps into an impotent rage with its vestigial wings if you dare mention that the Soviet Union has achieved the largest submarine-building program involving the most advanced undersea craft that the world has ever known. If you point out that the Russians now have over 105 missile submarines compared to our 41, the ostrich will lay an amphibious egg. But the "yolk" will be on him—and us—if we do not activate a powerful new antisubmarine warfare program to overtake and surpass the Russian submarine threat.

Skilled ASW men may differ over technical requirements for ASW aircraft carriers, turboprop planes, sonar buoys, new and better destroyers, and submarines to fight the underwater threat. But there are no differences on the urgency of the need to perfect our antisubmarine defenses.

Admiral Caldwell has this year testified before the Congress with a request very mindful of and deferential to the prevailing congressional mood. He made a very modest and practical request for a 10-percent increase in the Navy's ASW budget. He saw this as essential to mount even a minimum response to the new Soviet challenge.

As a Member of Congress, I am more free to speak out than the admiral and other distinguished naval officers. The admiral and his colleagues know what is happening in the Soviet submarine yards. They are deeply troubled by the specter of Russian submarine power. But they must be practical and frugal when they ask the angry taxpayers for money at a time when the antiwar vogue is such that naval ROTC units are being driven from our universities and many amphibious ostriches would like to converge on the Chesapeake Bay to foul up the U.S. Naval Academy.

I may be accused of being out of vogue because I do not want to put our Navy into the new miniskirts—or the slave chains the girls are wearing around their waists. But I am less interested in fashion than in fact. I say, "damn the ostriches, full speed ahead" on a realistic ASW program.

Let me explain to you why I have become such an agitator on this ASW question. I see it as the most sincere form of antiwar expression, the only real guarantee for peace. I am a peacenik in this

sense because I represent a constituency of citizens who go down to the sea in ships—citizens who are painfully aware of the horrors of war and cosmopolitan and sophisticated enough to know that war must be prevented.

It was only a year ago when we became aware that the Soviet Navy in 1968 had reached a submarine strength that our authorities did not believe they could attain until 1975. Moscow is running 7 years ahead of our best estimates, ahead of our computer projections. There were no amphibious ostriches to be found in the Soviet Union.

The Russian Navy now has more than 375 submarines; 65 of this number are nuclear powered. We have a total of 41 missile submarines compared to their 105 Polaris missile submarines. We have only 44 nuclear attack submarines.

Moscow's 105 missile submarines represent a great threat not only to our men at sea but to our cities at home. Next year, 1970, will not see us catching up. Indeed, the Russians will move even further ahead in nuclear submarine strength.

We must be concerned not only with existing Soviet submarine strength but the fantastic production base that has been established. There are also the qualitative improvements. Their submarines are quieter, faster, better than we imagined.

Fifty-eight percent of the Soviet Navy is less than 10 years old. This contrasts with our ships which average 18 years of age. All of the Soviet Navy has been built since the end of World War II. We are still using some elderly ships, destroyers as well as submarines, that should be retired forthwith.

The Russians next year will be even further ahead of us in submarine strength. The sad truth is that we are being left behind. There is no excuse for this. ASW is the essence of defense. It is linked to the safety and protection of our Nation with the traditional assignment of defending our ships and shores. Indeed, the time has come for a counter-attack. Those who would defend our Nation cannot go on the defensive.

Russia now has a submarine building yard so vast that it could include more yards than our country even possesses. The Russians could build 20 nuclear submarines a year. This includes 12 of the Polaris type.

In 1966 we had 300 students in naval architecture and marine engineering. The Russians had 7,000. That is the contrast in the emerging technical base.

Admiral Rickover has said:

Numerical superiority, however, does not tell the whole story. Weapons systems, speed, depth, detection devices, quietness of operation, and crew performance all make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of a submarine force. From what we have been able to learn during the past year, the Soviets have attained equality in a number of these characteristics and superiority in some.

Now that Moscow has reached a point of parity with us, and are moving ahead in submarine power, are they trimming sails? They certainly are not. They are expediting the pace of submarine construction.

Congress has just learned that the Russians now have the world's fastest submarine. Emboldened by their growing power, the Russians are operating farther away from their bases, in larger numbers, and for longer periods of time. New types of submarines and improved mother ships are emerging.

Russian submarines are no longer strangers to our coastal waters. Nor is the Soviet Navy showing timidity. There was nothing timid about the naval movements in Cuban waters and the Gulf of Mexico this summer. Nor are the threats to the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean indicating a meek posture.

Soviet submarine progress has been achieved in days when too many Americans do not want to hear about it. They have hypnotized themselves with some grandiose delusion that if we stop all defense spending our foreign enemies will fall in love with us while, at home, poverty and racial antagonisms will disappear from our cities.

I feel the time has come to take one compelling aspect of our defense and concentrate on it with an appeal to reason. That aspect is ASW. The basic sense of the American people is good. Even some of the amphibious ostriches may raise their heads out of the water.

What we can do in space, we can do on the seas and under the seas. ASW research and development must be glamorized. It must be accorded top priority.

What deeply disturbs me today as we consider the military construction appropriations bill is the elimination of funds for building a vitally needed naval undersea technology laboratory in San Diego. The laboratory would provide technical advice on the major naval efforts in ASW systems, analyze component and systems developments and conduct some operational testing, underwater environmental research and in-house applied research. This proposed laboratory is not one that was hastily conceived. It was first studied and recommended several years ago by the President's Office of Science and Technology which stated that the laboratory would serve as "a space setter" in the ASW field. It also urged that the center be established as promptly as possible to fill a gap in the Navy's research and development capability in ASW. Our House Armed Services Committee recognized this need also and has recommended construction of the laboratory. Now, we see the money for starting the laboratory being denied to the Navy, meaning that this project so vital to our Nation's seapower will slip another year.

The Appropriations Committee states in its report that it is not convinced that the Navy has sufficiently studied the possibility of using existing facilities for housing the laboratory. I should like to comment on this point, for the Navy as well as the Armed Services Committee indeed studied this possibility quite thoroughly, and it was determined by both that a new structure would be necessary to house the laboratory.

It is my hope that the Senate will recognize the need for starting this laboratory and approve the necessary funds so that when the House and Senate go into conference on this bill, another effort can

be made to grant the \$6.4 million appropriations for this important laboratory.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against H.R. 14751, the military construction appropriation bill. This bill has come to the House floor under a rule which waived all points of order. I feel that rule 21(6) has been disregarded and we have been deprived of the opportunity for study and careful consideration of this measure. The printed committee hearings, consisting of some 1,200 pages, were not available until yesterday, November 12, and the report became available just today. I do not believe we should be asked in this body to consider a \$2 billion appropriation bill under these circumstances.

I am deeply concerned, Mr. Chairman, that there are some moneys in this bill, the purpose of which has not been explained, or cannot be explained. In addition, the bill involves some \$14 million in new appropriations and \$97 million in total appropriations for the controversial anti-ballistic-missile system, to which I am opposed.

Further, I have long been concerned over the growing proportions of military spending. I am a cosponsor of legislation to bring new perspective to the question of national priorities, and to reassert congressional control over the Nation's military industrial establishment. I feel that the Vietnam war, which I have, of course, long opposed, has provided the opening for a military budget which is no longer related to our military needs. We cannot accept the premise that our national security depends only upon military expenditures. We need more of an understanding—an explanation—of what we as a nation are buying for our money. Extravagant military spending is not going to solve our most pressing national problems. The civilian sector of our national budget is being deprived. We must turn our attention to the need to rebuild ghetto communities, to improve our schools, provide more housing, and health facilities, and to fight pollution, crime, and drug addiction.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conscientiously vote for this \$2 billion appropriation in haste while the pressing needs of our country remain neglected and inadequately funded.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$271,605,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee might respond

to a question or two. I note in the committee report that there is no construction for Vietnam, and I am sure the chairman probably covered this in his earlier remarks, but I wanted to ask if he has the figures that were in the comparable bill last year for Vietnam for that construction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman asked me how much money was provided last year for Vietnam?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. It is going to take me a little while to run this down because I cannot put my finger on the exact amount. I can say since 1965, \$2.8 billion has been appropriated for construction in support of Southeast Asia. There is a June 30, 1969, obligational total of \$2.6 billion and expenditures of \$2.2 billion. As of August 31, 1969, there was a total of \$213.7 million available to carry on new construction projects in Vietnam. Because of the fact that there is no new requirement for money in Vietnam, there is none appropriated in this bill. There will be available the carryover funds from last year, which will primarily be used for Vietnamization of the war, to provide facilities which are required specifically for the Vietnamese units rather than the U.S. units. It is necessary to complete some of the facilities that were under construction.

If the gentleman from Minnesota will yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) the gentleman seems to have his finger on the item the gentleman requested.

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, on page 8 at the bottom of the page, the language there describes the construction in Vietnam as follows:

This consists of providing facilities for the Vietnamese Armed Forces, including dependent shelters, at an accelerated rate to facilitate the "Vietnamization" of the war.

The Chairman has quoted the total of \$213.7 million available for obligation in Vietnam as of August 31, 1969. If the gentleman will go on to read that section, he will find \$110 million will be available for the shelter program and other construction items, which will be utilized out of the money which is being carried over.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield further, specifically to answer the gentleman's question, now it has been brought to my attention from the committee hearings, in fiscal year 1969, \$189 million was appropriated for Vietnam.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman if perhaps he can clarify for the committee just why we need to spend money for new facilities? Why cannot the Vietnamese simply take over the American facilities being evacuated?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I will be glad to go into that.

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there is actually to be used, out of the carryover money, \$110 million for Vietnamization of the war.

This includes improving facilities or building facilities which are specifically required for Vietnam forces. Remember, they use a different type of equipment from what we use. They operate normally in smaller units. It is very costly for them to try to carry on the huge base complexes we have constructed.

This is a very significant requirement for the improvement of roads, particularly in those areas where the roads were used primarily for military traffic. They have taken a very bad beating in the course of the war, and simply have to be improved. That accounts for \$40 million.

There are emergency facilities required for the safety, health and security of United States forces. That is some \$57 million.

Funds are necessary to repair battle damage, which is continuing on our own installations, or from rocket attacks. That is \$16 million.

There are also facilities such as port repair, to support redeployment of U.S. units back home. That is \$15 million. Even though we are moving units out of Vietnam, it is still a costly operation to convert to the Vietnamese operation or to get our forces out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 6, line 19, strike out the period (.) and insert: "but no part of such funds may be used for construction associated with operational deployment of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is a logical time to present this amendment. It is true that the ABM debate a few months ago was extensive and thorough both in the House and Senate. After a very spirited fight the proponents for deployment of the ABM won. I was opposed to the deployment of the ABM in that debate. I am still strongly opposed to such deployment.

This amendment offers this House a second opportunity, perhaps the last chance, to take another look at the program.

First, Mr. Chairman, my amendment will not affect any research funds at all. It goes only to deployment. There is money in this bill for research facilities on Kwajalein Island. This amendment will not affect those funds.

The opponents of deployment of the ABM favor research. They are not opposed to research. They are opposed to deployment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a time for research and there is a time for deployment. When last year Congress hurried to approve the Sentinel ABM for the reason presumably that the time for deployment had come, those of us who opposed that move pointed out that the ABM system that was to be deployed around the Nation's cities would not work for that purpose. However, we were overruled.

It took President Nixon himself, early this year, to point out the fact that we had been correct. It would not work, he said. He exploded the argument that deployment of the Sentinel ABM would work around the Nation's cities.

The President himself said it. But then he changed the name and redeployed the ABM. I find it difficult to understand why a change of name—changing the name Sentinel to Safeguard—and moving deployment to two sites in Montana and in North Dakota, to protect our intercontinental ballistic missiles, would change the efficacy of the deployment. I still maintain that this is a highly questionable system. I do not believe it will work any better in its new role.

What is more important, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Foster, who is Director of Research of the Department of Defense, has stated in testimony before the Appropriations Committee that the ABM will not protect this Nation against an all-out attack by the Soviets, for whose missile might it is supposed to be a shield.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the gentleman's remarks. As a member of the subcommittee, I spent time studying the whole question of the ABM. I came out of the study with mixed feelings. While it might work, the question is, would it work well enough to justify the expenditure of the money. It seems to me we have other defense needs that are more justifiable, giving more defense for the dollar, than the ABM. I was forced, because the whole package was presented to us, at the time of the authorization, to vote for the ABM—and I was very unhappy at that time about it—because while I was opposed to deployment just now, I wanted to see that we kept on with research and development, looking to the time when we might get a real scientific breakthrough that would make the ABM more justifiable. I am very glad that the gentleman offers an amendment which enables me to do now, what I was unable to do at the time of the authorization; namely, to vote against a waste of money for the deployment but for a continuation of a research and development program.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman makes a very cogent argument in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we need these funds for other and better purposes, the Congress has approved an extra billion dollars for education. The Congress has approved approximately \$1 billion for clean water. Both of these appropriations are above the budget. Both are desperately needed. Both are much more necessary in the national interest than this expenditure for ABM deployment. The deployment of the ABM at this time is premature.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge striking the funds for the ABM deployment out of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have trod this ground many times before. This is the same effort to hamstring the ABM Safeguard program, which we have seen so often.

Mr. Chairman, there is no new money for the Army for Safeguard in the bill except for research and development facilities at Kwajalein, which I mentioned earlier. This money, \$14.1 million, is for research and development, which I believe just about everyone supports. There is also new money in the bill for the Air Force, at the Norad Combat Operations Center in Colorado. Of the \$20.8 million requested for alteration of this center, \$2.5 million, is to be used for headquarters facilities for Safeguard. The committee provided \$12.8 million of that request. The gentleman's amendment is really directed at prior year appropriations and authorizations. The money which is carried over must be utilized if we are going to have an orderly program. This money is to be spent for planning, land acquisition, access roads, and construction to insure the readiness of the two sites, which have been selected. If we do not continue the work which is now in progress, we will simply postpone the availability of this system for another year or two or three—an inexcusable delay for an already long delayed program.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this would be a most unwise procedure. No such limitations are imposed on the Russians or the Chinese. I trust that the House will reject the amendment.

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

Mr. SIKES. If I may, I will first yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. McFALL, and then to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to join with the gentleman in opposition to this amendment. While I think that the gentleman from Illinois certainly has presented his amendment at an appropriate time, it will not have the effect he desires because it applies to prior-year funds and the House had its opportunity to work its will as to whether or not to go forward with Safeguard.

I would join with the gentleman from Florida in opposing the amendment. The House has already considered the appropriateness of our country going ahead with Safeguard. The other body has in a memorable debate and a memorable vote decided to go ahead with Safeguard.

I feel that the committee is properly providing the money—carryover money from other years—to go ahead with Safeguard in accordance with the determination made by this House and by the other body in previous authorization bills.

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

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

Mr. YATES. As I understand it, the amount of money that is involved in my amendment approximates \$260 million; is that not correct?

Mr. SIKES. The amount of carryover money is \$279 million. However, not all of it would be expended in fiscal 1970.

Mr. YATES. But these are funds that will be used for deployment, are they not?

Mr. SIKES. This is carryover money from previous appropriations which will be used during the current fiscal year for the planning and construction of two sites which have been authorized.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the chairman in opposition to the amendment.

One of the distinctions that many of the opponents of the ABM and the installation of the ABM make is between research and development and deployment. I would suggest that the gentleman read Part I of our hearings where we went into the Safeguard matter. We went into this with Dr. Charles Johnson and General Starbird. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long) goes into quite a colloquy with them on the research and development involved in the actual installation at the sites in Montana and North Dakota. There is research and development involved at these installations. I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois has read this testimony or not.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman has read that testimony. My amendment goes to the deployment funds. If the money is to be used for research, my amendment will not reach it, and as the gentleman testified if research was to be pursued at those installations, my amendment would not prevent that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. But the gentleman from Illinois raises a rather cloudy question here.

Mr. YATES. Not cloudy at all.

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

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

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

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

Mr. YATES. My amendment goes entirely to the deployment. If the Department of Defense is of the opinion that what they are doing is limited entirely to research, my amendment will not touch it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think you have a rather difficult situation here in separating deployment from research because both are involved. If the gentleman will read the testimony of Dr. Johnson I think he will have to conclude that R. & D. is very, very much involved in the actual deployment on site.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my amendment reads:

No part may be used for construction associated with operational deployment.

I think that is quite clear.

Mr. CEDERBERG. In construction, you cannot separate operational deployment from the R. & D. You have got to have the construction for operational deployment before you can conduct R. & D.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if it is in connection with research only, my amendment would not touch it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. As a matter of fact the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) said when he questioned the witness that he wished Defense people would bring these things out more clearly.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thought Dr. Johnson's testimony was excellent. It was persuasive to me to the effect that there was much merit in some deployment at the two sites in North Dakota and Montana. I would, however, be very unwilling at this point to see any deployment at the other 12 sites until we really learn something further about this.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think there is any question of construction for further deployment, particularly in the 1970 program.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, let me point out that, regardless of how you dress it up, this is an anti-ABM amendment.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, yes.

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished friend from Illinois who offered the amendment agrees. We have plowed this ground very thoroughly before. I trust that we can speedily get on with a vote on the amendment, and I trust it will be rejected.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Just let me make one brief comment—

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make a correction. It is an anti-ABM deployment amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I respect the desire of the gentleman not to deploy the system.

I do have serious reservations as to how, under this amendment, you could separate the research and development aspect from deployment, as stated by Dr. Johnson in testifying on the deployment of the system.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman, because it is unclear in my mind, whether it is not true that there are plans to acquire land at these other locations, dozen locations around the country, besides the two in North Dakota and Montana.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I cannot answer the gentleman from Maryland exactly as to the request for the acquisition of other sites, but you can acquire land for sites and still not deploy.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield further to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding further, and I think the gentleman from Illinois made it very clear that he does not object to deployment at the two sites so long as this

comes under the heading of research and development, so I see no harm in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I agree with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. What the gentleman is saying is that the Defense Department says we are going to deploy in Montana and North Dakota, and we are doing it for R. & D. purposes. You want the Department of Defense to say that we have to deploy in North Dakota, for R. & D. purposes.

Mr. YATES. What they are doing at Kwajalein is just that; they are building it there because they are doing R. & D., and I have no particular opposition to that and, second, I am willing to take Dr. Long's explanation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If you will remember what Dr. Johnson said here, that a good deal of R. & D. is involved, then obviously the proposed amendment is not needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes. I just want to say that, although this question has been debated before on the floor of the House, it ought not to be regarded as a closed question. The nuclear arms race continues to bear very heavily in the total undertakings of this Government, and in the larger problems that we face as we begin our meeting with the Soviet Union on the SALT talks.

The problem I have with going ahead with the ABM, apart from the question of whether it will work, is that this is another part of the major thrust which we see as the United States proceeds without any delay in the testing of MIRV warheads for both the Minuteman III and the Poseidon missile, and as we move into construction on the AMSA bomber which is another strategic, nuclear-delivering vehicle.

It seems to me that the United States ought to be looking with more care at these programs to see if it is not possible that we can either slow these down or stop them, hopefully, under some agreement with the Soviet Union.

I want to take this occasion to express my deepest disappointment in the posture of the administration as it prepares to meet with the Soviet Union at Helsinki. It would appear to me that the hard-line, military viewpoint is prevailing as the administration defines its proposed position at Helsinki. We apparently, for example, are not considering the possibility of seeking agreement with the Soviet Union at that meeting to an end to MIRV testing.

Now, I deeply regret this. I have listened to too many eminent scientists and others who tell us that if we let this point of no return be passed in the testing of the MIRV, that we will have lost a very important control device which might have made an agreement on MIRV possible.

When we look at the question of going ahead with the ABM, it should be considered in connection with the other forward motion in the construction and deployment of other nuclear weapons.

So I would hope that the House and the Committee would give sympathetic consideration to this amendment. The Soviets are not moving ahead with their ABM, and it would seem to me that we can hold off on ours, particularly we could and should hold off until we see what the results are of the talks that are just beginning with the Soviet Union.

This is a matter of grave concern to the American people. It involves potentially tens of billions of dollars. We need to spend this money for our problems here at home. The security of the United States will not be advanced by both sides—the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.—spending another \$30 billion to \$50 billion on these weapons.

It seems to me we ought to consider taking a stronger leadership role in urging the administration to hold back on the development and deployment of these weapons and push harder for some kind of strategic arms limitation agreement.

So I think this amendment, if it were passed, would be an indication that we are reluctant to see these many billions of dollars being spent until it is thoroughly demonstrated that the security of the United States requires this.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the gentleman from Florida.

It may well be that the gentleman is unable to answer the question for the reason that the information may be classified. I understand there is some money appropriated in this bill the purpose of which cannot be explained on the floor of the House.

Is there construction money in this bill, if the gentleman can answer the question, for Okinawa? I ask the question because of the propaganda that has begun both in and out of the Congress for the purpose of causing the Government of this country to abandon Okinawa and turn it back to the Japanese. I also ask this question because if this Government is going to maintain a military bastion in the Pacific I believe the gentleman will agree that any money expended on Okinawa now would be lost if the island is abandoned. I believe he will further agree that it will cost an untold amount of money to build another comparable base somewhere in the Far Pacific if we are compelled to do so by virtue of having surrendered Okinawa.

Personally, I am absolutely opposed to surrendering Okinawa as long as it is deemed necessary to maintain a bastion in the Pacific.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. I am very glad to respond to the distinguished gentleman.

No, there is no money in this bill for military construction on Okinawa. As I stated earlier in the debate, this bill is patterned on the House authorization bill.

And in the House authorization bill, all the funds for major projects which were requested for military construction in Okinawa were eliminated. The committee in this bill also eliminated a small project there which was withdrawn by the service involved.

Now let me state that I agree emphatically with the gentleman's position on the importance of retaining Okinawa as a military bastion for our forces.

First it is very important to the security of the forces of freedom in the western Pacific. There is no other forward base which is as well located for the maintenance of a defense capability for the western Pacific. Then I must remind the House, a great many American lives were sacrificed in World War II on Okinawa because it was considered essential to our forces. I do not now see us moving out at the demand of the Japanese Government.

Not only do I feel that we should stay in Okinawa, but I think we should insist on the right to store and use whatever weapons may be required for the security of our own forces and the common defense of the area.

Let me state further to the gentleman that Okinawa base facilities are needed for our own forces. If they are restored in the conference action in the authorization bill and funded in the Senate, I intend to do what I can to see that they are accepted by the House committee and built.

I shall be very disappointed if our Government follows a weak policy in defending the interests of U.S. forces on Okinawa. New facilities for the military forces are needed in Okinawa if we are going to stay there at all, and I hope we stay there.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly thank the gentleman for the statement he has made. The gentleman is well aware, of course, that a conference, at which this subject will be, I am sure, a prime topic of consultation and conversation, will take place very shortly here in Washington. I rather hope that I am not around if Congress is ever called upon to replace Okinawa somewhere else in the Pacific. I am sure the gentleman will agree that such a replacement would cost hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars.

Mr. SIKES. It would very well run into hundreds of millions, possibly billions of dollars, and there is not another site that would be as good for the purpose of the common defense as is Okinawa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Appropriations Committee of this body for its exercise of good judgment in approving the location of a proposed Omega navigation station at Middle River, Minn. There had been some suggestion that this site should be relocated

to La Moure, N. Dak., but the background of this suggestion is as yet unknown. The Navy Department attempted to justify their factually baseless decisions for relocation by presenting ambiguous and—in some cases—clearly erroneous cost figures.

In due consideration of all the facts which are presently available, the Appropriations Committee yesterday voted to retain the Middle River site. The engineering report on site investigation for the Omega navigation station, Middle River, Minn., made by MacKichan & Madsen, consulting engineers, Grand Forks, N. Dak., and submitted to the Navy Department on December 22, 1967, states on page 3:

It is the opinion of the Consultant that the site is a suitable one for the proposed OMEGA Navigation Station. The topography, terrain, extent of cover and growth, foundation conditions, water supply, access roads, and utilities, together with ease of property acquisition are all suited to the purpose intended. *No unusual engineering, construction, or maintenance problems are anticipated at this site.* (Emphasis added.)

Likewise, the same report states on page 19:

From a technical standpoint and from the results of the Site Investigations made, the terrain, cover, foundation conditions and water supply are satisfactory for the purpose intended. The access and utilities are satisfactory and the property acquisition would be relatively simple. *From an engineering, construction, and maintenance standpoint the site appears to present no unusual problems.* (Emphasis added.)

There are some very pertinent economic considerations on behalf of the Middle River Omega Navigation Station; namely, that there will be no cost to the Government for the land involved, there will be no cost to the Government for clearing 910 acres of land, and that power rates are the lowest possible—with a calculated cost as low as 0.01008 per kilowatt hour. The facts supporting this can be found in the statement which I submitted to the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on October 31, 1969. For the information of the Members, a copy of the statement is available in my office, and can also be found in the House Military Construction Appropriations hearings for fiscal year 1970 on pages 1305 through 1314.

Again, let me express my appreciation to the Appropriations Committee for a thorough job and good judgment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, 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. 14751) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. 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 343, nays 32, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—343

Abernethy	Corbett	Halpern
Adair	Corman	Hamilton
Adams	Coughlin	Hammer-
Addabbo	Cowger	schmidt
Albert	Cramer	Hanley
Alexander	Culver	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson,	Cunningham	Hansen, Wash.
Calif.	Daniel, Va.	Harsha
Anderson, Ill.	Daniels, N.J.	Harvey
Anderson,	Davis, Ga.	Hastings
Tenn.	Davis, Wis.	Hathaway
Andrews, Ala.	Delaney	Hays
Andrews,	Dellenback	Hébert
N. Dak.	Dennis	Heckler, Mass.
Annunzio	Dent	Henderson
Arends	Derwinski	Hogan
Ashley	Devine	Holifield
Aspinall	Dickinson	Horton
Ayres	Dingell	Hull
Baring	Donohue	Hungate
Barrett	Dowdy	Hunt
Beall, Md.	Downing	Hutchinson
Belcher	Dulski	Ichord
Bell, Calif.	Duncan	Jacobs
Bennett	Dwyer	Jarman
Berry	Edmondson	Johnson, Calif.
Betts	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Biaggi	Edwards, La.	Jones, Ala.
Blester	Eilberg	Jones, N.C.
Blackburn	Erlenborn	Karth
Blanton	Esch	Kazen
Blatnik	Evans, Colo.	Kee
Boggs	Evens, Tenn.	Keith
Boland	Fallon	King
Bolling	Fascell	Kleppe
Bow	Feighan	Kluczynski
Bray	Findley	Kuykendall
Brinkley	Fish	Kyl
Broomfield	Fisher	Kyros
Brotzman	Flood	Landrum
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Langen
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Latta
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford,	Leggett
Broyhill, Va.	William D.	Lennon
Buchanan	Foreman	Lloyd
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Long, La.
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Burleson, Tex.	Friedel	Lujan
Burlison, Mo.	Fulton, Pa.	Lukens
Burton, Utah	Fulton, Tenn.	McClory
Bush	Fuqua	McCluskey
Button	Galifianakis	McClosure
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	McDade
Byrnes, Wis.	Gaydos	McDonald,
Caffery	Gettys	Mich.
Camp	Gialmo	McEwen
Carter	Gibbons	McFall
Casey	Goldwater	McKneally
Cederberg	Gonzalez	McMillan
Celler	Goodling	MacGregor
Chamberlain	Gray	Madden
Chappell	Green, Oreg.	Mahon
Clark	Green, Pa.	Mailhard
Clausen,	Griffin	Mann
Don H.	Griffiths	Marsh
Clawson, Del.	Gross	Matsunaga
Cleveland	Grover	Mayne
Collier	Gubser	Meeds
Collins	Gude	Melcher
Colmer	Hagan	Meskill
Conable	Haley	Michel
Conte	Hall	Miller, Ohio

Mills	Randall	Steiger, Wis.
Minish	Rarick	Stephens
Mink	Reid, Ill.	Stratton
Minshall	Reifel	Stubblefield
Mize	Reuss	Stuckey
Mizell	Rhodes	Sullivan
Mollohan	Rlegle	Symington
Monagan	Rivers	Taft
Montgomery	Roberts	Talcott
Moorhead	Robison	Taylor
Morgan	Rodino	Teague, Calif.
Morton	Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, Ga.
Moss	Rogers, Fla.	Thomson, Wis.
Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, N.Y.	Tiernan
Myers	Rooney, Pa.	Udall
Natcher	Rostenkowski	Ullman
Nedzi	Roth	Van Deerlin
Nelsen	Roudebush	Vander Jagt
Obeys	Ruppe	Vanik
O'Hara	Ruth	Vigorito
O'Konski	St Germain	Waggonner
Olsen	St. Onge	Wampler
O'Neal, Ga.	Sandman	Watson
O'Neill, Mass.	Satterfield	Watts
Fassman	Saylor	Weicker
Patman	Schadeberg	Whalen
Patten	Scherle	Whalley
Pelly	Schwengel	White
Perkins	Scott	Whitehurst
Pettis	Sebelius	Whitten
Philbin	Shipley	Widnall
Pickle	Shriver	Wiggins
Pike	Sikes	Williams
Pirnie	Sisk	Wilson, Bob
Poage	Skubitz	Winn
Poff	Slack	Wold
Pollock	Smith, Calif.	Wolf
Preyer, N.C.	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Wyatt
Pryor, Ark.	Snyder	Wydler
Pucinski	Stafford	Yatron
Purcell	Staggers	Zablocki
Quie	Stanton	Zion
Quillen	Steed	Zwach
Rallsback	Steiger, Ariz.	

## NAYS—32

Bingham	Harrington	Ottinger
Brasco	Hawkins	Podell
Burton, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Carey	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Clay	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Conyers	Koch	Ryan
Diggs	Lowenstein	Scheuer
Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy	Schneebell
Farbstein	Morse	Stokes
Fraser	Mosher	Yates
Gilbert	Nix	

## NOT VOTING—56

Abbutt	Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Frey	Nichols
Bevill	Garmatz	Pepper
Brademas	Hanna	Powell
Brock	Hicks	Price, Tex.
Brooks	Hosmer	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Springer
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Teague, Tex.
Cahill	Jones, Tenn.	Thompson, N.J.
Chisholm	Kirwan	Tunney
Clancy	Landgrebe	Utt
Cohelan	Lipscomb	Waldie
Daddario	McCulloch	Watkins
Dawson	Macdonald,	Wilson,
de la Garza	Mass.	Charles H.
Denney	Martin	Wyllie
Dorn	Mathias	Wyman
Eckhardt	May	Young
Eshleman	Mikva	
Flowers	Miller, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mrs. May.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Johnson, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Young with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Nicholas with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Denney.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Howard with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Lipscomb.  
Mr. Abbutt with Mr. Price of Texas.  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Landgrebe.  
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Springer.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wyman.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Wyllie.

Mr. Mikva with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. COUGHLIN and Mr. LUJAN

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.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 12, 1969.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished gentleman explain the differences between the Senate and House versions, before we have the question of consent to the conference report?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the House provided for a commission of 14 members, with the Comptroller General acting as an ex officio member. The Senate amendment to the House bill provided for a commission of nine members and placed the Comptroller General as a member of the commission.

Mr. HALL. But not as chairman?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But not as chairman. The conference substitute was for a 12-member commission consisting of

the Comptroller General and a proportionate appointment of the 12 as it was for the 14, and the Senate bill contained subpoena powers which assure that any subpoena that would be issued by a member of the subcommittee or commission could be done only at the direction of the commission itself and would require the subpoena to be signed by the chairman and vice chairman of the commission. Those are the only changes in the report.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation we have reduced by two, the number of members who would be on the \$100 per diem plus expenses. Is that a fair summary? It reduces the number from 14 to 12.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The present membership would be appointed two by the Speaker, a Republican and a Democrat, and two by the President of the Senate, a Republican and a Democrat, and each one would appoint one from the outside.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman did not understand my question. As I see it, the sum total effect of the conference report is that we reduce from 14 to 12 the number on the commission, thereby saving two of the \$100 per diem plus all expenses paid during the time they are in session. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, was the Comptroller General under the terms of the House bill an ex officio member?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He was. And under the terms of the conference report as agreed to, he becomes a member of the 12-man commission.

Mr. GROSS. A member of the commission?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But do we have any change with respect to the members of the commission?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He has the regular standing of a commission member.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in other words the Comptroller General has a vote. I presume he would not draw the per diem since he is on the payroll, and would be subject to the Dual Compensation Act, and so forth.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He does not.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the ranking minority member such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report and I hope it will be adopted so we can proceed to the appointment of the commission, which I think is very important. I hope it will be a hard-working commission in this field.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO DESIGNATE "MINERAL INDUSTRY WEEK"**

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning February 13, 1970, and ending February 19, 1970, as "Mineral Industry Week."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—as I understand it, the gentleman from Colorado is prepared to offer two resolutions of this nature to the House. Do either of these resolutions require the expenditure of any funds from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, neither of the two resolutions, this one, House Joint Resolution 888, or House Joint Resolution 10, which I will offer later, will require the expenditure of any funds whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any further commemorative week resolutions he is preparing to present to the House?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we have almost 80 now pending in our subcommittee. I do not know just how many we will offer.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say 80?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman does not have any more to present before Christmas?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. We may have some developments by Christmas.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—I have pending a resolution, now referred to the Judiciary Committee, to designate April 22 to honor the birthday of Queen Isabella, the person responsible for making possible Christopher Columbus' voyage of discovery. I would say Queen Isabella shares with Columbus the role of the chief persons responsible for the success of the voyage, and the discovery of America.

We in America honor Christopher Columbus' birthday, as he deserves every honor for his competence and courage. Equally, we should honor the birthday of Queen Isabella for her intelligent foresight in backing Columbus, which likewise took courage.

Is there any possibility that resolution can be reported out by the gentleman's subcommittee and the Judiciary Committee in the near future?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we have it under consideration and it may be reported. It is now uncertain.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I hope the Judiciary Committee can give attention to it, because the Daughters of Queen Isabella of the Catholic Church, many U.S. Governors and U.S. Mayors, as well as other local officials have already designated this day of celebration for Queen Isabella by resolutions and proclamations and ordinances. This resolution has wide support.

I am very interested in passage of this resolution. I feel that the woman responsible, as well as the man responsible, should get adequate and full recognition for the discovery of America.

Shall the omission be now corrected, and womankind receive their full share of credit for the discovery of America? Of course, omission of any tribute whatever or remembrance by the U.S. Congress for Queen Isabella can be outright discrimination against one of the leaders in the discovery of America, simply because Queen Isabella is a woman. No person denies the necessary and major part that Queen Isabella played in making possible the successful voyage of Columbus for the discovery of America.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 888

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of February 13 through February 19, 1970, as "Mineral Industry Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

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

**AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA WEEK**

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March in every year as Volunteers of America Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 10

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the second week of March of each year as Volunteers of America Week, and urging the people of the United States to express their gratitude for the untiring and selfless work of the Volun-*

teers of America, and to continue their support of its humanitarian activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 5, strike the words "of each year" and insert "1970".

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

Amend the title to read as follows: "Authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March, 1970, as Volunteers of America Week".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969**

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 676 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 676

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. 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 recommend.*

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The reading of the resolution makes it clear that this provides for two hours of

general debate with a closed rule. The purpose, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 14705 is to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. Under H.R. 14705 an employer will be subject to the Federal unemployment tax if he had one or more individuals in his employ in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year or paid wages of at least \$300 in any calendar quarter of the current or preceding calendar year. Approximately 1.3 million additional workers will be covered under this provision, effective January 1, 1972. Approximately 200,000 additional employees would be covered effective January 1, 1972, who are not now employees under common law rules, such as agent-drivers and outside salesmen.

There is a provision for newly covered agricultural workers who would be working in processing plants where either half or more of the commodities are not produced by the plant operator. Some additional 200,000 jobs perhaps would be covered under this provision in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the bill does provide for some substantial additional coverage. There are those of us, I am sure, who would like to have seen this bill go a good deal further. I was personally quite disappointed that it did not go further in covering certain agricultural workers and farm employees. Of course, I can understand some of the problems that the committee has had. My feeling, if I can say it, is that in the very near future I hope the Committee on Ways and Means does see fit to look further into the question of unemployment insurance coverage for farmworkers, because it is a subject of considerable interest across the country and one in which in many cases the farmers themselves are asking that they be brought under coverage. It is a matter that I hope will be considered in the future, as I say.

Employees of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and State institutions of higher education would be brought under the program. Approximately 2.6 million additional jobs would be covered by this provision, effective January 1, 1972.

Approximately 160,000 additional jobs, citizens of the United States employed outside the United States by an American employer—would be covered, effective January 1, 1972.

Exclusions would be provided for certain students, students' spouses, and hospital patients. These would be effective January 1, 1970.

The bill would repeal section 8524 of title 5 of the United States Code, which would have the effect of insuring that the accrued leave of ex-servicemen would be treated, in each State, in the same way as the accrued leave of all other unemployed workers, including former Federal civilian employees.

Approximately 58 million jobs are now protected by the unemployment compensation system. H.R. 14705 would extend coverage to about 4.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 676 in order that H.R. 14705 may be considered.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does my friend from California anticipate that there will ever come the day when a bill of any importance comes from the Committee on Ways and Means under an open rule?

Mr. SISK. If I can just comment to my good friend from Iowa, I could, I suppose, anticipate that day. We raise this question quite often with the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and the distinguished minority member Mr. BYRNES. They indicate that at some point they might consider such a move, but I would not want to hold my breath until that should happen, I might say to my good friend.

Mr. GROSS. I would not, either, I will say to the gentleman.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to respond to my good friend from Iowa by saying that the committee felt that if this bill was to be considered around 4:30 in the afternoon and disposed of the same day, it might be appropriate to have a closed rule on it, in view of the fact that, in all probability, it opens the entire Internal Revenue Code as well as the entire Social Security Act to amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Just for a quick observation.

The gentleman from Arkansas is more clairvoyant than I thought in that when he applied for the rule several days ago he knew the bill would be called up at 4:30 in the afternoon.

Mr. MILLS. I had been told that it would come behind an appropriation bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) this resolution calls for a 2-hour closed rule to consider the bill H.R. 14705, to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Federal-State unemployment compensation program in a number of particulars. Under the bill: Coverage is extended; a permanent program of extended benefit coverage is provided to assist those unemployed who have exhausted their regular coverage; judicial review is provided for a review of decisions of the Secretary of Labor, and the tax which funds the Federal share of the program is increased.

Today approximately 58 million jobs are now protected by the unemployment compensation system; some 16.8 million

jobs are now unprotected. The bill will provide coverage for the first time to some 4.5 million jobs in the following categories:

First. An employer would be subject to the Federal tax if he had one or more employees in 20 weeks of the year—current law sets the minimum coverage to employers of four or more—or if he has a payroll of \$300 in any calendar quarter.

Second. The definition of "employee" is modified so as to include agent-drivers and outside salesmen.

Third. Workers in agricultural processing plants where one-half or more of the commodities handled are not produced by the plant operator will be covered. Co-op processing plants will not be covered by the bill if more than one-half of the commodities handled are produced by its farm operator members.

Fourth. Employees of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher learning are included for the first time. Church employees, members of religious orders, and employees of schools other than institutions of higher learning are not covered.

Fifth. U.S. citizens employed by American companies outside of the United States would be covered for the first time—except in Canada.

Sixth. Students under 22 working as a part of a work-study program and spouses of students employed by a school under a program of assistance to the student would no longer be covered by the program.

Generally, these new coverages take effect on January 1, 1972. This date is picked to give the several States time to amend their unemployment compensation laws. The exemption for students or their spouses takes effect on January 1, 1970.

As of January 1, 1972, the State laws will have to meet four new requirements. These are:

First. A beneficiary would be required to have worked since the beginning of his benefit year—this will eliminate the possibility of one getting benefits for 2 consecutive benefit years between jobs.

Second. Compensation could no longer be denied to workers who are in approved training programs.

Third. Compensation could not be reduced or denied because a claimant lives or files his claim in another state.

Fourth. Wage credits would not be canceled or benefit rights totally reduced by a disqualifying act other than disqualifying act other than discharge for misconduct or fraud in connection with a benefit claim, on the receipt of disqualifying income such as pension payments.

The bill provides judicial review of the decisions of the Secretary of Labor. Any State which receives an adverse decision may appeal to a U.S. court of appeals within 60 days of notification of the action. The Secretary could take no further action until the 60 day period has run.

The bill establishes a new permanent program of extended benefits during times of high unemployment payable to workers who have exhausted their basic entitlements to the regular State unemployment compensation. This will go into effect on January 1, 1972. The Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the costs in each State. This program could only go into effect when, either on a national or State basis, a period of high unemployment exists in the previous calendar quarter. The bill defines national high unemployment as a figure of 4.5 percent of covered employees. A State level of unemployment benefit payments equal to 120 percent of the most recent 13 week period is defined as high unemployment for State purposes.

The extended benefit program created by a State must cover at least a 13-week period and pay a beneficiary his regular benefits, including dependents' allowances.

The Federal tax which finances the unemployment compensation program will be increased by one-tenth of 1 percent—from 3.1 to 3.2 percent beginning January 1, 1970. The taxable wage base, beginning January 1, 1972, will be increased from \$3,000 to \$4,200.

Finally, the bill creates a Federal unemployment compensation research program, and a program of grants to train personnel in the field. Also created is a Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation to review the operations of the program and make recommendation for its improvement. Employers, employees and the public will be represented equally and a staff of expert and technical personnel is authorized. The Commission is authorized to expend \$100,000 annually for its work, such funds to be appropriated from the Federal Unemployment Tax Act revenues. There are no minority views. The administration is supporting the reported bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

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

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. 14705, with Mr. GIAMMO 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 Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to speak in behalf of a bill reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee and against which I have heard not one single word of protest from anyone with respect to what is in it. There are some, of course, outside of Congress as well as some in Congress, perhaps, who would have had the bill go to some degree further with respect to coverage and some of the other aspects than it goes. However, I know of no objection from any source with respect to what is in the bill itself. I think that is probably the reason why bills sometimes come out of the committee unanimously—that in those instances none of us hear any protest from anyone back home about them.

Mr. Chairman, let me discuss very briefly what the bill does. Let me say, however, before I do that even, that although there are 2 hours of general debate allotted for consideration of the bill, I have no requests at this time on our side of the aisle for any participation in debate beyond the time that I shall consume. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES), if I am correct, perhaps will speak on his side and may have no further requests for time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It will be very limited.

Mr. MILLS. The debate will not take anything like 2 hours.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the result of the most intensive review of the unemployment compensation program that has been undertaken by the Congress since the program was established by the Social Security Act of 1935. It is the product of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is a bipartisan committee bill. The ranking minority member on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, joined with me in introducing the bill.

In 1965 and 1966, the Committee on Ways and Means spent months reviewing the unemployment compensation program in public hearings and executive session. The bill developed at that time (H.R. 15119, 89th Congress) was passed by the House and sent to the Senate. Unfortunately, the bill which passed the Senate contained provisions which were unacceptable to the members of the conference representing the House and as a result, no legislation was enacted at that time.

This year, the President sent to the Congress his proposals for improving the unemployment compensation program. The President's recommendations were based in large measure on the work done by the committee in 1965 and 1966. I in-

troduced a bill (H.R. 12625) embodying the President's proposals, also with the gentleman from Wisconsin as a cosponsor. This bill formed the base for the committee's study which began with public hearings on October 1, followed immediately by executive sessions and which ended with the introduction of H.R. 14705 on November 6 and the filing of the report on this bill on November 10.

Mr. Chairman, although the Committee on Ways and Means was able to act on this legislation with unusual dispatch it did not rush in doing its work. On the contrary, the provisions of H.R. 14705 were carefully put together after an unhurried and thorough study. Some of the provisions were designed in the 89th Congress and were improved and updated this year; other provisions were created this year. I do not claim perfection for the bill, of course. I am confident, though, that enactment of its provisions would go a long way toward making the Federal-State unemployment compensation system much more responsive to the needs of present day American workers. The changes it would make are those which are most urgently needed at the present time.

I am aware that there is no crisis await-action on this legislation. The unemployment compensation system is not being threatened today. That is precisely why this is an especially good time for us to be acting on this legislation. Too often in the past Congress has been moved to legislate in an atmosphere of emergency. Now is the time we can do the best job of modernizing the system so that it will withstand future emergencies and crises.

Mr. Chairman, the bill would make major modifications to the unemployment compensation system in five general areas: First, it would extend coverage to approximately 4.5 million jobs in which workers are not now protected; second, it would establish a permanent program of extended benefits to workers who exhaust their rights to regular unemployment compensation payments during times of high unemployment; third, it would provide the States with a new judicial review procedure; fourth, it would improve the financing of the program, and fifth, it would add a few new requirements for State unemployment compensation programs and make other changes to improve and strengthen the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

#### CHANGES IN COVERAGE

Today approximately 58 million jobs—including those of Federal employees, ex-servicemen, and railroad workers—are protected by unemployment compensation. Approximately 16.6 million jobs are not now covered. This bill would extend coverage to about 4.5 million jobs, effective January 1, 1972.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table which shows the number of employers and the number of jobs that would be covered under the unemployment compensation program by the bill:

## ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF EMPLOYERS AND JOBS ADDED TO COVERAGE BY H.R. 14705

Coverage	FUTA		State UI laws	
	Employers	Jobs	Employers	Jobs
Employers of 1 or more in 20 weeks, or with a payroll of \$800 or more in a calendar quarter.....	1,258,000	2,554,000	643,000	1,285,000
Definition of employee.....	(1)	360,000	(1)	210,000
Definition of agricultural labor.....	(2)	205,000	(2)	190,000
Nonprofit organizations.....			18,000	1,935,000
State hospitals and institutions of higher education.....			1,000	725,000
U.S. citizens employed by American employers overseas.....	(3)	160,000	(1)	160,000
Total.....	1,258,000	3,235,000	662,000	4,505,000

<sup>1</sup> Nearly all the employers involved are already covered.  
<sup>2</sup> Information not available.

The following are the groups of workers who would be affected by the bill:

First. Workers in the employ of persons or firms with less than four employees: Present Federal law applies only to those employers who have four or more workers in their employ in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year. Under the bill an employer would be brought under the Federal-State unemployment compensation system if he employs one or more individuals in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, or if he pays wages of \$800, or more, in any calendar quarter of the current or preceding calendar year. Approximately 1.3 million additional jobs would be covered under this provision.

Second. Workers affected by changed definition of employee: Approximately 200,000 additional jobs would be covered by adopting the definition of employee which is now used for the purposes of the old-age, survivors, disability and hospital insurance—OASDHI—program, with a modification. Those affected by this change are persons who are not considered employees under common law rules, such as certain agent-drivers and outside salesmen. The concept of employment in the bill differs from that of the OASDHI program in that it would not apply to full-time life insurance salesmen or to people who work in their homes on materials which are furnished by another if they are not employees under common law.

Third. Workers in agricultural processing: Approximately 200,000 additional jobs would be covered by adopting the definition of "agricultural labor" which now applies to the OASDHI system, with a modification. Included among the newly covered workers would be those working in processing plants, including cooperatives, where one-half or more of the commodities handled were not produced by the plant operator or farm operator members of the cooperative.

Fourth. Employees of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher education. Approximately 2.6 million jobs in nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and State institutions of higher education would be brought under the unemployment compensation system. Coverage would not be extended to certain of these employees, however, such as ministers of a church, university professors, university administrators, and so forth.

The States would be required to per-

mit nonprofit organizations the option of reimbursing the State for unemployment compensation costs attributable to service for them rather than paying the regular State unemployment insurance contributions. They would not be required to pay the Federal portion of the unemployment tax. A separate effective date would allow the States to put the reimbursable option into effect at any time after December 31, 1969.

Each State could determine the extent to which unemployment compensation based on employment with an institution of higher learning would be paid during summer vacation periods.

This extension of coverage would apply only to nonprofit organizations that employ four or more workers in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.

U.S. citizens employed outside the United States: Citizens of the United States who are employed by U.S. employers but who are working outside the United States would be covered by adopting with a modification the definition of employment which is now used for OASDHI purposes. An exception would be made for employment in Canada, with whom there are reciprocal agreements. Approximately 160,000 jobs would be covered by this provision.

Accrued leave of former members of the Armed Forces: The provision of present law which prevents the payment of unemployment compensation to former members of the Armed Forces for periods in which they are paid for accrued leave would be repealed. As a result, each State would be free to apply its own rules in determining whether unemployment compensation would be paid for these periods. Thus, under this provision, ex-servicemen would get the same treatment during a terminal leave period as is received by all other persons in a State, including former Federal employees.

Exclusion of certain students, students' spouses and hospital inpatients: New exclusions from coverage would be provided by the bill for students employed under work-study programs, for students' spouses employed by a university under a program of assistance to the students and for people employed by hospitals in which they are patients, effective January 1, 1970.

#### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

States would be required to amend their laws not later than January 1, 1972,

in order to obtain approval by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of Federal unemployment tax credits for employers, to provide that—

First, work requirement: A beneficiary must have had work after the beginning of his benefit year in order to obtain unemployment compensation in his next benefit year—prohibiting the so-called double dip which allows a worker to draw full benefits in 2 successive years following a single separation from work;

Second, cancellation of wage credits: The wage credits of a worker could not be canceled or his benefit rights totally reduced by reason of a disqualifying act other than discharge for misconduct connected with his work, or fraud in connection with a claim for compensation, or by reason of receipt of disqualifying income such as pension payments. But a State could, for example, disqualify a worker for the duration of a period of unemployment following a disqualifying act, such as a voluntary quit, so long as the worker's benefit rights are preserved for a future period of involuntary unemployment during the benefit year;

Third, worker training: Compensation could not be denied to workers who are undergoing training with the approval of the State unemployment compensation agency; and

Fourth, interstate and multistate claims: Compensation could not be denied or reduced because a claimant lives or files his claim in another State. In addition, States would be required to participate in arrangements, approved by the Secretary of Labor, for combining wage credits for employment covered under more than one State law.

#### JUDICIAL REVIEW

Under existing law a decision of the Secretary of Labor that a State law or State administration of its law does not meet the requirements of the Federal law is final. There is no specific provision in the law allowing a State to appeal such a decision to a court.

The bill would establish a procedure under which a State could appeal a decision of the Secretary to a U.S. Court of Appeals within 60 days after the Governor of the State has been notified of an adverse decision by the Secretary. Findings of fact by the Secretary would be conclusive upon the court if supported by substantial evidence on the whole record.

No adverse action could be taken by the Secretary, based on such determination, until after the expiration of the 60-day period in which an appeal could be filed. Any action by the Secretary would be automatically stayed for an additional 30-day period following the filing of a petition for judicial review. In addition, the court could grant the State such additional relief as would be warranted.

In view of the establishment of judicial review procedures, the bill contains a modification of provisions contained in the Internal Revenue Code relating to the authority of the Secretary of Labor to make findings with respect to the "labor standards" provisions of the code.

FEDERAL-STATE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT  
COMPENSATION PROGRAM

The bill would establish a new permanent program which would require the States to enact laws which would have to take effect no later than January 1, 1972, to pay extended benefits during periods of high unemployment to workers who exhaust their basic entitlement to unemployment compensation payments.

These benefits would be paid to workers only during an "extended benefit" period. Such period could exist, beginning after December 31, 1971, either on a national or State basis by the triggering of either a national or State "on" indicator. In addition, a State could make the program effective in the State earlier on the basis of the State "on" and "off" indicators alone.

There would be a national "on" indicator when the seasonally adjusted rate of insured unemployment for the whole Nation equaled or exceeded 4.5 percent in each of the three most recent calendar months. There would be a national "off" indicator when the seasonally adjusted rate of insured unemployment for the whole Nation was below 4.5 percent in each of the three most recent calendar months.

There would be a State "on" indicator when the rate of insured unemployment for the State equaled or exceeded, during a moving 13-week period, 120 percent of the average rate for the corresponding 13-week period in the preceding two calendar years and when such rate also equaled or exceeded 4 percent. There would be a State "off" indicator when either of these two conditions was not satisfied.

An extended benefit period would begin with the third week after a week for which there was a national "on" indicator or a State "on" indicator, whichever first occurs. The period would end with the third week after the first week for which there was both a national and a State "off" indicator. However, an extended benefit period would have to last for a period of not less than 13 consecutive weeks.

I think that it should be pointed out that when you talk about 4½ percent of the covered workers, you equate that into the total of workers by adding anywhere from 1 to 1½ percent on top of it; so you would have an unemployment rate, say, of about 6 percent in total before this program would trigger into effect nationwide.

We have had two experiences, one in 1958 and one in 1961, of enacting extended benefit programs providing unemployment payments during those periods of time. In each instance—and I had the responsibility, I guess, of being the author of the committee-developed bill in each instance, and I am not criticizing anyone any more than I am myself—but in each instance we acted after the fact. Unemployment was here. It had been with us before we ever passed the program. The recession or depression had deepened more than in all probability it would have had an unemployment

program providing extended benefits been in effect that would have triggered on, just as it was beginning.

So even though our program is in good shape and it has no problems today, we thought that while the sun was shining we would fix the roof on the house rather than wait until the rains come and the footing is rather slippery on the roof. So we think this is the time to act.

Benefits: During an extended benefit period, whether established by national or State conditions, the State must provide each eligible claimant with extended compensation, at the individual's regular weekly benefit amount—including dependents allowances—equal to one-half his basic entitlement, but not more than 13 times such weekly benefit amount, or the difference between his regular compensation and 39 times such weekly benefit amount, whichever is the lesser. The Federal Government will pay one-half the cost of the payments authorized by these provisions. The State may provide more benefits, but the Federal Government would not share in the cost of any such additional benefits.

FINANCING

The bill would increase the rate of tax under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from the present 3.1 percent of taxable wages to 3.2 percent, effective with respect to wages paid in calendar year 1970 and thereafter. No change would be made in the 2.7-percent credit allowed to employers in the States.

The taxable wage base under the act would be increased from the present \$3,000 a year to \$4,200 a year for calendar years 1972 and thereafter.

The bill in effect increases the net Federal unemployment tax from 0.4 to 0.5 percent. For 1970 and 1971 the additional Federal tax receipts resulting from the one-tenth of 1 percent tax rate increase would be put into a separate new account in the unemployment trust fund to finance the Federal share of the extended benefits program established by the bill. Thereafter, one-tenth of the net Federal tax would be credited to the account.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think that is an important point to make. We are now funding extended benefits during a time when funding is most appropriate, rather than waiting to face the problem when we are confronted with a recession. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLS. What the gentleman is referring to—and I am glad that he brought it up—we are putting into this fund in the first 2 years, 1970 and 1971, one-tenth of 1 percent across the board on payrolls. That would provide quite a lot of money, all of which, for those 2 years, would go into this special account. On January 1, 1970, with this one-tenth percent increase the total rate becomes 3.2 percent, with the State rate still being 2.7 percent, as it has been in the past. On January 1, 1972, we would raise the amount of wages paid by the employer

subject to the tax, from the present \$3,000 base, where it has been since 1939 to \$4,200.

The Secretary of Labor had asked us to raise the amount higher than that. We did not think it was necessary for us to do it now or in the foreseeable future, to provide funds for the administrative costs of the program. We think that this would take us at least to the 1975 fiscal year. We can then look at the situation, rather than saying now that on January 1, 1975, or January 1, 1974, we will increase the base. The Congress can look at the facts then before it, rather than for us to deal with the situation on a speculative basis.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The bill also contains provisions relating to—

First. Research, training, and Federal Advisory Council: Establishing a Federal unemployment compensation research program, a Federal program to train unemployment compensation personnel, both Federal and State, and a Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation to review the operation of the Federal-State program and to make recommendation for improvements.

Second. Certification date: Changing from December 31 to October 31 of each year the date with respect to which the Secretary of Labor certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury that the State laws and administration meet the requirements of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

Third. New employers and treatment in certain employment: First, permitting the States to reduce the tax rates of new employers—to not less than 1 percent—during the first 3 years they are under the unemployment compensation program and second, providing for enforcement of existing prohibitions against unequal treatment of maritime and other employment with respect to which the Federal Government has a special jurisdictional interest.

Fourth. Changes in ceilings, transfers, and the flow of funds among accounts in the Unemployment Trust Fund: In addition to establishing a new third account—the extended unemployment compensation account in the unemployment trust fund—the bill would specify the order of transferring amounts to each of the three accounts, the order of transferring funds between the three accounts and the maximum funds to be credited to each of the accounts.

Fifth. Employment service financing: Amounts authorized to be made available out of the employment security administration account for each fiscal year after June 30, 1972, would reflect the proportion of the total cost of administering the system of public employment offices as the President, in his budget, determines is an appropriate charge to that account.

Mr. Chairman, I have a table which shows the estimated flow of Federal tax collections under H.R. 14705 which I would like to have inserted, for the information of the Members, in the Record, at this point:

ESTIMATED FLOW OF FEDERAL TAX COLLECTIONS UNDER H.R. 14705<sup>1</sup>

[Amounts in millions]

Item	Fiscal year—						
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1. Total Federal collections.....	\$740	\$970	\$1,035	\$1,290	\$1,345	\$1,395	-----
2. Proportion transferred to extended unemployment compensation account <sup>2</sup> .....	14	194	177	129	135	140	-----
3. Administrative costs.....	691	790	849	880	974	1,079	-----
4. Collections for administration minus costs.....	35	14	9	281	236	176	-----
5. Administration account:							
(a) Current excess retained.....					281	79	-----
(b) Year beginning balance.....	0	35	21	30	311	390	-----
(c) Collections over costs in year.....	35	-14	9	281	236	176	-----
(d) Retained when extended unemployment compensation account is at ceiling.....	0	0	0	0	0	140	-----
(e) Balance at end of year.....	35	21	30	311	547	706	-----
(f) Statutory ceiling.....	(9)	(9)	(9)	352	390	432	-----
6. Annual excess end year <sup>4</sup> .....	3	0	0	281	236	316	-----
7. For credit beginning of year.....	3	0	0	0	281	236	\$316
(a) Retained administration account.....	0	0	0	0	281	79	42
(b) Extended unemployment compensation account.....	0	0	0	0	0	101	0
(c) Federal unemployment account.....	3	0	0	0	0	56	89
(d) State accounts.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
8. Extended unemployment compensation account:							
(a) Current excess credited.....	0	0	0	0	0	101	-----
(b) Year beginning balance.....	0	14	208	385	---	756	-----
(c) Monthly transfer from administration account.....	14	194	177	129	135	750	-----
(d) Balance end of year.....	14	208	385	514	649	750	-----
(e) Statutory ceiling end of year.....	750	750	750	750	750	750	-----
9. Federal unemployment account:							
(a) Current excess credited.....	3	0	0	0	0	56	-----
(b) Year beginning balance.....	550	550	550	550	550	606	-----
(c) Balance end of year.....	550	550	550	550	550	606	-----
(d) Statutory ceiling end of year.....	550	550	550	599	646	695	-----
10. Additional excess for distribution to State accounts.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$185

<sup>1</sup> Federal net tax rate increased to 0.5 percent effective Jan. 1, 1970; tax base increased to \$4,200 effective Jan. 1, 1972.<sup>2</sup> In 1970 and 1971 equal to 3/8 and in 1972 and thereafter equal to 1/10 of total Federal tax collections.<sup>3</sup> Under the provisions of Public Law 91-53 these amounts are not regarded as excess collections which can be credited to any account; they remain in the administration account, without regard to statutory ceiling, and are available as supplements to current tax collections for appropriation by Congress to finance administrative costs.<sup>4</sup> Annual excesses do not include interest earnings on funds in the 3 Federal accounts; interest amounts would range from about \$25,000,000 in fiscal year 1970 to about \$80,000,000 in fiscal year 1975.<sup>5</sup> To State accounts only under assumptions that neither National nor State extended benefits programs would trigger on and amounts would not be needed to replenish extended unemployment compensation account, and that insured unemployment rate would not exceed 2.2 percent for any year.

Note.—Assumptions: 1. IUR in each year is 2.2 percent. 2. Extended benefit program would not trigger at either Federal or State level.

Mr. Chairman, except for certain details, each of which I consider an improvement, this bill is basically similar to the bill this House adopted by a vote of 374 to 10 in June of 1966. I urge my colleagues to give the same support to this legislation.

(Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee one question. Over the years there has been a certain amount of hostility expressed, not so much in Congress, but from certain administration spokesmen and labor economists and so forth, to the so-called experience rating factors in many States, such as my own State of Ohio. Can the gentleman indicate whether or not this bill would in any way affect the State rating factor program?

Mr. MILLS. It would not change that part of the State program. Our States have this experience rating for the purpose of taxing, which means the employer who has the least amount of unemployment will pay the least amount.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, along that line, is it not true that some of the States

have built up considerable funds in their employment funds and have not needed them to be expended. If that is true, would this require them to add to that or change the rate of expenditure?

Mr. MILLS. There is nothing in this which says they must change the rate except with respect to the new business. We say the State may charge less than the maximum rate applicable in that State but not less than 1 percent. That is all I can remember in the Federal law that has to do with the rate.

We say we will tax all the wages up to \$4,200 per person. They are now being taxed up to \$3,000. If that develops enough money, in a State, the State can change its tax schedule. It means that we will get more flexibility. The taxpayer can have a much lesser rate at \$4,200 than at \$3,000 and still produce the same amount of money.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the Arkansas Traveler repairing the roof before it rains, repairing it while the sun is shining.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that is done in southwestern Missouri, too.

Mr. HALL. Are we going to make this applicable to one single employee?

Mr. MILLS. I have always been for that.

Mr. HALL. This would apply to a physician who has one combination nurse-secretary?

Mr. MILLS. It would. I hope we will bear in mind the real objective of the unemployment compensation is to take up

the slack created when a person has lost his job involuntarily.

Mr. HALL. That is true, but it also puts a tax on the employer.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. The tax would be on the employer if he has one or more employees provided that one works for as many as 20 weeks in the calendar year or he has a payroll of as much as \$800 for any quarter.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, along those same lines, I cannot help being a little surprised, considering that this will require a tax from every small merchant and every small attorney and every small dentist or what-have-you, at the chairman's statement that there has been no opposition expressed to the committee at all. Were these people aware of what this is going to do to them?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. All the organizations representing these people were there. I am sure of that. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) some time ago. We had hearings on it. The announcements of the committee with respect to its decisions were made public. As widespread publicity was given to this matter as to any matter before our committee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be pointed out that approximately 17 or 18 States, maybe more, already cover within their States the employers of one or more employees.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, in my own State—and the gentleman can correct me for the record if he wishes—it is my recollection any employer with one employee for any period of time is covered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I recall it, it is one in 10 days.

Mr. MILLS. There are 24 States, as I recall, that now have the provision for one or more.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Federal Government pays one-half the cost of the extended unemployment compensation provided?

Mr. MILLS. Out of a special fund we are setting up. It is not out of the general fund but out of the special fund.

Mr. DENNIS. Is there any estimate available as to what the other half will cost the State?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. Altogether, if the 1961 program had been financed on the 50-50 basis provided in this bill, the States would have been out about \$400 million within that general area.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The States are supporting it. At least, the people who operate the program within the States were represented within our executive sessions. We wrote the program in their presence. Their organization has endorsed this extended benefit program. The gentleman's

own man in Indiana is a member of the conference.

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

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

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

Mr. KYL. Let us take the case of a city employee who retires on a disability and then, for 36 months after retirement and after he starts drawing retirement pay, draws unemployment compensation. Is this type of extra assistance available in any State?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know of any State where it is. Perhaps the gentleman's State allows that.

Mr. KYL. The District of Columbia does.

Mr. MILLS. It may be that the District of Columbia does; I do not know; but if it does, it is the law of the District of Columbia that does it, not the Federal law.

We have tried to keep from prohibiting the States from doing the things the States believe are in the best interest of their people. There are a lot of decisions in this whole program which are left to the States.

For example, there are two States, I recall, which will pay unemployment benefits when employees are on strike, but only two out of 50 make that decision. That is their privilege to do so. They are taxing their employers within the State to pay unemployment benefits. If the legislature wants to do it, why not let them do it? I would not vote for it, and the gentleman would not vote for it, but if the State wants to do it we believe they ought to be given latitude to enable them to write the program they want.

Mr. KYL. Did not the Congress pass the law for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLS. If the Congress did, yes, but such law would apply only to the District of Columbia—that would not have been any bill from the Ways and Means Committee, however.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Would this legislation cover a domestic employed on a part-time or a full-time basis?

Mr. MILLS. Domestic employees are not required by Federal law to be covered in any State. There may be some States which cover them, but it is not a requirement of Federal law.

I should like to say further to my friend from Iowa that the District of Columbia unemployment bill was not the product of the Ways and Means Committee; it came from another committee of the House.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. The gentleman from California, in presenting the rule, mentioned that there had been some talk about the possibility of extending this to cover farm field workers.

Mr. MILLS. We talked about it at great length. The Department of Labor recom-

mended in the bill that they submitted to the Congress the inclusion of certain farmworkers. We tried in the committee to work it out, but without success.

As the gentleman knows from experience in the Congress, if one does not have the votes in the committee to put him in a majority he ends up in the minority with an idea.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Does the gentleman detect any strong sentiment in the direction of eventually covering farm field workers?

Mr. MILLS. I do. There is a growing feeling, I believe, as pointed out by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), even on the part of some of the farm operators, and particularly the very largest farm operators.

I have heard not directly but indirectly that they have some feeling that if they could extend to their workers unemployment compensation comparable to that which is extended in town, they might have more of an appeal to get certain folks within the town to come to work for them on the farms.

The experience which the State of North Dakota had in covering a segment of its farmers was such as to cause practically every other State to be very cautious about how they cover them. In that State the cost of coverage for farmworkers is many times the cost of coverage of workers in the industrial plants in the towns of North Dakota. It was much higher.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 24 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14705 recommends constructive improvements in our Federal-State unemployment insurance program. During the 30-year history of this Federal-State partnership, the program has insured the American worker against the economic loss attending unemployment while encouraging employers to stabilize their employment. The payment of benefits during economic downturns has also had a stabilizing effect on the economy. The value of this program has been demonstrated by experience. The committee's proposals build on the successful experience of the past by broadening coverage, removing inequities, improving financing, improving administration, and by providing a Federal-State program of extended benefits.

The House will recall that the committee reported and the House passed legislation in the 89th Congress that contained many improvements very similar to the ones included in this bill. However, the Senate attempted to federalize the program by imposing Federal benefit standards on the States, and an agreement was not reached in conference. The bill before the House is similar to the legislation that passed the House in the 89th Congress, although further study of the issues has resulted in some improvements. I will not go into the details of the various provisions of the bill, as they are fully explained in the committee

report. However, I do want to discuss some of the areas that represent substantial improvements in the program.

First, Mr. Chairman, the committee's bill includes a permanent program of extended benefits that would be "triggered in" during periods of unusually high unemployment, either at the State level or on a national basis. I have been advocating a permanent program of extended benefits for the last 8 to 10 years. I am therefore particularly pleased that the Ways and Means Committee has developed a sound proposal for a permanent extended benefits program.

In 1958 and again in 1961, when there was an increase in unemployment due to a downturn in the economy, the Congress provided for temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits. While this action by the Congress provided needed relief, it is not efficient for Congress to approach each situation on an ad hoc basis. While we sincerely hope that we will not experience an economic downturn, history teaches us to plan now to meet the problems a downturn will entail rather than deferring action until we are confronted with a crisis.

An ad hoc approach to the problem necessarily involves some lag between the time the recession begins and the time when workers begin receiving extended benefits. Additionally, an ad hoc approach prevents the development of the necessary financing in good times that will insure that we have resources to pay extended benefits in the event of a downturn. Finally, a permanent program enables the States to structure their programs to take account of extended benefits that will be available during periods of economic downturn.

Under the committee's bill a period of extended benefits would be "triggered in" on a national basis or in a specific State when insured unemployment exceeds the levels specified in "indicators" included in the bill. The national indicator requires that insured unemployment exceeds 4.5 percent in each of the 3 most recent calendar months. The State indicator requires that insured unemployment for the State equal or exceed, during a moving 13-week period, 120 percent of the average rate for the corresponding period in the preceding 2 calendar years. Additionally, the State indicator requires insured unemployment to equal or exceed 4 percent.

An extended benefit period would be triggered in a State when either the national or State indicator is "on," that is when unemployment equals or exceeds the levels specified in these indicators. The benefit period would terminate when both the national and State indicator is "off," but will not be shorter than 13 weeks in any case.

The new extended benefits are provided within the framework of our existing Federal-State unemployment compensation system. The individual will apply for benefits through his State program, and his benefit entitlement will be determined by reference to the benefit formula contained in State law. This is accomplished by providing that during an extended benefit period an individual who exhausts his basic benefits will in general be entitled to continue receiv-

ing his regular weekly benefits under State law for an additional period equal to one-half the period during which he drew his basic benefits.

The Federal and State Governments would share the costs of the extended benefit program on a 50-50 basis. A portion of the net Federal tax, which is increased by this bill, would be transferred to a new extended unemployment compensation account to finance the Federal share of the costs.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the committee's bill broadens coverage, primarily by redefining covered employers of non-profit organizations and certain State institutions. When the unemployment compensation law was originally enacted in 1935, it covered employers of eight or more employees in 20 weeks during a year. In 1954, the coverage was broadened by redefining an employer to include employers of four or more individuals in 20 weeks. The committee's bill would again redefine the term employer to include anyone employing one or more individuals in 20 weeks, or any employer with a payroll of \$800 or more in a calendar quarter. Over one-half of the States have coverage broader than that required by Federal law, and at least 18 States already meet or nearly meet the new requirements.

The bill also extends coverage to non-profit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher education that employ four or more employees in at least 20 weeks during the year. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the committee included in the bill—as it did in its recommendations in 1966—provisions that would require the States to permit nonprofit organizations to elect to be covered on a cost reimbursement basis or under the provisions of the regular program. Those that elect to be covered on a cost reimbursement basis will not be required to pay any portion of the Federal tax, and will only be required to pay into a State fund to the extent their employees actually draw benefits.

The other areas of broadened coverage include a redefinition of the term "employer" and "agricultural labor" to accord more closely with the definitions now used in the social security program, and a provision covering U.S. citizens employed by American employers overseas.

The third major area covered by the bill that I think is extremely important and represents a real improvement is the provision for judicial review of a determination by the Secretary of Labor that a State program is in nonconformance with the Federal law. If a State is found to be in noncompliance, the employers in that State may not credit against the Federal tax amounts they pay into their State program. The financial penalty involved when the Secretary makes a determination of noncompliance is so great that the States have no alternative but to comply, whether they agree with the Secretary's determination or not.

By providing for judicial review of the Secretary's determination, a State will, when threatened with the loss of certification of their State program, be entitled to an independent and impartial

review of the Secretary's determination. Since I have long advocated a provision for judicial review, I am particularly pleased with the committee's recommendation. I also feel that Secretary Shultz is to be commended for supporting this constructive improvement, which has been advocated for some time by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Administrators. Providing for an impartial determination of conflicting claims between a State and the Federal Government will improve the health of our Federal-State unemployment insurance partnership that has served our people so well.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is important to point out that the Ways and Means Committee's recommendations are as important for what is not included as for what is included. The bill does not include Federal standards relating to benefit amount and duration. The States will retain the latitude they have enjoyed during the history of the program to develop benefit formulas responding to economic and social conditions prevailing at the local level.

Needed improvements in the present program would be jeopardized if Federal benefit standards—which are wrong in principle and contrary to experience—are included in the bill. It will be recalled that in the 89th Congress the attempt to federalize the program prevented enactment of legislation that included many improvements in our unemployment compensation program similar to the ones now before the House. The administration is certainly to be commended for recommending constructive improvements in our present unemployment compensation laws that avoids making the Federal role predominant.

By not including Federal benefit standards in this legislation, the Ways and Means Committee reaffirms the basic structure of our Federal-State partnership in the unemployment insurance area. Due to continued pressure from some quarters to dissolve this partnership by substituting a sole proprietorship at the Federal level, it may be helpful to recall the origin of our present system and underscore its success. This Federal-State partnership in unemployment insurance was established by the Congress over 30 years ago pursuant to recommendations of the Committee on Economic Security appointed by President Roosevelt. Realizing the importance of establishing a program that enabled the States to respond to the varying economic and social conditions prevailing at the local level, the committee recommended:

The plan for unemployment compensation that we suggest contemplates that the States shall have broad freedom to set up the type of unemployment compensation they wish. We believe that all matters in which uniformity is not absolutely essential should be left to the States. The Federal Government, however, should assist the States in setting up their administration and in the solution of the problems they will encounter.

This foresight of the original architects of our unemployment insurance program has been proven by the success of the program in the intervening years. In 1961, Frances Perkins, who was Presi-

dent Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Committee on Economic Security, looked back on the original decision to establish a Federal-State partnership and concluded:

The result was a plan which has proved itself practical and effective and yet amenable to amendments and administrative changes as they have been necessary over the last twenty-five years.

During the history of the program, Mr. Chairman, the States have continually improved benefits by reducing the waiting period before which benefits are payable, increasing the duration over which benefits are payable, liberalizing eligibility requirements, and increasing benefit amounts. When the increase in weekly benefits, the shortening of the waiting period, and the extension of the benefit period are considered together with increases in benefit levels, the impressive record of the States in improving benefits is clearly seen. Beneficiaries today receive more benefits sooner, for a longer period of time, and can buy more real goods with what they received in 1939. Indeed, Father Joseph Becker, a noted scholar in the field of unemployment compensation, has observed that the establishment of Federal benefit standards might well have resulted in lower benefit levels in the larger industrial States where most workers reside than has actually prevailed.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this bill recognizes that improvements can and should be made in our unemployment insurance program. By recommending improvements that build on our past success in order to achieve future progress, the committee's bill insures the continued cooperation of our Federal and State governments in an effort to meet the needs of the unemployed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14705, a bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

This measure, which comprises the most intensive review of the unemployment compensation program since its inception in 1935 as a part of the Social Security Act, bears the unanimous recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee. It is the thoughtful and careful work of the committee including the extensive hearings and studies made in 1965 and 1966 and resulting then in a similar bill that was reported favorably.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member, are to be commended for the thoroughness of the hearings and study. In this period of relative high employment, it is time to act after studied deliberation, rather than under the pressure and haste of concern over high unemployment. I recommend the bill.

Let me emphasize that I believe the program of unemployment compensation insurance is proper and desirable. Its value as a stabilizing factor in the Nation's economy is proven. But in a program that has paid billions in benefits, it is important that abuses not be permitted to erode it.

There have been abuses and laxity that concerns me and feeds the reluctance to liberalize the program.

Today, Mr. Chairman, as you know, the classified sections of our newspapers are filled with help-wanted ads. The tight labor market has contributed to the escalation of building costs. Representatives of the construction industry have complained to me. A brick contractor, who does several millions of dollars worth of business every year, had to shut down some of his jobs and refuse to make new ones. Why? Because he could not get laborers to go to work at \$3.50 an hour. I have received similar complaints from the restaurant industry, as well as service station managers. These employers read about organizations such as Pride, Inc., funded by the Labor Department, the community action programs, and the extensive funds being provided to the poverty programs. And yet, they are desperate for workers. I do not exaggerate.

These employers feel that a large part of this abuse is due to the unemployment compensation program. Employers have made spot checks in the community, going to people sitting around doing nothing, to see if such persons can be hired as laborers. These prospective employers are asked, "What type of work is it? Will you pay me cash tonight?" Part of the problem constitutes what is a "suitable" job. For example, a hod carrier is available for work only as a hod carrier. He is not available for running a cement mixer, or something of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, what can I tell these industries? It is hard to explain to them that they must pay more in unemployment compensation taxes. How can we get these able-bodied people to work? If we can reach a better solution, I am convinced we can reduce the billions of dollars going into poverty programs. The administration of the program must be applied to make certain that idle employables are genuinely unemployed.

Unemployment insurance is an earned benefit. We must protect the fund made on behalf of those who have earned this benefit by seeing to it that the funds are paid only to those who should receive them. I am pleased that this measure includes a provision for training of personnel of State employment agencies, and the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation to review the operation of the Federal-State program and recommend improvements.

The bill preserves the Federal-State principle. At the same time, it strengthens and tightens the administration by such provision as the elimination of the so-called "double-dip" benefit. All States would be required to have an intervening work period before being eligible to receive benefits in the succeeding benefit year. All but 15 States now meet the new requirement proposed in the bill.

Training in occupational skills is fostered in this measure by a provision allowing individuals to continue to draw unemployment benefits while in approved training. Twenty-four States make no such provision now. These changes maintain the purpose of unemployment compensation to provide help to idle workers, and to prevent the weakening of the system by excluding benefits from those not entitled.

About 2.6 million of the 4.5 million workers to be added under coverage will be employees of nonprofit organizations, State hospitals and institutions of higher learning. Employees of church organizations or members of religious orders, however, would be excluded. Exclusion would continue also as to those performing service for a nonprofit organization in an instructional, research or principal administrative capacity.

Under the reimbursement method of financing unemployment compensation coverage for nonprofit organizations, such organizations would not be required to share in the costs of providing benefits to workers in profitmaking enterprises. Such organizations, for example, whose workers experience no compensated unemployment in a year would have no unemployment insurance costs for that year.

Research also is authorized under the bill. Such research will permit study of such matters as the problems of coverage of seasonal employees, and will enable the Secretary of Labor to turn first attention to the consideration of the extension of coverage to domestic workers in private households—who, of course, now are under the social security program.

Judicial review is assured to States concerning rulings of the Secretary of Labor relating to Federal administration grants to States and to rulings concerning the normal and additional tax credit to employers in a State under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

These are only some of the commendable features of the bill. This measure will extend the coverage, protect the integrity of the system, and strengthen it. With diligence of the administrators of the Federal-State system and of Congress, we can attain the purpose in providing assistance for our workers in a transitional period of unemployment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14705, a bill which would extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, and to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. MILLS) and members of his committee for the work it has done to report this measure to the House.

This bill, now before us, would operate as a forceful instrument to protect America's working force from the misfortunes of unemployment. H.R. 14705 represents a significant improvement over the existing unemployment compensation program, and it would extend compensation benefits to groups of workers who are presently not covered. It is estimated that about 4.5 million

workers, whose jobs are not now covered, would receive the protection of the unemployment compensation system under this bill.

I am especially pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means has seen fit to include in the reported bill an amendment which I proposed and which is now designated as section 105. This section would extend unemployment compensation benefits to those workmen who have answered their Government's call for the development of our Pacific bases and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Section 105 also extends unemployment compensation protection to U.S. citizens who are employed outside of the country by American employers, with the exception of those citizens so employed in Canada. It is estimated that this provision would extend coverage to 160,000 additional employees. It has been my great pleasure to have had a role in the inclusion of this important section in H.R. 14705.

At this time, I would also like to voice my support of section 104, which would provide nonprofit organizations with the method of financing unemployment insurance benefits by permitting them to pay their own unemployment insurance claims without a general subsidy to the system. This provision also permits those States which now require nonprofit organizations to create the same reserves as profitmaking industry to elect to changes from a contributions basis to a reimbursement basis. These States may then receive credit for the amount by which past contributions exceeded benefit payments attributable to services for them. As I previously expressed to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), I believe that this provision is both fair and just.

The nonprofit hospitals in my own State of Hawaii have reserves of approximately \$1 million in the unemployment insurance fund. It would have been strange indeed if these hospitals had been forced to donate these reserves to the unemployment insurance system in order to take advantage of the alternate financing provisions of section 104.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very deeply that this legislation is both timely and necessary. Dr. Walter W. Heller, regent's professor of economics at the University of Minnesota, has been quoted as saying that there is no "earthly way to achieve price stability or disinflate without knocking people out of jobs." As business activity has begun to slow down, the national rate of unemployment has risen to an all-time high in this decade of 3.9 percent in October. Economists predict that it will continue to rise to 4.5 or 5 percent in the next few months. This means that over 3 million Americans will know the agony of being without work. H.R. 14705, if adopted, will do a great deal toward making the plight of the jobless easier to bear.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 14705.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether in the hearings in connection with this bill the

States as entities appeared in any manner. Did the Council of State Governments or any organization of the States appear?

I have in mind this particular problem, if the chairman will permit me to state it. As I understand it, the States themselves, many of them, are going to have to bear their share of the cost as employers as far as employees in State hospitals and so on are concerned. This will increase their State burden. Also, in connection with the extended coverage program they will have to bear 50 percent of the cost. I am wondering if the States as entities appeared.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman, if he will yield, that the Interstate Conference on Employment Security Administrators are the people who administer the unemployment compensation program in the States. They not only appeared before the committee, but we had representatives of their group in the committee during the executive sessions for their advice and counsel on all of the various provisions included in this legislation. In this particular piece of legislation, the States were consulted in a closer way than probably in any piece of legislation that has come before this Congress.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLS. I doubt that I remember or, at least, I do not remember but I doubt that the Governors Conference appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means or were represented on unemployment compensation. They rely on these people that they appoint on compensation programs within their State to represent the State government's views. As the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, they were with us not only in this development but in 1966. This extended benefit program is very similar, costwise and otherwise, to a similar program which we had in the bill which passed the House in 1966. I never heard of any objection to that from any Governor or from anybody connected with any State government.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I appreciate the comments of the chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

If the gentleman will yield further, I raise this point because I also, as many of us were, at one time was a member of the State legislature. We are familiar with the fact that repeatedly, as these programs are enlarged and as we impose more and more responsibility upon the State government, the members of the legislature are prone on occasion to blame the Congress for these things and to claim that they did not have any voice in them at all. And I am curious as to whether the Council of State Governments, which I understand to be an organization of State legislators, ever appeared in connection with this bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. They made no request to be heard. Presumably they were satisfied for the State to be represented by the

Director of Unemployment Compensation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Permit me to add that I do not know of any group that is more zealous in protecting the rights of the States and the prerogatives of the States in this Federal-State system than the State administrators of unemployment compensation—and that is to their credit.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Secretary of Labor in submitting his program suggested that the entire cost of this extended benefit program be borne by the Federal Government, but here the directors of the unemployment compensation programs within the States representing the States met and voted and they overwhelmingly favored the program of Federal-State, 50-50 participation.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 14705, the Employment Security Amendments of 1969. Among the provisions of this legislation are new provisions to provide unemployment insurance protection for millions of employees in nonprofit organizations.

If these provisions should become law, some 2.1 million people will, for the first time, be provided with the essential protection of unemployment compensation. This is a matter both of individual equity and also of sound national economic policy. There simply is no good reason why the technician employed in a nonprofit hospital should be differentiated from his colleague who works in a profit-making industry. There is no good reason why the one man's family should become the victim of economic circumstance, while the other's family is protected by our Federal-State system of unemployment insurance laws.

The new provision reported by the committee would allow nonprofit organizations, such as hospitals, to contribute to the system on a reimbursement basis, rather than requiring them to reestablish large reserves. Evidence produced at the committee hearings has shown that employment in hospitals is relatively stable and thus does not justify the establishment of large reserves. The new method of contribution allowed nonprofit organizations will provide this much-needed protection for their employees at a minimum cost to the institutions for which they work.

In my own district, in Chicago, there are more than 20 hospitals with several thousand employees. It is my belief that each of these individuals, employed in the hospitals and other nonprofit institutions, including our universities and colleges, will be well served by this new extension of the employment insurance laws.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the action of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope and urge that the House will promptly approve this measure before us, H.R. 14705, designed to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The National and State impact and importance of the various provisions of this bill have been fully outlined and thoroughly explained by the distinguished, learned committee chairman and his dedicated committee associates.

In summary the bill will extend coverage to an additional 4.5 million workers, allow interstate and combined wage claims, restrict cancellation of wage credits, establish a permanent automatically triggered-off program to pay benefits during periods of high unemployment, and increase the net Federal tax from four-tenths of 1 percent to five-tenths of 1 percent of covered payroll as well as raise the taxable wage base from \$3,000 to \$4,200.

Mr. Chairman, many of us very earnestly wish this measure was indeed more inclusive and expansive in its coverage and payments and nobody would pretend it is the perfect solution to all the complexities involved in legislating a national unemployment insurance program equitable to all concerned. However, it does represent a very timely forward step in what should be our continuing persevering and cooperative effort toward the accomplishment of an unemployment insurance program of universal standard and acceptance that is so vitally important to the economic stability of this country and our working people during occasions of economic stress and strain.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, as I stated in my separate views, I cannot share the feeling of security which prevails on the present condition of the unemployment compensation fund and its capacity to face up to a difficult economic challenge.

At the present time, there are 50.9 million workers covered under State unemployment compensation laws. The wages of these workers in 1968 totaled \$331,562,437,000. Can we assume that 3.5 percent of the total wages of 1 year is a sufficient reserve? This reserve is sufficient for only the mildest of attacks of unemployment.

For each of the almost 51 million workers in the insured work force of the United States, there is about \$262 in the unemployment insurance fund. Six percent unemployment of insured workers would cost the unemployment insurance fund \$6 to \$7 billion per year. Two years of 6 percent unemployment of insured workers, a rate which prevailed in 1958, would completely deplete the unemployment insurance fund. It certainly would not carry us through anything more than a mild recession.

While we cannot be prophets, we must be provident. We must establish unemployment compensation reserves to measure up to the foreseeable task.

Although H.R. 14705 does not provide for minimum benefit standards, it is my hope that the several States will endeavor to increase benefit standards to a level where they are at least equal to one-half of the average weekly wages in each State. The present benefit standards are hardly sufficient to provide the cost of family housing during an unemployment crisis. The rest of the burden would have to be assumed by general welfare.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, there is

good reason to update and improve our employment laws in order to strengthen the Federal-State relationship which was established over 30 years ago. The bill before us does make improvement and progress. I intend to support it in its present form.

But, Mr. Chairman, the vote today on this bill should be no barometer to the other body that the House will pass any kind of unemployment bill. Many of us have serious and deep reservations about what might happen to the bill in the other body. Three years ago we passed a similar bill, and it died across the way. The precedent is laid that they might try to amend or change this bill in certain respects that would establish "Federal standards" in this vital and important program. If Federal standards are written into the bill later, and or if farmworkers are included, for instance, then this would materially affect the thinking of Members of the House. I have talked to dozens of my colleagues today who know that I served as a member of the Texas Employment Commission prior to my coming to Congress. Many of them have supported this bill today on the assertion of the Ways and Means Committee that no Federal standards will be added by the other body. If that is done, Mr. Chairman, let them know beforehand that the House will not accept them. Weekly benefit amounts, and the duration of weeks are matters which should be left to the States.

We vote for this bill today but with a caveat to the other body that Federal standards not be added unless they want the bill defeated.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I find myself a member of a small minority in voting against this measure, but I believe I have been true to sound principle in so doing.

There are, in my judgment, several valid reasons for opposing this bill.

For one thing, under the provisions of this bill it is possible to draw unemployment compensation even if the recipient voluntarily quits his employment.

Again, the bill establishes on a permanent basis an extended unemployment compensation program, the cost of which is to be borne one-half by the Federal Government and one-half by the several States. This puts the Federal Government directly into the field of paying unemployment compensation, on a permanent basis, and is estimated to impose a cost on the States of some \$400 million.

Above all, this measure subjects to the Federal unemployment tax—with some exceptions—every employer who had one or more individuals in his employ in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, where previous Federal law applies only to employers of four or more. In most States, including Indiana, the effect of this is that, for the first time, every small shopkeeper or merchant and every small professional man who has from one to three employees will be subjected to payment of the Federal unemployment compensation tax, and to the recordkeeping necessary as a consequence. This will necessarily be forced on the State regardless of the actual wishes of the State legislature, which will find it necessary to conform the State statutes

with the Federal law. Again we have an encroachment of Federal power at the expense of the States, and again we have increased taxation upon the small business and the professional man.

The bill in this aspect is in tune with the tenor of the times; the small independent in business and in the professions finds it ever more difficult to survive. This bill adds to his difficulty, and whatever its virtues may be said to be, I am unwilling, so far as I am concerned, to help to drive one more nail into his coffin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment.

The only amendments that are in order to the bill are amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAMMO, 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. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, pursuant to House Resolution 676, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 966. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

#### EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

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. BYRNES of Wisconsin. 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 337, nays 8, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

YEAS—337

Abernethy	Delaney	Keith
Adair	Dellenback	King
Adams	Derwinski	Kleppe
Addabbo	Devine	Kluczynski
Albert	Dickinson	Koch
Alexander	Dingell	Kyl
Anderson	Donohue	Kyros
Anderson, Calif.	Dowdy	Latta
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	Leggett
Anderson, Tenn.	Dulski	Lennon
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Long, Md.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dwyer	Lowenstein
Annunzio	Eckhardt	Lujan
Arends	Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy
Ashbrook	Edwards, La.	McClary
Ashley	Ellberg	McCloskey
Aspinall	Esch	McDade
Ayres	Evans, Colo.	McDonald
Baring	Evins, Tenn.	Mich.
Barrett	Fallon	McEwen
Beall, Md.	Farbstein	McFall
Belcher	Feighan	McNeally
Bell, Calif.	Findley	MacGregor
Bennett	Fish	Madden
Berry	Fisher	Mahon
Betts	Flood	Mailliard
Blaggi	Foley	Mann
Biester	Ford, Gerald R.	Marsh
Bingham	Ford,	Matsunaga
Blackburn	William D.	Mayne
Blanton	Foreman	Meeds
Blatnik	Fountain	Melcher
Boggs	Fraser	Meskill
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Ohio
Bolling	Frey	Mills
Bow	Friedel	Minish
Brasco	Fulton, Pa.	Mink
Bray	Fuqua	Mize
Brinkley	Gallifanakis	Mizell
Broomfield	Gallagher	Mollohan
Brotzman	Gaydos	Monagan
Brown, Mich.	Gettys	Montgomery
Brown, Ohio	Giammo	Moorehead
Broyhill, N.C.	Gilbert	Morgan
Broyhill, Va.	Goldwater	Morton
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Mosher
Burke, Fla.	Goodling	Moss
Burke, Mass.	Gray	Murphy, Ill.
Burleson, Tex.	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Green, Pa.	Myers
Burton, Calif.	Griffin	Natcher
Burton, Utah	Griffiths	Nedzi
Bush	Gross	Nelsen
Button	Grover	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Obey
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagan	O'Hara
Caffery	Haley	O'Konski
Carey	Hall	Olsen
Carter	Halpern	O'Neal, Ga.
Casey	Hamilton	Ottinger
Cederberg	Hammer	Passman
Celler	schmidt	Patman
Chamberlain	Hanley	Patten
Chappell	Hansen, Idaho	Pelly
Clancy	Hansen, Wash.	Perkins
Clark	Harvey	Philbin
Clausen, Don H.	Hastings	Pickle
Clawson, Del.	Hathaway	Pike
Clay	Hays	Pirnie
Cleveland	Hébert	Poage
Collier	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Collins	Heckler, Mass.	Poff
Colmer	Helstoski	Pollock
Conable	Henderson	Price, Ill.
Conte	Holfield	Pryor, Ark.
Conyers	Horton	Pucinski
Corbett	Hull	Quile
Corman	Hunt	Quillen
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Randall
Culver	Jacobs	Rarick
Cunningham	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Daniel, Va.	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Ala.	Reifel
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Reuss
Davis, Wis.	Karth	Rhodes
	Kastenmeter	Riegler
	Kazen	Rivers
	Kece	Robison

Rodino	Sikes	Tiernan
Rogers, Colo.	Sisk	Ullman
Rogers, Fla.	Skubitz	Vander Jagt
Rooney, N. Y.	Slack	Vanik
Rooney, Pa.	Smith, Calif.	Vigorito
Rosenthal	Smith, Iowa	Waggonner
Rostenkowski	Smith, N. Y.	Wampler
Roth	Snyder	Watts
Roudebush	Stafford	Weicker
Roybal	Staggers	Whalen
Ruppe	Stanton	Whalley
Ruth	Steed	White
Ryan	Steiger, Ariz.	Whitehurst
St Germain	Steiger, Wis.	Whitten
St. Onge	Stephens	Whitman
Sandman	Stokes	Wiggins
Satterfield	Stratton	Williams
Saylor	Stubblefield	Wilson, Bob
Schadeberg	Stuckey	Winn
Scherle	Sullivan	Wolf
Scheuer	Symington	Wright
Schneebeli	Taft	Yates
Schwengel	Talcott	Yatron
Scott	Taylor	Zablocki
Sebelius	Teague, Calif.	Zion
Shipley	Thompson, Ga.	Zwacher
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	

## NAYS—8

Camp	Jonas	McMillan
Dennis	Lloyd	Wold
Hogan	McClure	

## NOT VOTING—86

Abbitt	Hanna	Nichols
Bevill	Harrington	O'Neill, Mass.
Brademas	Harsha	Pepper
Brock	Hawkins	Pettis
Brooks	Hicks	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hosmer	Preyer, N.C.
Cabell	Howard	Price, Tex.
Cahill	Hungate	Purcell
Chisholm	Ichord	Railsback
Cohelan	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
Cowger	Jones, Tenn.	Roberts
Cramer	Kirwan	Springer
Daddario	Kuykendall	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Landgrebe	Thompson, N.J.
de la Garza	Landrum	Tunney
Denney	Langen	Udall
Dent	Lipscomb	Utt
Diggs	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Lukens	Waldie
Edmondson	McCulloch	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Macdonald,	Watson
Erlenborn	Mass.	Wilson,
Eshleman	Martin	Charles H.
Fascell	Mathias	Wyatt
Flowers	May	Wydler
Flynt	Michel	Wyllie
Fulton, Tenn.	Mikva	Wyman
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Young
Gibbons	Minshall	
Gude	Morse	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Lipscomb.  
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Minshall.  
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Brock.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Denney.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Young with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Gude.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Hosmer.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Howard with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Langen.  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Hicks with Mrs. May.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Landgrebe.  
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Pettis.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Lukens.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Dawson.  
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Harsha.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Wyman.  
Mr. Udall with Mr. Springer.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Wydler.  
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Wyatt.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Wylie.  
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Purcell.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Landrum.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Cohelan with Mrs. Chisholm.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Rees.

Mr. LLOYD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CONYERS and SEBELIUS 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.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise my own remarks and to include tables and extraneous material on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was in my district on an important matter and missed the vote on the military construction appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

## CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 966) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, lines 22 and 23, strike out "five days subsequent to the sine-die adjournment of the first session of the Ninety-first Congress," and insert "December 6, 1969,".

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I very much regret that

this continuing resolution has come over at this hour at this late date. You will recall that the House, by a rollcall vote of 137 to 116, adopted a recommittal motion for continuation of the resolution to 5 days subsequent to sine die adjournment. The reason for that is obvious, Mr. Speaker. The other body will not pass the HEW appropriation bill, the Defense appropriation bill, the foreign aid appropriation bill, and perhaps one or two others by December 6. This means that on December 6 we are going to have to go through the same exercise that we experienced on Tuesday, the 28th of October.

Now, the other body has waited until this late date to send the resolution back to us with this amendment, ignoring the rollcall vote of the House, ignoring the will of the House, and making the date December 6. This will put us back in the same position we were in on October 28 when we will have to consider another continuing resolution before December 6. They have today castigated the House for the resolution which we passed and said they would never accept another one like it. So, we will find ourselves in a rather poor position at that time.

But, do you not see what happened? We sent this over to them on the 28th day of October.

They could have acted long before this. Their committee reported it out only yesterday, and then, instead of taking it up when they went in session at 9:45 this morning, they waited until late this afternoon so the House would be in the position it finds itself in now.

I would object—and I may still object—because they are still in session and will be tomorrow. The thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure would concern every other Member of this House, is that unless there is a continuing resolution this week our armed services will not be paid. I am not one of those who would like to be put in a position of preventing payment to our armed services, particularly the men in Vietnam.

But it still seems to me that we do not have to shoulder this entire responsibility. If this bill had been sent back any time after the 28th of October, or even earlier today, we might have compromised the date of December 6 in some manner.

I would like to ask my distinguished chairman whether he would accept a compromise so that we might take some other date—perhaps not the sine die date, but let us say December 30? Then we would not have to return to this same kind of situation. Would the distinguished chairman offer such an amendment to enable us to return to the other body and ask them to agree?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the situation which the House faces this afternoon is of its own making.

Mr. BOW. I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I think he will

agree when I have completed my statement.

We passed the continuing resolution in the House on October 28—

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Under normal circumstances, consideration of a continuing resolution is more or less routine. Continuing resolutions have been agreed to for years and years between the House and the Senate, usually under a unanimous consent proceeding.

The first rule is that they be noncontroversial so as to secure prompt enactment and thus assure orderly continuation of the vast array of governmental functions on some rationally minimum basis until the final decisions on appropriations are made through the regular bill processes. And I would point out, for example, that when the first continuing resolution was adopted in late June, providing for continuation of a \$200,000,000 enterprise, it was done through a simple unanimous-consent proceeding.

But on October 28 the House, over the warnings of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Texas and others, insisted on making an appropriation bill out of the continuing resolution in respect to funds for education—something we had not heretofore done. It was explained at the time that it was the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Texas and others that such an unprecedented action was an affront to the other body because the other body was still holding hearings on the HEW bill containing funds for education. It had not acted on the appropriations for education, and in effect by our action we undertook to force the hand of the other body because of the absolute necessity of enacting a continuing resolution if Government functions were to continue in some orderly manner.

So, instead of this continuing resolution having been enacted by the first of November as it should have been, when the previous resolution expired, a delay of 13 days has occurred.

Now, I may say to the gentleman that I urged the leadership of the other body to go along with an expiration date of December 15, or, better still, go along with the date in the House version in order that we would not have to chance the uncertainties of consideration of another continuing resolution in early December. But there was no way found to bring about this situation.

If we had unlimited time, or if we had several days, then we might do something about it. But for us at this late hour and this late date to try to go to conference and work out a more acceptable date—and I would like to see a more acceptable date—I believe would be dangerous, because I am not willing, nor do I think any Member of this House is willing, to risk denying the Air Force or the Navy, which have paydays tomorrow for their men and women around the world, including the war zone, the necessary funds to meet those payments on schedule. I do not believe any Member of the House is willing to hazard their not being paid as a result of the tardiness of the Congress.

So I say to the gentleman, as unprece-

ded as this resolution may be, it is better than to hazard a situation which would be intolerable. We cannot tell what may develop if it should go to conference to fix any date and try to get both bodies to agree.

Under the circumstances, I would implore and urge my friend, and all other Members of the House, to go along with this continuing resolution even though we will, undoubtedly, have to go through the process of an extension before December 6.

Mr. BOW. I would like to reply to my distinguished friend that I am in agreement with most everything he has said except that this situation is of the Houses' own making. A continuing resolution could have been sent over here, anytime during the last 2 weeks, since our date of October 28. They waited until the last minute to put us in this position.

My suggestion to the gentleman is that we accept an amendment to make the date the 20th or 28th or some other date that might be agreeable, pass it here, and send it back to them. They can accept that just as well as asking us now to accept the 6th, and we will still pay the troops tomorrow. It would be a question of compromise which we do constantly and would not require a conference if it is sent back to them and they accept the date that we put in. Any compromise—not necessarily sine die—but let us make it a little longer so some of these bills may be passed and we do not have another situation of this kind. Let us send it back over with the date of the 23d instead of the 6th and let them take the responsibility of whether they accept it or not and whether the troops are paid. This is the date I think would be satisfactory.

Mr. MAHON. I think it not at all unreasonable to say that the other body was somewhat tolerant in accepting the unprecedented action of the House in making an appropriation bill out of a continuing resolution; accepting without changing a comma or a word the resolution which was sent over, except for the date. So shall we seek to extract the last pound of flesh or shall we compromise and not rock the boat?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman, I think, is familiar with the fact that those who put in this date of December 6 were not tolerant of the resolution we sent over, but knew others would support it. That is the reason the committee did what they did.

I say to you again, let us pass an amendment to send it back with the date of the 23d of December, and require them to resolve this. They can accept a later date.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to say what the gentleman from Ohio is saying makes a good deal of sense to me, especially in light of his earlier statement that it is his opinion, based on long experience, that the HEW appropriation will not be finally adopted by the 6th of December.

If that is the case, it seems to me if we have to bring this continuing resolu-

tion up again in December, we are going to have to go through the same kind of fight that we went through a couple of weeks ago over the appropriation for various Federal aid to education programs. I do not think any of us enjoy that kind of fight. I really cannot see us running around looking for a repetition of it.

I think if what the gentleman says is correct, and I have no reason to believe that it is not, that we would not have a final HEW appropriation by that time, then I think that is all the more reason we should seek to get a later terminal date on this resolution.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to point out that if the pending resolution is approved, it will mean that the House has spoken and the other body has spoken. Both bodies will have said that for the period before the HEW appropriation bill becomes law, they want to obtain the higher figure with respect to education funds.

Of course, the figures that will ultimately control will be the amounts that are in the final appropriation bill, and if in the interim the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare follows the very unwise policy of expending these additional funds—which I do not believe it is following or will follow until the final funding level is settled—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will find itself required to live within the final appropriations. It would be hazardous for them to proceed at an accelerated rate based on this resolution in the interim.

I should say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) that to provide for a continuation of the pending continuing resolution beyond December 6, if that becomes necessary, only the date would need to be changed. We would not have the fight again over the education funds, because the House has already accepted the higher rate in the pending resolution. So has the other body.

I fought the Joelson amendment on education, but nevertheless the House has spoken, and I do not think this should give us any trouble if and when we have to extend the continuing resolution beyond December 6.

Mr. BOW. In reply to that statement I would say to the gentleman that the other body, in debate today and also in their committee report, have stated they will not accept another resolution such as the one that was sent to them. The gentleman has said the next continuing resolution will merely require a change in the date. But they will still have the right to refuse to accept that resolution. Let me read what they say in their report:

The committee has reluctantly agreed to go along with this resolution. It desires to make it abundantly clear that this is not a precedent, and in the future the committee does not intend to report such a resolution.

There you have it. It is not just a question of date, but they have stated in their report that they will have no more of this. Now, let us keep this resolution in effect until the 23d of December.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if we adopt the pending resolution as it is now before us, that becomes the action of this body and the other body.

The Senate objected very decidedly to the action of this body and has said that it will not participate in this sort of thing being done again. But nonetheless this sort of thing is being done in the pending resolution, and all that we would need to do in the future would be to change the expiration date of the same resolution. If we did that, the resolution which the Senate adopted today would be the resolution which would be before the Senate again.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say, in reply to what the gentleman has just said concerning the date, that they have taken the resolution we sent to them and have changed the date. So it is possible to just change the date.

But they have also told us they will not accept this kind of resolution again. If we send a similar resolution to them before December 6, they could well leave the date we put in and then delete all the other material which they now object to, and we will not have the same resolution.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. We either have to accept this resolution as changed with respect to the date only by the other body or we have got to go to conference, and going to conference at this hour of the day and trying to come to an agreement with the other body and staying over until tomorrow—and I assume the other body will be in session—in my judgment would be too hazardous a course to follow, and I do not know what would be the outcome. Nobody can predict what a legislator or a legislative body will do. But if we adopt the pending resolution the employees will be paid, and we shall have this thing behind us at least until December 6. I would hope we could go along with this procedure.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I say to the gentleman that it is not necessary to go to conference. If we amend this resolution to make the date the 23d of December and send it back, they may well accept that, knowing the position the House has taken. It would not then be necessary to go to conference.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct in that suggestion, but how do we know that the other body would accept it, or

how do we know the other body is in session at this moment?

Mr. BOW. I checked a short time ago and the other body was in session. I understand they will be in session tomorrow.

The question comes to mind as to how they know we will accept this date. I point out that the House had spoken by a rollcall vote and amended, by motion to recommit, the original date of November 30. This resolution is for only 23 more days, and sent to us after being held in the other body for over 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I again implore the gentleman from Texas to offer an amendment to make the date December 23.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under all the circumstances, I believe the House should concur in the December 6 date.

Under leave, I include a statement of the situation governing the authorized funding rates for the period covered by the resolution.

Section 108 of the resolution provides that it takes effect as of November 1, 1969, replacing the previous resolution which expired October 31.

Thus, under the resolution the status each bill occupied on November 1, governs or determines the applicable rates of obligation authorized for the period beginning on November 1, as follows:

BILL STATUS ON NOVEMBER 1	AUTHORIZED RATE FROM NOVEMBER 1	BILLS TO WHICH APPLICABLE
A. Bill not passed the House.	The lower of the 1969 rate or the 1970 budget estimate.	Military construction. Transportation. District of Columbia. Foreign aid. Defense.
B. Bill passed the House.	The lower of the 1969 rate or the House allowance.	State—Justice—Commerce—Judiciary. Independent Office—HUD. Public Works—AEC. Labor—HEW (except special provision on Office of Education). Agriculture. Legislative.
C. Bill passed the House and the Senate.	(a) Where the allowances are the same, that is the rate; (b) Where the allowances differ, the lower allowance is the rate; (c) Where an item is included in only one version of the bill, the lower of the 1969 rate, or the allowance in the one version of the bill (special provision for Senate items).	

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF NOVEMBER 17, 1969

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have finished the program for the week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

Also on Monday the Rules Committee will take up House Resolution 675, providing for agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the bill (H.R. 12829) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax and for other purposes, with 1 hour of debate.

There are four suspensions:

S. 2000, to establish the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site;

Senate Joint Resolution 121, to authorize appropriations for the National Council on Indian Opportunity;

H.R. 7618, to convey certain real property to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; and

H.R. 14517, Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1969.

Tuesday and the balance of the week:

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

Also we will have H.R. 14794, Department of Transportation appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970; and

H.R. 14580, Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is

made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DUCKS UNLIMITED

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, duck hunting today is a sport which is enjoyed annually by thousands of Americans. In our age of expanding civilization with its problems of pollution and often damaging impact on wildlife and its breeding grounds, much of the credit for the maintenance and continued enjoyment of this sport must be given to the forward thinking of responsible men of a generation ago.

In 1929, as a result of the findings of a special commission, an organization was formed in the United States called the More Game Birds in America Foundation.

Through study and research carried out by this group, it was determined that the abundance, or lack of it, of wild duck and geese in America was dependent upon the protection and preservation of their natural breeding grounds in the main breeding provinces of Canada, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. Some 65 percent of these birds which use the U.S. flyways come from this region.

These findings in 1937 led to the founding of Ducks Unlimited. Its purpose, "to perpetuate the waterfowl population and the heritage of waterfowling on the North American continent by conserving and creating breeding habitat for waterfowl in the prairie nesting grounds in Canada, so vital to the production of the continental waterfowl resources."

From that day until this, Ducks Unlimited has acquired some 2½ million acres, including 8,000 acres of shoreline in Canada. On this acreage, projects ranging in size from over 500,000 acres to just a few have been undertaken and completed to protect and preserve the waterfowl nesting grounds.

However, much more work remains. To this task, Ducks Unlimited has committed itself to a 10-year, \$70 million program to purchase an additional 4½ million acres of Canadian land.

To date, I am informed all the money, time, and talent that has gone into the efforts of Ducks Unlimited has come from private citizens and firms. The Federal hunting license fee is used to protect and preserve wild waterfowl in this country but none of it, of course, can be spent in Canada. Thus, the work which needed to be done in cooperation with the Canadian authorities must be supplemented by nongovernmental sources.

One of the leaders in an effort to provide these moneys for this new 10-year program is the Middle Tennessee Chapter of Ducks Unlimited in Nashville, Tenn.

The enthusiasm this organization has shown for the program is demonstrated by its aggressive membership drive. In September of 1969, the Middle Tennessee

had just five sponsors. As of the first of this month, November 1969, that number had risen to 125. This makes the middle Tennessee chapter the Nation's outstanding growth chapter over the last year, ranking ahead of Minneapolis with 116 sponsors.

Each of the Nashville sponsors has pledged \$200 over the coming year in the drive to raise initial funds for the new 10-year program of Ducks Unlimited. It was the feeling of the Middle Tennessee Chapter members that the best way to prove the money could be raised was to tackle the job and show results. This they have done.

In recognition of the outstanding achievement of the Middle Tennessee Chapter, one of the lake projects in Canada costing some \$50,000 is being named, "Lake Nashville" and will be dedicated with appropriate ceremonies in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, in the 32 years since the founding of Ducks Unlimited, nearly 2½ million acres of game waterfowl habitat has been preserved in Canada. Within 10 years this total will be almost doubled. And it is thanks to the work of chapters such as the Middle Tennessee Chapter of Ducks Unlimited that this record will be achieved. This, and hundreds of other chapters have demonstrated an understanding of the conservation needs of game waterfowl. They are well on their way to meeting these needs.

These individuals and business firms in Nashville and across the Nation are to be commended highly for their concerned and effective conservation accomplishments and future goal. The ground they have and will sow will insure a rich harvest for generations to come.

#### COLONIALISM VERSUS RHODESIA

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly Members of Congress have denounced colonialism throughout the world. We have argued that the practice of minority rule over the vast majority is grossly unjust and most unacceptable. Now is the appropriate time for us to reflect on the current travesty in Rhodesia. November 11, 1969, marked the fourth anniversary of Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith's unilateral declaration of independence—UDI—from Great Britain.

Just 5 months ago we witnessed this white minority regime arrogate to itself by referendum vote of its unrepresentative electorate a mandate to prevent African majority rule forever. Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant has declared that the referendum of June 20, 1969, was a deplorable step in the wrong direction for Rhodesia, for Africa and for the rest of the world. He stated:

The persistence and strengthening of racist attitudes and acts in Rhodesia, as exemplified by the result of the referendum are a threat to peace which cannot and must not be ignored.

Our State Department has correctly labeled the Smith regime as an "illegal

white minority regime." The last official estimate—July 1969—of population in Rhodesia showed 260,000 whites—Europeans—and more than 5 million black Africans, with 20,000 to 25,000 of Asian or mixed origin. The African population is increasing at three times the rate of the European. The fact that three quarters of the white population has been in the country less than 20 years exemplifies even more dramatically the Rhodesian inequity.

The Smith regime has discriminated against the true Rhodesian or Zimbabwean both educationally and economically to the point of enslavement. Rhodesia since UDI has boasted of her performance in education. A government publication entitled "African Advancement in Rhodesia"—April 1966—states:

Rhodesia's impressive record in African education, which is unequaled in the Commonwealth is taking another great leap forward.

However, a European child in Rhodesia has a one one-hundred twenty-fifth chance of entering the university college, the African child's chance is one six-thousandths. Moreover, at the end of 1965, private schools in European areas were instructed by government circular to stop accepting African pupils. A government report early in 1966 suggested that Africans should be given school books "in which African customary respect for elders and traditional behavior patterns upholding social order are shown to emerge as moral examples." Ten times as much is spent on educating a European child as on an African.

Most of the Rhodesian blacks are subsistence farmers. Seventeen percent of the total working population of the country, about 700,000 persons are wage earners. Of the total number of workers, 13 percent are Europeans and 87 percent are Africans. But consider this, the average annual wage by 1967 was \$386.40 for Africans as compared with \$3,810.80 for Europeans.

Rhodesia's labor movement began to develop after World War II. Yet the first Industrial Conciliation Act of 1945 excluded African employees. An act passed in 1959 did recognize African unions, but prohibited farm laborers, domestic, and government workers from organizing into unions. Discrimination continues to persist beneath the facade of legislation. In unions where Africans are or might become a majority, their vote counts only as one-third—a prohibitive measure preventing blacks from controlling integrated unions.

The two major African Rhodesian political parties, Zimbabwe African National Union—ZANU—and Zimbabwe African People's Union—ZAPU—are banned in Rhodesia. Nevertheless, the goals and values of these two parties embody the true democratic spirit. On December 7, 1968, a ZANU statement included:

The only acceptable constitution for Zimbabwe is one based on the principle of one man one vote—free and unfettered by any artificial educational, income, property, or other discriminatory device or contrivance.

A ZAPU statement released in January 1969 called for the "drawing of an unqualified majority rule independence

constitution with no elements whatsoever of class, racial or tribal distinctions or differentiations." So much for any pretensions to democracy claimed by the white ruling elite of Rhodesia.

It is disheartening to note that the British Government which has had primary responsibility for Rhodesia, has failed to end the Smith rebellion. Twice since 1965, the British have offered compromises to postpone majority rule if provisions were made for African advancement. However, Great Britain's original refusal to use force against Smith's white-settler regime has left her with no leverage to influence Rhodesia's future. Britain, regrettably has squandered her role as an effective force in this situation.

The United Nations under pressure from its Afro-Asian block has condemned the white minority regime of Ian Smith. The U.N. resolutions against Rhodesia are based on the illegality of the Rhodesian declaration of independence, the absence of self-determination, and threat to tranquility posed by a white regime in the midst of a continent dominated by black people. The policy of sanctions voted by the U.N. may continue, but it does not stop the leaking of that policy by Rhodesia's neighbors, South Africa and Portuguese Mozambique. Thus, we see that U.N. sanctions have some but not a decisive effect on Rhodesian stability.

Perhaps the only alternative to perpetual white minority rule through a police state is victory by the Rhodesian nationalist forces. This probability is fraught with many problems. But these nationalists, representing the true majority of Zimbabwe cannot forever be suppressed.

Now is the time for Americans to speak out and espouse those freedoms for Rhodesia that we cherish so highly for ourselves. Our American Government must act immediately on the following measures:

First. The United States must close her consulate in Salisbury, Rhodesia.

Second. The United States must support and initiate action in the United Nations against those countries which have aided and abetted the violation of the mandatory U.N. sanctions.

Third. The United States must totally restrict American businesses from trading and investing in Rhodesia by whatever means are required.

These three steps are minimal. Yet their enactment will prove that the United States supports democracy and opposes repressive government.

#### LEGISLATION TO AID COMMUNITIES ESTABLISH RECREATION AREAS

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, all communities need more public water-based recreation and fish and wildlife facilities for their residents and for visitors. Recreation fulfills one of man's major environmental needs, provides more available jobs, and brings an area increased income from expenditures for equipment, vehi-

cle services, food and lodging, and other benefits.

Communities need to properly plan public water-based recreation and fish and wildlife developments to make best use of their natural resource base, blend recreation with other resource development potentials and with population patterns, and provide the needed water-based recreational facilities at a reasonable cost.

Many of the communities who have these needs for water-based recreation or fish and wildlife developments are not financially able to meet the costs because of a low tax base, heavy financial burden for public facilities and services, and low income of residents.

I am introducing legislation today which is similar to H.R. 4879, a bill I introduced previously. It would help many rural communities acquire the water-based recreation or fish and wildlife developments that they need.

These bills would add to the already substantial contribution being made to resource development opportunity in 56 resource conservation and development projects in the country. One of the first of these locally sponsored R.C. & D. projects is the west central Minnesota project. In this project, residents and communities of a 3-million-acre area have helped develop a major canoe trail; a wilderness saddle trail; a scenic drive; several lakes and camps; and other new recreation areas as part of a larger effort to increase job opportunities and community services and improve the natural resource base. Their efforts have shown the tremendous potential that exists for community action to bring about multiple-purpose resource developments.

My bill would give R.C. & D. communities the benefit of cost-sharing for needed land rights and installation of water-based recreation or fish and wildlife facilities, similar to the recreation provisions that are now in the small watershed program under Public Law 566.

Communities need to plan for recreational facilities at the same time as the other uses and developments for land and water are being considered. A better balance of resources and people's needs will result, and at substantially lower costs. It is in the Nation's interest to help speed effective water-based recreation and fish and wildlife development.

I am proud of the broad community action being taken by local people in the west central Minnesota R.C. & D. project with help of many Federal agencies coordinated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. I want to help make that action even more effective, and aid local efforts in the other 55 R.C. & D. projects in the country and the dozens of other communities who have applied for R.C. & D. project assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce this legislation along with Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. WAGGONNER, and Mr. WAMPLER.

#### APPROPRIATION STEP-UP

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills and reintroduced a resolution which will collectively relieve the near crisis which occurs when Congress is unable to pass appropriation bills by the beginning of the fiscal year.

The first bill provides that the fiscal year of the U.S. Government coincide with the calendar year. I listened very attentively to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) when he introduced an identical bill last month. Since that time, I have given the matter a great deal of thought and study, and I have concluded that having the fiscal year coincide with the calendar year is an important first step in assuring that vital governmental programs are funded at the beginning of the fiscal year.

That the Government's fiscal year should coincide with the calendar year is not a new idea. Indeed, the fiscal year and the calendar year did coincide until 1842. Our present fiscal year was instituted at that time for a very good reason. Congress was then a part-time body which finished its legislative business early in the year. It was very difficult to project the monetary requirements of the Government many months in advance, and Congress decided that by commencing the fiscal year in July, expenditures could be anticipated on a more accurate basis. Of course, the appropriation bills were always passed because Congress invariably finished all of its business and adjourned sine die prior to the first of July.

As we all know, Congress now stays in session most, if not all, of the year. Ever since Congress began holding year-around sessions, the vast majority of the regular governmental appropriation bills have not been passed by the beginning of the new fiscal year. This year, not a single major appropriation bill had been signed into law by the first of July.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that allowing Congress 12 months to consider the appropriation bills would be sufficient. However, just to be sure I have introduced a bill which amends the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so that Congress must stay in session around the clock when appropriation bills are not passed by the end of the calendar year. Such a requirement should provide a great incentive to get the work done on time.

Of course, under the present rules of the House, it is impossible for the Appropriations Committee to consider appropriation bills until the necessary authorizations have been passed. As a general rule, this is how it should be. But, Mr. Speaker, if the committees which work on the authorization bills drag their feet to the point where appropriation bills cannot be passed by the beginning of the fiscal year, then the Appropriations Committee should be able to act without an authorization bill.

On September 25, 1969, I joined with the distinguished gentleman from New

Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) and numerous other distinguished Members of this body in introducing a resolution which would amend the House rules so as to provide that appropriation measures might properly be considered after the first of June, irrespective of whether or not the authorizations have been passed. Today I am reintroducing substantially the same resolution, but there is one small difference. In order that the resolution correspond with the provisions of the bill to have fiscal year coincide with the calendar year, I am providing that it be in order to consider appropriation measures without the otherwise necessary authorizations 30 days prior to the commencement of the next fiscal year.

I do not think we can overestimate the importance of having regular appropriations made by the beginning of each fiscal year. Two separate kinds of governmental waste occur as a result of the practice of passing continuing appropriation resolutions providing for a continuation of programs at the previous year's levels pending enactment of the new appropriation.

The first type of waste comes about when Congress ultimately increases a program's funding over that of the previous year. In this case, the administrators of the program are forced to operate at the lower level for part of the year, and then suddenly find themselves fully funded. Of course, the administrators are anxious to at last commence programs which had been authorized by Congress. But, all too often, the money cannot be spent efficiently in the balance of the year. Nevertheless, the decision will be made to spend all of the money, because of the fear that Congress will be reluctant to refund a program which did not consume its full appropriation in the previous year.

The second type of waste occurs when Congress ultimately decides an appropriation cut is in order. Here, the department or agency will have to cut back on programs which had been funded on the basis of a continuing appropriation resolution. One result in this type of situation could be the discontinuance of much work already underway and thus, the wasting of the money already spent. Another possible result, and one which is just as bad, could be that Congress would be hesitant to kill genuinely wasteful programs simply because they had been allowed to go into the new fiscal year under a continuing resolution.

The havoc wrought by the current practice of operating the Government for up to 6 months on the basis of continuing appropriation resolutions is most clearly seen in the field of education. I will use my own State of Colorado as an example, but I am sure countless schools around the country fit the same pattern.

Colorado's schools operate on the basis of the calendar year, and must file their budgets by October 15. This entails making all of the financial commitments for the succeeding 12-month period. Mill levies must then be certified by October 31. One hardly needs a vivid imagination to visualize the difficulties encoun-

tered by the school administrators when the level of Federal funding is still uncertain in December.

The result is an utterly haphazard planning situation. After all of the sophisticated analysis and planning is completed, school officials must ultimately make their best guess as to the level of Federal support they will receive. Fortunately, educators have been able to arrive at fair estimates of available Federal funding more often than not, but when all is said and done, they still have to base their final decisions on guesswork.

This year the situation is even more critical than usual. School officials have had to make two guesses. First, they had to guess the level of Federal aid which would be available for the first 6 months of 1970 under the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970. Secondly, they have had to guess, with respect to the second half of 1970, the amount which would be available to them under the fiscal 1971 appropriation bill. I commend school officials for the admirable job they are doing under these impossible conditions. I hope that we in Congress will be willing to ease their burden by having the fiscal year for the Federal Government coincide with the calendar year and by then making sure that the appropriations are regularly made before the first of January.

The need for this legislation becomes even more critical in view of the recent action taken by the House with respect to the amendment to the continuing appropriation resolution passed last month. Members of the House were placed in the unenviable position of being damned if they did and damned if they did not. I am sure that all Members recall the amendment to which I am referring—the one which provided for the funding of educational programs at the levels approved of by the House in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, rather than at the level of support accorded those programs in fiscal 1969.

On the one hand, funding at the 1969 level would delay increases in necessary programs already approved by this body. This course of action probably would have required school districts to live on a hand-to-mouth basis for the rest of this calendar year and would have also required canceling many activities which had been programmed months in advance and for which the groundwork had been laid and the personnel hired. Instead, the House chose to fund the programs at the fiscal year 1970 level, even though the other body had not completed its hearings on the appropriation bill. This choice asked the Senate to accept the House bill as a floor for this year's education spending.

All of this could be avoided if the appropriation bills would be passed by the beginning of the fiscal year. Of course, it is too late to rectify the dilemma which has confronted the House this year, but this deplorable state of affairs can and should be prevented in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are numerous other aspects of the congressional logjam which will not be solved

by the enactment of this legislative package. Nevertheless, the most disastrous consequences of that logjam can be brought under control.

I further realize that conversion to the calendar year will cause some transition problems in view of the fact that the first round of appropriations under this proposal would involve only 6 months. However, this is a problem of logistics which can be resolved and I urge that hearings be commenced at the earliest possible date.

#### SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON FOR PEACE

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's November 4 address to the Nation on Vietnam was direct, candid, and determined. In my judgment the speech was enlightening and tremendously helpful.

For the first time in my memory, I sensed that our President was leveling with us. He was not talking politics; the speech was nonpartisan; it was directed primarily to the American people rather than to the South Vietnamese or the Communists. He took us into his confidence more than any other President. He shared private personal efforts as well as public diplomatic efforts in his quest for peace. Most Americans will appreciate this.

Every American may have wished or hoped for more—an announcement of a mutual termination of hostilities would, of course, have been welcomed by everyone. We could have "danced in the streets"—but the facts and the current conditions, of course, do not permit such a wondrous or euphoric announcement.

Presidential critics are not likely to desist in their kibitzing or harassment. Presidential criticism has become the stock in trade of some segments of our society. The President demonstrated praiseworthy courage in refusing to be sidetracked from his plans. It is often difficult to walk the narrow, middle road—no matter how wise or practical—and risk being attacked by the extremists on both sides. For the moment it might be much easier to hue the line of the vocal extremists to avoid their noisy harassments. This would only corrupt the correct course toward an early and permanent peace.

One persistent critic said, "the President did not give the American people enough hope." Of course, President Nixon did not foster false hopes—which these critics have come to expect or would want him to flaunt. His refusal to attempt to purchase time or solace with false hopes was a commendable aspect of his speech. He did give me hope that an honorable peace can be achieved. He gave me assurance that he is on the right course.

He showed that he had courage and determination. I hope that our citizenry can demonstrate equal courage and determination. I believe they can and will.

He recognized those who share other views and who would pursue different

tactics, but he made a convincing case for his principles, policies, and plans.

The President is sincerely seeking a permanent and honorable peace; he has made every effort to reduce the hostilities commensurate with the safety of our troops and allies; he has made every reasonable overture for negotiations. He has gone further in his pursuit of peace in Southeast Asia than all of the proposals of the minority of the Democratic Party Platform Committee at the National Convention in Chicago. It is difficult to understand how reasonable men could ask more.

I believe the great majority of responsible, reasonable citizens of this Nation, and the world, support our President in his policies and programs in Vietnam. I believe his objectives and goals for peace are shared by an overwhelming majority of Americans. I believe every American should support the President—certainly so long as his policy and programs have a chance for success.

As a matter of good and effective parliamentary procedure, I believe that until a Member of the Congress completely loses his effectiveness in the legislative Chambers that he should not take to the streets to achieve his legislative objectives. Of course, some Members of the Congress may be taking to the streets other than for legislative purposes to improve our representative parliamentary system of government.

Even if the President had been able to announce a mutual agreement for an immediate termination of all hostilities, a small group of organized and militant dissenters would have found something about which to be "disappointed" or critical. After mutual termination of hostilities they will find something more to demand.

Now is a time for all U.S. citizens to support President Nixon for peace.

#### THE RIGHTS OF THE MAJORITIES

(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, while juveniles disrupt the colleges, riot in the streets, and obstruct the processes of government, their apologists in and out of Congress inform us that "these kids are trying to tell us something." We are advised that they are exercising the right of dissent and we hear a good deal about the rights of minorities.

This afternoon I am going to be the advocate of some other young people—those who are trying to tell us something but are being drowned out by the mob. I am going to speak in behalf of those who wish to exercise the right of assent. I am going to discuss the rights of majorities.

Only an infinitesimal minority of students is guilty of criminal, seditious, treasonable, and anarchistic conduct. The overwhelming majority of our young people, whether they are in high school or college, are anxious to continue their education and resent having it interrupted by juveniles of all ages.

While a loudmouthed student minority, which is actually a minority of a minority, seeks the destruction of our free society, the abolishment of our system of free enterprise, and the overthrow of our free country, the great silent majority is beginning to speak up. While realizing that our society is not perfect, that the capitalistic system can be improved, and that our country has vices as well as virtues, the majority of students want to make improvements within the established system.

This majority, in expressing its right of assent, wishes, not to destroy society, but to elevate it. It wants, not to abolish free enterprise, but to extend it. It seeks, not the defeat of our Nation in its continuing struggle with tyranny, but its victory over our enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an example of the type of legal and constructive action that the responsible majority can use to counteract the lawless and destructive action by an irresponsible minority.

One of my constituents, Randall A. Kreiling, of Peoria, is a second-year law student at Southern Methodist University in Dallas. His activities with other students led him to believe that, as he expressed it:

There is an unnecessary and critical lack of communication between students and the Dallas community.

In order to counteract this unfortunate and unhealthy situation, the university-community caucus was established, Mr. Kreiling being its director. I will let him describe the caucus in his own words:

My activities with students at Southern Methodist University has led me to believe that there is an unnecessary and critical lack of communication between students and the Dallas community. The Caucus is the result of spontaneous enthusiasm from students who desperately want to work for constructive change in a working relationship with the Dallas community.

An assumption of radical schools of thought among students is that the business community—the establishment—is resolutely opposed to what the students consider meaningful change. Because they have abandoned hope of communicating with the business community, they have resorted to what they consider to be their only alternative, threats and violence.

Too many students advocating radical actions have abandoned existing channels for change without trying them. Nevertheless, a few radical students have cultivated a movement, a "revolutionary attitude," among an alarming number of sincere, well-intending students. An isolated protest at Columbia evolved into a riot, and a Harvard protest received overwhelming student support.

Hopefully, the Caucus will offer students and the community evidence that the establishment of Dallas is concerned and will consider their point of view. It is an effort to understand, not to advocate. It is an effort to respond to previously frustrated attempts to communicate with the people who can change things. It is an opportunity to build confidence and channel constructive enthusiasm from the community's most vital resource, its university students.

Two sessions of the caucus have been scheduled, one for November 19 and the other for December 3. Two hundred

Dallas businessmen, representing divergent backgrounds and interests, have been asked to attend. Each of them will be paired with a student.

The central issues that will be discussed by these teams are:

Does involvement in the corporate structure undermine or alter the individual's character?

Has the profit-motivated free enterprise system been abused?

Is the trend of changing social values undermining the political-economic structure of this country?

How are students and industry contributing to meaningful social change?

If my young constituent's idea proves successful, as I am confident it will, let us hope that it will inspire students and business people in other cities and towns to set up similar programs. Surely Randall Kreiling's constructive methods are better than those of the destructive militants.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to leave with my colleagues Randy Kreiling's definition of a conservative:

I consider a conservative to be one who effects change through existing institutions.

#### THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX BILL

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

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to appoint conferees for the interest equalization tax bill, H.R. 12829. During House-Senate conference on this bill, I wish to strongly endorse adoption of the Senate language of the Bennett amendment 7 which would eliminate the present recordkeeping requirements in sales of sporting type ammunition.

The present onerous regulations are not only a travesty of justice for the law-abiding American sportsman, but of equal importance is the fact that they have proved of no value in aiding law enforcement and are practically unworkable from the standpoint of compliance.

Under section 922(b)(5) of the Gun Control Act of 1968, all that is required by law is to record the name, age, and address of the customer. But the regulations drawn up by the Treasury Department go far beyond those specifically spelled out and in reality, are a backdoor approach to firearms registration—emphatically rejected by Congress last year. Customers are now summarily required to provide additionally the date of purchase, manufacturer, caliber, gage or type of component, quantity and furnish identification, driver's license, and so forth.

Both the Departments of Justice and Treasury have stated that these recordkeeping requirements for shotgun and rifle ammunition have proved of little value in law enforcement. In correspondence of September 26, Secretary Kennedy of the Treasury Department wrote:

Indeed, the Department knows of no instance where any of the recordkeeping provisions relating to sporting type ammunition has been helpful in law enforcement.

This excludes .22 caliber rimfire, which is usable in handguns as well as shoulder arms.

Since ammunition shells are not serially numbered, and indeed it would be impossible to do so, they are consequently hard to identify. Once the cartridges have been purchased they lose their identity, and this registration morass only shows that someone in fact purchased ammunition.

Compliance with these regulations has proved unfeasible and places an unnecessary burden on both the licensed dealer as well as the purchaser. Last year nearly 6 billion rounds of civilian-type ammunition were manufactured. On the average, 300,000 separate ammunition sales were transacted daily throughout the country. To comply with current regulations, the 143,903 licensed dealers must expend nearly 15,208 man-days in filling out what is useless information. These records must be retained by the dealer for 2 years but he is not required to forward them to the Federal Government. If this information were forwarded to Washington, it would take many thousand more employees of the IRS to sift through these records.

My own State of Wyoming is noted for its abundance of game and the sport of hunting is one of the great pleasures and indeed way of life of Wyomingites. I have received countless letters from constituents, both sportsmen and licensed dealers, who bitterly resent the ineffectual redtape they must go through in purchasing or selling a box of shotgun shells. One often associates hunting with westerners, but the great State of Pennsylvania this year alone issued over 1,280,000 licenses to hunters within the State, and I believe 90,000 licenses were issued to out-of-Staters.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that these pointless recordkeeping requirements for sporting ammunition must be eliminated. As evidenced in the past year, they have served no useful purpose but have only imposed an undue burden upon our law-abiding citizens.

#### INSURANCE AGAINST DAMAGE AND LOSS RESULTING FROM EARTHQUAKES AND EARTHSLIDES

(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, today I am introducing legislation that would provide insurance against damage and loss resulting from earthquakes and earthslides. This bill would establish a reasonable method of sharing the risk of losses through a program of insurance. Presently, it is uneconomical for the private insurance industry alone to make insurance available to those in need of such protection on reasonable terms and conditions.

The private insurance industry will carry out the program to the maximum extent practicable.

Recent fissures in the surface of the earth have caused hundreds of thousands of dollars damage and loss to the home-

owners in the Paseo del Mar area of San Pedro, Calif. The homeowners are not insured against such losses. Under the earthquake insurance program envisioned by this bill, a policyholder could recoup all or a portion of his losses by presenting a claim to the insurance company that has insured his home and belongings. The insurance company would share its losses with the Federal Government.

Although California reportedly has approximately 700 earthquakes a year, rarely do they result in property damage. Yet, the fact remains the insurance industry does not insure homes and businesses against the hazards of earthslides and earthquakes. This will be remedied by a program that will be based on workable methods of pooling risks, minimizing costs and distributing burdens equitably among those who will be protected by earthquake insurance.

Had the program been in effect prior to the disaster in San Pedro, the victims would not, at least, suffer a total loss as they do now. We must take action to aid the unfortunate few who, by chance, happen to fall victim to a phenomena of nature.

Through cooperation between the private and public sectors, I believe we can insure our property owners against the sort of tragedy that has occurred in San Pedro. Such an earthquake insurance program as I have introduced would provide coverage of those involved in such unavoidable disasters as earthquakes and earthslides.

#### THE FIRING OF A. ERNEST FITZGERALD, AN AIR FORCE EFFICIENCY EXPERT

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the 60 Members of this House who signed a letter to President Nixon condemning the firing of A. Ernest Fitzgerald, an Air Force efficiency expert. Were it not for many of us exposing this punitive action, the public might never have been told the true story and these games with the public interest might have gone on and on.

The facts read like a George Orwell novel. Mr. Fitzgerald, who was hired to reduce waste and inefficiency in weapon systems procurement which annually consumes over \$20 billion of the taxpayers' money, uncovered that the C-5A giant transport plane, built by Lockheed, would cost more than \$2 billion above and beyond the estimated cost by the Pentagon. For this he was fired. The Defense Department explained that this action was an "economy move" aimed at saving money. Yet on the very day that Mr. Fitzgerald was fired, John J. Dyment was employed to fill his position. Mr. Dyment is a partner in Arthur Young & Co., auditor for Lockheed and codefendant in a suit charging both companies with concealing the massive cost overruns on the C-5A.

In addition, the man who hired Mr. Dyment and fired Mr. Fitzgerald was the

Air Force Assistant Secretary for Financial Management, Spencer J. Schedler. Mr. Schedler's wife, Judy, is an \$11,000 a year auditor at Arthur Young's Washington branch. And we find yet one more connection: Mr. Schedler and Mr. Dyment were classmates at the Harvard Business School.

Mr. Fitzgerald has apparently been a thorn in the side of the military for some time, challenging portions of other major weapons systems such as the F-111. He has been a thorn that threatened the old-fashioned idea that the military is sacrosanct and should never be openly questioned.

Can anyone believe that such a case encourages other employees to speak out when they see government waste? No one wants to be fired for doing what his conscience tells him to do, Mr. Speaker, and no one should be confronted with such a choice.

Not only should Mr. Fitzgerald be restored to his former duties, but he and other public servants should be allowed to continue their work to the best of their ability without fear of revenge. President Nixon should go on public record, guaranteeing the right of all government officials to speak honestly and candidly. The public deserves no less.

#### TAX LOOPHOLES AND MEDICAL NEEDS FOR MILLIONS

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to receive numerous letters not only from my district but from other parts of the country regarding the necessity for the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to expand medical education, hospitals, et cetera in order to at least partially fulfill the demand for tens of thousands of doctors and nurses by the medical profession.

It is indeed unfortunate that the Congress body did not in this session of Congress complete the job of repealing all of the scandalous and fraudulent loopholes enjoyed by big oil, foundations, real estate, and multimillionaire tax dodgers who take advantage of tax-free bonds et cetera. The American taxpayer will never be satisfied with the skimmed milk tax reform bill which is coming back from the other body in a few days. The meager 7½-percent reduction the House made on the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance was but a slap-on-the-wrist gesture to the big oil operators who in many cases pay no tax whatsoever on their multimillions of annual profits. A fair and just closing of loopholes in this session of Congress would have brought into the treasury many billions of dollars that could have been applied to medical science, medical care, hospitalization, housing, education, medicare, et cetera for millions of American families.

I wish to submit a letter from two former Indiana constituents who moved to the State of Texas to secure hospitalization for their invalid son. The letter speaks for itself:

BAYTOWN, TEX.,  
November 10, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States,  
HON. BIRCH BAYH,  
U.S. Senator, State of Indiana,  
HON. VANCE HARTKE,  
U.S. Senator, State of Indiana,  
HON. EARL LANDGREBE,  
U.S. Representative, State of Indiana,  
HON. RAY MADDEN,  
U.S. Representative, State of Indiana.

GENTLEMEN: As former residents, almost life-long, of Porter County, Indiana and at present residents of Harris County, Texas, we address this plea to each and everyone of you on behalf of all victims of cancer and other such insidious diseases—that you may, each, individually, see fit to do all in your own power to stop the curtailment of federal funds available for medical research in these areas.

We have left our native state of Indiana thankful to God that we were able to secure treatment for our six year old son, Peter, who is currently an outpatient at the M.D. Anderson Cancer and Tumor Institute, University of Texas Medical Center in Houston. Peter's future, even his living to maturity, and that of hundreds of other children like him, not even counting the adults who suffer from cancer and related diseases, depends almost entirely on the research being done at M.D. Anderson Hospital and a very few similar places in this country.

We are not pacifists nor war mongers but parents and it seems to us that the worst place of all to start cutting this country's budget is in areas concerning the health and welfare of our children, this country's future adult citizens. We have known more than sixteen children, personally, who have died since March because modern medicine could do only as much as present research has allowed. We would not want the cutting of research funds for medicine to be on our consciences if we were public officials. The devotion and dedication of the entire staff at M.D. Anderson Hospital is something to behold. From the lowest paid position to the highest, the main concern is for the patient and, especially, the children. We thought we had met many kind people in our lifetimes but nothing has compared to what we have experienced during the past eight months.

Also, the bravery of these little children leaves a "lump" and one cannot easily forget them. We would suggest a tour of the pediatric department at any research center by the honorable members of the Congress before they sign their name as being in favor of cutting medical research funds. We are sure that the experience in itself would be a very moving one. It would give each of them plenty of "food for thought."

Our names, we are sure, will be familiar to some of you. We were sorry to leave Indiana, but as we mentioned previously, Texas has the help we need and for that we are grateful.

Respectfully,

GEORGE and MARY CUSHMAN.

#### DOWN OFF THE FARMS

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, my mail today contains a letter and a clipping from the Carbon County, Mont., News, which tells rather dramatically, not what is going on down on the farm, but what is going off of the farms in my State, and across the Nation.

Because of the economic depression in agriculture, increasing numbers of farmers are selling out and taking their fam-

ilies out of the country to urban areas in search of opportunity.

The editor of the Carbon County News reported in his column:

Farm auctions are becoming almost a weekly event in Carbon County. Five years ago we ran maybe a dozen a year in the News; we've had more than 30 this year. Auctioneer Gus Bender has these scheduled: next Sunday, the Edward C. Kent farm 8 miles south of Rockvale; Nov. 4—G. F. Schuster and Gabe Wetch place four miles northeast of Bridger; Nov. 6—Hendricks Ranch, mile west and mile south of Edgar; Nov. 8—Elmer Webb place, four miles south of Belfry.

I am deeply concerned by this exodus of small farmers. I am concerned for humanitarian reasons. I am also concerned because the small family farm is essential to our national food supply.

I hear a great deal about the large number of small farmers producing a relatively small proportion of our total food. But they are the safety valve; they are the part of the agricultural production plant which adjusts rapidly to changes in national requirements and demand. While the large farms with heavy investment in particular types of production equipment find it difficult or impossible to shift from one product to another, the small family farm can expand or contract pork production, or cattle feeding, or lamb feeding, or move from one crop to another, with relative ease. They do not have the massive investments in specialized production that the large farms have.

I am also concerned by the social consequence of rural-urban imbalance, and I was extremely interested that Mr. M. B. Gillis, of the International Minerals & Chemical Corp., the president of the distinguished National Agricultural Research Institute, expressed that same concern in his annual presidential message to the institute here in Washington a week or two ago.

An official in a firm which has prospered helping to increase the efficiency of agricultural production with chemicals of all kinds. Mr. Gillis told his fellows in the Agricultural Research Institute:

There has been an almost callous acceptance of the concept that the small or the "family farm" must be eliminated. That a way of life that has contributed much to the American heritage and national character must disappear if it does not meet our concepts of modern efficiency . . .

In my opinion this country is long overdue for a reexamination at the national level of policies and planning which would make the rural or non-urban areas more practical and more attractive places to live.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe Mr. Gillis is speaking of a reexamination of policies which needs to be made now, by this Congress, I include in the RECORD that portion of his address to the Agricultural Research Institute which deals with the wisdom of rebuilding rural America:

#### CHANGE AND THE ARI

(By M. B. Gillis)

Research will continue to be one of the essential supports of a viable and progressive agriculture. In my opinion, however, in the next decade or two research will be less critical to agriculture and to our rural environment than other impinging social and eco-

nomic forces. Also in my opinion the rural or non-urban areas of this country must increasingly fulfill roles of vast importance to our national well being. These will be over and above the mere provision of an ample food supply for our people and for a part of our international trade.

We have now become predominantly an urban society. The change from a rural oriented people to a society based on an urban environment did not occur abruptly. But it has occurred swiftly enough to create enormous problems—many of which we have not solved and which pessimists fear we can never solve.

Technological advances have drastically reduced the manpower requirements for agriculture. The misplaced labour has migrated mainly to the great urban centres. There the same technology which uprooted people in the first place has been largely, but not totally, successful in utilizing them in the industrial megapoli. In addition to incomplete utilization of manpower, the growth of industry and urban centres has been effected at great social cost and with the creation of enormous problems, such as inadequate housing, decay in the urban environment, unequal opportunities, riots and other forms of social unrest, increasing dependence on government social programs, with concomitant lowering of self-reliance and self-esteem in the individual.

To some extent the same type problems have beset the displaced population stranded in small towns and cities—those forced off the land but who didn't make it to the big cities.

Meanwhile "back on the farm" there is a steady trend to bigger unit operations, to corporate farming and toward government regulation. There has been an almost callous acceptance of the concept that the small farm or the "family farm" must be eliminated. That a way of life that has contributed much to the American heritage and national character must disappear if it does not meet our concepts of modern efficiency.

Little thought and less effort has been given to ways and means of keeping the rural population out of the cities—either on farms or in smaller towns and cities. Whatever has been achieved in this direction has been mostly due to local efforts. Local efforts to attract industry or effect other community improvements.

In my opinion the country is long overdue for a reexamination at the national level of policies and planning which would make the rural or non-urban areas more practical and more attractive places to live. I am not referring merely to the development and preservation of more parks and recreational areas. Incentives must be created for wider dispersion of the industrial complex to non-urban areas. Employment opportunities for non-farm labor in rural areas will act as a damper on further urban migration. At the same time, and I know this is unpopular heresy, some attention should be given to ways and means of enabling the smaller farmers to maintain a constructive and successful position in American agriculture. Maybe as a starter we could spend one-half as much time thinking of ways to keep people on the farm as we now spend trying to get them off.

I firmly believe the long-range best interests of our country require that we stabilize, and eventually reverse the trend toward further urbanization of our society. It seems improbable to me that this automatically means a lower efficiency for either agriculture or industry.

The consequences of the alternates must be carefully weighed. Further impersonalization of agriculture, further urbanization of industry, and gradual deterioration of the rural environment will have their effects. It seems likely that the social, political and economic problems of the great metropolitan areas would become so overpowering as

to demand virtually all of the nation's talent and resources. In these circumstances agriculture would suffer increasingly from neglect. Agriculture could conceivably become virtually a government-run operation to provide low cost food for the teeming cities.

At this point in time ARI needs to think carefully and clearly about its own future role. I do not think we need retreat from our vital concern with an effective research program for agriculture. We must continue that interest. I do think, however, that we must widen the areas of our concern and involvement. We must be increasingly concerned about the environmental—social, political, economic—in which agriculture exists. We must be involved with those facets of economics and sociology which determine the balance between the urban and the non-urban population and welfare. We must be vitally concerned with the quality of the rural environment as a home for both agriculture and industry. I think we ought to be concerned with helping people farm who want to farm.

I am not sure that our name "Agricultural Research Institute" is any longer entirely appropriate to the times. Certainly it does not describe all our legitimate interests, nor does it convey the capabilities of our membership for contributions to the national welfare. Perhaps another designation such as Institute for Agricultural and Rural Problems would be more appropriate to the challenges and opportunities we face.

#### OPERATION SPEAK OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks upon Operation Speak Out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time today along with my distinguished colleague from Indiana, RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, a former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to call attention to an effort which has been named Operation Speak Out. I am proud to be associated with this program because I firmly believe that there are millions of people throughout this country that are prone to say nothing even though they have very different ideas on the major issues confronting our Nation. These are the people who represent the silent majority of citizens who so frequently fail to speak out.

They are never heard, unfortunately, but only the voices of the vocal minority are heard who again and again carry on their demonstrations.

As a former commander of Post 1000 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my home city of Independence, Mo., I think I know how the vast majority of the Veterans of Foreign Wars feel and I am sure they will be active all this week in participating in this patriotic program which has been designated Operation Speak Out, and the millions in the membership of 60 patriotic organizations.

Commander in Chief Ray Gallagher sent a letter to our office in which he

asked that I would lend my support to this operation, "if you are in agreement with our position." Well, of course, I am in agreement and I am proud to have this part in this discussion tonight.

There will be many who have indicated they will participate in this special order. All that we can do on the floor this afternoon is to call attention to what is going on in America not only at every post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but in every post of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, the Navy League, the Association of the Army of the United States, the Sergeants Association of the Air Force, and the Marine Corps League.

What we are trying to emphasize here this afternoon and what every member of these distinguished patriotic organizations I have named are trying to accomplish is to make the silent majority a vocal majority.

Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that in the 185 years of our history there has even been such a dramatization of the divisiveness as that which sweeps across the country today. It comes at a time when our need is also at its all-time high for unity among the people who are blessed with the privilege of living in the best clothed, best fed, best housed and best educated country in the world.

I have no intention to issue a blanket denouncement of the protests against the war in Vietnam. That war is opposed by many citizens whose patriotism is far above any impunity. Unfortunately, most of the leadership for expressing organized opposition has been provided by people whose motives are impure and whose morals are of such disrepute as to disqualify them for the rights of American citizenship and constitutional protection to which they so tenaciously cling in asserting their rights to protest. It is they who have led this country to such a state of disunity as to threaten our security and imperil our national position as a leader among nations. In doing so they have compromised the rights of those who, like myself, are weary of war and seek a way out, but without loss of honor and without rendering vain the loss of lives and the casualties we have already suffered in that conflict. The unscrupulous demonstrators have made tools of the really conscientious objectors; they have threatened to make untenable and impotent the present efforts of our President as he seeks a negotiated end to hostilities.

Out of the darkness that has enveloped the Nation because of the nonpeaceful war protests of the past 2 years, there have emerged three substantial developments from which all reasonable Americans can achieve new hope.

First. In late October, Raymond A. Gallagher, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, scheduled for the week of November 9 to 15 a national movement called Operation Speak Out. Through this observance the VFW seeks to carry to every corner of the Nation the message by which the world will be told that the people of the United States do, indeed, support their Government and their President.

Second. On November 3 the President of the United States told the Nation of the course he has plotted through which we may gain prayed-for peace in the Vietnam war and he asked for solidarity among Americans as we pursue this course.

Third. On November 6 that great American, Bob Hope, announced the formation of a committee to lead observance of a Week of National Unity, November 9 through 15. Like many of my colleagues, I have been asked to serve as a cochairman of that committee, whose objective is to urge participation in activities to display a national unity among "the great silent majority" of Americans, about whom the President had spoken last Monday night.

These three events, if successful, will focus world attention on the fact that in this country there are, among those who retire from the placard carrying, rabble rousing picket line, a great preponderance of citizens from whom there may be derived a bottomless source of assistance and support for maintaining an attitude of solidarity sufficient to put down any suggestion that America will literally retreat from her responsibilities or abandon her honor in an area where so many of her sons have fought and died.

Of special significance is VFW's Operation Speak Out. The sponsoring organization is composed of men who have known the horrors of war, the heartbreak of leaving family and home; men who have seen first-hand the tragedy of combat.

In suggesting events for observing Operation Speak Out, VFW follows a line that might be pursued by an advertising agency in making the public aware of some special promotion. It may seem unnecessary that thinking Americans be reminded of our tremendous national responsibilities and obligations. But, in total, the VFW project seeks to do this because there has been so much lack of public expression in support of the Nation's position as to suggest there is overwhelming absence of such support. To overcome this seeming indifference, and to counter the effects of those who have had much of the limelight until now, it is suggested that there be programs for the public schools for making the students more sensitive to the value of national freedom and the need for defending that priceless possession.

Basically, Operation Speak Out is to be locally implemented, with local posts and commanders undertaking responsibility for spreading the message of American unity. To do this, national headquarters has provided local commanders with a series of spot announcements for use on radio and television and suggested copy to be included in newspaper advertisements.

There can be no doubt that, as demonstrations on our streets increase in number and activity, the incidence of confidence on the part of Hanoi and her negotiators must increase. They can read the signs. They know that growing disension, as evidenced by the one-sided expressions of sentiment pertaining to our participation in the Vietnam war, must multiply the odds that they can get at the conference table the gains

they have not yet been able to win on the battlefield.

There seems to have been in this country in recent years a growing feeling that patriotic expression is passé. It has not seemed to be an "in" thing to publicly express love for country. Operation Speak Out moves to reverse this deplorable trend. They urge that especially during the week of November 9 to 15, the American flag be displayed. If I might go a little farther, I suggest that it be displayed by loyal Americans every day from now until this bitter conflict in Southeast Asia is brought to an honorable conclusion.

Let us take a moment to look at the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam or New MOBE.

One of the leaders of the moratorium movement is Dr. Benjamin Spock, who has been characterized as "the diaper rash specialist turned military strategist." Actually, Dr. Spock's ability as a military strategist seems limited to aiding in the deterioration process at home. The truth is, Dr. Spock has the colic. By a technicality, he was recently freed by an overly benevolent court of charges of advocating, aiding, and abetting draft card burning rituals. What a grand and glorious pursuit to be followed in the name of patriotism. His skills as a medical man may be unquestioned. But his philosophies as a child psychologist might be questioned. His ability as a leader of America's young manhood can be seriously challenged. He was the great preacher of permissiveness, which advocated parental disregard of childish misbehavior. His greatest fame was achieved in the 1950's when his books on child care sold by the millions. Now those children brought up by his teachings are following him into the streets to advocate American surrender. He is one of the top leaders, working through such puppets as Sam Brown, who, purportedly is a nonpolitical, dedicated conscientious war objector with no ax to grind but that of peace in America at any cost—or at all costs. The Communist newspaper Daily World delights in quoting young Mr. Brown. But no less do they quote Dr. Benjamin Spock, because Dr. Spock, according to the Internal Security Committee of the House of Representatives, is a member of the Communist-run National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the Communist-created Freedom and Peace Party. He is a sponsor of the November peace demonstrations and of the "New MOBE," successor to the Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which is also a Communist-influenced organization.

There are, of course, others very prominent in the leadership of the November demonstration, including Abbie Hoffman, Dave Dellinger, Jerry Rubin—who desecrated his country's flag by converting it to a hippy costume in which to try to ridicule a congressional function—and many others of known Communist affiliation. But Dr. Spock and his affiliations are dwelt upon here in order to illustrate how the name of a man who has been highly regarded in many households for his professional skills has degenerated from pediatric expert and

Navy lieutenant commander in World War II to the position of actively advocating the subversion of his country and taking with him thousands, and perhaps millions, of unsuspecting good Americans who have joined in the war protest for good and conscientious reasons of their own.

Dave Dellinger has said he is not a "Russian type" Communist. Is he a Chi Com or a Mao Communist? The truth is there is only one brand of communism and it is anti-American.

Dave Dellinger met at Bratislava in Czechoslovakia with Vietcong agents just before launching the "peace march" against the Pentagon in October 1969.

Dellinger met with agents in Communist Rumania just before triggering the violent demonstrations in Chicago at the time of the Democratic National Convention.

Mr. Dellinger is now a key sponsor of the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which is planning demonstrations in Washington, D.C., November 14 and 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?

One of our Washington papers said on the front page that the New Mobilization "is an umbrella for diverse antiwar groups" instead of revealing that the hard-core leadership of the New Mobilization has little relationship to any sincere U.S. peace elements?

Television was severely criticized recently by independent commissions, officials, and by many individuals, for actually inciting violence in Chicago by irresponsible reporting of the demonstrations there.

Notwithstanding 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 over-emotional reporting. The news media, printed, visual and audible can be a responsible part of Operation Speak Out if only through responsible reporting.

All the influence of new MOBE can be overcome if the Veterans of Foreign Wars can successfully promote their Operation Speak Out during this week. A successful observance will reawaken Americans all over the country to the vital necessity that they support their country and their President in the pursuit of a just and honorable peace.

The recent development I mentioned, from which Americans may take new hope for a united America was President Nixon's speech on November 3.

I am not of Mr. Nixon's party and there may be many things about which I disagree with him. But no one could agree with him more than I in his pronouncement of need for a rising chorus from the vast number of silent Americans in support of the Nation's policies, looking

for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

There are more than 200 million people in this great country. All too often a very small minority of these Americans, by banding together in a common cause, can create the impression that they speak for the majority simply because they speak, or yell more loudly, and have the mobility for getting around to many places in order to make their voices heard.

Regardless of their number, indications are that large numbers of genuine, conscience-filled Americans who joined the protesters last month will be missing from this November offensive.

I have an inborn pride in my native State, Missouri, which actually needs no prodding to be kept alive. But every so often something happens to make me fairly burst anew with pride for my State and the people who live there. There was such an event last month at Missouri University in Rolla. On an almost spontaneous basis, and with practically no leadtime for preparations, a band of students there got together on Tuesday night, October 14—on the eve of the so-called M-day of October 15—and agreed to a program of peaceful responses which led to a total rout of the Vietnam Moratorium Day protest. These thoughtful students secured practically all of the red, white, and blue ribbon available in the town, from which they made armbands for themselves. They hurriedly arranged for a booth from which these armbands could be dispensed to other students. Just about every American flag in the town was obtained for display on the campus on October 15. The Jefferson City Post-Tribune, reporting on the highly successful counterdemonstration said:

They turned M-day, which also could have been a day of ignominy, into an American day of honor to our commitments and in support of our troops who are fighting in that faraway land.

I hope "Operation Speak Out" may be just as effective nationwide.

This is the Week of National Unity effort, sponsored by a great patriot, Bob Hope.

I hate to have to admit our lack of national unity, but starting with VFW's Operation Speak Out, and moving on through the President's unifying speech of November 3 and including the efforts of Bob Hope and his Committee for a Week of National Unity, we most certainly have the makings from which our great Nation can be jolted into universal awareness of the dangers that threaten if we continue to operate in a vacuum of seemingly national indifference, permitting the mistaken impression to exist that the noisy ones in the streets speak for the majority of Americans.

In the third chapter of Mark, 25th verse, these words appear:

If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot long stand.

If those who criticize this war would go back and properly inform themselves as to how we became involved in this conflict, they might better understand the situation as it exists today. Actually, the events leading up to this day un-

folded so slowly at first, and the intertwining of U.S. interests with those of the Vietnamese people evolved so very gradually, the significance of our involvement would tend to escape us. It is not Nixon's war; nor was it Johnson's. Five U.S. Presidents, starting with Harry S. Truman, have had a part in shaping events that led us to the present point in time. It was Lyndon Johnson's misfortune to have occupied the White House at the time U.S. forces were fired upon in the Gulf of Tonkin, which precipitated us into the shooting phase of our Vietnam involvement. But the die was cast long before that night in August, 1965; it included the convention in 1962, out of which grew the Geneva accords, and it included our participation in the formulation of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. We are not in that conflict alone; several other countries are vitally concerned with an honorable resolution of the Vietnam problem. Failure to satisfactorily resolve that conflict would, without question, lead to a crumbling of a sufficient number of defenses as to provide a wide, unobstructed corridor through which communism can march to conquer all the remainder of the free world, or to a far greater conflict than that in which we are now engaged if we are to stop that march.

I am not one who insists that the war can be won by continued fighting on the battlefield. Vietnamization of the war appears to be proceeding at a pace that promises release of the United States from that involvement within the foreseeable future. Unfortunately, there seems to be no honorable alternative to continued military action by U.S. forces while this transfer of responsibility takes place and pending more progress in negotiations at the conference table. But international politics and diplomacy are extremely sensitive arts which can be influenced by a single phrase uttered by a person in high government. No less influential can be the attitude of a substantial portion of a country's population. No country can afford the luxury of popular indifference in matters affecting national security. No country can afford unlimited, unbridled abuse of the privilege of speech unchallenged, when that privilege is exercised for no purpose but to advocate surrender.

For these reasons the Veterans of Foreign Wars has sponsored Operation Speak Out, and Bob Hope has taken time from his busy schedule to head up the activities of a Week of National Unity. The people of this Nation must depart from provincialism; separatism that tends to leave the impression that we are a divided, disunited nation. We must move toward the display of a solid national front in support of the policies to which our Nation is committed by treaty and by honor. When this comes about, then the end of hostilities in Vietnam will be in sight; our troops will be withdrawn and we can turn our attentions to domestic problems and to the priorities we must meet at home.

Mr. Speaker, in this very Chamber earlier today, we were all privileged to hear the President of the United States

make some remarks about his efforts to try to obtain a just and honorable peace in Vietnam. President Nixon recounted this morning how when he first came to the Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives, he supported President Truman in his foreign policy. President Nixon pointed out how it had been his privilege to support President Truman during the Korean crisis. I mention these facts only to say that those of us who joined in the resolution which now contains over three hundred signatures of Members of the House, for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam, are not striking out on a new course or engaging in an innovation. We are simply following the course with a Republican President that was followed by many Republicans during the Truman Administration, believing that when it comes to important or vital issues of foreign policy, we become Americans first and then partisan on domestic issues. In matters of vital foreign policy bipartisan support means national unity. Let us put it this way. It is all right to differ as much and as long as one may prefer over internal or domestic issues, but when we reach the water's edge we should try hard for national unity—to resolve our differences to present a unified front not as members of either party, but as Americans.

I yield to the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his participation as well as being one of the movers of this program, and also thank the great former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) for doing what they are doing here this evening. I am honored to be listed in your company. To speak out for America is the least that we can do for those who are giving so much and sacrificing so much for our security and for the salvation of this country. The great silent masses must not remain silent. The rampant minority, the irresponsible minority, is on the move. The only way to stop them is for those who in the final analysis will lose to raise their voices and give a hand to the efforts of people like the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) and those others who are listed in this cause with them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank these gentlemen for giving me this opportunity to join with them in this noble effort of speaking out and speaking up for America. No more laudable or higher cause could you champion or promote for the salvation of America. I wish again to thank you for letting me be with you even though the hour is late. Words are too few to thank you for what you are doing. God bless you.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank my colleague for yielding and I wish to commend him for his part in this great effort to give

voice to the silent majority, a majority that is real and which does support not just our President but our country and our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, if those who are participating in the "death march," so-called, should prevail, it would indeed bring about a death march for millions of Vietnamese who seek only to be free and to exercise self-help which would be taken from them by brutal Communist force without our continuing assistance. But, because of the growing strength of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, that infant democratic republic, because of its growing capability to take over the military effort successfully, I believe our President's policy of phased withdrawal, and the step-by-step Vietnamization of the efforts of the Vietnamese will prevail and we will succeed in walking a pathway to an honorable peace, a just peace, and a lasting peace that will entail freedom and self-determination for the people of that troubled land.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri and all of those who have participated with him in this effort to give voice to the convictions of millions and millions of Americans who believe in our country and who stand behind our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I observed a moment ago that we have a past national commander of the Veterans on Foreign Wars on the floor who will have his own time and will lead a further discussion of Operation Speak Out. However, it is my privilege at this time to yield to a past national commander of the American Legion, a distinguished Member of this body and one I am proud to be associated with on the Committee on Armed Services. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the VFW for initiating this Speak Out program and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) for initiating the effort on this side of the aisle.

There is much debate about the method of disengaging in Vietnam. I favor an orderly withdrawal consistent with the safety of our men and our national security. To "bug out" or to announce a specific withdrawal date will serve the cause of neither.

I think the time has come for the silent majority to be heard.

It is true that our country has many faults or many shortcomings. But, it has been my experience in traveling on every continent except Australia, I have been persuaded in spite of these shortcomings, that we still are the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

We have an economic system which has provided for us the highest standard of living known in the world. In spite of the fact that some of our freedoms and liberties have been eroded away by court decisions, by executive agreement, by legislative procedure at the State and National levels, we still have more freedom and more liberty than any other

people with whom I have come in contact.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, to visit the battlefields in Vietnam on three occasions. I told those young men that I would take advantage of every opportunity to say something on their behalf.

It is well for all of us to remember that our young men in Vietnam are not fighting in a vacuum. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the winds of freedom have collided with the winds of slavery in that banana-shaped country hugging the coast of Southeast Asia. The future of your children and mine will be determined by which wind prevails.

Let us unite in the true American tradition to bring this horrible war to an honorable conclusion.

A few months ago there appeared in the press of America the picture of a dirty soldier in Vietnam. In his face was a desperate, haunting look, but in his eyes was a look of courage and determination. When asked by a photographer what he most wanted in the world, he merely replied, "A tomorrow—a tomorrow."

In those simple terms he represents the hope of all mankind. We all seek a tomorrow in which life will be more abundantly worth living, a tomorrow in which the principles and ideals for which they are fighting will prevail. The great challenge to all of us is to work diligently toward that tomorrow.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the fine comments of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and I want to make certain that our distinguished colleague, the former past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, will have time to present his remarks.

Although some of the comments made by those of us in the well and those who have participated in this special order have been general in nature, and have covered the thinking of those of us who believe that this is a time for national unity rather than a time for divisiveness in our country, before we conclude I think it would be most appropriate that we spell out exactly what all of our colleagues who are of like mind can do the remainder of this evening, tomorrow, tomorrow night, Saturday and Saturday evening—what exactly can be done by each of us in an effective and peaceful way of counterdemonstration? Some suggestions have been enumerated, including driving with our motorcar lights on. Another has been suggested, that there be a light of peace demonstration by turning on one's porchlights on the evening of the march to show that one is in favor of a just and honorable peace. Some of us tried to show support for Operation Speak Out by attending a Freedom Rally at the Sylvan Theater on Veterans Day, Tuesday afternoon. There were countless similar rallies across the country.

The one thing that I would suggest all of you do in the 2 days that lie ahead, and ask your families and all your friends and your constituents and everyone who you may be able to influence, is to urge

your fellow citizens to fly the Stars and Stripes on the 14th and 15th and to continue to fly them all the while the New MOBE is making its demonstrations. This is one certain, effective, and peaceful way to put on our own counterdemonstration. If enough of our friends and those of like mind across this great country of ours take this same course of action, then truly the great silent majority, by displaying their flag, wearing their flag, which quite affirmatively means showing their colors, can change the silent majority into a vocal majority. All of us can participate in Operation Speak Out by flying the flag and wearing a replica of the Stars and Stripes on our lapels and our ladies on their dresses, as an effective and peaceful showing that we are not a part of the New MOBE but are a part of Operation Speak Out.

(Mr. ICHORD (at the request of Mr. RANDALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to raise my voice on behalf of the vast majority of the American people who have too long been silent but who began during last Tuesday's Veterans Day freedom rallies to let the world know this Nation stands behind its sons in battle and its President in these most difficult times.

This week is encompassing two demonstrations nationwide, one by the New Mobilization Committee Against the War in Vietnam—abbreviated New MOBE—and the other arranged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Although there will be undoubtedly many citizens sincerely exercising their constitutional right to dissent in the New MOBE demonstrations, I can assure you that all the evidence in the case of New MOBE indicates that much of its leadership is more interested in serving the interests of Hanoi than in exercising the right of dissent. The VFW demonstration called Operation Speak Out is a program designed to encourage the silent majority to show their support to our Government and to demonstrate their belief in America by flying the U.S. flag during the entire weeklong activities of New MOBE. Operation Speak Out is being given strong support nationwide from veterans' groups and civic organizations and emphasizes the blessings of our American heritages.

If I were in the President's position, I would be pursuing a different policy in order to bring an end to America's combat participation in the Vietnam war. But my plan and the myriad of plans advanced are equally subject to criticism and possible pitfalls. Under the circumstances, I firmly believe that his course of action is reasonable and the chances of success appear good. Regardless of our party affiliation, Richard M. Nixon is the President, my President, your President, our duly elected Commander in Chief. I must support him on this issue which is so vital to the future of our Nation.

We hear much demagoguery about the war in Vietnam, much lamentation over the past mistakes of the Nation, but no responsible plans for disengagement. To

paraphrase from the words of the President, if New MOBE prevails, this Nation has no future as a free society.

Americans have never been a people to "cut and run" from any contest worth the struggle though, at the instigation of the extremist elements of the so-called New Left, some have been persuaded that "peace at any price," including surrender, is a choice they are prepared to make.

I am not prepared to consider such a choice. Neither are the people of my district and State. Missourians still believe citizenship in these United States is a sacred trust; that the inalienable rights upon which this Nation was founded carry with them very definite responsibilities; that our flag is to be honored; that our institutions are to be cherished, that freedom's cause, whether it be in some far-off land or here at home, when threatened by tyranny's aggression, is worth fighting for—and if it must come to that—worth supreme sacrifices.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen of this great land, I support our men in Vietnam and I support our President. None should remain silent in giving such support. It is America that needs our support at this time when our institutions, ideals and strength are being sorely tested by enemies and "sunshine" friends at home and abroad.

In truth, it is this land of liberty that needs our support. It is our flag which needs support. Our prayers and support should be with our men fighting and dying in the rice paddies and jungles of South Vietnam to deter Communist subversion, terrorism and aggression against people who want to be free. Our prayers and support should be with the President and his advisers as they seek "peace with honor." From this moment forward, let us again show the world the mettle of which we are made as a people born free and determined to remain so.

(Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. RANDALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in this period of special orders. All too few good Americans—the silent majority—have repeatedly spoken out as have those loud voices of the minority. However, last Tuesday, Veterans Day, thousands upon thousands of the good American participated in ceremonies across the Nation honoring the dead of our wars.

Tuesday afternoon at the Washington Monument some 15,000 Americans attended a freedom rally, sponsored by both the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the American Legion. Across the Nation the some 10,000 VFW posts participated in that organization's Operational Speak Out. The VFW called on its 1,500,000 members to fly the flag throughout this week, to drive with their headlights turned on and to participate in activities affirming the people's desire for a just peace with freedom in Vietnam and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the voice of the so-called silent majority is becoming more audible, thanks to the millions of voices rolling in

from coast to coast—voices telling us that patriotism is not dead; that our faith is not dead. During the last few days, we have heard the voices of religious and civic groups speaking from the heart of America. We have heard these voices call for unity and domestic tranquility, for peace with freedom, for peace with justice, and for peace that provides self-determination for those struggling against Communist aggression.

I am proud that we have set aside this period in order to join our voices with all those patriotic Americans who are speaking out to let the world know they support their President and their country.

#### OPERATION SPEAK OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate on this occasion—a day when we in this body express the need for unity and harmony in support of America's policy in Vietnam. My purpose in calling for these special orders is twofold: to applaud and commend those millions of patriotic Americans all over our Nation who are speaking out to combat the voices of dissent we have been hearing so much here of late; and to give us an opportunity to join our voices in support of the actions of such organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars in their "Operation Speak Out" to encourage the "silent majority" to show their support of the Government for the President's policy on Vietnam.

This body is not a 1-day-a-year organization, as we operate for the United States 365 days of the year. But I think it is most fitting and appropriate that on this day we underline and spotlight a spirit of unity and determination with regard to our commitments in Vietnam.

There are certain traditional days which Americans reserve for special celebrations and observations—days such as Christmas, Easter, Independence Day, and Veterans Day. Tuesday of this week—Veterans Day—we saw an unprecedented display of patriotism: honoring those valiant men of all wars who gave their lives for freedom, and affirming anew America's faith and determination to maintain that freedom for which so many have fought and died. I can think of nothing more important than a pause here today to speak out in tribute to our country and to true patriotism.

The voice of the so-called silent majority is becoming more audible, thanks to the millions of voices rolling in from coast to coast—voices telling us that patriotism is not dead; that our faith is not dead. During the past few days, we have heard the voices of religious and civic groups, as well as those of patriotic groups such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veterans' organizations, speaking from the heart of the America. We have heard these voices calling for unity and domestic tranquility, for peace with freedom, for peace with justice, and

for peace that provides self-determination for those struggling against Communist aggression.

This is a day when we should accentuate the positive in our country; when we should speak out on what is right about our country, our Government and our people. Despite our frailties, the good in this Nation far outweighs the bad. Unfortunately, we too seldom hear or read about the good things—for the good things rarely make the news.

The conflicts, the frictions, the brickbats make juicy stories. Constructive activities, building programs, idealistic achievements all too frequently go unnoticed and unheralded. I am confident that our good deeds, that our positive actions and the things we do which are right will eventually win out. The fact that we are all here today testifies to the determination of this body.

Today, we have over 50 million youths under the age of 25 in the United States. They look to our generation and to this body for guidance and leadership. Therefore, we must speak with a clear voice and we must use simple words.

We believe in our Government. We cherish our ideals. We stand ready to defend our freedom against all threats—foreign and domestic. We pledge our allegiance as have our forebears from generation to generation.

I congratulate my colleagues in setting aside this period as a time to speak out in support of our President and our Government. The voice of the silent majority is the voice of wisdom and strength—for it is the true voice of America. And patriotic Americans across the length and breadth of this great land are voicing their belief in America, in our leadership, and in our determination to have peace with freedom in Vietnam.

I am especially proud of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and other veterans groups this week, whose performance we witnessed with great pride. I refer to the every successful Operation Speak Out at the Washington Monument on Veterans Day. The large numbers who participated in this very moving ceremony was indicative of a much larger silent majority who support our troops in Vietnam and our President in their efforts to bring about a durable and just peace.

I commend the veterans and other patriots who spoke out in behalf of the silent majority all over the Nation on Veterans Day in city, in hamlet, in towns, and county courthouses, in cemeteries, and at memorials all over this great Nation. I commend these thousands who spoke out in support of our policy in Vietnam.

This represented a change or departure from previous years. For the first time, veterans decided it was time to speak up and be heard on these vital issues which are of such intense concern to war veterans and to every patriotic American. We commend those veterans leaders who had the foresight and initiative and took the necessary action to make this Veterans Day a day to speak up for national unity and in support of our constituted leaders.

Another favorable byproduct of this

past Veterans Day was the wide coverage provided by the national press, radio and TV. We all have seen how the television cameras seem to be present to provide full coverage for speeches and actions by those groups who would divide and weaken this Nation. We all know how the "way out" crowd gets the publicity. On Tuesday Americans were privileged to see and hear a large cross section of this Nation who stand for peace but peace with strength. These veterans leaders and other patriots who spoke on Veterans Day throughout the Nation brought a message, which, I am sure, the silent majority have been waiting to hear and wanted to hear. These veterans leaders understand why this Nation is the greatest nation on earth. These veterans leaders know that in unity there is strength. They served in previous wars. They know that the greatest morale booster for those who are doing the fighting and dying is that the people back home are supporting them. When there is division on the homefront, it is bad for the morale of the troops who are facing the enemy.

That is why I am particularly proud of all those who are participating in Operation Speak Out and National Unity Week. It is high time that the silent majority are taking the lead. Let us hope that those who would destroy this country will get the message and that the world will know that the great overwhelming majority of Americans support their President and their country in our efforts to achieve a lasting and durable peace.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS), the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) may be permitted to extend their remarks following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend of many years for yielding at this particular time. I want to congratulate him for his leadership this afternoon.

He is a great American and a great patriot. He has fought for his country and has served in every capacity that a man can serve his country, in making this a better place to live. It is the great men like our colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL), who have kept this country free and will keep it free.

I also want to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for their initiation and their leadership and other veterans organizations who

have also participated in making this day a Speak Out Day.

Our country once again has reached a time of testing. Many times throughout our history we have seen our country having to arise on occasion to protect people throughout the world as well as our own people, as well as to promote justice and peace throughout the world.

These decisions, as they have happened here at home and abroad, have not always been the most popular. They have not always been universally accepted. Once again today we see that there will be a march during this weekend, the so-called death march. On last October 15, the first moratorium, I can see how some disenfranchised, some young people who are frustrated and who did not understand the real issue might have taken part in that moratorium with all good sincerity in wanting an early peace. But since that time our President, I feel, has done an excellent job in presenting the position of this country, and the very reason we are in Southeast Asia, and a plan for bringing an early end to this terrible conflict.

It seems to me that any who would take part in the moratorium this weekend are making a grave mistake toward the peace of the world, justice, and the security of this country.

Today is a day that we are setting aside to speak out for the silent majority. Just how long that majority will remain silent we will have to see. There are more people speaking up each day now. But the great majority of people who consider themselves silent have feelings. Recently we have seen that in our visits back home. The people of this country have almost unanimously supported our President, not because he happens to belong to one political party, but because he is our President, and he is the Commander in Chief of our troops who are serving throughout the world and fighting today in South Vietnam. When they support our Commander in Chief, they are also supporting our troops who are fighting for justice and to save lives throughout the world.

The President said that our task was not an easy one, it was not a simple one, but it was the right one. How right he was when he made his statement. He further said that North Vietnam could not embarrass or defeat the United States, that only Americans could do that.

You know, our theme today is, "Speak Out." There is a delightful young group that travels throughout the country who are speaking out. "Speak Out, America," is their theme. I think that is the name of the song group. There are similar groups in various sections of the country. One of their songs is, "Which Way, America?" I think that song, "Which Way, America?" on which they do an excellent job, is a challenge for our generation and for us in this body and the vast so-called silent majority that we represent. It is not only a challenge of "which way, America?" but it is our responsibility to step forward today and say, "This way, America." I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, some of us who love our

country, our flag, and all of its traditions and are not ashamed of letting it show, are called superpatriots. For those people who do not get a chill running up and down their spine when they see Old Glory ripple in the breeze or sense of deep pride when they hear the "Star Spangled Banner," I have only sympathy. I am proud to be called a patriot. I am proud of my country and those things it stands for, peace, liberty, justice, and opportunity.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), not only for the generosity of his remarks, but also for the fine contribution he has made during our "Speak Out, America," special order today.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH), for his taking this particular time at this particular point in history to express himself not only as a former national commander, but as a great American. I know the gentleman from Indiana is not comfortable in the Well. He carries with him some of the scars of a previous conflict in which he risked his life many times for the preservation of the very freedom that we are talking about here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we witnessed here today a unique experience in having the President of the United States, with very little notice, address this body. A great and a grateful President came to this body, the House of Representatives, where he served 22 years ago, and he thanked the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for giving him a very definite vote of confidence in his efforts to win the peace.

I happen to have been honored to be one of the bipartisan group of Members of Congress who went to the White House yesterday afternoon, at which time we were able to present to the President of the United States the news that over 300 of the Members of this body, a substantial majority, had introduced a resolution to support the President's position, and to back him up on the remarks that he made Monday night, November 3. That was a grateful President that came to the House today to acknowledge this and to thank us for demonstrating the unity that has made America a great country.

On the occasion of our visit to the White House last evening the President was quite enthused about this expression of confidence by the Members of the House—and, of course, the 300 or so Members who represent millions of American people—and we had with us also representatives of the other body where, I believe 59 Senators have indicated their support of the President's position to win the peace. This was a thrilling experience, of course, to the President, and he, in our presence, called our Ambassador in Paris, Henry Cabot Lodge, and had the Members of

the House—Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois; and Mr. ADAIR of Indiana—talk to the Ambassador and to give him the news in order that he might be fortified in his negotiation with the enemy to express the freedoms. America is indeed speaking out, Mr. Speaker, and I again commend the gentleman from Indiana for making it possible for the Members to so express themselves.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Ohio.

As we proceed with this debate, I want again to emphasize that is not the result of the effort of me or any one person. Certainly I pay the warmest respects to my very dear friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) for the very good job he did in organizing the speakers on his side of the aisle.

Also, as I commented, we had, on Tuesday, Veterans Day in this country. As I saw the parades—and there were three big ones in the district I represent in Indiana—I never saw banners of any one organization or any one group predominating over the other. It was a joint effort of all the great veterans organizations.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) for the splendid remarks he has made today.

Also I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) for the special order he took today and for his timely and appropriate remarks.

Certainly this is a worthwhile and wonderful project, this Operation Speak Out. As I understand it, it has been sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the other veterans organizations. Certainly they should be commended for pushing this project we are engaged in.

I know the gentleman in the well is a former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I understand the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is a former State officer in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also a former post commander in his State of Missouri. I might say I have the honor of being a member of one of the largest posts in the South, located in my home State of Mississippi.

I do not think patriotism is dead. I think these two hours we have secured may have the effect of waking up and stirring up patriotism. I feel it. I know other people across the land and other people in Congress certainly feel it. One example, Mr. Speaker, is the number of Members of Congress and the people, so-called, who work on the Hill who are wearing a great number of American flags. I used to wear a fraternity pin, but now I am wearing the American flag, and I am going to continue to wear it for a good while.

If the gentleman in the well will yield further, I would like to make one brief

comment. I had the opportunity on Veterans Day, last Tuesday, of going to Walter Reed Army Hospital, where I visited some of the young men from my State and from all over the country who have been wounded in Vietnam. There is no question about it, it is a bad war. People get hurt and are defaced and lose arms and legs. But the young men I talked to were in good spirits and had no bitterness toward anyone. They wanted to start a new life and wanted to do anything they could to improve this country. As far as I could tell—and I was there for a couple of hours and talked to them—and from what I could observe of these men, including those who had horrible wounds, I never did see any type of sadness. They said: "Well, I am sorry I did not get to go home on Veterans Day, but I think maybe I am going to get home on Thanksgiving. I am looking forward to getting back home and starting a new life."

So, Mr. Speaker, the people who have paid the most for the war in Vietnam, in my opinion, are not the ones who are griping and causing trouble. These young men want to get back and start a new life and make a new adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his comments. I think as the gentleman removed the fraternity pin from his lapel and placed the flag in its place, he joined the great fraternity of all Americans.

Certainly, I too, want to comment on the patriotism and the spirit shown by these young men in our veterans and in our service hospitals.

Certainly I believe that no one could more conscientiously object against war than the man who has fought in a war. The man who has fought in a war is honestly an objector against war, because none of us like the bloodshed and the suffering that becomes a part of a war.

The strange thing to me, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, is the great hue and cry in this country is mainly from men who never heard the first rifle crack or never suffered with their comrades on the field of battle.

I certainly commend the gentleman on his fine statement, and I appreciate very much his joining in these remarks.

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

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

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had not intended to take any part in the special orders here tonight, but I do want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle for making this time possible. I do want to associate myself with what has been said here tonight.

Some years ago I read a speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have absolutely no idea now who made the speech. I recall nothing in the body of the speech. But I do remember the last portion of that speech, and I should like to read that. I hope I have it just about the way it was given:

Someone must mix the mortar.

Someone must gather the stone.  
For neither the man nor the master  
Has ever built alone.

In building a roof for the lowly,  
Or a palace for the king,  
It is only by working together  
That we will ever accomplish a thing.

During recent days I believe we have observed a unanimity rarely experienced among the Members of this body. We have not been Republicans or Democrats, we have been Americans. In times of crises this is as it should be. Americans always rise above partisanship when the occasion demands.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I certainly want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I might say that his remarks remind me of one thing. I have spent 9 years now in the House of Representatives, and I have come to the rather complete conclusion that no party has any corner on patriotism or intelligence. I certainly commend my colleagues on the Democratic side as well as my colleagues on the Republican side. I believe that this message here in the well of the House tonight, as well as that delivered by my good friend from Missouri, will be well heard throughout this Nation.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished friend and colleague, Commander DICK ROUDEBUSH, for requesting this time. I am delighted to join him in speaking out in support of our President and in support of our men in Vietnam.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are doing their country a great service in sponsoring Operation Speak Out and giving concerned Americans a forum to express their disagreement with the demonstrators and protesters.

Our President needs and deserves the support of every American who wants to see an early conclusion to the conflict in Vietnam. Those who take to the streets merely add to the resolve of a stubborn enemy which has disregard for human lives. Those who give aid and comfort to the enemy are not in favor of peace. They prolong the war and the killing.

The moratorium demonstration in Washington is a blueprint for a future attempt at anarchy. It is a blueprint for the overthrow of legitimate governments elected by the people.

This demonstration is not the way to legislate, promote peace, or change foreign policy. It is a blatant attempt to force by sheer weight of numbers and demonstrations a change in national policy. It is pressure. It is a form of force which is a dangerous precedent—dangerous to the legislative processes and representative government. It is a threat to the President's constitutional power, duties, and responsibilities. It is an attempt to reduce the President of the United States to a cringing vassal, a stooge of mobs and demonstrators. If the President and the Congress can be pressured by mobs and demonstrations, then freedom and orderly legislative processes will become a mockery and a fraud.

This demonstration is directed at the wrong place, the wrong people, and the wrong time. Its petitions and demands

should be directed to Hanoi, Moscow, and Peiping. The United States has made every effort to negotiate a just and honorable peace. We have called off the bombings. We have slowed the military tempo in South Vietnam. We have done everything possible only to be met with ridicule, epithets, and refusals to negotiate. The Communists in Paris and Hanoi could stop this war in 1 hour by agreeing to a simple cease-fire.

The demonstrators are demanding free elections in South Vietnam. They have had free elections. Eighty-two percent of the voters voted under the threat of death from the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. The government in Saigon is a legitimate government elected by the people. The demonstrators should demand free elections in North Vietnam, China, and Czechoslovakia.

It was the imperial warlords of Japan's designs on Vietnam, Indochina, and Southeast Asia that led to a strong stand by the United States and subsequently the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. If ever there was a nation in the history of the world which had a responsibility in Southeast Asia and Asia, it is the United States of America. Our blood and our money saved all of the Far East from aggression during World War II.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the Veterans of Foreign Wars—those who know firsthand the horrors of war—in speaking out in support of our men in Vietnam. I support the President and call on all Americans for unity. Standing together, united, we can secure a just and honorable peace in Southeast Asia. Demonstrations encourage aggression and a continuation of the war which could mean disaster and could lead to a nuclear holocaust.

I am pleased to join in Operation Speak Out and commend these patriotic and good thinking VFW members who are sponsoring it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the world, and particularly Hanoi, should be shown without equivocation that the great majority of the people of the United States do support their Government. The world, and particularly Hanoi, should be shown now that the great majority of the people of the United States do support our troops in Vietnam.

This week, as the organized and directed protests try to force decisions in the streets rather than in the time-honored process of democratic rule, it is imperative that those of us who do represent the great majority of sincere, patriotic, concerned Americans, speak out and speak out clearly to define for those who do not understand our ways, the nature of dissent.

Our process, our system of free and independent press, and the penchant of television and other media to focus on the dramatic may mislead those who do not understand. They may believe that those in the streets speak for the majority.

We who do understand know better, but too seldom do we challenge the demonstrators. The issue is not war or peace—the issue is whether our leaders can, by pressures from a vocal minority who know how to perform for TV cam-

eras, be forced to hasty decisions. I do not believe they can.

The demonstrators seek to claim the desire for peace as their sole right. Let them know that those of us who know the havoc of war first have had a stronger desire for peace and the end of strife than do any who are inclined to follow the directions of some of dubious intent. Peace is not the issue. We all want peace. No thinking American wants American men to die in foreign lands needlessly. But lessons of history, the known intent of the monsters in Hanoi, and the total stability of the world are the basis for our commitment. And until the policy of this Government is changed by changed conditions, then I feel that to undermine and weaken those brave Americans who represent this Nation in Vietnam is not only misguided but nearing on treason.

There are ways, powerful ways, to express dissent to a Government policy without taking to the streets and following the lead of those whose intent is questionable to say the least. Let me quote from the words of Raymond A. Gallagher, commander in chief of the VFW:

It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective. Their expressions of dissent and protest provide the North Vietnamese with reason to believe that they can achieve the victory our men in uniform are denying them on the battlefield through a split in our ranks on the home front.

Never in the history of our nation has there been a greater need for national unity and support of our constituted leaders. The withholding of traditional bipartisan Congressional support from the President in the conduct of foreign policy can only serve to undercut his bargaining strength with our enemies and diminish his status among our friends.

I want to commend the VFW and the other civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations who are sponsoring "Operation Speak Out." I join them in speaking out in support of our policy our Government, and most particularly those gallant men who are carrying out their orders in Vietnam and elsewhere where freedom is threatened.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I read my mail. If I were not already in full support of our President in his herculean effort to obtain an honorable peace in Vietnam, I would be worrying a little bit. Indiana's Eighth Congressional District listened to what President Nixon had to say as he addressed the Nation on Vietnam. And the response was overwhelmingly in favor of his course of action.

My district has long been regarded as a bellweather reflector of the national mood. Apparently it still is. Housewives, businessmen, farmers, office secretaries, high school students—have written in great numbers in response to what the President had to say—and they are decidedly in his corner. They are fed up with peace marches which serve only to disrupt not unify national sentiment.

They are tired of the minority of Americans who, though they may be well motivated, serve unwittingly the cause of Hanoi, Moscow, and Peking. These folks see the October moratorium as a great disservice to our young men who are still on the combat field being subjected to the renewed strength of an enemy that takes heart from the expressions of dissent in our land. They write concerned letters straight from the heart and ask that I, as their representative, support President Nixon as he chooses to follow the difficult road to peace.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to honor the wishes of this not-so-silent majority which has finally had enough of anti-war demonstrations. This other point of view has written me, too, and I respect their views. But their's are not mine and I cannot march to their drummer. Our national purpose must be for me as it is for the President.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the advance elements of the expected swarm of 200,000 demonstrators have descended upon the capital city of the American Republic. It has put a cloud upon the life of the city, indeed, of the entire country.

But the darkest cloud of all is now beginning to form, and will hang over the heads of the demonstrators—each and every one. It is the greatest element of tragedy in this whole senseless business. No one knows whether the march will be peaceful, or whether there will be violence. No one knows if the demonstrators will conduct themselves with the proper amount of decency and respect for their Nation's Capital, for its buildings, for its beauty, for its peace, and for its officials and leaders—and, I might add, for their millions of fellow Americans, as well, for this city is a truly national city that belongs to all of us.

No—the major tragedy, this darkest cloud of all, of which I speak, was something we knew was sure to come. At the very time the first demonstrators were arriving here in the city, North Vietnam's ambassador to the Paris peace talks spoke smugly and confidently of the "strong wave of protest in American public opinion," and made it plain Hanoi is counting on this and other demonstrations to end the war—on Hanoi's terms.

I do not, cannot, and will not question the sincerity and devotion of many thousands who will come to Washington. But I do question, for I cannot, myself, understand, how their consciences—and we hear much from them of appeals to "conscience" with the influence always being that only they have such a thing as a conscience and that their Government and their fellow Americans do not—how their consciences let them take this stigma, this blight, upon what they do.

Observers who in no sense of the word can be called "conservative" have charged flatly and openly that the demonstration has been planned since summer by, and I quote directly, "advocates of violent revolution in the United States who openly support Communist forces in Vietnam," and containing among them past and present Communist Party members and supporters of the Vietcong.

Here, then, is the real tragedy. Deception of the gullible; seduction of the in-

nocent; duping the well-meaning; betraying the truly conscientious; perversion of the qualities of humanity and compassion that I know exist in the hearts and minds of many demonstrators.

We can forgive much, we Americans, for we are an openhearted, generous, forgiving, and tolerant people. Anyone questioning this has only to look at our actions with regard to defeated, subjugated enemies following both world wars.

But I think we are probably more forgiving, and more likely to extend this quality of patience and tolerance, to outright enemies who had made no secret of their intentions to destroy us and all we hold, rather than to our own fellow citizens who have let their dedication align them with forces of destruction.

It is an indelible stain that can never be erased. Shakespeare has Lady Macbeth shriek her despair when she realizes that blood guilt cannot ever be erased from her hands. I believe the day will come when these same people of whom I speak today will, like Lady Macbeth, realize in horror that what they have unwittingly done has imprinted them with this same mark.

Yes, blood guilt. Hanoi is applying a dictum first enunciated by Frederick the Great in 1747:

The art of war is divided between force and strategem. What cannot be done by force must be done by strategem.

Force alone—continued killing of American soldiers in Vietnam—is matched with strategem—playing on the credulity of Americans at home.

More tragic than the spectacle of a city virtually under siege; more tragic than the spectacle of an outright traitor who deserts and actively works against his native land; more tragic than the adherence to the foolish idea of making a country's foreign policy by use of street mobs; more tragic than all of these is the defilement of honor and abasement of wisdom among our own people.

As the preacher, in Ecclesiastes X, 1, said so well:

Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour; so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour.

A little folly; a great tragedy; a lifetime of remorse.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend and colleague from Indiana. There should be no mistake in the minds of the leaders of North Vietnam that today's events represent the real feelings of the average American. This is simply a well-coordinated propaganda attempt by Hanoi, with assistance from other Communist nations, to snatch a political victory from the jaws of military defeat. To do this they are playing upon the natural weariness and frustrations of the American people over the conflict in Vietnam. It is an effort to divide the American people over the issue just when real progress is being made in Vietnam. It is a great source of regret to many of us here in the Congress that well-meaning people are being caught up in this further attempt to pressure the President into abandoning

South Vietnam forthwith. The demands of some of the people who are sponsoring these events amount to little more than complete capitulation to Communist aggression. This we cannot allow to happen. This would make just as much sense as disbanding our police forces because the people are weary of attempting to fight crime. Do some of the critics really want the kind of peace in Vietnam that would be imposed by North Vietnam? When Ho Chi Minh took over North Vietnam 15 years ago, he murdered more than 50,000 people and thousands more died in his slave labor camps. Vietcong terrorist activities indicate it would be no different in South Vietnam. Now, more than ever, we need to show strong support of the President in his search for a just peace in Vietnam.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, today begins the second in the series of antiwar protests that have been labeled moratorium day. If this is moratorium day, I wish that somebody would tell the North Vietnamese about it. Just a few days ago, American troops captured documents on North Vietnamese soldiers which called for a new wave of attacks against American troops to coincide with these demonstrations. Not only are the demonstrators giving aid and comfort to the enemy, but their actions are encouraging renewed fighting at a time when there has been a significant lull in hostile activity.

I do not believe that any of the people who will be in the streets participating in these protests would wish the consequences of their actions to result in the death of one American soldier. Some of the demonstrators are sincere in their desire to bring our troops home. Many of them undoubtedly have husbands, sons, and friends in Vietnam, but apparently they do not understand that the irresponsible actions which they are taking, and which their leaders espouse, are not only making the peace negotiations more difficult, but are, in effect, urging the North Vietnamese to increase their fighting efforts against our own boys.

I am pleased to join Congressman ROUBENBUSH and others here today who represent the great majority of Americans who support this country's efforts to bring a stable government and a lasting peace to Vietnam. The President of the United States has called upon the people of this country to stand behind him as he undertakes the most difficult role in the world—the role of peacemaker. We are supporting both the peace efforts and our young men in Vietnam when we support him.

The country evidenced much of that support in the wave of Veterans Day activities which occurred all over the Nation on Tuesday. I was gratified to see the large number of people who participated in honoring this country's men and women in uniform here in the Nation's Capital. Over 10,000 people turned out to express an old-fashioned love of country and support of this country's efforts in Vietnam. But even more important than this large demonstration were the literally thousands of planned Veterans Day activities in large and small communities throughout the land.

In my own State of Alabama, many

cities followed the example set by Birmingham and held parades under colorful avenues of flags. The streets of Alabama cities were lined with hundreds of American flags waving in the November breezes. It was a beautiful sight to behold, and the streets were crowded with people who turned out to say thank you and express pride in our servicemen and veterans.

Thank you is an expression we do not hear too much of today. But the people of this great country do appreciate our servicemen and resent very much those who engage in name-calling and disruptive activities which dishonor the democratic processes and freedom that they have fought to preserve.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana for obtaining this special order to speak in support of President Nixon's policies in Vietnam. I share the President's desire for peace as does the gentleman from Indiana. The President wisely has elected to pursue the quest for peace on terms other than those dictated by Hanoi. A majority of the Congress has already voiced its support of the President's policies. Despite the action of an articulate and demonstrative minority, I am convinced that an overwhelming majority of the American people support the President's Vietnam policy.

This period in American history is unique. It is a period of radical departure from those days when our citizens, as their ancestors before them, quietly went about the business of earning a living, raising a family, playing a responsible role in their communities—and answering the call to arms when their freedom was challenged.

This day and age call for a different kind of involvement—it is a call for all of America's responsive, responsible citizens to speak out in defense of freedom, in defense of our Government, our Constitution, and our President.

This week in rallies and ceremonies across the Nation, millions of Americans, including 3 million veterans, have responded to the call and have spoken out in one positive, patriotic voice in support of our position in Vietnam, and in support of our President and our Government. The Nation's veterans organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and others, are to be commended for sponsoring and encouraging this outpouring of support.

It is a special privilege for me to join with those millions of other Americans who take pride in our country—those normally silent Americans who have found it necessary to speak out on the grave situation that faces America today and to renew their pledge of allegiance to the flag and to the country for which it stands.

It is my earnest hope that the voices of millions of patriotic Americans across the land will be heard by those who are fighting for our freedom and the freedom of our allies, and by those who would destroy us. Then they will know we stand for freedom with justice for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once remarked:

I like to see a person proud of the place in which he lives and then so live that the place will be proud of him.

The vast majority of our citizens are proud of this great Nation of ours, and our country has reason to be proud of them.

I am proud that we have set aside this period in order to join our voices with all those patriotic Americans who are speaking out to let the world know they support their President and their country.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans are marching this weekend to Hanoi's tune. The background music is that of tormented imprisoned souls in communism. These marches are a blight on the image of this country, and they are a help to the enemy.

These people make a lot of noise, the kind of sound that Hanoi likes. Many good innocent Americans have joined this march. But regardless of whether or not they know what they are doing, they are nevertheless giving aid and comfort to the enemy of everything we hold dear. They are doing damage to peace efforts, and their efforts in the past have prolonged the war.

These people are again being congratulated by Hanoi. Hanoi knows that their actions are more responsible for large death lists of American soldiers on the field than even Hanoi troops.

Hanoi radio said today that North Vietnam peace organizations "warmly welcome and support" this week's antiwar demonstrations in the United States.

The leaders of this weekend's demonstrations are a weird assortment of extremists, Communists, radicals, and militant leftists.

It is no wonder that many of our colleagues who supported the October 15th moratorium have now disassociated themselves with the present demonstrations. It is my opinion that those promotorium Congressmen have heard from home, and also they now know the true character of the leaders, and the motive for the demonstrations.

Let us take one example. Dave Dellinger is one of the chief sponsors of this weekend's demonstrations.

This Dave Dellinger is the same person who met with agents of Communist Rumania just before triggering the violent demonstrations in Chicago at the time of the Democratic National Convention.

He is the same Dave Dellinger who met in Czechoslovakia with Vietcong agents just before launching the "peace march" against the Pentagon.

It is disturbing to me to see hundreds of well-meaning protestors being led by such people, who are working hand in hand with Hanoi.

Our soldiers in Vietnam cannot understand how we can allow these demonstrations which would in past days have been judged outright treason. Those fighting our battles in Vietnam are deeply hurt by such actions as their fellow soldiers are cut to the ground by an enemy being aided by folks at home.

The next of kin of deceased men who give their lives in Vietnam are insulted that these "peaceniks" read the names

of their sons in public. They ask, "What can we do?"

Many mothers, fathers, and wives of deceased servicemen have traveled for a long distance to request the MOBE to refrain from reading the name of their son or husband. It is a disgrace that people, who have already given so much, would have to humiliate themselves to retrieve the names of their deceased servicemen.

I have today introduced legislation that would prohibit the use of the names of certain deceased servicemen unless consent is given by the next-of-kin.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

#### ADDRESS BY SPEAKER MATHIAS BEFORE THE MARYLAND FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 24, my former colleague and good friend, Senator "MAC" MATHIAS, addressed the Maryland Federation of Republican Women. He spoke of the pressing need for immediate draft reform and President Nixon's efforts to revise the Selective Service System. I think the topic and Senator MATHIAS' remarks warrant the attention of my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives and therefore, insert the text of his speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today:

#### REMARKS OF SENATOR MATHIAS

President Nixon last week achieved a major political breakthrough. I do not refer to his welfare reform—a program that promises to revolutionize the current welfare system, nor to his revenue sharing proposal, that the New York Times has called potentially the most important reform in a generation. Both of these Presidential proposals are of overwhelming import and I am co-sponsoring both in the Senate. But they are both programs that have never before been introduced with Presidential support; and Nixon's welfare, or workfare, program is a unique product of his Administration. The resistance to these initiatives has yet to be tested. The breakthrough I mean—and I celebrate—is the success in the House Armed Services Committee of the President's proposals for reform of the draft.

The President's ideas seem so logical that it is hard to believe their acceptance—by a vote of 33-0—represents a major and unexpected triumph. Only those who have for years been fighting for draft reform, and watched previous Presidents establish endless commissions to study the problem—and observed General Hershey manipulate the commission's data so that it would confirm the status quo; only those who have seen the House restrict discussion on student deferments to just 45 seconds—yes, you heard me—45 seconds for this question of life and death importance to every young man—only someone who has been long engaged in this battle—will recognize the dimensions of the President's achievement; The probable replacement of General Hershey with general reform of Selective Service.

Nixon's action was accompanied with effective elimination of the calls for November and December. When the President blew the whistle, Selective Service was gobbling up manpower at a rate even higher than last

year. If calls had continued, the 1969 total would have exceeded 1968 by over 50,000.

Of course the President did not do it alone and of course the battle is not yet over. The Republican platform in both 1964 and 1968 advocated creation of a volunteer military. And widespread disaffection of young people and their parents with the present system's inequities also made Nixon's job easier.

The issue was not whether all young men should serve their country. For the draft never used more than one half of all those eligible and the eligible total was only slightly over half of all those examined, since almost 50 percent is excluded on physical or mental grounds. The issue was the capriciousness of the system of exemptions and choices that compromised the lives of all young men whether they were drafted or not. A healthy young man might well not be drafted (it would depend on where he lived and the level of the quota). But the possibility—impending for almost a decade after he finishes school—meant that he was at a disadvantage in competing for jobs with those who were 4-F or otherwise exempt. It was hard to plan sensibly for marriage—many either rushed into it in hope of exemption; or delayed in anticipation of a call that might never come. Thus, the draft not only affects its immediate victims—it casts a shadow over the marriage and career choices of all eligible young men.

The shadow of the draft, moreover, stretches well beyond our young men to affect all our citizens. I receive countless letters from constituents of all ages—from small children who cannot understand why their teacher gets taken in the middle of the year; and from elderly employers who lose key personnel at age 25 just as they become most valuable. Last week I got a letter from a teacher in Calvert County who was pulled from the classroom and is now studying Vietnamese in Fort Bliss, Texas. Then as an unfortunate symbol of our national priorities, there is the drafting of Peace Corps Volunteers. These young people work for subsistence pay in foreign countries and often suffer conditions worse than those endured by all but combat troops. Yet they often are called home right out of the field where they have learned the language and are contributing uniquely to our foreign goals.

These policies have produced the deep cynicism felt by many American young people toward the Selective Service System. This system worked well during World War II when nearly everyone served. It is out-of-date today. It has been obsolescent for many years. But only Nixon acted to change it—and talked tough to Congress to have it changed. He said if Congress didn't act, he would act himself to reform the system as much as possible by executive order. The Armed Services Committee responded to his challenge by the astounding vote of 33-0.

Nixon's reform proposals closely resemble a bill I introduced in the House two years ago and this year again in the Senate. The key provisions are one year eligibility, youngest first, and random selection, often called a lottery. Young men would become eligible for one year only, either at age 19 or after graduation from college. The draft board would still interrupt the plans of many youths, but it would no longer cast a heavy shadow over their early careers, hang a sword—or at least a board—of Damocles over their lives for nearly a decade.

This change is vital to restore the faith of youth in the integrity and rationality of the American system. For very many young men, induction is the first ceremony of citizenship. The present inequities of the draft contribute significantly to the spirit of civil cynicism evident on many campuses.

Beyond the Nixon proposals, the Senate

bill introduced by Senator Schweiker, myself and eight others, including our new Minority Leader Senator Scott, includes provisions for national standards and for a national manpower pool. These measures are designed to overcome the great discrepancies currently existing between local boards in different sections of the country. Together these proposals go a long way to remove current inequities and to fulfill the Republican campaign pledges of 1964 and 1968.

The draft can never be really fair, however, as long as less than one-half of each age group is needed by the military. Secretary Laird has pointed out that even during the period of highest demand for Vietnam, only half the eligibles were called. If we return to pre-1965 levels, only one-third will be needed. And if we adopt the troop reduction proposals now contemplated by the Administration, less than 25 percent of our eligible young men will ultimately be required to serve.

Under these conditions, a lottery might seem technically fair to those who run it. But it will not seem fair to the relatively small number who lose. Nixon's draft commission study has disclosed a preliminary finding that we will soon be able to move to a volunteer military at a reasonable cost. Our party is on record for such a shift and the Nixon Administration is moving toward such a system.

The Administration's draft proposals compromise just one of several major new initiatives in its excellent legislative program. While public attention has focused on other matters—from Vietnam to Supreme Court appointments—the President has proposed a quiet revolution in the course of American policy. Included are proposals for retrenchment in Vietnam, military cutbacks, revenue sharing, tax reform, and a complete overhaul of welfare. When the Administration succeeds in directing the attention of the people toward these initiatives—and away from unnecessary controversies and divisions—I think the public will recognize that it has a potentially great new President. And my confidence in the Administration in these areas gives me a spirit of great optimism for the country as we confront this age of crisis. The willingness at last to face the inequities of the draft, as well as welfare and revenue distribution—after years of a kind of draft evasion on the part of previous Administrations—symbolizes a new Republican spirit of confrontation in Washington—confronting problems rather than people. And I hope this new spirit will dominate the Administration and uplift the national spirit in years to come.

#### SOLUTION TO PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL AIRPORT AT BOWIE, MD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, I stated in a press conference that I had personally discussed with the President of the United States, the question of the proposed industrial airpark at Bowie, Md. The President instructed his aides to see what could be done to block its construction.

At the same conference, I stated that I would make an alternate proposal. This is my intent today.

What is hoped for by the proponents of the airpark can be accomplished by the alternate proposal, and, at the same time, all that is objectionable to the opponents can be removed.

Allow me to review the situation briefly and to reiterate my reasons for opposition. More than ever, I am convinced that my position has been, and is, correct. The proposed airpark would be a hazard to those residents nearby and it would be unsafe for air operations.

In my contention concerning the unsafe condition for air operations I am supported by some very substantial authorities—two Secretaries of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force and officials at Andrews Air Force Base, and the mayor and city council of Bowie, Md.

As far back as December 30, 1968, the then Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, wrote to the then Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, as follows:

Since September 1967, when we first became aware of the Prince Georges Airport proposal, we have endeavored to halt the project. . . . In our opinion, the location selected for this airport presents an unacceptable hazard to safety of flight, and portends operational delays to military traffic at Andrews Air Force Base. Axiomatically, this would also be true of Prince Georges Airport traffic. Essentially, our concern is that construction of this airport will initially interject an increasingly large volume of uncontrolled visual flight rule air traffic through existing arrival and departure paths serving Andrews. Safety would hinge upon the precarious principle of "see and avoid." In the mid-seventies it is expected that the instrument flight rule operations will reach a considerable volume at the proposed airport. The relatively small vectoring airspace, which is now barely adequate for Andrews operations, will be further eroded.

I want you to keep in mind the particular quote from the letter that in the mid-seventies "instrument flight rule operations will reach a considerable volume at the proposed airport," because I shall show how important this is to the view I hold in opposition.

In February 1969, the present Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, wrote on this question to Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe:

Secretary Boyd responded to a letter from Secretary Clifford, dated December 30, 1968, which expressed concern with the Federal Aviation Administration endorsement of a new airport in the vicinity of Andrews Air Force Base. After detailed review of this correspondence, I am convinced that the establishment of Prince Georges County Airport within eight miles of Andrews Air Force Base would constitute a serious flight safety hazard. The site selected for this airport lies immediately below the departure and arrival routes serving Andrews Air Force Base which would cause high performance aircraft to intermingle with slower general aviation aircraft. The large increase of uncontrolled general aviation aircraft operating in the vicinity of Andrews Air Force Base would greatly increase the possibility of mid-air collision. Takeoffs, landing, and low approaches at Andrews Air Force Base exceed 200,000 annually. Of these operations, it is estimated that approximately 55% would traverse the Prince George's County Airport traffic area.

In this letter I call to your special attention the danger of midair collision specifically by uncontrolled general aviation aircraft as referred to by Secretary Laird. I shall discuss this later.

In addition to these two letters, I have the clear opposition by the Air Force in a letter to me from Secretary of the Air

Force, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., dated July 22 of this year. Secretary Seamans writes:

The proposal of additional air traffic in one of the most heavily congested sectors in the United States and in close proximity to three nearly saturated airports would compound safety problems. Additionally, severe restrictions would be imposed on Air Force operations at Andrews. Departure routes would be complicated and restricted from those currently in existence. Arrivals would be delayed because Andrews traffic would alternate with instrument flight rules traffic at Prince Georges County Airport. Terminal approach procedures would be more complicated and more difficult to execute. Paradoxically, it was for these basic reasons the Air Force and Navy moved their flying operations to Andrews from the Bolling-Anacostia complex at the request of the Federal Aviation Administration several years ago.

On September 30, 1969, the Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration, issued a notice of proposed rulemaking for "terminal control areas." Of the 22 major cities listed, Washington is among them with such a plan to be implemented here after January 1, 1970.

The plan seeks to create positive control airspace for heavily trafficked areas, such as our Washington airports. My concern with the FAA proposal is with the area adjacent to Andrews which is under this terminal control plan.

As proposed by the FAA, the control airspace looks like an inverted layer wedding cake. To this concept I addressed myself in a telegram to Secretary Volpe directing his attention to the question of air safety as it concerned Andrews Air Force Base operations and the location of the Prince George's airpark.

Simply stated, the overhang, which is a terminal control area, is at 1,500 feet, mean sea level—MSL—of altitude and this is directly over the proposed airpark. The control area then rises to 3,000 feet MSL at which altitude it extends out further to rise to 7,000 feet MSL. The higher altitudes are of no concern with the airpark. What I questioned was the area of airspace to be controlled at 1,500 feet which means, in effect, that aircraft from the proposed airpark will have a ceiling restriction imposed on them. At that point, the distance from Andrews is approximately 10 nautical miles. General aviation will be restricted from penetrating the controlled airspace unless they carry special equipment—the transponder. This permits the craft to be identified by the radar beacon. In addition, any aircraft operating in the control area must have a two-way radio. Further restrictions state that no pilot can take off or land in a terminal control area unless he holds a private pilot certificate. This means that student pilots would be unable to penetrate that airspace. Without the equipment I have mentioned as required under the FAA plan, an aircraft could penetrate the airspace, especially if it is operating from an airport which is right on the boundary of the controlled airspace area as is the proposed Prince George's County Airpark.

It is safe to assume that student pi-

lots would probably constitute a majority of the offenders. Then, also, there is the question of that restricted ceiling of 1,500 feet over the airpark. This means that for all practical purposes small craft would have about 1,000 feet of vertical airspace in which to operate. They cannot fly at low level nor would they be at the 1,500-foot maximum altitude as they would want to maintain a buffer to the restricted overhanging controlled airspace.

This was the essential text of my telegram to Secretary Volpe concerning the new terminal control plan and Prince George's Airpark. However, since that communication, the Air Force has evaluated the plan and is considering an expansion of the proposed controlled airspace to the north at the 1,500 feet to 7,000 feet levels, 18 nautical miles from the outer circle of the control area, 30 degrees east thence west to the edge of the Beltsville Airport. This is a sizable increase in controlled airspace under the plan but, more important for our particular considerations, is the fact that it is completely over the proposed airpark. The Air Force has requested this additional area in order to guarantee better and safer approaches to Andrews Air Force Base.

By no means is the FAA proposal without other critics. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association state in a position paper:

The FAA proposal for traffic management around major airports is a hodgepodge of shapes, sizes and attitudes. Not only would such a shape be difficult to identify and remain clear of, it would also "bunch" traffic into narrow areas at concentrated entry points and narrow altitudes.

Now we return to the points I emphasized earlier from the letters of Secretaries Clifford and Laird.

The proposed airport is intended to serve general aviation and student pilot training. Secretary Clifford clearly defines the hazard to Andrews as "slower general aviation aircraft" and, in respect to midair collision such aircraft would be described as "uncontrolled." Add to this student pilots and the peril is compounded.

As stated by the planners, the airport is intended for general aviation. The term is deceptive if one thinks that aircraft in that category are only the small ones. From the proposed runway length of 5,400 feet one can conclude that it is intended to land larger aircraft at the Prince George's County Airpark. The FAA has stated that the county commissioners plan to increase this runway to 7,000 feet.

If this proposed airpark is intended to be of any value of any industrial area nearby, it must be able to land all types of aircraft in all-weather conditions. Today, industry and business have large high-performance aircraft in their fleets—some of identical type to those used by commercial carriers.

This leads me to another important point: Such aircraft require all-weather landing systems or instrument flight rules—IFR—equipment. This complicates the situation, as Secretary Laird pointed out in his letter when he referred

to the IFR operations in the midseventies at the proposed airport. Because IFR conditions obviously demand more precision flying because of bad weather, the more airspace available the better. The airspace allotted to Andrews is small and with the airport operational under IFR conditions it will be even smaller in the sense that maneuver space for safety reasons would be restricted.

As far as the smaller aircraft not equipped for IFR conditions, Laird points out that "uncontrolled visual flight rule air traffic," or VFR, in a large volume and uncontrolled, would be a hazard to Andrews. Add to that the IFR aircraft and you can see how the dangers would be increased.

I believe that it is quite evident that the questions of air safety caused by the difficulties in operations in the crowded airspace around Metropolitan Washington today, not to mention what it would be if the airport becomes operational, leave no doubt about the dangers. All of these questions would not be raised if the airport were located elsewhere.

I have addressed myself to the question of air safety to this point. However, it is closely related to the safety of those residents on the ground who are nearby. Building permits have been issued to construct homes near the airport without any regard for a buffer zone as is recommended by the FAA itself. The community will be subjected to noise and to the ever-present danger from accidents.

In this age when we are well aware of problems caused by air operations, it appears rather ridiculous to start an airport with all the problems present before you turn a spadeful of earth. It seems to me the enlightened point of view would be to construct a facility for aviation in an area away from homes, with a proper buffer zone, so that the safety factors would be increased.

Mr. Speaker, I have said all along that FAA's desire to alleviate the congestion at National Airport by transferring some of that traffic to the Prince Georges Airpark is understandable, but it does not make sense to transfer the safety problems at National to a residential area of Prince Georges County.

I have a plan which will enable the FAA to take the stress off National through a preferable alternative to building the airport at the Bowie site. I propose that immediate consideration be given to making Andrews Air Force Base a "joint-use" facility, used for both military and civilian aircraft operations.

There are four reasons for such a use:

First, Andrews is not a tactical aircraft air base. At present, the military units there are not required for the defense of this area. The President's and VIP aircraft are already kept in a maximum security area, since the base is open to the public.

Second, the overall size of the base is adequate for a combined use. The two parallel runways—one of 9,300 feet and the other of 9,755 feet—can easily accommodate any type of aircraft currently operational.

Third, Andrews has all the needed air control equipment for all-weather flying. As a matter of fact, the Andrews tower is already operated by the FAA.

Fourth, its location. Andrews can serve the entire greater Washington area. It is located immediately off the Capital Beltway for access from communities surrounding Washington and has a direct road, Suitland Parkway, for access from the heart of the District of Columbia.

In addition there is public transportation. Andrews can be served by the proposed Metro line.

The three large airports near Washington have the following comparative statistics for operations in 1969: Washington National 341,500 and well saturated; Dulles, 217,114; and Andrews, 206,409. When one compares Andrews to O'Hare in Chicago with its 676,000 flight operations, it can be readily seen that it has not reached anywhere near its potential, which is estimated to be 500,000 flights.

The idea of joint use is not unique. There are 281 joint airports in the United States. Of these, 110 are under military control; 171 are under civilian control. So my proposal is neither new nor unique.

When I spoke to the President recently at the White House, I approached him on this subject. He said he thought it was a good idea. He saw no objection to such joint use for Andrews and instructed an assistant to check into the matter.

When we discussed the idea with FAA officials, including FAA Administrator Jack Shaffer, they reacted very favorably to it. Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORRON, Republican national chairman and himself a pilot, has endorsed the concept.

The most singular and important contribution such use for Andrews can make to the inevitable progress of aviation, is to provide facilities especially to accommodate the new giant air buses which are to go into operation next year.

These jumbo jets will deplane as many as 500 passengers. The present facilities at National and at Dulles pose a monumental problem for such a large number of passengers deplaning at one time. At Andrews we could begin with a new terminal designed and equipped especially to handle such a large number of people and their baggage.

These planes will demand such new facilities. Why spend more money at the other airports to adapt them for this new air vehicle? Why try to adapt already overcrowded terminals? In addition to the aircraft themselves, there is sufficient land area for the parking of cars. Then, too, as I mentioned, the metro would be able to handle a very large number of passengers. With a station underneath such a terminal, and a direct ride into Washington to stations near their residences it would constitute a rare luxury for passengers in these times of congested automobile traffic.

Andrews can easily handle these giant aircraft on its present runways, in addition to the other military air traffic.

Andrews can take care of the aircraft of business and industry of any size which is envisioned for the proposed Prince Georges County Airpark. With one less airport, the question of airspace becomes more orderly and safe. Since the Air Force has asked that it be given greater airspace at Andrews under the

FAA Terminal Control plan, it could operate more effectively and accommodate the additional civil aircraft if it did not have to worry about traffic from the Bowie Airport.

With Andrews so ideally located in Prince Georges County and with ample underused capacity, it makes no sense to create another airport in a congested residential area which will increase the dangers in flight operations and create hazards on the ground.

As Prince Georges County grows, Andrews will become even more centrally located to the needs of its citizens and an adjunct to its development. Encouraged by first-rate facilities, safety conditions, and all-weather operational ability, all types of large aircraft owned by business and industry would be eager to use Andrews and bring stimulation to the county's economy. They will be close to any industrial park. Even Charles County stands to benefit economically, since it is closer to Andrews.

I believe that I have demonstrated that the proposed airport should not and need not be constructed at all. First, for reasons of air safety; and second, for reasons of safety to the residents. In place of this airport, the use of Andrews in a joint military-civilian operation is a feasible and satisfactory alternative.

#### THE PEARSON COMMISSION REPORT: NEW EMPHASIS ON THE PROBLEM OF POPULATION GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, as part of its comprehensive and intensive review of the challenge of international development, the Pearson Commission has dealt frankly with the problem of population growth. An approach to slowing the growth of population is a major element of their "strategy for development." The Commission says:

We believe that the right to knowledge and means of family planning should be available to all, and that no child should be born unwanted. Rapid population growth not only affects parents and their families but also slows up economic and social advance in many developing countries. Countries which have not yet recognized the dimensions of their population problems should take cognizance of its impact on their development efforts and take appropriate action. Those which have already launched ambitious policies to bring down their birth rates should obtain energetic support. Aid-givers cannot be indifferent to whether population problems receive the attention they require, and both bilateral and international agencies should press for adequate analysis of these problems and their bearing on development programs.

International organizations have a large part to play, especially in the training of population and family planning specialists. We believe that the handling of population problems by the United Nations agencies is in need of firm direction and coordination and therefore endorse the proposal to appoint a Commissioner for Population in the United Nations.

The full dimensions of the population problem go beyond family planning and require deeper attention. In particular, social

policies which reduce the dependence on the family as the sole source of security would lessen the need and desire for large families.

There is also a great need for coordination, liaison, and finance for research in human reproduction, aiming at the development of a genuinely satisfactory method for fertility control. The World Bank, in consultation with the World Health Organization, should launch an international program for the mobilization of research resources in this field.

The Commission points out that as late as two decades ago, population growth was generally not anticipated as a major obstacle to development of poor countries. Paradoxically, success in reducing mortality rates—a major development effort—has made it so.

We are now beginning to understand that a sharp decrease in mortality rates is perhaps a first step in making it rational for parents in the poor countries to choose to have fewer children. Indeed, assuring a parent that his children will survive to maturity may be an essential element of programs to reduce birth rates.

The Pearson Commission spells out the now all too familiar problems associated with high birth rates. They suggest a number of ways to improve efforts to slow population growth—including the need for more research into human reproduction and contraception and the need for better coordination efforts in the U.N. in the field of population.

But perhaps the Pearson Commission's most important contribution in this critical area is in broadening the definition of the problem beyond direct family planning activities. The report points out the usefulness of integrating family planning activities with public health programs, particularly child and mental health programs. Such programs may be predominantly devoted to activities other than family planning but interest in and use of better family planning activities may be a primary result.

A broad range of social and economic institutional changes can have profound impact on parents' decisions about the ideal size of their families. The Commission recommends wide support and attention by aid suppliers and recipients to areas of social policy which are closely related to family size.

I believe the Commission's reviews are well taken. Definition of family planning activities should be broad enough to encompass related efforts which promise results in long-term reduction of birth rates. Both aid agencies and recipient nations must act in light of such broader definition if we are to achieve real progress in limiting the dangerous growth of population.

#### VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW SPEAKS AT REGIONAL REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW has again hit the bullseye with his remarks prepared for the Mid-

west Regional Republican Committee meeting in Des Moines this evening. The subject of his talk has been a topic of discussion not only in the halls of Congress and in the cloakrooms of both sides of the aisle, but throughout the country, where thinking people have taken the time to analyze what they have been seeing and hearing via the air waves.

Most politicians are reluctant to be critical in any way, shape or form of those connected with the news media, but we have come to know that our Vice President is a man of conviction and with plenty of intestinal fortitude to say exactly what is on his mind in no uncertain terms without mincing any words.

The Vice President has issued a challenge to those in the television news reporting business particularly to take a good objective look at their whole operation and I would heartily concur with what he has said, and I insert the full text of the Vice President's address at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT MID-WEST REGIONAL REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE MEETING

Tonight I want to discuss the importance of the television news medium to the American people. No nation depends more on the intelligent judgment of its citizens. No medium has a more profound influence over public opinion. Nowhere in our system are there fewer checks on vast power. So, nowhere should there be more conscientious responsibility exercised than by the news media. The question is . . . are we demanding enough of our television news presentations? . . . And, are the men of this medium demanding enough of themselves?

Monday night, a week ago, President Nixon delivered the most important address of his Administration, one of the most important of our decade. His subject was Vietnam. His hope was to rally the American people to see the conflict through to a lasting and just peace in the Pacific. For thirty-two minutes, he reasoned with a nation that has suffered almost a third of a million casualties in the longest war in its history.

When the President completed his address—an address that he spent weeks in preparing—his words and policies were subjected to instant analysis and querulous criticism. The audience of seventy million Americans—gathered to hear the President of the United States—was inherited by a small band of network commentators and self-appointed analysts, the majority of whom expressed, in one way or another, their hostility to what he had to say.

It was obvious that their minds were made up in advance. Those who recall the fumbling and groping that followed President Johnson's dramatic disclosure of his intention not to seek reelection have seen these men in a genuine state of non-preparedness. This was not it.

One commentator twice contradicted the President's statement about the exchange of correspondence with Ho Chi Minh. Another challenged the President's abilities as a politician. A third asserted that the President was now "following the Pentagon line." Others, by the expressions on their faces, the tone of their questions, and the sarcasm of their responses, made clear their sharp disapproval.

To guarantee in advance that the President's plea for national unity would be challenged, one network trotted out Averell Harriman for the occasion. Throughout the President's address he waited in the wings. When the President concluded, Mr. Harriman recited perfectly. He attacked the Thieu Government as unrepresentative; he criticized the President's speech for various

deficiencies; he twice issued a call to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to debate Vietnam once again; he stated his belief that the Viet Cong or North Vietnamese did not really want a military take-over of South Vietnam; he told a little anecdote about a "very, very responsible" fellow he had met in the North Vietnamese delegation.

All in all, Mr. Harriman offered a broad range of gratuitous advice—challenging and contradicting the policies outlined by the President of the United States. Where the President had issued a call for unity, Mr. Harriman was encouraging the country not to listen him.

A word about Mr. Harriman. For ten months he was America's chief negotiator at the Paris Peace Talks—a period in which the United States swapped some of the greatest military concessions in the history of warfare for an enemy agreement on the shape of a bargaining table. Like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, Mr. Harriman seems to be under some heavy compulsion to justify his failures to anyone who will listen. The networks have shown themselves willing to give him all the air time he desires.

Every American has a right to disagree with the President of the United States, and to express publicly that disagreement.

But the President of the United States has a right to communicate directly with the people who elected him, and the people of this country have the right to make up their own minds and form their own opinions about a Presidential address without having the President's words and thoughts characterized through the prejudices of hostile critics before they can even be digested.

When Winston Churchill rallied public opinion to stay the course against Hitler's Germany, he did not have to contend with a gaggle of commentators raising doubts about whether he was reading public opinion right, or whether Britain had the stamina to see the war through. When President Kennedy rallied the Nation in the Cuban Missile Crisis, his address to the people was not chewed over by a round-table of critics who disparaged the course of action he had asked American to follow.

The purpose of my remarks tonight is to focus your attention on this little group of men who not only enjoy a right of instant rebuttal to every Presidential address, but more importantly, wield a free hand in selecting, presenting and interpreting the great issues of our Nation.

First, let us define that power. At least forty million Americans each night, it is estimated, watch the network news. Seven million of them view ABC; the remainder being divided between NBC and CBS. According to Harris polls and other studies, for millions of Americans the networks are the sole source of national and world news.

In Will Rogers' observation, what you knew was what you read in the newspaper. Today, for growing millions of Americans, it is what they see and hear on their television sets.

How is this network news determined? A small group of men, numbering perhaps no more than a dozen "anchormen," commentators and executive producers, settle upon the 20 minutes or so of film and commentary that is to reach the public. This selection is made from the 90 to 180 minutes that may be available. Their powers of choice are broad. They decide what forty to fifty million Americans will learn of the day's events in the Nation and the world.

We cannot measure this power and influence by traditional democratic standards for these men can create national issues overnight. They can make or break—by their coverage and commentary—a Moratorium on the war. They can elevate men from local obscurity to national prominence within a week. They can reward some politicians with national exposure and ignore others. For millions of Americans, the network reporter

who covers a continuing issue, like ABM or Civil Rights, becomes in effect, the presiding judge in a national trial by jury.

It must be recognized that the networks have made important contributions to the national knowledge. Through news, documentaries and specials, they have often used their power constructively and creatively to awaken the public conscience to critical problems.

The networks made "hunger" and "black lung" disease national issues overnight. The TV networks have done what no other medium could have done in terms of dramatizing the horrors of war. The networks have tackled our most difficult social problems with a directness and immediacy that is the gift of their medium. They have focused the nation's attention on its environmental abuses. . . . on pollution in the Great Lakes and the threatened ecology of the Everglades.

But it was also the networks that elevated Stokely Carmichael and George Lincoln Rockwell from obscurity to national prominence. . . . nor is their power confined to the substantive.

A raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast can raise doubts in a million minds about the veracity of a public official or the wisdom of a government policy.

One Federal Communications Commissioner considers the power of the networks to equal that of local, state and federal governments combined. Certainly, it represents a concentration of power over American public opinion unknown in history.

What do Americans know of the men who wield this power? Of the men who produce and direct the network news—the nation knows practically nothing. Of the commentators, most Americans know little, other than that they reflect an urbane and assured presence, seemingly well informed on every important matter.

We do know that, to a man, these commentators and producers live and work in the geographical and intellectual confines of Washington, D.C. or New York City—the latter of which James Reston terms the "most unrepresentative community in the entire United States." Both communities bask in their own provincialism, their own parochialism. We can deduce that these men thus read the same newspapers, and draw their political and social views from the same sources. Worse, they talk constantly to one another, thereby providing artificial reinforcement to their shared viewpoints.

Do they allow their biases to influence the selection and presentation of the news? David Brinkley states, "objectivity is impossible to normal human behavior." Rather, he says, we should strive for "fairness."

Another anchorman on a network news show contends: "You can't expunge all your private convictions just because you sit in a seat like this and a camera starts to stare at you. . . . I think your program has to reflect what your basic feelings are. I'll plead guilty to that."

Less than a week before the 1968 election, this same commentator charged that President Nixon's campaign commitments were no more durable than campaign balloons. He claimed that, were it not for fear of a hostile reaction, Richard Nixon would be giving into, and I quote the commentator, "His natural instinct to smash the enemy with a club or go after him with a meat axe."

Had this slander been made by one political candidate about another, it would have been dismissed by most commentators as a partisan assault. But this attack emanated from the privileged sanctuary of a network studio and therefore had the apparent dignity of an objective statement.

The American people would rightly not tolerate this kind of concentration of power in government. Is it not fair and relevant to question its concentration in the hands of

a tiny and closed fraternity of privileged men, elected by no one, and enjoying a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government?

The views of this fraternity do not represent the views of America. That is why such a great gulf existed between how the nation received the President's address—and how the networks reviewed it.

As with other American institutions, perhaps it is time that the networks were made more responsive to the views of the nation and more responsible to the people they serve.

I am not asking for government censorship or any other kind of censorship. I am asking whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that forty million Americans receive each night is determined by a handful of men responsible only to their corporate employers and filtered through a handful of commentators who admit to their own set of biases.

The questions I am raising here tonight should have been raised by others long ago. They should have been raised by those Americans who have traditionally considered the preservation of freedom of speech and freedom of the press their special provinces of responsibility and concern. They should have been raised by those Americans who share the view of the late Justice Learned Hand that "right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues than through any kind of authoritative selection."

Advocates for the networks have claimed a first amendment right to the same unlimited freedoms held by the great newspapers of America.

The situations are not identical. Where the *New York Times* reaches 800,000 people, NBC reaches twenty times that number with its evening news. Nor can the tremendous impact of seeing television film and hearing commentary be compared with reading the printed page.

A decade ago, before the network news acquired such dominance over public opinion, Walter Lippmann spoke to the issue: "There is an essential and radical difference," he stated, "between television and printing . . . the three or four competing television stations control virtually all that can be received over the air by ordinary television sets. But, besides the mass circulation dailies, there are the weeklies, the monthlies, the out-of-town newspapers, and books. If a man does not like his newspaper, he can read another from out of town, or wait for a weekly news magazine. It is not ideal. But it is infinitely better than the situation in television. There, if a man does not like what the networks offer him, all he can do is turn them off, and listen to a phonograph."

"Networks," he stated, "which are few in number, have a virtual monopoly of a whole medium of communication." The newspapers of mass circulation have no monopoly of the medium of print.

"A virtual monopoly of a whole medium of communication" is not something a democratic people should blithely ignore.

And we are not going to cut off our television sets and listen to the phonograph because the air waves do not belong to the networks; they belong to the people.

As Justice Byron White wrote in his landmark opinion six months ago, "It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."

It is argued that this power presents no danger in the hands of those who have used it responsibly.

But as to whether or not the networks have abused the power they enjoy, let us call as our first witnesses, former Vice President Humphrey and the City of Chicago.

According to Theodore H. White, television's intercutting the film from the streets

of Chicago with the "current proceedings on the floor of the convention created the most striking and false political picture of 1968—the nomination of a man for the American Presidency by the brutality and violence of merciless police."

If we are to believe a recent report of the House Commerce Committee, then television's presentation of the violence in the streets worked an injustice on the reputation of the Chicago police.

According to the Committee findings, one network in particular presented "a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors." Film of provocations of police that was available never saw the light of day, while the film of the police response which the protestors provoked was shown to millions.

Another network showed virtually the same scene of violence—from three separate angles—without making clear it was the same scene.

While the full report is reticent in drawing conclusions, it is not a document to inspire confidence in the fairness of the network news.

Our knowledge of the impact of network news on the national mind is far from complete. But some early returns are available. Again, we have enough information to raise serious questions about its effect on a democratic society.

Several years ago, Fred Friendly, one of the pioneers of network news, wrote that its missing ingredients were "conviction, controversy and a point of view." The networks have compensated with a vengeance.

And in the networks' endless pursuit of controversy, we should ask what is the end value . . . to enlighten or to profit? What is the end result . . . to inform or to confuse? How does the on-going exploration for more action, more excitement, more drama, serve our national search for internal peace and stability?

Gresham's law seems to be operating in the network news.

Bad news drives out good news. The irrational is more controversial than the rational. Concurrence can no longer compete with dissent. One minute of Eldridge Cleaver is worth ten minutes of Roy Wilkins. The labor crisis settled at the negotiating table is nothing compared to the confrontation that results in a strike—or, better yet, violence along the picket line. Normality has become the nemesis of the evening news.

The upshot of all this controversy is that a narrow and distorted picture of America often emerges from the televised news. A single dramatic piece of the mosaic becomes, in the minds of millions, the whole picture. The American who relies upon television for his news might conclude that the majority of American students are embittered radicals, that the majority of black Americans feel no regard for their country; that violence and lawlessness are the rule, rather than the exception, on the American campus. None of these conclusions is true.

Television may have destroyed the old stereotypes—but has it not created new ones in their place?

What has this passionate pursuit of "controversy" done to the politics of progress through logical compromise, essential to the functioning of a democratic society?

The members of Congress or the Senate who follow their principles and philosophy quietly in a spirit of compromise are unknown to many Americans—while the loudest and most extreme dissenters on every issue are known to every man in the street.

How many marchers and demonstrations would we have if the marchers did not know that the ever-faithful TV cameras would be there to record their antics for the next news show.

We have heard demands that Senators and

Congressmen and Judges make known all their financial connections—so that the public will know who and what influences their decisions or votes. Strong arguments can be made for that view. But when a single commentator or producer, night after night, determines for millions of people how much of each side of a great issue they are going to see and hear; should he not first disclose his personal views on the issue as well?

In this search for excitement and controversy, has more than equal time gone to that minority of Americans who specialize in attacking the United States, its institutions and its citizens?

Tonight, I have raised questions, I have made no attempt to suggest answers. These answers must come from the media men. They are challenged to turn their critical powers on themselves. They are challenged to direct their energy, talent and conviction toward improving the quality and objectivity of news presentation. They are challenged to structure their own civic ethics to relate their great freedom with their great responsibility.

And the people of America are challenged too . . . challenged to press for responsible news presentations. The people can let the networks know that they want their news straight and objective. The people can register their complaints on bias through mail to the networks and phone calls to local stations. This is one case where the people must defend themselves . . . where the citizen—not government—must be the reformer . . . where the consumer can be the most effective crusader.

By way of conclusion, let me say that every elected leader in the United States depends on these men of the media. Whether what I have said to you tonight will be heard and seen at all by the nation is not my decision; it is not your decision; it is their decision.

In tomorrow's edition of the *Des Moines Register* you will be able to read a news story detailing what I have said tonight; editorial comment will be reserved for the editorial page, where it belongs. Should not the same wall of separation exist between news and comment on the nation's network.

We would never trust such power over public opinion in the hands of an elected government—it is time we questioned it in the hands of a small and un-elected elite. The great networks have dominated Ameri-

ca's airwaves for decades; the people are entitled to a full accounting of their stewardship.

### FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the most recent report from the Department of Defense indicates that the level of free world shipping to North Vietnam continues to show a significant decline over last year. During this past October, I am advised, six such vessels, four flying the British flag and one each under the registry of Cyprus and Japan, frequented North Vietnamese ports. This brings the total for 1969 to 85 free world arrivals as compared to the 122 arrivals that took place during the first 10 months of 1968. This represents a substantial 30 percent reduction in this traffic. This is most encouraging. Still there is no reason for complacency so long as men are dying in South Vietnam from North Vietnamese bullets. I was particularly disturbed to note the appearance in this October trade of a Japanese vessel, the third such arrival this year. Regardless of whatever contribution this particular vessel may have made in terms of commerce it should serve as a signal for our Government to make the strongest representations to the Japanese Government urging the removal of vessels under Japanese registry from this traffic.

At this point I insert a chart identifying free world ship arrivals to North Vietnam during 1969 together with U.S. Maritime Administration Report No. 28 listing the names of certain of the free world and Polish flag vessels that have engaged in trade with North Vietnam.

1969 FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

	British	Somali	Cyprus	Singapore	Japanese	Maltese	Total
January	8	2	1				11
February	6		1	2	1		10
March	6	1					7
April	7	1			1		9
May	9	1	1			1	12
June	6	2	2	1			11
July	6	1					7
August	4		2				6
September	4		1	1			6
October	4		1		1		6
Total	60	8	9	4	3	1	85

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION REPORT NO. 28

##### LIST OF FOREIGN FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying the carriage of United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States on foreign flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through September 12, 1969. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China,

which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports.

Flag of registry—	Gross tonnage
Name of ship:	
Total, all flags, 53 ships	354, 232
Polish (32 ships)	243, 514
<i>Andrzej Strug</i>	6, 919
<i>Beniowski</i>	10, 443
<i>Djakarta</i>	6, 915
<i>Emilia Plater</i>	6, 718
<i>Energetyk</i>	10, 876
<i>Florian Ceynowa</i>	6, 784
<i>General Sikorski</i>	6, 785
<i>Hanka Sawicka</i>	6, 944
<i>Hanoi</i>	6, 914
<i>Hugo Kollataj</i>	3, 755
<i>Jan Matejko</i>	6, 748
<i>Janek Krasicki</i>	6, 904

Flag of registry—	Gross tonnage
Name of ship—Continued	
Polish—Continued	
<i>Josef Conrad</i>	8, 730
<i>Kapitan Kosko</i>	6, 629
<i>Kochanowski</i>	8, 231
<i>Konopnicka</i>	9, 690
<i>Kraszewski</i>	10, 363
<i>Lelewel</i>	7, 817
<i>Ludwik Solski</i>	6, 904
<i>Marceli Nowotko</i>	6, 660
<i>Mickiewicz</i>	4, 344
<i>Moniuszko</i>	9, 247
<i>Norwid</i>	5, 512
<i>Nowowiejski</i>	9, 186
<i>Pawel Finder</i>	4, 911
<i>Phenian</i>	6, 923
<i>Przyjazn Narodow</i>	8, 876
<i>Stefan Okrzeja</i>	6, 620
<i>Szymanowski</i>	9, 203
<i>Transportowiec</i>	10, 854
<i>Wieniawski</i>	9, 190
<i>Wladyslaw Broniewski</i>	6, 919
British (14 ships)	77, 041
<i>Fortune Glory</i>	5, 832
<i>Golden Ocean</i>	3, 827
<i>Greenford</i>	2, 964
<i>Kingford</i>	2, 911
<sup>1</sup> <i>Meadow Court</i> (Trip to North Vietnam as the <i>Ardrossmore</i> , British)	5, 820
<i>Rochford</i>	3, 324
<sup>1</sup> <i>Rosetta Maud</i> (Trip to North Vietnam as the <i>Arctara</i> , British)	5, 795
<i>Ruthy Ann</i>	7, 361
<sup>1</sup> <i>Shun On</i> (Trip to North Vietnam as the <i>Pundua</i> , British)	7, 295
<i>Shun Wah</i> (Previous trip to North Vietnam as the <i>Vercharmian</i> , British)	7, 255
<i>Shun Wing</i>	6, 987
<i>Taipieng</i> (Tanker)	5, 676
<i>Tetrarch</i> (Previous trips to North Vietnam as the <i>Ardowan</i> , British)	7, 300
<sup>2</sup> <i>Tong Hoek</i>	4, 684
Cypriot (2 ships)	7, 308
<i>Amfithea</i>	5, 171
<i>Marianthi</i>	2, 137
Somali (2 ships)	13, 531
<i>Happy Dragon</i>	4, 534
<i>Yvonne</i> (Tanker)	8, 997
Greek (1 ship)	6, 724
<sup>2</sup> <i>Leontis</i> (Trip to North Vietnam as the <i>Shirley Christine</i> , British)	6, 724
Panamanian (1 ship)	1, 889
<sup>2</sup> <i>Salamanca</i> (Trips to North Vietnam as the <i>Milford</i> , British)	1, 889
Singapore: (1 Ship)	4, 225
<i>Lucky Dragon</i>	4, 225

Section 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) that such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade as long as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade and;

(b) that no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the

North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c) and;

(c) that vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

Flag of Registry—

Name of Ship:

a. Since Last Report: None.

b. Previous Reports—Flag of Registry:

	Number of ships
British .....	1
Italian .....	1

Section 3. The following number of vessels have been removed from this list since they have been broken up, sunk or wrecked.

	Gross tonnage
a. Since last report:	
<i>Court Harwell</i> (British) .....	7,133
<i>Inch Stuart</i> (British) .....	7,043
<i>Isabel Erica</i> (British) .....	7,105

b. Previous reports—Flag of registry:

	Broken up, sunk or wrecked
British .....	5
Cypriot .....	7
Greek .....	1
Lebanese .....	2
Maltese .....	1
Polish .....	1
Somali .....	1

<sup>1</sup> Ships appearing on the List which have made no trips to North Vietnam under the present registry.

<sup>2</sup> Added to Report No. 27 appearing in the Federal Register issue of July 31, 1969.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.  
Date: September 16, 1969.

JOHN M. O'CONNELL,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### NECESSITY FOR RENTAL ASSISTANCE TO VERY LOW-INCOME TENANTS OF PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Congress enunciated the historic goal of "a decent home for every American family" when it passed the National Housing Act of 1949. We reaffirmed this goal and gave it the "highest priority" with the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Today, we are faced with the prospect of potential failure of this goal in one major segment of our housing program.

Public housing has been one of the major means toward implementing the policy of a decent home for every American family. The public housing authority program places responsibility for development, ownership, and management in the hands of local housing authorities. Federal aid to local authorities consists essentially of annual contributions by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to cover the cost of retiring the locally issued tax-exempt bonds used to finance the projects. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is also authorized to pay local housing authorities an additional \$120 per year for

the benefit of each family which is elderly, displaced, extremely poor, or contains four or more children.

When the Federal aid formula to local housing authorities was first written into law, it was believed that Federal assistance was necessary only for capital outlays. Rent could thus be kept low and within the means of low-income families since it only had to cover operating expenses. This rationale proved correct through 1967.

Today, it is becoming increasingly apparent, however, that in many housing authorities rental payments no longer cover the costs of ordinary operation and maintenance. Because rent is the major source of operating and maintenance expenses, many local housing authorities are moving toward financial instability and insolvency. This is dramatically portrayed in the results of a 1968 survey of 82 major size local housing authorities made by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The 82 housing authorities operate a total of 400,000 dwelling units or nearly two-thirds of the dwelling units in the entire public housing program.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development found that 39 of the 82 housing authorities were operating at a deficit—that is, operating income was not sufficient to cover total operating expenditures. The 39 housing authorities operate a combined total of 271,483 dwelling units.

Fifty-one of the 82 housing authorities surveyed were operating with financial problems—that is, at least 85 percent of the total available operating receipts were being spent on "routine" expenses. This left an insufficient amount of income available for "nonroutine" needs and maintenance of reserves at needed levels. These 39 authorities operate a combined total of 326,166 dwelling units.

Fifteen of the 82 housing authorities have reached such serious financial operating condition that they are considered insolvent or nearly so. The normal rate of "routine" operating expenditures for these 15 housing authorities either exceeds operating receipts or nearly does. This does not consider income resources for "nonroutine" expenditures or reserves. These fifteen housing authorities operate a combined total of 192,541 dwelling units.

The most important point in the grim recital of these statistics is that only one of the 82 housing authorities was considered in serious financial condition in 1966. At the end of 1967, seven were considered to be in serious financial condition and 15 at the end of 1968. The 15 housing authorities listed in order of the seriousness of financial difficulty are: Washington, D.C.; Kansas City, Mo.; San Francisco, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Columbus, Ohio; New York City, N.Y.; New Haven, Conn.; Omaha, Nebr.; Boston, Mass.; Newark, N.J.; Chicago Ill.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Louisville, Ky.; and Detroit, Mich.

The reason why these 15 housing authorities are in such financial danger and why more may well move into this category is simply that the cost of op-

eration and maintenance has skyrocketed while tenant income has gone down. The trend in public housing is toward serving progressively lower income families. Thus, while the median income of families in public housing was 54 percent of the national urban median in 1944, it had dropped to approximately 33 percent of the national urban median by 1967.

While tenant income has dropped, routine operating expenses have risen. Routine operating expenses are made up of administrative expense, utility expense, and ordinary maintenance and operation expense. On a nationwide level, administrative expenses rose approximately 18.8 percent from 1967-70. Utility expenses, although rising at a lesser rate than the national average, rose approximately 10 percent for the period 1967-70. Ordinary operating and maintenance expense rose approximately 16 percent between 1967 and 1970.

The rise in expenses compared to tenant ability to bear increased rental is most dramatically shown by examining individual areas. In Detroit, for example, operating expenses have risen 106 percent since 1952 while tenant incomes have gone up only 9 percent in the same period. Albert A. Walsh, chairman of the New York Housing Authority, has reported that in New York tenant income increased 65.1 percent between 1952 and 1967 while routine operating expenses increased 125.6 percent. During the same period, according to Mr. Walsh, rents were increased 71.6 percent.

While some of the increases in operating expenses can be charged to management inefficiency, the greatest single factor is simply the increase in costs. And, these actual increases do not always reflect an accurate picture. Wages, the largest factor in increased costs, often lag behind local prevailing rates. Many projects are suffering from additional expense due to increasing age of the facilities. Because of lack of money, many authorities are forced to make temporary repairs which in the end does little more than delay and ultimately increase costs.

Tenants cannot bear the cost of further rental increases. Already, many tenants are required to pay an undue proportion of their income to rent. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 50 percent of the senior citizens living in public housing paid 30 percent or more of their income to rent in 1967. Twenty-two percent of all other families living in public housing paid 30 percent or more of their income to rent. The House of Representatives recently amended section 101 of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act to provide for rent supplements in the leased-housing program where rent exceeds 20 percent of income.

If housing authorities are forced to raise rents, fewer and fewer low-income families will be able to afford the public housing which was originally designed to provide them with a decent place in which to live. We are already forcing many lower income families presently living in housing projects to pay

far higher rents than they can properly afford. We are, in effect, forcing them to make the choice of paying catastrophic rents or returning to the slums from which they are attempting to escape.

On the other hand, if local public housing authorities continue to operate at their present deficits, we face the prospect—already becoming apparent in some areas—that public housing will end up as public subsidized slums.

Section 211 of the Senate-passed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 provides for rental assistance in behalf of very low income tenants of public housing projects. The following explanation of the section is contained in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency report to accompany S. 2864:

**ADDITIONAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE IN BEHALF OF VERY LOW INCOME TENANTS OF PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS**

Section 211 of the bill would amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to add a new section 24 which would provide an additional assistance program in behalf of very low-income tenants of public housing projects.

This section would authorize rental assistance payments with respect to units in low-rent housing projects, including low-rent housing in private accommodations, to enable families of very low income to afford rentals with no more than 25 percent of their incomes. Assistance would be in the form of annual payments by the Secretary to public housing agencies pursuant to contracts entered into with the local agencies. Existing as well as new units would qualify for assistance and assistance could be continued for the life of the project so long as it served low-income tenants.

At the present time, annual contribution payments by the Federal Government to local agencies cover the debt service on private borrowings financing the development or acquisition cost of the projects. Operating and maintenance expenses are payable out of rentals paid by the low-income tenants. The nationwide average operating cost per unit is now about \$50 a month, or \$600 a year. In some geographical areas operating costs are substantially higher. These costs are too high for the very poor to bear. Section 206 of the bill, which would authorize annual contributions in excess of debt service, would not materially reduce the burden on the tenants. Local housing agencies have attempted to meet this problem by charging minimum rents for some units below the operating costs attributable to the units, with the higher income tenants making up the difference. This has helped somewhat but not enough. For the most part, the neediest families have been excluded from the public housing program.

This section would enable families, regardless of how low their incomes are, to afford the rentals necessary to support project operating costs with no more than 25 percent of their income. This is the rent-to-income ratio used in HUD's other subsidized rental programs (rent supplement and section 236 rental assistance). Standards for tenant incomes would be established by the Secretary on a uniform nationwide basis. Since many low-income families are receiving welfare housing allowances, the Secretary would be expected to take steps to assure that the rental assistance payments are not relied on as substitutes for welfare payments.

Although the subsidy was authorized primarily to help families of very low income, the committee intends that it apply to all families who otherwise would be required to pay more than 25 percent of income for rent or who would be barred from public housing

because their income was inadequate to pay this rent required; for example, a large family needing a four or five bedroom unit.

For purposes of determining the maximum amount of assistance payments with respect to any unit, the "rental" for such unit would be the proportionate share of the total shelter costs to be borne by the low-income tenants of a project attributable to that unit. The actual rental for any unit charged could be higher than the proportionate share of total shelter costs attributable to that unit, but assistance payments would be calculated on the basis of this proportionate share or, if lower, the actual rental charged.

One of the purposes of this section is to permit improved operating and maintenance services in public housing projects while still permitting occupancy by very low-income tenants. The Secretary would be expected, however, with respect to assistance contracts entered into with local housing agencies, to insure that excess operating costs, and consequently higher rentals, are not incurred.

This section would provide authority for the Secretary to enter into assistance payment contracts, as approved in appropriation acts, in the amount of \$75 million annually. This amount should be adequate to get the program initiated with respect to all existing projects and any new projects over the next 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, this provision, which the Senate has already passed, would go far in alleviating the problems which I have previously described. I, therefore, urge that the House conference committee members give this proposal favorable consideration when it meets with the Senate conferees.

**SUEZ CANAL: CENTENNIAL**

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, the two key crossroads of the world are the Isthmuses of Panama and Suez. What happens at one makes its impact on the other. This interaction was dramatically brought into focus by the 1956 nationalization by Egypt of the Suez Canal and subsequent assaults by Panamanian mobs on the Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, few members of the press have studied the history of either waterway and hence have not been able to write with the objectivity required when discussing these vital matters. Both have deep historic roots.

As the year 1969 marks the centennial of the opening of the Suez Canal, I have read in the September-October 1969 issue of *Aramco World* magazine an illuminating article on the Suez Canal by John Brinton, a specialist in 19th-century Near Eastern history.

As the indicated article should be of interest to all concerned with the Panama Canal, I quote it as part of my remarks:

**SUEZ: A CENTENNIAL**

(By John Brinton)

Under the sound of the guns the echoes of the past are muted. This, on the eve of its 100th birthday, is the story of the Suez Canal.

In July, 100 years ago, Ismail, Viceroy of Egypt, toured the Continent grandly handing out to the crowned heads of Europe invitations to ceremonies marking the opening of a canal through the Isthmus of Suez. He also invited 1,000 notables of the day, including 100 famous men like Zola, Dumas and Ibsen

who were to come as his personal guests—i.e. all expenses paid.

Even for a ruler known for extravagance it was an extravagant gesture. And it was only the first of many. Before the end of the ceremonies he would build a new road to the pyramids, construct a palace for the Empress Eugenie of France and build an opera house. He would also commission, but not get in time, an opera by Verdi, give a ball which 6,000 people would attend, and import 1,500 cooks and servants from Europe to tend to things. It was grand; it was splendid; it was magnificent—as befitted one of the few moments in history that was truly historic: the opening of a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea with the Red Sea, Europe with India, West with East.

The Suez Canal was not a new idea. As early, possibly, as 2,000 B.C., a canal linking an ancient branch of the Nile with the Bitter Lakes was built. Around 500 B.C., a Persian conqueror named Darius extended it, but stopped when he was warned that the Red Sea was higher than the Mediterranean and the opening of a canal would bring the sea flooding into Egypt. (A myth, that would persist through Napoleon's invasion of Egypt and get even stronger when French engineers made what Lord Kinross called "a miscalculation of major proportions.")

But history moved on. Greeks came and built locks near what is now the shell-pocked town of Suez. Romans under Trajan put slaves to work digging a new link to the mainstream of the Nile and called it "Trajan's River." Arabs, 100 years later, reopened "Trajan's River," then finally filled it up again as a defense measure and left it that way for another 1,000 years. During that time Europe found a route to India around Africa and, until Napoleon landed in Egypt, forgot about its filled-in ditch across the Isthmus.

Napoleon's invasion of Egypt had a tremendous impact on England. Safe behind its shield of stout English seapower, getting rich on the returns of its swift merchantmen, England, until that moment, had been perfectly content to subdue its interests in the Mediterranean. But roused by the possibility that France would control an area from which it could threaten England's grip on India, British statesmen decided on a course of action that would shape history for the next 119 years. They decided that England would, hereafter, prop up the sagging military strength of the Ottoman Empire which still ruled, however feebly, all of the Middle East. It was a fateful decision, one that would drag England into the Crimean War, spawn the ill-fated Chesney expedition to develop a new route to India via the Euphrates river (*Aramco World*, March-April, 1969) and harden into a stubborn, illogical opposition to the dynamic Frenchman who was to become the 'Father of the Canal,' Ferdinand de Lesseps.

The story of Ferdinand de Lesseps is as odd as it is fascinating. It begins with a 19-year-old boy going off to Spain as a very junior diplomat, winning fame for some skillful negotiations there and in Egypt, but later falling into disfavor with the new rulers of Republican France and resigning, apparently a failure at a young age.

During his career, however, De Lesseps had met many interesting individuals: Thomas Waghorn who had fought such a heartbreaking fight to convince a stubborn British government that an overland route to India across the Isthmus of Suez was feasible (*Aramco World*, November-December, 1968); Adolphe Linant de Bellefonds, an engineer in the service of Egypt and a fierce proponent of a canal; Prosper Enfantin, a religious fanatic whose faith somehow saw a canal as a route to salvation and, above all, a chubby little prince with an appetite for macaroni.

The prince's name was Muhammad Sa'id. He was 13, corpulent and lazy—to the dismay of his father, the great Muhammad

Alli, Viceroy of Egypt, whose own physical prowess and vigor had been important factors in his rise to power. Insistent that this condition be remedied, the story goes, the viceroy put Muhammad Sa'id on a strict diet and sent him to the harbor in Alexandria each day to exercise on a naval vessel there, a vessel, as fate would have it, not far from the home of Ferdinand de Lesseps, then vice consul in Alexandria.

The vice consul who had amiable relations with Muhammad Ali's whole family, took pity on the boy and secretly let him into his kitchen and fed him great helpings of macaroni. It was a small kindness, but as one writer later put it, a "landmark in the history of the canal." Muhammad Sa'id never forgot that kindness and when, 20 years later, he became viceroy, one of his first acts was to repay it: he granted De Lesseps an exclusive concession to construct a canal.

As history and De Lesseps himself have made clear, this was not as fortuitous as a brief summary sounds. De Lesseps did not simply stumble into a good thing; he quite coldly planned it and had, as a matter of fact, been planning it for some time.

As one version has it, De Lesseps' plans for Suez had germinated years before when, quarantined in Alexandria, he read the report of Napoleon's engineer J. M. Lepere on the feasibility of building a canal. Soon he was to see Waghorn prove that even an overland route across the isthmus was a shortcut. He also came into contact with a mystical religious sect called the "Saint-Simonians" whose beliefs had somehow come to focus on construction of a canal. He discussed the matter with Linant and Captain Chesney, both of whom had corrected the myth that one sea was higher than the other. It is also known that he kept an eye on the possibilities during the next two decades—even to the point of making an inquiry not long before his prince came to power. In short, De Lesseps did not come to his patron with a sudden inspiration, but with a scheme that had engaged his thoughts for years. De Lesseps was a man who looked ahead.

The actual decision was made under most dramatic circumstances. It took place during military maneuvers in the desert, to which the new viceroy had invited De Lesseps, and the best version is De Lesseps' own:

"On the 30th of November, 1854, I presented myself at the tent of the Viceroy, placed on an eminence surrounded by a wall of rough stones, forming a little fortification with enclosures for cannon. I had remarked that there was a place where we could leap with a horse onto the parapet, there being a terrace outside on which the horse had clearance of footing. The Viceroy welcomed my project, and requested me to go to my tent to prepare a report for him, which he permitted me to bring him. I vaulted on my horse, which leaped the parapet, galloped down the slope, and then brought me back to the enclosure, when I had taken the time necessary to draw up the report, which had been ready for several years. The whole question was clearly set forth in a page and a half; and when the Prince himself had read it to his followers, accompanying it with a translation in Turkish, and had asked their advice, he received unanimous answer that the proposal of the guest, whose friendship for the family of Mohammed Ali was known, could not be otherwise than favorable, and that it was desirable to accept.

"The concession was immediately granted. The word of Mohammed Sa'id was as good as a contract."

In the capitals of Europe, the viceroy's decision provoked sudden meetings and long discussions. The presentations were varied but the point was the same: that an upstart with neither money nor power, and for unknown motives, had suddenly thrown a weighty new factor onto the delicate balances of power in 19th-century Europe and

that this could not be permitted to happen. England, with Lord Palmerston at the head of its government, was particularly alarmed. Permit a French company to develop—and then control—a new route to India? A route through which French warships could carry troops to the vulnerable sub-continent? Never, said Palmerston, and sent off word to his envoy in Istanbul: under no circumstances can England permit the Sultan to approve this step.

It was a shrewd move. For Muhammad Sa'id, friend or not, had cautiously added a codicil to his sweeping grant to De Lesseps. The codicil simply said that before construction of a canal could be initiated the "concession must be ratified by His Imperial Majesty the Sultan." It was a natural condition; however shaky his grip, the Sultan still ruled Egypt and still laid claim to Sa'id's loyalty and obedience. But it gave England, the Sultan's chief supporter, a lever with which to exert pressure on De Lesseps and England exerted it. For the next 12 years the Sultan would steadfastly refuse to ratify the concession.

The building of the Suez Canal has always seemed like a great engineering challenge; a man-against-the-desert epic of formidable magnitude. And certainly it was not easy: to excavate millions of cubic feet of sand in the waterless wastes of a desert required an incredible effort—if just to bring a stream of fresh water close enough to permit the work to go on. But the highest point of land involved was only 59 feet above sea level, and it was being cut in a straight line. Once De Lesseps had persuaded the Viceroy—in one of his more shameless schemes—to conscript peasants by the thousands and force them to work on the excavations, the engineering problems were relatively minor. The major ones he soon solved by the bold importation of huge new steam dredgers. No, the engineering was not the main problem. The real problems were in politics, finance and diplomacy, fields, as it turned out, in which Ferdinand de Lesseps excelled.

The Sultan's initial refusal was a body blow to De Lesseps. After visiting the capitals of Europe he realized how serious, and developed his tactics accordingly. Instead of trying to persuade the Sultan directly, he decided it would be far easier to persuade the Emperor of France to persuade the Sultan. De Lesseps would form a company which the Emperor of France could support. Naturally the formation of a company required capital which could be accumulated by the presentation of a scientifically sound project.

It was enough to discourage a titan, but De Lesseps went confidently forward. He formed a group called the International Scientific Commission and sent it to Egypt to prepare a report on the feasibility of a canal. With the report of the commission in hand—"proving" that the canal was quite practical—he wrung a second concession from Sa'id and then, for the next five years, unflaggingly traveled, talked and planned his venture. He saw Queen Victoria and Albert. He talked to the Royal Geographical Society. He approached the Prime Minister of Austria. He harangued editors, businessmen and bankers and, simultaneously, mounted a worldwide propaganda campaign.

Support grew, especially after native troops in India rebelled and England sent troops across the isthmus to save time, thus proving one of De Lesseps' major contentions. But it didn't grow fast enough so in 1858 he formed a company—the *Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez*—put up enormous amounts of capital that western investors were supposed to have provided.

When even that failed to move the Sultan or affect the English position he decided on a reckless gamble. If it failed, so would the canal. But he had negotiated long enough; it was time to bring the issue to a head. It was time to see if the French Emperor was

going to permit England to frustrate a project of such vast import to France. He ordered the start of construction and with appropriate ceremonies and suitable fanfare, the first spadeful of desert sand was turned and the Suez Canal got underway.

As De Lesseps had expected, Europe responded violently. From Prime Ministers, Viziers, shareholders, bankers and consuls in five countries came a torrent of arguments, and at last the Sultan stirred. He issued an order to the company to cease work. De Lesseps had not expected this. Worse, Sa'id, his friend and supporter, was losing confidence. The company was clearly foundering.

Whether the next step was taken in desperation or whether Ferdinand de Lesseps had cynically maneuvered public opinion so as to bring it about is a point that scholars can debate forever. Whichever it was, De Lesseps took it. He went personally to the Emperor and put the question to him: will the Emperor of France permit England to block a vital French enterprise? The Emperor, Napoleon III, hesitated and then said softly: "M. de Lesseps, you can count upon my support and protection. The British opposition is unimportant. We must just trim our sails to it."

This was the turning point. It solved nothing in itself; in fact the company was to totter and nearly collapse several times in the coming years as politicians and financiers, sensing victory and profit, closed in on De Lesseps and nearly snatched his prize from him. But the French Emperor's decision cleared the way and the Sultan ratified the concession in March, 1863. Construction proceeded to such an extent that it was soon clear that success was inevitable. Everyone saw it, including the Khedive Ismail, successor to Sa'id. In July, 1869 he set out for Europe issuing his invitations to the opening. He promised everyone it would be worth attending.

Now it was a race against time. Palaces were going up, a seven-mile road was inching toward the pyramids and an opera house was being completed. But the canal was still not finished and at the last minute they had found, on the bottom of a narrow passage, a ledge that had been overlooked, a ledge high enough to tear the bottom out of a ship. Try dynamite, said De Lesseps. Impossible, said the engineers. No one has ever set off that big a charge underwater. We have no choice, De Lesseps said. Try it. They tried it and in an enormous explosion that sent canal water spraying over a good part of the desert, demolished the ledge, and opened the canal.

At Port Sa'id, Cairo, Suez and Ismailia, meanwhile, royalty, nobility, wealth and fame were gathering for the momentous occasion—the voyage of the monarchs through the canal. At Port Sa'id, the *L'Agile* already lay at anchor while the Empress went sight-seeing. Around her were gathering corvettes, frigates, yachts and merchantmen from everywhere. Prince Henry of the Netherlands was there. The Emperor of Austria was coming. So were the Crown Prince of Prussia and others.

At the last minute Ismail, pale and shaking, summoned De Lesseps. A ship sent through to test the canal had gone aground and was blocking the passage. De Lesseps was stunned. We'll float it, he promised. Float it, said Ismail grimly, or blow it up!

It was not necessary. The ship floated free and not long after *L'Agile*, as majestic as its royal passenger, weighed anchor and moved into the canal followed at carefully spaced intervals by 40 other ships. In stately procession they proceeded to the first stop: Lake Timsah where thousands of spectators cheered their arrival and French warships, firing salvo after salvo, signaled the beginning of 24 hours of celebration. There was a banquet given by De Lesseps, an "equestrian fantasia," and a great dinner for 1,000 guests served on tables set in the dunes under the

desert stars. As Ismail had promised, it was worth attending.

The next day the great convoy moved on to the Bitter Lakes where the royal guests rowed back and forth in the dark to visit each other as rockets soared into the sky. On the third day they reached Suez. It was the sight of the century. As the great ships slowly rounded the last turn, came about and dropped anchor, with all flags flying, cannons thundered, crowds cheered and band after band played lustily under the sun. The Suez Canal was open at last. It was November 19, 1869.

#### A POLICY ON ARID LANDS IS PART OF THE OVERALL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROBLEM

(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 a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and as part of the band of Congressmen dedicated to the preservation and improvement of our Nation's environment, I have been privileged to receive a number of independent studies and reports on the conditions of our environment. I wish to bring to your attention a recent study by a leading conservationist from the State of New Mexico, Mr. Henry M. Zeller, conservation chairman for the Rio Grande chapter of the Sierra Club.

In a paper entitled "Arid Lands—Use or Destruction," Zeller paints a broad picture of the evils facing the Nation if we do not learn to control our burgeoning technology. This is a theme I have sounded on many occasions and I am happy to present a thoughtful and well-reasoned view of the problem particularly as it affects the status of arid lands throughout the country. Mr. Zeller points out that because space will be at a premium in the future it is extremely important what we do now about the proper utilization of our arid lands. In addition to his perceptive comments on land utilization, the paper is important for another reason. All too often, conservationists have a tendency to "tunnel in" on one particular concern to the exclusion of others. This is not the case with Mr. Zeller's paper; it is obvious he realizes that a policy for arid lands should be an integral part of a national policy dealing with the total environment.

The article follows:

##### ARID LANDS—USE OR DESTRUCTION?

(By Henry M. Zeller, conservation chairman, Rio Grande chapter, Sierra Club)

##### I. ARID LANDS—WHAT USE?

This conference is based on the premise that "arid lands throughout the world offer considerable possibilities for greater use, but also present serious problems for permanent human settlement and use." This premise is sound, but the arid lands offer no cure-all for the consequences of the human population explosion. (1)

For years people have disparaged the Malthusian theories, but the doubt begins to dissipate as we so obviously fill up the earth. In the meantime, despite the fact that Malthus does seem to be having his day, his theories need some rethinking because he related the problems of over-population too closely to food supply alone. (2)

It is now well-known what happens to mammal populations that overwhelm their

habitat. They do not, as a rule, just starve. Experience indicates that crowding induces glandular hyperactivity, which in turn causes ethological and physiological effects, culminating in a die-off, which tend to cut back the population to a number that can tolerate itself within the habitat without stress. Food supply is not the controlling factor. (2)

Edward T. Hall in *The Hidden Dimension* brings out that uncontrolled human population growth, the "population explosion", may produce its effects by crowding through implosion at the points of concentration of population. In every such concentration there is the potential for the development of a behavioral sink like those suffered by John Calhoun's rats in his Rockville, Maryland, experiments. It appears that such sinks may already be forming in our city slums. It is difficult to argue that man can boast of any immunity not shared by other mammals. (1, 2, 3)

According to William Mulloy in a recent article, although European contacts finished the job, the direct cause of the destruction of the Easter Island culture was intra-island warfare in a restricted, over-populated environment. This history tends to confirm Hall's ideas. (4)

If this experience with other mammals has meaning for man, as Hall thinks it does, then food supply is no key to human survival in the fact of exponential increases in populations and the consequent pathology of the behavioral sinks which bring spreading ethological and physiological breakdown. With this in mind, but in any event, it appears that the usefulness of the arid lands in affording some relief from population pressure would lie more in the provision of living space than in intensified food production. Production in dry farming areas is strictly limited by the care needed to prevent destruction of the land. Dry farming is a considerable gamble requiring large capitalization, and only certain crops can be grown. Stock raising must give increasing consideration to ecological factors. As for irrigated farming, compared to other economic sectors it consumes very large quantities of water and the rate of return is very low. It also can be destructive. Particularly for irrigated farming, government involvement in providing water at prices far below cost, as well as other forms of subsidy and assistance, is required to keep it in existence on the present scale. It is questionable whether government intervention on the American style is economically feasible except in very special cases, being even more questionable when there is a surplus of cropland such as we have. At the same time, the arid lands, particularly the warm, sunny desert and semi-desert areas, are pleasant for living and attractive to industry. These areas and the mountains are invaluable for recreation and for tourism as an industry, provided the natural setting is not destroyed. (5, 6) (7, 8)

It is reasonable to conclude that land use in the arid lands should be carefully controlled, and that the bulk of the world food supply should be produced in those regions which are naturally adopted to that function. Arid lands should not be used for food production beyond their capacity for sustained yield of those crops to which they are suited. Under a free enterprise system, a preliminary judgment in the case of any given agricultural activity can be reached on the basis of whether sustained production will make a profit without subsidy. Of course, any final judgment should be made on ecological criteria.

The imminent danger to the arid lands, as the expanding population causes implosions here and there, is that there will be correspondingly expanding pressures for their over-exploitation. Promises that the "desert can be made to bloom" are particularly

frightening in this respect. People involved in such promises seldom have either a long-term or an ecological outlook and have little idea of the true consequences of what they propose. Population pressures may increase to the point where any technology offering a furlorn hope of relief of some sort, or worse, bolstered by inflated advertising holding out false promises, will be tried out without regard to possible or even certain adverse effects. (6)

We must keep in mind that the productive capacity of the earth is a finite quantity. Even though the ultimate limit has not yet been fixed, and regardless of how the marginal lands are used, capacity cannot continue to improve at the same rate as a wildly expanding population. Quite apart from the chance of prior human breakdown, any general overtaxing of the earth must fail in the end, and man will find himself without habitat. I sincerely believe that without effective population control our species has no future. (2, 3, 4, 9, 10)

The antidote for the pressures threatened by over-population is population control. Any rational planning for the future must start with the assumption that the antidote will be administered before it is too late, but the antidote cannot bring an abrupt halt to population trends; there is bound to be an over-ride. For this reason, planning to accommodate more people in the arid lands is necessary for the interim period and beyond. We must plan for their increased use, but we must remember their fragility as we do so. This fragility means that their use must be carefully restricted and organized.

#### II. GOVERNMENT INCAPACITY FOR ARID LANDS MANAGEMENT—HISTORY

Unfortunately, our political systems seem incapable of the management required for the careful use of the arid lands. I base this statement mainly on experience in the United States. I doubt if anyone else does much better.

The history of the settlement of the American West has been marked by lack of plan and a sort of schizophrenic irrationality, divided between the opposing and equally wrong ideas that the West was nothing but the "Great American Desert" or that it could easily be made into a garden. In the latter part of the last century homesteaders with the "garden" misconception flocked westward to get their 160 acres of public land, which proved completely inadequate for making a living in the dry country, and their failures made the fortunes of the speculators and the big cattlemen. In the end, the Homestead Act defeated its own purpose, which was to provide an outlet in land for the increasing American population by helping the small farmer with his "family farm". (11)

There was one man who had a clear idea of the West, seeing neither desert nor garden. He saw the great variety of the western lands as compared to the broad arable acres of the humid regions, and the consequent need to classify lands for their best use. As for agriculture, he saw the need for the integrated use of land and water, the different requirements for farming and pasturage, the necessity for collective action in employing irrigation, and the asininity of the arbitrary 160-acre homestead based on a rectangular survey without regard to water resources, soil, or topography. Knowing what we know today, we may not agree with everything he advocated but he did have a clear idea of what should be done within the limits of the applicable knowledge and philosophy of his day. If his ideas had been followed, there could have been rational adaptation to meet the accumulation of experience, because his primary tenet had to do with the application of knowledge to planning, which should be comprehensive and integrated with an eye to the future. (11)

This man was Major John Wesley Powell,

the father of the United States Geological Survey and the Newlands or Reclamation Act, besides other aspects of government. This year, 1969, is the centenary of his exploration of the Colorado River, including the Grand Canyon, the first complete and fully reported exploration of this awesome area. He was a brave and energetic man and a devoted civil servant who had much to do with the origins of the association of science with government for the good of all. (11)

Some of Powell's ideas were adopted, but the integrated whole was rejected by government so that there was no philosophy, no binding force. Perhaps the most important element rejected was Powell's ecological outlook, which was far ahead of his time. Meanwhile, those of his ideas that were adopted separately have been distorted by speculators, special interests, subjective bureaucrats, and by glib or parochial legislators. Now we need another Powell.

### III. GOVERNMENT AND WATER

In the American West, one of the greatest failures of government lies in its acceptance of the idea of a "water shortage", always looming just ahead. Government permits, even encourages, the allocation of water against ecologic and economic principles. It then compounds this error by maintaining water rights law and pricing systems, and does nothing to correct public attitudes, all of which are largely in opposition to change. In this way, inefficient and wasteful, even damaging uses of water become entrenched to the point that they are above challenge and there is no water for new uses. On the assumption that established uses have "prior rights" and so must be continued, public officials call passionately for more water. Usually, the idea is that the Federal government will come to the rescue and will provide additional water by massive works which will utilize some all-powerful technology. (5, 6, 12)

An excellent example of the consequences of the water shortage concept is the current Central Arizona Project for the delivery of water of the Colorado River to the Phoenix-Tucson area, which has been authorized by Congress but not yet funded. There is little doubt that it will be constructed eventually, although there is grave doubt that it will solve Arizona's water problem, which is to find the most efficient uses for already available water in terms of ecologically acceptable economics. Any water which the CAP may deliver to the Phoenix-Tucson area will be too costly to compete in the near future with the water already there. In addition, Arizona's unused share of Colorado River water could probably best be used nearer the river. The main effect of the CAP is likely to be the encouragement of the wasteful use of water according to precedent, thus fostering continued demands for more water. Demands for more water are inevitable if present attitudes and allocations to states continue, because the water supply available to the CAP is expected to drop to a mere fraction of the authorized quantity as the upper basin states take their share over the years. (5, 7, 13, 14)

Arizona's achievement in obtaining authorization of the Central Arizona Project is noteworthy as the result of more than forty years of contest over the waters of the Colorado River. Seven states within the river basin are involved, and their battlefield has extended to the U.S. Supreme Court and the Congress. The Colorado River itself has joined the battle, refusing to maintain the flow expected of it, thus confounding all planning through forcing the allocation of water deficits which are unpredictable. It is this imponderable which threatens the future CAP water supply as the upper basin states take their share and annual deficits must be apportioned. Every hoped-for drop of water is committed, and proposals ancillary to the

exploitation of the river have threatened the desecration of the Grand Canyon itself. Its reservoirs have a storage capacity five times the annual flow of the stream. (12, 13, 15)

Now, as a logical consequence of the division and sub-division of the waters of the Colorado River to the last drop, the water shortage truly comes into its own, and seven states cry for more water! (12, 15)

Such demands are extant in the form of proposals for the importation of water from distant regions that are more fortunately endowed. These proposals give no thought to ecological consequences, to true costs, or to alternatives, and they disregard many political and social factors. They are based on the idea that people must be encouraged to settle wherever they like, even in the arid country, where there is always the assurance that the Federal government will step in to supply more water when needed, from somewhere, somehow, regardless of how ill-considered and extravagant the so-called need may be. Most unthinking and selfish is the demand for irrigation water, even though the area be only marginal for agriculture and farmers cannot afford the actual cost of the water, and disregarding the fact that the water could be used more productively where it exists naturally. All this is not to mention the fact that agricultural experts predict a surplus of cropland in our country for an indefinite period. (8)

The Colorado Basin is not the only locus of water troubles, albeit creating more emotion than most. An attempt has been made at the Federal level to introduce some rationality into planning through the creation of a National Water Commission. This body is intended to carry out a thorough study of national water needs and all possible ways of satisfying them. The point of view is intended to be that of the national interest, long-term and objective. This concept is superb but it is far from unanimously accepted.

During an address at Albuquerque, New Mexico, on 18 November 1966, Congressman Wayne Aspinall of Colorado unburdened himself of his misgivings about the then proposed National Water Commission. At one point he expressed his concern that some Federal groups were "attempting to apply the scientific or theoretical approach to our national water problems," and a Federal official had said that the National Water Commission would provide an overview of water problems by experts in the field without any commitment to parochial interests. He continued, "How can (italic supplied) an independent evaluation, free of state, regional, or local interests resolve complicated water issues involving water rights, interstate compacts, long-standing agreements, etc?" He went on to quote a report of the National Academy of Sciences which expressed certain findings about Federal reclamation policy. He concluded, "You can imagine what might happen to water development in the West if the decisions were left to a group such as this." This *reductio ad absurdum* was supplied by a recognized leader in the reclamation field, who is hogtied by the questionable constraints which he himself has helped to perpetuate. It would be difficult to express any better our basic weakness in water planning. (16)

(NOTE.—In the Appendix is an account concerning the proposed Hooker Dam and Reservoir, a unit of the Central Arizona Project. It affords in microcosm a representative spectrum of the "water shortage" fixation. To dissect it is a sort of a laboratory exercise in the examination of how water problems are handled.)

### IV. GOVERNMENT AND ARID LANDS POLICY

There is a tendency to dwell almost exclusively on water problems because their solution is of such primary importance to the management of arid lands, but this does

not mean that government does any better with other aspects of the overall situation. One of the foremost examples of government policy gone generally astray is the case of Southern California. Through a chain reaction of resource exploitation, advertising, and industrial buildup, coupled with a not unpleasant climate, people have come to the area in droves and are still coming. This influx, already taking on the appearance of implosion, has received, and is still receiving, the active encouragement of government. There has been some evidence of behavioral breakdown in the Watts riots and various extremist cults, the hippie aberration, and the disorders in educational institutions. Southern California is not alone in having these troubles and some are of relatively long standing, but to admit this neither invalidates the symptoms nor explains the cause, nor does it obviate the need to observe and consider them. At the same time, it is becoming evident that the physical resources of the area and the entire surrounding region are being overtaxed to support the implosion. (3, 17)

*The Destruction of California and A Different Kind of Country*, by Raymond F. Dasmann, present the Southern California situation comprehensively and thoroughly. The need to check the unending flow of people into Southern California implies that government must restrict the freedom of individuals to live where they will. The same implication applies to arid lands in general. Moreover, the proper management of arid lands requires that government oversee the uses to which they are put. Restrictions such as these need not be applied by authoritarian methods. Economic measures such as taxation, water pricing, and the like can be effective. So can the simple refusal to provide roads, schools, utilities, etc., or to encourage industrial or agricultural expansion beyond a certain capacity for population reckoned from ecological considerations. A system of land use classification enforced by strict zoning law could be very effective, as would strong anti-pollution regulations. (1, 17)

It must be recognized that a general policy of limiting immigration to an area and controlling activity there is bound to cause a wave of protest among the expansion minded. In this country there will be objections to what will be called restraints on individual freedom, and there will be dire predictions of economic collapse. Government will be hard put to keep to such a policy unless new political and economic ideas are formulated to fit the situation. For one thing we must junk the worship of perennial growth. In our country the structure of government itself will have to be redesigned if straightforward, objective planning and action are to be maintained. I am certain that there is a similar prognosis for any democratic country with a similar situation on its hands.

In countries with authoritarian government, policies can be established easily and maintained without too much regard for public opinion. There the danger lies in the perpetuation of bad decisions, because of the lack of public opinion checks, so authoritarianism in itself is no solution to arid lands management.

If greater use is to be made of the arid lands, I believe that government must assume a grave task for which it is not prepared. The task is to protect the environment while arranging to accommodate people in numbers commensurate with its carrying capacity. To take an idea from Dasmann, the best way to accommodate a considerable human population, particularly in marginal conditions, is *not* to be indulgent with the people concerned, but to be tender toward their habitat. Thus, the first requirement for more use of our arid lands is the rethinking of many of our political concepts and patterns of government. This is a problem for

the social sciences which must be solved before the advances of the physical sciences can be used constructively. (1)

#### V. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—THE NEED FOR ORDER FROM CONFUSION

Although I have blamed many of our troubles in the American West on the ineptitude of government, science must share the onus. A recurring cause of environmental deterioration is the unscientific application of applied science. There are a number of reasons for this, but the most fundamental is the lack of coordination in the field of science, both basic and applied.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the damage to the environment which has been both the direct and the side effect of technology. Much of the trouble comes from the fact that technologies tend to become associated with vested interests, both industrial and governmental. I would like, then, to reemphasize my fear of the even greater damage that may come in the future through the misuse of technologies which may result from subjective thinking encouraged by irrational demands stimulated by population pressures. This dangerous potential must be forestalled. (10, 18)

Therefore, the second requirement for the greater use of the arid lands is the coordination of the effort in science and technology. We must make sure that sufficient work is devoted to research pertaining to the arid lands in both the physical and social sciences. Besides supplying the needed knowledge, this work must cover the organization for and the methodology of government decision-making. We must ensure that the application of the physical sciences as technology receives coordinated planning and management in the interest of the whole environment. Decisions based on the social sciences must precede the employment of technologies, but all scientific application must be grounded in ecology. Even though the use of the social sciences be stressed, there must be no over-emphasis on the purely economic, certainly not from a short-range or narrow point of view. Emphasis on the *quality of life*, including aesthetic and other abstract factors, must assume a place in all decisions. (10, 13, 16).

A major aspect of modern science is the pure bulk of knowledge. So much is known, even in specific branches of science, that no one man can retain much except in his specialty. Even so, there are many gaps in knowledge, particularly as to the side effects of applied science. Who then is to tie all this knowledge together? Who is to see that the gaps are filled? Who is to see that when a technology is developed all of its aspects and effects are explored? This last is a key question because often the by-products of a technology are outside the competence of its originators.

A start toward solving these problems was provided by last summer's *Joint House-Senate Colloquium to Discuss a National Policy for the Environment*. Many distinguished witnesses were called. In his written statement, Lamont C. Cole (page 172) stresses the need for the ecological overview, saying, "Many of the traditional organizations are so ignorant of the field that it never occurs to them that ecologists might know something that would not be immediately apparent to a chemist or engineer." David M. Gates, in his statement (page 174), includes a section on ecosystem management in which he says, "It seems to me that an entirely new profession is required by modern man—the ecological management of the world in which we live." Much light was cast on the problem of establishing a national policy for the environment, which has particular importance for the arid lands, but more light is required. (10)

In reaching toward solutions it is possible to get in a "hen or egg" type argument, but

in my view it is a responsibility of government to coordinate science and technology, particularly the latter, although much of the necessary reform of government should be based on the results of scientific research. Without doubt, there is a large task for the scientific community, which should be accepted willingly without government pressure, even though the essential responsibility remains with government. In the United States, the groundwork for this association of government with science was laid by John Wesley Powell nearly a century ago, and it was never so necessary as now.

An important function of science or schools or government or all together is the education of people, for it is they who are fundamentally responsible for the troubles of arid land management. Everyone must understand the capabilities of the environment in which he finds himself. Society must adopt Aldo Leopold's *ecological conscience* as the basis for the *land ethic* which he also suggests. Cultural elements such as these should take their places with conventional religion and morality to form the true basis for the salvation of mankind. Men must become aware of their role as members of a community based on the land, and as any other members of the community they must adapt themselves individually and as a species to play that role. To destroy the habitat which sustains them or to pollute it should come to be recognized as a major offense against society.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

These points I have made about the need for coordination in science and technology are important, especially for the arid lands. The same is true of the need for the reform of government. Historically, the most successful use of dry country has been by those primitive peoples who have truly adapted themselves to aridity. Peoples classified as more advanced have sometimes seemed intent more on *making* deserts than in using the arid environment successfully. Now, with advanced technologies we can get very quick results at desert-making if we insist on distorting nature to our often ill-conceived designs. To prevent habitat destruction we need knowledge which can be supplied only by science through cooperation with government. We must create governmental mechanisms which will permit the full use of our intelligence both in general planning as it affects the environment, and in the evaluation of apparent opportunities for technological solutions.

If we wish to survive as a species our first thought must be to stabilize human numbers. While we are accomplishing this, the increased use of our arid lands will become necessary, but this must be undertaken with due regard for their best use, which is *not* intensified food production, but *is* the provision of living space. From what we know of the reactions of other mammals to crowding, we shall need space. As populations grow, one of the first tests of mankind will be the quality of his use of the arid lands.

#### REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. *A Different Kind of Country*, Raymond F. Dasmann, The Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1968.
2. *The Hidden Dimension*, Edward T. Hall, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1966.
3. *Old Nature, Modern Man*, Paul B. Sears, Audubon, Vol. 70, No. 3, May-June 1968.
4. *Easter Island*, William Mulloy, Natural History, Vol. LXXVI, No. 10, Dec. 1967.
5. *Patterns of Water Use in the Arizona Economy*, William E. Martin and Leonard G. Bower, Arizona Review, Dec. 1966.
6. *The Changing Role of Water in Arid Lands*, Gilbert F. White, Arizona Review, Mar. 1967 (reprint of Riecker Memorial Lecture, Nov. 1960, Univ. of Ariz.).
7. *The Economics of Arizona's Water Problem*, Robert A. Young and William E. Martin, Arizona Review, Mar. 1967.

8. *Demand for Rural Resources in the Context of Long-Range National Needs*, Marion Clawson and E. Burnell Held, Resources for the Future, Reprint No. 44, Dec. 1963.

9. *The Coming Famine*, Paul B. Ehrlich, Natural History, Vol. LXXVII, No. 5, May 1968.

10. Report of Joint House-Senate Colloquium to Discuss a National Policy for the Environment, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 17 July 1968.

11. *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian*, Wallace Stegner, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass., 1962 (copyright 1953, 1954).

12. *The Battle of Grand Canyon*, Congressman Craig Hosmer, Per/Se Magazine, Winter, 1966.

13. *Water and Choice in the Colorado Basin*, National Academy of Sciences, Publication 1689, 1968.

14. Public Law 90-537, 30 Sep. 68, an Act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.

15. Report of Hearing, Lower Colorado River Basin Project, House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 23 Aug.-1 Sep. 1965.

16. *Alternatives in Water Management*, National Academy of Sciences, Publication 1408, 1966.

17. *The Destruction of California*, Raymond F. Dasmann, The Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1965.

18. *Science and Survival*, Barry Commoner, The Viking Press, 1967 (copyright 1963, 1964, 1966).

19. *A Sand County Almanac*, Aldo Leopold, Oxford Univ. Press, N.Y., 1948.

#### HOOVER DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Hoover Dam and Reservoir, which is one of the units of the Central Arizona Project, affords in microcosm a representative spectrum of the "water shortage" fixation. To dissect it is a sort of laboratory exercise in the examination of how water problems are handled. (1)

Much of the flow of the Gila River originates in New Mexico, but the best farm lands along its valley are in Arizona. The early use of these lands and the nearby Gila waters gave Arizona water rights senior to those which were established later in New Mexico. Meanwhile, Arizona's long-standing feud with California over the waters of the Colorado River led to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1952. The Gila, being a tributary of the Colorado, was soon brought into the case, as was the State of New Mexico. (2)

The Court decision in 1964 was unsatisfactory to New Mexico, not only because she was allowed only 31,000 acre feet per annum of the total Gila flow of some 1.75 million acre feet, but because her pleas for consideration of her future needs fell on deaf ears. Arizona was not only allotted most of the Gila flow, but this water was not charged against her share of the Colorado. The Court did make the doubtful concession that future additional needs in New Mexico could be considered in case there were a change in conditions. (2, 3)

The New Mexico authorities at once became alert for any opportunity to improve the Gila situation. Such an opportunity came in 1965 because of Congressional consideration of a bill to authorize the Central Arizona Project. The bargaining over this bill led to the fabrication of a typical legislative patchwork involving all the Basin states, this time aptly described by California's Congressman Craig Hosmer as "one of the most delicately-structured compromises ever placed before Congress." New Mexico's contribution to the patchwork was the simple declaration that the state could not agree to the CAP proposal unless she were granted additional use of Gila River waters. The senior users in Arizona would be compen-

sated from CAP deliveries, in other words, from Arizona's share of the Colorado main stream. Arizona finally accepted this "ransom" demand, as it was dubbed during Congressional discussion. It is now written into the CAP authorization, and the Hooker project is the instrument for making the additional Gila River water available in New Mexico. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Additional Gila River water for New Mexico:

1. 18,000 acre feet per annum as soon as the CAP begins operation, allocated as follows according to the State Engineer:

	Acre-feet per annum
Consumptive uses:	
Municipal (Silver City)-----	800
Industrial (mining and milling) --	10,000
Reservoir evaporation-----	6,400
Irrigation-----	700
Not specified-----	100
<b>Total -----</b>	<b>18,000</b>

2. 30,000 acre feet per annum of additional water if and when the Colorado River should be augmented by water from outside the river system.

Various benefits are asserted for the project, but they do not stand examination. To begin with, its specifications have not been worked out, so the burden of proof clearly rests on the proponents. It is sure, however, that some 6,000 acre feet of water would be lost to evaporation annually simply because water would be held in the reservoir. The benefits claimed for agriculture are absurdly insignificant because there isn't much agriculture. The main benefits are said to be in the provision of additional water for municipal and industrial purposes, but no customers can be identified. Silver City, the only important community in the vicinity, has sufficient underground water for the indefinite future, according to a U.S. Geological Survey appraisal dated September 1968. The newly reopened copper mine at Tyrone was said to be the prospective user for a relatively large quantity of water, but the company has already supplied its needs through the purchase of Gila Valley agricultural land with attached water rights, thus putting this land out of irrigated production at least for the foreseeable future and weakening the already weak case for assistance to agriculture in the Valley. The reservoir's physical characteristics would make it a poor recreation lake. It would be inferior to the nearby reservoir the mining company is building on a Gila tributary to facilitate use of its purchased water at Tyrone, in which the State Game and Fish Department has an interest by agreement. (1, 7)

The alteration of the flow of the Gila below the dam would destroy or damage the uniquely interesting ecology, and the reservoir would drop much riparian and gorge scenery, above, as well as the biotic community. Just as serious from a legal and philosophical standpoint would be the fact that the Hooker Reservoir would extend upstream for several miles and would thereby encroach on the Gila Wilderness. Although the Wilderness Act authorizes the exploitation of water resources in units of the National Wilderness Preservation System if the President decides such action is required to serve the national interest, this provision clearly intends to put the burden of proof on the advocates of wilderness encroachment. The casual way in which the Hooker project was conceived, proposed, and authorized has constituted a clear violation of this principle. This fact was recognized by enough members of Congress to cause the Hooker authorization to be qualified. The act authorizes the Hooker Dam and Reservoir or suitable alternative. (1, 6, 8, 9)

Against the showing that the Hooker Dam and Reservoir as proposed would be expensively and destructively unnecessary, the de-

ference of the State Engineer has been the assertion that if the additional water should be made available it would be used. In making this defense, he appears to join in discounting the claimed benefits other than the arbitrary provision of more water, thus tending to confirm the logical conclusion that the claims are a mere rationalization. The Hooker project thus stands out as a product of the "water shortage" fixation. In recognizing this, one must concede a certain sincerity on the part of the state officials and representatives concerned. Based on the American concept of perennial growth and development, a vague foreboding of looming water shortage is excusable, if not justified in an objective sense, especially since precedent seems to forbid the reform of water law and practices. (1)

From the conservationist point of view, hope must be based on the law as written and the search for an alternative. The failure of both the President and the Congress properly to defend the Wilderness System has placed the burden of any such search on the citizen conservationist. This is a heavy burden to bear in the absence of official status, yet from an objective viewpoint it appears possible that a satisfactory and inexpensive alternative can be conceived. It is possible, too, that the alternative can be made flexible in design so as to enable construction in stages as need is demonstrated in the course of time. Whether such an alternative will be accepted is another question, however, because of the predilection for large multipurpose dams on the part of government engineers and the desire of the local citizens for the "pork barrel" income to be derived from a large construction job. Of such stuff are water decisions made.

#### REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. *Report on Hooker Dam*, Henry M. Zeller, Jan. 1968, published as Sierra Club, Rio Grande Chapter, paper; also in Congressional Record, 1 Feb. 1968, pp. H722-6.
2. Report of Hearing, Lower Colorado River Basin Project, House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 23 Aug.-1 Sep. 1965.
3. *The Battle of Grand Canyon*, Congressman Craig Hosmer, *Per/Se Magazine*, Winter 1966.
4. Report of Hearing, Lower Colorado River Basin Project, House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 9-18 May 1966.
5. Report No. 1312, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 2nd Session.
6. Public Law 90-537, 30 Sep. 68, an Act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin Project, and for other purposes.
7. *Water Resources Appraisal of the Silver City Area, Grant County, N.M.*, Sep. 1968, F. C. Koopman, F. D. Trauger, and J. A. Basler, U.S. Geological Survey.
8. *The Gila Valley in Southwestern New Mexico as an Important Wildlife Reservoir*, Dale A. Zimmerman, 1968, unpublished paper (copies available from Zeller).
9. Impact Survey Report, Hooker Dam and Reservoir Project, U.S. Forest Service 1968.

#### A TIME FOR WAR AND A TIME FOR PEACE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

MR. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, once again we stand at the center of a new maelstrom of protest against the American involvement in Vietnam. Nothing there has changed.

Our men continue to die. Their men continue to die. Our treasure continues its flow abroad in massive quantities, to

vanish down the bottomless pit which has swallowed more than \$100 billion. The Paris talks stand at a fruitless impasse.

Here at home, nothing has changed. Protests continue and mount in intensity. Our cities are a little shabbier and older. Our poor are considerably poorer. Our prices are much higher. Inflation rages unchecked. Young Americans increasingly lose faith in their Government, elders, and institutions. President Nixon has succeeded in exacerbating an already deteriorating situation. Civil liberties stand in more peril than ever before because of this administration. Government intransigence has increased as the administration appeals to emotions rather than reason to gain a temporary respite from criticism. Of course, it will be to no avail. What, then, has changed?

That is just it. Nothing has changed significantly. This is our main difficulty and danger. Our Nation, like a powerless ship, stands dead in the ocean of events. No new course has been charted. We drift, helplessly, prey to vicissitudes of an inscrutable fate. Instead of controlling events, we are at the mercy of them. Rather than acting and awaiting reaction, we stand helplessly, reciting positions and excuses like a bankrupt litany. We await some miraculous light from the darkness to lead us to a solution or some promised land. Nothing could be more futile. Is it not a confession of intellectual and moral bankruptcy to see our President offer an appeal to jingoism as his new solution to this present incredible impasse?

Is America so bereft of ingenuity and ideas that all we can do is throw up our hands, blame enemies abroad and within and withdraw like a tortoise into a protective shell? Is this all the Government of the mightiest power the earth has ever beheld can produce? I refuse to accept such a response. To follow such a policy is to invite license on the part of every right and left wing extremist in the land.

If we are such a mighty state militarily, can we not summon up political force of equal magnitude? Must we reply through the mouth of an Agnew in response to questions of the world and the vast majority of our own people? A Gordian knot can never be unraveled. It must be cut. Leadership implies statesmanship. Power must be exercised. Yet this is exactly what the President cannot or will not do. So he demands conformity in the name of patriotism. Hollow rhetoric and solemnly delivered slogans can be no substitute for a new alternative.

Because, as President Nixon suggested, we can never be defeated in the field, we can pursue new options with impunity, sure that such efforts will not be mistaken for weakness. Standing pat behind Thieu and Ky gives them a blank military check. No pressure is placed on the Army of South Vietnam to perform any better. Heavier weight must lean upon them. A new sense of urgency must be imparted to them. Only the President can cause this to be done. If he does not, divisions in American life over the war

will lead to polarization of opinion and destruction of the middle ground upon which we always meet to compromise. How ironic that the very inability of the enemy to defeat us abroad may sow seeds for our own destruction at home by our very selves. For in order to fight dissent rising to intolerable levels, government itself may become an intolerable oppressor.

The first public statement by newly re-elected President Marcos of the Philippines was to promise withdrawal from Vietnam of all Filipino troops. An ominous sign. Another small but significant event which again takes an initiative away from us. I believe it would be worthwhile for this Government to begin withdrawal of nonessential support units from South Vietnam. Several hundred thousand of these personnel are there, and can be spared easily. No better notice could be served on the Saigon government. Simultaneously, this could be used effectively at the negotiating table. Certainly, it is worth trying, because as of now we seem to be losing ground rather than gaining it.

We have, by our own President's recent statement, taken an inflexible stand. No concession or even recognition has been offered dissenters. In fact, their position has been ridiculed and their rights questioned by those who are supposedly guardians of such guarantees. A national holiday has just been turned into a political forum in order to combat protest.

No democratic government can be intransigent abroad and inflexible at home and hope to survive, much less provide meaningful leadership. To surrender initiative for peace is to invite political disaster far out of proportion to any losses we may suffer on the battlefield.

Individual protestors may be irresponsible. So may individual government officials. But the national administration of the world's most powerful state and democracy cannot afford such weakness. Government must above all show maturity instead of petulance and pettiness. It must recognize failure for what it is. It must be able to define what is good in the long run for the state and what is evil. This is what separates mature civilizations from mere powerful states which wax strong, then disappear into the limbo of history.

There is a time for war and a time for peace. In case of any major threat from a menacing foe, America would unite in any effort to defend our liberties. This is not the case now. This is a time for peace, and the initiative must be seized.

#### IMPORTS: CLAREMONT EAGLE CLEARLY SEES SHOE INDUSTRY PLIGHT

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, the Claremont Daily Eagle published one of the best editorials I have yet seen on the critical situation facing the shoe industry in New England.

In clear, forthright words, this ludicrous and tragic situation is described. It is ludicrous to the extent that the

situation has been created in large part by our own Government: our Government tolerates shoes to be imported which are manufactured under labor wage and working conditions, and often under Government subsidy, which would be illegal in the United States. At the same time, the Government is imposing greater and greater restrictions on domestic industry through heavy taxes, rigid specifications of working conditions, minimum wages, and marketing restrictions of various kinds.

The situation is tragic because of the thousands of workers who will be thrown out of work if their Government does not come to their aid forthwith. The closing of these factories would have grave impact upon their communities.

On February 26, I introduced H.R. 7696, the Orderly Footwear Marketing Act. It is past time for action on this legislation. Very little has been done in either House or by the administration to help in this situation.

I call on my colleagues for their help and comment to them this excellent editorial. As I say, I have never seen this urgent problem more clearly described: [From the Claremont (N.H.) Daily Eagle, Nov. 8, 1969]

#### FOR SHOES: A GOOD DOSE OF TARIFF

The Eagle is printing a three-part series by a United Press feature writer on the "sick, dying, New England shoe industry."

The only real trouble with the "sick, dying, New England shoe industry" is "sick, disinterested government" which fails to protect it on the one hand, makes it difficult or impossible to operate on the other hand and of the shoe labor unions which have done little or nothing to join with management in making government responsible and responsive to the needs of the industry as a whole and the men and women that work for it.

What we see is management, virtually alone, struggling in admittedly antiquated buildings with expensive equipment, to market a product manufactured by American men and women for American men and women.

And what we see, too, is pacific unionism, content with collecting dues, but not interested in joining with management in shutting off the flow of shoe imports from countries with sub-standard wages and working conditions.

We also see administrations—be they Democratic or Republican—and office-holders for the most part, turn their backs on the need for a tariff on shoe imports to save the New England shoe industry and New England jobs of workingmen and workingwomen.

How interested the government is when it pokes its nose into industry to dictate minimum wages and working conditions; how indifferent it is when this industry needs protection from competition which the same government would never tolerate in the United States.

We believe that management, in most instances, has done all that it can (and again under government supervision and law) to meet foreign competition.

Here, in New Hampshire, and even in Claremont, we have seen relatively new shoe machinery move into a new plant, employ local (mostly women) workers, and still not make a go of it.

The problem deepens when unions representing these workers are indifferent to the major plight of the industry—a plight not caused by the shoe manufacturer—but by administrations that these union leaders have often urged their members to vote for!

The only salvation of and for the New

England shoe industry is enactment of a stiff tariff on low-cost slave-labor imports.

The only hope for such a tariff is massive political pressure, pressure that must come from shoe workers, led by their union, working together with management for the common cause—survival and jobs.

The American people have been asleep at the switch.

Too much has been handed over to men—professional bureaucrats—the executors of abortive treaty agreements under congressional fiat.

There is nothing much wrong with the shoe industry that a good dose of tariff won't cure, and cure fast.

#### EVERYTHING BUT A HOUSE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, according to the great movers and doers of the administration, the average American lives in a newly emerging paradise. Of course, the "great silent majority" could tell them such is not exactly the case. In no area is this more evident than in housing. Today, a decent house for a worker's family at a modest price is practically nonexistent. Traditionally, for between \$15,000 to \$20,000 the average working man could purchase such a dwelling. Today it is a dream gone a-glimmering. Rental quarters are all that is available, usually starting at about \$150 monthly. That precious word "equity" is disappearing from workingmen's vocabularies. And the situation worsens daily. Such is paradise today.

At present, a seller's market dominates the national real estate scene. Coupled with inflation and prohibitive interest rates, a home is becoming more than just difficult to obtain. It is becoming impossible. Once a thorough knowledge of this permeates the minds of America's working citizens, how much faith will they have in the Nation? Previously, a home was the tangible goal of so many. It made sacrificing worthwhile. Now this administration delivers a terrible blow at such fond hopes.

The nationwide median selling price of new houses covered by conventional mortgages has increased 31 percent in just 4 years; from \$22,700 in 1965 to \$29,900 this year. Less than 4 years ago, nearly 50 percent of new single family residences were constructed at costs of less than \$20,000. This year, there are fewer than 25 percent being built at that price level.

When President Nixon took office last January, the yearly rate of new housing starts stood at 1.8 million units. In August of this year, it stood at 1.3 million starts. As of today, it is plunging well below the 1 million mark, eloquent testimony to the stark reality of our present situation. The homebuilding industry is of course a disaster area employment-wise. Yet the National Housing Act of 1968 envisioned a goal of 26 million new housing units by 1978.

Population increases, especially notable in marriage figures, bode even worse for the future. More than 2.1 million couples were married in one recent year, compared to 1.8 million couples 4 years earlier. What hopes do these young people have of owning their own home, given

the existing situation? The old, the young, and moderate- and low-income citizens are penalized most by this trend.

In my own home city of New York, for the first time in metropolitan history, the city suffered a net loss of 21,000 housing units from 1965 to 1968. Housing units there are being retired twice as fast as new ones are being put into use. Two thirds of abandoned buildings being torn down as unsafe could be restored. High costs of land, plus outlandish interest rates are making new private housing in the city a sole preserve of the wealthy. It has been predicted that New York City will require a long term commitment of \$1 billion annually in Federal funds to reverse this decay spiral, ten times what it is now receiving.

In response, what has President Nixon offered? Certainly not a new housing program. Not even a reasonable proposal—Congress has taken its own action without administration initiative. We are reaching a point where our nonhousing policy is creating slums much faster than they can ever be eradicated. Thus, our social problems are being compounded.

The American people have plenty of guns. Plenty of thermonuclear weapons. Plenty of poison gas and germ agents. Plenty of autos that can go 125 miles per hour. Soon we may have bigger trucks on our Interstate System. Plenty of pollution of all kinds; air, water, oil, pesticide, thermal, and noise. Soon we shall have an SST, to get us from traffic jam to traffic jam even faster. We have plenty of wire-taps and detention camps. Oodles of men in uniform. Millions of tons of garbage with no disposal plants for it. All the tax loopholes we will ever need. But no housing for the average citizen. A plethora of high interest rates and price hikes by big banking and bigger business. Not too many bungalows for the young or poor, though. Very few places for the elderly to live in comfort. Can not have that. Might spoil them. Turn them into effete snobs. Decent living quarters have been known to have that effect on people, you know.

Those are new directions, are they not? Or are they? Well, once you have seen one low priced home, you have seen them all.

#### IN DEFENSE OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the floor of the House has, in recent months, been used as a forum to malign and condemn the United Mine Workers of America. Some of this criticism has been warranted, most of it has been uncalled for and most inaccurate.

I think the time has come to put this criticism in the larger context of the history of the American labor movement and the place of the United Mine Workers within that movement.

Founded in 1890, the UMWA is America's first major industrial union, and through its efforts, the United Steelworkers and the United Auto Workers were formed. It was John L. Lewis, who

broke with the AFL to form the CIO, and it was John L. Lewis at the head of the United Mine Workers who then organized the auto industry and the steel industry.

But this industrial union has found itself a pioneer in more areas than just organization. It has been a pioneer in virtually every phase of union endeavor. It was the first union to establish a private pension plan for its membership back in 1946. It, along with the rail brotherhoods was the first union to provide hospitalization for its members, and my State of West Virginia is dotted with the hospitals established for and by the United Mine Workers.

The UMWA-forged policy in an area where many other unions are just beginning to formulate their planning: The area of automation. Just after World War II, the coal industry was the sick man of American industry, and the mine workers faced the dilemma of allowing mechanization in the coal mines resulting in a reduction of personnel or the failure of the coal mining industry with the consequence of massive depression for the vast majority of the union members.

The UMWA faced this bitter decision and allowed mechanization in return for good wages for those remaining in the mines. This decision, in retrospect, seems the only rational or intelligent decision that could be made. But, ask any union leader today about the problem of automation and layoffs due to new technology and you will find that this is one of the most thorny and, as yet, unresolved problems in the American labor movement.

The UMWA, along with the major labor unions in this Nation, had to adjust to an industrial decline as severe as that of the coal industry. Alone within the industrial labor movement, it forged industrywide agreements before the Wagner Act. It was the UMWA which rallied American labor for the election of President Roosevelt and this union is responsible for the present safety regulations in the coal industry.

We are now completing our work on the most comprehensive legislation for the protection of health and safety of employees that this Nation has witnessed. The Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 will bring standards for compensation and protection through research and regulation that no other industry enjoys.

It is legislation which will save lives and protect the health of coal miners for generations to come. With its passage, we will have entered a new era of industrial relations, an era where the concern for preventing harm to the American worker will achieve a new priority in our country. All of us, who have played a part of its passage, can share with the coal miners and their union a large amount of satisfaction that we have taken a significant step toward a more humane society.

It is altogether too easy for some to forget this and other monumental triumphs of the UMWA, a union which has been responsible for the creation of many of American labor's rights and riches. Because of the desperate struggle for sur-

vival within the fuel industry, it is not always realized that the coal industry is the only member of the fuel industry which has uniform unionization and is unsubsidized by the Government.

Likewise, it is easy to forget or disregard the contributions of the many forward looking men who would not yield to the tremendous adversity that has accompanied this union's challenges since its birth.

Men like John L. Lewis forged a safer and more secure way of life, not only for an industry but for an entire section of America.

I have had the privilege of working together with the membership and leadership of this union from shop steward to president for more than 30 years. I have watched men like John L. Lewis fight day in and day out to bring a new day and a new way of life to men and their families and an entire area in one of the most competitive and dangerous industries in the Nation.

I have watched this union transform the landscape of labor relations in our Nation, and I have watched the leadership of this union fight for the safety of their members when the survival of the coal industry itself was in grave doubt.

The sheer endurance of this union and its members is a credit to their strength and their perseverance and now as the coal industry again begins to boom, they face a new day armed with comprehensive health and safety legislation which will be the model for virtually all future industrial health and safety regulations. Again, the UMWA has been a pioneer among its brother organizations in the American labor movement and once again the American labor movement owes them a debt of gratitude.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REQUIRING REPORTING OF AIR CARGO LOSSES

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to require air carriers to file reports with the Civil Aeronautics Board listing lost, damaged, and stolen baggage and cargo.

This is identical to S. 2737 introduced in the other body by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE).

This legislation is a response to sharp increase in air cargo losses throughout the country, especially at our major air terminals. Frankly, I am disappointed that the CAB has failed to exercise its administrative authority to require such reports. But in the absence of the CAB action it is imperative that the Congress act promptly to assure that uniform and required reporting procedures are placed into effect.

I can testify firsthand the seriousness of the problem of air cargo losses. This situation was called to my attention earlier this year by many constituents who are engaged in the business of interstate and foreign shipping. I then personally visited John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York, where air cargo losses are greatest, and saw

shocking instances of broken, missing, and damaged shipments.

Moreover I have studied the investigation into this problem that has been undertaken in great depth by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which is chaired by the gentleman from Nevada. The Senator and his excellent committee staff have compiled distressing information about the gravity of the problem of lost and stolen air cargo.

Accurate statistics on air cargo losses are necessary if we are to have adequate insurance standards for air freight and passenger baggage and if the problem is to be dealt with properly.

The absence of such statistics has proved a serious impediment to efforts to control the problem because of widely differing views about the extent of the problem among those involved.

Congress cannot be expected to legislate in this area, nor can the CAB fulfill its responsibilities, unless complete information is available. Since the CAB has failed to discharge its responsibility in requiring complete reporting of air cargo losses the Congress must step in and insist that this necessary step be taken.

**CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO COMMENDS CHICAGO ATTORNEY BENJAMIN BECKER ON HIS NEW BOOK—"IS THE UNITED NATIONS DEAD?"**

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to call to the attention of my colleagues a book written by Benjamin M. Becker, "Is the United Nations Dead?" with a foreword by Hon. Paul H. Douglas, former U.S. Senator from Illinois.

The author is a distinguished practicing lawyer for over 35 years in Chicago and is a member of the board of directors and past vice president of the American Association for the United Nations, Chicago, Ill., division.

I have known Benjamin Becker for more than 25 years. He has been a former Chicago city councilman and a member of former Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner's commission on State government.

He is the author of many articles and books dealing with various phases of law practice, including Federal taxation, estate planning, labor relations, and legal ethics. He is a former lecturer at DePaul University and has long been an advocate for attainment of world peace.

As all of us know that we failed in our efforts after World War I to achieve world peace through the League of Nations. Again, after World War II, it was the hope and aspiration of men everywhere that a United Nation's organization could be created to insure peace for the peoples of the world. We did eventually establish the United Nations and it was created in the belief and hope of mankind that war could be eliminated through an effective international organization dedicated to peace and fully supported by the countries of the world.

Mr. Becker deals with this entire problem in his book "Is the United Nations

Dead?" and I commend him for a very comprehensive and cogent appraisal of the failures and drawbacks of the United Nations. He presents an excellent evaluation and it is a book that every American who is deeply concerned with the issue of world peace should read.

**CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: A BACKGROUND SERIES—I**

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, over the next several days, my colleague from California (Mr. REES) and I will be reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain historical documents relevant to the pending issue of congressional reform.

Every Member of Congress, as well as other interested citizens, has his own opinions of what should be done to modernize the National Legislature. A special subcommittee of the House Rules Committee is in the process of preparing legislation to bring about some changes in our operations and procedures. Hearings on the subcommittee's print of the bill began this morning. I urge Members to monitor these hearings with the utmost care and to devote serious study to each of the proposed changes and to the reform package in the aggregate. The ramifications of this legislation are serious and widespread. They go to the very heart of the question of well- or malfunctioning of Government in our continuing experiment in American democracy. I believe the issue of congressional reform transcends in importance all of the issues before us except the question of war and peace.

As a part of my remarks today, I include below the text of House Concurrent Resolution 18, 79th Congress, first session, which established the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1945. Other material to follow will include the final report of this first joint organization committee, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and similar documents of the 1965 joint organization committee. Our purpose in calling attention to these documents is to give Members and others interested in congressional reform a background by which to judge the legislation currently being proposed by the Rules Committee. House Concurrent Resolution 18 follows:

**HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18**

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

Passed the House of Representatives January 18, 1945.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,  
Clerk.

Passed the Senate amended February 12, 1945.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,  
Secretary.

House agrees to Senate amendments February 19, 1945.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,  
Clerk.

## ITALIAN STYLE

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Italian Style" that appeared recently in Twin Circle—The National Catholic Press of Culver City, Calif.

The article is about a recent student demonstration that took place in the city of Pescara, Italy, and how the Italian parents took the situation well in hand. I believe my colleagues will appreciate the comments made in this article, and I feel that we in America should think seriously about restoring papa as the head of his household.

The article follows:

## ITALIAN STYLE

In the Italian city of Pescara, a group of rebellious students decided to fight it out with the police. They had plenty of rocks and insulting slogans to hurl, and across the campus the police stood ready. But suddenly, disaster hit the students from the rear. An angry crowd of mothers, fathers, grandparents and older brothers swept in and began slapping the students and "hauling them off by the ears." Did you ever see an Italian boy when his mother has him firmly by the ear, or when his father has him by the collar? That is all it takes. Discipline has to start somewhere, and there is still no substitute for the home.

It recalls the account some years ago about Judge Leibowitz in Chicago. After 30 years in juvenile court, the judge decided to make a study of delinquency in Europe. To his surprise, he found that Italy had the lowest delinquency rate on the continent. So he went there for three months to find out why. The answer, he found, was simple: in Italy the father is the head of the house. Italian children learn to obey at home, before stepping out into that bigger society beyond the front door. Said the Judge, on his return from Italy: "If you want to stop delinquency in this country, put the father back as the head of the house."

If we just have sense enough to buy it, this could be the greatest export since Columbus.—D.L.

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH OF  
NOVEMBER 3

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's November 3 speech was a firm and reasonable answer to those Americans who ask for peace at any price in Vietnam. Refusing to let the Nation's foreign policies be influenced by mob action, Mr. Nixon courageously committed the United States to continue its firm stand against Communist aggression in Vietnam. The President promised continuing withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, but only as the Vietnamese Army can take up the fight. These were the answers to those who took to the streets on moratorium day, seeking an American surrender in Vietnam and Southeast Asia. They got their answer. It was not what they wanted, but the President has made it plain what his policy shall be. Nationwide polls show the vast

majority of Americans support Mr. Nixon's decision. Throughout our national history, we have never elected to take the easy road out of difficulties, and so broad support of the President's decision is not really very surprising.

With the Nation thus recommitted to attaining a just and lasting peace in Vietnam, the futility of further mob demonstrations is readily apparent. Nevertheless, encouraged by the rich propaganda gains of past antiwar demonstrations, the Communists are going all out to create a large demonstration in Washington on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday this week. Ignoring the hard political fact that this demonstration is a mere dead letter following the President's declared policy, they are pointedly ignoring the President's plea for unity. For these efforts, they are receiving wholehearted and enthusiastic support from the North Vietnamese, the Vietcong, and Communist sympathizers around the world.

Mr. Speaker, radicals in this Nation, because of their repugnant tactics and their determination to achieve anarchy, are steadily eroding the freedoms of the majority of this country. Though the ballot box was designed precisely for the purpose of creating or changing governments, the radicals, failing there, have resorted to the device of creating an atmosphere of violence.

Now, another large demonstration looms over Washington. Extreme leftists and avowed Communists are already gathering to attempt to blackmail the elected American Government into acceding to their demands. No one endeavors to deny any of the American people the right to peacefully petition their Government, yet the evidence is clear that many come to Washington not to peacefully demonstrate but to provoke confrontation which is a synonym for violence.

There are many valid and convincing reasons as to why I believe this to be the case. First, it is glaringly apparent that there has been collaboration between the leaders of the Vietnam moratorium and those of the so-called New Mobe from the very beginning. Although members of these groups would have us believe to the contrary, there is more than a scintilla of evidence that these groups have long been working jointly on the events of the fall offensive.

Second, a very bright Red shadow is cast by the leaders of these groups. The rosters of almost every planning session contain the names of Communists and pro-Communists, including members and partisans of both the Communist Party U.S.A. and, most particularly, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance.

For example, at the August 15 meeting of the New Mobe in San Francisco, 17 of the 40 people invited were outright Communist Party U.S.A. members or affiliated with other organizations obviously pro-Communist or revolutionary in nature.

With such parentage, it is alarmingly clear that the November 3 moratorium is not a child of legitimate, sincere protest against the presumed inadequacies

of our policies in Southeast Asia; it is the heir of outright Communist manipulation, exploitation and subversion. It can trace its conspicuously Communist lineage from its inception at the National Antiwar Conference in Cleveland last August to wherever major planning sessions have been conducted. For at every one of these meetings, trained members and supporters of the Communist and Socialist Workers Parties have been present to contribute their invaluable expertise.

With such overwhelming evidence, I cannot view this November moratorium as simply an exercise in democracy. Although there will be many who are sincerely expressing their opposition to President Nixon's Vietnam policies this weekend, they are unfortunately the emotional pawns of those whose only intent is to prolong the war to America's disadvantage. In other words, I think that many who are participating in the November moratorium are being "had."

I must ask these Americans that if they are cognizant of this fact, can they believe that by alining themselves with subversives and reactionaries, they will contribute to a peaceful demise of the Vietnam war? I would not answer for them, I would only hope that their answer would be "no." The cold facts are that new demonstrations can only serve to encourage the enemy, feed his propaganda mills and further weaken the bargaining position of the United States at the Paris peace talks. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have repeatedly used the antiwar movement in the United States to strengthen their own demands and to propagandize their own people to the effect that American public opinion will force the United States to eventually abandon South Vietnam to their forces.

To those who would continue to prostitute democracy in this manner, however, let them be aware of their deeds. By beginning such a contradictory program as a fall offensive for peace steered by a plethora of Communists, they are no harbingers of peace to the war torn fields of Vietnam or to the shores of the United States. Rather, they sow the seeds of needless discord that will neither stop the killing nor bring our boys home but will aid the cause of the Communists in Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi.

GENERAL CUSHMAN, FORT DEVENS  
COMMANDER, SALUTES CAUSE OF  
FREEDOM AND THOSE WHO DEFEND  
IT IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this week seems a very appropriate time to place in the Record a fine statement by an outstanding soldier, Brig. Gen. John H. Cushman, the commanding general of Fort Devens, Mass.

This address was given by the general last month in Nashua, N.H., during ceremonies dedicating a monument to the men of the region who have fallen in defense of liberty and their country's honor

in Vietnam. It is one of the first such monuments in the country.

I was privileged to be among the official guests at the dedication and I was very struck by the forcefulness and earnestness of this capable young general. He has served two tours of duty in Vietnam, the first as senior adviser to a Vietnamese infantry division and the second as commanding officer, 2d Brigade, 101st Airborne Division.

He has led Americans and Vietnamese in battle. He has tested their courage—and his own—and drawn conclusions which are a moving tribute to the men of both nations.

I am honored to place his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommend it to those who may be tempted to follow the "turn-tail-and-run" crowd which infests some of the activities that will be taking place in the Capital over the next few days.

REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN H. CUSHMAN, U.S. ARMY COMMANDING GENERAL, FORT DEVENS, MASS., AT DEDICATION OF VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL, MEMORIAL PARK, NASHUA, N.H., OCTOBER 12, 1969

Senator McIntyre, Congressman Cleveland, Councilor Streeter, Mayor Sullivan, Commissioner Silber, distinguished guests—

Today, we gather in this attractive town in beautiful New England to dedicate a memorial to the men of this region who have given their lives in yet one more war.

In almost every New England town one finds memorials like this—erected to men of the countryside who left their homes and went out, oftentimes to very distant places, and laid down their lives for their country's purposes.

This memorial is one of the first of its kind. It is to the men who have died in Vietnam.

I asked myself, why have I been asked to speak at this dedication? Although I command a nearby Army post, and am proud and pleased to be among the people of New England, I am really a transient. I did not come from this land as did the sons in whose memories we gather.

Nevertheless, I accept this task. Fort Devens is not ancient, but for more than fifty years it has been bound up in New England's history, and has served well the Army's purposes in this area through wars, and times of crisis, and in peacetime. It so serves them today.

Furthermore, the Army which I represent had its origins long ago not many miles from this place when our first Commander-in-Chief, General Washington, took command of the Continental Army on Cambridge Common in June of 1775. The traditions of the Minuteman and citizen soldier stem from this region as does the long cherished principle of our land by which the standing Army is subservient to the civil authority. And, although we are professional soldiers among you, our institution is fully responsive to the people and we as individuals are intimately connected with the fabric of American life and in fact inseparable therefrom.

Furthermore, I have been to Vietnam for two tours of duty. I know something of conditions in that countryside. I know, from having commanded him in battle, that the American soldier from every walk of life has handled himself magnificently in his duties there. I have seen how he has endured the hardships of that faraway battlefield.

#### BRIGHT, BRAVE MEN

So I will talk to you today about the young men whom we honor, and about the cause in which they died.

Let me tell you about the soldier—and what I say applies to the sailor, and the airman, and the Marine, as well.

He is intelligent—more intelligent than any soldier we have ever had. He is better educated and more aware of the world around him. He thinks for himself—even more, I think, than my generation did. He sees it like it is. These qualities do indeed put a challenge to us, his leadership. But it is a challenge we gladly accept because the results if we meet it well are most remarkable and rewarding.

He is compassionate. He has an instinctive liking for young children, for older people, and for those in difficulty. It is heartwarming to see the American serviceman overseas, and in the United States as well, surrounded by kids and playing with them. The good works of the soldier in foreign lands supporting orphanages, hospitals, churches and other causes are too numerous to recount.

He has a sense of humor. He has the ability to meet adversity and difficulty with a smile or a joke that eases the situation and makes things right. I remember one time in Vietnam when I was with a rifle platoon in the rice paddies in a driving rain that had everyone soaking wet and that we all thought would never end. A new replacement came into the platoon and asked one of the soldiers a question—"Does it always rain like this?" The young soldier replied, "No it doesn't—sometimes it rains from the other direction!"

Finally, he is heroic. He rises to the occasion. Somewhere within him, he finds the resources to take those dangerous steps forward when his duty calls for him to do so. He does not flaunt this heroism, but performs with day-to-day bravery and nonchalant indifference to danger that is truly inspiring. I have commanded him under very difficult circumstances and have never seen him unit down, or fail to do his duty.

You hear a lot today about the younger generation and its problems, but I have just described to you the younger generation of Americans, and I want to say that we must be doing something right.

#### DEEP RESPONSIBILITY

It is a great responsibility to have in your charge men like these. The mission of armed forces being what it is, the lives of these men are placed at risk. We, your Army's leaders, feel this responsibility most deeply. To be worthy of our trust, we must have a deep reverence for human lives. Because when we talk of military operations, we are not talking simply of weapons, and tactics, and strategy; we are talking about our men—your men—and the individual lives of each of these men.

When war comes, lives are in the balance and freedom is also in the balance. And when such profound and fundamental issues as human life and human freedom are involved, there can be no simple answers. The Army man who has thought about these matters knows that when he is called upon to do his duty, and lives must be spent in the doing of it, the basic purposes for which these sacrifices are made must indeed be good.

Today the fabric of American life is under great strain, in large part because of the war in which have died the men whom we honor today.

I would use this occasion to present to you my own views as to the purposes of this war. I suspect that what I will say is not entirely unlike what many of the men whom we honor would say if they could speak to us today.

First, I would say to you that I believe that the effort in which these men died was a worthy cause—worthy of them and worthy of our land. For in that distant land where your sons died, freedom has long been under attack. The frail, fragile society of the Re-

public of Vietnam, struggling to make a decent and good life for its people, and under brutal onslaught from beyond its borders, would long ago have been destroyed were it not for the assistance offered by the United States of America.

#### LIVES FOR FREEDOM

The assistance has been offered for one reason only—to deny to the attacker his goal of destroying that small nation—to make it possible that some day the institutions of that small country will be able to grow and develop in their own ways, so that the needs of each citizen can be met. That is all your country seeks and that is what these men gave their lives for.

It is a simple objective, but its realization seems at times agonizingly remote. Yet those who are concerned about this world and its future should ponder well what might be the result should that simple objective not be attained.

If that should happen, I for one would be deeply saddened. I say this, among other reasons, because I have come to know the Vietnamese people and to admire them. I have seen what has been done to helpless people among them who do not bend to the will of those who would take over their village, and district, and country.

The country which we in uniform serve stands for noble ideals—ideals such as "all men are created equal," and "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"—ideals which are worthy of our support and for which American men have laid down their lives for two centuries. Your Army exists for one purpose alone—to serve that country, and, under the control of our magistrates, elected by the people, to do what it is ordered to do.

On behalf of your Army, I congratulate the people of Nashua on this memorial. May it remain here as a symbol of the sacrifices which the brave men of this region have made in pursuit of the ideals for which our country stands. And may their sacrifices always be marked by the people of this region as in a worthy cause.

#### ADMINISTRATION CONSIDERS OCEAN AGENCY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have learned from my good friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) that within the next few weeks the administration will be making a decision on a proposed new ocean agency.

According to the gentleman from Ohio, the administration will take a position on NOAA—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency—following a meeting between the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization and the President's task force on oceanography. A decision is expected within the next 30 to 60 days.

NOAA is a priority recommendation of the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Development. The Commission report, entitled, "Our Nation and the Sea," was released in January of this year. NOAA would be an independent agency comprising many of the Federal ocean-related agencies now scattered throughout the bureaucracy. It would be responsible for formulating a national policy for the oceans and for assisting and coordinating State and private industry ocean-related activities.

I would urge those who are interested in the creation of this new ocean agency to convey their views to both Mr. Roy Ash, Chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, and Dr. James H. Wakelin, chairman of the Presidential task force on oceanography.

At this point in the RECORD I include the press statement from Congressman Mosher's office, an article from the Sunday Star of November 9, and my testimony before the Oceanography Subcommittee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries in support of NOAA.

PRESS RELEASE FROM HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

WASHINGTON.—Congressman Charles A. Mosher (R.-Ohio) has learned that the Nixon Administration will take an official position within 60 days on the proposal to reorganize the federal government's marine science activities.

Mosher is the ranking minority member of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

In an exchange of correspondence following Mosher's urgent inquiry to the President regarding whether he will support a reorganization plan, the Congressman learned from Peter Flanagan, Assistant to the President, that the Administration will formulate its position "within the next 30 to 60 days."

The principal question is whether a new federal agency should be created to centralize and coordinate the government's current programs relating to the marine sciences. Such a reorganization plan has been urged by the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources—a distinguished Commission authorized by Congress in 1966 and approved by President Johnson. That group released a four-volume report in January after studying all aspects of the marine sciences for two years.

The Commission recommended creation of a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) by assigning to it the following federal agencies: Coast Guard, Environmental Science Services Administration, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, National Sea Grant Program, U.S. Lake Survey, National Oceanographic Data Center and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

The House Oceanography Subcommittee has held 27 days of extensive hearings on the NOAA proposal and is on the verge of reporting out legislation to create the new agency. Congressional observers believe the bill will pass the House of Representatives this year.

As yet, the Nixon Administration has taken no position on the NOAA question.

Mosher, along with subcommittee chairman Congressman Alton Lennon (D.-N.C.) is considered a vigorous advocate of the NOAA proposal.

"It is highly significant," Mosher said, "that the Administration has now gone on record by saying it will decide whether to support the NOAA idea, or perhaps suggest some other reorganization proposal, or recommend that nothing new be done."

"I, for one, am optimistic they will see the wisdom of rising above bureaucratic infighting and petty jealousies and will announce a full-fledged, 100 percent commitment to reorganizing our presently fragmented and diluted oceanographic efforts."

The Administration's position will be developed, Mosher learned from Flanagan, following a meeting between the Chairman of the Presidential Task Force on Oceanography, Dr. James H. Wakelin, and members of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Reorganization, chaired by Roy Ash.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Nov. 9, 1969]

PLAN TO HARVEST RICHES OF SEAS STIRS UP STORM—CREATING OVERALL AGENCY LACKS EXECUTIVE SUPPORT

(By Bailey Morris)

The sea around us—how to harness its power, harvest its resources and prevent its pollution—has become a subject of considerable controversy between Congress and the executive branch of the government. The economic potentials are vast.

At issue in the current debate is a recommendation by the prestigious Commission on Marine Science and Engineering Resources, headed by Julius A. Stratton, that a National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) be established at the federal level to co-ordinate and direct a national marine policy.

The idea of a national movement is not controversial because most people agree we have been slow to learn about and develop the great bodies of water around us that offer fish, rich protein foods, recreational facilities, vast mineral resources and knowledge about our weather patterns.

But the question of who or what will direct the movement is controversial.

SUPPORT DIVIDED

The establishment of NOAA has strong support among oceanographers, and industry leaders, particularly in oil, and Congressional leaders.

It is not supported by the executive branch including the Departments of Interior, Commerce, Transportation and the U.S. Corps of Engineers, each of which stands to lose something by its creation.

They stand to lose because NOAA, as recommended by the Stratton Commission would be formed by:

1. Transferring the Coast Guard with its 5,400 officers, 31,000 enlisted men and 5,900 support personnel from the Transportation Department to NOAA.
2. Transferring the Bureaus of Commercial Fisheries and Sport Fisheries and Wildlife from the Interior Department.
3. Transferring the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) which includes the U.S. Weather Bureau, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Central Radio Propagation Lab of the National Bureau of Standards from Commerce.
4. Transferring the U.S. Lake Survey from the U.S. Corps of Engineers to the new agency.

OTHERS INCLUDED

This is not a complete list of all agencies and functions that would go into the making of NOAA which, according to the Stratton Commission, would bring under one roof the nation's fragmented water-use policies that currently are spread out among about 20 federal agencies and departments.

But it does explain why there is vigorous opposition from the federal agencies who have publicly attacked the NOAA concept in congressional hearings with these comments: the NOAA concept is too broad, the NOAA concept is not broad enough, existing agencies are adequate to do the job, NOAA would be too big to be well managed, funding for the program is unrealistic, the Stratton Commission did not give adequate consideration to alternatives, we should not be hasty in creating such an agency.

Bills urging the creation of NOAA have been introduced on both the House and Senate sides by Rep. Alton Lennon, D-N.C., chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oceanography, and Democratic Sen. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina who chairs a subcommittee on U.N. suboceanic land policy.

ACTION SOUGHT NOW

Both men have held extensive hearings on the proposal, both want action on the bills

this session of Congress. An aide to Lennon says they hope to have their bill reported out of committee before Christmas.

But passage of the bills once they reach the floor will, according to congressional aides, largely depend on two considerations: The amount of money it will take to create a NOAA and the administration's stand on the issue.

The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, currently conducting a study on NOAA, was asked in February by President Nixon to make recommendations to him on the matter.

Murray Camarow, executive director of the Council, says he expects the staff to complete its report in two to three weeks. After that, the report will go to the five-man Council who will then report directly to President Nixon.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANOGRAPHY, MAY 7, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

I am most grateful for this opportunity to appear before you today and discuss with you the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, "Our Nation and the Sea."

When I first indicated an interest in the Stratton Commission report earlier this year, someone expressed to me his surprise that a congressman from land-locked Rockford, Illinois should get excited about oceanography. But it's really not so unusual when you consider that my district borders on the Mississippi River and my State on Lake Michigan, both of which received some attention from the Commission. But moreover, I am deeply concerned about the problems and needs of our nation, and indeed, all mankind. We are all linked by our land-air-sea environment and we are all linked by the shrinking nature of our planet and the problems this portends.

As people become more and more numerous and as land and resources become more and more scarce, we must seek new ways to cope with this imminent crisis. The upcoming decade of the oceans holds great promise and high adventure in man's quest to meet his growing needs on this last great frontier on earth—a frontier spanning over two-thirds of the earth's surface yet one which we have barely skimmed.

The Congress recognized this potential back in 1966 with the passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act calling for a national ocean program. This committee is to be commended for the excellent leadership it has exerted and continues to exert in this area, and the Marine Resources Council and Marine Science Commission deserve our highest praise for the fine work they have done to date.

But the Commission has expired and left us with an impressive report and set of recommendations and the life of the Council has been extended for only one year. We must now decide what to do about the Stratton Commission report and what direction our national ocean program will take when the Council is disbanded.

It is obvious that if we are to proceed with a national marine policy in an orderly and unified fashion, we must seek new organizational means to bring such order and unity to our efforts; we need both a national and a rational approach. For this reason, I fully endorse the recommendation of the Stratton Commission to create a new, strong and independent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to coordinate and direct our national marine policy in the years ahead.

I refrain from the temptation to call this a "wet NASA" as some have done since the analogy just doesn't hold water. As Dr. Wenk

has pointed out, this is not a crash program, nor is it an exclusively Federal program. Industry, Academia and State and local bodies all play key roles in ocean-related research and development, and this is as it should be.

At the same time, there is a definite need for Federal leadership in this area, for a national plan of action based on a national policy. There is a need to draw together the proliferation of marine missions scattered throughout our sprawling Federal bureaucracy. There is a need to give some central direction and support to marine missions being conducted in industry, by universities and by State and local groupings. In short, there is a need to provide for a means for undertaking a full range of marine-related activities geared to broad human needs; or, as the 1966 Act put it, "to develop, encourage and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind."

I don't see how these needs could possibly be met without a strong, independent agency like NOAA. NOAA is central to the success of a large number of the Commission's recommendations and the Commission has therefore urged its "immediate adoption" if we are to "mobilize the resources of our Government in the most effective manner to lend strength and power to the Nation's marine commitment."

I concur with this assessment and urge this Committee to give priority attention to the implementation of the NOAA proposal.

I think it is significant to note that the Commission has chosen not to adopt the wholesale consolidation of all marine activities within a single structure. It recognized that some of these programs provide close operational support to the departments and agencies in which they are presently located and should therefore not be moved. These include the National Science Foundation's marine and atmospheric science programs, the Interior Department's fresh water, sea-shore and mineral resource programs, the Army Corps of Engineers' coastal and waterways programs, the Smithsonian Institution's biological and geological oceanography studies, the activities of the Office of Naval Research and the Naval Oceanographer, and the marine-related nuclear energy programs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I think the decision to keep these out of NOAA is realistic, at least for the time being, since they are major components of their parent bodies. At the same time it is most vital that NOAA exert some type of coordination and planning role over these as the Commission has recommended.

For example, the Navy is way out in front as a leader in oceanographic research and development work, especially with the "Man in the Sea" program begun last year. Much of this work has spin-off civilian benefits of great value to our civil marine program. I am most concerned that NOAA has some built-in mechanism to catch such spin-off benefits and to avoid duplication. I think any legislation to create NOAA should clearly define its role with relation to civil marine programs outside NOAA and provide an effective means for their coordination.

Hopefully, this will be one of the primary responsibilities of the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans under NOAA, as proposed by the Stratton Commission. I question whether the head of NOAA could directly assume the sole responsibility for inter-agency planning and coordination as the Commission report has suggested.

However, there are marine programs within various Federal departments and agencies which are peripheral to the primary missions of their parent bodies and in their present form are too small to have visibility and impact. Instead, they breed insularity, overlap and competition and are obstacles to an integrated national approach. These are the components which must be brought

together in a strong independent agency of our government, an agency like NOAA.

The Stratton Commission recommends that NOAA should be comprised of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Environmental Science Services Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the U.S. Lake Survey, the National Sea Grant Program, the National Oceanographic Data Center, certain programs of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and possibly the National Center for Atmospheric Research and support for the United States Antarctic Research Program.

This reorganization would shift some 55,000 employees under the roof of NOAA as well as 320 seagoing ships. The Commission is also recommending several new programs under NOAA as well as the development of an undersea capability.

The proposed bureaucratic shifts are bound to raise some controversy, especially among those who tend to jealously guard their bureaucratic preserves. This is understandable and the full implications of such shifts should receive a thorough airing. But, as Dr. Stratton so ably pointed out in his testimony before this subcommittee last week, we must look beyond mere bureaucratic interests; in his words, "The real issue here is the national interest." We must think in terms of the human problems and needs such an approach addresses itself to.

In the words of the Commission report: "How fully and wisely the United States uses the sea in the decades ahead will affect profoundly its security, its economy, its ability to meet increasing demands for food and raw materials, its position and influence in the world community, and the quality of the environment in which its people live."

The time for decision has arrived. Will we turn to the sea and work together to meet its challenges and realize its potential; or will we turn our backs on the sea and reject the opportunity to improve our environment and constructively utilize its resources?

The Commission has stated: "The Nation's stake can only be realized by a determined national effort great enough for the vast and rewarding task ahead."

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Committee to spur the great national effort that is needed by establishing an agency capable of carrying out the mandate of the Stratton Commission.

#### PEOPLE OF BIRMINGHAM PROVE DEVOTION ON VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Birmingham once again set the pace for the rest of the Nation in this year's observance of Veterans Day. The people of Birmingham and Jefferson County left no doubt as to their devotion to this country and their appreciation of the servicemen now in Vietnam and all veterans who have previously served their country.

Beginning a week-long observance honoring all veterans, the association of the U.S. Army, Birmingham chapter, honored Lt. Gen. John C. Persons (retired), by changing its name from the "Heart of Dixie" to the John C. Persons Chapter. As a result, General Persons became the first National Guard general to have his name applied to an AUSA Chapter. Three military leaders flew into Birmingham from Washington to honor General Persons—Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the Army's National Guard Bureau; Maj. Gen. William J. Sutton, Chief of the Army Reserve; and

Lt. Gen. William R. Peers, Chief of the Officers of Reserve Components.

The Annual Distinguished National Veteran Award, created in Birmingham for America's first official national Veterans Day observance in 1954, was presented to aviation pioneer Col. Roscoe Turner. The presentation was made at a formal dinner on Monday evening, November 10, 1969 by Cooper T. Holt, executive secretary of the 1.5 million-member Veterans of Foreign Wars.

On the following day, Veterans Day began with memorial services, followed by the world peace luncheon. The purpose of this annual event, one of the outstanding events of the day in America, is to reaffirm faith in the governmental principles of freedom throughout the world, and to rededicate ourselves to active and forceful opposition to aggression and the favoring of strong military forces as the best guarantee for a continuing peace. The speaker for this year's luncheon was the Honorable Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army.

Then came the parade. Some 35,000 persons marched with bands, floats, and military units before an estimated crowd of 250,000 cheering, flag-waving people. It was the biggest parade in the history of the city. The day was culminated at a Red, White, and Blue Rally in the city auditorium when Alabama's Governor, Albert P. Brewer, led the march from downtown to the auditorium. There, before a cheering throng of some 4,000 people, a patriotic extravaganza unfolded to precipitate a rededication to patriotism. The crowd sat in awe and respect as Capt. James S. Sprayberry of Sylacauga, Ala., one of Alabama's two Medal of Honor winners in the Vietnam war, spoke. The other Congressional Medal of Honor winner, the late Sgt. Mathew Leonard, received the citation posthumously on December 19, 1969. His widow and their five children were present and received a standing ovation presented to the audience.

Veterans Day observances like that in Birmingham do not just happen. Under the able direction of State Representative Raymond Weeks and with the cooperation of such men as Maj. Gen. Horace B. Hanson, Jr., Commanding General of the 87th Maneuver Area Command; Maj. Gen. Alfred C. Harrison, the Adjutant General of the State of Alabama; Maj. Gen. George R. Doster, Jr., Commanding General of Alabama's Air National Guard, and the sponsoring organizations—The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Marine Corps League, The Rainbow Division of the Veterans Association, the United Spanish War Veterans, World War I Association, Jewish War Veterans, and the Amvets—the annual Veterans Day observances help make Birmingham America's most patriotic city.

#### WM. Mc. MARTIN, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, AND HIS ATTEMPT TO REWRITE HISTORY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Wm. Mc. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board will soon be retiring from his position by law. I have charged that Mr. Martin has been the most expensive public official this country, and probably the world, has ever known. To date Mr. Martin has cost the American people over \$300 billion in excessive interest costs. Mr. Speaker, this is an expensive luxury which this Nation and its people can ill afford.

Now, with the retirement of Mr. Martin at hand, he has decided to, as he views it, set the record straight, concerning two very important events. These are the so-called "accord" of 1951 and the action taken by the Federal Reserve Board in December of 1965 when by unilateral action the Federal Reserve raised interest rates—the discount—rate by 37½ percent.

Mr. Speaker, I have personally checked the official reports of President Truman and Johnson and at this point would like to report what the record actually says on these two important historic occasions.

In his address to the Business Council at Hot Springs, Va., October 17, 1969, William McChesney Martin casts a brief glance back over the years during which he has served as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. It is a curious speech, somewhat defensive in tone, in that it deals primarily with two specific events during Mr. Martin's tenure and, by implication, with the issue which precipitated these events—namely, the seized independence of the Fed and the opposition of two Presidents to its policies.

Mr. Martin professes, during the course of his remarks, to "like studying history" and if this is so, he should have more respect for accuracy as the fundamental requirement of the process of recording or interpreting the past. In dealing at some length with the so-called Treasury Fed "accord" of 1951 and the increase in the discount rate of December 1965, he chooses to ignore the primary issue from the point of view of his superiors, Presidents Truman and Johnson, and to substitute his assessment of their views for an account of what actually occurred. In retrospect, it appears to Mr. Martin that he agreed to his nomination to the Federal Reserve Board by President Truman with the understanding that there was a basic disagreement between them, that he and the President did not have "the same understanding of the market process." He says that he explained his position and that Mr. Truman merely asked for an assurance "that—whatever might happen—you'll do the best that you can." In other words according to Mr. Martin, the President, although finding himself at odds with the man he was to appoint, put forth the nomination anyway because he had confidence in Mr. Martin's judgment. Since, however, Mr. Martin states that the President "didn't understand market processes fully," it is also possible to infer that Mr. Truman was unaware that he was nominating a man whose views were not consistent with his own.

An examination of the events of 1951 indicates that Mr. Martin's rendering is

greatly oversimplified and gives a false impression of the issues involved. Unfortunately, the so-called "accord" has never been seen by anyone not directly involved in the matter. Although Randolph Burgess, who came in as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs in 1953, describes it as "a lot of codicils and strings and things," Mr. Martin has denied that an actual document was drawn up. It is necessary, therefore, to piece together the events of the period from the testimony of those involved.

In his autobiography, *Beckoning Frontiers*, Marriner Eccles, a former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and a member of the Board in 1951, writes that, prior to Mr. Martin's nomination, there was a movement afoot within the Fed to stop pegging the Government securities market. As of January 1951, however, the Fed had not made a formal presentation of its views to the Truman administration nor taken any action to accomplish its objective. Meanwhile, in November 1950, the President's Council of Economic Advisers, with the concurrence of the President, told the Congress that, in its view:

An important inflationary movement should be met by increasing the facilities and volume of production. This process requires cheap and ample credit, and until the volume of output increases, inflationary pressure will increase and must be curbed by other than monetary measures of the kind which increase the cost of capital.

The preceding statement is by John D. Clark, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers; *United States Monetary Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 83d Congress, second session, December 1954, page 48. The Council opposed the suggestion made by the Federal Reserve that it should cease to support the Government bond market and let rising interest rates serve as a curb on inflation because, as the Council said:

The one and only way (such a policy) reduces prices is by bringing about less employment, less output, and less demand for goods and services than would otherwise exist (*ibid.*, p. 48).

As noted, the President concurred in these views but had an additional reason for urging the Federal Reserve to continue to support the market. In his *Memoirs*, Mr. Truman writes that:

It was my position that until we could determine the extent of the defense requirements that might result we should maintain a stable position in reference to money rates that affected the management of the public debt . . . It did not seem appropriate to me that we should enter into a period of deficit financing on a rising money-rate pattern. I also felt strongly that in the amount of impending crisis we should not take deliberate steps that could possibly disturb public confidence in the nation's financing. (*Memoirs* by Harry S. Truman, Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, N.Y., 1956; Volume II, p. 44).

Mr. Truman explains what happened next:

As the head of the Government I felt I had a duty as well as right to use every available resource to make sure of the success of the defense program. For that reason I in-

vited the members of the Federal Reserve Board to visit with me. At this conference I asked them to give the Treasury their full support for its financing program, just as they had done during World War II.

I was given assurance at this meeting that the Federal Reserve Board would support the Treasury's plans for the financing of the action in Korea. This assurance was given entirely voluntarily. At no time during the conference did I attempt to dictate to the Board or tell them what specific steps they ought to take. I explained to them the problems that faced me as Chief Executive, and when they left I firmly believed that I had their agreement to cooperate in our financing program. I was taken by surprise when subsequently they failed to support the program.

Eventually an agreement was reached, but not until the differences of opinion between the Treasury and the Board had caused considerable worry to the President and much added expense to the taxpayers. (*Ibid.*, pp. 44-45).

The White House had interpreted the expressions of support volunteered by Board members to mean that it would concur in the following statement of January 18, 1951, by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder:

In the firm belief, after long consideration, that the 2½ per cent long-term rate is fair and equitable to the investor, and that market stability is essential, the Treasury Department has concluded, after joint conferences with President Truman and Chairman McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board, that the refunding of new money issues will be financed within the pattern of that rate. (Quoted by Marriner Eccles, *Beckoning Frontiers*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1951, p. 484).

Mr. Eccles disagreed with this position and felt that a majority of the Federal Open Market Committee concurred in his views. On his own initiative as he writes, he brought the matter out into the open by releasing the memorandum of its meeting with the President which the Board had prepared. Focusing on the fact that the President had not tried to "dictate to the Board or tell them what specific steps they ought to take," Eccles denied that the Board had agreed to continue to support the Government bond market or maintain the 2½ percent long-term rate. He interpreted the Board's offer of support as just a vague commitment "to protect the Government credit." He emphasized the fact that Chairman McCabe had suggested to the President that the Board "consult frequently with the Secretary of the Treasury, giving him our views at all times and presenting our point of view strongly, and that by every means possible we try to reach an agreement."—*Ibid.*, page 489.

During this period of consultations between the Board and Treasury, Treasury Secretary Snyder became ill and William McChesney Martin took his place as spokesman for the Treasury at the meetings which Chairman McCabe had suggested. Describing his role during the subsequent hearings on his nomination as a member of the Board, March 19, 1951, Mr. Martin said:

I pled with the Federal Reserve Board and with the Open Market Committee to go along with us on this operation; that we both of us jointly agree to keep within the family what our policies and programs were, and that I

wanted to have a working relationship between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve that would make it possible for us to combine our judgments as to what proper pricing of securities should be. (*Nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr.*, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 82nd Cong., 1st Sess., March 19, 1951, p. 10.)

During the course of these negotiations, Chairman McCabe submitted his resignation effective March 31, 1951, and President Truman nominated Mr. Martin, the Treasury spokesman, to succeed him. Subsequently, Mr. Eccles implied that McCabe resigned in protest over the terms of the accord—possibly because he was unaware that, in the end, the Fed would win. During the hearings on his nomination, Mr. Martin gave his view of the projected relationship between the Fed and Treasury:

I don't see any way that we can move forward, regardless of how the arrangements that currently exist were arrived at, to refinance in the balance of this year \$39,000,000,000 in addition to some \$13,000,000,000 of bills, plus any new money demands that may be faced by the Treasury—I don't see how we can move forward to face that sort of a situation unless the Treasury and the Federal Reserve are working hand in glove. (*Ibid.*, p. 6).

Elsewhere during the course of these hearings, Mr. Martin defined the so-called "accord" in a colloquy with Senator Bricker:

Senator BRICKER. What further commitments, if any, are there on the part of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve under this so-called understanding, which of course was never reduced to writing in any way, shape, or form, or any definite promise, but what is the understanding as to the future?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, the understanding as to the future is that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve work very, very closely together.

Senator BRICKER. That is what I was getting at, whether there was any definite understanding of any kind or character or whether there was just an understanding that would be a definite working arrangement.

Mr. MARTIN. There is a working arrangement, yes, sir. (*Ibid.*, p. 13).

The "accord," then, appears to have been an arrangement for consultation between the Fed and Treasury as to policy. Both Mr. Truman's Memoirs and Mr. Martin's testimony emphasize the need for a coordination of policy. Mr. Truman writes that, after a period during which the Fed "failed to support the program," "an agreement was reached" which appears to have been satisfactory to the President. During his 1956 testimony, Mr. Martin elaborated on this point and revealed that the Fed, under his chairmanship, had acted to coordinate its policies with those of the Treasury and, while pushing through a compromise as to pricing, had continued to support the Government bond market. As Senator Douglas' interrogation in the following colloquy reveals, this was the first public acknowledgment of Fed policy in the post-agreement period and contradicted a widely held misconception as to the actual timetable of events:

Mr. MARTIN. Going back to the March 1951 Treasury-Federal Reserve accord, at that time it was clearly understood that the Federal Reserve would continue to be an underwriter for Treasury securities.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct. Would continue to be an underwriter for Treasury securities during the time they were being offered. In other words, we supported Treasury issues to a limited extent and stood ready to support them all during the period of the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord, which was the last nine months of 1951—from March 4, 1951, until January 1, 1952.

Senator DOUGLAS. Then you decided not to?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Senator DOUGLAS. Or you did not do so?

Mr. MARTIN. No. We gradually worked in that direction. You see, it was an evolutionary process.

Senator DOUGLAS. And you made public affirmation on September 24, 1953, that you did not intend to?

Mr. MARTIN. We had arrived at the point where we hoped we did not have to ever again directly support Treasury securities. (*Nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr.*, Hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., January 27, 1956; pp. 14-15).

A final comment on the accord, tending to support Mr. Martin's testimony, came from Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs in the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Burgess said:

Now the agreement had a lot of codicils and strings and things to it that made it far from perfect, but it was a great step forward. It did not go all the way. It did not completely free the market from Federal Reserve support. The Treasury, I think, continued to try to put over its securities at artificially low rates. When we came in, at the end of 1952 and the beginning of 1953, we recognized those principles. We felt we carried them to their logical conclusion in giving the Federal Reserve the freedom it needed to fulfill its lawful function of influencing the credit situation in the public interest. (*Conflicting Official Views on Monetary Policy: April 1956*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 84th Cong., 2d Sess., June 12, 1956: p. 40).

These excerpts present a picture of the accord which is far more complex than the version handed out by Mr. Martin at Hot Springs in the name of "Reminiscence and Reflections." It would appear from the foregoing remarks that the Fed did not seize its independence, as so often claimed, in 1951, but, rather that it obtained its independence by administrative fiat in 1953. In other words, the Eisenhower administration granted the Fed its independence together with a specific mandate to raise interest rates. As for Mr. Martin—whatever other differences he may have had with President Truman, he appears to have agreed with the central premise of the Truman position; that is, that the policies of the Fed should be coordinated with those of the administration. His action in 1953 was not inconsistent with that view. It was a response to a new administration and a new policy.

Mr. Martin sees himself as consistent as well, but in a different sense. He links together the events of 1951 and 1965 as emanating from a single sustained point of view—his view, enunciated for the first time in his conversations with President Truman, "that markets will not wait upon Kings, Prime Ministers, Presidents, Secretaries of the Treasury—or Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board." His

disagreements with Presidents Truman and Johnson arose, he implies, because they favored imposing an artificial interest rate on the market. Mr. Martin ignores the fact that the Fed's concept of a "free" market has been under attack for years and from a number of different points of view. He chooses, instead, to characterize President Johnson as a politician who liked interest rates "to be low—all the time," and as a President who would not face up to his "budgetary responsibility." Mr. Martin says he warned the President in 1965 that he would have to increase taxes and reduce expenditures and that the President agreed. But the President wanted to delay action for fear that it would result in "overkill." The implication is that, since the President would not act in the face of "inflationary pressures" which "were burgeoning," the Fed had to act on its own initiative to raise discount rates. The President objected. But Mr. Martin does not tell us why he objected. Presumably it is because of the President's bias for low interest rates.

In his statement on the Board's action, December 5, 1965, President Johnson was as "totally frank" as Mr. Martin says he was. President Johnson admits that he regrets, "as do most Americans, any action that raises the cost of credit, particularly for homes, schools, hospitals, and factories." Nevertheless, this was not the only reason that the President objected to the increase in the discount rate. As he said:

I particularly regret that this action was taken before January when we will have before us the full facts on next year's budget, Vietnam costs, housing starts, State and local spending, and other elements in the economic outlook.

My view and the view of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers is that the decision on interest rates should be a coordinated policy decision in January, when the nature and impact of the administration's budgetary and Vietnam decisions are known. This view was apparently shared by three of the seven board members.

As this excerpt indicates, President Johnson objected to the fact that, as he said, this was "an independent decision" by the Fed. His view of the necessity for a coordination of monetary policy with the overall economic policies of the Government was no different from that of President Truman. One might add that this was also the view of Presidents Roosevelt and Kennedy and that, at one time, it was even the view of William McChesney Martin. One cannot fault Mr. Martin for disagreeing with the policies of any administration. That is the prerogative of any public official or private citizen. Nevertheless, one cannot imagine any other Government agency or department taking unilateral action on an issue in the face of the President's disapproval.

President Johnson prefaced his remarks on December 5, 1965 with the following statement:

The Federal Reserve Board is an independent agency. Its decision was an independent decision.

The basis for the Federal Reserve's claim to independence is its role as an agent of Congress rather than as a department or agency of the administra-

tion. However, the Federal Reserve was not responding to the will of Congress in its action of December 1965, nor has the Congress, acting within the constitutional framework of a balance of powers, ever made use of its agent, the Federal Reserve, to thwart the will of the executive. Through its control of the purse strings, Congress has a substantive veto over administrative policy which it opposes. It has no such control over the Federal Reserve. Historically, whatever degree of control the Government has had over the Federal Reserve has been exercised by the administration. Up to 1935, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency were ex officio members of the Federal Reserve Board. Thereafter, control was exercised by agreement around the principle of the necessity for coordinating policy.

The 1935 Act has been interpreted by the Federal Reserve as an expression of congressional determination to maintain its constitutional prerogative to issue money and regulate its value, and to retain the Federal Reserve as an agency of Congress as opposed to an adjunct of the administration. However, such a resolution on the part of Congress would require a greater obligation for control over the actions of the Federal Reserve than is currently exercised. The Congress must impose as much responsibility on the Federal Reserve for maintaining its goals—the goals of the Employment Act of 1946—as it has imposed upon the executive. The issue of congressional control over money must be resolved, not abrogated.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Mr. Martin in this speech where he attempts to rewrite history, has as his objective that of nailing down the specious argument that the Federal Reserve is an independent agency and that this independence emanates from congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, this is a false and misleading statement and misinterpretation of the fact and law. I trust this analysis will place at rest the arguments advanced by Mr. Martin.

#### NO BARGAINS IN THE CREDIT MARKET

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, absolutely no indication has yet been given by the Nation's large commercial banks that they are recovering from their latest attack of paralysis of the conscience. The symptoms became apparent last December 2, the Christmas season notwithstanding, and the fever for profit did not peak out until June 9. During that 6-month period the large commercial banks raised their prime rate—the rate on loans to their largest, lowest risk customers—five times to the current, exorbitant, completely unjustified level of 8½ percent. That level has been maintained for 5 months and has had a profound effect in terms of weakening the Nation's economy because raising the prime rate has meant that interest rates on all other loans have also been increased.

The bankers were asked to explain their actions during hearings held by the House Banking and Currency Committee. They presented what could only be described as irrational mumbblings that amounted to the excuse that they just could not bring themselves to say no to their big borrowers and that the only way they could reduce demands for inflationary loans and preserve their liquidity was to raise the interest rate five times. The public outcry that followed the last increase apparently checked any plans to openly raise the prime rate further. By the same token, these same bankers are now quietly saying no to prime rate applicants when they feel they should not make such loans.

In the meantime the prime rate sickness of the large bankers has crept through the economy, pushing up interest rates on consumer loans and mortgages and raising the cost of practically every item on the market. There is no escape from the fact that increasing the cost of money required by all businesses and industries to remain in operation raises the cost of the goods and services they produce. It also creates a perfect climate for small business and industry failures.

Mr. Speaker, some excellent examples of what raising the prime rate has meant to the people of this Nation, especially our low- and moderate-income families, are contained in two articles which appeared in the Guide, a new weekly newspaper being published in Rapid City, S. Dak. The editors are to be congratulated for doing a fine job and it is my hope they will be given every encouragement to continue informing the public about such vital issues. I present these articles to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Guide,  
Oct. 23, 1969]

HOW TO SHOP FOR THE MONEY YOU BORROW—  
NEW YORK BANKERS DICTATE INTEREST  
HERE

(By Ernie Stallworth)

Are you making more money these days and finding it buys less? If you are, maybe you've picketed grocery stores, complained bitterly about taxes, protested to a store manager, or written to Detroit.

Have you even thought of picketing David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank in New York?

Well, if you haven't, maybe you ought to. Mr. Rockefeller's bank, and a small handful of huge Eastern and Western banks, are profitably enjoying inflation—and some people here think they may be causing more of it.

Rapid City may be about 2,000 miles from New York, but the money market is national. A rise in the prime rate of interest—granted to only the best credit risks—means a rise in interest rates for loans for cars, appliances, furniture, and houses.

A rise in the prime rate of interest—it's gone up five times in the last year to 8.5 percent—also means a higher cost of doing business for corporations and other businesses. The corporations, naturally, pass on that higher cost to the consumer.

The question, then, is one of control. And, control of the prime rate is in the hands of Chase Manhattan Bank, a few other banks, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The justification for the prime rate's rise is known, and believed, by most first year economic students: men and businessmen

are rational economic animals, and they'll quit borrowing money if the interest rate is high enough. When they quit or slow borrowing, the economy cools down and inflation is halted.

There's just one problem. People need cars (and houses and appliances), and businessmen need growth in their businesses. Both will pay the going rate to get what they want.

Bankers say interest rates will be "whatever the market will bear," and it will bear a lot because middle class America finds houses, cars, and appliances to be necessities.

"The big banks do get rich off this deal," one finance company manager said, "and it's running the small finance companies out of business. The small companies are still charging the top legal rate to the consumer, but money costs them more and more. The profit margin is constantly shrinking."

Large, national finance companies can get money at rates close to the prime rate (say, nine percent), but the little finance company has to borrow at 14 or 15 percent. Both firms have to obey the maximum legal rate of 30 percent for the first \$300 of a loan under South Dakota's small loan law. If even a small percentage of customers default on their payments, the small companies are in trouble.

Most consumer advocates are not greatly concerned over the small finance company's plight—the small "fly-by-night" loan company is guilty of many abuses to the consumer, they say—but they are concerned over the increasingly high interest rates.

Interest rates affect all business prices, consumer advocates say, although the cost may be hidden. And, interest charges are one item most families don't figure into a yearly budget.

Direct interest charges to nearly every consumer are over \$100 a year, and bad credit risks or persons who do a lot of installment buying will find credit charges in the hundreds of dollars yearly.

National labor union officials have recently called for wage and price controls to stop inflation in a war economy, and some bankers and finance company executives here tend to agree with them.

"I hope the government will see that raising interest rates is not the answer," one finance company manager said. "They should reduce the rates, and use other means—even wage and price controls—to control inflation."

Higher interest rates have not affected the national economy to any significant degree although some economists are predicting a slower growth rate in the first quarter of 1970. Bankers and other credit managers here also report no decrease in borrowing.

"It hasn't done anything to my business," an automobile credit manager reported. "In fact, I've already written more contracts this year than I wrote in the entire 1965 year."

And, the money crunch supposed to be caused by higher prime rates has not affected South Dakota. Plenty of money is available here for consumer loans and even for home mortgages, but the high interest charges—up to 8 percent—probably affect the home construction market.

"If you're a new consumer borrower anywhere in the country, you can get money," one bank executive said, "but if you're a new commercial customer in a metropolitan market, you probably won't get any."

Walter Palling, president of South Dakota National Bank, explained why local banks have funds and urban America is running short. "Most city banks are running at 85 percent in loan to deposit ratios, but we're only at 59 percent and we won't go much higher," Palling said.

Increasing finance costs due to higher wages and inflation directly affect local interest charges at banks more than the increasing prime rate, Palling said.

Banks, of course, have depositors' cash to lend. This money costs them, at most 5.25

percent interest—well below the current prime rate. For this reason, banks can afford to charge consumers less interest on loans than finance companies and their rates are affected most directly by higher overhead costs.

#### SHOPPING FOR CREDIT

In interviews with about 20 bankers, automobile credit managers, finance company managers, credit managers at local stores, the credit bureau, and consumer representatives, we found that a long-established wealthy resident of the community could receive his lowest interest from a bank.

The wealthy resident has collateral and is a very low risk borrower—but, of course, many credit managers say he doesn't really need much loan money.

Most consumers, however, who shop for credit to finance a car will find they will receive about the same interest charges from banks, finance companies, and car dealers. In the area of personal loans, the banks will almost always charge a lower rate than the finance companies.

There is one qualification regarding this observable trend: consumers who do not shop for credit will almost always be charged higher rates of interest.

And most Rapid City consumers are more interested in the amount of the monthly payment than they are in the hundreds of dollars of interest charged on a normal car loan.

"A guy will know what size monthly payment he can handle when he comes in," an automobile company credit manager said, "and if the payment we quote is pretty close to what he figured, that's as far as it goes. It's not that we don't tell him the true interest rate—we're in favor of truth in lending and we can give him as good a deal as anywhere—it's just that he's not really interested."

A consumer who is not really interested in interest charges could pay 14 percent annually for a three-year car loan he could have obtained for 12 percent. Or a borderline credit risk—rejected by a car dealer's normal source of credit—might pay 25 percent annually without really knowing why.

"Even one percent can make a difference over a long mortgage," a local banker said, "but the little guy doesn't know where to go for money. Some people borrow from finance companies for years without knowing they might get a two-to-three percent lower rate from us."

All credit people interviewed supported the new federal legislation requiring complete disclosure of simple annual interest rates to the consumer, but bankers were especially enthusiastic about the law which went into effect July 1.

"It takes a lot of criticism off of us," one bank said. "When other things get dull, people attack the banks, you know. We supported it, and I think it is good for the consumer."

Another banker thought it would help business. "It's really great for us," he said. "When people shop for credit they usually find that we can give them the lowest interest, so we get their business."

The new federal law might be helping banks, but of far more impact on their business is the relatively new aggressiveness in the bank loan departments. Nationally, banks have been late entering the consumer loan market which has been expanding explosively during the last 25 years.

"The banks have found out where the income is," one finance company manager said. "Years ago they wouldn't talk about personal loans. Now most of the people in their credit departments are finance company trained, they're much more aggressive, and they're hurting us."

One finance company manager said banks here were more aggressive than most banks in small towns, but not yet as aggressive as big city banks. "Banks in the cities take

many more borderline risks, and they make our business there even riskier," he said.

And, for some strange reason, banks seem to have fewer defaults on their loans. "People seem to think they have to pay a bank, and that they can just leave us hanging high and dry," a finance company manager said. "The bank credit department might have 1,000 accounts in the hands of each man, but we can only handle 250 accounts per man here because of more payment problems."

Banks seem to have a smaller overhead than finance companies, but their lower interest rates on loans are actually a result of paying depositors less than the going prime rate for money. In most cases they can get depositors' money at four percent less than finance companies can borrow it.

Finance companies—with one exception—can never match the bank rates to consumers who borrow on their personal signatures without collateral because they operate under different laws than banks.

Banks operate under either the usury law (which sets a ceiling of eight percent simple interest) or the installment loan law (which has maximums of eight percent add on interest—about 15 percent simple—on the first \$1,000 and six percent add on interest—about 11 percent—on amounts above \$1,000).

Most banks, and the one finance company, operate under the installment loan law because eight percent simple annual interest is too low a ceiling to be profitable.

"We're not at the maximum under the installment loan law," the finance company manager said. "We would charge you six percent add on for a loan of \$1,200." Most banks do not operate at the maximum under the law, either.

Asked why his company used the lower limits of the installment loan law, the manager laughed and said, "That's why we make more loans than most other companies. We are pretty comparable to banks in this area, but we offer fast service and we'll take a customer if he's leaving town because we're a national company."

The company, however, uses the small loan law—which is normal for finance companies—for loans under \$1,000 because of higher overhead costs compared to the bank, the manager said.

Most finance companies operate under this small loan law which allows 30 percent interest on the first \$300 of a loan, 24 percent interest between \$300 and \$600, 18 percent between \$600 and \$1,200, and 12 percent between \$1,200 and \$2,500. All of the companies operate at or near the maximum limits.

The difference between a bank loan of \$1,000 at about 15 percent interest for three years and a finance company loan at about 25 percent interest can be several hundred dollars.

The consumer who would make such a loan with a finance company is probably a bad credit risk, or was turned down by a bank for one of several reasons, or did not shop for credit. However, the finance company managers do not feel they are necessarily overcharging the consumer.

"Our overhead is higher than the bank's," one finance company manager said. "We just don't have as many sources of income, money costs us more, and we have a higher loss ratio."

Finance company officials estimated that about a \$500 loan is the breakeven point below which they did not make any money. Bank officials said the national bank breakeven point is \$435.

One finance company official said the cost of approving a new customer is \$37 and costs for posting one payment are \$5. Therefore, on a \$500 six-month loan the finance company cost is \$67, and interest charges are only \$39.

Approving a loan for an old customer costs \$19, the official said, therefore the second \$500 six month loan costs \$49.

"We're losing money on both of these kinds of transactions," the official said "but we're building up to a larger loan in the future. We have to expect to lose some money while we're gaining a new customer."

Finance companies here vary in size and operation from a lone individually operated firm to the largest national chains. And, the amount of business, size of an average loan, and the average monthly income of a consumer also varies with the size of the firm.

The biggest chain companies here will average loans of \$1,000 and other regional chains will average from \$600 to \$800. The average customer will usually make \$500 a month or more. Other, smaller chains will take greater risks with consumers and will average smaller loans.

One local manager of a national company said the average monthly income of South Dakota borrower is \$480 for his firm, and that 48 percent of the customers are military people.

Three aspects of finance company operations are particularly appealing to military people; fast service, quick checks of old financial records, and the mobility offered by national chains.

"Some military people haven't used credit for three years," one finance company official said, "if they were civilians, we'd be hesitant. But, with the military we call the old credit references and usually give them credit."

#### THE GREAT DISPUTE OVER CAR LOANS

Finance companies—particularly the smaller, regional chains—do a tremendous portion of their business with automobile dealers, furniture stores, and appliance stores.

The consumer usually deals directly with the businessman in such cases, and the businessman calls the finance company for a credit check and to sell the contract. The system works in two ways—either the dealer partially guarantees payment of the loan and receives some of the interest charges (cars) or the dealer acts as the finance company's agent without payment.

In the case of automobile loans, a finance company or a bank will quote a "dealer rate" to local credit managers for automobile firms. The dealer will guarantee the payment of the balance of the account if the customer defaults, and will keep part of the interest charged to the customer as a "dealer reserve" against defaults.

In Rapid City, the going dealer rate is about 5.75 percent add on interest (about 11 percent simple) and the customer usually pays between 6.5 and 7.0 add on interest (about 13 percent simple). A consumer with good credit can probably get a lower rate by shopping for credit, but the days of 4.5 or 5.0 percent add on rates for cars are gone.

Most dealers make about \$100 on each contract, and when 400 contracts are written in a year the dealer reserve can reach \$40,000. National Automobile Dealer Association figures say about 50 percent of a dealer's profit for the year will come out of the dealer reserve account.

Car dealers and finance companies have various arrangements and different reserve account procedures, but a good estimate would be that at least one-half of the gross dealer reserve remains at the end of the year as profit.

One credit manager for a local car dealer furnished this example of how the system works:

The dealer sells a car to a good customer who needs a \$2,000 loan. The dealer offers the customer six percent add on interest (insurance isn't needed), and the finance company gets 5.75 percent add on interest off the top.

The finance charges are \$369.69. The finance company gets \$354.40 and the dealer puts \$15.29 in the dealer reserve.

As is obvious, the greater the difference

between the customer rate and the dealer rate, the more dealer reserve—and profit—made by the car dealer. Although each person concerned with credit interviewed for this story agreed interest charges had climbed about two to three percent during the last year or two, there was a big dispute over who offered the best rates for cars.

"Any time you eliminate a middle man you will get a better deal," one banker said. "It just stands to reason we can give the consumer a better rate than the dealer can."

"We're competitive with the banks—we have to be if we want the business," one dealer said. "The average customer will get the same rate here he would get at the bank. The bank isn't going to give him the dealer rate."

The consumer won't get the dealer rate because the dealer has guaranteed the balance of the loan will be repaid if the bank returns the car to him within 90 days after a default. Still, the dispute rages on about how low the rate will drop at a bank.

"GMAC—and other finance companies—pay 9.5 percent for their money," one banker said. "We don't pay that much so it stands to reason that our rates will be lower."

And, a comment from an "impartial" finance company official. "Oh, I think you'd get the same rate here, in the showroom, or at the bank. The bank has this line about lower rates because they want the business. Actually, they just make more profit, they don't have lower rates."

It is clear that a wealthy, well-established consumer can get pretty close to the dealer rate—and the best deal—from a bank, but it is unclear where the best deal awaits the average consumer. He'll have to shop to find out.

The car dealer, however, is under considerably more pressure than the bank to see that a borderline credit risk gets a loan.

"The bank doesn't have to take the contract, but the dealer has to finance cars—particularly used cars—to stay in business," a dealer said. "You can't expect us to guarantee payment without having some reserve, can you?"

The car dealer may make \$20,000 to \$30,000 profit yearly on his dealer reserve during good economic times, but he can be in big trouble if a recession hits or a large, local industry shuts down.

"The average dealer guarantees an amount of paper far in excess of what he can normally financially handle," a dealer said. "When you talk about 300 new units a year, you have a lot of paper in three years. And, used cars are even more dangerous."

During 1936 many car dealers went out of business because of numerous repossessions, and the recessions in the 1950's were not happy times.

"Construction booms are one thing to watch out for," a car dealer said, "the workers will make a lot of overtime and they will over buy. If the boom dies, they either refuse to pay or they can't pay. The cars become repossessions, and the dealer is in trouble."

Dealers are usually pretty careful about checking credit ratings on the purchases of new cars, but they take risks on used cars. "We have to move those used cars because we're constantly getting more trade-ins. We'll take more borderline cases and we'll try to keep a large dealer reserve to avoid being wiped out," a dealer said.

#### BUYING ON "TIME"

The second type of contract business done by finance companies is considerably less complicated. Small furniture and appliance dealers offer credit services to their customers, and when they write the contract they act as agents for a finance company.

"The salesman will call us, we'll check the credit and tell him whether we'll take the contract," a finance company manager said. "About 60 percent of our business is done

with small appliance and furniture companies."

The larger, national finance companies handle most of the automobile contracts, and the smaller, regional companies handle most of the appliance contracts. The finance company rates are higher on appliances than either direct loans from a bank or charge accounts with department stores would be.

Many of the appliance contracts have rates of 1 percent add on interest a month or about 22 percent a year. Most charge accounts at large department stores charge 1.5 percent a month on the unpaid balance of 18 percent annually. A \$500 loan from a bank can be obtained for about 15 percent annually.

Consumers who may be knowledgeable about credit shopping for automobiles many times have little interest or knowledge about the credit terms and pitfalls in the booming charge account business in America.

And, the impact of the family charge account on a nice, neat budget cannot be blamed on profit-seeking New York bankers—whatever else can be blamed on them.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Guide, Oct. 30, 1969]

#### HOW TO SHOP FOR MONEY YOU BORROW—CREDIT REFORM PRESSURE MOUNTING BUT CONSUMERS ARE GENERALLY APATHETIC

(By Ernie Stallworth)

The banks have a well-heeled Washington lobby which is so powerful it recently stopped a Congressional investigation of its activities. The finance companies fund studies the writing of uniform laws. Department stores can exert terrific pressure on lawmakers.

Who speaks for the consumer?

Until recently few people did. Now, a growing consumer revolt—fed by the muckraking of Ralph Nader and energetic mayoral commissions in New York and Washington—is spawning national, statewide, and local organizations to fight for consumer rights.

One right the South Dakota Consumer's League, an organization with expanding influence since its formation in 1968, will fight for next legislative session will be the right to a reasonable rate of interest, and an end to what consumer advocates call privileged laws for banks, finance companies, and department stores.

The league, armed with research done by local attorney James Abourezk, will challenge some of the credit industry's most jealously guarded assumptions and some of its most stoutly defended laws.

And, it will attempt to do this while fighting a Uniform Consumer Credit Code (UCCC) which Abourezk says is favorable to the creditors and was funded by national finance companies, and national retail chains.

"Some of my best friends are bankers," Abourezk said, grinning. "But, they only gouge you more reasonably than the finance companies."

Abourezk's major contentions in a study he is completing for the consumer's league will spark some hot arguments during the next legislative session, and the league is certain to face tough opposition if it attempts the reforms he suggests.

For the consumer, the reforms could mean more of an interest rebate when a loan is paid off early, the elimination of large payments at the end of the installment period, the guarantee that defective merchandise would always be a defense against non-payment, and the assurance that an item to be purchased would always be considered enough collateral for a loan.

Other proposals in the league study will call for lower finance charges—Abourezk calls them interest charges—on charge accounts at major department stores, and lower interest charges on small loans.

In justifying his proposals, Abourezk at-

tacks a basic assumption of the credit industry—the existence of a free market in money.

The free market concept is used by the credit industry to justify high legal ceilings on the amount of interest it can charge. The argument is that high ceilings will make entry into the market easier, and that—after this entry is obtained—the resulting competition will drive down the price of interest.

"The free market thing is a myth," Abourezk said. "The credit industry just uses it to make bigger profits because of the higher ceilings."

There are plenty of credit outlets here, Abourezk said, and the average customer will get about the same rate of interest quoted to him all over town. "Most of the finance companies are at the maximum already. I don't see any competition here."

And, the situation will not improve. "I can't see that the supply of money will ever exceed people's demand for it because people have to have cars, appliances, and houses," Abourezk said.

Abourezk, therefore, feels the legislature should set reasonable ceilings for interest rates, but that the UCCC proposals are too high.

"I grew up in the retail business," Abourezk said, "and my family still extends a great deal of credit. But, they have never had to charge an interest rate."

"Credit losses because of non-paying customers and because of the use of money for an extended period of time deserve an interest charge, but not to the extent proposed by the large retail chains," he said.

Most retail outlets charge from 1.2 to 1.5 percent interest a month, but Abourezk said one percent would be more fair. "If this rate would force the companies to tighten up on credit, it'll be fine with me. I do a lot of personal bankruptcies because credit is too easy."

Strangely enough, many people in the credit industry agree with Abourezk in his criticisms of too easy credit and in his belief that a free market does not exist in money.

However, most of the 20 persons in banking, finance companies, department stores, and automobile firms interviewed for this series feel they are not to blame for the rising interest rates. The rates and the rising profits are made by the big New York and San Francisco banks, most said, and they advocated curbing the banks at the national level.

And, finance company executives felt they were being squeezed between the rising price for money, inflationary increases in costs, and the legal ceiling for interest rates.

The facts of an expanding credit market here and yet the disappearance of the individually owned finance company would appear to substantiate some of these fears. Four companies have sold out to large chain operations in the last two years, and one individually owned store is currently in the process of going out of business.

The fault for the closing of these individually operated companies obviously does not belong on the shoulders of local consumers who are well thought of by most in the credit industry.

Reflecting the ranch, small town, non-urban background of its residents, Rapid City people are "straight" and "square." One of the things this means is they pay their debts, are concerned about image in the community, and make up a good credit risk town.

"People still believe in people here," one newly arrived finance company manager said. "They still try to find a solution to their payment problems. In the cities, people don't believe in anybody anymore. They lie awake at night thinking of ways to beat you."

#### PITFALLS INHERENT IN "THE SYSTEM"

However good credit risks consumers here happen to be, they are still subject to the

normal pitfalls inherent in the credit system.

For the knowledgeable credit shopper, these pitfalls are easily avoided. But, for the unknowing and trusting young person or wage earner, buying on "time" can be disastrous for the well-balanced budget.

The first guideline for the wary buyer is that a consumer who shops for credit will invariably do better than one who does not. This, of course, is a commonplace, but too many consumers forget that interest accounts for several hundred dollars in the yearly budget.

And, sometimes those who are aware of the cost are too embarrassed or too intimidated by the crisp atmosphere in a finance company to shop for money.

A knowledgeable guess would be that a shopper for car loans will be offered about the same rate of interest anywhere he shops (although there is a small debate over this which we covered in last week's installment).

A personal unsecured loan to tide a family over Christmas or an unexpected expense is probably best obtained at a bank because the bank operates under the installment loan law and offers lower interest across the board than a finance company.

For example, a \$200 90-day note at a bank can usually be obtained for as little as \$2, and even a \$700 loan for six months can be handled for as little as \$20. However, a finance company will charge about \$40 for a six month \$500 loan.

A second helpful factor in credit shopping is knowing where you stand with the local credit bureau. New federal guidelines require old information to be deleted from your records after seven years. Although Miss Florence Burnette, manager of the Credit Bureau of Rapid City, assured us these guidelines were followed, checking the records would not hurt you.

Miss Burnette said about 100 people a month go over their records at the bureau, but most are referred by local stores. Accurate information may not be a problem, but a consumer should be certain his good credit references are included in the records as well as the bad ones.

A knowledgeable consumer will also be aware that personal affairs unrelated to ability to pay may influence his credit risk. Among these are divorce proceedings, age, stability in residence, and stability in job. Many of these considerations are no longer as important as they once were at banks, but they are still taken into account.

For example, a person involved in divorce proceedings should know that he will receive a much lower rate of interest if he postpones buying until the divorce is completed. Most credit agencies are reluctant to lend during a divorce, and interest on a three-year car loan, for instance, could rise several hundred dollars.

A fourth guideline is to watch out for the friendly man who offers to refinance your car. "We'll be glad to handle that for you and lower the monthly rate," he'll say.

The reason he'll be delighted to handle this for you is the ceiling on annual rates of interest for over two-year-old cars is 27 percent. You are probably paying 15 percent or less annually now.

Incidentally, the helpful man is not really trying to trick you. He will show you the true annual interest (as the new federal legislation requires), but unless you are cognizant of the interest change you will probably think the lower monthly payment is a good deal.

However, someone who is trying to trick you on refinancing is the man who will sell you a high-priced car and give you a fairly low monthly payment—with a "balloon" or high payment at the end of the 36-month contract.

"I know a guy who bought a real fancy car, paid \$110 a month, and had a \$2,900 pay-

ment at the end," one finance company manager said. "Then, of course they refinanced him at 27 percent for another three years. He really couldn't afford the car to start with."

The "balloon" payment is legal as is another trap to watch out for—the so-called cross collateral provision. In this case, a credit source will lend a consumer money for a car, but will take the car and the household goods as collateral.

Abourezk and the Consumer's League (which has a local affiliate here in the Black Hills) will try to make both of these tactics illegal in the next legislature, and will probably have the support of bankers and most finance company officials in the attempt.

"These things don't effect us," one banker said. "If some shyster wants to operate this way, he'd probably find another way if they changed the law. Usually there's something in the past of guys who go to him."

Most bankers asked what cross collateral provisions were, and expressed surprise that anyone would do such a thing. "That's amazing," one young banker said. "We would never do that."

Another pitfall for the consumer occurs in small appliance and furniture stores which don't have their own credit departments. As a service to the customer, the store will write a contract for 1 percent add on interest per month (22 percent a year), and sell it to one of the smaller, regional finance companies here.

The stores do this to serve their customers, and oftentimes the finance companies have to loan at 22 percent annually to make a profit. However, large department stores have charge accounts for 1.2 or 1.5 percent a month on the unpaid balance (14.4 and 18 percent annually).

And, a loan of the same amount can be obtained from a bank for about 15 percent annually.

Of course, financing arrangements at large, as well as, small stores are not only pushed in order to sell goods, but also to make money for the store. This aspect of the situation should be recognized in arranging credit.

However, credit managers of large department stores here said there was a finance—not an interest-charge on the purchases and several maintained the stores did not make money on the credit transactions.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. and Montgomery Ward & Co. both charge 1.5 percent interest a month (18 percent annually) on the unpaid balance in an account. Another large department store here, whose manager asked that its name not be used, charges 1.2 percent a month (14.4 percent annually) on the first \$500 in an account, and one percent a month on accounts over \$500.

Officials at the unidentified store said the regional office processed all credit applications, and stressed that they did not know how much profit, if any, was made on credit.

Miss Alta Maron, credit manager at Ward's, said a completed application was cleared through the Denver regional office before credit was approved. The store attempts to accurately judge the amount of money earned and the amount spent by a customer each month, she said.

"I think you could call it financial consultation," Miss Maron said. "We have a general idea about how much money it takes to live in Rapid City, and we add that to the monthly payments a customer already has to pay. Our intention is not to sell people something they can't pay for."

Miss Maron said Ward's personnel here usually could tell whether Denver would approve credit and would counsel customers accordingly. "I don't know how much money we make on credit, but there are bookkeeping and insurance expenses," Miss Maron said.

"About fifty percent of our business depends on credit, so it's a necessity."

Harold G. Jansen, credit manager at Sears, said he was concerned about high interest rates, particularly on home mortgages, but stressed the breakeven nature of Sears' credit operation.

"We have to pay for merchandise," Jansen said. "Sears has to borrow a lot of money. We used to borrow at four percent, but now it's up to 6.5 percent at commercial banks. So, costs have gone up, but our rate is the same."

Although Sears clears accounts through a computer in Minneapolis, the store has one of the few fully staffed credit departments in the city. And, Jansen—who said he spoke only for himself, not the store—felt lower finance rates could possibly curtail its operation.

"A one percent a month restriction (as proposed by Abourezk) would impose real severe restriction on this type of credit," Jansen said. "We'll have to get fussy about who gets an account. Now we're real liberal, and take chances. We'd also have to cut down the size of our operation—maybe by taking a girl off collections."

A one percent limit is imposed in Nebraska, and Jansen said the chain was losing money on its operations there. One reason is that many persons use the service as a 30-day account, pay their bills at the end of the month, and are not charged interest.

"This (charge accounts) is an easier way to shop and a service to the customers," Jansen said. "We like this type of selling because it encourages people to buy. We make money on the merchandise, not on credit."

(One type of credit—the time payment or installment variety for big purchases—does yield profit for Sears. The standard rate is 10 percent add on or 20 percent simple annual interest. The rate is higher than a bank rate, but probably lower than most finance company rates.)

Although Jansen said three-fourths of Sears' customers were more interested in the amount of the monthly payment than in interest, several complaints have been registered recently. "They are somewhat concerned about rates, but if it's explained properly they understand," he said.

One person who doesn't understand is Abourezk who says, "I think they make 18 percent a year, and I'd have to see their figures to be convinced otherwise. I also think that people with good credit shouldn't be the insurers for people with bad credit. If the rates were lower and they tightened up on credit, fewer people would get in trouble with debts and the others would pay less."

The Uniform Consumer Credit Code, rejected by this year's legislature on the advice of the state's three commissioners on uniform state laws, is currently being studied by the Legislative Research Committee in Pierre.

Most knowledgeable observers don't think the code stands much of a chance of passage in the next session, probably because of the commissioners' opposition.

Most lawmakers, it is safe to assume, know very little about the credit industry. An illustration of this ignorance came last session when a change in interest ceilings under the small loan law was proposed by the finance companies under the heading of a "better break" for the consumer.

After only scattered and unorganized opposition, the house passed the bill, 57 to 15, and the Senate passed it, 27 to 8. The only Pennington County lawmaker to vote against it was Sen. Frank Henderson, a Republican.

One lawmaker contacted for this series said, "I can't tell you why I voted for it." Vote for it he did, and Abourezk estimates the bill will cost consumers \$1.5 million more in interest charges during one year. The bill lowered the interest ceiling for loans under \$300 from 36 percent to 30 percent.

But, the old bill maintained an interest ceiling for loans over \$300 at 12 percent. The new bill established a 24 percent ceiling between \$300 and \$600, a 18 percent ceiling between \$600 and \$1,200, and left the 12 percent ceiling on loans between \$1,200 and \$2,500.

As we have discussed earlier, the finance companies operate near or at the maximum rate allowed by law, and the average loans run between \$600 and \$1,000.

The consumer was obviously the loser under the new law, Abourezk said, and repeal of the higher ceilings will be asked of the next legislature.

Another slip made by the legislature last session occurred when it set the maximum interest a municipality could pay for municipal bonds at six percent simple annual interest. The lawmakers meant to raise the ceiling from five to seven percent, but a mistake in the preparation of the bill means that no city can float a bond until the next session.

The going rate for municipal bonds is currently 6.2 percent and higher, and banks are refusing to lend at the maximum 6 percent, local officials said, even if a community like Rapid City is A-rated on the market.

The city of Phillip, about 70 miles from here, currently is experiencing a crisis in its waterworks, but cannot float any bonds to attack the problem even though the voters have approved them.

In view of the legislature's record in the recent past, there is no accurate way of determining what it will do with the reforms to be proposed in Abourezk's report.

Among those are the elimination of cross collateral provisions and the demise of the balloon payment. Most people in the credit industry, as we have learned, will probably support these measures.

Other proposals will include the elimination of the rule of 78's payoff and the "holder in due course" doctrine, both of which will spark disagreements with the credit industry.

According to the rule of 78's, the credit source apportiones the interest charges throughout the 36-month contract period, but assigns more interest to the first months of the contract than to the last months.

Thus, a customer who pays off early receives less interest back than he would if the interest charge were apportioned evenly over the period.

"There is obviously a flat expense for bookkeeping," Abourezk said, "and I believe the consumer has the right to repay his loan without penalty. The method is unreasonable. Why shouldn't you figure interest on the amount of time the money is used?"

Bankers said the beginning bookkeeping expenses—the "front-end" costs—are large and that a greater amount of interest should be charged when the greater amount of the principal is outstanding.

"We must be protected," one banker said, "After all, a customer is breaking the contract when he pays off early."

The "holder in due course" doctrine absolves the credit source (a bank, say) of any responsibility for a disagreement between a seller and a buyer over defective merchandise.

So, if an appliance or a piece of furniture is defective and the firm will not replace it, the consumer has no alternative but to pay the bank anyway. Defective merchandise cannot be a defense against a "neutral" credit source for non-payment of the contract.

Bankers and finance company officials say they must be protected in this manner. "We have no knowledge, and no responsibility, for trouble between you and a store," one banker said. "We just lend the money."

Abourezk, of course, sees things a bit differently. "The credit source is not entirely innocent," he said. "The buyer may have no

expertise, but the bank does these things regularly and is in a much better position to know if a dealer is scrupulous than the consumer."

If the consumer could use defects as a defense against not paying the contract, Abourezk said, "The banks and finance companies would pressure the dealers to stand behind their products. This pressure would really be effective because the credit sources can make or break the dealer."

The final proposal for change would not require any legislation.

"I feel that counseling type help is needed here for families in trouble over their credit," a finance company manager said. "Many people need to be straightened out, and they shouldn't have to go to a court or a pro-rater."

A pro-rater company will consolidate large bills into a single payment that a family can meet, and the court will determine a settlement, but the people involved cannot afford the attorney's fees or the pro-rater's cost, the official said.

"We do some of it," he said, "but we need a full time office for family counseling funded by all the finance companies and the banks. I've suggested it several times to friends."

Whether or not a counseling service is established, we found during several days spent in the offices of the credit industry here a remarkably frank and honest group of men whose constant worry is the budget of their neighbor in the community.

And, those men wished the neighbor—the consumer—knew a bit more about credit and interest rates as the prime rate climbed, budgets stretched, and inflation continued.

#### FRANK TURNER, IRF MAN-OF-THE-YEAR

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the October 1969, issue of American Highways features a story on Francis C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator. The story tells about Mr. Turner's being named the 1969 Man-of-the-Year by the International Road Federation.

It would be difficult to think of a man more deserving of this award. There is no other individual in recent history to whom this Nation owes so much gratitude for its excellent highway system. Frank Turner has labored long and hard to produce the great Interstate System, which many of us utilize almost daily. He has made a tremendous contribution to the concept to which I refer to as the "Fifth Great Freedom": the freedom of movement of men and goods.

My most sincere congratulations go to Mr. Turner.

The story referred to, follows:

FRANCIS C. TURNER, IRF MAN-OF-THE-YEAR—1969

Francis C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, has been named International Road Federation's 1969 Man-of-the-Year. This award is considered a top recognition in the world-wide field of roads and road transportation.

In making the announcement, IRF President Robert O. Swain stated that Turner's award was predicated in part on his 40 years of service in the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and his contributions to various countries outside the United States which he has served as consultant in the road and road transportation field. He was also recognized

for his work in the development of the Alaskan Highway and the transportation rehabilitation program of the Philippines following World War II.

Turner, a native of Texas and a graduate of Texas A&M University, joined the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads in Texas in 1929. He served in various capacities with the Bureau, including Chief Engineer and Assistant Federal Highway Administrator. He was appointed Federal Highway Administrator by President Nixon in February, 1969.

Turner is the second American to receive this award. The first was former Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton who received the award in 1966.

The actual presentation of the award, in the form of a diploma and a silver plaque, will be made at the 1969 IRF meeting to be held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Other Men-of-the-Year who have been acknowledged for their contributions to road transportation, world-wide, include Romulo O'Farrill, a newspaper publisher in Mexico (1951); Luis de Carli, road contractor in Argentina (1956); Luigi Tocchetti, professor of the University of Naples (1959); Vincente Mortes, former deputy minister of public works of Spain (1964); Hellmuth Swietelsky, Austrian contractor (1965); Fernando Belaunde Terry, former president of Peru (1967); and John A. L. Shaw, a former highway commissioner for Australia (1968).

Selection of Mr. Turner was made by the Board of Directors of the International Road Federation in early July at Woodcote Park, Epsom, Surrey, England and it represented the unanimous choice of the Federation whose membership includes 75 countries around the world.

#### THE ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have read with concern of the plans for the anti-war demonstration which is to have its climax in a march through Washington this Saturday.

Few of us in the House object to the peaceful expression of views, pro or con, on Vietnam, or any other subject. Certainly, everyone has the right to speak out for or against Government's actions and policies, so long as they do so in a lawful manner.

Tuesday's freedom rallies and last month's observances of the Vietnam moratorium, were, for the most part, peaceful and lawful expressions of points of view.

But the November 15 march in Washington may be a very different sort of demonstration.

Most of those planning to participate in this Saturday's observance, are seeking no more than a prompt and peaceful solution to the problem of Vietnam. They view their participation in the march as an expression of this desire.

But there are others involved in the march whose objectives are much broader, who seek to destroy our democratic institutions and who hope to use the march to create confusion and division.

Among them are persons and organizations which have been at the forefront of demonstrations punctuated by violence. I specifically cite the disturbances surrounding the Pentagon march and the Democratic National Convention last year.

Even the planning sessions for this

current demonstration have not been free from violent conflict. According to newspaper reports, a meeting in Los Angeles on October 27 was disrupted by fistfights between antagonistic factions of the Students for a Democratic Society.

The SDS—and its conflicting subgroups—are only one component of the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. Other organizations participating include the Yippies—the Youth International Party, the Communist Party of the United States, the W. E. B. Du Bois Society, and the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance.

Some of these associated with the New Mobilization Committee are experts in what they term "confrontation politics." Their tactic is to edge over the borderline between legal activity and that which is expressly forbidden, and by so doing challenge law enforcement officers, attempting to goad them into violent reaction. When police response is restrained these militants step up their own level of unlawful provocations until a clash with police results.

It is my fear that innocent and sincere young people will come to Washington to participate in what they believe will be a peaceful demonstration, only to be exploited by publicity-seeking extremists who seek to disrupt the orderly processes of government by violent means.

I hope that those who are contemplating participation in the Washington march will consider their actions carefully. They might ask themselves this question:

"Will a demonstration deeply involving militants and extremist elements committed to the destruction of our social system really serve to express my views on the question of peace in Vietnam, or can I better express my convictions by joining with local citizens planning peaceful demonstrations in communities across the Nation?"

I believe that those who feel they must march to demonstrate their opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam would do so more effectively and with less risk by pursuing the latter course.

#### PROTESTING ADMINISTRATION'S DEFENSE JOB CUT

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. MINK, Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1969, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird announced that the Nixon administration would reduce military spending by \$3 billion in fiscal 1970. This, at first, was welcome news to our Nation which had seen the military budget nearly double in 5 years reaching a point of requiring 40 cents out of every tax dollar collected. This decision to cut back was made by the Secretary under the authority of the Executive power of the President before either House of the Congress had acted on the military budget.

On October 29, 1969, however, Secretary Laird revealed the philosophy of this administration with regard to priorities. He announced that to implement the reduction, 27,000 civilian jobs would

be eliminated with a saving of \$609 million. This kind of budget cutting while at the same time supporting billions of dollars for defense contracts for the ABM, MIRV and C-5A's indicates a shocking kind of insensitivity to people whose dislocation and personal hardship ought to be of prime concern rather than more hardware of dubious value.

I have opposed the construction and deployment of the ABM, MIRV, and C-5A's. Deletion of just these three items would save us billions of dollars in the future without elimination of a single job.

But the deliberate creation of unemployment is admitted as the preferred economic policy of the Nixon administration. Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy testified this summer before the Senate Finance Committee that an increase in the unemployment rate was needed to help curb inflation.

I rise today to express my vigorous opposition to this ill-conceived policy. I urge the President and the Secretary of Defense to reconsider this approach to savings, as counterproductive and unnecessary particularly when so much can be saved by cutting back on defense contracts instead of precipitous large-scale unemployment of longtime, loyal Government employees.

Last week Mr. Ernest Fitzgerald was fired by the Department of Defense. He was the Air Force efficiency expert who alerted the Congress about a \$2 billion cost overrun in the C-5A aircraft which was being concealed from Congress by high Pentagon officials. Shortly after his unusual and startling testimony he was removed from his responsibilities and banished to a job checking bowling alleys in Thailand. On the day Fitzgerald was fired, the same Air Force office hired at \$100 a day an accountant whose firm audits one of the airplane firms involved in the C-5A scandal.

This is further indication that the Nixon administration has little regard for internal savings. Rather than reward a man for his courage in advising the Congress of these billions of dollars of cost overruns, the President instead fires him and replaces him with a Lockheed consultant. The evidence is unmistakably clear.

The real economies in the military budget have not been considered by this administration. The goal is not en masse reductions in jobs or overnight base closing, but rather reduction of manpower by gradual cutbacks, transfers, attrition, and retirements. The fast dollar savings in billions can be achieved by cutting back on the development of weapons systems like the ABM which many experts testify is already obsolete.

The list of weapons systems which we sought to delete from this fiscal year's budget totaled over \$2 billion. We failed to win these deletions because of the opposition of the Nixon administration to this effort. The President has instead chosen elimination of 27,000 civilian jobs at a savings of \$609 million. I hardly call 27,000 persons without jobs as any kind of savings at all.

Let us examine whether these cuts in military spending were Congress' idea, or the President's. To do so we have to go back to the Johnson administration

budget request of \$79 billion, including no shutdowns of military bases, or job reductions in force, for fiscal year 1970.

The Nixon administration had been in office less than 2 months when it began whittling down this figure with a view toward sizable reductions in military and civilian defense employment. On March 19, Defense Secretary Laird went before the Senate Armed Services Committee and disclosed that the Nixon administration had plans to lower defense outlays below the Johnson budget by \$500 million to \$78.5 billion. This was long before either House of Congress had acted on the budget request and was, in fact, during hearings on the administration's spending revision plans.

On April 11, Secretary Laird announced further slashes of \$600 million in defense outlays for fiscal 1970. This brought the total reduction to \$1.1 billion, or a budget of \$77.9 billion. He told the House Armed Services Committee, which was just starting to consider the budget request, that the cuts were prompted by the administration's general policy of budget cutting, rather than by congressional actions. Mr. Laird told the committee:

The Nation is confronted with an extremely difficult and dangerous economic and fiscal situation, and all demands on the Federal budget would have to be matched against a strict sense of national priorities.

The new administration began spelling out its concept of national priorities in greater detail on April 15 when President Nixon's revisions for the entire Federal budget were sent to Congress. The administration slashed \$4 billion from what President Johnson had sought, including \$2.9 billion from domestic programs and the \$1.1 billion in defense reductions. One of the biggest savings which received publicity attention was a cut in social security increases from the Johnson request of 10 percent, to 7 percent, for a \$1 billion reduction. Later President Nixon changed his mind after congressional and public criticism and endorsed the Johnson request of 10 percent.

According to the Bureau of the Budget, this across-the-board budget reduction had three purposes: to cut spending so as to curb inflation; to bring Federal spending under control; and to begin redirecting current programs toward the goals of the administration. Nowhere was there a mention of responding to any congressional pressure to reduce military spending.

On August 21, prior to congressional approval of defense appropriations, Secretary Laird announced further reductions of more than \$1 billion in military spending. He said this was a first step toward eventual reductions of \$3 billion in expenditures, a cutback which would be in addition to the \$1.1 billion reduction which had already been made.

He said the August 21 cuts would require reductions of 100,000 military personnel and 50,000 civilian jobs. Other actions would include a slash of \$500 million by the Army in non-Southeast Asia operations, the inactivation by the Navy of more than 100 ships, and a decrease of 300,000 flying hours in Air Force non-Southeast Asia training.

Some of the specific cuts to be made were disclosed on October 29 by Secretary Laird. These reductions, of \$609 million, eliminated about 37,800 military and 27,000 civilian positions. Obviously, since this is only about half the \$1 billion cutback announced on August 21 and about one-fifth of the overall \$3 billion retrenchment which the administration plans to effect this fiscal year, far more drastic job losses, base closings, and defense reductions are scheduled over the coming months due to the administration decisions.

Certain Republican spokesmen have attempted to defend the administration for its job-cutting policy by saying it was the rising crescendo of certain Members of Congress for defense cuts that forced Secretary Laird into cutting jobs. The people of Hawaii should realize that primary responsibility for these job cuts rests with the President and not with the Congress.

A deliberate policy of massive unemployment is a tragic mistake. I oppose it, and the people of Hawaii must know that it is the administration's own choice of priorities which brought it about. If defense critics had their way these job cuts would not have been necessary. We have sought reductions in spending on new and costly weapons systems that are not necessary for national defense. By eliminating these many billions of dollars in future costs proposed by the administration, we could accomplish tremendous savings without the loss of jobs. Just one more vote in the Senate against the unwise and obsolete ABM system would have saved more than the entire job reduction plan announced on August 21 by Defense Secretary Laird. A single additional vote by any Senator could have prevented these job losses in Hawaii. In effect, those who voted for the ABM voted for massive unemployment in Hawaii.

Those opposed to wasteful and unnecessary spending on weapons of war proposed amendments in the House last month to reduce arms outlays by \$2.3 billion from the total requested by the Nixon administration. The administration, however, opposed the House amendments to reduce military weapons spending. Despite this, the House did cut military weapons procurement on October 3 by \$615 million from the administration request—an amount in excess of the saving the administration announced on October 29 by elimination of jobs. Congressional saving would be in the area of weapons procurement rather than elimination of jobs and would be a far more desirable approach toward balancing the budget.

The Senate on September 18 cut \$1.3 billion from the administration's weapons procurement request, and I expect that the final reduction by Congress could well eliminate the alleged basis for eliminating \$1.1 billion in jobs as the administration is doing. However, it appears that the administration is proceeding on its job-cutting course despite our actions.

In the absence of budgetary necessity for the defense jobs cutbacks, the administration's goal appears to be to "trade-

off" inflation control for an undetermined level of unemployment. Certainly, unemployment has been the result of such administration actions as the 75 percent Federal construction cancellation. Unemployment jumped to 4 percent of the national labor force in September from 3.5 percent in August. Current unemployment is the highest in years.

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy has told members of the Joint Economic Committee in Congress that the battle against inflation would cost some people their jobs. On October 7 he told the committee that unemployment would increase as the administration pressed its counterinflation policies. He added that the current high level of 4 percent or more was acceptable to the administration.

It is perfectly clear that the administration wants to increase unemployment. It apparently feels that when people are out of work and can no longer buy food, clothing, housing, and other necessities of life, that the demand for these things will be reduced and prices will therefore go down. This is extremely heartless and inhumane way of cooling down the economy. I protest this policy and urge its condemnation.

#### OCCUPIED WASHINGTON—ADMINISTRATION APEASES HANOI FIFTH COLUMN

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the moratorium crowd has now been given the keys to our Nation's Capital. Under the smokescreen of dissent, they have been issued parade permits and given free run of the Nation's Capital.

The citizens and public servants who normally anticipate use of the District streets and some freedom of movement now find that their freedoms are severely restricted to make way for those who are not here on governmental business. Extra police and military units, all at the expense of the taxpayers, are also being jammed into the District. The normal area set aside for the operation of our Nation's Government has now been converted to a marshalling yard for non-violent riots. The regular business of the Government has been, for all practical purposes, curtailed if not shut down relying on assurances from the loud-mouthed minority that their activities the remainder of the week will be non-violent. Every extremist group which has been identified with violence is participating and is in this city now.

The police and the military who have been summoned to the District to protect the demonstrators are under express orders not to become involved in any confrontation. They are required to submit to indignities such as, if not worse, than those we saw in Chicago.

Most Americans recognize the moratorium mob as the enemy's fifth column. Without these "dear American friends" Hanoi would have jumped at peace offers 2 years ago. Reliance on subversion in the United States has always been a key

element in the enemy's war plans. The moratorium leaders must be held personally responsible for having prolonged the war. The blood of every man killed in the past 2 years is on their hands and the Nation's leaders know this well.

If, as they assure our leaders, the fifth column leaders can keep their violent members nonviolent, how did they whitewash the many acts of sabotage against our country and national defense? Sabotage, such as assaults on draft boards, disruption of railways, explosions in industries which manufacture military equipment, and this morning, attempts by some of their number to blow up Army trucks.

For the U.S. Department of Justice to make a gentleman's agreement with known Communists and subversives is as ridiculous as the billeting of the enemy's fifth column in the churches of Washington, as is also occurring.

Maybe those decisionmakers in our Government are naive enough to think they can deal with Communists by appeasement but neither side is fooling the American people who can see what is actually going on and disapprove.

I include pertinent news clippings and some representative views of the American people as expressed in letters-to-the-editor in tonight's paper:

#### BOMB SHATTERS WALLS IN NEW YORK COURT BUILDING

NEW YORK, November 12—An explosion shattered two walls in a washroom of the Criminal Courts building near police headquarters in downtown Manhattan tonight, and police chased down a new rash of bomb threats that came in the wake of blasts earlier this week at three major office buildings.

Two men carrying dynamite were taken into custody by FBI agents on lower Park Avenue. Further details were not immediately available.

About an hour after the newest blast in a fifth-floor men's room of the 20-story court building, a bomb threat was received by a security guard at the Columbia Broadcasting System building on Sixth Avenue near Rockefeller Center.

Three floors of the building were evacuated, taking the network's FM radio station off the air, CBS said.

The explosion at the court building occurred about 8:30 p.m.

One woman, identified as Norma Davis, 21, of Brooklyn, was in a ladies' room directly below the blast and was taken to Beekman Downtown Hospital for observation. Police said she works in the building as a typist.

Night court was in session at the time of the explosion and the building was evacuated.

Soon after the explosion, police received a telephone warning that a second device would go off in the building.

Early Tuesday morning, there were coordinated, almost simultaneous explosions in the RCA Building in Rockefeller Center, the General Motors Building on Fifth Avenue and the Chase Manhattan Building in the Wall Street area.

There have been a dozen unsolved blasts in the city in recent months. Among them were an Aug. 20 explosion at the Marine Midland Building on lower Broadway that injured 19, a Sept. 19 blast at the Federal Office Building at Federal Plaza that left no injuries, an Oct. 7 explosion at the Armed Forces Induction Center on Whitehall Street that also caused no injuries and a series of six explosions in four days early in October at Macy's in Herald Square.

The explosion at the Criminal Court building capped a day during which the city was plagued with a rash of false bomb threats.

#### MOLOTOV COCKTAILS FOUND AT HOTEL; FIRE EXTINGUISHED

While fighting a blaze apparently started by a molotov cocktail at the Madison Hotel at 15th and M Streets NW early today, firemen discovered a smoldering second incendiary device near the building but extinguished it before it could explode, fire officials said.

Firemen said they found broken glass and the "strong smell of gasoline" while fighting a small blaze in six trash bins at the rear of the hotel. They said they also found a gallon jug of gasoline equipped with a wick in a window well on the M Street side of the hotel.

The jug was wrapped in a paper bag that had been set on fire, but the small blaze was put out before the gas could explode, firemen said.

The fire caused no damage to the hotel.

#### BLAST DESTROYS ARC FACILITY

An explosion and fire ripped through a West Hanover, Mass. production facility of Atlantic Research Corp. yesterday, totally destroying the building. There were no reported injuries.

The fire broke out in a frame structure used by the company to assemble Army cartridge launchers for a riot control agent known as CS. A quantity of CS, which is similar to tear gas, was released but company officials say it is non-toxic. Damages have not been estimated by Atlantic Research, which is a division of the Susquehanna Corp.

#### SIX ACCUSED OF PLOT TO BOMB SCHOOLS; FIVE CITED IN INDICTMENT ARE SOUGHT—ONE DENIES GUILT

(By Morris Kaplan)

Six men were indicted yesterday on charges of conspiring and attempting to bomb and burn two public schools in East Harlem.

District Attorney Frank S. Hogan announced the arrest of one of the men—Jose Santiago, unemployed, of 120 East 101st Street. Arraigned before Superior Court Justice Mitchell D. Schweitzer. Mr. Santiago, guilty and was held in \$15,000 bail.

Mr. Hogan's office withheld the names of the five others, but a police alarm named three and described each of the two others as "John Doe." The police are looking for Edmundo Sacini, 35, of 207 East 97th Street; John Roman, 31, of 342 East 105th Street, and George Eapada, 34, of 123 East 102d Street.

All six were said to have congregated at a recently formed community organization, El Barrio Nuevo, 1567 Lexington Avenue, at 101st Street. Spokesmen for the city's Human Resources Administration and the East Harlem Community Corporation reported that the organization was not financed by city, state or Federal funds.

#### HARASSMENT PLAN CHARGED

The indictment charged the defendants with conspiracy to commit arson and two counts of attempted arson. On Sept. 10, the indictment said, the defendants agreed to bomb Public School 109, at 215 East 99th Street, and Public School 72, at 104th Street and Lexington Avenue.

This purportedly was part of an over-all plan to harass elements of the city government responsible for administering the welfare and public schools systems. The scheme was to focus public attention on demands by welfare mothers for clothing allowances for their children.

If the plot had succeeded, the schools would have been closed, thereby depriving the city of state aid allotted on the basis of attendance.

The defendants were alleged to have made 11 molotov cocktails and, shortly after mid-

night on Sept. 11, to have approached Public School 109.

Details of the arrest were not disclosed, but Detective Louis Julianelli of the East 104th Street Station seized Mr. Santiago.

Assistant District Attorney William I. Aronow was in charge of the investigation.

#### FIVE BOMBS EXPLODE IN MACY'S AT NIGHT (By William Borders)

A fifth time bomb exploded at Macy's early yesterday morning as two dozen security officers were searching the store for clues to four earlier explosions during the night.

Like the first four blasts, which were set in series on different floors of the huge Herald Square department store, the last explosion, in the shower-curtain department on the sixth floor, caused no injuries and did little damage.

"We cleaned up quickly and we'll be back at the old stand Monday, business as usual," promised David L. Yunich, president of Macy's. He said he had "absolutely no idea whatsoever" on who set out the bombs, or why.

The Fire Department and the Police Department Bomb Squad also reported no clues, although one policeman said that the small, homemade bombs were similar to those set in three Woolworth's stores here last summer.

#### HIDDEN BEFORE STORE CLOSED

The five bombs were apparently planted around Macy's just before 6 P.M. Saturday, when the store closed. The first one, which had been tucked into the pocket of a woman's coat hanging on a rack, exploded at 9:38 P.M.

The others, in a sofa, in the pocket of a man's raincoat, amid some Halloween costumes in the toy department, and on a shelf of shower curtains, followed at irregular intervals, ending at 5:15 A.M., yesterday.

Each explosion started a small fire, but in each case the heat automatically turned on the ceiling sprinkler system in the area. Most of the damage was from water and all of it was cleaned up by yesterday afternoon.

Saturday night, dozens of firemen spent several hours searching the store, and at 11:15, a sixth bomb was found hidden between two rugs that were rolled up on the seventh floor.

The bomb was deactivated, and the police checked it for fingerprints and studied its mechanism for clues.

#### CIGARETTE PACKAGE USED

The unexploded bomb, which the police presumed to be typical of all six, had been put together in an empty Parliament cigarette package, made of cardboard.

The explosive was believed to be potassium chlorate, ignited by a mechanism made from a small battery and a cheap wrist watch.

One fire official said that the use of the watch limited the life of the bomb to 12 hours, leading to the conclusion that the bombs could have been set out no earlier than 5:15 P.M. Saturday.

#### NO WARNING RECEIVED

Mr. Yunich said that the store received bomb threats "from time to time" but had no warning in this case. He added:

"It could have been some kind of protest, or a deranged individual, I just don't know. But people do seem often to gravitate to department stores for things like this."

In March, 1968, small fires were set in Macy's and three other midtown department stores during shopping hours. Also, in Chicago at that time, arsonists set more serious fires in several Chicago stores.

#### THREE JERSEY SCHOOLS HIT BY FIREBOMBS: 3 COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS ALSO STRUCK IN FREEHOLD

(By Ronald Sullivan)

FREEHOLD, N.J., August 13.—Three schools and three commercial buildings here were firebombed late last night and early today.

The police reported that no one was injured by the crude Molotov cocktails fashioned from empty wine bottles. Two buildings used to store seed grain were heavily damaged, but the three schools were only slightly damaged.

The bombings followed the conviction and sentencing of four Negroes and two whites yesterday on charges stemming from a racial fight here July 25. However, the police said they had no evidence this evening that the bombings were racially motivated.

The first two bombs were thrown against an elementary school shortly after 11 P.M. One of them crashed through a window into a hallway and caused slight damage before the police extinguished it.

Four minutes later, a third bomb sputtered out harmlessly on the grass outside the regional high school. Two more bombs burned out minutes later without damaging an intermediate school.

Similar firebombs caused heavy damage to the business office of the Holland and McClesney Feed plant and scorched a shed at Hillpot Store, a nearby grain supplier.

Another bomb caused a trash fire at a warehouse across the street.

Last month's brawl followed the picketing by the Concerned Citizens of Greater Freehold of a white-owned delicatessen. The pickets, who were virtually all black, charged that the owner, Richard Weinick, had mistreated an elderly Negro.

John Davis, the president of Concerned Citizens, received a 60-day jail term in Municipal Court. Three other Negroes also received jail sentences, although they were suspended in two cases.

Mr. Weinick was convicted of assault, too. But his sentencing was postponed. The other white, Raymond Marino, received a 15-day jail term.

The brawl came about two months after more than 100 Negro youths ran through the small downtown section here, breaking windows and looting stores.

#### EXPLOSION WRECKS U.S. OFFICES HERE

(By Thomas A. Johnson)

An explosion of undetermined origin shattered the United States Department of Commerce offices on the 40th floor of the one-year-old Federal Building at Foley Square at 2 o'clock yesterday morning.

No one was injured and there was no fire. Teams of policemen and firemen and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation searched for clues throughout the day, but said last night that they just did not know what had caused the blast.

Policemen and firemen on the scene early in the morning had speculated that the explosion was caused by either a homemade bomb or accumulations of gases.

Late today, Joseph Ponder, a special agent who is supervising the F.B.I. investigation, said simply that "the investigation is still under way and it has not yet been resolved."

#### DEBRIS COVERS FLOOR

The north end of the 40th floor was covered with debris. A six-foot-square hole had been ripped in a wall opposite the shaftway that contained circuit breakers, electric panels, ducts and utility wires. File cabinets and furniture had been smashed by flying pieces of concrete.

A 25-by-40-foot section of the ceiling had been ripped out and the floor of the 41st floor was damaged.

Ceiling tiles fell onto the floor, desks and files of the Selective Service offices that are on the 39th floor of the Federal Office building.

No financial estimates of damages could be obtained late yesterday.

The 41-story building, housing some 60 Federal agencies, was closed yesterday to the general public and to most of the 6,000 employees. Maintenance men and some executives assisted in the investigations, however.

All water and electrical systems were out of order. A New York Telephone Company spokesman said 4,000 telephones had been rendered inoperative and that repair crews would work around the clock to have them back in service by Monday.

Edward V. Kline, regional administrator of the General Services Administration, said he hoped to have the building open to employees and the general public by Monday.

Dominating the complex of government buildings at Foley Square, the 41-story Federal Office Building is the tallest Federal structure in the nation. It has 1,147,139 square feet of usable floor space, second only in Federal structures to the Pentagon which has some 3,762,000 square feet of floor space.

#### THE "NEW MOBILIZATION"

SIR: The administration awaits the arrival of the peace marchers with all the consideration of Sitting Bull waiting for Custer. The marchers might avoid trouble and be more relevant if they realize the power is not at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but is across the Potomac at the Pentagon. The only thing the Capitol does well is vote money for the Pentagon—seventy percent of all federal taxes. The thing the White House does best is acquiesce. In our society money is power. So why not march where the power is, in the acres of space around the Pentagon. The Vietnam war is not the cause of our dismay, it is an effect. The Pentagon congeries are the cause.

If a half million marchers arrive, let them gather at the Washington Monument grounds and march to the area around the Pentagon. They should not sing "We Shall Overcome," for they shall not overcome. Let them stand or sit quietly for an hour, forgetting for the moment Vietnam, war dead and draft (there will be other Vietnams), and just think of money and power. No Viet Cong flags. No gibes about the Pentagon being Kremlin West. No suggestions to Pentagonians that they resign and seek honest work. No attempts to enter; a thousand cracked skulls would prove nothing.

Let them reflect that the marchers have spent, or will spend in their lifetimes, more on the Pentagon than for food and clothing for their families, or for housing, or for all the automobiles they will ever own. Let them reflect that the old War Department in the Pentagon, if memory serves, got by on \$15 billion per year; but then the name was changed euphemistically to Defense, since taxpayers who might object to paying for war would not object to paying for defense. So Defense now gets \$80 billion per year.

Rejoice that the name was not changed to Department of Peace, and quietly go home, remembering that even Mr. Nixon's "silent majority" dislikes high taxes for self-destructive use, and may some day be led to see the light. And I don't mean that well-known light at the end of the tunnel.

J. SAM MAWHINNEY, JR.

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: On November 15th, let veterans get out their Purple Heart or whatever it is and wear it. The rest of us will purchase a small American flag, such as you can get at a dime store. We will attach these to our dresses corsage-style. Lacking a flag, a bow of red-white-and blue ribbon would be enough.

I am not against peace, any more than I am against patriotism or honor. There has to be a way out of the present dilemma, and it will be found, but not by a slogan-following, fuzzy-thinking mob.

GLORIA J. RICKEL.

SIR: If the demonstrators insist on their "fun and games," it will show the country—the vast majority of silent Americans—that these demonstrators, with their Viet Cong flags and Ho Chi Minh chants, are more in-

terested in a communistic victory than peace.

TOM L. PHILLIPS, JR.

SIR: It seems to me that the present administration and the Justice Department are deliberately creating a dangerous atmosphere to guarantee violence and division in our land over the upcoming Moratorium.

Name calling, frustrating people's constitutional right to protest, polarizing and pitting one group against the other—is this the spirit in which we are supposed to go "Forward Together"? Are we only to march together to praise Caesar? If so, this is no better than dictatorship. Are we only to agree? If so, this is no better than communism.

WORRIED AMERICAN.

SIR: The Mobilization's structure does not appear to be in the best interests of peace, the ideals of the young activists, or our country's good. Though perhaps poorly informed, I am probably not less so than the majority of the participants in the demonstrations.

BETHESDA, MD.

ANGELA ROCKS.

SIR: These long haired nuts are being even now congratulated by Hanoi; for they know that they are more responsible for the big death list of our American soldiers on the field than even Hanoi's troops. If they are so anxious to keep up this division in America, why don't they go over and join the enemy, for that is where they belong.

MARK J. BENNETT.

ARVADA, COLO.

SIR: I cannot understand dissent which parades the flag of an enemy power, chants the name of an enemy head of state, and uses the recognized tactics of an enemy ideology. Neither can I understand law makers who by their patronizing attitude and flaccid statements give comfort and encouragement to subversive dissent against the country they swore to defend.

T. C.

SIR: If surrender is in the minds of the Mobilization marchers, and it seems to be, they should all carry white flags to identify them for what they are and what their true aims are.

J. EZRA TROTH.

ROCKVILLE, MD.

SIR: While the sick minority are washing their peek-a-boobos in public, the silent majority vote!

PETER K. BROS.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

SIR: On Oct. 15, there was no violence, and if it occurs on Nov. 15, there will be strong conviction all over the country that the administration encouraged it.

CHARLES AND CAROLYN PLANCK.

FREMONT, CALIF.

SIR: The Moratorium on Oct. 15 was so wonderful, we hope this demonstration will be as orderly. But, if it isn't, let us remember that anything the marchers might do can't possibly be as bad as what ex-President Johnson and President Nixon have done by allowing an unnecessary war that has caused the deaths of 40,000 of our boys, and injured many many more.

ETHEL P. MARKEL.

JOHN M. MARKEL.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

SIR: Here is a suggestion for the "MOBE" crowd: Drop by the Red Cross and donate a pint of blood! Then they would be really

doing something constructive for once in their lives. It might even impress some of the over-40 crowd that they really do have something to give to their country.

ALICE DEISROTH.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

SIR: I would like to comment on what seems to be a growing misconception concerning the recent Vietnam Moratorium.

In the first place we are not Communist pinkos, long-haired weirdos, SDS members, or anything of the sort. We are Americans who care a great deal for our country. It is the greatest country on the face of the earth. We only want to make it a place where all can live in peace. We are not against the American soldier in Vietnam—rather the policy that sends him to die for a country that can't even uphold a stable government.

RONALD LARGE,

University of Virginia.

SIR: I have become more than a little frustrated by the attempts of pseudo-intellectuals to conduct or influence the conduct of the business of government from the streets. I believe that they suffer from the illusion that they are speaking for and acting in the best interests of the majority of U.S. citizens. (Some of our Congressmen suffer more than a little from the same illusion.) God helps us if it is so!

FRUSTRATED.

#### GROUP OF LAWYERS, CLERICS TO MONITOR ANTIWAR MARCH

About 200 lawyers and 75 clergymen will monitor the antiwar demonstrations here this week, watching the behavior of both the marchers and the authorities, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark announced yesterday.

The "Lawyers' Task Force" probably will write a report later analyzing what happens, Clark said at a press conference.

He said they will act as "objective, disinterested eyewitnesses" who could eventually provide an accurate account of what goes on.

Clark also asserted that there has been far too much talk of possible violence connected with the antiwar demonstrations.

"If you pay attention to all the rumors of violence, you can be in so great a state of nervous shock that you can't do anything," he said.

"The high probabilities are that it (the march downtown) will go off peacefully and with dignity and that's what all Americans should want."

The plan for a detached report on what happens during the march recalled the so-called Walker Report on the street confrontations during the Democratic National Convention last year. It was prepared by a large task force under the direction of a Chicago lawyer, Daniel Walker.

Clark cited the action of officials in Chicago as an example of the "repressive activity" that has characterized the response to several protest demonstrations in the past few years. "The country can't afford any more Chicagos," he said.

The lawyers and clergymen monitoring this week's demonstrations here will be stationed at points along the march route Saturday. Some of them will be in the line of march.

They will wear white armbands bearing the phrase, "Lawyers' Task Force." The attorneys were recruited from private firms and congressional offices among other locations.

Clark, who as attorney general in the Johnson administration supervised preparations for several demonstrations, also said that much information reaching the government before protests start contains unverified rumors about potential violence.

He said, for example, that before the Poor People's campaign here in the spring of 1968

he became "red-eyed" reading reports of impending violence, including forecasts that Potomac bridges would be blown up.

**PROTEST SEEN HURTING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S BUSINESSES**

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Unless many of Washington's leading businessmen are wrong, the Downtown shopping area is going to be a slow, dull place Friday and Saturday. The reason: The mobilization.

"I can't see where it's going to help business," said Arthur T. Lyon, executive vice president of Raleigh's. Most other businessmen contacted yesterday agreed.

Nevertheless, businessmen are resigned to the demonstration and don't appear to feel vehement about it one way or the other.

"Generally, when there's a lot of (political) activity downtown, people are not in a shopping mood," said B. B. Burgunder, vice president of Kann's. He estimates normal traffic may decline 15 or 20 percent Friday, and 25 to 30 per cent on Saturday.

A spokesman for Woodward & Lothrop said the decline "could go as high as 50 per cent on Saturday.

"I would be delighted if we lose only 10 per cent over the three days (Thursday, Friday and Saturday)," Garfinckel president William Hansen said. But he also thinks that some merchants' predictions may be too pessimistic and that shoppers are less timid than businessmen think.

"Maybe our people are getting crisis-oriented," he said.

Many executives of big chains expect that at least part of their central city losses will be offset by additional sales at their suburban branches.

However, some merchants predict that the demonstration's psychological fallout will depress sales all over the metropolitan area.

"Everyone is going to be concerned on one side or the other . . . I don't think that people will be too interested in buying shoes," says Frank Rich, the president of Rich's Shoe Stores and head of the Metropolitan Urban Coalition. Two of Rich's children—a son at Harvard and a daughter in Wisconsin—will return to Washington to demonstrate.

Despite their anxiety, most businessmen don't expect violence. No major store is closing.

**LAWYERS TASK FORCE TO MONITOR PROTEST**

Former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark announced today the formation of a task force of almost 200 attorneys to monitor activities of both participants and law enforcement officials during the coming three days of anti-war demonstration on Washington's streets.

As chairman of the unofficial but potentially influential lawyers' group, Clark will be in the unique position of passing judgment on the decisions made by his immediate successor, Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell.

Mitchell, his deputy, Richard G. Kleindienst, and other Justice Department officials are among the principal architects of the Nixon administration's strategy aimed at containing the demonstrations and preventing violence.

Clark's announcement carefully delineated the need for an independent legal organization to monitor the actions of both the demonstrators and police, but the emphasis was clearly placed on the task force's plans to watch for the use of excessive or unnecessary force on the part of police.

**GROUP'S OBJECTIVES**

"As lawyers, we are committed both to nonviolence and to the constitutional right of citizens freely to express their political views and to petition their government," the task force statement explained.

Organizers of the task force said that if necessary—if the protestors are violent or if police are overzealous or brutal—they would

prepare a report similar to the now-famous "Walker Report" on street violence during last year's Democratic National Convention.

"We hope this announcement will have some moderating effect on the conduct of both police and demonstrators," said a leader of the group which organized the task force, the Center for Law and Social Policy, one of the several "public interest" law firms established in Washington during the past year.

**EXPECTS PEACEFUL MARCH**

Clark emphasized that his group is neither supporting nor opposing the demonstrations but predicted "the high probabilities are that the march will go off with dignity and peacefully."

Asked if he would be among those actually observing conduct on the streets, Clark answered in the negative. "This is a young lawyers' project. They don't want an old man out there," he said.

Clark described the project as one of several current manifestations of a rising concern among young attorneys for "our traditions, right, and tolerances."

Reporters several times attempted to draw from Clark criticism of the current attorney general's handling of the antiwar protest situation, but Clark limited himself to saying only that when he headed the Justice Department he spent much of his time denying reports of impending violence rather than predicting it.

**AT STREET STATIONS**

The task force expects to have nearly 200 volunteer attorneys placed throughout the city's streets to check on all activities during the next three days. All will wear identifying armbands.

They are being recruited from the staffs of numerous House and Senate members as well as from such well-known Washington law firms as Arnold & Porter, Covington and Burling, Williams and Connolly and Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering.

**CITY TRAFFIC RULES SET FOR SATURDAY MARCH**

Special parking and traffic regulations will be placed in effect for Saturday's antiwar march and rally.

Beginning at 12:01 a.m. Saturday, no parking will be permitted in the area bounded by 6th Street NE and 23d Street NW, from Independence Avenue on the south to K Street on the north.

At 9:40 a.m. Saturday, police will close Pennsylvania Avenue to traffic from 1st Street NW to 8th Street NW.

Constitution Avenue, from New Jersey Avenue to 18th Street NW, will also be closed at that time.

Beginning at 9:40 a.m., the area between F Street on the north and Independence Avenue on the south will be banned to north-south traffic between 1st and 18th Streets NW.

Buses bringing demonstrators to Washington will be unloaded in West Potomac Park at Ohio Drive and 23d Street NW, Hains Point and on George Washington Memorial Parkway across Memorial Bridge.

Motorists bringing demonstrators to the city have been urged to leave their cars in the city's fringe parking areas.

**MEDALS OF VALOR AWARDED ST. LOUIS AREA POLICE HEROES**

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 10, it was my privilege to attend the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce Medal of Valor Awards Luncheon honoring 11 law enforcement officers from the Metropolitan St. Louis area for their performance of duty.

With the objective of improving police-

community relations in the bi-State area, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce conceived the idea of a Medal of Valor Awards as recognition of an officer's performance "of an act in excess of the demands of police service, executed under circumstances wherein the officer is fully aware of the scope of the feat attempted and the immediate present threat to his own physical safety, having confidence the objective he is attempting is, in fact, reasonably possible of accomplishment."

It is indeed appropriate that a local organization such as the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce took the lead in this program. Law enforcement is basically a local responsibility, and with the support of outstanding groups as the chamber of commerce our local law-enforcement efforts are strengthened significantly. This represents citizen participation at its best. I commend the chamber of commerce for the sponsorship of such recognition of the service police officers give day in and day out in our communities.

I am pleased to report that two of the 11 police officers honored are from East St. Louis, Ill. One is Sgt. George R. Thompson, a 5-year veteran of the East St. Louis Police Department. His citation reads in part:

Although Sergeant Thompson has been injured two previous times in the line of duty, he is being given the Medal of Valor today for his unhesitating response to a sudden emergency. In the face of great personal peril he demonstrated his unique ability in handling a delicate situation which resulted in saving a woman's life.

Sgt. William Leroy Jeremais, a 31-year-old police officer and 6-year veteran of the East St. Louis Police Department presently assigned to the traffic division, is the other Medal of Valor recipient from the 24th Illinois Congressional District. The Medal of Valor is awarded to Sergeant Jeremais, the citation reads:

For the courage and compassion that led him to enter a burning house three times at the risk of his own safety in his successful efforts to rescue not only an injured woman but a litter of newborn puppies as well.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the residents of East St. Louis are indebted to these two officers, both of whom, I might add, are married and fathers. The heroism of these two gentlemen at the risk of great personal sacrifice is worthy of the recognition paid these fine officers. I would like to add my personal congratulations to them.

**SENATOR KENNEDY'S SPRINGFIELD, MASS., ADDRESS ASKS GREATER ADMINISTRATION ROLE IN FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION**

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senate majority whip, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, warned in a Springfield address last week that the administration's spartan economic policy is causing the Nation to pay a heavy price in high interest rates and unemployment.

Senator KENNEDY's November 6 analysis of the war against inflation—the overriding economic issue in the Nation—was borne out the following day with the Bureau of Labor Statistics announcement of the 3.9 percent October unemployment level, underscoring an earlier indication that the big jump from 3.5 to 4.0 percent in September was no fluke.

In an address to the joint civic agencies of Greater Springfield last Thursday, Senator KENNEDY said the time has come to begin to relax the tight money policy maintained by the administration. He also urged the administration to play a greater role in enlisting the voluntary cooperation of business and labor leaders in the fight against inflation.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts noted the high toll exacted by inflation, and emphasized that there are serious dangers in the monetary and fiscal policies now pursued by the administration. He pointed out that it might take as long as 6 to 9 months for a relaxation in monetary policy to take hold and reflect itself in the economy; therefore, it was time to begin to relax the heavy restraint on credit.

With respect to price and wage decisions, Senator KENNEDY listed a number of inflationary price and wage increases in 1969. He renounced the use of wage and price controls or a return at this time to the strict price-wage guideposts, but he said the administration should not totally abdicate its responsibility to represent the national interest in this area.

Senator KENNEDY said that by failing to make such efforts, the administration was squandering a valuable opportunity to reduce the pressures of inflation. He noted that a role for the administration was especially important at this time, when the period of excess demand in the economy appeared to have passed its peak, so that employers and unions have larger discretion over their price and wage decisions.

In discussing the need for voluntary cooperation between the administration and business and labor leaders to combat inflation, Senator KENNEDY mentioned the current General Electric strike, and criticized the refusal of the administration to challenge the company's statement that it planned an inflationary price increase after the settlement.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent permission, I herewith include the text of Senator KENNEDY's address before the joint civic agencies of Greater Springfield, and the Washington Post news-story of Saturday, November 8, stating that the October unemployment rate of 3.9 percent for October was essentially unchanged from the 4.0 percent rate in September:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE JOINT CIVIC AGENCIES OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MASS., NOVEMBER 6, 1969

I am delighted to be in Springfield today under the auspices of the Joint Civic Agencies to address this distinguished audience of public officials and private citizens.

In large part because of the dedicated guidance and leadership of the Joint Civic Agencies, the greater Springfield area has made immense progress in recent years in promoting the economic, social, physical and human development of the region. The cooperation between business, labor and public officials is outstanding. Your Model

Cities proposal is emulated by metropolitan areas throughout the nation. Your "Better Homes for Springfield" program has played a major role in housing. Indeed, I believe there is no Chamber of Commerce in New England that is more involved than Springfield in the development of its own community. I commend you, therefore, not only for your deep concern with the problems of Springfield, but also for your achievements in promoting a fuller life for all your citizens.

Three weeks ago in Boston, on the day of the National Moratorium, I had the honor of addressing the World Affairs Council, where I discussed the single overriding issue of our day—the war in Vietnam. Today in Springfield, I would like to discuss the overriding economic issue of the day—the war against inflation.

The facts of our inflation are distressingly clear to all of us:

Throughout 1969, consumer prices have been rising at the steady annual rate of 6 per cent, higher than at any time since the Korean War. In Massachusetts, the increase has been over 7 per cent. At the present rate, the dollar will lose half its value in a decade.

Inflation rides the market-basket of every shopper. Food prices are 5.7 per cent above their level a year ago. Beef is up 13 per cent. Eggs are up 15 per cent. Carrots 18 per cent.

The rate of unemployment jumped from 3.5 per cent in August to 4.0 per cent in September, its highest level since the fall of 1967, and the highest monthly increase since the 1960 presidential campaign. Over 3.2 million persons are now unemployed. Experts predict a rate of 5 per cent in 1970, and the Administration declines to say what an "unacceptable" level would be. In Springfield, the rate has been close to 5 per cent throughout the year.

Inflation plagues the homeowner. The cost of mortgages, taxes, insurance, repairs and all the other expenses of homeowners are up 11 per cent over 1968. Even if young couples are able to get a mortgage to buy a home, they cannot afford the payments.

The gift of good health has never been more precious. In the three years we have had of Medicare, the cost of health is up by 22 per cent, or nearly double the increase in general consumer prices. Hospital charges have soared by the astronomical rate of 55 per cent, almost five times the rise in consumer prices.

As these dramatic facts reveal, inflation is placing a cruel tax on millions of our citizens, especially those of fixed income and others who can least afford it. The special tragedy of this inflation is that we had the tools, we had the knowledge to avoid it.

In a very real sense, the decade of the Sixties marks a watershed in American economic thought. It is a measure of how far we have come that the bold measures of the "new economics" proclaimed by President Kennedy in his commencement address at Yale University in 1962 have now achieved wide public acceptance. The pathbreaking element of that policy was the decision to embark on a continuing program to preserve and encourage our economic prosperity.

For the first time, a President of the United States accepted the principle that the tools of economic policy are essential even in periods when the economy is not threatened by crisis, that they are best used as preventive medicine to maintain the good health of the economy, rather than as surgery to restore the health of a sick economy. The decade of the Fifties was marked by major recessions that caused enormous turbulence in our economy. Throughout the Sixties, marred only by the recent inflation that has come to plague us, we have enjoyed a period of unprecedented and uninterrupted economic growth that has brought enormous prosperity to millions of Americans.

Today, fiscal policy and monetary policy

are widely accepted as the twin pillars of economic management for our modern, dynamic economy. By the use of fiscal policy, the government restrains the economy by reducing expenditures and increasing taxes. By the use of monetary policy, the government stimulates or restrains the economy by regulating the supply of money, and by modifying the availability of credit through changes in the discount rate and other actions of the Federal Reserve System.

Largely because of the skillful mix of fiscal and monetary policy in the early 1960's, the nation experienced a period of stable growth that was almost completely free of inflation. Indeed, during the entire period from 1961 until 1966, the nation enjoyed continued price stability and increased employment—a combination of happy economic circumstances that we had never before experienced for such a long stretch in our entire recorded economic history.

Our record of price stability broke in 1966 under the burden of escalation in Vietnam, an escalation that pumped far too much steam into the American economy. Had we lowered the pressure by the early tax increase called for by the new economists, we could have cooled the economy and blocked inflation, just as President Kennedy's big tax cut in 1964 got a lagging economy moving again earlier in the decade.

To be sure, we cannot trace our current inflation to a single cause. Throughout the period from 1966 well into 1969, we underestimated the buoyancy of the economy. We failed to keep our monetary policy tight after we enacted the 10 per cent tax surcharge in 1968. We did not realize the degree to which inflation had taken hold.

Yet, by the time President Johnson left office, our policy was on the proper track. Taxes had been raised, our budget belt had been tightened, and monetary policy was again doing its fair share in fighting inflation. The basic validity of this policy was accepted and continued when the new Administration took office.

Of course, every new Administration needs time to establish its policies, time to sift the policies of the old administration, time to set the distinctive course of the new one. In making the transition, errors are inevitable, and the judgments we pass must not be too harsh.

By hindsight, there were obvious early mistakes by the new administration in its eagerness to establish its own distinctive economic policy. Regrettably, the mistakes continue to impede our fight against inflation.

Four episodes stand out:

*First*, at the beginning the economists of the new administration made the fight against inflation look too easy. In the 1968 campaign, Mr. Nixon himself had told his audience that the only extra unemployment necessary to curb inflation was the unemployment of President Johnson's economic advisers. In April, Dr. Arthur Burns, one of the President's principal economic counselors and now the Chairman-designate of the Federal Reserve Board, told a nationwide television audience that the rate of inflation by the year's end would be down to 3 per cent, and expressed his confidence that inflation could be controlled with no substantial rise in unemployment. Today, well before the end of the year, the unemployment rate has risen to 4 per cent, and the consumer price index has risen at a rate of 6 per cent.

*Second*, at his initial press conference in January, confident of his decision not to resurrect the wage-price guideposts used by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, President Nixon in effect granted carte blanche for wage and price increases, and thereby encouraged a new spiral of inflation.

*Third*, this same complacency contributed to the Administration's long delay and indecisiveness in taking up President Johnson's call for extension of the surtax beyond

June 30. It was late in April before Congress received a recommendation on an issue whose need was crystal clear on January 20.

Fourth, the persistent rattling of the skeleton of wage and price controls by high officials of the administration added to inflation by playing on the fears of business and labor leaders, alarmed by the spectre of such controls.

It is not my purpose here to dwell on these mistakes. In most of his other fiscal and monetary actions, the President deserves our praise for his sound economic policy. After all, the war against inflation, like the war in Vietnam, is a war he inherited from the previous administration, along with the basic economic strategy he has continued to use. Indeed, by the time the present administration took office, the strategy against inflation had already begun to take hold in major areas of the economy. Unfortunately, however, our progress in 1969 has not been as rapid as we all had hoped.

Today, because some gains have been made against inflation, a great economic debate is beginning in the nation. The issue can be phrased in relatively simple terms—is it time for the government to begin to take its foot off the brake on our economy, and relax the heavy restraints that have been imposed for so long? Or, must we continue to press the brake to the floor, and continue the full impact of those restraints?

The position of the administration is clear—it is too early, they say, to relax the restraints. We must still exert our maximum efforts to halt inflation. It is too early, they say, for the Federal Reserve Board to allow interest rates to descend by easing monetary policy.

The view of the administration has prevailed for the present. Indeed, the indications are that there is even less talk in the Federal Reserve System of easing monetary policy now than there was last month, or the month before. I suspect that the System may be over-reacting to its action of 1968, when it relaxed monetary restraint too quickly, after Congress had enacted the income tax surcharge in June. Today, the situation is different. Fiscal and monetary policy have been on a relatively well-fixed course for many months. No major new fiscal step has been taken to confuse the predicted impact of a relaxation in monetary policy.

The Administration is pursuing a spartan policy—it would have us press the fight against inflation until we are certain it is won, even though we pay a heavy price in high interest rates, high taxes, and rising unemployment—even though we would face the very real threat of a severe recession if the pressure is too heavy or is applied too long.

Many eminent economists take a different view. They say that the risks of continuing total war against inflation have now become too great. It is better, they say, to begin to relax the pressure slowly, and risk the somewhat slower conquest of inflation, than to keep the pressure on and face the risk of overkill, recession, and worse.

In recent weeks I have come increasingly to believe that the time is arriving to begin reducing the pressure we have imposed upon the economy. Even the Administration tells us that it may take as long as six to nine months for a change in monetary policy to take hold, and to reflect itself in the economy. We cannot simply look at the situation as it is today. We must assess what it will be farther down the road, in the middle of 1970 and beyond.

We know that the Administration has already pledged itself to a tight fiscal policy, including extension of the surtax into 1970, repeal of the investment credit, and strict expenditure controls. In these circumstances, the burden of tight money and the continuing credit crunch may be too heavy. If we think, as I do, that it is essential to relieve the plight of the homeowner and the homebuilder, to insure against the growing level

of unemployment and against the significant risk of recession, then I think we must begin to ease the monetary pressure in a timely fashion.

The problem of unemployment deserves our special attention. When we speak of weighing the cost of unemployment against the benefit of reduced inflation, we must use a weighted measure of unemployment. As the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers recently put it, "Everyone does not have an equal chance of being unemployed." It is not enough simply to discuss unemployment in terms of bare percentages—3½ per cent in June or 4 per cent in September, representing so many additional millions of unemployed. We must also recognize that the people who lose their jobs because of the fight against inflation are the most vulnerable citizens of our society—the disadvantaged, the hard-core unemployed, the blacks and other minority groups, the unskilled and semi-skilled, the oppressed—on all of whom the burden of unemployment is especially heavy.

Equally important, we must be aware that it is these same groups who are involved most heavily in the social and political tensions of the nation. Therefore, to be sensitive to the needs and burdens of these citizens in setting economic policy is right not only because it is our moral and ethical obligation to do so. It is right also because in the best pragmatic tradition, it is the most effective policy to insure political and social stability in the nation.

There is another area of the economy where I feel that not enough is being done. I do not believe the Administration acted wisely when it renounced the pressure exerted by the previous Administrations on business and labor leaders to forego excessive price and wage increases. Ironically, at the very time the new President was continuing a strict anti-inflationary strategy with his fiscal and monetary policy, he was rejecting the wise voluntary restraints on wages and prices that had contributed so much to reducing the pressure of inflation in the past. As we know, business and labor wasted no time in responding to the invitation:

In 1969, the prices of copper, steel, zinc and aluminum have risen steeply. At their present rate, the price increase of many of these products will be greater in 1969 alone than the total increase for all the eight preceding years combined.

The 1970 auto models have by far the largest rise in price tags in more than a decade. The price of gasoline is rising at the annual rate of nearly 10 per cent.

In the first three quarters of 1969, total wages rose by 6.6 per cent. For construction workers, the increase was 12.5 per cent.

By failing to enlist the voluntary cooperation of business and labor in the fight against inflation, I believe the Administration has been squandering a valuable opportunity to reduce the inflationary price and wage increases demonstrated by these examples. As many economists have pointed out in recent months, the period of excess demand in the economy appears to have passed its peak, so that employers and unions now have an increasingly large discretion over their wage and price decisions.

Now that our fiscal and monetary policy has begun to work, the need for voluntary cooperation by business and labor on wage and price restraint is all the more important. Now that government has put its own house in order, it is appropriate for government to ask the private sector to do the same. I believe that efforts to enlist such voluntary cooperation can make the difference between falling back into more inflation and moving forward to a successful conclusion of the fight.

It is an unfortunate fact that the quietly effective operation of the price-wage guideposts in countless cases in the early Sixties was overshadowed by the few loud public disagreements that occurred. We know,

however, that during the seven years the guideposts lived, many business and labor leaders heard the arguments of the President and the Council of Economic Advisers, and agreed in the national interest to leash their market power and trim their price and wage increases.

Today, the Secretary of Labor says we are on the threshold of an unusually difficult period of negotiations between business and labor, with the prospect of a sizable number of strikes. In coming months, there will be major contract negotiations in industries like auto, rubber, railroad, and airline, and the fact of inflation will be always present. Almost 150,000 workers of the General Electric Company—over 30,000 of them in Massachusetts—are idled by a strike. The Chairman of the company tells us in advance that there will be a price increase after the strike. The settlement is bound to be inflationary, he says, and its impact will spread to other industries. Inflation threatens, but the Administration announces it has no role to play.

I deplore the continuing refusal by the Administration to challenge inflationary wage and price decisions, especially where, as here, the threat of inflation is spread out upon the public record. When the chairman of the nation's fourth largest manufacturer publicly admits that his company plans an inflationary price increase, the Administration simply cannot abdicate its responsibility to represent the public interest.

Let me emphasize here—and these are crucial points—that I reject the use of mandatory wage and price controls. I do not propose a return to the old formula of price-wage guideposts at this time. I do not propose a knee-jerk intervention by the Administration in the collective bargaining process, either in the General Electric strike or any other labor dispute. But neither do I propose the total abdication of any possible role for the Administration in such disputes where inflation looms.

What I am advocating is that the Administration must do more in appealing to the sense of public responsibility of the private sector in helping to combat inflation. The prestige of the White House can and should be used to focus the spotlight of public opinion on inflationary developments in the economy. The need is especially great in the case of individual price and wage decisions made outside the context of collective bargaining, with its long history of free institutions important to our democracy. But the need is also present when inflation threatens the collective bargaining process as well.

The spotlight of public opinion is intense. Properly marshaled, it can be one of the greatest disinfectants against the disease of inflation in our free society. It is a force that no responsible employer or union leader should deny, a force that can be brought to bear only by the President and the power of his high office. Only he can use it, and it is his obligation to use it for the good of all the people.

Three weeks ago, President Nixon made his first public move toward invoking this power. In his personal letter to two thousand business leaders, including a number of the prominent citizens in this audience, the President urged them to be cautious in their price decisions, because, he said, to feed inflation would work against their own best interests. At last, it seems the President is beginning to move toward using the prestige of the White House to bring restraint to price and wage decisions.

Although I commend the President for embracing the philosophy of the "jawbone," I urge him to go further. *In the first place*, as we know from the early months of President Kennedy's administration, it is not enough simply to make a general plea for price and wage restraint. Gratified as they must be to correspond with the President,

both sides reply that restraint is their normal way of life. The important thing, therefore, is not the general plea, but the more specific guidance that only the Administration is capable of providing.

That guidance should emerge only after the fullest consultation between the Administration and the leaders of business and labor. They should be heard, and they should be asked for their ideas on how to achieve our common goal of non-inflationary prosperity that is so vital to the interest of all our people.

Second, it is not enough simply to exhort business and labor leaders to pursue their own self-interest. When the prestige of the White House is invoked, it should be invoked in the national interest. Business and labor must, of course, attend to their own interests, but they must also heed the national interest. At a time when the nation at last appears to be turning the corner against inflation, it is especially important that every decision by a business leader, and every wage decision by a union leader, must take the national interest into account. This is what restraint is all about. This is the area where national economic policy is still at fault, where greater efforts must be made.

There are many who argue that the use of such Presidential power is unfair, because it singles out individual industries and individual price and wage decisions that are highly visible, and are therefore highly vulnerable to the pressure of the President, when similar action by others goes undetected.

That argument is wrong. We reject it in many other daily actions, and we must reject it in the crucial area of our nation's economic policy. It says in effect that the referee on the football field is forbidden to penalize any player because he knows he cannot catch all the violators. We know, however, that for every penalty called, other players are deterred to keep the peace and play within the rules.

This is the area of the economy where we need greater leadership from the Administration. We cannot continue to insist that the entire burden of the war against inflation must be carried by our tight money policy and our stringent fiscal policy. To do so is to ask too high a price in terms of unemployment, reduced output, and the danger of recession. I believe the Administration should formalize a flexible procedure that enables the national interest to be represented as an equal partner in purely voluntary consultations. The President and the Administration should be in a position to blow the whistle well in advance on inflationary price and wage decisions, without the need to resort to bitter personal confrontations over decisions by individual firms or unions.

The time is ripe for a new initiative. I urge the Administration to take advantage of the fertile opportunity that now exists, and to institute the sort of program that I and many others concerned with the war against inflation have recommended. By playing a more active role against inflationary price and wage decisions, the Administration will gain even greater flexibility in easing our brutally high interest rates, the foremost area of the economy where the strictness of our current policy should be relaxed.

In closing, let me say that I am optimistic that we can make greater progress against inflation. As we begin to emerge from the tunnel through which we have traveled for so long, the landscape we see is not a pleasant one. It is marred by the blight of the political and social problems facing all our people—rich and poor, black and white, business and labor.

A sound national economy is the cornerstone for all our plans for a better America. For far too long, the war against inflation has sapped our energy and thwarted our plans to build on the many advances we

made in the early Sixties. Under stable economic growth, we can move forward to provide better education for our children, better housing for our cities, and better health for us all. We can advance in all the other areas of great need in the nation. The challenge is enormous, but with inflation under control, we will at last be able to believe that our resources are equal to our task.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1969]

#### JOBLESS RATE DROPS SLIGHTLY

(By Frank C. Porter)

Unemployment was essentially unchanged last month indicating that the big jump from 3.5 to 4.0 per cent in September was no fluke.

A substantial drop in the average work week was further evidence of a general slowdown in the nation's economy. After remaining steady for seven months, it fell from 37.8 to 37.5 hours after seasonal adjustment.

In manufacturing, the work week was at its lowest level since February.

The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate slipped from 4.0 per cent to 3.9 per cent. But Harold Goldstein, Assistant Commissioner of Labor Statistics, noted a change of this size is not statistically significant because of random fluctuations and possible sampling errors.

There had been speculation that the big September rise was a one-month abbreviation. Consequently, government analysts awaited the October figure with more than ordinary anticipation. Had the rate dropped back to 3.5 or 3.6 per cent, say, the thesis would have been borne out.

As it is, the figures for only two months do not necessarily establish a trend. But since the higher jobless rates were spread broadly across worker categories and the work week dropped for all types of employment except finance, insurance and real estate, the consensus among analysts was that the rate of economic expansion has indeed slowed markedly.

There was little change in separate rates for white and non-white workers. The white rate inched downward from 3.6 to 3.5 per cent and the non-white rate crept up 6.8 to 6.9 per cent. But as the Bureau of Labor Statistics explained, neither change is statistically significant.

For the second straight month the non-white rate remained slightly below the historic ratio of more than double the white rate. This appeared as a contradiction of the classic situation in which, as economic activity slows, disadvantaged workers and particularly blacks suffer disproportionately—the last-hired, first-fired situation.

Most other rates showed little or no change from the September levels. That for married men held steady at 1.7 per cent; women slipped from 4.2 to 4.0 per cent; blue collar workers dipped from 4.4 to 4.3 per cent and white collar workers rose from 2.2 to 2.4 per cent.

After seasonal adjustment, nonfarm payroll employment rose by 190,000 to a record high of 70.7 million. More revealing, however, was a special table showing that this employment has risen an average of only 93,000 a month over the past half-year in contrast to the average of 234,000 in the previous six months (October 1968 to last June).

Average hourly earnings for rank-and-file employees in the private economy edged up 1 cent last month to \$3.11—6.9 per cent above the year-ago level. But because of the fall in hours, average weekly earnings dropped 86 cents to \$116.94 or 6.0 per cent above the mark for October of last year.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr.

GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of a meeting of the Dr. Eisenhower Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. FALLON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER, for Thursday, November 13 and Friday, November 14, on account of official business.

Mr. FREY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLD), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENDEL, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. MICHEL for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 10 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHAIMO, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OLSEN, for 60 minutes, on November 18.

Mr. WOLFF, for 60 minutes, on November 19.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 60 minutes, on November 20.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 14751.

Mr. DICKINSON (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia); to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during consideration of House Joint Resolution 966, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in three instances.

Mr. MCCLURE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. KLEPPE in two instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. HOGAN in two instances.  
 Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. WHITEHURST.  
 Mr. LUJAN in two instances.  
 Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.  
 Mr. SEBELIUS.  
 Mr. MATHIAS.  
 Mr. BUSH.  
 Mr. GOLDWATER.  
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.  
 Mr. BURKE of Florida.  
 Mr. ROTH.  
 Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. ROBISON in two instances.  
 Mr. SNYDER in three instances.  
 Mr. CARTER in four instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOCH.  
 Mr. MATSUNAGA.  
 Mr. HAYS in two instances.  
 Mr. CORMAN.  
 Mr. SATTERFIELD.  
 Mr. BRINKLEY.  
 Mr. HATHAWAY.  
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
 Mr. DIGGS.  
 Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.  
 Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.  
 Mr. HEBERT.  
 Mr. FULTON of Tennessee.  
 Mr. LONG of Maryland.  
 Mr. VANIK in two instances.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
 Mr. FRASER.  
 Mr. BROWN of California in four instances.  
 Mr. SYMINGTON.  
 Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. PICKLE.  
 Mr. DULSKI in three instances.  
 Mr. JACOBS in three instances.  
 Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a Joint Resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 966. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles:

On November 7, 1969:

H.R. 10595. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program;

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; and

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

On November 13, 1969:

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.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 17, 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:

1333. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 7, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on running water draw watershed, Plainview, Tex., in partial response to resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted August 12, 1954 and June 13, 1956 (H. Doc. 91-192); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1334. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Eleventh report on deficiencies in administration of Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (Rept. No. 91-637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4302. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, section 753, to authorize payment by the United States of fees charged by court reporters for furnishing certain transcripts in proceedings under the Criminal Justice Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9677. A bill to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-639). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14485. A bill to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-640). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4248. A bill to amend title

5, United States Code, to authorize civilians employed by the Department of Defense to administer oaths while conducting official investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-641). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. Res. 613. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam (Rept. No. 91-643). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14794. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 14781. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide protection thereunder against losses resulting from earthquakes, and earthslides; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 14782. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14783. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide that the Congress may not adjourn sine die in any session of Congress or recess after December 31 of each year until all appropriation measures for the fiscal year concerned have been considered and disposed of, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14784. A bill to make it unlawful for any person to drive a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia past a school bus that is stopped to receive or discharge school children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 14785. A bill to provide that the corporation known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America shall have within the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 14786. 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.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14787. A bill to establish marine sanctuaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14788. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 14789. A bill to amend title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the Foreign Service retirement

and disability system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 14790. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 14791. 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. WOLFF:

H.R. 14792. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to require air carriers to file reports with the Civil Aeronautics Board listing lost, damaged, and stolen baggage and cargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. WAGGONNER, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 14793. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 14794. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14795. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14796. 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. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 14797. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 14798. A bill to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes prohibiting the landing of certain fish or fish products in U.S. ports; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 14799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make qualification under State law a prerequisite to registration under the narcotic drug and marijuana laws; to eliminate the provision permitting payment of tax to acquire marijuana by unregistered persons, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 14800. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 14801. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit a State, under its agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for the control of radiation hazards, to impose standards (including standards

regulating the discharge of radioactive waste materials from nuclear facilities) which are more restrictive than the corresponding standards imposed by the Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14802. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 14803. 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. BOGGS:

H.R. 14804. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain sales of real property by a corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14805. A bill to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study and investigation of the effects of the use of pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14806. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain lands for addition to Kenesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 14807. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next-of-kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 14808. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 14809. 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.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14810. A bill to amend section 602(3) and section 608c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.J. Res. 982. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review and assess all available data on smoking and health including the carrying on of original scientific research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.J. Res. 983. Joint resolution to provide a program to improve the opportunity of stu-

dents in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 984. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 13 through November 20, 1969, as National Unity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 446. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to public expression of religious faith by American astronauts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 447. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to public expression of religious faith by American astronauts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. Con. Res. 448. Concurrent resolution Red Cross prisoner-of-war declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 449. Concurrent resolution urging that a national plebiscite be held in order to determine the public will with respect to the policy of seeking the peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. FULTON of Tennessee):

H. Res. 691. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 692. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 693. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H. Res. 694. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Res. 695. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 696. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 697. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to expedite the enactment of general appropriation measures, to facilitate the making of appropriations for subsequent fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. HOSMER, Mrs. MAY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. TEAGUE of California):

H. Res. 698. Resolution relating to withdrawals from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H. Res. 699. Resolution for withdrawal of U.S. Forces in South Vietnam on an orderly and fixed schedule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. RUTH, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. KEE, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. COLMER, Mr. PASS-

MAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. RARICK, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WOLD, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FOREMAN, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 700. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Internal Security to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. BRAY, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DORN, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana):

H. Res. 701. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Internal Security

to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H. Res. 702. Resolution to proclaim National Week of Unity November 9–November 16; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 703. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 704. Resolution for withdrawal of U.S. forces in South Vietnam on an orderly and fixed schedule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Res. 705. Resolution commending the

American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 706. Resolution commending the American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 14811. A bill for the relief of Carol Min Houts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 14812. A bill for the relief of Alina Polkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### STRAIGHT TALK TO THE AMERICAN MAJORITY

#### HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear a prominent American speak out plainly and honestly on vital national issues. In a time of confusing charges and counter charges, and continual controversies, words of sound commonsense are more valuable than ever.

On October 30, in Harrisburg, Pa., Vice President SPIRO AGNEW made such a speech. The reaction was predictable—the very people who for years have heaped the worst abuse on this country and our leaders suddenly complained that they were being “intemperately” attacked.

In effect, they proved that they consider freedom of speech an extremist monopoly that responsible spokesmen of the silent majority are not entitled to. This is a strange and alien concept, but it reveals the hypocrisy which lies at the root of a “peace” movement that prolongs a bloody war and injures the morale of America’s fighting men.

In the end, however, the few dissident howls were drowned out by an overwhelming public endorsement of the Vice President’s words. So that everyone can have a chance to evaluate this important speech in full—not just excerpts or out-of-context quotes—I am including it in the RECORD. I recommend it to those of my colleagues who have not yet read it fully, and to all concerned, patriotic Americans:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICAN DINNER, OCTOBER 30, 1969

A little over a week ago, I took a rather unusual step for a Vice President . . . I said something. Particularly, I said something that was predictably unpopular with the people who would like to run the country without the inconvenience of seeking public office. I said I did not like some of the things I saw happening in this country. I criticized those who encouraged government by street

carnival and suggested it was time to stop the carousel.

It appears that by slaughtering a sacred cow I triggered a holy war. I have no regrets. I do not intend to repudiate my beliefs, recant my words, or run and hide.

What I said before, I will say again. It is time for the preponderant majority, the responsible citizens of this country, to assert their rights. It is time to stop dignifying the immature actions of arrogant, reckless, inexperienced elements within our society. The reason is compelling. It is simply that their tantrums are insidiously destroying the fabric of American democracy.

By accepting unbridled protest as a way of life, we have tacitly suggested that the great issues of our times are best decided by posturing and shouting matches in the streets. America today is drifting toward Plato’s classic definition of a degenerating democracy . . . a democracy that permits the voice of the mob to dominate the affairs of government.

Last week I was lambasted for my lack of “mental and moral sensitivity.” I say that any leader who does not perceive where persistent street struggles are going to lead this nation lacks mental acuity. And any leader who does not caution this nation on the danger of this direction lacks moral strength.

I believe in Constitutional dissent. I believe in the people registering their views with their elected representatives, and I commend those people who care enough about their country to involve themselves in its great issues. I believe in legal protest within the Constitutional limits of free speech, including peaceful assembly and the right of petition. But I do not believe that demonstrations, lawful or unlawful, merit my approval or even my silence where the purpose is fundamentally unsound. In the case of the Vietnam Moratorium, the objective announced by the leaders—immediate unilateral withdrawal of all our forces from Vietnam—was not only unsound but idiotic. The tragedy was that thousands who participated wanted only to show a fervent desire for peace, but were used by the political hustlers who ran the event.

It is worth remembering that our country’s founding fathers wisely shaped a Constitutional republic, not a pure democracy. The representative government they contemplated and skillfully constructed never intended that elected officials should decide crucial questions by counting the number of bodies cavorting in the streets. They recognized that freedom cannot endure dependent upon referendum every time part of the electorate desires it.

So great is the latitude of our liberty that

only a subtle line divides use from abuse. I am convinced that our preoccupation with emotional demonstration, frequently crossing the line to civil disruption and even violence could inexorably lead us across that line forever.

Ironically, it is neither the greedy nor the malicious, but the self-righteous who are guilty of history’s worst atrocities. Society understands greed and malice and erects barriers of law to defend itself from these vices. But evil cloaked in emotional causes is well disguised and often undiscovered until it is too late.

We have just such a group of self-proclaimed saviors of the American soul at work today. Relentless in their criticism of intolerance in America, they themselves are intolerant of those who differ with their views. In the name of academic freedom, they destroy academic freedom. Denouncing violence, they seize and vandalize buildings of great universities. Fiercely expressing their respect for truth, they disavow the logic and discipline necessary to pursue truth.

They would have us believe that they alone know what is good for America; what is true and right and beautiful. They would have us believe that their reflexive action is superior to our reflective action; that their revealed righteousness is more effective than our reason and experience.

Think about it. Small bands of students are allowed to shut down great universities. Small groups of dissidents are allowed to shout down political candidates. Small cadres of professional protesters are allowed to jeopardize the peace efforts of the President of the United States.

It is time to question the credentials of their leaders. And, if in questioning we disturb a few people, I say it is time for them to be disturbed. If, in challenging, we polarize the American people, I say it is time for a positive polarization.

It is time for a healthy in-depth examination of policies and a constructive realignment in this country. It is time to rip away the rhetoric and to divide on authentic lines. It is time to discard the fiction that in a country of 200 million people, everyone is qualified to quarterback the government.

For too long we have accepted superficial categorization—young versus old; white versus black; rich versus poor. Now it is time for an alignment based on principles and values shared by all citizens regardless of age, race, creed, or income. This, after all, is what America is all about.

America’s pluralistic society was forged on the premise that what unites us in ideals is greater than what divides us as individuals. Our political and economic institutions were