

nebulous record blamed, or have it said that there is some other standard, for Judge Haynsworth has been "dynamic" as the Senator from Maryland said in the hearings.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS FOLLOWING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to file reports, including minority, supplemental, and individual views, following the adjournment of the Senate today until midnight tonight.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 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 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 21, 1969, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 20, 1969:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294:

To be first lieutenant

Divers, Walter A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be second lieutenant

O'Hara, Kerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be major

Busdiecker, Carl C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Campbell, Bruce B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casey, Leonard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
De Moss, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deprospero, Albert A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Jay, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stice, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Bell, Major H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Birt, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Capps, Eugene S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliott, McPherson G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gritz, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hankins, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrison, Cecil L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Helela, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoover, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jenkins, Lester F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Rudd H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ledford, Jerry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCall, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
McVey, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mullen, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Norte, Raul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Opstad, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pace, Johnny L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pinckney, Marion, xxx-xx-xxxx
Reese, George W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rodriguez, Joe A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scoler, Albert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waits, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Warnshuis, Roger E., xxx-xx-xxxx
White, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be first lieutenant

Avriett, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Battaglioli, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bickel, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Braud, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cadigan, Peter Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cancellare, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carpenter, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collopy, Eugene A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comiso, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Crum, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dean, Wallace R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doyle, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, Benjamin F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fesler, Lorenzo E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fite, Don G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foley, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
French, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garbarino, Lloyd N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gonzales, Joe C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graves, Harold G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hiller, Fredric I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horner, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
John, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kernea, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kinzer, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirkby, Norman O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krohn, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Longley, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lyons, Matthew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
McElwain, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx
McGuffie, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
McLaughlin, Noel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
McSwain, Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx

Miller, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Minetree, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nataluk, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oriofsky, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paine, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parish, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pelfrey, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phelps, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plaster, Curtis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raduege, Floyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, Wynn G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rickman, Travis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robertson, Robin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robison, Cecil M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salazar, Andres M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanford, Dan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Saunders, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Searls, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, Delbert W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherrer, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Earnest L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simpson, Edwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutherland, Garrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tonsetic, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Torres, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vaughn, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Viduya, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wade, Patrick C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waits, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waldrop, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wells, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Welsh, James J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Harvey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wissinger, Dennis O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wright, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wright, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Thurlow D., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be second lieutenant

Britton, Randall T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burns, Francis P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fiser, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Funkhouser, Preston L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harbour, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbard, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kernan, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Latta, Byron F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pilvinsky, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poulton, Charles R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Tyrone, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Withrow, Gene, xxx-xx-xxxx
Zimmerman, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 20, 1969:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Walter E. Mason, Jr., to be commander, and ending Jack K. Stice, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 17, 1969.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, November 20, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Bob Harrington, the chaplain of Bourbon Street, New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

My dear Lord, thank You for loving us so much in spite of our actions in many cases. Help us, O Lord, to learn to love You more and serve You better in these troubled times. May I thank You personally, Lord Jesus, for allowing me to be born the first time in this great Nation under God in order that I might be born again, saved, set free through Your precious salvation for lost sinners. Help each of us this date to be most

conscious of our relationship to You and our fellowship through Your love. Lord, as each of us strives to serve mankind, may we do so as You challenge us with your desire that none should perish but all should have everlasting life through faith in You.

May each of us as we raise our heads from this prayer be more like You would have us to be and less like we have been.

In Christ's name I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11612) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 499. An act for the relief of Ludger J. Cossette;

S. 632. An act for the relief of Raymond C. Melvin; and

S. 757. An act for the relief of Yvonne Davis.

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

S. 849. An act to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; and

S. 2734. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of ROBERT A. ROE as a Representative-elect to the 91st Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Charles S. Joelson, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

The SPEAKER. The Representative-elect will present himself at the bar of the House for the purpose of having the oath of office administered to him.

Mr. ROE presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday, November 21, to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S "TIGHT MONEY" POLICY

(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, President Nixon's "tight money" policy, designed to curb inflation, is showing results in the wrong direction for those in need of housing.

The annual rate of new housing starts fell to the lowest level of the year during October. If interest rates continue at the present level, housing construction will probably fall off even more.

The policy of the President not to act in rolling back interest rates is sabotaging the national goal of producing 26 million housing units within the next 10 years.

How can we avoid a housing crisis in the seventies? To start with, the President should review his economic policy with an eye toward lowering interest rates. It appears the President should also consider placing a higher priority on solving the housing problems of the Nation in place of defending and explaining the actions of his loquacious Vice President.

MASSACRE OF VIETNAMESE CIVILIANS

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today the Cleveland Plain Dealer published authentic photographs indicating the likelihood of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by military personnel in a place known as Somny Village.

These photographs add to the reports of American military personnel and make it incumbent upon the Army to provide a full disclosure of the facts which are clearly in its possession. This is no time for a whitewash.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer is to be commended for its public service in connection with this publication in response to the public right to know.

TIME TO PRAY FOR END OF ARMS RACE

(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, now is the time for men of all faiths to join in prayer for success in the strategic arms limitation talks being conducted in Helsinki, Finland.

The reports regarding our runaway arms race are bleak indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the world today is spending more for military purposes than its total production of goods and services at the start of the century. Arms outlays are doubling every 15 years and efforts to control them so far have been marginal if not illusory.

Furthermore, not only is spending on arms rising faster than total production

of goods and services, the gap is wider for the poor countries than for the rich.

In our own country, the expenditures for military equipment are hampering our ability to provide the services so dramatically needed in our cities and States for programs for the poor, for education, for mass transit systems, and for the multitude of other services now lacking adequate financing.

This is not to say we should leave our country in a weakened defensive posture, but there are devices today to provide protection, and Mr. Speaker, my prayers go with our negotiators in Helsinki in the desire for successful agreement on ending this suicidal arms race. I also hope that our Chaplain can add to one of his prayers which open each session of this House the wish for successful agreement at Helsinki.

INTIMIDATION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and distressed if what I have read in yesterday's morning newspaper is true—that some of my colleagues have attempted to intimidate the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

It is inconceivable to me that they have launched a political attack on the FCC Chairman before he barely has time to get his feet wet.

And they have warned him against acting expeditiously or cutting redtape. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) should reassess his attack on Commission Chairman Burch.

Let me read from yesterday morning's Washington Post, which is not exactly my Bible, and see if the gentlemen from California, even more than the Commissioner, has not given us cause for concern:

Van Deerlin said he was troubled that Burch on his third day in office chose to contact the networks personally for the transcripts, when the usual procedure is to obtain them through a request from the Commission's Secretary. Network executives told Van Deerlin they couldn't remember a similar request coming directly from the Chief of the regulatory agency.

"I just want to advise you in the friendliest manner possible," said Van Deerlin, "I hope your request did not represent a new trend at the Commission. . . . Our views are so strong on this that we might be found climbing up your back if there are more incidents such as this."

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear threat. The FCC Chairman, whose job it is to regulate the airways, has been told he will be climbed all over if he dares to deal directly with network officials.

If there is intimidation, it is clear it is not coming from Commissioner Burch.

THE ALLEGED KILLING OF SOUTH VIETNAMESE CIVILIANS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Cleveland Plain Dealer there appeared a very shocking story, with two full pages of graphic pictures, detailing what is reputed to be an eyewitness account of the incident in Mylai on March 16, 1968, where it is reported that some American GI's reportedly killed over 1,000 South Vietnamese civilians. If the facts are true, this is an appalling and most disturbing situation, one that has been kept from the public for nearly 20 months, just short of 2 years, all under the guise that "If the facts were known, they would have prejudiced the rights of certain individuals." I am amazed at such concealment, "the sweeping under the rug," of such a sordid tale. It smacks of the same kind of secrecy that shrouded the "Green Beret" case.

Accordingly, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the Subcommittee on Defense, I have requested my chairman, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, to call a meeting of this committee as soon as possible and to have such person or persons in DOD and the Department of the Army to give us a complete delineation of the facts. The American people are certainly entitled to know the entire truth of something that happened nearly 2 years ago and, to date, has been kept from them.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Wednesday, November 19, I was absent from the floor for rollcall No. 282, on official business in connection with the immigrant status of a resident of my district—a sorely needed doctor in our community. Had I been present for the vote on the conference report on the interest equalization tax bill, which included the repeal of the requirements for recordkeeping of the sales of shotgun and rifle ammunition, I would have voted in the affirmative.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. 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. 283]	
Abbitt	Clark	Fraser
Abernethy	Clausen.	Fulton, Tenn.
Anderson, Ill.	Don H.	Gibbons
Andrews,	Clawson, Del	Goldwater
N. Dak.	Clay	Gray
Ayres	Corman	Griffin
Barrett	Dawson	Gubser
Belcher	de la Garza	Hanna
Blatnik	Denney	Hansen, Wash.
Boland	Diggs	Hébert
Brown, Calif.	Edmondson	Heckler, Mass.
Cabell	Ellberg	Hollifield
Camp	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Tenn.
Carey	Flynt	Kirwan
Celler	Ford.	Kuykendall
Chisholm	William D.	Kyl

Langen	O'Neal, Ga.	Scheuer
Leggett	Patman	Shipley
Lipscomb	Pepper	Stephens
McCarthy	Pirnie	Symington
McCulloch	Pollock	Talcott
McEwen	Powell	Teague, Tex.
McMillan	Pryor, Ark.	Thompson, N.J.
MacGregor	Pucinski	Tunney
Mathias	Rees	Utt
May	Reifel	Watson
Mills	Rosenthal	Whalley
Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Wold
Morton	Sandman	Wolff
Murphy, N.Y.	Scherie	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 613, PEACE WITH JUSTICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 722, Rept. No. 661) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 722

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 resolution (H. Res. 613) toward peace with justice in Vietnam. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14741, COST ESTIMATE FOR INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 721, Rept. No. 660) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 721

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. 14741) to amend title 23 of the United States Code to revise the next due date for the cost estimate for the Interstate System, to amend chapter 4 relating to highway safety, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 6 of said bill are hereby waived. 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 Public Works, the bill shall be read for amend-

ment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO PREVENT IMPORTATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES OF FISH OR WILDLIFE INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11363) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "part or products or egg" and insert "part, products, egg, or offspring thereof, or the dead body or parts".

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "imports, in violation of sections 2 through 5 of this Act," and insert "imports".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "such sections," and insert "section 3 of this Act,".

Page 3, line 6, after "mercial" insert: or sporting

Page 3, line 7, strike out "manmade" and insert "man-made".

Page 4, line 24, after "(a)" insert "(1)".

Page 4, line 24, strike out "the provisions" and insert "any provision".

Page 4, line 25, strike out "sections 2 and 3" and insert "section 2 or 3".

Page 5, line 1, after "thereunder" insert ", or any regulation issued under subsection (d) of this section, other than a violation the penalty for which is prescribed by subsection (b) of this section,".

Page 5, line 3, strike out "shall be" where it appears the second time and insert "is".

Page 5, line 4, strike out "on such charge" and insert "with respect to such violation".

Page 5, line 7, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph".

Page 5, line 12, after "action," insert "In hearing such action, the court shall have authority to review the violation and the assessment of the civil penalty de novo."

Page 5, after line 12, insert:

"(2) Any employee authorized pursuant to subsection (c) of this section to enforce the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act, and any regulations or permits issued pursuant thereto or pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, shall have authority, in addition to any other authority provided by law relating to search and seizure, to execute any warrant to search for and seize any fish or wildlife or property or items taken, used, or possessed in connection with any violation of any such section, regulation, or permit with respect to which a civil penalty may be assessed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection. Such fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized shall be held by any employee authorized by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury pending disposition of proceedings by the Secretary involving the assessment of a civil penalty pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection; except that the Secretary may, in lieu of holding such

fish, wildlife, property, or item, permit such person to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary. Upon the assessment of a civil penalty pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection for any nonwillful violation of any such section, regulation, or permit, such fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized may be proceeded against in any court of competent jurisdiction and forfeited to the Secretary for disposition by him in such manner as he deems appropriate. The owner or consignee of any such fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized shall, as soon as practicable following such seizure, be notified of that fact in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury. Whenever any fish or wildlife or property or item is seized pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall move to dispose of the civil penalty proceedings pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection as expeditiously as possible. If, with respect to any such fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized no action is commenced in any court of competent jurisdiction to obtain the forfeiture of such fish, wildlife, property, or item within thirty days following the disposition of proceedings involving the assessment of a civil penalty, such fish, wildlife, property, or item shall be immediately returned to the owner or the consignee in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary."

Page 5, line 13, strike out "the provisions" and insert "any provision".

Page 5, line 14, strike out "sections 2 and 3" and insert "section 2 or 3".

Page 5, line 15, after "thereunder" insert "or any regulation issued under subsection (d) of this section".

Page 5, after line 17, insert:

"(c) The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act and any regulations or permits issued pursuant thereto or pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall be enforced by either the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury, or both such Secretaries. Either Secretary may utilize, by agreement, the personnel, services, and facilities of any other Federal agency or any State agency. Any employee of the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Treasury authorized by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury may, without a warrant, arrest any person who such employee has probable cause to believe is willfully violating, in his presence or view, any such section, or any regulation or permit issued thereunder, the penalty for which is provided under subsection (b) of this section, and may execute a warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of such sections, regulations or permits. An employee who has made an arrest of a person in connection with any such willful violation may search such person at the time of his arrest and seize any fish or wildlife or property or items taken, used, or possessed in connection with any such violation, or any such employee shall have authority, in addition to any other authority provided by law relating to search and seizure, to execute any warrant to search for and seize any such fish, wildlife, property, or item so taken, used, or possessed. Any fish or wildlife or property or item seized shall be held by any employee authorized by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury or by a United States marshal pending disposition of the case by the court, commissioner, or magistrate, except that the Secretary may, in lieu thereof, permit such person to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to him. Upon conviction, any (1) fish or wildlife seized shall be forfeited to the Secretary for disposal by him in such manner as he deems appropriate, and (2) any other property or items seized may, in the discretion of the court, commissioner, or magistrate, be forfeited to the United States or otherwise disposed of. The owner or consignee of any such

fish, wildlife, property, or item so seized, shall, as soon as practicable following such seizure, be notified of that fact in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury. If no conviction results from any such alleged violation, such fish, wildlife, property or item so seized in connection therewith shall be immediately returned to the owner or consignee in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, unless the Secretary, within thirty days following the final disposition of the case involving such violation, commences proceedings under subsection (a) of this section."

Page 5, line 18, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Page 6, line 3, after "designations" insert "; except that the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, may permit importation at nondesignated ports for movement to designated ports of entry".

Page 6, line 4, after "provide" insert "other".

Page 6, strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 8 on page 7.

Page 7, line 12, after "5." insert "(a)".

Page 7, line 13, strike out "through 4" and insert "and 3".

Page 7, line 16, strike out "such" and insert "any".

Page 8, after line 9, insert:

"(b) To assure the worldwide conservation of endangered species and to prevent competitive harm to affected United States industries, the Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall seek the convening of an international ministerial meeting on fish and wildlife prior to June 30, 1971, and included in the business of that meeting shall be the signing of a binding international convention on the conservation of endangered species."

Page 8, after line 9, insert:

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$200,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, such sums to remain available until expended."

Page 8, after line 25, insert:

"(c) Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed as superseding or limiting in any manner the functions and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, including, without limitation, section 527 of said Act (19 U.S.C. 1527) relating to the importation of wildlife taken, killed, possessed or exported to the United States in violation of the laws or regulations of a foreign country."

Page 9, line 1, after "7." insert "(a)".

Page 9, line 7, strike out "or" where it appears the first time.

Page 9, line 7, after "transports" insert ", or ships, by any means whatever".

Page 9, line 10, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "or" where it appears the first time.

Page 9, line 12, after "transports" insert ", or ships, by any means whatever".

Page 9, line 16, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 9, line 17, strike out "and" and insert "or".

Page 9, line 20, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 10, line 1, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 10, line 11, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 10, line 15, strike out "taken" and insert "taken, transported, or sold".

Page 10, line 22, strike out "Bird" and insert "Birds and Game Mammals".

Page 11, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert:

"(c) (1) Any person who knowingly violates, or who, in the exercise of due care,

should know that he is violating, any provision of subsection (a) or (b) of".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "shall be" and insert "is".

Page 11, line 9, strike out "on such charge." and insert "with respect to such violation."

Page 11, line 11, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph".

Page 11, line 16, after "action." insert "In hearing such action, the court shall have authority to review the violation and the assessment of the civil penalty de novo."

Page 11, after line 16, insert:

"(2) Any employee authorized by the Secretary to enforce the provisions of this section, or any officer of the customs, shall have authority to execute any warrant to search for and seize any wildlife, product, property, or item used or possessed in violation of this section with respect to which a civil penalty may be assessed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection. Such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized shall be held by such employee pending disposition of proceedings by the Secretary involving the assessment of a civil penalty pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection; except that the Secretary may, in lieu of holding such wildlife, product, property, or item, permit such person to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary. Upon the assessment of a civil penalty pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection for any nonwillful violation of this section, such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized may be proceeded against in any court of competent jurisdiction and forfeited to the Secretary for disposition by him in such manner as he deems appropriate. The owner or consignee of any such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized shall, as soon as practicable following such seizure, be notified of that fact in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury. Whenever any wildlife, product, property, or item is seized pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall move to dispose of the civil penalty proceedings pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection as expeditiously as possible. If, with respect to any such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized, no action is commenced in any court of competent jurisdiction to obtain the forfeiture of such wildlife, product, property, or item within thirty days following the disposition of proceedings involving the assessment of a civil penalty, such wildlife, product, property, or item shall be immediately returned to the owner or the consignee in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "the provisions" and insert "any provision".

Page 11, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"(e) Any wildlife or products thereof seized in connection with any knowing and willful violation of this section with respect to which a penalty may be imposed pursuant to subsection (d) shall, upon conviction of such violation, be forfeited to the Secretary to be disposed of by him in such manner as he deems appropriate. Any other property or item so seized may upon conviction, in the discretion of the court, be forfeited to the United States or otherwise disposed of. The owner or consignee of any such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized shall, as soon as practicable following such seizure, be notified of that fact in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury. If no conviction results from any such alleged violation, such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized in connection therewith shall be immediately returned to the owner or consignee in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, unless the Secretary, within thirty days following the final disposition of the case in-

volving such violation, commences proceedings under subsection (c) of this section."

Page 12, lines 6 and 7, strike out "part or egg" and insert "part, egg, or offspring thereof, or the dead body or parts".

Page 12, after line 14, insert:

"(b) Section 3054 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3054. Officers' powers involving animals and birds

"Any employee authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce sections 42, 43, and 44 of this title, and any officer of the customs, may arrest any person who violates section 42 or 44, or who such employee or officer of the customs has probably cause to believe is knowingly, and willfully violating section 43, in his presence or view, and may execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of said sections."

"(c) Section 3112 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3112. Search warrants for seizure of animals, birds, or eggs

"Any employee authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce sections 42, 43, and 44 of this title, and any officer of the customs, shall have authority to execute any warrant to search for and seize any wildlife, product, property, or item used or possessed in connection with a violation of section 42 or 44, or in connection with a knowing and willful violation of section 43, and any such wildlife, product, property, or item so seized shall be held by him or by the United States marshal pending disposition thereof by the court."

Page 12, strike out lines 15 to 20, inclusive.

Page 12, line 21, strike out "10." and insert "8. (a)".

Page 13, line 6, strike out "lead to the" and insert "create a significant".

Page 13, lines 7 and 8, strike out "and affect the ability to insure the package and its contents,".

Page 13, line 12, strike out "11." and insert "9."

Page 13, strike out all after line 14 over to and including line 13 on page 14 and insert:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person—

"(1) to deliver or receive for transportation, or to transport, by any means whatsoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, any black bass and other fish if such person knows or in the exercise of due care should know and (A) such delivery or transportation is contrary to the law of the State or any foreign country from which such black bass or other fish is found or transported, or is contrary to other applicable law, or (B) such black bass or other fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State or foreign country, in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported, or contrary to other applicable law;

"(2) to purchase or receive any such black bass or other fish, if such person knows, or in the exercise of due care should know, that such bass or fish has been transported in violation of the provisions of this Act;

"(3) receiving any shipment of black bass or other fish transported in interstate or foreign commerce to make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment, if such person knows, or in the exercise of due care should know, that such record or account is false. For the purposes of this section, the provisions of section 10 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the term "interstate or foreign commerce"."

Page 14, after line 25, insert:

"(d) The first section of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C.

851), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and the term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.'"

Page 15, line 1, strike out "12." and insert "10."

Page 15, line 4, strike out "13." and insert "11."

Page 15, line 4, strike out "12." and insert "10."

Page 15, line 7, strike out "14." and insert "12."

Page 16, line 9, strike out "1969." and insert "1969'."

Page 16, after line 13, insert:

"(f) The provisions of sections 4 and 5 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 929; 16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee), as amended, shall hereinafter be cited as the 'National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.'"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would briefly explain the nature of the Senate amendments and any additional funding that may have been included.

Mr. DINGELL. I will be most happy to. Mr. Speaker, the significant changes in the bill, and I will insert them in the RECORD following my statement, briefly explained are as follows:

First. The forfeiture provisions would be handled a little differently than they would under the House version with respect to civil and criminal procedure and in my opinion a little more fairly.

Second. The second major change would authorize an appropriation of \$200,000 for the purpose of convening an international conference on the prevention of these endangering species of which there are now, as I am sure my good friend knows, a great number.

The last change is a fairly minor one, which deals with the points at which endangered species and other species of wildlife could be imported into the United States at nondesignated ports of entry.

There are no other major changes. I will tell my good friend from Iowa that it is the pledge of both the Senate and also the Member who now speaks, that it will probably not be necessary for there to be an actual expenditure of \$200,000, because it is anticipated that the matter can be handled on the ambassadorial level in Geneva, and that the convening of a ministerial-level conference will probably not be necessary. If this should occur the expenditure of funds authorized probably will not be called for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, following is a brief explanation of the major Senate amendments to H.R. 11363:

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF MAJOR SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11363, ENDANGERED SPECIES LEGISLATION

SECTION 4, PAGES 4 TO 11

The House version authorized employees of the Interior and Treasury, under certain conditions, to arrest, search, and seize prop-

erty. A civil penalty was authorized to be imposed against violators in addition to a criminal penalty.

The Senate argued that the seizure provision, when coupled with a civil penalty, made little sense and could conceivably create Constitutional difficulties. Accordingly, the enforcement section was redrafted in order to treat a seizure which accompanies a civil penalty proceeding differently from a seizure which arises in conjunction with a criminal violation of the statute. At the same time, various safeguards were added to increase the protection which a person would be afforded when involved in an enforcement proceeding. Following are the major substantive changes made:

(a) In a suit to collect a civil penalty which the Secretary has assessed a court would have the authority to review the violation and assessment *de novo*. This would serve as a check on arbitrary action by the Secretary.

(b) When seizure accompanies a civil penalty proceeding, the Secretary would not be allowed to order forfeiture. He would be required to seek forfeiture in court action.

(c) Whenever seizure takes place, regardless of whether connected with a civil or criminal violation, the Secretary would be required to notify the owner or consignee of such seizure as soon as practicable.

(d) Since forfeiture in connection with a civil proceeding can be sought by the Secretary only after assessment of the penalty, the Secretary would be required to conclude the proceeding as expeditiously as possible. Should the Secretary not seek forfeiture within 30 days after conclusion of civil proceeding, the seized merchandise would be required to be returned to the owner. Similarly, if the Secretary does not commence civil penalty proceedings within 30 days after an acquittal in a criminal prosecution, any seized merchandise would be required to be immediately returned to the owner.

2. Under Section 4(d) of the House bill the Secretary is authorized to designate ports of entry for the importation of fish and wildlife in order to facilitate enforcement. In order to relieve an importer of substantial expense created by a lengthy routing, the Senate added a provision to allow the Secretary to permit importation at non-designated ports for movement to designated ports.

SECTION 5, PAGES 11 TO 12

The House bill directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, to take appropriate steps to encourage other countries to take measures to prevent species from becoming endangered. The House report emphasized that it expected the Secretaries to follow through on a convention now underway that would accomplish this purpose. If this effort should fail the Committee instructed the Secretaries to seek an international convention which would have as its goal the signing of this convention.

The Senate amended the bill to include language to carry out the intent of the House report. In addition, it authorized to be appropriated \$200,000 in order to implement the provision. Language in the Senate report indicates that the IUCN has circulated a draft proposal among more than 60 nations and that Switzerland has agreed to act as depository for the convention. A request has been made to have the Ambassadors of all member nations sign the convention. Should this occur, then none of the \$200,000 authorized to be appropriated would need to be funded. This is the only increase in the cost of the legislation to the Federal Government and if the ambassadorial level convention is successful, then there would be no increase in cost.

SECTION 6, PAGES 12 TO 13

A new Subsection 6(c) was added by the Senate to make it clear nothing in the bill

supersedes the provisions of Section 527 of the Tariff Act of 1930. That Section requires importers of wild mammals or birds protected in foreign countries or whose exportation to the United States is restricted to obtain a certificate from the United States Consul in that country prior to importation.

SECTION 7 (A) AND (B), PAGES 11 AND 15

The words "or ships by any means whatever" are contained in present law but were inadvertently omitted when the House rewrote certain provisions of the Lacey Act (18 U.S.C. 43). Similarly, wherever the provision referred to wildlife "taken" in violation of an Act of Congress or State or foreign law, the words "transported or sold", which are contained in present law, were inadvertently omitted. The Senate has restored these words in the appropriate places.

SECTION 7 (C), (D), AND (E), PAGES 16 TO 19

These Subsections relate to the transportation of fish and wildlife taken in violation of a State, Federal or foreign law. It is particularly designed to eliminate illegal traffic in alligator hides. The Subsections authorize civil penalties, as well as criminal penalties and, under certain conditions, authorize arrest, search and seizure of property. Reference is made to Section I 1. of this explanation for more information on the amendments.

PAGE 20—18 USC 3054 AND 3112

Section 42 of Title 18, USC, governs the importation of injurious mammals, birds, etc. into the United States. However, it contains no provision for arrest and execution of warrants to enforce its provisions. This authority exists in connection with Sections 43 and 44 which is provided under Sections 3054 and 3112 of Title 18. The House bill would extend these provisions to Section 42.

The Senate amended the House bill to make conforming changes with respect to civil and criminal penalties and search and seizure similar to those made under Sections 4 and 7 of this bill.

SECTION 9, PAGES 22 AND 24

Section 9 amends the Black Bass Act to prohibit interstate sale or transportation of any black bass or other fish which was taken illegally in a foreign country and imported to the United States.

The Senate amended the Section to clarify the nature of the various violations. Also it made amendments that would impose penalties upon a person who knows, or in the exercise of due care should know, that he is committing one of the enumerated violations. This change has the effect of bringing the Black Bass Act into conformity with the legal standard which will be used for violations of Section 43 of Title 18 under the amendments incorporated in the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted to know that our chairman, Dr. MORGAN has left his bed and is with us today. He will assist in the further consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes.

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

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 14580, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed that section 1, ending on page 62, line 23, of the bill would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point. Are there any amendments to that section?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I am correct, this is the 23d year of the so-called foreign aid program. For the first 2 years of its life I was not privileged to be a Member of this body, but for the last 21 years I have served here and have faithfully supported this legislation. I have voted for every authorization, every appropriation. I have supported former Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and now I support President Nixon in his request for an authorization for the so-called mutual security program for the current fiscal year.

I can vividly recall the foreign aid programs we had 20 or 21 years ago. If I am correct, in those days the authorization was somewhere in the magnitude of \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year in a total Federal budget of about \$70 billion to \$80 billion a year—a far greater percentage of our annual Federal expenditures than we have at the present time.

In the early days foreign aid was a program aimed at rehabilitating primarily Western Europe devastated by World War II. Gradually, for reasons we all know, the program was shifted from Western Europe to a worldwide program. It was a program change from one aimed at rehabilitating countries that had been former industrial giants to one aimed at helping the underdeveloped countries on the one part and helping Western European countries militarily on the other.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen a gradual reduction in dollar amounts from \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year to a program today which is in the magnitude roughly of about \$2 billion annually. It is not only a lesser amount in dollars, but it is a far smaller percentage of our total Federal Government expenditures.

I supported the program 21 years ago, because I thought it was in the national interest. I supported the program 21 years ago and each year since, because I think we have an obligation as a rich and powerful nation to help other people and other nations for humanitarian reasons.

I must confess at times I have been disappointed with the results. I think there have been deficiencies in the administration, whether it was a Republican administration or a Democratic administration. I have been sorely disappointed by the response of some nations that have been extremely generous beneficiaries of our aid and assistance, both economic and military, but as I look at the record of this program for the last 23 years, 21 of which I have had an opportunity to participate in, I believe there have been far more pluses than minuses.

So without any hesitation or qualification today, I intend to support the bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting a program recommended by a Republican President. I intend to support a bill reported out by a committee dominated in the majority by the Democrats. But this program almost from its inception has been supported on a bipartisan basis, and I am glad to see here today that some kind of bipartisanship.

If Members will go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the last 21 years, to my personal knowledge, the Members will find dramatic speeches made in support of this program by former Speakers Sam Rayburn and Joe Martin. Of course, our present Speaker, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK over the years has stood in the well of this House and supported not only a Republican Presidential request, but also a Democratic Presidential request.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, my predecessor in the job of Republican leader, the Honorable Charles Halleck, on many occasions took the well of this House and spoke for the program, supporting either a Democratic or a Republican President in either a Democratic or a Republican Congress. So it seems to me that on this occasion today we as Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, ought to support the committee recommendations under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. MORGAN) and the Democratic and Republican members of this committee.

I know any President, in the past or present, would greatly prefer, if it were in the national interest, to divert the \$2 billion or \$3 billion we have annually spent in recent years to domestic programs. We have great domestic needs in this country. Our metropolitan cities need help and assistance. Our educational programs need help. We must affirmatively attack the problems of water pollution, of air pollution, of mass transit, et cetera.

I know the Presidents in the past as well as the present would like to take this money that we have been spending annually on the foreign aid program and use it as a tax benefit, to provide some tax relief to the overburdened American taxpayer at the Federal level.

But every President since the inception of this program, when he looked at the priorities, has come to the conclusion that it was in our national interest to have a program such as this.

This President and his predecessors for the past 23 years have recommended a program in this area.

Therefore, I intend to support the committee recommendations. I intend to support the dollar amounts.

I may support an amendment today that may be offered, particularly on military assistance, because I believe military assistance has been helpful and beneficial in our national interest.

One final word: It would be tragic for this Congress to be the first Congress in 11 to end a program that has had far more pluses than minuses. It would be sad indeed if this Congress by action today or tomorrow were to "gut" this bill by substantial reductions. In my humble judgment, this is the minimum amount that this program needs at this crucial hour in our Nation's history.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the committee. This is the most effective way that I can support the President who needs this help at this time.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In view of the debt and deficit situation of this Nation, how can the gentleman say that we are rolling in wealth to the extent that we can pour out another \$2 billion plus the billions that are in the pipeline and available for spending? How can the gentleman say that this kind of program is justified under the circumstances?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. My answer to my distinguished friend from Iowa is that if we do not have this program the net result will be far more serious than continuing it. I believe that this program over the years has had far more pluses than minuses. I look at what the prospects are if we do not have the program, and such circumstances look very dim and dark to me.

I admit that we have financial problems in the U.S. Government. As the gentleman knows, I have done my utmost to try to hold down Federal spending in many, many areas.

On the other hand, this program does have a high priority. Therefore, when I look at the prospects—if there were no program—compared to a continuation of this program at this level, I support the President and the committee's recommendations.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of corrective amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 20, lines 10 and 11, strike out "population

control" and insert in lieu thereof "family planning".

Page 20, line 14, strike out "population control" and insert in lieu thereof "family planning".

Page 44, line 19, strike out "section 204 (d) (4) (B)" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 204(d) (4) (B) and 306".

Page 44, line 24, after "of" insert "the".

Page 55, line 16, after "Inter-American" insert "Social".

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in yesterday's debate, there are clerical and typographical errors in the bill, and mistakes made in the printing. The amendment proposes to correct them.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. These amendments do not go to any of the money figures in the bill?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Nor to any substantive language?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. They are purely correcting typographical errors?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. With the striking out of the "population control" words and inserting "family planning" it is the intent that it should be family planning rather than any policy of the U.S. Government in U.S. foreign aid to control populations of foreign countries by this program. Is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct. That is the language that was used in the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 4, line 2, strike out "and".

Page 4, line 9, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

Page 4, after line 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(1) encourage the development and strengthening of free and democratic trade unions as part of United States technical assistance objectives."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, this is reinserting language that was inadvertently omitted from the new bill. It has been cleared with the committee.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am sure there is no objection to correcting all of these in-

advertent errors, but I think the Record should show there are also more serious errors in which cooperation in correcting them would be appreciated.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is a matter of opinion, and I sincerely respect the gentleman's opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 10, line 18, immediately before the period insert the following: "and which are consistent with the appropriate recommendations of the periodic Inter-American Conference of Labor Ministers".

Mr. ZABLOCKI. This language was inadvertently omitted from the bill. This language was cleared with the minority and it was agreed that it should have been put into the bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Who is the minority that the gentleman talks about?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking minority member of the committee is speaking for the minority.

Mr. GROSS. There is also the minority of the minority, I will advise the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure that the gentleman does not have any objection to this amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. No objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 8, beginning in line 20, strike out "\$475,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$475,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971" and insert in lieu thereof the following "\$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, simply stated, the effect of this amendment would be to reduce further the amount of the development loan fund by \$50 million from the sum recommended by the committee.

As the executive proposal came to the committee there was a request for \$675,500,000. The committee reduced that by \$200 million, to the figure of \$475,500,000. Thus, if this amendment is adopted, the total reduction in development loans from the executive request would be \$250 million.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee will have noted that the number of countries which may receive development loans under the proposed bill is limited to 20. Most of the funds as programmed for the new money in the bill would go to the following countries: India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Turkey, and

Korea, and small amounts for several countries in Africa.

I think it can be safely said, Mr. Chairman, that a program of this magnitude almost at midpoint in the fiscal year can be reduced by the amount that I have proposed without doing any injury to the valid parts of the program.

Last year the authorized amount as the bill left the House was \$350 million. We are told by the executive witnesses that the needs this year, especially in the countries that I have mentioned, are somewhat greater and, hence, the proposed reduction is somewhat less.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I think the reduction can be made to effect a savings of considerable magnitude and yet not endanger in any way our American security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In order to get the figures right, is this for each of the 2 years or over the 2-year period?

Mr. ADAIR. I am glad that the gentleman raised that question. It is for each of the 2 years.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So that the total reduction in this figure for the 2-year period is \$100 million?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this additional cut was considered in the committee. I might add that the present amount in the bill for development loans is \$475.5 million. This figure that the committee has reported out is \$200 million below the executive request. It is, however, the same figure that was authorized last year.

We did give a great deal of consideration to this particular question.

It was the strong feeling of the committee that this figure that is in the bill is supportable, and should be supported by the committee. I know that the gentleman who introduced the amendment had some reservations on it, and there are quite a few people who had reservations, but it was the consensus of the committee that this figure was the fair figure, and the desirable figure, and it would meet the needs of the executive branch this year.

I might say that since 1948 the United States has made development loans in excess of \$7 billion. Similarly, the United States has collected over \$1.1 billion in principal and interest. So that while it is a slow return, nevertheless the development loan program has been a good investment, has been extremely helpful, and the United States is getting money back on it.

The principal loans go to India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Turkey, and Korea. I might say that after considerable debate and discussion in the committee that the figure that is in the bill is the figure that we felt was most desirable and neces-

sary. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and hope the committee would vote the amendment down.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, one thing that worries me about a deeper cut than made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and as the Members know, the committee made a cut of \$200 million—I wonder whether the author of the amendment took into consideration whether or not a cut of \$50 million will injure some of the small countries in Africa? Most of the money was programmed for big countries but if we cut too deep there will not be enough for the smaller ones.

I am afraid that a further cut of \$50 million in this program would interfere with some of the real vital projects in the continent of Africa and in other parts of the world.

Large countries like India, which has received a large part of the development loan money, might be able to stand a substantial cut, but I fear that some of the small, very essential loans that do so much good in Africa, might be reduced as a result of this cut of \$50 million.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

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

I will say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, in response to the question he has just put, that that factor certainly was taken into account in arriving at the proposed reduction.

As illustrative of this, the proposed programs for the several countries of Africa involved, total about \$92 million for the fiscal years about which we are speaking. I felt that there was a sufficient amount of money allocated to other countries so that those desirable programs such as the malaria control and others about which the gentleman speaks might not be seriously harmed.

In short, the answer to the question of the chairman of the committee is that those factors were taken into account.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, but I would say that this is the first test on the money cuts, and I hope that the committee will be supported, and that the words of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) will be recalled when we vote on this.

This is an essential part. I believe it is important that we vote this amendment down, and I would hope that the committee will vote the amendment down.

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

Mr. Chairman, during general debate yesterday I pointed out that the development loan program is where cuts—deep cuts—have already been made. Thirty percent has been cut from the amount requested.

If we should accept a further cut, we would be making available for all development loans somewhat more—\$425

million—than the administration considers desirable to spend in one country, in India. They are seeking to make available \$385 million for India alone.

The gentleman from Indiana suggested that there are some countries where development loans would be desirable and emphasis should be made on those. If we should assume, for example, that countries in Africa have desirable programs, we would have to assume that other countries have less desirable ones.

I would like to point out that over 90 percent of development loans go to five countries—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Indonesia, and Korea.

Frankly, I can see no place where we could take substantial cuts without having very undesirable consequences as to what is being attempted.

I mentioned yesterday that almost half of the aid to be made available through development loans is for agricultural purposes. Are we trying to prevent further progress in countries like Pakistan and India in the problem of feeding their own people? I would assume that we would consider this a desirable program. Or, are we going to turn on our friend, Korea? And are we not going to help on a multilateral basis a country like Indonesia?

In other words, I would suggest that the cuts already made in the committee are already too deep, since the needs in all these countries are very real.

Let me conclude by pointing out that development loans in almost every case are on a multilateral basis. In India, Pakistan, and Turkey there are consortiums with other countries involved. If we should be obliged to reduce the amount that we can contribute to a consortium, it inevitably will have a boomerang effect. Other donor countries will provide less if we cut back our aid, and the effect on the recipient country will be very adverse.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons I think it would be most unwise for us to go below the committee's recommendation. A further cut may not affect our own national security, but it could greatly reduce the effectiveness both of what we have done in the past and what we could legitimately do, in concert with others, in this current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the amendment is defeated.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 8, line 20, strike out "\$475,500,000" and all that follows down through "amounts" in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000,00 for the fiscal year 1970, which amount".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a self-explanatory amendment.

I would like to set the stage for a brief discussion by pointing out that I fully concur with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER) when he points out that in this first money amendment,

we may well set the stage for what we do this afternoon and the vote will demonstrate the mood and temper of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members, though, that it is an absolute open secret that every year the bureaucrats from AID march up to the Hill with an exaggerated request for funds—and do not think for a moment that the cuts made by the committee very drastically affect the program—what really happens is that the committee goes through the exercise of trimming the original request—and that makes the committee look good—and then Members stand on the floor and offer other amendments which trim the bill, and that makes the entire House look good.

The Agency still gets far more for its program than logic dictates.

My amendment provides for two things—\$300 million for the fiscal year 1970, which is the exact amount that we appropriated for the fiscal year 1969. I am not aware of any statement by anyone in the Agency or in the State Department or on the floor that has charged that action of the Committee on Appropriations last year ruined the program. They have lived with \$300 million and I think they can live with the \$300 million again.

My amendment also limits this amount to fiscal year 1970. If you will please note, this program as now in the bill will authorize funds for fiscal year 1971. We are surrendering control here in the House of Representatives over this program.

May I also emphasize that any charge made that this program has to be sustained in its present form to serve the needs of the country is on the face of it ludicrous.

There are so many additional programs which are really foreign aid carried on under all the international programs that have been brought out of the Banking and Currency Committee that we could well do without this program for an entire fiscal year. Other programs of direct benefit to foreign countries may exceed \$10 billion.

The issue before us is clear: Do we want a very effective, practical figure? I submit that the figure approved in last year's appropriation is practical and effective.

Earlier I listened, as did all Members, to the eloquent plea of the minority leader for support of this program. We must remember that minority leaders are required to say certain things. I yield to no one, not even my minority leader, in loyalty to this administration. But I do not think loyalty to the administration presumes loyalty to the foreign aid program. A blow for economy in support of last year's appropriation figure would be in order.

My amendment makes sense: I hope my amendment could be defended by anybody who supports the program, and I emphasize that it does give us a chance, to draw the lines here this afternoon: Will we restore funds that the agency does not need, or will we give them the funds they received a year ago and lived with?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that my amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is in order and is a far more effective figure. I emphasize that in my opinion it will not harm the AID program. They can or will live with it, and I appeal to the House to support this progressive amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The difference between the gentleman's substitute and the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana would cut this particular money figure by \$100 million and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would cut it by \$175 million over a 2-year period; is that correct?

Mr. DERWINSKI. For the first year, and my amendment would eliminate the authorization for fiscal 1971 so that we could continue to have some semblance of control over this program. It is a double blow for economy.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is suggesting that his amendment would not gut or even harm the program. I am sure the gentleman remembers the spokesman for AID, Hon. Maurice V. Williams, testifying before our committee both on the reasons why substantially more development loans have been requested and what the effect would be if there was a major cut. Let me remind the gentleman that even without his amendment there would be a major cut.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I point out to the gentleman that we should make the decisions and not blindly accept the figures from the AID agency.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my opposition to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969. Since coming to Congress, I have voiced consistent opposition to efforts on the part of certain individuals and groups to expand U.S. foreign aid commitments. I have done so because, in my opinion, this country cannot maintain its strength and well-being if it continues to give its national treasure away to countries around the world.

When discussing foreign aid, certain facts must be kept in mind. Without reference to them, it is indeed difficult to maintain a clear perspective on the issue.

First. The cost of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 is almost \$2 billion.

Second. At present, roughly \$19 billion exists unspent in the foreign aid pipeline.

Third. If the Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1969 is approved unchanged by the Congress, total foreign aid funds will total approximately \$21 billion.

Fourth. Net cost of the foreign aid program since its inception in 1946, including the interest on what we have bor-

rowed to finance the program totals almost \$183 billion.

Fifth. During the years that the U.S. foreign aid program has been in operation, our gold holdings have been reduced by \$12½ billion.

Sixth. Since the United States started the foreign aid program which involved our borrowing money in order to finance giveaways, short-term loans which the United States has outstanding increased from \$8,645 million to \$35,665 million. This is an increase of over \$27 billion.

Seventh. U.S. current indebtedness on short-term loans is so great that we could not even meet our financial obligations if demands for repayment were made.

Eighth. During the period that the foreign aid program has been in operation, our balance-of-payments situation has drastically deteriorated. To date we have sent to foreign countries around the world \$36,896 million more than has been returned to us.

Ninth. As a nation we have become so dedicated in recent years to pursuing a vigorous foreign aid program that we are now borrowing money from more than thirty foreign nations of the world in order to finance our giveaways.

Tenth. To date our national treasure has been distributed among the entire 3½ billion people of the world, with the exception of a mere 36 million people.

Eleventh. We presently have well over 4,000 foreign aid projects located in countries around the world. While we closed down many domestic projects last year for lack of funds, not a single foreign aid project suffered as much as a \$1 reduction from the much talked about limitations imposed by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1969.

Twelfth. It is estimated that during fiscal year 1970 the U.S. foreign aid program will function in 99 nations and five territories of the world.

Thirteenth. During fiscal year 1970, it is estimated that the foreign aid program will number more than 51,000 individuals on its payroll. This includes U.S. and foreign personnel and participants.

Mr. Chairman, we are borrowing money from the American people to pay for commodities and services which are given free to foreign nations. At the same time we are borrowing money from foreign nations in order to improve temporarily our balance-of-payments situation. One example is as follows: Thailand is the recipient of over \$1 billion of our aid, both in commodities and in services. The United States borrowed the money to pay for these commodities and services we have given to Thailand. During the same period, however, Thailand, out of its own resources, created a surplus in its foreign exchange and gold reserves of over \$1 billion. This is the shocking part. After long diplomatic wrangling, Thailand reluctantly but finally agreed to make the United States a loan of \$100 million. Terms: 4½ years at 6 percent interest. This is just one of many examples of the mess we are getting into with our free-wheeling, worldwide spending program. This does not include the billions of counterpart funds which have built up over the years in

various countries and can only be spent in that country. These are American taxpayers' dollars also.

The figures I have cited are accurate ones. They come from recent compilations published by the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. In my mind, these figures are shocking. They tell the story of a great nation that has seriously dislocated itself by pursuing a well-intentioned but ill-practiced foreign aid program.

I believe that our national interest is advanced by some forms of foreign aid. For example, through technical and military assistance, we have created important allies in our global fight against communism. Through initiating economic development programs we have visibly demonstrated the strength and values of democracy to millions around the world, and justly earned their lasting friendships.

In my view, perhaps the main problem with our foreign aid program as presently conceived and operated is that we are using a shotgun instead of a rifle approach. We should trade our costly, expansive, and wide-based foreign aid program for a limited and narrow-gaged program strictly designed to promote our national interest. We should give foreign aid only to promote the economic health and well-being of nations that are either firm allies or potential allies of the United States, and that are willing to help themselves.

In addition to making basic changes in our philosophy and practice of foreign aid, we need to flush the currently unspent funds out of the foreign aid pipeline. The \$19 billion that presently is lying uselessly in limbo can be put to productive use, thereby easing the strain that foreign aid places on the national budget.

Mr. Chairman, until the changes I have outlined, or similar ones, become established policy, I shall continue to oppose the foreign aid program. To do otherwise, would be to ignore both the dictates of my conscience and the express wishes of the overwhelming majority of voters in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

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

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, it will no doubt surprise some of our colleagues who have known me in the House for the past 17 years and who know how I have always felt about the foreign aid program, to hear me say that I commend this bill and the Foreign Affairs Committee for its diligent work in preparing it.

But before anyone thinks that I have been converted from my opposition to the foreign aid program, I must hasten to say that my commendation of the bill and the distinguished committee that prepared it, is somewhat limited. I look upon the bill with favor only to the extent that it pares \$441 million from the \$2.63 billion requested by the administration for foreign aid program authorizations, and is \$430 million less than the

amount we appropriated—unjustifiably in my opinion—for the program in the last fiscal year.

I must, however, make one thing quite clear. I oppose this bill, as I have opposed other foreign aid authorizations during my tenure in this body, for several reasons. I oppose it because—even with the cuts ordered by the committee—it provides for too great a drain on the resources of the harassed taxpayers of this Nation and because it does not provide proper safeguards to prevent repetition of the stupid and wasteful—and in some instances corrupt—practices which have marked the management of the foreign aid boondoggle since its inception.

It would be my hope that this body will make substantial cuts in the authorizations the committee has recommended for this program. I approved of the cuts the committee has made and I realize that with present commitments we cannot deal the foreign aid program the death blow it deserves, but I feel that we must go beyond the committee's cuts. I am of the opinion that additional reductions ranging from \$350 to \$500 million could be made and I will support amendments to that end.

I am convinced that this bill contains a glaring fault in its failure to deny aid funds to nations trading with North Vietnam. I cannot believe that the distinguished members of the committee intended to leave the door open to aid to nations which are aiding our mortal enemy—I think this must have been an oversight. But in any event, I think the bill should be amended in such manner that American taxpayers will not be required to provide aid to nations which in turn provide aid to a nation in killing the sons and husbands of American taxpayers.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, after careful consideration, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has indeed cut the Executive request by 30 percent. We cut it \$200 million. The gentleman from Illinois desires to cut the request by over 50 percent. He knows that 41 percent of development loan funds are for agricultural programs in underdeveloped countries with the purpose of bringing about a better economy in those countries. I believe it would be irresponsible to cut so deeply into the program, in fact, gutting the program. Regardless of what the opinion may be of the gentleman from Illinois, it would be a deep and harmful cut. I know that he would prefer, and we in the Foreign Affairs Committee have indicated our preference by following the policy of encouraging loans rather than grants. Many of the countries with whom we have these loan programs are on a self-help basis.

We would be undermining their own efforts and setting them back many years. I hope committee members will overwhelmingly defeat this proposal, because this will, indeed, hamper the programs and in some areas where substantial success has been in evidence.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

I would like to quote the statement by Maurice J. Williams, of AID, who testified as follows before our committee:

India and Pakistan could get along with less aid, say with last year's level, only at considerable cost to their development program and to the development process.

At this point, let me say that \$271 million for development loans was made available to India and Pakistan last year even at the reduced level appropriation that was available. The cut proposed would reduce loans by at least that much.

Mr. Williams' testimony continued:

Both these countries, with less aid, will manage their financial affairs conservatively. But they will manage at the expense of development, at the expense of the economic growth which would otherwise be possible—a slower rate of investment, fewer new jobs, there will be idle industry, farmers will be underproducing.

For example, it is possible to realize an annual rate of growth of about 6 percent in India in the next few years. This depends on the critical margin of foreign exchange provided by aid from the United States and other donors.

This statement, Mr. Chairman, demonstrates very clearly the nature of the problem. If we are less generous in helping meet the needs of the countries concerned, it surely will slow down the process of growth, which is the whole point of our giving aid in the first place.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I must underline the position our chairman has stated, that even the \$50 million cut would not hurt so much the richer countries receiving development loan funds as it would hurt the smaller countries such as Turkey, Indonesia, Korea, and the countries of Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure this committee does not want to hamper these countries or in any way cause problems in these small countries which are really trying to improve their economic situation.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I join the gentleman in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, who described his amendment as "progressive, thoughtful, and scholarly." However, the gentleman talked about trimming, but the committee did trim this request. I see no reason why we should at this point devastate this program. This would not only trim it, but would swing a meat ax that in the end will really determine that this program cannot continue. If we oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) on the ground that it would be harmful, then I think we must consider that this substitute amendment would be devastating and would cut \$175 million out of this program.

This is not only a program that the

AID requested, but it is also a program requested by the President of the United States, and by the Secretary of State, and it was supported by Dr. Hannah, who is doing an outstanding job in administering the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, when the session opened this afternoon, we were treated to a discourse by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) on the lack of housing in this country, and the growing unemployment. Mr. Chairman, here today, is a chance for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) and the Members on both sides of the aisle to join in husbanding the resources of this country and dedicating those resources to the purposes for which they were taken from the taxpayers of this country—that is to take care of our problems here at home, and they are monumental.

It is about time we give attention to them instead of testing once every year how much can be gouged out of the taxpayers for unappreciative foreigners around the world.

We hear the same pious statements every time the AID bill comes up. It is a sacred cow. It is untouchable, and we are beginning to hear that here this afternoon. We are told that we must take what the committee hands out. I sometimes wonder if the Foreign Affairs Committee is not an appendage of the State Department and the AID Agency rather than a constituent body of the House of Representatives. It invariably carries the torch for the executive branch.

Speaking of India, how appreciative is that country into which we have unloaded \$9 billion by way of foreign aid? There are several hundred million people in India. It is one of the heaviest populated countries in the world. India had 7 million men under arms in World War II, but what contribution have they made to the containment of communism? Do Members know of a single combat soldier India sent to either Korea or Vietnam in behalf of the containment of communism? They stand on the threshold of communism in Asia but they refuse to help us in the fighting and dying.

I understand there will be an amendment offered to this bill to provide more military planes for Taiwan before we get through. We have borrowed \$20 million at 6 percent interest from Taiwan. Why should we now give Taiwan \$50 million worth of planes?

Getting back to India, Calcutta has 7 million population. How much do they raise in taxes from the people of that city? About \$7 million a year from 7 million people. India is one of the worst corruption-ridden governments in the world yet we have poured \$9 billion into that country.

I again remind the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), who spoke a while ago in all-out support of this year's luscious giveaway, we have already spent \$182 billion, including interest on the money borrowed to finance it, and President Nixon is calling for a 75-percent cut in public works in this country.

Yesterday I gave some figures on that.

I do not have them here now, but I will get them and insert them later, as to how many projects have been denied the various areas of this country for flood control, water resources, pollution—you name it—schools, education, hospitals. Yet the President's spokesmen stand here today and say this \$2 billion bill is sacred; it must not be cut. Instead of hard-nosed diplomacy there must be a continuation of checkbook diplomacy—trying to buy our way.

I am for the gentleman's amendment to hold it to 1 year, go back and take a look at it next year, and cut it by \$175 million down to \$300 million. The Lord knows that is too much.

If this succeeds, I will offer amendments to cut 75 percent out of other money figures in this bill, because that is the kind of a cut President Nixon says the people of this country must take.

I just am not going to be a second-class citizen for India or any other foreign country, nor do I intend that the citizens of the Third District of Iowa be made to pay the bills while foreigners ride the gravy train.

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

I heard with great interest the opposition of my friend from Iowa against some of these countries that are being benefited by this foreign aid bill. I do not have very much use for these governments, either, but when one thinks and when one considers the fact that in Calcutta, the very place in India which the gentleman mentioned, there are people lying starving in the streets, this is something we must not forget.

It is not the governments that we are aiding. We are trying to help these poor starving people in underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

I do not believe I must become emotional in this situation. Everyone here is aware of the situation as it exists. We are not trying to help out those nations that can take care of themselves. These are all underdeveloped countries. These are people we are trying to help, in order that revolution will not take place within those nations.

This is the reason why we have a foreign aid bill. I say to the Members, depending upon the result of this amendment will depend the fate of this bill. I urge the Members to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again engaging in the financial emasculation of an already skeletonized authorization. I believe that an adequate foreign assistance program is in the national interest and I do not believe that the trend to reduce the amounts made available for economic development in the lesser developed countries is wise.

In fiscal 1949 the United States made total economic aid commitments of \$7.2 billion. This was 18.3 percent of the Federal budget and 2.78 percent of a gross national product of \$260 billion.

In fiscal 1968 U.S. official commitments totaled an estimated \$4 billion, \$3.2 billion less than in 1949 even though the Federal budget was three times larger than that of 1949. And where foreign aid in 1949 was 2.78 percent of the gross national product, U.S. official aid flows

in 1968 were only 0.41 percent of a gross national product that had more than tripled during the same period.

If you look at this reduction in foreign aid flows in relation to what other countries are providing, it means that the United States now ranks eighth behind Portugal, France, Australia, the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, and the United Kingdom, in the amount of aid given. Of course, we provide more economic assistance than any other country in dollar amounts. But we do not provide as much as we can or as much as we should when you consider the great wealth of this country in comparison with that of those countries who devote a greater percentage of their gross national product to the lesser developed countries.

I submit that this policy is shortsighted. It is to our own self-interest and in our own defense and for our own security to keep our foreign aid program at the highest level that we can afford. A world at peace, getting on with the job of economic development in an environment free of conflict and chaos is to our long term interests. But this kind of a world cannot be achieved without substantial economic and technical assistance from the rich countries. As long as there is poverty and hunger, illiteracy and deprivation in almost two-thirds of the world, the potential for violence and revolution exists. When this violence erupts or revolution takes place, none of us are safe. It, therefore, behooves the United States to do what it can to help create the condition of stability and progress in which peaceful development can take place. We can make a meaningful contribution to the creation of a peaceful world order by passing this bill. As President Nixon said in his foreign aid message to the Congress:

The support by the Congress for these programs will help enable us to press forward in new ways toward building of respect for the United States, security for our people and dignity for human beings in every corner of the globe.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think it should be pointed out, in response to the gentleman from Iowa's remarks, about what India does—and admittedly Indians at certain times as well as their leaders are difficult to get along with, as we all know who have had contact with them—it is a fact that perhaps they cannot do much about communism with China on their borders. However, the great investment in the free world has been to see whether a great country of 524 million people can stay out of the Communist orbit. That is the great investment that we have made there. It is to see whether or not free governments can survive. It is a part of that investment that the free world made in India. They have a population which is nearly four times as great as the total population in Latin America put together.

The gentleman also said something about the people here who are not our friends. Well, Korea is in here, and they are certainly our friends. They are dying

with us in Vietnam, and they were the first to rally to our cause there. Indonesia rose up and threw out the Communists there. There are 100 million people in that country. So these countries are trying. India is certainly trying under very difficult conditions. If we say now that we are going to turn our backs on them by gutting this bill and denying them help, it seems to me that we would be committing a great error, and creating intolerable conditions for people who are our friends and allies.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to cosponsor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) for \$50 million annual reduction in development loan program authorization, reducing the figure in the bill from \$475 million to \$425 million for fiscal year 1970, and \$425 million for fiscal year 1971.

I think this is a moderate cut, but necessary to make for economy and efficiency. The sum of \$300 million was appropriated during fiscal year 1969 for the development loan program under U.S. foreign aid.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Can the gentleman give this House the assurance that if we authorize \$425 million on the Development Loan Fund in the Adair amendment that the great subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) is going to give that much money to the Development Loan Fund?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I do not think that either of us has very much influence, I would say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, on the gentleman from Louisiana in respect to his future actions with respect to this bill. I do not think that the point the House of Representatives starts from on U.S. foreign aid authorization legislation should be anything but what we decide is practical. The reason why I cosponsor the Adair amendment, is that I believe the gentleman from Indiana's amendment is practical, sensible, and will cause developing countries to review and refinance external obligations, and development loans previously contracted for at high interest rates and short maturities with parties and agencies other than the U.S. Government.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the chairman's reference to the Committee on Appropriations, I would like to ask if this is some kind of a shell game we are engaged in here today? Do we lift the shell and see what another committee may do? Are we to be guided by that sort of a procedure?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe that we should be practical and economical in our approach to the U.S. foreign aid program. Therefore, I am in favor of and cosponsor the amendment

of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) to reduce the current funding of the Development Loan Fund provision to \$425 million authorization for this year and the same authorization figure for the next fiscal year, 1971, coming up. One reason why this figure should be cut, I believe, is to require some of these developing countries to put their fiscal houses in order. On page 13 of the report you will read:

The burden of debt of the less developed countries, caused in part by past loans with relatively high interest rates and short maturities, has grown rapidly over the past several years—

Listen to this:

Debt service, including service on export credits amounted to \$4.1 billion in 1967—

And, watch this closely—

nearly half of the total new aid they received that year from all donors.

That means that one-half of the aid from all donors and lenders currently going into these developing countries is now going into payments to other than aid loans at high interest rates and large loans and large repayments with short maturity. The U.S. aid program on development loans only charges 2 percent during the grace period on these development loans and 3 percent thereafter, much less than the interest rates in our country.

We are also taking substantial cuts in our own districts on development programs, flood control, highway, school and housing construction. Therefore, when we recommend a decrease in the Development Loan Fund, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) does, we are really going ahead rather than destroying the aid program.

Mr. Chairman, I do feel that the \$300 million level recommended by the gentleman from Illinois is an appreciable level of funding. Nevertheless, if we start at that figure now, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) that the cut could well develop into too drastic a cut.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to me and to the entire House what is inconsistent with asking Members to vote for a figure of \$300 million which they voted to appropriate a year ago? They have already voted for that figure. It, obviously, has their blessing. That precedent is the reason to simplify the debate and arrive at a figure.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. You are very logical but not conclusive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out very carefully the difference between the two increases. I believe the authorization for the development loan programs should be for a 2-year period. I think that is why the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) is right in his amendment covering a 2-year period, \$425 million for each fiscal year, 1970 and 1971, while the gentleman from Illinois by his amendment, provides for an

authorization for a 1-year period at \$300 million level.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Under the amounts of money that you have in the bill at the present time, are we moving ahead any in terms of improving our commitment to the world struggle for improving the condition of people from where we were last year? As I recall, we were at about 0.37 percent of our gross national product.

With everything that we are doing have we increased our stance anywhere measurably by anything you have recommended this year?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no, we have not. As a matter of fact, we are trailing behind many other countries in providing assistance to the developing countries.

Mr. HANNA. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that this House has available to it information from places like the Pearson report that was done for the United Nations, and the work that we hope will soon be forthcoming from the Peterson report? With all of that information available to this House which I hope we can use as a point of reference, do they not indicate that if we are going to do anything really effective or what we have set out to do, we will have to increase the amount we are making available?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Very definitely. The Pearson report points in that direction. It is expected that the Peterson report will likewise clearly spell out the fact that it is necessary for all developed countries to set aside a somewhat larger portion of their resources, of their gross national product, for that purpose. The gentleman from California is correct.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct in asking this kind of question of the committee.

It is very clear in view of the state of the world, the situation that exists from north to south, from east to west, in the less developed and developing countries, that unless we change our plans and devote more of our talent and initiative to helping them solve their problems, we are asking for more trouble than we can possibly deal with. I am not talking only about national security but in terms of world problems of the masses of people who are in deep, desperate trouble. We just cannot ignore it.

It is ridiculous to think that we can go back to the 1961 budget or to the budget of last year. The world does not stand still.

The world does not stand still. Population does not stand still. Our problems do not stand still. It is just a question of how reasonable and sensible we can be. Obviously if you can do it with \$1 million you can make some contribution. You can live with it, you know. But

then in terms of the problems of the world that would be completely unrealistic.

Mr. HANNA. I would like to make this point, that, if we address ourselves to that group in this House, that besides that we are in the very unfortunate, calamitable, if you would like, situation in which we have to live as a country within our borders, and still exist in a world which is around us. We are not living as a nation in a vacuum; we are living in a troubled, dynamic, and demanding world.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, anybody who has studied the circumstances have indicated that those people who are on, as the gentleman from Florida has said, the north side of the world, who have most of the wealth and resources, if they do not make some commitment to those people who are on the south side of the world, who have the numbers of people. Two-thirds of the world are have-nots, and one-third of the world are haves. If we do not make some kind of adjustment, we will end up with a world that is not livable for any one of us.

It has been said in the last 6 years that we ought to commit 1 percent of our gross national product. We are not doing that. The minimum that the Pearson report says is 0.75 percent. We are not doing that. The average that we were doing up until recently was 0.37, and the chairman tells me we are not doing that.

So I would say to those of you who believe that the United States cannot indulge in the luxury of reducing itself within its own borders and living with its own problems—and they are large enough, as the gentleman from Iowa has pointed out, and he is right—that may be one thing—but the true and hard fact is that we cannot live alone. We cannot live within our own borders. We have 4 percent of our gross national product that we export. Our gross national product is expanding. Therefore exports must expand. This means new markets must be created. These new markets largely must come from bringing the underdeveloped countries into the mainstream of world trade. We tie most of our aid to American goods, if we reduce our efforts we reduce our present exports as well as fail to provide for future expansion. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford this cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HANNA was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has cited the so-called Pearson report as calling upon the United States by 1975 to hand over 1 percent of its gross national product for foreign aid, and that would amount to at least \$11 billion. The Pearson referred to, I assume, is the former Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. HANNA. I referred to the Pearson report, yes. I think he called upon all of the northern countries to give 1 percent.

Mr. GROSS. He was very free when he said he wanted to put the 1 percent

levy on the people of the United States, but I read the report and did not find a single reference to how much Canada would put into the foreign giveaway kitty.

Mr. HANNA. I think, to set the gentleman straight, that he said that the have nations ought to commit 1 percent of their gross national product.

Mr. GROSS. He certainly applied that to the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield, the United States today is now spending one-quarter of 1 percent of its gross national product for foreign aid. There are seven other countries that are spending more.

Mr. HANNA. I do not think that we are in the lead insofar as percentage of gross national product is concerned. We are in the lead in terms of dollars, but we are not in the lead in percentage of what we have to work with.

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, as I understand it, would fix this figure at the level of what the House passed last year. Looking at the figures before me here, I judge that we have quite a ways to go in cutting funds out of this bill if we are to bring it down to last year's level, inasmuch as we have heard that only about \$1.7 billion was actually appropriated last year, and we have over \$2 billion in this measure here.

Therefore if we are going to put ourselves in the position where we can say we actually made a reduction over last year, we have a ways to go.

It seems to me a logical place to start off is by putting this figure where we were last year, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests.

I assume that the gentlemen who are for this bill want to see it passed—and as a matter of fact I want to see a bill passed, because there are things in this bill that I favor—but in my judgment there are a lot of votes in this House that probably will be lacking for the bill if it gets too far above last year's appropriation.

It seems to me that is a practical thing to think about here.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Indiana has put his finger on a very valuable point.

In keeping with the spirit that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER) is trying to establish, I hope that this first series of amendments will set the stage for a pattern.

I would like to emphasize though, and the gentleman from New Jersey might agree with me, it is a little misleading to tell the House that some countries give a greater share of their GNP to aid, because in that category you will find Great Britain and France, and they give "aid"—quote, unquote—to their former colonies for the purpose of maintaining economic control a far less visionary and spirited type of aid than we engage in.

So their aid programs are intended to maintain economic supremacy. Our aid program has been an example of national generosity from the start.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman that the figure of \$300 million that he quoted from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) was last year's appropriation figure. This is an authorization bill. If you want to compare it to what was authorized last year, the figure is \$350 million because that was last year's authorization figure. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) has related his amendment to the appropriation figure—and not the authorization.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has pointed out something that sometimes we forget in these various debates—and that is that we cannot compare validly an authorization figure and an appropriation figure. This is a two-step legislative process. We are now dealing with an authorization, and to relate the appropriation figure of last year to the prospective authorization figure today is an instance of comparing apples with oranges.

I think we ought to relate authorization to authorization and one fiscal year to the next.

Now let us take a look, if we might, at the figure recommended by the President, and the figure, the lowest figure before us, the figure represented by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

I understand that in the budget request, in the authorization category, the President asked in this area for \$675 million. The committee made a reduction of \$200 million, recommending to this body a total figure for development loans of \$475 million.

The gentleman from Indiana has offered an amendment to reduce that figure by \$50 million. I believe the gentleman's amendment is moderate. I do feel, however, that the amendment offered by my dear and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, is far, far too deep.

I would like to add, however, that I intend to support the committee, and to bolster my views, may I read excerpts from a letter just delivered to me which I think might be persuasive, and I hope very persuasive, with a number of Members of this body at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I quote in part from a letter from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: I want you to know of my personal conviction that the United States must, in our own long-term interest, con-

tinue to provide an adequate level of economic and military assistance to those less developed countries willing to help themselves.

I appreciate that foreign assistance is difficult and vulnerable legislation in a period of severe demands on the Federal budget. However, my request of \$2.2 billion for economic assistance was the lowest such request in the last ten years. It represented roughly one percent of the Federal budget, compared with much higher proportions in the earlier years of this decade. My request for \$425 million of grant military assistance was about the minimum needed to support mutual security arrangements, primarily in Asia.

However, the Foreign Affairs Committee has already reduced my requested authorization by \$416 million in economic assistance and \$25 million in military assistance and has added new programs which compound the extent of the reductions.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am sure my dear minority leader—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Our affection is getting out of hand here in the floor.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am sure the gentleman is not implying that my amendment is intended to embarrass the President. It is merely offered to help the President continue to trim the budget, and I have a sneaking suspicion that even though that is an eloquent letter—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And eloquently read.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, eloquently read—since the President is greatly engrossed in the Supreme Court controversy in the other body and he has his heart and soul in that issue, there will be a letter to the minority leader there. I do not recognize the same spirit in the letter that the gentleman from Michigan just read. I think at least those on this side of the aisle know that if my amendment is supported, the President will still sleep well tonight.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me conclude, if I have time left, Mr. Chairman. As I said a few moments ago, I personally believe very strongly in the basic principles and objectives of this program, and on the basis of the pluses and minuses over 23 years, I know there are far more pluses than minuses. The committee has carefully, I believe constructively, made adjustments in the amounts recommended by the President. I personally hope and trust that the maximum amount that can be obtained here in economic and military aid will be approved, and I support the committee as strongly as I possibly can.

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

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When this discourse began this afternoon, the gentleman from Michigan went to the well of the House and called for support of the committee bill. Now I notice he is supporting a small-size cut in this particular item.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No. Will the gentleman be corrected? I reiterated, I thought, my support for the committee bill. I said the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana was a modest one. I believe those were my words. On the other hand, I indicated my allegiance to the committee recommendations.

Mr. GROSS. Where does the gentleman stand? Is he for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. How many times do I have to tell my good and dear friend that I am for the committee recommendation?

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman said that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana was a moderate amendment; did he not?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In relation to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois it is a modest attempt to make a reduction—a very logical comment even though I prefer the committee's figure.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is not for any cuts in this bill at all?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am for the committee recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 36, noes 53.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 51, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PELLY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: Page 58, line 19, after the period insert the following: "The President shall suspend the contributions to the United Nations Development Program authorized by this subsection if the United Nations adopts any resolution or takes any other action which directly or indirectly jeopardizes the sovereignty granted to coastal states under the Convention on the Continental Shelf, April 29, 1958 (15 U.S.T. 472; T.I.A.S. No. 5578); that is the submerged Continental land mass of coastal nations. Such suspension of contributions shall continue until the President determines that the resolution or other action which caused the suspension has been rescinded."

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in 1967, Ambassador Pardo of Malta presented a resolution in the United Nations calling for the establishment of an international regime which would be charged with the responsibility of exploring and

exploiting the resources of the oceans for the benefit of mankind with particular emphasis upon the needs of the so-called developing nations.

Following this proposal, the United Nations at the 22d session on December 28, 1967, adopted a resolution establishing an ad hoc committee to study the peaceful uses of the seabed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. It was directed to prepare a study which included recommendations concerning practical means to promote international cooperation in the exploration, conservation, and use of the seabed and ocean floor within the framework of the Malta resolution.

At the 23d session of the U.N. General Assembly, a resolution was adopted establishing a committee composed of 42 member States on the peaceful uses of the seabed. This committee was instructed, among other things, to study legal principles which would promote international cooperation in the exploration and use of the seabed and ocean floor and insure that the exploitation of ocean resources would be for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that in the United Nations this week the United States is prepared to back a revised resolution on this matter. The United States has worked to remove some unacceptable, to me, provisions. However, this still is the first foot in the door by which we can lose the seabed over which the United States presently has sovereignty. Our own State Department, Mr. Chairman, apparently is turning its back on the apprehension and concern that is being expressed by many of us here in the Congress.

It is for this reason I am introducing this amendment today to the foreign aid bill that would suspend the contributions to the United Nations development program if the United Nations adopts any resolution or takes any other action which directly or indirectly jeopardizes the sovereignty granted to coastal States under the Convention on the Continental Shelf of 1958; that is, to the submerged Continental land mass of coastal nations.

The question of what is the land over which a coastal nation has sovereignty is clearly indicated in my amendment. This is important, Mr. Chairman, as the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, which became effective in 1964, recognizes the existence of an exclusive territorial sea, but it does not specify its breadth.

The Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf was promulgated in 1958, becoming effective in 1964, and this document for the first time attempted to formulate the seaward limit of national jurisdiction. It defines the Continental Shelf in the following manner:

For the purpose of these articles, the term "Continental Shelf" is used as referring to the sea-bed and subsoil of the submarine area adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, but to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the super-adjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas.

The definition of the Continental Shelf, as set forth in article I of the convention, contains two specific and alternative measurements. On the one hand, the definition purports to limit the jurisdiction of the coastal state to the point where the superadjacent water reaches a depth of 200 meters or about 650 feet. On the other hand, the definition goes on to extend this jurisdiction potentially "beyond that limit, to exploitation." It is my understanding that at the time this convention was drafted 200 meters was the effective limit of economical undersea oil and gas extraction. However, the state of the art now has progressed dramatically beyond that point.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that while firm jurisdiction is necessary, the action of the United Nations now is to open the way for developing countries, whether coastal or not, to get a share of coastal jurisdiction of nations, such as the United States. This to me is ceding our already granted jurisdiction, and I am opposed as I think all Americans should be opposed.

As indicated previously, the resolution of Ambassador Pardo of Malta envisioned the vesting in the United Nations of jurisdiction over the seabed and subsoil of the oceans beyond national jurisdiction. This concept entails establishment of an organization which would license member states or nationals of member states to explore and exploit specific areas of the ocean floor. I am opposed.

My amendment to this bill would clearly demonstrate the concern of the Congress toward any giveaway of our sovereignty as established by international law. This amendment would serve notice on the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to our own State Department, I might add, that the Congress of the United States will not stand idly by while they liquidate the rich resources of the submerged continental land mass adjacent to and seaward of our coastal shores.

I urge adoption of this amendment to suspend contributions to the United Nations development program if the United Nations passes a resolution which would jeopardize the sovereignty granted to coastal States.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PELLY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, as the former chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, I certainly share the gentleman's concern. The distinguished present chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER), is also present.

As the gentleman knows, our subcommittee and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have held hearings and watched this matter very carefully. The State Department, as far as I know, has opposed any action which would

jeopardize the interests of the United States under the convention. I am convinced that no action of the United Nations General Assembly will change that or have any effect on it.

I can assure the gentleman that all of the committees that have jurisdiction over, and are interested in, this matter are watching it very carefully.

As the gentleman has correctly said, at the present time in the United Nations there have been efforts made to deal with the Malta resolution. The resolution is under consideration now. What we are asking for is to be sure that the interests of the United States and other coastal States are adequately protected on the question of fisheries, territorial waters, the seabed, and the Continental Shelf. Therefore, I hope while the matter is a pending matter in the United Nations that we can suspend the amendment offered by the gentleman, because it could have a direct effect on the attitudes and votes of the countries involved in that issue.

We will watch it very carefully and be sure that the gentleman's interests are fully protected, and we assure him that we have a continuing and deep interest in this matter, as he has also manifested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PELLY, at the request of Mr. GALLAGHER, was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, in 1967, held hearings on this, and I know of his concern in it. Many Members of Congress introduced legislation expressing their opposition to any transfer of our sovereignty. I certainly do not want to embarrass our representatives in the United Nations, but I want to serve notice on the United Nations that this Congress will not stand idly by and see any of our rights given away without the consent of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to compliment the gentleman for raising a tremendously important issue which we all tend to overlook. I would like to assure him that the Subcommittee on International Movements and Organizations, which I presently chair, does intend to hold hearings on this matter before we proceed any further. I would like to give the gentleman that assurance in the event he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his assurance.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my words to what others have said. We do appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to our attention. This subject has been one in which the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been interested. As a result of the gentleman's action here today, he may be assured that the committee will continue to give

close attention to the situation and will recommend any corrective legislation that may be necessary.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the assurances that I am given, I would like to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and at some later time perhaps I can present my arguments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just received a letter from President Nixon. I understand the minority leader also received a letter. I received it a few minutes ago. It relates to the bill pending before the House. I would like to have the contents of the letter read to the House so that the Members will have in mind the views expressed by the President in his letter to me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to read the letter of the President of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the letter as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I want you to know of my personal conviction that the United States must, in our own long-term interest, continue to provide an adequate level of economic and military assistance to those less developed countries willing to help themselves.

I appreciate that foreign assistance is difficult and vulnerable legislation in a period of severe demands on the Federal budget. However, my request of \$2.2 billion for economic assistance was the lowest such request in the last ten years. It represented roughly one percent of the Federal budget, compared with much higher proportions in the earlier years of this decade. My request for \$425 million of grant military assistance was about the minimum needed to support mutual security arrangements, primarily in Asia.

However, the Foreign Affairs Committee has already reduced my requested authorization by \$416 million in economic assistance and \$25 million in military assistance and has added new programs which compound the extent of the reductions. More particularly:

—The reduction of \$100 million in supporting assistance will severely limit our ability to help finance the cost of "Vietnamization" of the war effort, which is so critical to the success of our overall strategy in that area. Any additional reductions, coming just after the Vietnamese Government has undertaken a draconian set of tax increases which required tremendous political courage, would run a serious risk of our being charged with bad faith. The tightly budgeted supporting assistance request is also required for essential security programs in Laos and Thailand, and for relief in Nigeria.

—The \$116 million cut in authorization of AID programs in Latin America will raise questions about our willingness to continue and improve our support for social progress in this hemisphere. The decisions of the Congress will be made during the course of

an inter-American meeting taking place in Washington designed to lay the basis for closer economic cooperation.

I understand your concern over the need to bring a new approach into our foreign assistance efforts, and I share that concern. As you know, I have appointed a Task Force, under the chairmanship of Rudolph Peterson, to develop just such an approach. I am confident that it will do so and I look forward to proposing a new program to you next year.

In the meanwhile, however, I hope that Congressional leaders will approach this year's decisions on foreign assistance with a full appreciation of the serious consequences of both the reductions so far and any deeper cuts that may be advocated. Such reductions will have virtually no effect on our actual expenditures in FY 1970 because of the lag in actually disbursing the funds, but would have an extremely serious impact on our leadership responsibilities in this important field. I therefore urge you to avoid or minimize further cuts in the bill now before the House.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the views of the President of the United States, without regard to political party or the political party of the President, are always worthy of consideration by the Members of this body.

President Nixon has expressed his views in the letter which has just been read to the House. I concur with his views.

Mr. Chairman, I can remember when foreign aid first started there were those who said that it might go for 1 or 2 years. But I further remember taking the floor and saying that I wanted the RECORD to show that at least one Member realized that this type of activity on the part of our Government will have to continue for many years to come. To me it is the affirmative side of our Government in meeting the challenges that exist in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, whenever I vote for defense legislation or whatever it might be—appropriations for the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Air Force as well as the other elements of our national security, I basically have in mind that that is in connection with the preservation of my country in case of necessity and in case of any attack.

I remember Pearl Harbor. I offered a resolution declaring war the day after Pearl Harbor in this very Chamber. Fortunately, as I said before, several weeks ago, we had time to recover then. We will never have another opportunity to recover again after another attack. So, we have got to be prepared before the fact. Therefore, when it comes to national defense that is vitally important in my mind.

While it is not entirely negative, because our national defense to a great extent helps carry out our policies in the diplomatic field, nevertheless it is related to preservation and it is negative in a sense. But foreign aid has been affirmative. It is the affirmative side of our Government in the challenge that confronts us in the world of today, the affirmative side in connection with our national interests.

I realize the difficulties, I realize the

sensitiveness, and I realize the disappointments in the minds of many of my colleagues, and also in the minds of many of our people throughout the United States, but nevertheless it is the affirmative side in this challenge that exists in the world today—and necessity for it exists just as strong today as it did 10 or 15 or 20 years ago. It is for this basic reason that I have always supported legislation of this type.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 61, line 18, strike out everything following "1970," down through "which amounts" in line 19 and insert in lieu thereof "which amount".

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, when the committee considered the legislation before us, the authorization for supporting assistance was intended to be for 1 year. In error, the bill came out of the committee providing for a 2-year authorization.

This amendment is a corrective amendment to reflect exactly what the committee had done. Therefore, I am presenting it to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. I am hopeful, however, that my amendment will not prevail. We are now in the fifth month of the fiscal year and the 11th month of the calendar year. It makes little sense to authorize supporting assistance funds for the remainder of fiscal 1970 and to have to consider another authorization in a few months, particularly since the bill carries 2-year authorizations for the other parts of the program. It is the consensus of the majority of the members of the committee that a 2-year authorization should be provided for supporting assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I am merely presenting this amendment because it is proper to do so. I hope it will not prevail.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

In light of the situation the gentleman has outlined, and the confusion between the 1- and 2-year provisions in this bill, together with the fact that, as has been pointed out, we are so far advanced into this fiscal year, I would join the gentleman in hoping that his amendment would be defeated. I believe that in the long run this move will effect economies in this program.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 61, beginning in line 17, strike out "\$416,600,000" and all that follows down to, but not including, "shall remain" in line 19, and insert in lieu thereof "\$104,150,000 for the fiscal year 1970, which amount".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no illusion as to what will happen to this amendment.

This is the first of a series of amendments I had intended to offer and may yet offer—I do not know. But the defeat of these first amendments pretty well seals the fate of other amendments to put some financial sanity in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to cut this item by 75 percent in conformity with President Nixon's demand for a 75-percent cut in construction here at home in needed projects—veterans' hospitals, flood control projects, water resource projects—you name it.

If it is good for the people of this country to cut their projects 75 percent, it ought to follow that it is good for foreigners to cut the giveaway program by 75 percent in all its ramifications.

You can stand here today and shed crocodile tears for people around the world, but the truth of the matter is, and you know it, that this Government is in deep financial trouble. Moreover, we have dishied out \$182 billion-plus, including interest on the money, around this world, and we have fewer friends than we had before.

So, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to make the record. Let us see whether it is proposed to make fish of the American people and fowl of foreigners. I simply give you the opportunity to take the President up on his proposition of denying the American people worthwhile projects while he, at the same time, demands additional millions for foreigners.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. Chairman, there may be a little confusion here about this whole thing since the gentleman from Wisconsin offered an amendment which he hopes will be defeated. I find myself in an anomalous situation, wanting the same thing, for perhaps different reasons.

I join in everything the gentleman said about the lateness of the hour, so far as the calendar year and the fiscal year is concerned. It has been very difficult if not impossible for any of the subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to function because we are always tied up in the full committee with the foreign aid bill for the biggest part of the year.

I have never been an advocate of a 2-year authorization for this bill. But by the time this gets through both bodies, it is only going to be a 16- or 17-month authorization, I think. I would like to have some time next year to explore in some depth with my subcommittee, and I know other subcommittees would like to, some of the administration of this act.

Before any of you Republicans get a bit worried about that, let me say that most of the exploration will be done mostly about Democrats because they are the holdovers down there and they are the ones who are running the pro-

gram—presumably they were Democrats when they were appointed—heaven only knows what they might be now.

But I am really concerned that the program is being administered in some countries at least mainly for the benefit of the bureaucracy which runs the show rather than to get the job done. At the risk of being a bore, I will again remind you, and some of you may not even know this, one time a few years ago I made an unannounced trip to Colombia. Nobody knew that I was in the country until I called at the Ambassador's office with a list which had been given to me by the Washington office of 62 people, if my memory is correct, 62 employees of the AID mission and I said I wanted to see all of them. I found out to my amazement, because nobody tipped me off to this—I wanted to see them and find out what they were doing—30 of them were not in the country and some of them had not been there for more than a year. Yet, they were carried on the rolls and carried on the payroll as being employees of the AID agency in Colombia.

Now I get criticized a little bit for traveling. I told a reporter this morning that, as chairman of this subcommittee, if I did the job the way it ought to be done, I would not be here at all. You cannot call them in. My friend from Iowa has said, "Why don't you call them in front of the committee here?"

We had done that, as far as Colombia is concerned, and they said, "These people are there. This is their title. This is what they are doing."

The minority leader may be interested to know that one of them had been at the University of Michigan for 1 year and was separated from the program, but he was still on the rolls and running one of the departments down there.

So I support a 2-year, or 15-month, or 17-month authorization, whatever it is.

I would like to speak for a minute or two further on the bill, since I have not yet spoken on the bill. I find myself pulled in two directions by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). I had prepared an amendment and had offered an amendment which I had hoped would give the President "more flexibility," which tied foreign aid expenditures directly to whatever he should determine he could afford to spend in this country.

My amendment stated that foreign aid shall be cut by whatever percentage the President cuts domestic construction, which meant that, if he suddenly decided he could go 50 percent for that, he could go 50 percent for foreign aid. If we got in such good shape that he could go 75 percent, foreign aid would come up accordingly.

I submitted the amendment to the Parliamentarian and he said that it is not germane. I said to him—and I am going to say it here—we have got ourselves tied up with so many rules and precedents that we cannot legislate. Why should that not be germane? Why should not what is good enough for Americans be good enough for the foreign aid program? Why should not we tie it directly to what the President thinks he can

spend? But I am precluded from offering that amendment, and I have mixed emotions about a total 75-percent cut. I probably will not vote for the bill because of the fact that there is no flexibility and because I do not want any part of this grandiose steal that is written in the bill, which has the misleading title of "OPIC." I do not know what that "OPIC" means, but if it means "OPIC a flaw," I can pick a thousand of them.

Some of you were around here when the RFC was in the law. I say to you that OPIC will make the RFC look like a Sunday school convention, because it would open the gates wide and long and would say, "Come, boys, and help yourselves." So I probably will wind up, for the second time in my life, voting against foreign aid. I probably could support it if we got rid of OPIC. I understand an amendment will be offered to do that.

Depending upon the fate of that amendment, I have an amendment to go to knock out the supergrades they want for OPIC to the number of 20 or so. I feel positive it will prevail, because I think we have agreement on both sides.

But what I got up here to say in the first place was that I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that his amendment should be defeated.

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

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

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

(On request of Mr. Gross, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. In further support of my amendment, I merely wish to read a couple of short paragraphs from my remarks of yesterday:

The Corps of Engineers, for instance, was given by the House only enough money to begin construction of 25 out of a total of 161 needed flood control, water supply, and pollution control projects.

In fiscal 1969, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation delayed or stretched out 139 projects already underway throughout the United States and the corps had to issue 101 notices to contractors that its funds were exhausted.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say I am sympathetic with the gentleman, and what he has read is true. I am very candid, as most of you know by this time. I hoped to get my amendment in to use a little leverage on the President and get him to raise domestic construction. I had a double motive there—in fact, I had more like a single motive, which was to get a little more money into some of these needed projects at home, because I know and you know—and I speak as one with deep knowledge of the subject and for 19 or 20 years a supporter and a loud and strong supporter—that foreign aid is the pet of every President we have had.

If I could have gotten my amendment in, it would have been interesting to see if the President would have been so interested in his foreign aid that he would have relaxed somewhat on his curtailment of the domestic expenditures.

So I must say I stand before this Committee very sad indeed that my amendment was not considered germane.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in general debate, I pointed out not only the purpose of my amendment, but expressed also the hope that it would not prevail. I also pointed out the need and the purpose and the use of the supporting assistance.

Supporting assistance, I stated, was economic aid, but it is related primarily to the advantage of the United States. The United States gets as much, if not more, benefit from it than the recipient country.

If the gentleman's cut of 75 percent will prevail, it will certainly jeopardize the programs of support in Vietnam, and in Laos, and in Thailand.

As the committee knows, \$414,600,000 is authorized in the bill for supporting assistance. This item has been carefully considered in the committee. We have cut it \$100 million below the executive request, but I submit that if we would even for a moment entertain the thought of cutting it to \$104 million, we would be doing great damage to very important programs, particularly in Southeast Asia, where we would be undercutting the efforts of our allies in that area.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's substitute amendment will not prevail.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield very briefly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for a point of clarification. There are two votes involved. One is to vote on the substitute offered by Mr. Gross, cutting the assistance program by three-quarters, since it takes out \$300 million of the \$414 million. That is the first vote. Then the second vote comes on the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin urged should be defeated, so that the program can have a 2-year authorization in line with the rest of the program.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. To further clarify it, I respectfully hope that the committee will vote no in both instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is correct.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote no on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and no on the committee amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned Thailand. Does the gentleman know the Government of that country loaned the U.S. Government \$100 million last year at 6 percent interest? What would be their need?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Iowa asked that question. As the gentleman knows, every country has to maintain a foreign currency reserve. They keep it in the

form of gold or of major foreign currencies. In the case of Thailand and Korea and Taiwan, instead of holding their reserves in gold, they buy U.S. Government securities. I think they are doing us a favor as far as our balance of payments and gold flow are concerned. I would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that I would like to see every country purchase U.S. Government securities as a reserve against their foreign currency requirements.

Furthermore, I might say it does indicate the confidence they have in the United States. If we follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa, that confidence will soon be lost.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised a point. I must advise that 93 percent of the money in supporting assistance programs goes to Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that today we should evaluate the effects of the present foreign aid program. What has been done?

Of course, we realize that the Marshall plan was effective. That was many years ago, and the countries so helped are able now to stand on their feet.

Now, what good is it doing in this hemisphere and throughout the world? What are the results? I have heard very little said about what has been accomplished.

What has been done in El Salvador, for instance, or in Nicaragua? If I remember correctly, we gave El Salvador \$5.8 million in military aid. We also gave the little country of Nicaragua \$6.9 million of military aid. What happened? They engaged in what is called the soccer war, financed by the people of the United States, by the taxpayers here in our country.

I say it is time now for us to bring this senseless way of doing to a halt, to a conclusion.

What happened to India and Pakistan? We had given them hundreds of millions of dollars of military aid. They had a war financed with American taxpayers' money.

Of course, I realize that certain aid to India is necessary. In all fairness, I should like to help the teeming millions. On the other hand, why should we give them military aid? Why should we give that aid to Pakistan, to have another war, when we have seen one? We promoted one or financed one in their countries.

In all the talk I hear of affirmative stances and affirmative positions, I do not hear what conclusions have been reached, what things have been done, or of economic levels which have been raised. I hear nothing, really, of the method by which we have helped these underprivileged countries; and that is through family planning and birth control. We know that in South America

today the population is increasing by leaps and bounds. The simple way of accomplishing foreign aid is by promoting family planning in that area. If we do not do something there are going to be more wars and there is going to be more unrest.

Today the money which we are so wildly spending in these foreign areas could be well used here at home. The taxpayers of America are tired of financing worthless projects in other countries.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, although I have constantly voted against the Foreign Assistance Act each year it comes before the House, I do firmly believe that foreign aid is a valuable tool of foreign policy. If I had been in Congress when the Marshall plan was considered, I would have been a vigorous champion of the program. Such a program was necessary to rebuild the war-torn nations of Europe. But since the Marshall plan was terminated some 18 years ago, foreign aid has been extended to 121 nations and seven territories of the world. During 1970, the foreign aid program will be operating in 99 nations and five territories of the world. The arguments for foreign aid have become so numerous, and in some cases, so complicated, that they have permanently escaped the gravity of realism. For example, it is often argued that foreign aid helps the U.S. economy because the funds given or lent in many cases are spent in the United States.

Today, we consider a bill authorizing \$2.1 billion, however, it must be borne in mind that this is only a small part of the total foreign aid cost. Foreign aid has been fragmented among several programs and this is only a part of the total foreign aid programs which will cost approximately \$10 billion during the next fiscal year. Since 1946, we have spent \$122 billion in foreign aid. To this sum, there must be added the interest cost of \$60 billion, making a grand total of \$182 billion. Although I consider some of the programs worth while I cannot vote for a program of such magnitude.

There has been so much waste in the program, so many mistakes made that it can be seriously questioned whether the program does more good than harm. I firmly believe that the program has too often involved us too closely in the internal affairs of other nations. It has over the long run weakened many of our allies and friends by doing something for them which they should have been doing themselves.

Here we are asked to authorize an additional \$2.1 billion when we have \$19 billion in the pipeline at the present time. Can the Nation afford an additional \$2.1 billion when we see our own domestic programs curtailed in the interest of economy? Can the Nation with a national debt of more than \$360 billion now paying 7-percent interest for the money it borrows afford to authorize

foreign loan programs calling for 2- and 3-percent interest? Should we as Members of Congress authorize another \$2.1 billion in foreign aid and continue to cut back on programs designed to solve the many serious domestic problems we have? Because of the severe demands placed upon available funds we are in fact faced with a choice between the funding of foreign aid programs and the funding of needed domestic programs. In view of the present financial situation, I hope the House will drastically reduce the funds sought to authorize in H.R. 14580 and the Gross amendments now being considered is a good place to start.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to point out, by way of clarification, that I believe the gentleman is talking about military assistance. Of course, that is not the section of the bill on which the amendment before the Committee is based. This is supporting assistance.

To go on for just a moment, to raise other questions, I made some inquiry yesterday, after noting some of the statements made on the floor with respect to the amounts expended over a period of 23 years on foreign aid and the interest said to have been paid on that. Some of the figures I thought were a little conjured up and do not relate to foreign aid. However, even taking the figure on foreign aid of \$182 billion—

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer that now.

I want to assure the distinguished gentleman every figure I quoted yesterday came from our Library of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to give the gentleman one more figure to consider.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is, in this 23-year period—

Mr. CARTER. I have never referred to a 15-year period, but to a 23-year period.

Mr. TAFT. The gentleman is correct, of course. The period involves 1946 up to the present.

Mr. CARTER. That is exactly right.

Mr. TAFT. In that period over \$1 trillion has been spent on the defense budget. Does not the gentleman believe it might be worth while to try to stabilize things in the world a little with a little supporting assistance as proposed in this section of the bill?

Mr. CARTER. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

I feel it is time to cut back and if we cannot show good effects from our spending, then we should bring this to a halt. It certainly should be reorganized or reworked so that it can be helpful to those for whom it is intended. Our taxpayers' money should not be used so as to support wars between AID recipients; rather our efforts should be directed in the paths of peace. Neither should the taxpayers' money be used to prop up the regimes of dictators such as Francois Duvalier who do not know the meaning of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—yeas 26, nays 54.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: Page 42, after line 2, insert the following: "Not more than 10 per centum of the total capital authorized to be paid into the corporation under section 322 shall be loaned under this subsection to a single firm."

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment and I shall be brief. What I propose here is that not more than 10 percent of the capitalization of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC—can be loaned to a single firm. I consider this important so that we can be assured that the resources of OPIC will not go to one or two firms and thereby undermine the entire program that OPIC not be used, with all of its management, personnel, and expenses of operation to serve one or two U.S. firms.

When President Nixon first proposed creation of OPIC and when administration spokesmen appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this idea, we were assured that it would add a new dimension to our foreign assistance program through increased private participation.

I welcome this. As a consistent supporter of foreign aid I have regularly urged increased participation of the private sector in international development. In fact, with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) I coauthored the amendment in 1966 which created the International Private Investment Advisory Council—the forerunner of OPIC.

Now, if OPIC is indeed considered part of this bill and if it does pass and if it is to achieve its goal of broadening the scope of private sector involvement in overseas development which is a highly worthy goal it is essential that its available resources not be given and limited to one or two projects, no matter how desirable they may appear.

Thus the committee adopted amendments I offered to limit to 10 percent the total amount of investment guaranties and investment insurance available to a single firm.

The amendment I am now offering would have the same effect on loan funds.

Unless this amendment is adopted there is the very real danger that one or two massive projects would absorb all available loan funds and preclude OPIC from achieving its goal of expanding private involvement in foreign aid.

Certainly, if the purpose of OPIC is to be realized, it must share its resources

among a number of investors. If it uses all its funds on one or two projects, it will prove an exercise in futility.

This amendment, then, may be looked upon as insurance against disruption of OPIC aims through loans that would be unreasonably large and a distribution of the risk taken. I consider this an essential step if OPIC is to be successful and urge its adoption by the House.

OPIC offers us a new opportunity for international development; we must not permit it to flounder or be used before it begins.

I urge you to limit the loans extended so that no one firm or group will be the recipient of the entire amount available.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. For the purposes of clarification, would it be fair to say that the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to limit to about \$2 million the size of any single contract?

Mr. WOLFF. That is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a supporter of limitations, I really do not see any objection to this amendment.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: Page 32, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through page 53, line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

"SEC. 321. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) In order to facilitate and increase the participation of private enterprise in furthering the development of the economic resources and productive capacities of less developed friendly countries and areas, the President is authorized to issue guaranties as provided in subsection (b) of this section of investments in connection with projects, including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises, in any friendly country or area with the government of which the President has agreed to institute the guaranty program. The guaranty program authorized by this title shall be administered under broad criteria, and each project shall be approved by the President.

"(b) The President may issue guaranties to eligible investors—

"(1) assuring protection in whole or in part against any or all of the following risks:

"(A) inability to convert into United States dollars other currencies, or credits in such currencies, received as earnings or profits from the approved project, as repayment or return of the investment therein, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof,

"(B) loss of investment, in whole or in part, in the approved project due to expropriation or confiscation by action of a foreign government, and

"(C) loss due to war, revolution, or insurrection:

Provided, That the total face amount of guaranties issued under this paragraph (1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$8,500,000,000, and

"(2) where the President determines such action to be important in the furtherance

of the purposes of this title, assuring against loss, due to such risks and upon such terms and conditions as the President may determine, or—

"(A) any loan investment for credit unions where the loan investment is made by a credit union, or an association of credit unions, which is an eligible United States investor, or

"(B) not to exceed 75 per centum of any other investment:

Provided, That guaranties issued under this paragraph (2) shall emphasize economic development projects furthering social progress and the development of small independent business enterprises: Provided further, That no payment may be made under this paragraph (2) for any loss of equity investment arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible, or for any loss of loan investment arising out of fraud or misrepresentation, for which the investor is responsible: Provided further, That the total face amount of the guaranties issued under this paragraph (2) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$550,000,000, and guaranties issued under this paragraph (2) for credit unions shall not exceed \$1,250,000: Provided further, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1972.

"(c) No guaranty shall exceed the dollar value, as of the date of the investment, of the investment made in the project with the approval of the President plus earnings or profits actually accrued on said investment to the extent provided by such guaranty, nor shall any guaranty of an equity investment extend beyond twenty years from the date of issuance.

"(d) The President shall make suitable arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States Government in connection with any guaranty issued under section 321(b), including arrangements with respect to the ownership, use, and disposition of the currency, credits, assets, or investment on account of which payment under such guaranty is to be made, and any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith.

"(e) (1) No guaranty of a loan or equity investment of an eligible investor in a foreign bank, finance company, or other credit institution (hereinafter the 'original investment') shall cover any loss of a loan or equity investment of such bank, finance company, or credit institution; and in no event shall payment be made under any such guaranty except for loss of the original investment, and, where provided for by such guaranty, earnings or profits actually accrued thereon.

"(2) In the administration of this subsection, the eligible investor may be deemed to have sustained a loss of the original investment only if the foreign bank, finance company, or credit institution in which the original investment was made becomes or is likely to become insolvent due to the occurrence of an event against which protection is provided by the guaranty.

"Sec. 322. General Provisions.—(a) A fee shall be charged for each guaranty in an amount to be determined by the President. In the event the fee to be charged for a type of guaranty authorized under section 321 is reduced, fees to be paid under existing contracts for the same type of guaranty may be similarly reduced.

"(b) Except as provided by section 204(d) (4) (B), all fees collected in connection with guaranties issued under section 321(b) or prior investment guaranty authority repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, under sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and under section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1509(b) (3)) (exclusive of fees for informational media guaranties heretofore or here-

after issued pursuant to section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1442), and section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended), shall be available for meeting necessary administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the provisions of sections 321 and 324 (including, but not limited to, expenses pertaining to personnel, supplies, and printing) subject to such limitations as may be imposed in annual appropriation Acts, for meeting management and custodial costs incurred with respect to currencies or other assets acquired under guaranties made pursuant to section 321(b) of this part, sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties) and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties, and shall be available for expenditure in discharge of liabilities under guaranties made pursuant to such sections, until such time as all such property has been disposed of and all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired, or until all such fees have been expended in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(c) In computing the total face amount of guaranties outstanding at any one time for purposes of paragraph (1) of section 321 (b), the President shall include the face amount of outstanding guaranties theretofore issued pursuant to such paragraph, sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, but shall exclude informational media guaranties.

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under section 321(b) of this part or prior investment guaranty authority repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 322(b) (excluding fees required for purposes other than the discharge of liabilities under guaranties) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b) (4) (F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 322(f).

"(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title or similar guaranty authority repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 322(d) of this part.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such amount,

to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(g) In making a determination to issue a guaranty under section 321(b), the President shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States.

"(h) Guaranties committed, authorized, or outstanding under prior investment guaranty authorities repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 shall continue subject to provisions of law originally applicable thereto and fees collected hereafter with respect to such guaranties shall be available for the purposes specified in section 322(b).

"SEC. 323. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this title—(a) the term 'investment' includes any contribution of capital commodities, services, patents, processes, or techniques in the form of (1) a loan or loans to an approved project, (2) the purchase of a share of ownership in any such project, (3) participation in royalties, earnings, or profits of any such project, and (4) the furnishing of capital commodities and related services pursuant to a lease or contract providing for payment in whole or in part after the end of the fiscal year in which the guaranty of such investment is made;

"(b) the term 'expropriation' includes but is not limited to any abrogation, repudiation, or impairment by a foreign government of its own contract with an investor, where such abrogation, repudiation, or impairment is not caused by the investor's own fault or misconduct, and materially adversely affects the continued operation of the project; and

"(c) the term 'eligible investors' means United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners: *Provided further*, That in the case of any loan investment a final determination of eligibility may be made at the time the guaranty is issued; in all other cases, the investors must be eligible at the time a claim arises as well as at the time the guaranty is issued.

"TITLE III—SURVEY OF INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

"SEC. 324. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) In order to encourage and promote the undertaking by private enterprise of surveys of investment opportunities, other than surveys of extraction opportunities, in less developed friendly countries and areas, the President is authorized to participate in the financing of such surveys undertaken by any person on such terms and conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That his participation shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of any such survey. The making of each such survey shall be approved by the President.

"(b) In the event that a person who has undertaken a survey in accordance with this title determines, within a period of time to be determined by the President, not to undertake, directly or indirectly, the investment opportunity surveyed, such person shall turn over to the President a professionally acceptable technical report with respect to all matters explored. Such report shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be entitled to have access

to, and obtain copies of, all underlying correspondence, memorandums, working papers, documents, and other materials in connection with the survey.

"SEC. 325. AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use beginning in the fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this title not to exceed \$2,100,000 which shall remain available until expended.

"SEC. 326. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this title—

"(a) the term 'person' means a citizen of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens; and

"(b) the term 'survey of extraction opportunities' means any survey directed (1) to ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of ore, oil, gas or other mineral, or (2) to determining the feasibility of undertaking operations for the mining or other extraction of any such mineral or for the processing of any such mineral to the stage of commercial marketability."

Page 9, lines 5 and 6, strike out ", section 204(b), and section 322" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and section 204(b)."

Page 11, line 7, strike out "328(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "323(c)".

Page 26, line 11, strike out "The" and all that follows down through the period in line 22.

Page 32, line 6, strike out "328(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "323(c)".

Page 54, immediately before line 1, insert the following:

"TITLE IV—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Page 54, line 24, strike out "Corporation" and insert in lieu thereof "President".

Page 55, lines 19 and 20, strike out "The guaranty reserve established under section 325(c) shall be available to make such payments" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums".

Page 56, line 8, strike out "Corporation" and insert in lieu thereof "President".

Page 56, strike out line 14 down through line 21.

Mr. GROSS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this is a 15-page amendment. If the language in the law should be repealed, if the amendment is adopted, and the language in the bill which creates the Overseas Investment Corporation should be deleted, it is necessary to reinstitute the language now to be found in the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended. This is verbatim to the present provisions of the law as it now exists. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, since it is verbatim to the law as it now exists.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Iowa is asking unanimous consent to have the substitute considered as read and printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I might say that we have had an extensive study of this amendment and we have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Wisconsin is acquainted with the text of the amendment which I offer and

knows it to be the law as it presently exists?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the question is this: Is this amendment to go into effect only if OPIC provisions are deleted from the bill as it now stands?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield; yes. This strikes out the language in the bill creating the Overseas Investment Corporation but would substitute for that language the present law.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: The gentleman from Wisconsin is not objecting to the unanimous-consent request that the amendment be considered as read?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman agree to the amendment?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all right.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have had a tremendous lot of lobbying and propaganda out of Foggy Bottom in behalf of this Overseas Investment Corporation.

I would like to restate what I had to say about this gimmick yesterday.

The AID propagandists, of course, loudly sing the praises of this so-called Corporation and claim that it is the way to take the Government out of the foreign assistance business. Private industry, they say, will run it with private industry's money.

Nothing in this world, Mr. Chairman, could be further from the truth. What these AID people are attempting is to create yet another layer of bureaucratic blubber.

First of all, the foreign aiders have been in the business of guaranteeing the overseas investments of U.S. corporations for 20 years. They have been running an insurance company, in effect, and they have made a profit doing it.

Several years ago they came to the House, bleeding at every pore, insisting that the minimum appropriation they had to have to back this insurance program was \$180 million.

They did not get it, and the American people owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) and his Appropriations Subcommittee for cutting them down to \$30 million.

I am sure that my friend from Louisiana will agree with me that even the \$30 million was unnecessary.

By charging a premium for their in-

surance on foreign investments on the part of U.S. firms, the AID boys have actually accumulated a kitty of \$68 million. They have had to pay out approximately \$12 million for losses suffered by the insured American businesses in these years, and since those same firms paid in approximately \$80 million in insurance premiums, you wind up with a \$68 million fund. But, as you might expect, these bureaucrats are not satisfied. They did not turn over this \$68 million to the Treasury, where it might have been used to reduce the public debt.

There it sits—\$68 million. It is a bewitching sight to a bureaucrat. It is tantalizing. Hypnotic. The urge to spend it is overwhelming, but under the existing rules, the AID boys cannot touch it. What a shame. So what to do?

Why, create a corporation. You take most of the AID employees, who, right now—today—are running this foreign investment guarantee program, and put them on the so-called corporation's payroll. Then you ask for additional employees, create a high-powered and expensive board of directors, and you are almost ready to do the identical business that was being done by AID. Almost, but not quite.

There is the matter of the \$57.4 million of appropriated reserves held by AID. Transfer that to the so-called corporation and you begin operations with more than \$130 million.

But, just in case Members of Congress are suckers enough to fall for it, they, the foreign aiders, are asking for an additional appropriation of \$40 million for a program that, under a different name and with an inflated staff, would have more than a \$130 million surplus the day it is created.

If these people have been able to amass a fund in excess of \$130 million over the years and have sustained only \$12 million in losses, why should we give them another \$40 million?

More than that, why should we permit these empire builders to split off this one, self-sustaining segment of the AID Agency and allow them to add still another costly layer of Federal bureaucratic fat?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my substitute amendment to dispense with this latest gimmick and boondoggle in the foreign handout program.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that yesterday we completed action on a conference report providing for a foreign investment tax, a tax on foreign investments, then today we are asked to set up this arrangement to encourage foreign investment.

Does the gentleman from Iowa think this is an inconsistent position for us to take?

Mr. GROSS. Why, of course. It is one more of the many inconsistencies and contradictions that are the trademark

of this whole nefarious program of trying to finance the world and be all things to all people.

I thank my friend from Michigan for his observation.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is as good a time as any to go into the whole question of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. It appears as though the gentleman from Iowa seeks by his substitute amendment to remove the entire provision for the creation of this corporation.

Let us get this into context. What is this corporation? What is this ogre that has been presented to us this afternoon?

It was determined when the Agency for International Development was first created that there was a desire by various organizations, various businesses, to invest in the underdeveloped countries. Was this bad? No.

As a matter of fact, we sought to encourage private business to go into the underdeveloped countries because the more money that is invested in other countries, the less money the U.S. Government will have to give them or lend them.

So they came to the Agency for International Development and said—"Now, look, we are satisfied to invest in underdeveloped countries, but we want to be secured against confiscation and against appropriation by the various countries. We want to be insured against currency devaluation. We want to be guaranteed against any loss that we may have."

Now we are going to pay a premium for this. So it was determined by the committee that this was a wise thing and so there was sold insurance.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Not now, please.

Mr. HAYS. I might make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I will try to get more time and I will try to answer your question. But please let me finish.

So there was sold insurance to those people who sought to invest in the underdeveloped countries and also guarantees.

It so happens this turned out to be a good business deal. As time went on there was so much business on the part of private industry to invest in the underdeveloped countries that it was felt by the Agency for International Development that there should be a separate division created within that Agency. So the Office of Private Services was created, and the entire consideration and supervision of any loans made or any investment made in underdeveloped countries was handled through this Office of Private Services.

As time went on, it so happened that this Government agency was unable to make decisions fast enough. As a matter of fact, India needed fertilizer plants. But until a decision could be made by the Office of Private Services to lend sufficient money for the building of fertilizer plants by these private companies that wanted to invest there and save this Government money, 18 months elapsed.

This situation has existed throughout the entire administration of the AID. They try their best but they cannot make decisions fast enough. When it was learned that business was becoming reluctant to invest because of their inability to get decisions from the AID the Agency then determined that perhaps there ought to be created a separate corporation and this is what the Office of Private Investment Corporation is. It was created primarily for the purpose of having a business organization that would be able to make a decision quickly so that private industry could get into the underdeveloped countries and invest their money.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Now you know and I know that was not the reason it was set up at all—to get a decision quickly.

You said yourself that it was set up to guarantee that these people would not lose a dime. Now you know, and I have a question—

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Just a moment. Do not tell me that I said—you know. Let me give you an answer to your question.

In the first place, there is no more than 75 percent, and not the entire amount that is guaranteed, and this is by extending the guarantee for which greater premiums are paid. The Government cannot guarantee the entire investment.

Also, there is insurance sold by the Government under the Office of Private Services today which will be transferred to the Office of Private Investment Corporation who would do the very same thing.

This Office of Private Investment Corporation can take over the Office of Private Services practically lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. HAYS. Who is paying for it?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Nobody is paying for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) has expired.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Go ahead.

Mr. HAYS. I have reserved the right to object.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. May I continue?

Mr. HAYS. No, you may not continue. I have the time now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves the right to object.

Mr. HAYS. I may or may not object, I do not know yet.

But I want to make a couple of points here myself. Do you know—and this is a question I want to ask you—do you know of any place that a private corporation that may be in business or may be set up as a risk business, a capital risk corporation, that wants to operate in this country can go to get their investment insured—and whether they pay a premium or not? You know there is no such place.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Will the gentleman permit me to answer?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I will be happy to have you answer.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In the first place, if there is any private organization that is willing to risk its money in the underdeveloped countries, and we seek by this entire foreign aid bill to prevent revolution and prevent communism and to try to help these underdeveloped countries—we say, "Go ahead—you invest. We have tried to do all we could to sell guarantees or insurance to protect private investment." What is wrong with that?

Mr. HAYS. Are you telling me that these corporations that want to be guaranteed are going into these countries because they really want to get in there and make foreign aid work, or are they going in to make a profit?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. No, they are going in there to make money, and it is in the interest of the U.S. Government and in the interest of the taxpayers to get these private corporations to invest their money in the underdeveloped countries and thereby save them taxes.

Mr. HAYS. At no risk to themselves.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. They are paying for the guarantees.

Mr. HAYS. They are paying a premium. If I could get the Government to guarantee me a profit for my farming operation, believe me, I would be delighted to pay a premium.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, except that profit for your farm is not in the interest of the U.S. Government. Also remember that they still have to retain a 25-percent equity in their investment.

Mr. HAYS. I am still reserving the right to object, and, if the regular order is asked for, I will object. Let me say I think it is more in the interest of the U.S. Government to see that I make a profit than to see that some company makes a profit in Bulgaria or in some other country.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Twenty-five percent of the risk is taken by the private investor.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from New York for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to serve notice that I believe 5 minutes is sufficient for any Member to defend his amendment on the floor, and I am going to object to any further requests for additional time.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Anyhow, what happened was that this corporation was

created for the purpose of taking over the burden of the Office of Private Services; and, to make sure that there are safeguards, there is created a board of directors that may make a decision when the time arises for a proposal to be made by a private corporation. That is basically the reason for the private corporation.

On the board of directors you would have a representative of labor, a representative of small business, and a representative of cooperatives. The policy of the corporation will be laid down by the Secretary of State. They are to follow the policies of the U.S. Government. What is wrong in allowing these corporations to go into the underdeveloped countries for the purpose of making a profit? It is true that at the same time the U.S. Government has made profits as a result of the premiums they have received for selling insurance and selling guarantees.

The Office of Private Investment is taking over the Office of Private Services so that it can be run practically so that a decision will not have to wait 18 months before a private business will invest.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am wondering whether this section does not really mean we are saying to business firms, "Heads you win, tails the U.S. Government loses?"

Mr. FARBSTEIN. If that is so, then the Office of Private Services exists for the same purpose. The Office of Private Services sells guarantees and has the very same service, but when it is given the name "Office of Private Investment Services," everybody suddenly seems to become disturbed.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. It has been said or implied that this guarantee would guarantee a profit. That is not the case, is it?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. MONAGAN. This is a guarantee against certain specific risks—inability to convert, losses through expropriation or confiscation due to war, and so forth.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is correct, except that extended guarantees, when they are paid for, will guarantee them against loss.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the decision of the committee to recommend establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation was considered in great detail by the committee, that hearings were held both in the full committee and in the subcommittee on this point, and a decision was made that there should be a change in the present structure so as to improve the opportunities for business to participate and help those countries?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is exactly correct.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this Overseas Private Investment Corporation empire is built, will it also have—as the International Monetary Fund had to have—a golf course and lush country club out in Maryland to take care of its well-paid employees?

So I say, Mr. Chairman, we are building up an ogre that simply does not exist. This is simply an extension of the present Office of Private Services. It is just that we are trying, by this function, to take care of investments by private corporations which will have the assistance of the Federal Government in order that our foreign policy may be continued.

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

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

ARAB REFUGEE CAMPS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I refer to chapter 4, section 401, page 59, lines 17 to 25 inclusive, which reads as follows:

"(g) No contributions by the United States shall be made to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East except on the condition that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving military training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army or any other guerrilla type organization or who has engaged in any act of terrorism.

This is a restatement of the present law. This prohibition has been rendered a nullity by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. It has been honored in the breach rather than in the observance. It is a dead letter. The officials of this organization and those others in the U.N. and our State Department who may be held responsible or partly responsible, should be condemned for their flouting the law.

We are now told that some 14 out of 15 of the Palestine refugee camps in Lebanon are in the control of guerrillas and members of the Palestine Liberation Army. Thus our money is being used to maintain these refugee camps which, in turn, are used for recruiting soldiers to attack Israeli settlements. Our moneys are used to lend encouragement to El Fatah and Arab marauders who bomb marketplaces, buses, and homes that take the lives of the innocent.

These camps have cost us since 1948 to date \$471,618,000. The authorization for the current fiscal year will be \$23 million, that is about 53 percent of the total cost of maintenance of these camps. Heretofore our contribution has been 70 percent. Surely we must direct our attention to this vast outlay which has accomplished little or nothing, but on the contrary has brought about genuine evil. The number of refugees has not diminished.

The number has yearly been augmented. Many are in these camps who

are not really refugees. Ration cards are often bought and sold. Many are self-supporting. They should be weeded out. No accurate assessment has been made by the United Nations Relief and Work Agency. The latter has a ridiculous working rule: "once a refugee always a refugee." Refugee status is handed down from the original refugees to their children and their children's children and all subsequent generations. This definition is absurd.

The United States helps pay for the education of children of refugees in the schools inside these camps. In these schools are taught hatred and animosity of the Israelis. The children are saturated with anti-Israel propaganda—and we in part pay for such so-called education.

Reassessments indeed are in order. More light must be shed upon this situation.

Warning is hereby given to this extent: That if conditions in these camps do not materially change for the better, most drastic legislative measures will be taken. Presently no amendments to the present language of the bill as far as these camps are concerned. But our patience is not inexhaustible.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. Chairman, the private investment provisions of the foreign aid bill have been around for a good many years. Really the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the very beginning of foreign aid wrote in the section on investment guarantees. Private enterprise has been part and parcel of the foreign aid program since it began in 1948 and has made a great contribution.

Many people in this House hope the day will arrive when we can get foreign aid off the taxpayers' back and move in other directions. Private enterprise can contribute to this effort, one of the major new elements in this program this year is the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. This was sent up by President Nixon, in the hope that there would be some new directions to the foreign aid program.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is one of the important elements in this new direction in foreign aid, and the other aspect of the new direction is the new emphasis on technical assistance.

This is not something just dreamed up in order that private enterprise can cash in on and make a lot of new money out of the foreign aid program. This is a new effort by the present President, in the hope that it will be possible to move private enterprise further in the direction of investing in the underdeveloped countries. This ought to cut down the foreign aid burden.

I hate to see this effort get sidetracked in arguments about building a new agency or building a new bureaucracy. This is something that is an experiment. This new Government corporation will help us to move private enterprise further and further into the area

which is now being financed with foreign aid funds, so that we can relieve the American taxpayer.

I hope before we vote we take this fact into consideration.

This is nothing new. This is not a boondoggle. It is an effort to move private capital in this country deeper and deeper into foreign aid so we can give some relief to the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This year, for the first time, the President of the United States, in his message to the Congress on foreign assistance, made clear the commitment of our people and our Government to the development process.

There just is not enough money from public sources in this country or any of the developing nations to do the job, so in order to inspire and stimulate the transfer of capital, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation has been proposed in order to stimulate foreign investment in developing nations.

The President this year placed three new emphases on the foreign aid bill.

The first placed greater emphasis on multilateral channels.

The second called for intensification of our efforts in technical assistance.

The third was the proposal of this device to stimulate and to encourage private investment to contribute to development of the LDC's.

This legislative proposal which is before us now is a direct result of action taken by this House not long ago when it created the International Private Investment Advisory Council. That group recommended the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. The Pearson Commission conceptually endorsed the idea. The recent Rockefeller report also noted the importance of private investment.

A number of other countries—Great Britain, France, Germany—already have similar government corporations.

I believe we would err if we do not give the President of the United States the opportunity to marshal private resources for development through the creation of the OPIC.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. If the transfer of the development functions goes over to this private organization, is it not true that the administrative costs will not be charged to the Agency of International Development for the carrying on of that part of the program?

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. FASCELL. And that all administrative costs would then be borne within the framework of the premiums and other charges made for the issuance of investment guarantees within the corporation? One of the primary benefits, in addition to getting business management input into the program, is the fact that administrative costs would be lifted from the AID agency.

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. As has been suggested earlier, the House—and indeed the Congress—for years have been attempting to involve private enterprise more and more in the matter of assisting the developing nations. In the past I believe we have done well in this respect.

It seems to me that OPIC is another logical step forward. I would therefore urge the defeat of the amendment proposed to strike it out.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am seeking guidance on this. We would all like to see more private initiative in this whole field of foreign aid. What disturbs many of us is whether it is genuinely private enterprise and initiative when the Government is guaranteeing losses. I should like to get some feeling as to what the limit of these losses could be. If the Government is simply going to put billions and billions of dollars into guaranteeing losses, it cannot be called private initiative, because private initiative means not only the opportunity to make money but also the risk of losing money. I cannot see how we can get one without the other.

Mr. MORSE. If I may respond, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation would administer two programs. One is an insurance program which would insure the investor against three specific kinds of risks; expropriation, loss of convertibility, and the losses due to war.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MORSE. Second is the extended guarantee program. By the time this activity gets underway there will be investments of about \$200 million for which, under the act, there will be a requirement of a 25-percent reserve. That is one of the principal reasons for the requirement for funds.

These are extended guarantees. It is not carte blanche by any stretch of the imagination. It does not guarantee profits. It merely guarantees against losses including commercial risks.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to point out that the present U.S. guarantee program already has shown a profit of some \$36 million on the payments made over the losses. That is why I support OPIC.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I support the Government guarantee program for private investment and still will. But what this OPIC is doing is adding another layer with another

set of bureaucrats on top of what is already there. I must say, if any of you read the morning paper about a certain delightful gambler who was losing his money in Reno and said it was a Member of Congress who very dextrously picked his pocket to prevent him from losing more money, I must say that I have no idea who it was, but the gentleman from Florida verbally was very dextrous in picking the Government's pocket and saying that this was not going to cost anything to the taxpayers because it is simply transferring it from one pocket to another. It is going to cost the taxpayers, and let nobody be fooled about that.

Now, if we are going to have this great OPIC thing—and I have a real strong feeling that this is a great exercise in futility, because I have a deep feeling that the House Subcommittee on Appropriations is not going to fund this thing, anyway, so we might as well save our breath about it. I get that feeling from more than just reaching up and getting it out of the air. If they are not going to fund it, forget about it. And I do not think they will. If they do fund it, there is provision in there to pay for another layer of bureaucrats except this time they are going to have a Government corporation set of bureaucrats.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to you. I would like you to yield to me, though. You did not yield to me. I reserved the right to object and yield to you.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In connection with your statement that this will be another layer of gook. I thought I had said that this corporation is going to take over the Office of Private Investment Service and do all the work that they are doing now. They are going to try to make it so that it will run in a businesslike fashion and will do the job better.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there has never been a bureaucracy set up in this city in the history of this country which has ever been taken over by another one? They all go on together. I can cite you chapter and verse on that. You know the War Claims Commission set up to settle claims in World War I is still in business at the same old stand, with the same number of bureaucrats, doing the same old thing. Only God knows what claims they are settling now. The last I heard of was they were settling Bulgarian claims. If they run out of them, we will find that they are settling something else. I am not picking on the War Claims Commission, but I just happen to know about that.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. With you there I am sure they will watch their step.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think that my being there will have a thing to do with it, because I have had very little influence over them so far. I have very little influence over the way the AID agency spends money. If I had my way, there would be a lot of programs that they would not have funded. If I had my way, there would not be a lot of people on the payroll that are there.

Since you brought that up, let me tell you another little experience I had down in Bogotá. Of the people who were there I interviewed some of them and one of them was a policeman from, of all places, Albuquerque, N. Mex. I think he was from down in the Southwest somewhere, anyway. I said to him, "What are you doing down here?" He said, "I am training the police here on how to be good policemen." I said, "What salary are you getting?" He said, "\$16,000 a year and housing allowances." I said, "What did you get back in Albuquerque?" He said, "\$7,200." I said, "Well, this is a much better job, is it not?" And he said, "It beats the hell out of Albuquerque."

And you can bet that this new crop of bureaucrats that OPIC is going to spawn, if it ever passes, is going to beat what they have now, whatever they are and whoever they are and wherever they come from.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) passes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 24, noes 48.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOLFF. What we are voting on now is to limit the amount of investment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the vote will be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: Page 38, line 6, strike out "thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty".

Page 38, lines 8-12, strike out all that follows the word "regulations" down through "thereof:" on line 12, page 38.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not take very long. I think there is general agreement about it.

Since OPIC has passed, all this does is take some of the icing off the cake. The icing was about an inch thick and I am paring it down to about a half-inch thick. They had in there, despite all you heard about bureaucracy, 35 supergrades which we were authorizing for them and God only knows how many below the supergrades.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to accept the amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say that during the markup of this bill the com-

mittee was very careful in trying to cooperate as much as possible with the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service headed by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

Mr. HAYS. If you use all my time, will you help me obtain additional time?

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say that as far as the committee is concerned, we will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HAYS. I am not one to overplead my case.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I just want to keep this automobile on the right road and the train on the right track.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman going to accept the amendment?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will bear with me, I am satisfied that this amendment should be accepted, but there is only one point that I want to make. If you are going to run a business you want people who know how to run a business. In this instance you want people who are able to run a business of \$60 million or \$80 million or \$100 million.

Mr. HAYS. I do not yield any further to the gentleman. The gentleman is making a speech on my time. The gentleman did not say that this was a \$60 million or \$80 million or \$100 million corporation. The gentleman said it was a \$20 million corporation. I happen to know that if you have enough chiefs around here you have got to have enough Indians to support them. So, what I am trying to do with this little \$20 million corporation is to cut the supergrades down to about 15 and that is about one for every \$1 million and that ought to be enough.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to say on behalf of the minority that I have been consulted about this matter and agree to it.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I was beginning to think I was the minority.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is most interesting. This bill is supposed to be sacrosanct, perfect, and not be altered in any way. Where is my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), the distinguished minority leader, who said the committee bill is a good bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Maybe I can set something straight on this.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman if he can.

Mr. HAYS. I am a very pragmatic fellow. I know when I am licked. And this was part of a little deal that I made with some of the leadership around here to get a little something into this bill that would help the poor old taxpayer. I made a little deal that, since the year is almost gone anyway that I would support the 2-year extension for getting rid of some of these supergrades. That is the answer.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. I know the gentleman from Iowa is the ranking member on the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Manpower. I know how strongly the gentleman feels about the increase in supergrades in Government employment. The gentleman from Iowa knows that I myself offered the amendments during the markup to eliminate most of the supergrades in the bill, in consultation with the gentleman from Iowa, and in consultation with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

I took it upon myself when the bill was introduced personally to write a letter to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and send him a copy of the bill, and told the gentleman that I was going to cooperate with him, and I intend to.

So I do not believe this is any deal. I believe this is just following the regular procedure of cleaning the bill up as far as supergrades are concerned, and I am relying on the good judgment of the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) to supply the proper supergrades to operate the Agency after it comes into effect.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for offering the amendment. The gentleman knows I would have offered it if he had not done so, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) was also prepared to offer an amendment.

But the thing that amazes me is the fact that this is a perfect bill. It is not to be altered yet here are amendments to give it 2 years of life instead of 1.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, some imperfections stand out, and this was one we came upon, and we were able to convince a lot of people.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONAGAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONAGAN: Page 32, beginning in line 7, strike out "as well as" and all that follows down through the word "mortgages" in line 12.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple but important.

When the amendment to this section was proposed in committee I opposed it because I thought the language indefinite. I now have moved to take from the bill a portion of the language which was added in committee for this same reason. This language begins on line 7 of page 32 and proceeds to the end of the sentence on line 12.

Guarantees in the amount of \$130 million are authorized under this section and it certainly is important that the language authorizing the guarantees be clear. I submit that such is not the case with the language which I propose to remove. What are "investments made to strengthen the programs"? What is the "mobilization of local savings"? How does an institution engage "directly or indirectly" in this occupation?

As a trustee of the taxpayers of this country can the Overseas Private Investment Corporation determine what the Congress had in mind from this language? I cannot do so and I am sure that no administrator would be able to do so.

The insurance against loss is controversial in itself, even where its limits are fully understood, but it is doubly and trebly controversial in a case like this where the limits are vague and indefinite.

In the interest of the soundness of the investment guarantee program, which I believe to be a progressive innovation, I submit that the language in question should be removed from the bill.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept the amendment. We have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment, either.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: Page 4, after line 18, insert the following:

"Sec. 104. It is the sense of the Congress that it is of paramount importance that long-range economic plans take cognizance of the need for a dependable supply of raw materials for developing countries and for free world use, which is necessary to orderly and stable development and growth, and that dependence not be placed upon sources which are inherently hostile to free countries and the ultimate well-being of economically underdeveloped countries and which might exploit such dependence for ultimate political domination. It is further the sense of the Congress that agencies of government in the United States should work with other countries in developing plans for basing development programs on the use of the large and stable supply of raw materials available in the free world. It is further the sense of the Congress that, after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, no prohibition should be imposed or continued against any nation in the supplying of raw materials, without the express approval of the Congress."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to insure for the developing countries and the free world an adequate supply of raw materials.

If you will look at page 160 of the Foreign Affairs Committee report, there is set out section 647, which speaks of a dependable fuel supply. My amendment takes the same language that is at present in the provision of the Foreign Aid Act on fuels and applies it over to raw materials. It also adds on, what you might say this is the Rhodesia sanction part of the amendment.

It says further:

It is further the sense of the Congress that, after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, no prohibition should be imposed or continued against any nation in the supplying of raw materials, without the express approval of the Congress.

This portion says that there should be no sanctions imposed by act of the Executive alone without the approval of the Congress. This portion also provides that the present Executive order which imposed sanctions on Rhodesia by the previous administration can be continued after the date of this act with the express consent of the Congress.

The Congress should assert our right to approve or disapprove the waging of economic warfare against any country or people, the purpose of which is to condemn any people to poverty, privation, and want, with the purpose of starving civilian populations into submission. Under the present Executive order, there can be violations punished with 10 years in prison and \$10,000 fine, simply through an Executive order without any approval of the criminal provisions by the Congress nor any statute authorizing such severity.

The U.S. policy backing a British policy where by order in council in 1966 that has wiped out the structure of the government in Rhodesia and assign absolute control of the government in London and reduced Rhodesia to a Crown Colony status. They never were a crown colony.

I am pleased to say that the National Republican Congressional Committee has made this question the "issue of the day" in their release of November 19, 1969. This issue of economic warfare against the people of Rhodesia has been made the Republican congressional prime issue for November 19, 1969.

Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly points out that U.S. sanctions have imperiled our U.S. vital supply of defense oriented materials, metals, based on alloys with chromite.

As a result of the U.S. policy of economic sanctions against the people of Rhodesia, our industries are having to buy chromite at 50 percent more cost than our previous cost of supply of chromite from Rhodesia. Our Russian contract runs out in 1970 and the United States now has less than a year's stockpile of chromite in this country for our necessary steel making. Chromite ore is necessary in manufacture of stainless steel and alloys. U.S. industry badly needs chromite for use in steel for our jet planes and aerospace engines and our atomic reactors. Not only U.S. defense industries, but fabricating and manufacturing industries of all kinds are being seriously affected by this U.S. policy.

Fifty percent higher prices for chromite means inflation and more inflation in the United States.

U.S. companies own mines and refineries in Rhodesia. Right now there are 207,000 tons of U.S.-owned chrome ore on U.S. company property in Rhodesia that cannot be brought into this country to meet the acute U.S. shortage and keep chrome prices from going even higher. Amazingly, there comes into this country from any country other than Rhodesia at \$15 to \$35 a ton higher prices than delivery can be made by U.S. suppliers with U.S.-owned chrome already mined and now on U.S.-company-owned property in Rhodesia.

Other countries must chuckle, but rake in the profits.

I certainly think this is a crazy policy, and I want it changed. My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that we not think the present Executive order imposing economic sanctions on the peoples of Rhodesia should be continued beyond the signing of this act for U.S. foreign aid without approval of the Congress, and likewise my amendment expresses the sense of Congress that no further prohibition in the form of economic sanctions by the United States should be imposed or maintained without the express authorization of the Congress.

Are we in the U.S. Congress, as well as the U.S. Senate, going to be left out of such basic foreign policy decisions completely? My answer to that question is, No. We need chrome to protect our U.S. defense, and to supply our U.S. basic industries, as well as to prevent inflation. At least, let us bring the chrome in that is mined by U.S. companies in Rhodesia. U.S. sanctions against our own U.S. industries which benefit foreign industries, and raise U.S. prices by 50 percent, causing further inflation through higher prices, is completely absurd.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, never before in the history of mankind has there been demonstrated such shortsighted generosity as our expensive, badly executed, unrealistic, uncontrolled, and uncontrollable foreign aid giveaway program. This is the only Federal aid program I know of that does not exert Federal control along with the granting of Federal funds.

Since its inception, we have dished out \$182 billion, counting the interest we have paid on the money we have borrowed to give away, to over 100 of the 120 nations on the face of the earth, and we have less international respect and fewer friends than we did when we started this runaway boondoggle.

IMPORTANT TRUTHS

The public debt of the United States stands at more than \$360 billion. The annual interest alone on that debt is more than \$18 billion.

Interest on Federal borrowing is now more than 7 percent. Compare this with the rate at which loans are now made under foreign assistance—2 percent for

the first 10 years and 3 percent for the next 30 years.

Federal taxes are at their highest level to say nothing of State and local taxes. We hear with increasing frequency of a taxpayers' revolt. If the taxpayers knew the full story of the extravagance and waste in this program, the threat would be even more real.

With the increased unsettled conditions abroad, how much longer can defenders of this program argue that it is in our national interest; that it will promote security and development? Many of the recipients of our largesse are destroying their resources and themselves at a rate faster than we can try to save them.

Three countries that have been receiving, and will continue to receive, funds under this bill—Thailand, Korea, and Taiwan—are now lending money to the United States at 6-percent interest.

Let us tell these hard truths to our constituents and see what kind of a response we get on how to vote on this grab bag.

FRIEND OR FOE?

What has this program done for the United States? Take a look at the \$9 billion given India since 1952.

The masses of India are poorer than ever. India's turn to the left has been even more dramatic. India is talking about raising its relations with North Vietnam to the ambassador level. India consistently opposes the United States in the United Nations, and not the least concern of Congress should be the matter that India has used the U.S. funds to finance two-thirds of its own foreign assistance program.

This year's foreign aid assistance bill contains funds for such projects as a \$40 million water desalting plant in Israel. One Member said, "Israel needs the water and this plant should do a lot for Israel."

I say the U.S. taxpayers need the \$40 million and it would do a lot for U.S. communities. For that matter, I can think of several New Mexico communities that also need water and would not be opposed to the installation of such a facility right here on U.S. soil.

CONCERN FOR THE HUNGRY?

To those who ask me, "Do you not care about the poor or the hungry people of Africa or India?" I reply, of course, I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about the poor overburdened taxpayers of America who are stuck with the bill for the irresponsible waste involved in these aid programs. At a time when we have millions of hungry and uneducated Americans in our own country, why do we not give them some aid? How about feeding them and educating them first? Why do we not look after our own family before we start trying to raise the living standards of the world?

PROPOSED SOLUTION

We must initiate drastic reductions in foreign aid in all instances, except where technological and military assistance is necessary to the defense of the free world and is economically advantageous to the United States. We must initiate some

tough-fisted management over it. We must use commonsense in our administration of it and curb its waste and mismanagement.

We can do this by restricting grants to the careful distribution of surplus farm products to friendly underdeveloped countries to fill hungry bellies, by providing needed medicines to the sick, and by providing technological assistance and instruction to those who show a willingness and desire to help themselves. Our money and equipment sent to countries needing help should be only to non-Communist countries, and this should not be grants; rather it should be in the form of sound, hard, reasonable interest-bearing loans, backed up with collateral, and to be repaid according to a specified, sensible, businesslike schedule.

Mr. Chairman, it is an unforgivable disgrace, indeed, for a country with a national debt greater than all the countries of the world combined, to continue to tax our people to give away our goods to try to buy friends among people who readily turn against us when the till goes empty and the chips are down. Any supporter of this wasteful throwaway program, who has one hungry child or one depressed business in his district, should hang his head in shame if he continues to vote funds that are to be so irresponsibly spent. How absurd, how ignorant can we get when we throw our money away so foolishly?

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to deal with a particular problem related to one of our raw materials supplied to us, but his amendment is so broad, it would be disastrous and crippling to the President in carrying out his responsibility in the conduct of our foreign policy. One of the reasons the League of Nations failed was that we tried to apply sanctions against Italy after its invasion of Ethiopia, and such pressures as are reflected in the gentleman's concern began to crumble the sanctions. Ultimately we ended up doing nothing, and we moved into World War II.

Under the language proposed, the President would be barred from imposing restrictions on the imports from Communist countries and it would bar the President from dealing with a whole variety of foreign policy situations. I do not think it is in the interest of our foreign policy that the President should have this broad-scale attack on his authority or power merely in the interest of one particular raw material problem.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota. This would seem to be in direct conflict with the authority already provided the President in such legislation as the Import Control Act, the Munitions Control Act, the U.N. Participation Act, and the Trading With the Enemy Act.

True, this language does say it is the sense of Congress that boycotts should

not be imposed or continued without express approval. So apparently the President could thumb his nose at the Congress in spite of this language, if it were enacted. But it would be a most unfortunate development if we should even seem to be changing or limiting authority which we have taken deliberately in certain areas, specifically with respect to the United Nations and the situation in Rhodesia.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been quite frank that he wants the boycott against Rhodesia lifted, but I think it would be most inadvisable for us to use that method to try to achieve that objective.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Is it not also true that in a matter of this consequence, which would change the whole basic approach to our policy toward Africa, any measure of this magnitude ought to be considered most carefully in hearings and debated on its merits rather than accepting it as an amendment to the foreign aid bill dealing with one commodity?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I do. And as I said before I think the effort is to solve one particular problem, and it threatens to adversely affect the whole foreign policy power of the President.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The trouble is the real thrust of what happens here is something entirely extraneous to the issue.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. It would seem to me that adoption of the amendment would be construed as hostile action directed at the entire United Nations structure, the United States participation in the United Nations and, further than that, it would be construed by the black community in the United States as a hostile action toward it, for this community has great interest in the problem of Rhodesia.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. As has been pointed out by Dean Acheson, the former Secretary of State, the first effect of these sanctions is on the black community in Rhodesia.

These sanctions cause hardship and distress, unemployment and suffering on the families of the black population, and the poor whites in the lowest economic group of Rhodesia. The time has come for United States foreign policy to stop being based on the starvation and repression of poor people, and forced economic depression and reduced standards of living, through economic warfare. This exercise of economic warfare abroad is just like the starvation imposed on a

striker's families, which is no longer tolerated in the United States.

Rhodesia has increased its gross national product in the past year by 10 percent. So the policy of sanctions is not a success but a ghastly error against our best humanitarian instincts.

As for me, when the United States is fighting economic warfare abroad, I want the U.S. Congress to have something to say about committing the American people to such an expensive, cruel, and unnecessary course of action, which has proved so unsuccessful even in wartime.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I represent a district that needs chrome to make stainless steel, but I feel very strongly this is the wrong way to help my district obtain the chrome to maintain the steel output.

This amendment would conflict with the President's authority under section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act to take action in the U.N. Security Council decisions. The result could effectively prohibit the United States from fulfilling its obligations under the United Nations Charter. It would potentially apply to all countries, not just Rhodesia.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not related at all to the Foreign Assistance Act. It is very unwise to include it in the Foreign Assistance Act, such provisions which deal with such unrelated problems.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not innocent enough to think the Senate is going to bring this amendment, but I certainly think this House should, as the sense of Congress, urge that it be considered, so before any further economic sanctions are put on, we will get some more attention. That is why I am bringing it up now, so we can discuss it. I hope we will have a division so we can show some support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 25, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: On page 20, line 4, strike "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$75,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1971, \$100,000,000."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this is a part of the bill that the 2-year authorization was not offered on or it did not pass—I do not recall which—in the committee. This particular section very briefly deals with the population control legislation amendment. I propose to cut

it from \$100 million for this fiscal year and to authorize the \$100 million that they asked for for next fiscal year.

The reason I propose to cut it in this fiscal year is because they have said they cannot usefully spend that much money. There is no point in authorizing it if they cannot usefully spend it. They have said that \$75 million is the maximum they can usefully use, and I suspect that will be cut somewhat by the appropriating committee. So this just makes it a 2-year authorization with a \$25 million cut.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the committee will be willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give strong support to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS). I proposed to offer such an amendment myself, in view of the 2-year provisions and in view of the fact that some of the year has already passed.

I should like to point out once again, as I did yesterday, that this has been an increasing earmarking proposition, and I believe there is no part of the foreign aid bill as to which it is more necessary to have some such earmarking. Under the stimulus of earmarking we authorized \$35 million 2 years ago, \$50 million last year, and now we hope \$75 million this year, and then \$100 million in fiscal 1971. I believe we will see a redirection of some of the efforts of the AID organization in this direction as a result.

It is a program that is absolutely essential to many other programs in the developing countries which are affected. Otherwise, the population will increase more than any possible benefits which might come from those other programs.

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

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say that the gentleman did most of the work on this amendment in the committee. It was his original amendment that was adopted. Previously during the debate he came over to me and said he had an amendment similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Again I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), for going along with the intent of the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask a question. First I should like to commend the gentleman for his leadership in the committee on this vital area.

Is the gentleman satisfied in accepting or endorsing this amendment that the program would not spend the full funding at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I am convinced of that as to the first year. Of course, we have only the period between now and June 30,

1970, to which to apply the \$75 million figure. As a matter of fact, there was some testimony very much along that line, and on that I base my judgment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman—

Technically and socially, the world is now better equipped to deal with population problems than in the past. Recent research has produced new and better methods of contraception; an increasing number of nations has initiated and expanded family planning programs. Improvement in the world food supply has brought some additional time in which answers can be found to high fertility and the economic and social problems it endangers.

This paragraph comes from the 1969 AID report of population program assistance.

However, we have really only scratched the surface. The Republican task force on earth resources and population has heard from numerous experts in this area of population program assistance to developing countries. The need for a research breakthrough in contraceptive methods is urgent. The need for better delivery services of present contraceptive devices is urgent. More trained people, more facilities, more materials all are needed. We cannot afford to ignore the population problems of the developing countries. They simply do not have the capabilities to do this job themselves. They definitely have the desire to achieve stable population levels. The United Nations has appointed a Commissioner for Population within the United Nations development program. Secretary General U Thant said in January of this year:

There is ever-increasing realization that too rapid population growth constitutes a major obstacle to education and the promotion of the welfare of the young in general, the attainment of adequate standards of health, the chance of earning a decent living, and in many cases even the availability of food at subsistence level.

AID Administrator Dr. John Hannah said:

Overpopulation and underdevelopment go hand in hand. World Bank President, Robert McNamara said: "No achievable rate of economic growth can be sufficient to cope with an unlimited proliferation of people on our planet."

Let us think seriously about the children of the world. No other aspect of explosive population growth such as the world now has is more frightening than the number of dependent children. As the growth rate continues more and more humans are dependent on fewer and fewer providers. How can we seriously believe that we will have stronger and healthier generations if we continually have more mouths to feed and nourish than there are people to provide the food and nourishment. The large number of dependent children relative to the number of members of the labor force increases the burden of dependency, tends to promote spending for immediate consumption, to restrict both private and public saving and hence to inhibit productive investment. Also, the cohort of young men and women entering the years of fertility each year is significantly larger in the less developed countries, perhaps three times as great than the

number of older people growing out of the age of fertility during that year. This then further drives the population growth rate up more dramatically.

In his population message last July, President Nixon said:

When future generations evaluate the record of our time, one of the most important factors in their judgment will be the way in which we responded to population growth. Let us act in such a way that those who come after us—even as they lift their eyes beyond earth's bounds—can do so with pride in the planet on which they live, with gratitude to those who lived on it in the past, and with continuing confidence in its future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments which are similar. One is for \$15 million, one is for \$7 million, and one is for \$12.9 million to do this same thing. I will explain the amendments. One of them relates to American schools abroad, one to the Indus Basin, and the other to the President's contingency fund.

All they would do is to provide the same amount for next year as we are authorizing for this year.

To save the time of the Members and to permit other Members to get the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the amendments en bloc.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman not put a cut in each one of those items?

Mr. HAYS. I would like to. If some Member wanted to offer an amendment to cut them I would not object. They are small amounts.

Let me say that the President's contingency fund, \$15 million, is the lowest it has been in my memory. If I offered an amendment to cut it I probably would be accused of being political, and I am not. I really think it is about as low as it ought to go.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there is more than \$18 billion in the pipeline.

Mr. HAYS. I am aware of that. This is a very small amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HAYS: Page 29, line 19, immediately after "President" insert "(1)".

Page 29, line 22, immediately before the period insert the following: ", and (2) for the fiscal year 1971, \$12,900,000, to remain available until expended".

Page 58, line 23, immediately after "\$7,530,000," insert the following: "and for use in the fiscal year 1971, \$7,530,000."

Page 62, line 16, immediately after "\$15,000,000" insert the following: ", and for the fiscal year 1971 not to exceed \$15,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes.

The same arguments apply to these amendments that applied to the others I have offered, to make it a 2-year authorization. In fact, over half of this fiscal year will be gone by the time this bill and is appropriation clear both Houses. The fact is that the committee would hate to have to start in right away to go through another 6 months of hearings that it just finished. Third, this would permit the subcommittees to do a little legislative oversight on the whole program. That is the reason for offering the amendments.

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

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection and is happy to accept the amendments.

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

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, we were consulted about this matter. In view of the time situation here I find myself in agreement and accept the amendments on behalf of our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: Page 4, strike out lines 10 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 103. MIDDLE EAST POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President, in his efforts to obtain a just peace in the Middle East, should maintain his alertness to the continued military support which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is providing to the radical Arab States and that any settlement should take into account the historic duplicity of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the desire of that country since Peter the Great to control the Mediterranean, and the continuing anti-Semitism of the Soviet Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact, after years of service here in the House and now 7 years on the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Congress of the United States often finds itself in the position of offering gratuitous advice to Presidents. However, we are going through a typical period in the thinking of our State Department where this type of an amendment is necessary. However, with the opening of the talks in Helsinki and with the few very carefully calculated gestures of good will by the Soviet Union, we again will hear the line that the Soviet Union is mellowing and that we can coexist with them. I would recognize, even with our natural preoccupation with Vietnam, that anyone would be blind if he did not realize the tremendous complications inherent in the Middle East problem and

would be blind also if he did not recognize the direct participation of the Soviet Union in the radical statements and policies of certain nations versus Israel. Also anyone making a study of history, would appreciate that since the days of Peter the Great the Russians have dreamed of controlling the Mediterranean and are obviously using the Middle East dispute to seize control of the Mediterranean.

My amendment merely advises or alerts the President to these historic facts of life. It states things that I trust are recognized by all Members. What it really does is indicate that the Congress is aware of the Soviet involvement in the Middle East, and I think in this case, with a sense of timing, it alerts the President.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I want to say to the gentleman his amendment is very cleverly drawn. It makes it completely impossible for a staunch friend of Israel to be against it. It might not be quite as evenhanded as the President said he would like to be, but it is a tough one to vote against. So I just point that out to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to know that that is as fine a remark as has been directed at me all day long. I appreciate it and the spirit in which it was intended.

Mr. HAYS. I meant it to be complimentary.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. After reading the amendment and hearing the gentleman's reasons for proposing it I would suggest that the gentleman give thought to the possibility that the President is sensitive to the facts of history and aware of the situation which exists in the Middle East. I would expect that the President is fully aware of that situation. Therefore, the gentleman's amendment would appear unnecessary and untimely.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman from Wisconsin well knows that at various times the House for other Presidents has adopted sense-of-Congress resolutions which I am sure were relevant facts that the President already knew. But I do want to reemphasize the fact that many have a feeling that the Soviet Union can be trusted. I believe with the adoption of this amendment we will also be speaking to the State Department advisers who may have undue influence over foreign policy.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Is it the gentleman's intent to echo the Arab and the Soviet line, that he wants to eliminate from this paragraph the idea of direct talks among the parties concerned?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No.

Mr. WOLFF. This has been the Soviet line and this has been the Arab line.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, no; not at all. I do not see how that can be read into the language at all.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in other words you are requesting to limit your amendment to that area of the bill that does not interfere with direct talks.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am merely pointing out, as I read this language to the President, that we have to be awfully careful and not to trust the Soviet Union.

May I say to the gentleman that I surely do not believe the so-called Four Power talks are going to be the answer to the problem in the Middle East, because I do not think the Soviet Union has the intent to be helpful.

Mr. WOLFF. You do not seek to eliminate lines 12 to 18?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Again I will say that what I hope to do is to stand on my language and I refer to the language before us, I merely emphasize the necessary caution, the extraordinary caution, that we must use in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Mr. WOLFF. But this amendment as it stands eliminates lines 12 to 18 and plays into the Arab and Communist hands.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Under this bill I think my language is clear enough.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would suggest that the committee language, language contained in the bill that was given thorough consideration after a special subcommittee had carefully considered it and obtained the points of view of many Members interested in this important and sensitive area, has unanimous support in the committee. I submit to the gentleman from Illinois that he is doing an injustice to the cause that he is trying to promote.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. It is not true also that the language in the bill is substantially the same as the language in the present law, and that any retreat from that would be construed as very unfriendly to the Israel position for direct talks?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is absolutely true.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the gentleman should be complimented for alerting the President and the Congress to the menace of communism and the Soviet threat. But I would agree with my colleagues that this language in the bill has been carefully worked out with both sides represented in the discussion.

I agree with the gentleman from New York that this would be a retreat on a fixed position. While the gentleman is certainly interested in alerting us all to the problem of communism, I think it

would be untimely for us to change the language in floor debate on such an intricate and complex subject.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, may I say very sincerely in an effort to be helpful to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) that I would urge him to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am considering it. May I preface that comment that I hope to have emphasized to those in attendance that we should not be misled by Soviet acting, but the reason I ask that my amendment be withdrawn is that we were obviously in agreement in the desire to see peace develop in the Middle East. I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time we could determine how many amendments are on the desk to title I?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are five amendments at the desk?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on part I and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have been here since 12 o'clock on a perfect bill reported by the committee that took 3 months to write it up. With the exception of one amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), who withdrew the amendment, we have listened to nothing but committee members arguing about things that should have been threshed out in committee.

It is about time that other Members of the Congress are entitled to have something to say about this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 20, strike out line 17 and all that follows down through page 22, line 18.

And remember the following sections accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has added a new dimension to giving. It established what may become known as the Committee on Foreign Affairs Favorite Country Award. The award consists of authorizations beyond those dreamed up by the Executive. The winners this year were Korea and Israel. Applications for next year will be in order as soon as this bill passes. They may be submitted to almost any member of the committee. To assure favorable consideration foreign

diplomats and lobbyists are advised to spend less time cultivating the executive branch and to work harder on the Congress. No purchases in the United States are necessary, but any faint suggestion that some of the prize money will be spent here will undoubtedly carry weight.

To counterbalance the award the committee has also provided for a Committee on Foreign Affairs Condemnation Citation. This will be limited to those countries whose governments oppose free and peaceful development of democratic institutions or which deny fundamental freedoms to its people. Military aid would be cut off to any government that comes into power through other than its constitutional processes. Competition is expected to be heavy for the citation. No applications are necessary. The committee will make its decisions based upon the latest version of each country's constitution provided it can be found before the next mark-up of the foreign aid bill, apparently 2 years hence.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to strike out the \$40 million for a desalting or desalination plant for Israel.

In the first place, we should save the \$40 million. In the second place, if you want to create trouble around the world, one of the best ways to do it is to pick out a country and give \$40 million for this purpose.

I do not know how this committee—if this provision is approved—can possibly avoid approving \$40 million desalting plants for every country around the world that has salt water in enough quantity to operate such plant. Mind you, this is not for the purpose of furnishing water for human consumption. This desalination plant is for the purpose of providing water for irrigation. There is no way in the world so far as I know that salt water can be converted to fresh water at a cost that will permit use for irrigation. There are gentlemen on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), who are far more competent on this subject because the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs handles the legislation on this subject. This Government is already spending millions for experimentation in desalting and I am confident they would agree that desalting water for irrigation purposes is not feasible.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be adopted. This Government ought not to incur the wrath of other nations around the world who are certainly going to demand similar plants and will have to be refused.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not as simple as the gentleman makes it appear, that we are really encouraging people to line up to get large sums of money.

This proposal provides an opportunity for the United States to participate in

one of the most advanced technological advances in water desalting programs in the world. It is of great benefit to us and allows us to have free access to the total involvement of desalination development of the Israeli Government. All of our scientists and all of our water experts will be participating in a joint venture to the point where we will have coming from this great benefit to certain dry areas of our country where people have been embarked on this kind of a program now for many years.

Participation in this specific project provides an excellent opportunity to study a system of water use for agriculture that is vital to the United States. The Israelis are in a peculiarly unique situation in having a fully integrated water system serving the bulk of the nation's irrigation for agriculture and other uses and provides perhaps one of the only total water management projects in the world.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am wondering if this would also have some side effects and some additional values contributing toward peace in the Middle East. Because, as I understand it, and I do not claim to know a great deal, one of the principal causes of friction in the Middle East is the battle between the Israelis and the Jordanians and others for water. By increasing the supply of water out there, it might very well make some small contribution toward peace in the Middle East. Is that right?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has made a very significant point. This may be a large contribution toward peace because I venture to say that is one of the real problems of the continual battles that swing back and forth in that area.

I might say further that this plant will be purchased here in the United States.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do hope the amendment is defeated because the proposal for a desalting plant would seem to have much merit.

As the gentleman pointed out, there will be available from a plant of this kind assets for the United States. The information is to be made available to us. Also, I do think there is a real potential for a contribution toward peace.

At the moment, unfortunately, the product of a desalting plant presumably will not be available to our country. As long ago as 15 years, President Eisenhower and others did suggest that a desalting plant in this locality could be a contribution to peace.

At the moment there is no immediate prospect of peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors. But the construction of a plant, I do think would be a way in which a substantial contribution could be made to all of the peoples of that area once a settlement has been reached.

I do not think we need to belabor the point. The committee discussed this thoroughly, and it was the majority opinion that we should advocate this project, even though we recognize it is an add-on. It was not requested by the administration.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Obviously, our investment in this development will certainly lead to a low-cost desalination process, which will be extremely useful to the United States. The plant itself, I believe, will materially aid the cause of peace.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Is it not also true that if this pilot plant works out, as it is expected it will, it will be of enormous benefit to some of the other countries which the gentleman from Iowa mentioned that would be interested in the same problem? The problem of lack of water is a worldwide problem, or a very widespread problem, and this project would be of enormous benefit to other countries, as well as the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has made a valid point.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Are you prepared to locate a \$40 million desalting plant in Jordan, another in Saudi Arabia, and so on, all around the Middle East?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe the skills that will be acquired from the building of this plant would be beneficial not alone to Israel. One of the things that would add materially to peace in the Middle East would be if Jordan could benefit from this same kind of information, skills, and technical know-how. So I think in the long-range view we may be taking toward the day when we will be aiding Jordan in this way. It is a lot better than giving them arms. If it helps bring peace to the Mideast then this small investment in desalination could be the best investment we are making in this bill. We are helping Israel, and we should, but in a broader sense we are acquiring knowledge and skills by this help for the United States. Yet above all of this is the simple argument that what we are really making is a small investment in peace on the Mideast.

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

Some of the arguments for this project fall far short of the merits of the case. I suppose I ought to keep my mouth shut and not be so candid, but I just cannot do it, I am afraid. I suppose there will be some benefits to the United States from this, but there would be a lot more benefits if it were built in this country. I am going to support it because, like the rest of you who have given some other reasons, I have some Jewish constituents who want it, too.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I

move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am going to be brief. I think it is obvious the gentleman from Iowa will not prevail in his amendment. But I think he has performed a very valuable service to the House because we have spelled out in the commentary and discussion points that were not adequately covered in the committee report or, for that matter, in discussion in the committee, of which there is not enough record. As I understand, emphasis is now being placed on the fact that this desalting plant, when functioning, and given peaceful conditions in the Middle East, is intended by this committee to serve the entire Middle East as a vehicle to demonstrate that with cooperation and obviously under peaceful conditions, progress could come to the Middle East. I hope anyone who reads interprets the RECORD, today will put that emphasis upon it.

I believe one item should be clarified for the record. It is true this was not requested by the administration. It is also true, that this plant was not requested by the Government of Israel. So this action was one that emanated from the leadership of the committee, and I trust that the Foreign Affairs Committee intends that this be a vehicle to bring nations together, and that peace will be the end result.

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

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to go on record in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and again make the record clear that this simply cannot be of any benefit to the United States of America and to its taxpayers. We have an ongoing program of our own which has not yielded the results which would justify this kind of investment in a foreign country, and the technology that we will get access to is simply not in addition to our own, but a duplication of our own program.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) has put his finger on the reason for the presence of this particular item in this particular measure, and I think the taxpayers of this country should recognize absolutely and clearly the reason for this amount of money being in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, certainly I am in agreement with this proposition of construction of desalting plants in this area. This is a part of the foreign aid program with which I can agree. If we do this, and if we are able to supply water to the arid areas of the Middle East, then we can do much to accomplish something toward peace in that area. This is a forward-looking part of our program. I regret that many other parts of the program have not been so forward looking. The program has not had helpful innovations such as this. Aid has been used to sustain dictatorships rather than to aid the economic development of the poor areas of the world.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) which would strike out section 209 which au-

thorizes \$40 million for U.S. participation in a prototype desalination plant in Israel.

By passing section 209, the House will be doing its part in upholding the commitment which President Johnson made last January to Premier Eshkol of Israel.

At that time he informed Premier Eshkol that the United States would participate in the construction of this vitally needed project, and \$40 million was included in the fiscal year 1970 budget for this purpose.

I have introduced legislation in both the 90th and 91st Congresses for such a desalination project. In this Congress it is H.R. 587—H.R. 4307 with cosponsors—and I am pleased that it is now in the bill before us.

This legislative proposal is the culmination of a long period of study and research into the feasibility and utility of constructing a desalination plant in Israel. On February 6, 1964, President Johnson, in a speech delivered to the Weizmann Institute of Science, announced that the United States had "begun discussions with the representatives of Israel on cooperative research in using nuclear energy to turn salt water into fresh water." These discussions led to the formation of a United States-Israel team which conducted feasibility studies.

The research benefits of this project having been well established by these studies, the United States should proceed to participate in the construction.

This project offers many potential benefits in terms of research on desalination processes to the United States as well as to Israel.

In addition to the research to be gained by the United States, the resulting economic benefits would accrue to the entire area. It would also reduce international tensions which have long been aggravated by a lack of water. A desalination project would make possible the cultivation of large portions of arid desert land which have hitherto been unusable. The land and jobs which such a plant would create would make a sizable contribution to stability in the Middle East.

This project is an important aspect of continuing American support for Israel. I urge President Nixon to act promptly to implement section 209 and to reaffirm Executive support for U.S. participation in the construction of this facility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 22, after line 18, insert a new subsection (g) as follows:

"(g) No funds appropriated for the Office of Saline Water pursuant to the appropriation authorized by the Act of July 11, 1969 (83 Stat. 45, Public Law 91-43), or prior authorization Acts, shall be used to carry out the purposes of this section."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with respect to one provision in this bill. This is section 209 which authorizes the United States to contribute \$40 million toward the construction of a large desalting plant in Israel. In addition, the President is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of any Federal agency in this joint venture.

I have indicated my position on this matter to Chairman MORGAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee on several occasions and I appreciate the fact that he has kept me fully advised of his committee's consideration of this proposed provision. My position has been that construction of a plant such as proposed here will be of no value to the saline water research program in the United States and that we would actually be doing an injustice to Israel by leading the people of that country to believe that desalting water for agricultural purposes is feasible when it is not; \$40 million is almost twice as much as the Office of Saline Water spent on its entire research program in the last fiscal year. If Congress wants to give to Israel \$40 million as a part of the foreign aid program, that is one thing, but to authorize this expenditure on the pretense that we are to have a feasible desalting operation which will contribute to desalting technology in this country is just not consistent with the facts.

So far as I know, there were only two witnesses who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this provision. They were Dr. Abel Wolman and Mr. Phillip Sporn, both highly respected in their fields, and I have no disagreement with what they said. They made a good case for the need for additional water in Israel. But neither made a case for the merits of the proposal or the feasibility of the plant. As a matter of fact, Dr. Wolman stated:

The cost will be high. It obviously will be too high for any country, including Israel, to use for agricultural purposes unless it is in fact subsidized, as in the suggestion in the bill before you today.

Mr. Chairman, no one questions the critical need in Israel for additional water but nothing was said with respect to that need that could not also be said about many areas in the Southwest part of the United States. If the United States has this kind of money to spend on research in this field, I believe it can be put to better use in connection with our own research program here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I can find out, the Committee on Foreign Affairs received no testimony from the Office of Saline Water or the Department of the Interior or any other agency in connection with this provision. Also, so far as I can find out—and if I am wrong I want someone to correct me—the administration has indicated no support for this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the approval of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it was not the intention of the committee that funds appropriated for the Office of Saline Water be made available for the desalination plant in Israel. The committee is happy to accept the clarifying amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, speaking for the minority we share that view.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969. I do so, not only because I generally oppose the foreign aid program in principle, but also, because section 209 of this legislation subverts the clear and present intent of Congress to specifically prohibit the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior from contributing funds, participating as an agent for, or in the supervision of, the construction or operation of a foreign desalting plant or its components.

In view of this, I support the amendment to H.R. 14580 offered by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I ask that the Committee of the Whole House and particularly members of the Foreign Affairs Committee reflect carefully on the nature of the amendment as it represents the combined wisdom and experience of the 17 years in which our committee has involved itself with the predictions, promises, and problems connected with desalination. I can proudly say that no other body of men in the Congress can boast of comparable expertise with regard to efforts to desalinate saline and brackish waters and on the basis of that, members of the Interior Committee are painfully aware of the limitations of the state of the desalting art.

Section 209 of the foreign aid assistance bill says that the people of Israel can have in 5 years and for \$40 million what the United States itself has been unable to obtain in 17 years at a cost of \$157 million. Mr. Chairman, proposals such as section 209 may appear to make for good international politics but the facts of the matter are that the raising of hope in Israel, or anywhere else for that matter, when there is no hope will ultimately prove disastrous to our foreign policy.

A brief look at the legislative history of the U.S. desalination program should convince any Member that we are nowhere near to creating the technological breakthrough on this problem that is implied by the language of section 209. In 1952, the House Interior Committee started a modest, \$2 million, 5-year program on desalination. We were told by all the experts that a breakthrough was "just around the corner," and that only a little money and a little time was

needed to prove the efficacy and desirability of a national commitment to desalination efforts. In the intervening time, the yearly appropriations to the Office of Saline Water have climbed higher and higher, the reports get thicker and thicker, the OSW personnel rises in accordance with "Parkinson's Law," and we are no closer to a breakthrough than we were then.

The final truth about our efforts in this field were admitted by former Secretary of the Interior Udall when he stated in the 1968 OSW report his "disappointment" over the progress of the prototype facility planned for southern California. Congress in 1967 passed Public Law 90-18 which authorized the appropriation of \$57,200,000 for the participation in developing technology on a large-scale prototype dual-purpose power and desalting project. This 150 million gallon per day proposal was to be on a cost-share basis with private utilities. Before acting on a \$40,000,000 proposal today, it is wise to ask where we stand on that \$57,000,000 project of 2 years ago.

The answer: All agreements have been terminated and all matters relating to the project are being closed out. In other words, the project was not and is not yet feasible. Again, I find myself in the position where I must say to my colleagues, "I told you so." I stated at the time of the funding of the Southern California project that it was not feasible based on the then-existing state of the desalting art. I remind my colleagues of my statement that such a project was raising a false hope for the people of California and those private utilities engaged in the venture. Section 209 of the present bill is the same kind of situation only adding that we are dealing with a foreign nation.

Only as recently as May 14 of this year, this Congress passed Public Law 91-43, authorizing appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, in the sum of \$26,000,000. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in reporting the legislation to the House stated in its report:

The Office of Saline Water, under this program, should limit its participation in foreign activities to the interchange of data with foreign entities and should refrain from entering into business relationships with non-domestic entities, or otherwise engaging in activities having foreign policy or foreign aid connotations. Any assistance by the United States in the development of foreign desalting projects should be accomplished under the foreign aid program, rather than under this program.

The language of section 209 would circumvent this clear expression of congressional intent.

In 1952, when the saline water conversion program was initiated, it was conceived as a Federal program of national interest and scope to assist in meeting the water problems throughout this country. The program has been expanded and extended, and despite increased levels of funding, there have been no significant breakthroughs in any desalting process or technology. These expenditures have far exceeded the bene-

fits—real or promised—received by the American taxpayer in meeting this Nation's water problems. We cannot hold out a false hope to a foreign nation on the basis of that experience. My suggestion is for the Office of Saline Water to concentrate on achieving the technological breakthrough in desalinization we have been promised all these years. Once that is accomplished, I will be the first to help spread that technology throughout the world.

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

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to speak out of order.)

APOLLO VOYAGE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the Apollo capsule has been going around the moon. They have united the several parts of it, and tomorrow they will be, we hope, successfully on their way back to earth.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI), who is handling the bill on the floor, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) for accepting this amendment which would make certain that we will carry on our saline water research program in the United States in conformity with its authorization and appropriation without any embarrassment and diminution with the home program when related to the activities in Israel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, again I renew the unanimous-consent request that all debate on part I extending from the bottom of page 1 to the bottom of page 62 close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been very patient. I was here on the floor from the beginning. The gentleman from Colorado and I were here offering amendments at the very start. We have been going for three and a half hours, with amendments just from members of the committee. It seems to me perhaps the Chairman might at least give me the opportunity and the privilege of being able to offer one amendment from a Member who is not on the committee. Unless the gentleman is prepared to do that, I will object.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee understands there are only two amendments pending, and that is why he requested the limitation of the time.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, we already have 10 or 15 Members standing, and that means I would have 1 minute to explain this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee will be glad to extend the request to 5 o'clock.

I have no intention of cutting anybody off.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the chairman of the committee is suggesting debate wind up at 5 o'clock?

Mr. MORGAN. At 5 o'clock, on part I. Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are pending?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, only two are pending at the desk.

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

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, there were two amendments at the desk, and it is the intention of the chairman of the committee to ask that debate close at 5 o'clock and that the time be allocated between now and then between those two amendments.

Mr. MORGAN. That is on part I only.

Mr. McCLURE. And the time will be allocated between now and then on the two amendments which are now at the desk?

Mr. MORGAN. On those and on all amendments thereto.

Mr. McCLURE. And all amendments thereto?

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to divide the time equally among the Members standing.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: Page 4, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 104. It is the sense of the Congress that in order to promote the objectives of peace and security in the Far East, the President, prior to entering into any agreement or commitment to return Okinawa to Japan under any restrictions or limitations that would impair present United States capability to protect the peace and security of Korea, the Republic of China, the Philippines, or any other Asian nation for whom assistance is authorized by this Act, should (1) consult on these matters with the appropriate committee of both Houses of the Congress, and (2) obtain from Japan an agreement that, in consideration for such return, Japan will increase its own level of self defense activity and its contribution to the defense of peace and security in the Far East, including the assumption of a greater measure of the costs of economic assistance to other free countries in the Far East, to such a degree as will offset the reduction and impairment in the peace and security of the Far East caused by the return of Okinawa to Japan."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the Okinawa amendment.

The Prime Minister of Japan is in town today. There will be a communique issued tomorrow, presumably, if the press are to be believed, announcing the decision of the President to return Okinawa to Japan, although the actual conditions may be left a little fuzzy.

Neither the Foreign Affairs Committee nor the Committee on Armed Services has had any detailed information about the details of this agreement which is to be announced tomorrow, with rather sweeping implications for our own security in Asia.

I made a rather detailed statement on the House floor on Tuesday, which is printed in the RECORD, expressing my feeling that if we are going to return Okinawa to Japan and undergo the impairment which it will involve in our ability to provide help and security protection to Korea, to the Philippines, to the Republic of China—countries mentioned in this bill—as well as to Japan itself, then at the very least we ought to go on RECORD as urging the Japanese, in return for our agreeing to the reversion of Okinawa, to make a commitment on their part to increase their own efforts not only for their own defense but also for the common defense of the whole area of the Far East, in partnership with ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am a friend of Japan. I want to urge them to work more closely with us in taking over the heavy burden of maintaining peace and stability in Asia, just as we work closely in Europe with West Germany in NATO. After all, Japan is the third largest industrial nation in the world today, and yet she is spending only eight-tenths of 1 percent on its national security. She has been getting a free ride in the area of defense. I think we have a right now, as we meet her wishes on Okinawa, to ask her to move for her own and for the common defense.

If we are going to pull back from our commitments around the world, as President Nixon suggested last summer in the Guam doctrine that we should do, then we have got to get other countries to bear a greater part of that load which we have been carrying almost alone. No country is better capable of doing that than Japan. If we do not nail down some such commitment as a part of this agreement on Okinawa, I am deeply worried that we may have lost an opportunity that will never come again.

This amendment would simply express the sense of Congress to this effect, but also includes language to urge the President to consult with us on what he has in mind in connection with Okinawa before the whole agreement is signed, sealed, and delivered in final form. I urge that it be adopted to match a similar expression of concern already adopted in the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

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

I might point out to the members of this committee that the subcommittee of which I was chairman for many years, the Subcommittee on the Far East, and the subcommittee of which I am now proud to be the chairman, the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, have gone into this very delicate and controversial subject.

I submit to my colleagues that, as

the gentleman from New York has stated in his opening remarks, Prime Minister Sato of Japan is in Washington at this very moment involved in discussions which are expected to lead to negotiations and agreement on the return of Okinawa. Therefore, it would be most untimely for the Congress to make an expression willy-nilly, so to speak, at this particular time on this subject.

Although I agree with the gentleman that there may be some merit in his intentions—and I know he is sincere in them—I believe that it would be wrong to say, as the amendment does, that there must be an agreement before there is any announcement of the result of the meeting between President Nixon and Premier Sato. I believe it would be wrong to demand that Japan agree to increase its own level of military activity before the results of the White House discussions are released. Therefore I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 24, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, when I spoke on this bill yesterday in the debate I said that we ought to be selective and it should not be a global welfare commitment but rather an instrument of American policy. I would like to reiterate that today, particularly on this matter where assistance of various kinds is directed to Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand. Helping them to survive is currently a very basic issue of American policy. I would oppose amendments which tended to cut assistance to these countries because that really is something, under the present circumstances, with the war on, which is for America. Other things, to my mind, come in a different type of category. That is why I am sorry we have not had some reductions in more general categories here. The failure to make such reductions makes it very difficult for me to support the bill. I may add that I hope that on our motion to recommit we may yet be given some opportunity to make substantial cuts.

If any further amendment is offered to cut assistance to these particular countries I have mentioned, such as the Republic of Vietnam, then I will consider that I have opposed these amendments ahead of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the situation in the Arab refugee camps in Lebanon, where terrorists are reportedly in control, is a matter of the utmost concern. The Israel delegation at the U.N. has properly protested that the UNRWA should not allow misuse of its relief grants and facilities by terrorist groups, and the U.S. delegation should also support that position.

For too long the United States has been carrying a disproportionate share of the burden of financing the operations of UNRWA. The camps have been breeding grounds for hatred and have been used more recently as training areas for terrorists. The Arab States have steadfastly refused to allow the refugees to be resettled in accordance with the original UNRWA concept, preferring instead to keep the camps going as a source of political infection. In my view the United States should long since have indicated its determination to cut down its contributions to UNRWA on a phased basis, and it should begin to do so now.

In view of the recent reports of Palestinian terrorists being in actual control of most of the camps in Lebanon, I had seriously considered proposing an amendment to the pending bill which would cut off further U.S. contributions to UNRWA unless and until effective steps were taken to remove the camps from terrorist control. However, after consulting with a number of colleagues and other knowledgeable persons interested in the Middle East both in and out of Government, I have come to the conclusion that adoption of such an amendment at this time might have unforeseen and undesirable political consequences which would not contribute to peace in the area. Accordingly, bearing in mind the delicate situation which prevails, especially with respect to the Government of Lebanon, I have decided not to offer the amendment.

I trust that the administration will do all in its power to the end that the intolerable situation in the UNRWA refugee camps may be corrected as swiftly as possible.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, included in section 304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969—Support of Voluntary Assistance—is a \$5 million authorization for the expansion and improvement of the medical facilities of Hadassah in Israel. The primary target of this aid is the Hadassah medical complex at Ein Karem and the buildings located on Mount Scopus, on the outskirts of Jerusalem.

I am pleased to have had a role in seeing this specific authorization through the committee stage of this bill. For several reasons, this contribution is the sort of foreign aid project we should encourage.

The \$5 million will assist a substantial institution located in a democratic nation. The Hadassah complex has benefited over the years from a great infusion of private American aid.

The Hadassah Medical Organization has been active in the Middle East for almost 60 years. Hadassah's 318,000 women in 1,320 chapters throughout the United States take great pride, and rightly so, in the medical complex whose growth their organization has nourished for so long.

The medical complex which is the fruit of these generous and longterm

efforts is now known throughout the world. It makes a special contribution in the worldwide treatment of ills endemic to the developing peoples of Africa and Asia.

It is able to make this special contribution because it trains in its medical, dental, and nursing schools physicians, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses for medical institutions in Asia, Africa, and Central America. Its doctors have established clinics in many developing nations. And, it is physically located at the crossroads of Africa-Asia-Europe, serving a heterogeneous population. This affords the Hadassah Medical Center the opportunity to perform unique studies and comparative tests, yielding results applicable throughout the world.

Work done in the Hadassah complex and by Hadassah fieldworkers has had a great impact on trachoma, for instance, a scourge of poorer, less developed countries.

A very significant result of the Hadassah effort is the transmission of high American standards of medical care and equipment to developing countries. Hadassah has helped to make these standards the norm in Israel and through the training of medical personnel from other lands, these high standards are being disseminated to a wider and appreciative audience.

It is my belief that medical technicians and professionals trained in Israel are much more likely to return to the countries of their birth than those trained in the United States. Israel is not devoid of the attractions of an affluent Western society, but nevertheless it does have the atmosphere of a developing and self-sacrificing society and this is, I believe, transmitted to many of its temporary residents.

For all of these reasons I commend to my colleagues in the House this bargain in foreign assistance.

Mr. Chairman, a new provision, subsection (c), has been added to section 452, supporting assistance.

Supporting assistance is given to nations in which the United States believes it has immediate foreign policy interests in order to help maintain political and economic stability. The President is authorized to furnish assistance under this section "on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to or for friendly countries and areas, and to organizations and bodies eligible to receive assistance" under part I of the act authorizing economic assistance. United Nations peacekeeping operations are included.

The new subsection (c) authorizes specific Middle East aid expenditures once the President has determined that a peaceful settlement has been achieved in that explosive area. There is nothing in this new provision which would circumscribe existing authority to authorize supporting assistance for any eligible country. This new standby authorization is in addition to the existing authority for the Middle East aid under part I.

Section (c) authorizes:

First, peacekeeping activities;

Second, resettlement and vocational training of refugees;

Third, rehabilitation and restoration of public service facilities damaged by war; and

Fourth, programs of health, education, agriculture, and community development.

The objectives of the section are to speed settlement in the Mideast and to help make the settlement a durable one. The assistance would be extended to all nations and peoples of the geographic area: Arab and Israeli, Christian, Moslem, and Jew. This standby authority, the committee believes, may increase the President's ability to positively influence the tragic course of events in the Middle East by:

First, increasing his capacity to contribute toward efforts to achieve peace in the area;

Second, enabling him to act quickly, once peace is established, to ameliorate the war-caused social and economic disruptions; and

Third, enabling the President to commence development aid rapidly.

If the world community knows that the United States is ready to join other industrial nations in aiding rehabilitation of the Middle East, there may be less antagonism and fear surrounding efforts to achieve the peace. The aid envisioned by subsection 452(c) is contingent upon a peaceful settlement being achieved in the Middle East. Whether or not the peace we all hope for is achieved, aid to the Middle East under other provisions of part I including sections 452 (a) and (b), continues to be authorized.

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. FASCELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign aid bill and especially an amendment which was cosponsored by myself and 16 other Members of the House of Representatives from both political parties. The bipartisan amendment provides a partial U.S. guaranty on the repayment of loans by banks and other private financial institutions to groups of campesinos in Latin America for self-help community development projects. It is now a part of the foreign aid bill pending before you. And it was also recommended by the Rockefeller report.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee held public hearings on the amendment and agreed that it should be tried on a pilot basis in five Latin American countries. Responsibility for its administration would be placed under the newly proposed Overseas Private Investment Corporation. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Dr. Morgan, and also the gentlemen from Connecticut and Pennsylvania (Mr. MONAGAN and Mr. FULTON), for offering the amendment in committee and gaining its adoption. This amendment, frankly, is an experiment. I like to think of it as a bold and needed experiment. It would authorize a partial U.S. Government guaranty on the repayment of loans made by private banks, cooperatives, credit unions and other

financial institutions in Latin America. The loans would go to deserving farmers and workers for rural and urban self-help community development projects.

The guaranties will be confined to 25 percent of an institution's portfolio of loans made for self-help community development projects, subject to an additional restriction that the liability of the United States cannot exceed 75 percent of any one loan in such a portfolio.

The concept—in more than one sense—is revolutionary. We have never done this before in the U.S. foreign aid program. The revolution I am talking about enlists the private sector of Latin America in a peaceful but effective program of economic and social reform. There will be no violence. But there will be change—and all will benefit if the program is successful. This will be the beginning of a quiet but meaningful revolution.

The loans would finance such worthwhile improvements as water pumps, wells, farm machinery, small schoolhouses, short access roads—agrarian reform projects, including improved seed, fertilizer, and pesticides for groups of farmers—small vocational training centers in slum areas—improved breeding stock for farm animals, grain warehouses, sanitation facilities, small health centers, irrigation systems, looms and other handicraft-making aids for groups of artisans, and many other types of projects. Some would cost only a few hundred dollars. As you can see, many of them would be income-producing and help to pay for themselves. In short, they would be improvements which a community or group itself feels are important to its development. The labor for most of these self-help community development projects would come from the group itself. This, of course, constitutes a substantial equity alone. The primary security for the loan would be the honor of the community to repay.

The loans would be handled by private banks, national development foundations, credit unions, cooperatives and savings and loan associations. Guidelines in agreements with these institutions will insure that such loans are made only to groups of people who cannot obtain credit for worthwhile development projects. However, the emphasis should be on a minimum of redtape. No guaranty would apply to any loan already in effect or be available to persons who already qualify for bank credit.

A similar program carried on by the Pan American Development Foundation during the past 2 years shows that the campesinos have a repayment record of 95 percent, involving more than 400 different community developing projects costing a total of \$700,000.

The House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, was greatly impressed with the high repayment record by ordinary people benefiting from credit programs sponsored through the U.S. aid program in Latin America. Our review of U.S. aid operations last year included some agricultural credit and low-cost housing projects where the repayment rate was 97 and 98 percent. Con-

versations with Latin American bankers and businessmen also confirmed the low default rate. They stated that when such loans were made, the default rate was actually below 5 percent, especially in the rural areas. In Mexico, the default rate on personal loans was recently reported at 1 percent.

The type of guarantee program we propose would have many advantages. Chief among them are:

First. The loans would go directly to the people and quickly provide communities with visible and practical improvements to assist development. There would be no protracted delays waiting for aid to "filter down" through government-sponsored programs.

Second. Inasmuch as the campesino pays for the improvement, he retains his dignity by being able to pull himself up by his own bootstraps. The loan program is not a charitable operation. It is a business proposition. Loans would be at legal commercial interest rates but far below rates charged by moneylenders.

Third. It provides a system whereby the rich can make a contribution to helping the poor. It thus encourages a greater social consciousness on the part of the privileged. Equally important, it permits the wealthy to invest their money at home under a guaranty. Hopefully, this would provide an effective weapon against capital flight. The economic power structure would support the program.

Fourth. In large part, it bypasses unpopular and repressive governments that the United States might not want to help perpetuate in office through government-to-government aid. It puts funds to use directly without being diluted through bureaucratic mazes, diversion, corruption and unfriendly and callous officials.

Fifth. Because it emphasizes chiefly a group or community responsibility, it encourages the growth of democratic institutions envisioned in title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act. It also helps to establish a future tax base and attitudes conducive to sharing the costs of community improvements and services.

Sixth. If the program is successful in Latin America and the default rate remains low, the plan can be expanded to include other types of projects now being financed by U.S. Government loans and grants and to other areas of the world. A high rate of success would result in substantial savings. Many countries currently being aided by the United States through government-to-government loans are finding it difficult to make repayments. The proposed program would put more of the burden on the private sector and utilize more money now held by the affluent.

Seventh. It would cut the dollar drain by utilizing local currencies owned by the private sector in Latin America instead of appropriated U.S. dollars. It would further add to a more favorable U.S. balance of payments by increasing American export sales to Latin America for machinery and other items needed in community development.

Eighth. The cost to the U.S. taxpayer would be much less than traditional loan

programs designed to achieve the same local development objectives. When the aid program began, it emphasized grants. We then moved to loans. If the proposed program described here proves workable, we can now move more in the direction of guaranties for certain types of programs and actual foreign aid dollar spending can gradually be reduced.

The 25-percent guaranty applies to the portfolio of such self-help community development loans held by each participating bank or other financial institution. In my view, and the opinion of experts in our Government intimately familiar with Latin America, this will provide the incentive needed to encourage a sufficient number of banks to take part in the program.

However, I believe the repayment rate by the campesinos would still be 95 percent or better, regardless of the amount or form of the U.S. guaranty. I know from my own experience as a former credit manager that a poor man is often a better credit risk than some professional people. In short, we must have confidence in the "little man" to advocate a program of this type. Otherwise, it does not make sense.

Originally, it was our intention not to require any security other than the honor of the community to repay. However, further study shows that it is illegal to make an unsecured loan in some countries. Many banks in Latin America also feel strongly that any machinery or similar items to be purchased under the loan should be considered as collateral. This is the practice we follow in the United States and does not appear unreasonable. However, I think it would be most unwise if the banks went beyond that point for collateral. It is certainly not our intention to place anyone's home or land in jeopardy.

The new guaranty program would provide a total of \$15 million in guaranties over a 3-year period. Because we are guaranteeing 25 percent, this would generate \$60 million in private Latin American loan money. The actual cost to the United States, with an expected default rate at 5 percent, would be \$3 million. This is equivalent to less than 1 hour's cost of the Vietnam war. The number of self-help community development projects for campesinos would be 45,000 projects. If each project involved an average of 10 persons, almost half a million human beings would be helped.

It is exceedingly difficult to estimate the turnover in loans because the term of commercial bank loans varies in each of the 21 countries. It ranges from as low as 6 months to as high as 8 years. Most would be closer to the lower figure. Therefore, if we assume that only half the loans would roll over in the 3-year period, this would permit another \$7.5 million in U.S. guaranties to be made available, or an overall total of \$22.5 million during the 3-year authorization. This would finance a total of 67,500 projects, involving 675,000 people. Thus, I think you will agree this program would have great impact. It has the potential of touching many lives—and in a lasting way.

The language of the amendment is broad enough to permit also a guaranty on loans made by banks to other financial institutions to provide capital for self-help community development loans. This will be most helpful in making more capital available.

I want to emphasize it was our intention that the loans would be available mainly to groups of people. Each group must have a common problem, a common commitment, and a common obligation.

The Peace Corps and U.S. voluntary agencies operating overseas can help to identify deserving groups and encourage them to qualify for self-help loans. These organizations often recognize what a community needs but are unable to provide the necessary funds. In addition, the communities often resent charity and would prefer to pay the cost themselves if they could only obtain the credit. As of now, they cannot—so nothing is done.

There is a tremendous need for the U.S. foreign aid program to identify itself directly with the basic aspirations of the people of Latin America. We have an opportunity here to help our friends in Latin America lift themselves by their own bootstraps. We can speed the development of a middle class. More important, we can provide a catalyst for the faster attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress, which, of course, is our key objective.

In summary, this new guaranty program will permit the people of the United States to help many people in Latin America right at the grassroots level. For every dollar we actually spend, it will generate \$20 worth of Latin American money for vitally needed community development. I know of no other aid program which gives a rate of return of 20 to 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McCLURE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLURE: On page 4, line 19, insert the following:

"Sec. 104. It is the sense of Congress that the President take immediate steps to rescind sanctions against the Republic of Rhodesia and effect immediate recognition of the sovereignty and independence of that nation."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order against the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLLIER yielded his time to Mr. McCLURE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, earlier the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) offered an amendment which went to the same subject matter in regard to Rhodesia. At that time there was some extensive discussion about the problem of the sanctions, economic sanctions, against that country and the reasons for them and the reasons why they ought to be lifted.

The major objection raised at that time to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) was that his amendment went too far, that it went further than the single subject of Rhodesia and, therefore, his amendment should not be agreed to.

At that time there was not one word—not one word—of objection to the question of removing the sanctions which we have applied against Rhodesia. For that reason I prepared and submitted this amendment which applies only to Rhodesia and to that single question and to that single problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Members who objected to the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will not object to this amendment which addresses itself very carefully to the single subject matter of the sanctions against Rhodesia.

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

Mr. McCLURE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object most strenuously to an amendment of this kind. It seems to me that the effect of the Fulton amendment would be to lift the sanctions against Rhodesia and that has been disposed of. I think that the imposition of sanctions was the right action for this country to have taken. I only wish that we had had more opportunity to discuss this question at greater length.

Mr. McCLURE. Certainly, I agree with the gentleman that we are in disagreement on this point. It is too bad that he was not a little more candid in objecting to the Fulton amendment. Now we find the gentleman was in opposition to the subject matter of Rhodesia.

I think the House full well knows what the conditions are, and I would hope they would take a favorable stand on this amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure that the gentleman is aware that the Subcommittee on Africa has held extensive hearings, and continues to hold hearings this very week, so the entire matter of Rhodesia is under consideration. I would submit to the gentleman from Idaho that it would be untimely for us to take action on such a sense-of-Congress resolution at this point, and I would hope that the gentleman would withdraw his amendment.

We know about the situation. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman in presenting his amendment, but again I say it is untimely.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that we have been temporizing with the problem for far too long already, and I think it is high time we had the sentiment of the Congress as to the action taken by the Executive by which American officials can be fined for actions regarding their own properties, let alone what it does to the people in Rhodesia. This is unwise, and should now be rescinded, and I would hope that the amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to renew his point of order?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his point of order.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the Subcommittee on Africa is holding hearings on this very question. On Wednesday of this week we had the distinguished former Secretary of State Dean Acheson testify before the subcommittee.

I just want to inform the gentleman from Idaho, the author of the amendment, that his President can do this any time he wants to, and he does not need any sense-of-Congress resolution to do it. The President has the right to do it. So it does not need a sense-of-Congress resolution, and it does not need to be written into this foreign aid bill. I do not like the foreign aid bill to become the catchall of all kinds of unrelated matters. All the gentleman has to do is to call down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and inform the President, and he has authority to do as the gentleman wants him to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I shall be brief.

Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to protest the process by which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) was agreed to, although I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Connecticut and for the committee. But when a reading of the amendment does not reveal what the contents are, and there is no explanation given, and a copy of the amendment is not available to members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, this process is really lamentable.

Mr. Chairman, I understand what the amendment means now because the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) has very carefully explained it to me. The gentleman pointed out that it was merely to exclude extremely indefinite authority in addition to the quite definite authority described. I am not against it. I simply feel we should have some process in this House by which Members can readily be informed of the content of an amendment before they vote.

I say again that I do not in any way reflect on the able gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) or upon his presentation of his amendment.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would only wish

to state that since both sides agreed, I understood it was not incumbent upon me to explain the amendment, although I was prepared to do so. I would further like to say that the amendment was available at the desk, however, from the beginning.

Mr. ECKHARDT. That is correct. The gentleman was ready to explain his amendment but I think the House was a bit too restless to listen to the explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand wire service stories that appeared yesterday and the day before. The first reports that "black marketeers have made more than \$1 billion by illegal manipulation" of dollars and piasters in Vietnam. The second reports that the currency black markets and "flight of millions of dollars out of the war zone creates economic chaos and hampers even limited U.S. war objectives."

Then I show you this headline of November 2: "Inflation Perils Thieu on Anniversary of Diem Overthrow."

And there is this headline of November 1: "Prices of Staples Soar, Under Thieu Luxury Tax."

It is quite obvious that the commercial import program that is supposed to be the device to control inflation in Vietnam is an expensive and dismal failure.

And then there is the captured Vietcong major who said:

Without American money, guns, food, medicine and supplies, we of the NLF would have a hard time surviving.

There has been a billion dollars spent to control inflation; by this CIP program. What it has done, is to feed the black market and supply our adversary—the Vietcong. We are subsidizing luxuries.

I have been told in committee and in other discussions that the CIP is working.

The facts belie this, because no amount of imported merchandise can overcome the rampant corruption and diversion of our aid in Vietnam.

I have here a report of the Committee on Government Operations in which it is recommended that the Secretary of State and our Ambassador take a firmer stand with the Government of Vietnam—GVN. Quoting:

It is the Committee's view that U.S. officials have too often attempted to avoid "rocking the boat" rather than pressing for necessary reforms. This attitude, if continued, will lead to neither reform, nor progress nor broad popular support for the GVN.

This report is 2 years old and nothing, absolutely nothing, has been done in that time to improve the situation.

In fact, the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, is even today awaiting confirmation of an unnecessary, excess purchase of \$100 million of rice while the United States and GVN knew rice was stockpiled.

How can we be so gullible to believe that this bandaid approach to a cancer-

ous growth can solve the problem of money manipulation and corruption in Vietnam.

If I had my way we would do away with the unsuccessful, wasteful CIP. Is it too much to ask that we limit this authorization to the amount authorized last year?

The fact we juggled our accounts in fiscal 1969 to get more money for this commercial import program, this endless pit of waste, is no reason to perpetuate our past errors. If we force the Vietnamese to live within reasonable bounds, by limiting the authorization to last year's authorization, maybe someone will have the good sense to force the GVN to fulfill its responsibility and put a lid on inflation.

The entire mockery is compounded by the fact that we are made to believe that the CIP is our only contribution to price stabilization. The facts are different.

American goods and purchases are designed to supply a full 90 percent of the \$800 million in this program. We are not spending \$240 million for the fight against Viet inflation; we are spending \$720 million—\$720 million so that the South Vietnamese can indulge themselves in luxuries, fat bank accounts in Paris, "Hondas," and the like, when they are supposed to be fighting a war; \$720 million in support of corruption, diversion, and money manipulation.

I recall quite vividly the price controls we imposed on ourselves during World War II. If their administration was sometimes less than perfect, they certainly served a purpose. But there are no controls in Vietnam today and the Vietnamese do not know what a wartime economy should be.

Why should we permit a wheeling-dealing government to go uncontrolled while Uncle Sam writes a blank check? I ask that we reduce the CIP request by \$110 million to make it equal to last year's appropriation.

Let us Vietnamize the economic aspects of this war, as we are attempting to do with the military. Let us let the fat pockets in Saigon know there is a war going on.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: Page 61, lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$414,600,000 for the fiscal year 1970" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$304,600,000 for the fiscal year 1970".

Page 62, immediately after line 13, insert the following: "(d) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1970 under subsection (b), not more than \$130,000,000 may be used for the commercial import program in South Vietnam."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy: Page 2, at the end of line 15, insert the following:

"The Congress further declares it is the national policy of the United States to balance her international accounts and bring inflation under control, in order to insure dignity, freedom, and a decent standard of living for American citizens. The Congress further declares that this policy serves our national purpose to maintain a free and peaceful United States of America. To this end, the United States should conserve its resources for use in building her own necessary human and material resources, and economic and social institutions which serve the aspirations of her own people, to the end that the United States may continue to be the backbone of the free world. To insure the effectiveness of this national policy, no appropriation of money hereunder shall be expended in any year in which the national debt is not reduced by at least \$5 billion."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Dowdy).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to part I? If not, the Clerk will read.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have 2 minutes of time for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the limitation of time for debate was by the clock. The time expired at 5 o'clock.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 2. Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 503(a), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting "barter" between the words "loan" and "or grant";

(b) Section 504, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), delete "\$375,000,000" and "1969" and substitute therefor "\$350,000,000" and "1970" respectively;

(2) in the second proviso of subsection (a) insert after the word "country" the words "other than Greece, Turkey, the Republic of China, the Philippines and Korea";

(3) add new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The military assistance program for any country in any fiscal year shall not be increased beyond 20 percent of the amount justified to the Congress or \$1,000,000, whichever is greater, unless the President determines that such an increase in such program is essential to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress within thirty days after each such determination."; and

(4) add new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this part in Korea, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purpose, not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970 and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

(c) Section 506(a), which relates to special authority, is amended by deleting "1969" each place it appears and substituting "1970".

(d) Section 507, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Latin America, is amended by deleting subsection (d).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 64, line 3, after the letter "(d)", add "and

(e)", and after line 10 add a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this part in the Republic of China, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purpose, not to exceed \$54,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I believe the importance of this amendment is recognized in the language of the report on page 51. I understand the problems of the committee. It has many demands, dollars are scarce. I am confident the committee is sympathetic to the purpose of the amendment.

First, let me make certain that the amendment is understood. It would increase the authorization in foreign military assistance by the amount of \$54.5 million for the purpose of providing a squadron of F-4D aircraft to the Republic of China in Taiwan. It has been stated repeatedly that the most economical form of mutual security is obtained through friendly foreign military forces which are equipped with U.S. weapons systems. The F-4D is not our most modern aircraft, but it is one which has been used most successfully in South Vietnam where it has proven a match for the most modern Mig's, and it is the same model which is being provided for the Republic of Korea. It is also the model which the Taiwan Government has requested.

There are a number of reasons why this amendment should be approved. This administration has made it clear that it seeks to encourage our friends abroad to rely more on their own military resources. By providing more adequate weapons for Taiwan, we help to make this possible. The Taiwanese forces now are equipped with F-86 and F-100 aircraft. These are not a match in any sense for the modern Mig fighters with which the Red Chinese forces are equipped and which they also are manufacturing. They are out of date. Please bear in mind that the Red Chinese forces are overwhelmingly larger than the Taiwan forces. If the latter are to have a chance to survive in the event of war, it is essential that they be better equipped.

The people of the Republic of China are among our very best friends. Already they are paying heavily from their own funds for their defense needs. They help to keep a brake on Red China by their firm stand for the Western alliance. Their effectiveness as a deterrent to Red Chinese aggression certainly is dependent upon the effectiveness of their fighting forces.

Every U.S. observer will state their fighting forces are outstanding but they will also tell you the Taiwanese equipment is getting old, it is getting obsolescent, and it is no match for the equipment of the Red Chinese forces. Taiwan is one of the very few nations which has volunteered fighting forces—combat units—to assist the allied cause in South Vietnam. Their offer was not accepted, principally because the U.S. State Department did not want to aggravate Red China, but the offer still stands. These are staunch friends. We do not have many in the world who are willing to fight by

our side. If we have help to give, let us give it to those we know are with us.

Let us look at our situation in the Pacific. The Philippines are withdrawing their forces from South Vietnam. It was only a token force of support troops. There were no combat units. But even this they are unwilling to provide for the common security. Japan, which contributes nothing to the common defense, apparently is to get Okinawa back lock, stock, and barrel on their own terms, this despite the fact that Okinawa is the most important forward bastion that we have and our forces will be severely handicapped if our use of Okinawa is limited in the manner in which the Japanese propose. All of this encourages aggression.

The world is watching the United States: If we show no signs of standing by those few who are our proven friends, our entire Pacific structure may collapse like a house of cards. The Russians are very busy in that area. They are making deals in whatever way they can, with everyone they can. Taiwan is one of the few nations left which refuses to consider the Communist blandishments and Red China is threatening on every side.

This is a very small amount of money but it carries a lot of significance. It will hearten our friends in the Republic of China and those in other nations who want to continue to stand by us. I consider it to be one of the best investments we can make.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the amendment and the statement of the distinguished author of the amendment. This is military assistance and not foreign aid. The Republic of China is one of our few allies that can support an F-4 aircraft, can maintain it, operate it, and fulfill their mission in the Far East. They have 20 divisions ready to help us, but they do not have adequate air cover. At least we owe them the opportunity to have air cover in their commitment to carry out the fight for freedom.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Aid of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, my enthusiasm for foreign aid is not any higher this year than it has been in previous years—and I have never yet voted for a foreign aid authorization bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, based on principle, and having in my possession certain information, I think I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say to the Members of the House that this is a very meritorious proposal; and for the first time in my 23 years in the House, I am going to vote for an amendment to increase the amount in the authorization bill by \$54,500,000.

In my opinion, Nationalist China is one of our best friends—if not our best friend—in that part of the world, even though we may have cut them off from the economic aid program much earlier than some of the other countries that need to be cut off. They accepted that decision without complaint and have adjusted their national budget to compensate for it, even though there are other countries in the world still receiving economic aid who, in my opinion, should be cut out of the program.

Several Members have mentioned today the talks that are taking place between the President and Prime Minister Sato of Japan regarding the return of Okinawa to Japan. To me, that would make the friendship and cooperation of Nationalist China even more important, if we are to maintain a realistic posture of defense capability in that part of the world. Therefore, I repeat, I intend to vote for this amendment, even though I will vote against final passage of the bill, and will do whatever I can in my own committee to see that the objective of the amendment is fully funded.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from Florida on his forceful and compelling statement and assure him that I shall vote for his pending amendment. The argument that the gentleman makes in favor of the expenditure of these funds for these aircraft is verified at page 51 of the written report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, where they say:

There is danger that the number and quality of aircraft in the Nationalist China inventory may not be adequate to cope with the new and sophisticated aircraft now appearing, in increasing numbers, in the armed forces of Communist China.

Mr. Chairman, I urge full support of the gentleman's pending amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES). I think this is a meritorious amendment. I think it may get us more for the money than any other part of the bill we have had yet.

I think we ought to pass the amendment.

I intend to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sikes amendment. It seems to me in this day and at this time, when we consider the number of really dependable friends the United States has around this world, we must consider Taiwan as one that is among the most prominent and dependable. That is the Republic of China. They have been our friends from the beginning. They have a tremendous military force of great potential. They wield a stabilizing effect throughout Southeast Asia.

If the time arrives—which God forbid—when there should be a major conflict developing in that area of the world, the presence of this country with its military capability can be of tremendous value to the whole free world. Now, of all times, we need to enhance the capability that does exist there. Those people need these airplanes if we are to make the maximum and best use of the potential they have to give to us and to the free world.

We know Red China has repeatedly threatened to invade Formosa. We know our friends in Taiwan are under the Communist gun. We know it is in our national interest to keep Formosa free, strong, and prepared. Above everything it is imperative that this little country have a modern air force. I earnestly hope this amendment will be overwhelmingly approved.

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

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES). I think it is a very good amendment. I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Texas and all the other gentlemen who have stated their support for this amendment. It is surely an effort to stand with our friends and is worthy of our support.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Florida, a few questions. I also want to say, as one who has been around here a great many years and who has seen the contribution that Taiwan has made to the defense strategy of the United States, that I support the objective of the amendment to assist the Government of China in its effort to keep that part of the world free.

But as one who has chaired this committee for a great many years, and who always has opposed earmarking military funds for specific countries, because I felt we were likely to find ourselves with unnecessary problems which are created by earmarking, I wonder if the gentleman from Florida, the author of the amendment, could assure this House that the money will be spent by the Department of Defense for the purpose he advocates.

Mr. SIKES. Of course I am not authorized to speak for the Department of Defense, but I am authorized to state that the planes are available. It has been recommended by our own military forces that the planes be made available out of any funds that can be allocated or appropriated for that purpose.

I am not authorized to speak for the Department of Defense or the administration, but in my opinion they will be delighted to have an opportunity to make these aircraft available.

Mr. MORGAN. This bill already carries an earmarking of \$50 million for military assistance for South Korea, put in by a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), during the markup of the bill. At that time many of us knew the great need for rehabilitating the military equipment necessary for the defense of South Korea.

I know it has been a long time since we have supplied the Republic of Taiwan with an adequate amount of up-to-date equipment. I recognize that their military equipment is getting pretty shopworn, so I can see that, considering their strategic location, so close to Red China, they are going to need modern aircraft equipment.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. I should like to state that I commend the gentleman's committee on the fact that additional funds are provided for the Republic of South Korea as well. I know something about the inadequacy of the equipment of our friends all over the world.

That is one of our principal problems. We are asking our friends to take on a bigger part of the burden or responsibility for their own defense but we are not making additional equipment available to them that is modern enough for them to withstand Communist aggression on their own borders. It is very important that we help our friends to modernize all over the world.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse this amendment. I might add that there are high ranking responsible people in the administration who believe that this amendment is a very worthwhile one. The aircraft are available. There is a need.

It seems to me, in the light of all the problems we have in Southeast Asia and particularly if we believe in the President's new Southeast Asian policy, this amendment ought to be approved.

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the chairman for yielding. I was going to get my own time.

I can say I am not going to support this amendment. I should like to ask the distinguished author of the amendment why it is that these kinds of planes are coming under an aid amendment instead of a military amendment? I thought we had been through this a little earlier. I am at a loss to appreciate how this kind of materiel is coming under the foreign aid program.

Mr. SIKES. May I state to the distinguished gentleman that this type of equipment, these weapons systems, al-

ways comes under military assistance in the Foreign Assistance Act. That is a part of the regular procedure of the House.

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

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORGAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the RECORD ought to at least show that there were no hearings, no justification whatever before the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the amendment that is now proposed. This is too much money to add to this bill without the slightest justification except the statements of the sponsors.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to speak in opposition to the amendment for several reasons. I hope that the author of the amendment might be helpful in responding to some questions.

Is it your intention to give this aircraft to the Nationalist Government?

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. The purpose of the amendment is to provide funds to make the aircraft available. Of course, we would be purchasing them with U.S. funds to make them available to the Government of Taiwan. Keep in mind that the Republic of Taiwan is spending very considerable sums of their own money in their defense program. This is just a drop in the bucket compared to the amounts of money that they require for even a minimum of defense for the Republic of China. It is essential, and I am sure they will make good use of it.

Mr. FRASER. I wanted to know if we are going to give it to them. I understand under your amendment we will give these airplanes to the Government of Taiwan.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman understand that when we provide military assistance such as airplanes to the country of Israel, that she has to pay for them?

Mr. SIKES. I am not an expert on that, and I would have to refer the question to an expert on the matter on the committee.

Mr. FRASER. Will the gentleman tell me where these airplanes are manufactured that we will be turning over to the Government of Taiwan?

Mr. SIKES. In the United States. I cannot tell you exactly. It is not in my district. I can tell you that.

Mr. FRASER. You do not know the manufacturer of the aircraft?

Mr. SIKES. St. Louis, Mo., McDonnell-Douglas.

Mr. FRASER. Can the gentleman tell us this: Do the Chinese, the Communist Chinese, have a seaborne capability

which would allow them to mount an invasion of Taiwan from the sea?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, they do have a seaborne capability.

Mr. FRASER. Will the gentleman tell us just what seaborne capability they have?

Mr. SIKES. I do not have that spelled out in front of me, and I am sure the gentleman realized it when he asked his question.

Mr. FRASER. Let me say I understand they do not have a seaborne capability and if the gentleman from Florida knows they do, I wish he would tell us just what the facts are.

Mr. SIKES. I think my information on the situation is as sound as that of the distinguished gentleman in the well. It is my information that they do have the capability.

Mr. FRASER. Will the gentleman tell us what that capability is? What ships do they have?

Mr. SIKES. I do not carry around lists, as I spelled out, of the waterborne capability of any nation, including our own.

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

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman want to help me on the answers to some of these questions?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am just seeking light. I do believe that the Chinese Communists, although they do not have a seaborne capability of great importance, do have an airborne capability.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman understand that they will invade Taiwan from the air and move enough troops over by air so that they will pose a direct security threat to Taiwan?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I do not suppose that, but they do represent a military threat.

Let me say that I have been consistently opposing much of our military aid. We are throwing it around the world everywhere, in a lot of places where we are not justified in doing so. But I have always felt that military aid for big countries on the threshold of Communist aggression is worthwhile. That is why I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FRASER. Is the gentleman making the statement that without this aid Taiwan is in danger of being successfully invaded?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I do not think that I can ever take a position on that, because no one knows what any country will do at a given time. We hope that we are not that close and we hope that we have a margin of safety. If I thought it was just a squadron of planes that was going to make the difference between war and peace, that would be something else.

Mr. FRASER. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I find it ridiculous to come in and ask this House to give \$54 million, or whatever figure is asked for, for planes to go to the Government of Taiwan when we make other countries such as Israel, which is directly faced with attack day in and day out, pay for their airplanes. There is no credible evi-

dence that the Communist Chinese have a capability of invading Taiwan. This free use of the taxpayers' money is the reason why our program gets into trouble. To bring this amendment to the floor of the House without hearings and with no substantial justification or facts means that this kind of an amendment should be rejected out of hand. I hope that the House committee will take that view on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I do want to make it very clear insofar as my own feelings are concerned that I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) to add \$54 million for Taiwan.

I believe it is in the best interests of the United States. This is an area which is extremely vital to us. I certainly hope that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union approves this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: Page 63, strike out lines 10 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), strike out '\$375,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969' and substitute '\$350,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$350,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971';"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this is the next to the last amendment which will make the bill come in all areas to the authorization for fiscal year 1971, as well as for the rest of fiscal year 1970.

The committee for the first time since I can remember reduced military assistance from \$375 million to \$350 million for 1 year. My amendment carries out the intent of the committee to put it at the \$350 million mark which the committee decided upon and which represents a cut of \$25 million, and the same amount for fiscal year 1971.

I do not think there is much confusion about the amendment. However, if there are any questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The committee is happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: On page 63, line 20, strike out "or."

On line 21, strike out "\$1,000,000, whichever is greater."

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to tighten up congressional control over the allocation of military assistance to the various countries of the world, especially the underdeveloped countries.

Before the original language of this bill was written, the military assistance program was entirely on an illustrative basis. The purpose of putting in the original language limiting it was to make sure that if the State Department, or AID, or the military proposed to allocate funds in any different manner than what they justified to the Congress, they would have to come back to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the administration feels it needs some more flexibility in this matter and they have offered a 20-percent leeway, or \$1 million. I feel that \$1 million gives them too much leeway. I made some calculations and in some cases this would result not in a 20-percent leeway but in several hundred percent.

Actually there is plenty of flexibility because there is a further clause in the bill which says, "Unless the President determines that such an increase in such program is essential to the national interest of the United States"—Thus the administration has means of flexibility here, first is 20 percent and the second the Presidential escape clause.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that this amendment will be accepted.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We certainly understand the sincerity with which the gentleman proposes this amendment. But there is some concern about how it would affect situations where there are small military training programs involving several hundred thousand dollars.

Would the gentleman's proposal bring about a hardship on such situations, particularly when there are increased costs for training, for instance? Would the gentleman explain how his amendment would affect such types of military training programs?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Of course, it would allow them to add on another 20 percent above what they justified. Remember, they come here each year for justification. But if that were not enough and they had a real meritorious situation then they would go to the President and make use of the Presidential escape clause. And that is the reason why they have \$1 million in here, because they do not want to go to the President, and they do not want to go to the Congress; they want to be allowed to do so on their own.

I do feel we need more restriction on this. I do not feel it works a hardship.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Personally, I do not have very strong feelings about this, but I do hope the amendment will not hurt some of the small programs.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. My understanding is that you accept my amendment.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman has made the

point, and they always seem to be talking about flexibility. The only people this gives flexibility to are the military. As the gentleman says, there is one overriding reason, the President can issue an order and give them any amount they want.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The committee then accepts the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying—if you have made a sale, close the order book and go home.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to part II, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 601, which relates to private enterprise, is deleted and the following section is substituted therefor:

"SEC. 601. STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In furtherance of the purposes of part I the President is encouraged to utilize, whenever he deems appropriate, the services of State and local organizations on contract or other basis to provide technical assistance authorized under part I. The President shall encourage and coordinate technical assistance activities of such state and local organizations, both those financed under part I and those otherwise financed, in order to promote their maximum development effect."

(b) Section 602, which relates to small business, is deleted.

(c) Section 608(a), which relates to advance acquisition of property, is amended by deleting in the second sentence "section 212" and substituting therefor "section 202".

(d) Section 609(a), which relates to the special account, is amended by deleting the words "chapter 4 of part I" and substituting therefor "section 452".

(e) Section 610, which relates to transfers between accounts, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (a) insert after the words funds made available for any provision of this Act "the first time they appear the words (except funds made available pursuant to title II of chapter 3 of part I)".

(2) In paragraph (b), delete the words "sections 451" and substitute the words "sections 453" therefor and delete the words "section 402" and substitute the words "section 452" therefor.

(f) Section 611, which relates to plans and cost estimates, is amended by deleting the words "under titles I, II, and VI of chapter 2 and chapter 4 of part I" in paragraphs (a) and (e) and substituting therefor the words "under chapter 2 of part I and section 452".

(g) Section 614(b), which relates to special authorities, is amended by deleting the words "chapter 4 of part I" and substituting therefor the words "section 452".

(h) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (m) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof, substituting a comma and adding the words "unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the national security of the United States and promptly reports such determination to the Congress, together with his reasons therefor."

(2) Subsection (s) is amended to read as follows:

"(s) (1) In order to restrain arms races and proliferation of sophisticated weapons, and to ensure that resources intended for economic development are not diverted to military purposes, the President shall take into account before furnishing development loans, Alliance loans or supporting assistance to any country under this Act, and before making sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended:

"(A) the percentage of the recipient or purchasing country's budget which is devoted to military purposes;

"(B) the degree to which the recipient or purchasing country is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment; and

"(C) the amount spent by the recipient or purchasing country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, from any country.

"(2) The President shall report annually to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate his actions in carrying out this provision."

(3) Subsection (v) is amended to read as follows:

"(v) United States military assistance should not be provided to any government which opposes the free and peaceful development of democratic institutions or which denies fundamental freedoms to the people of that country. In furnishing military assistance under this part, the President shall take into consideration the external threat to the recipient country, its political traditions, and the political, economic, and social conditions existent therein, and the impact of United States military assistance thereon. The shipment of defense articles and the providing of defense services, other than the training of military personnel, should be terminated to any government which has come into power through means other than through the constitutional processes of that country."

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 624(d), which relates to the duties and responsibilities of the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, is amended as follows:

(1) In subparagraph (2)(A) insert after the words "under part I of this Act" the following: "(including the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), and under part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (the Inter-American Social Development Institute)".

(2) In paragraph (5), before the period at the end of the first sentence insert the following: "and part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969".

(3) In paragraph (7), in the first sentence immediately after "programs under part I or II of this Act," add the following: "and part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969".

(b) Section 626(a), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, is amended by deleting the words "rates not in excess of \$100 per diem" and substituting therefor the words "rates not to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the general schedule established by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code".

(c) Section 632(a), which relates to allocation or transfer of funds, is amended by inserting after the words "any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act" the following: "(other than funds available under title II, chapter 3 of part I)".

(d) Section 634, which relates to reports and information, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (a) after the words "concerning operations" insert "(other than those reported pursuant to section 332)", and delete the last sentence.

(2) In paragraph (b), delete from the second sentence the words "from the Development Loan Fund established pursuant to section 201(a)" and substitute "pursuant to section 203" therefor.

(3) In paragraph (d), delete in the first sentence "1969" and substitute "1971" therefor and delete in the last sentence "303" and substitute "401(b)" therefor.

(e) Section 635(a), which relates to general authorities, is amended as follows:

(1) Insert between the words "of" and "commodities" the words "defense articles and".

(2) Add the following new sentence at the end thereof: "Defense articles and commodities transferred to the United States Government in exchange for assistance provided under this Act may be used to carry out this Act, or may be transferred without reimbursement to any agency of the United States Government for stockpiling or other purposes."

(f) Section 635(h), which relates to general authorities, is amended by deleting "titles II, V, and VI (except development loans) of chapter 2 of part I" and substituting "sections 202 and 205" therefor.

(g) Section 636, which relates to uses of funds, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (c), (d) and (e), delete wherever it appears the following "title I of chapter 2 of part I" and substitute "section 203" therefor.

(2) In paragraph (f), delete "212" and substitute "202" therefor, delete "title I of chapter 2 of part I" and substitute "section 203" therefor, and immediately before the period at the end thereof insert: "or by the Corporation established under chapter 3 of part I with respect to loan activities which it carries out under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended".

(h) In section 637(a), which authorizes appropriations for administrative expenses, delete "1969, \$53,000,000" and substitute "1970, \$52,250,000" therefor.

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. Section 643 of chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to saving provisions, is amended by inserting after the words "section 642(a)" and "section 642(a)(2)" each time they appear the words "and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969".

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: Page 71, strike out line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "substitute '1970, \$52,250,000, and for the fiscal year 1971, \$52,250,000.'"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of the conforming amendments to make it an authorization for 1971 as well.

This is \$52,250,000 for administrative expenses. The AID asked for \$54,250,000. I believe we had an amendment by the chairman himself to cut it \$2 million. I am not sure we cut it enough, but

at least it is a cut which they can live with, they do not argue that. And we are authorizing the same amount for next year since the program we have authorized will be exactly identical for the next fiscal year, and they ought to be able to administer it with the same amount of money.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 66, after line 12, insert: the following new paragraph:

"(1) Subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any Communist country or to any international, regional, or other organization which gives any form of foreign assistance to a Communist country. For the purposes of this subsection, the term—

"(1) 'foreign assistance' means any type of government-sponsored grant, loan, guarantee, insurance, or other assistance of a type similar to the assistance furnished under this Act; and

"(2) 'Communist country' shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

"Peoples Republic of Albania,
"Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
"Peoples Republic of China,
"Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,
"German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
"Estonia,
"Hungarian Peoples Republic,
"Latvia,
"Lithuania,
"North Korean Peoples Republic,
"North Vietnam,
"Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
"Polish Peoples Republic,
"Rumanian Peoples Republic,
"Tibet,
"Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
"Cuba, and
"Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics)."

And renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. HALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I believe speaks for itself. I shall not take the entire time. It is well known to the committee and to the Members of the House that it is identical to the amendment, in the Ex-Im Bank law, title 12, United States Code, section

32, chapter 6A, 635b(3), and that is the reason I presumed to ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read.

The Export-Import Bank spells out the identical words of the amendment except, of course, that this one has to do with furnishing military or economic assistance whereas the other one has to do with extending credit. Outside of that it is the same and I would hope that it will be accepted.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to locate this language in the act.

Mr. HALL. I have the act here, Mr. Chairman, it is the title 12, United States Code, section 635, chapter 6A, section 635b(2)(3).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I might submit to the gentleman, we do not have the Code here and the Code references by sections would be different from the act we have.

Mr. HALL. Let me supply it to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The list of countries that the gentleman has in the amendment is not listed.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say we do not have a copy at all on this side.

Mr. HALL. Yes, there is a copy of the amendment at the minority desk.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We cannot seem to find it.

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

Mr. HALL. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We have found the reference the gentleman has made to the Export-Import Bank. In order to further understand the gentleman's amendment, would he answer this question: if the amendment were adopted, would any of the U.S. contributions to the United Nations such as, for example, the voluntary contributions to the special fund be affected if in any way special fund assistance would be made available to a Communist nation or to a nation which would be trading with a Communist nation?

Mr. HALL. No, in my opinion they would not. It says very plainly subsection (f) would be amended to read as follows:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any Communist country.

And the way it is placed in the proposed bill, it certainly is not the intent of the gentleman from Missouri in offering this amendment, to influence any funding of the United Nations, the special fund, the general fund, or the WHO or other funds therein; although I do not believe we should support them to the extent and percentage that we do. I do not think this is applicable. This applies only to this act.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's intention, but I would respectfully submit that the way

the language is written it would do exactly that.

In other words, the language of the amendment says that subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any Communist country or to any international, regional, or other organization which gives any form of foreign assistance to a Communist country.

In the bill before us there is \$100 million for the United Nations development program and other contributions of a voluntary nature to the United Nations specialized agencies. I am afraid that this amendment would directly restrict those fundings under this act. That is the way I read it and I do not see any other way you can read it.

Mr. HALL. Again I assert to the gentleman and the members of the committee that, as written, this amendment to H.R. 14580, on page 66, following line 12, as it is inserted in the text is not intended to have such an intent. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment states clearly:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any Communist country or to any international, regional, or other organization which gives any form of foreign assistance to a Communist country.

It would seem to me that that language would preclude our participation in any of the voluntary agencies within the U.N. in which Communist countries do participate. In most of the U.N. voluntary agencies and movements Communist countries are involved and are contributing. From the complex language presented, it seems to me that this would cut off our participation in any further funding in the U.N. voluntary movements and many of the U.N. development programs. I think because we do have a disagreement as to interpretation, that this is far too broad to be adopted at this point in the debate.

Therefore, in the interest of interpretative clarification as what agencies can participate in the United Nations funding programs, I would hope that the amendment would be voted down.

Though I do understand the gentleman's words, it seems to me that even a liberal interpretation of paragraph (f) of his amendment would preclude further funding in the voluntary agencies of the United Nations. The amendment should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey in his interpretation. I also wish to point out that the way the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is now written, it would eliminate the presidential waiver provision of the existing law. That is the only other change it would make in the present law, because the present law already covers all the countries mentioned in the amendment.

So the two changes proposed by the amendment are, first, it eliminates the presidential waiver; second, it eliminates

for all practical purposes any contribution under this act to any international organization. I just do not see how it could be read in any other way.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No matter what the intent of the author of the amendment, the plain language of the amendment would prohibit assistance provided under this act to a great many international organizations. Let me read a few of them: the U.N. Development Program, the U.N. Children's Fund, the F.A.O. Program, the World Food Program, the World Population Program, the U.N. Institute for Training and Research, and a number of others. A great many international programs would be involved. The prohibition is quite specific. There is no escape clause. I do hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of anything better that could happen around here today than to accept one amendment that would prevent the President, any President, from interfering with what ought to be done, in other words, take away his discretionary authority to set aside the intent of Congress. And I cannot think of an amendment that I would more gladly support than to short-change those who consort with the Communists in that Tower of Babel, otherwise known as the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: Page 68, after line 5, add the following:

"(4) Add the following new subsection:

"(w) The President shall suspend assistance to any country receiving assistance under this Act when the government of such country—

"(1) violates the principle of freedom of navigation in international waters by seizing any United States vessel traveling in international waters; or

"(2) fails to make such arrangements as the President deems adequate for (A) the return of passengers, crews and planes which have been forcibly diverted during flight and taken to such country, and (B) the extradition of the persons responsible for such forcible diversion.

Such suspension of assistance shall continue for such period as the President deems necessary. The provisions of this subsection do not apply to any case governed by an international agreement to which the United States is a party."

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to deter hijacking of aircraft and insure adherence by recipient nations to the basic principles of free passage on the high seas and in international air space. President Nixon in his speech September 18 to the U.N. General Assembly stressed that—

By any standards, aircraft hijackings are morally, politically and legally indefensible.

Certainly we have every right to expect those countries receiving assistance under the foreign aid program to rigidly adhere to these basic principles.

As I said yesterday during general debate I believe we have responsibility to affix certain strings to our aid program. Respect for international law is not only a valid condition for aid, it is necessary.

The problem of airplane hijacking, as the Members well realize, is a growing menace. The grave threat posed by hijacking to the safety of airplane crews and passengers cannot be overemphasized. And there is also the problem of property losses that could result when the aircraft themselves are not returned.

This amendment would provide that if and when a plane were hijacked to a recipient nation that the passengers, crew and aircraft would have to be returned safely. Also and most important extradition of the hijacker would be required of recipient nations.

This latter point is quite important because the threat or prosecution is an important deterrent to hijacking.

Earlier this year, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Charles H. Ruby, president of the Air Lines Pilots Association, reported that his group, along with the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations, favors "compulsory extradition" as the best deterrent to hijacking.

While we do not have the means to assure compulsory extradition on the part of all countries, we can certainly take this important first step with those nations that receive our foreign assistance.

Mr. Ruby went on to explain that prosecution of hijackers "is the final answer to this problem." We must therefore take this step to bring about prosecution whenever possible.

Now I have heard the arguments that this amendment is not necessary because recipient nations are friendly nations willing to cooperate with the United States. But I ask the Members, What about Italy? Certainly Italy is our respected friend. Yet Italy has refused to return the hijacker in their custody. This amendment is necessary to insure extradition whenever applicable as a deterrent to hijacking.

At the same time, this amendment will provide that in those instances over which we have control the safety of the crew and passengers will be protected. The gravity of this problem was pointed to in an IFALPA resolution that referred to hijacking as "a great hazard faced by both passengers and crew in air transportation."

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have here a simple but important amendment that will deter hijacking without impairing, in any sense, our aid program.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman points out the case of Italy. Only three countries have been involved

in hijacking: Syria, Cuba, and Italy. None of those countries are included in this particular bill. Only one country has refused to return a plane, and that is Syria. So the amendment, while it has a very worthy purpose with which I agree, nevertheless does not apply to these countries. The fact of the matter is that none of the three countries involved would be affected, they are not included in the bill.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New Jersey could guarantee me that further hijackings would not go into any of those areas that would be affected by this amendment, then I would agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, we could make an attempt to limit the hijackings to non-aid recipient countries.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York could guarantee me that the sanctions imposed by his amendment could deter hijackings, I would support the amendment. Believe me, I am very sensitive to this problem of hijacking. More of the hijackings have occurred in and out of my area than probably any other area of the world, so I am very sensitive to the question and what the gentleman is trying to do.

However, when we examine what is involved, it seems to me we will already be on the way to getting the job done. First of all, with respect to international waters, we already have the Pelly amendment and the protection of it as it applies to international waters. It seems to me we ought to stay with that provisions and keep the handling of this problem within the framework of the Fishermen's Protective Act, when it is right now.

If we write a subsequent and complementary section under this act, we will have some confusion as to which act should be applied, if any. It would be far better to leave it applicable under the Fishermen's Protective Act, in my judgment.

With respect to highjackings, the United States has moved very fast in the area of bilateral agreements. We now have over 80. We have also adhered to the Tokyo Convention. Recently, in Montreal, at the meeting of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the U.S. delegation has worked very hard with the object of getting a new convention or a protocol to the Tokyo Convention to help take care of the problem about which the gentleman is talking.

And in the United Nations, where I am serving at present as U.S. delegate, our delegation has been doing all in our power to bring the weight of world public opinion to bear on a resolution of this problem.

As the gentleman can see, therefore, we are moving on all available fronts.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, but unfortunately on a government basis today, we have been unable to do anything to deter this. This is an added insurance policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. MAYNE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLFF was al-

lowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. MAYNE. While we do not have a copy of the amendment here, it would seem to me that the language of the gentleman's amendment is so broad, referring to interference with navigation in international waters, as to include attacks on ships in international waters.

Mr. WOLFF. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. Is it not entirely possible that this amendment would require the President to preclude any aid to the nation which attacked one of our ships during the lightning war of 1967?

Mr. WOLFF. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. It seems to me that goes a good deal further.

Mr. WOLFF. It does not take the authority away from the President, but allows the President to act in what he believes is the best interest of this Nation.

Mr. MAYNE. I thought, as the gentleman read it, it said, "the President shall suspend" and it did not leave discretion to the President.

Mr. WOLFF. The gentleman listened to the latter part of the amendment, which said that such suspension of assistance shall continue for such period as the President deems necessary.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Page 68, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

"(4) Add the following new subsection:

"(w) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which—

"(1) engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of the United States; or

"(2) furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing, or sales by non-wholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance, or advisers to a nation described in paragraph (1)."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, again this is one of the exclusion amendments. This one, I believe, could certainly be agreed to. We have accepted it in our Ex-Im Bank, in our Development Bank, in our overseas food program, Public Law 480, FAO, and many others.

This simply precludes assistance to any country that does engage in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of our own sovereign Nation, the United States, or furnishes direct governmental action, with certain areas excluded, including chartering to avoid chartered ships, and so forth; but furnishing by direct governmental action goods, supplies, military assistance, or advisers to a nation described in paragraph (1).

I believe anyone could accept this. It does not have the danger of the other one, insofar as the international or regional organizations are concerned.

I believe it is the obvious intent just to strengthen the bill. Again this is taken from the title 12, United States Code, section 635, chapter 6A, subparagraph (3), which states in particular that:

The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product, technical data, or other information by a national or agency of any nation—

(A) which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of the United States; or

(B) which furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing or sales by non-wholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance, or advisers to a nation described in subparagraph (A);

nor shall the Bank guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase by any nation (or national or agency thereof) of any product, technical data, or other information which is to be used principally by or in a nation described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Merely to clarify the intent of the amendment and make legislative history, I would like to ask this question: Would the amendment apply if there was no armed conflict but, rather, an inadvertent attack on a U.S. vessel such as the one that occurred when a U.S. vessel off the coast of Israel was strafed and damaged with the loss of a number of lives. Would this amendment affect any aid given to a country that may by error attack a vessel of the United States?

Mr. HALL. I certainly think that would be within the discretion of the executive branch. There is nothing retroactive in this whatsoever. Where an error was made and the intention was stated and reparations were made, it would certainly be up to the President or the Commander in Chief.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And the decision would be made by the President of the United States as to whether the provisions of the amendment should be put into effect?

Mr. HALL. There is no question of that, in my opinion, by virtue of your own language in the bill which this succeeds on page 68.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Because of the fact that this is in the Export-Import Bank law, the chairman of the committee would be glad to take it to conference and see what we can do with it. We accept the amendment.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and thank him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to part III? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART IV—INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

SEC. 6. INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE.—(a) There is created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate to be known as the "Inter-American Social Development Institute" (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Institute").

(b) The future of freedom, security, and economic development in the Western Hemisphere rests on the realization that man is the foundation of all human progress. It is the purpose of this section to provide support for developmental activities designed to achieve conditions in the Western Hemisphere under which the dignity and the worth of each human person will be respected and under which all men will be afforded the opportunity to develop their potential, to seek through gainful and productive work the fulfillment of their aspirations for a better life, and to live in justice and peace. To this end, it shall be the purpose of the Institute, primarily in cooperation with private, regional, and international organizations, to—

(1) strengthen the bonds of friendship and understanding among the peoples of this hemisphere;

(2) support self-help efforts designed to enlarge the opportunities for individual development;

(3) stimulate and assist effective and ever wider participation of the people in the development process;

(4) encourage the establishment and growth of democratic institutions, private and governmental, appropriate to the requirements of the individual sovereign nations of this hemisphere.

In pursuing these purposes, the Institute shall place primary emphasis on the enlargement of educational opportunities at all levels, the production of food and the development of agriculture, and the improvement of environmental conditions relating to health, maternal, and child care, family planning, housing, and other social and economic needs of the people.

(c) The Institute shall carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section primarily through and with private organizations, individuals, and international organizations by undertaking or sponsoring appropriate research and by planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing programs and projects designed to promote the achievement of such purposes.

(d) In carrying out its functions under this section, the Institute shall, to the maximum extent possible, coordinate its undertakings with the developmental activities in the Western Hemisphere of the various organs of the Organization of American States, the United States Government, international organizations, and other entities engaged in promoting social and economic development of Latin America.

(e) The Institute, as a corporation—

(1) shall have perpetual succession unless sooner dissolved by an Act of Congress;

(2) may adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may make and perform contracts and other agreements with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated whether within or without the United States of America, and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign;

(4) shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid;

(5) may, as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Institute, employ, and fix the compensation of not to exceed one hundred persons at any one time;

(6) may acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise lease, hold, and improve, such real and personal property as

it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and use as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property;

(7) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government;

(8) may, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this section;

(9) may accept money, funds, property, and services of every kind by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise, and make advances, grants, and loans to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Institute in furtherance of its purposes;

(10) may sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction; and

(11) shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this section.

(f) Upon termination of the corporate life of the Institute all of its assets shall be liquidated and, unless otherwise provided by Congress, shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

(g) The management of the Institute shall be vested in a board of directors (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Board") composed of seven members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom he shall designate to serve as Chairman of the Board and one of whom he shall designate to serve as Vice Chairman of the Board. Four members of the Board shall be appointed from private life. Three members of the Board shall be appointed from among officers or employees of agencies of the United States concerned with inter-American affairs. Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of six years, except that of the members first appointed two shall be appointed for terms of two years and two shall be appointed for terms of four years, as designated by the President at the time of their appointment. A member of the Board appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term; but upon the expiration of his term of office a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and shall have qualified. Members of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment.

(h) Members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses not in excess of \$50 per day, and for transportation expenses, while engaged in their duties on behalf of the corporation.

(i) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Institute.

(j) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Institute may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed. A majority of the Board shall be required as a quorum.

(k) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Institute as the Board finds to be for the best interests of the Institute, each committee to consist of two or more members of the Board, which

committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Institute.

(l) The chief executive officer of the Institute shall be an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the Board of Directors on such terms as the Board may determine. The Executive Director shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315).

(m) In order to further the purposes of the Institute there shall be established an Advisory Council to be composed of such number of individuals as may be selected by the Board from among individuals knowledgeable concerning developmental activities in the Western Hemisphere. The Board shall, from time to time, consult with such Advisory Council concerning the objectives of the Institute. Members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their functions under this subsection.

(n) The Institute shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its directors, officers, and employees and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes set forth in this section. No director, officer, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

(o) When approved by the Institute, in furtherance of its purpose, the officers and employees of the Institute may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments or governmental agencies of foreign countries.

(p) The Secretary of State shall have authority to detail employees of any agency under his jurisdiction to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine. Any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of any such agency by virtue of such detail.

(q) The Institute shall establish a principal office. The Institute is authorized to establish agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or elsewhere in any of which locations the Institute may carry on all or any of its operations and business.

(r) The Institute, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation nor or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any territory or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

(s) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1970 to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available to carry out the purposes of this section. Funds made available to carry out the purposes of this section under the preceding sentence are authorized to remain available until expended. For subsequent fiscal years there are authorized to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this section.

(t) The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading).
Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent

that part IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to part IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 72, line 20, immediately after "housing," insert the following: "free trade union development."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply makes it clear and consistent with other language throughout the bill that one of the techniques and instruments of social development is the promotion of free trade union development. The language of the amendment would make that clear with respect to the purposes which are set forth on page 72 of the bill.

Although no further amendment is necessary, this same broad definition would also apply with regard to subsection (d) on page 73, when we talk about different entities which may be engaged in social development.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

PART V—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

SEC. 7. Chapter 33, subchapter III, and chapter 35, subchapter IV of title 5, United States Code, are amended as follows:

(a) Section 3343(b), which relates to details of personnel to international organizations, is amended by deleting "3" and substituting therefor "5" and is further amended by deleting the period at the end thereof, substituting a comma and adding the following: "except that under special circumstances, where the President determines it to be in the national interest, he may extend the 5-year period up to an additional 3 years."

(b) Section 3581(5), which relates to rights of personnel who transfer to international organizations, is amended by deleting the words "the first 3 consecutive years after entering the employ of the international organization" and substituting therefor the following: "the first 5 consecutive years, or any extension thereof, after entering the employ of the international organization".

(c) Section 3582(b)(1) is amended by deleting the words "3 years" and substituting

therefor the following: "5 years, or any extension thereof."

(d) Section 3582(b), which relates to re-employment rights for personnel who transfer to international organizations, is amended—

(1) by striking out " , except a congressional employee," in the first sentence; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentences: "On reemployment, he is entitled to be paid, under such regulations as the President may prescribe and from appropriations or funds of the agency from which transferred, an amount equal to the difference between the pay, allowances, post differential, and other monetary benefits paid by the international organization and the pay, allowances, post differential, and other monetary benefits that would have been paid by the agency had he been detailed to the international organization under section 3343 of this title. Such a payment shall be made to an employee who is unable to exercise his reemployment right because of disability incurred while on transfer to an international organization under this subchapter and, in the case of any employee who dies while on such a transfer or during the period after separation from the international organization in which he is properly exercising or could exercise his reemployment right, in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of this title. This subsection does not apply to a congressional employee nor may any payment provided for in the preceding two sentences of this subsection be based on a period of employment with an international organization occurring before the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969."

(e) Section 3582(c) is amended by deleting the words "3 years" and substituting therefor the following: "5 years, or any extension thereof."

(f) Section 3582(a)(1), which relates to rights of personnel who transfer to international organizations, is amended by deleting the semi-colon at the end thereof, substituting a comma, and adding the following: "except that such service shall not be considered creditable service for the purpose of any retirement system for transferring personnel, if such service forms the basis, in whole or in part, for an annuity or pension under the retirement system of the international organization."

(g) Section 3582(a)(2), which relates to rights of personnel who transfer to international organizations, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to retain coverage, rights, and benefits under chapters 87 and 89 of this title, if necessary employee deductions and agency contributions in payment for the coverage, rights, and benefits for the period of employment with the international organization are currently deposited in the Employees' Life Insurance Fund and the Employees' Health Benefits Fund, as applicable, and the period during which coverage, rights, and benefits are retained under this paragraph is deemed service as an employee under chapters 87 and 89 of this title;"

(h) Section 3582(d), which relates to agency contributions to retirement and insurance programs for personnel who transfer to international organizations, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) During the employee's period of service with the international organization, the agency from which the employee is transferred shall make contributions for retirement and insurance purposes from the appropriations or funds of that agency so long as contributions are made by the employee."

SEC. 8. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (59 Stat. 597; 31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by deleting "Development Loan Fund," and substituting therefor "Overseas Private Investment Corporation;"

SEC. 9. Chapter 53, subchapter II of title 5 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(a) Section 5314, which relates to level III of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(54) President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation."

(b) Section 5315, which relates to level IV of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(92) Executive Vice President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation."

(c) Section 5316, which relates to level V of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(128) Auditor—General of the Agency for International Development; (129) Vice Presidents, Overseas Private Investment Corporation (3)."

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to announce to the members of the committee that the motion to recommit will be the amendment proposed earlier today with respect to the Development Loan Fund which would reduce that fund by \$50 million for the current fiscal year and \$50 million for the next fiscal year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, now, as never before, there is a need for the United States to meet the great challenge posed by Vietnam, Asia, and the rest of the underdeveloped world and the changing situation in Europe. To meet this challenge, however, we must first recognize the inadequacies of our organization for planning and conducting of foreign relations as a whole. In addition, and more importantly, we must recognize and admit the inadequacies of our knowledge and understanding we, as a people, bring to our foreign relations position and program.

Because we have moved so rapidly from a position of relative isolation and a very minor role in world affairs, to a deep involvement in and heavy responsibilities as the strongest and most prosperous nation in what is now a much more interdependent and interrelated world, we must give attention to our capabilities and our obligations to lead.

The United States of America should, indeed, be more intelligently involved, not only because we can, but because we owe so much to a world that has given so much to us. "The more we have, the more we owe to those who do not have," is an accepted principle and teaching of many Americans and some important institutions and organizations in our country. This is an admonition that we should note more than we do.

American history also teaches us that whenever we extend freedom and opportunity to people who have less than we have, all the people benefit. There are so many experiences in American history that confirm this, but none better than the freedom and opportunity we have given to the Negroes.

On the matter of foreign policy and our present inadequacies, it would be unfortunate if we did not note that we have not completely failed.

In fact, considering our lack of experience, we have done extremely well and if there is a blame to be assessed, it should not be placed so much on the State Department and its personnel as it should on the American people for failing to give enough attention to foreign

policy and develop adequate programs for its prosecution.

The challenge, then, of this administration is to evolve a program, objectives, and policy that is consistent with the very best of our ideals and that has been tested by experience within our boundaries and one that would be acceptable and defensible outside of the United States of America.

Others have said, and I believe, that the trouble with our foreign policy is that we have no foreign policy. If we had a foreign policy and the capabilities to plan ahead, then the men at the top in our State Department would not have to, as they often have to do now, jump from crisis to crisis, thus staying behind of problems as they develop, rather than ahead of them.

Before we can adopt and enunciate a foreign policy, it may be well for us to reflect on the forces, the developments, and the influences that came together to make us what we are. I have said many times, and I believe, that we in America are the benefactors of the grandest, the broadest, and the greatest foreign aid programs ever conceived or received by any nation. Foreign aid is not a new thing in the world in which we live and its importance is not limited to today's underdeveloped countries. A great part, indeed, is an important part of American history, is the history of aid. Aid from every part of the world, mostly from Europe. The most magnificent and important part of our aid were the 45 million people who came to this country from every part of the world. They brought ideas, ideals, and cultures. They brought the desire to be free and the ambition to grow in stature. They brought technology, know-how, and because somebody had outlined a system, a way of life, a plan for government, they could come here and grow with each other, even though they were from many different tongues and many cultures and from all over the world.

Our aid was not just this kind of aid, however, it was technical, military, and economic, and it came over a period of two centuries. It came in the form of skills, customs, primitive equipment and livestock brought over by the early settlers and copied or reproduced here as the country moved West. It came in the form of machinery and materials that Americans imported, and though most of this was paid for by the products of the American soil, a portion—possibly a decisive portion—was financed in the early decades of the 19th Century with private loans from foreign governments—the enemies and rivals of England—to support the American Revolution. The United States is in a real sense the creation of European foreign aid, received in relatively small amounts at crucial points in our history applied with energy and ingenuity by Americans to American resources.

When the Colonies declared their independence in 1776, foreign military aid had already begun. Secret negotiations with France, and later Spain, led to early military and financial assistance. On May 2, 1776, Louis XVI of France decided to ship munitions, money, and supplies to the rebellious American Colonies.

The first formal diplomatic note in our history was addressed by Benjamin Franklin on December 23, 1776, to the Foreign Minister of France, leading to requests for financial aid and political support. Aid arrived to the new United States in the form of loans, grants, and military assistance. When the Peace Treaty of 1783 formally acknowledged America's independence, the Nation had received loans from France, Holland, and Spain, totaling nearly \$9 million, a lot of money to an unstable country. Grants, in the form of outright gifts, from France equaled more than \$2 million, and an additional \$6 million was provided, without charge, by France's use of her Army and Navy in our cause. In addition, France had given the U.S. direct military assistance in the form of military clothing, gunpowder, cannons, mortars and muskets. Historians generally agree that without French foreign aid and French influence in enlisting the aid of other European nations, our national independence "could not have been won." Ninety percent of the gunpowder the colonists used to fight the mother country was provided by the military assistance programs of the European powers.

From 1783 to 1814, foreign aid rescued the credit of the American Government on several occasions. In the early years, loans from Holland made it possible for the Nation to pay the principal and interest on the mounting national debt.

Military aid from Europe was not restricted to wartime alliances nor was it always confined to the recognized, constitutional government of the United States.

During the Napoleonic wars in Europe, the struggle among the interests of France, Spain, and England was transferred to the American back country. West Point and the early work of the Corps of Engineers on American defense installations owe much to French example and to French military technicians, and the English furnished arms and powder to the Indians to attack the pioneer settlements. The South received significant support from British landed aristocrats and cotton manufacturers at the time of our Civil War. The National Government survived through the strength of its own efforts, but that strength was formed and that nationhood established in the crucial years of the American Revolution with significant direct military assistance from abroad. There are few instances in history of so small an investment producing so enormous a result. Add to all of this the talent, sacrifices and dedication of such foreign greats as Baron von Steuben, Kostosky, Pulaski, and La Fayette, and one must admit that military aid was tremendous.

Many development loans from European investors in the next four decades went to State governments to develop basic economic functions at the local level. Loans to transportation projects, agriculture, public utilities, and new industries began to process.

Jefferson voiced "the growing desire of Americans for internal progress" in 1805 by calling for peacetime development of "rivers, canals, roads, arts, man-

ufactures, education, and other great objects within each State."

Between 1800 and 1843, our foreign obligations had risen from \$75 million to \$225 million, by 1869 to \$1½ billion, and at the end of the century, our foreign debts reached \$3.3 billion. Throughout the 19th century, foreign capital, both public and private, helped us achieve rapid economic development. Great Britain played the major foreign role in the economic development of the United States during the 19th century, although many other countries shared in American investment. British capital supplemented congressional land grants in financing the railroads and shared in mining and other basic industries. Almost no aspect of American society failed to benefit from foreign investments. Agriculture, railroads, land holdings, mines, petroleum banking, fisheries, breweries, commerce, public utilities, securities, insurance companies, manufacturers, as well as the military materially benefited from foreign capital. Such significant waterways as the Erie and Ohio Canals were financed largely by European capital. Cotton and sugar plantations depended for working capital on foreign funds, loaned to the growers through local and State banks. As our industry grew and more economic functions were performed by the private sector of our economy, larger amounts of foreign capital were invested in corporations, and smaller amounts were loaned or granted to State and local governments. By 1919 more than 90 percent of the foreign capital was invested in private industry. Throughout our entire westward expansion, foreign loans aided, inspired, and supported the economic development of the Nation. Nineteenth century America tells a convincing story about the positive relationship between foreign aid and rapid economic development.

By 1870, Americans had developed their economy far enough to begin to buy back large quantities of securities held by foreign sources. In fact, at the end of the century, America itself began to become a foreign lender, principally by helping to develop other regions in North America, Canada, Mexico, and Cuba. Still as late as 1914, the United States was a net debtor nation, that is, the Government and its people owed far more to Europe than was owed to us. Foreign investments in the United States totaled about \$6 million, although by this date, America had invested almost \$2½ billion in foreign markets. This left the United States in 1914, a net debtor nation of more than \$3½ billion.

The First World War changed all this. By 1919, the United States had turned from a net debtor to the world's leading creditor nation. This was accomplished in three ways, all of which were based on the strong foundation of 150 years of economic development as a recipient of foreign capital. Large amounts of foreign owned securities were sold in this country in order to obtain American dollars to finance the World War in Europe. American exports to Europe were stimulated due to the war, adding significantly to our capital strength. American loans to the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium,

Serbia, and others, accelerated total capital accumulation.

Consequently, by the end of the First World War, the United States instead of being a debtor to other countries, was a net creditor to the extent of over \$10 billion. For the first time in our history, the economic development of the United States was a worldwide, visible accomplishment.

The early experience of the United States demonstrates the value of foreign aid for the military security and the economic development of a young, threatened, and relatively poor nation. With the help of foreign experience, foreign understanding, foreign grants, military assistance, loans, and other capital investments, the national independence of the United States was secured, our essential economic foundations established, and our economic development begun. For us, foreign aid was a support to our own efforts to create national strength and wealth. Having created that wealth and strength, we were ready by 1919 to begin to extend the basic freedoms, to export capital and technology to Europe, and to new nations which stood where we had stood at the outset of our national history.

Mr. Chairman, a nation which has benefited so much from the foreign aid it received can afford to give foreign aid. It is admitted, of course, that there are right and wrong ways to give foreign aid. It must be understood, also, that money is not the only kind of foreign aid we can give nor is it the only kind of foreign aid that a nation will receive. The lesson of America for the world, it seems to me, is that there are all kinds of foreign aid that any national can receive just as we have from the experience of others. This is the kind of foreign aid we cannot give. Only history and experience can give it and it is there for the asking. We can and we should share our good will, our talent, and our example. We can and we should be good neighbors in every way that we can and one way is to show our appreciation to the countries, to the peoples and to the nations that have been so good to us. Reflecting on this should make us lose whatever arrogance we have and take on a spirit of humility. We can and we should intelligently give foreign aid in the form of money, but we ought to have sound rules. We ought to have simple procedures. We ought to have fair and equitable application and it ought to be designed to aid and abet the basic freedoms in a way it does not insult, belittle, or underrate any of the ancient systems and cultures.

Further, our policy ought to be one that is positive, not negative. In this age the idea of stopping communism, especially with a gun, is wrong and futile. The best recent example of this is Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, realizing that this bill is not a perfect bill, yet, it is the result of the best judgments of the committee, I shall vote for the bill, hoping that this administration will make some reappraisals of our foreign aid programs, that they will raise their sights by setting out obtainable goals that are entirely consistent with the basic freedoms and

there are five of them with which we can build a safer, more prosperous and adequate world.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, the United States played a key role in bringing Greece into NATO in 1952. Since then, and through several changes of government, Greece has remained a loyal member of the alliance and an important factor in NATO strategy. The American military assistance program for Greece is devoted to supplying the equipment and training necessary for Greece to play a meaningful part in NATO strategy. You have only to look at a map of the eastern Mediterranean to realize how important that part is. Look at Greece's Balkan neighbors. Look at how naval units exiting the Dardanelles from the Black Sea must pass through clusters of the Greek Islands in the Aegean Sea before they reach the Mediterranean.

Logistically and tactically, Greece provides unique geography for the defense of the southern flank of NATO. The military assistance program for Greece is designed to make it possible for Greek soldiers to take an important part in that defense. The military aid program for Greece is already a minimum effort, to reduce it further or eliminate it entirely would certainly weaken the capability of the Greek Armed Forces to meet a NATO emergency, would inevitably weaken the ties of Greece to NATO and further weaken NATO itself. It should be clear to anyone whose mind is open on this subject, that the fact that we provide Greek military forces with material which is to be used by those military forces as part of the NATO alliance in the defense of the Western World has no relationship to our attitude toward the kind of government which rules in Greece. How we make our attitude toward that Government known to it is a diplomatic problem. The question of supplying military aid to a NATO ally should be treated simply in the context of where the best interests of the United States lie.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, America's annual giveaway program for friend and foe alike is before the House of Representatives for funding—and I hereby register the loudest possible protest from the poverty-stricken people of America as I vote "no."

I vote "no" to giving \$4.5 billion to other countries while we have a single family struggling to make ends meet on less-than-adequate income.

I vote "no" to sending billions abroad while we have a single American youth barred from a college education for lack of a few hundred dollars.

I vote "no" to a senseless and irrational program that calls for us to give money to Thailand, Korea, and Taiwan on the one hand and then borrow hundreds of millions of dollars from them at 6-percent interest on the other.

I vote "no" to pouring American dollars into Bolivia while that country seizes all of the American-owned property it can find within its borders.

I vote "no" to favoring Ecuador and Peru with gifts of American tax dollars while those nations repay our generosity by seizing our fishing vessels, fining their

owners, and expropriating the property of our citizens.

I vote "no" to giving away a single tax dollar at a time when our people are laboring under the heaviest tax burden in our history, struggling to meet our overwhelming domestic needs, straining to whittle away at our \$360 billion public debt, paying a self-imposed surtax, and witnessing a 75 percent cutback in Federal construction projects in our fight against internal inflation.

Mr. Chairman, the generosity of Americans is legendary throughout the world. As the wealthiest nation on earth, we have been unstinting in our assistance to the weak, the faltering, the underprivileged, and less-fortunate peoples of the world.

But America herself is now in grave financial trouble. Our gold supply has been drained to a point below that necessary to meet our outstanding commitments; we are caught in a deadly spiral of inflation that threatens to destroy our economy; our balance of payments with other countries has shifted to our disadvantage; our interest rates are at an all-time high, thus curtailing home building and other vital internal projects.

This is no time for America to throw her largesse to the rest of the world.

Rather, it is time for all those countries who have been on the receiving end of our patronage to realize that the goose that lays the golden eggs is in process of being cooked. It is time for them to say, "Save yourself, America, for without your strength we are lost."

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 15480. I have at no time in my 7 years as a Member of this House, voted to tax the American citizen to support any foreign government and frankly I do not intend to begin now. If ever this House ought to take a long hard look into this program, it is now when we are faced with an economic crisis, and tremendous unmet needs in the area of housing, welfare, and pollution. While I respect the integrity of those who differ with me and feel it is in the interest of this Nation, I submit I cannot in conscience force by my vote the people of my district to dig deeper into their dwindling resources to support others who are not our responsibility. The world is not going to come to an end because we refuse to tax our people to support others.

While I have never opposed the granting of loans to other governments listed among our friends at reasonable rates of interest payable over a reasonable length of time, I feel that as long as one American cannot secure money on a basis equal to the loans we make to foreign governments; as long as one American farmer is forced off of his land because of increasing taxes; as long as one American property owner cannot secure aid from his Government to fund programs designed to prevent the loss of shoreline property; as long as one community cannot receive aid under the Hill-Burton Act to build a hospital because of lack of funds; as long as one American worker is denied job training because of the economic bind in which

we find ourselves; as long as one American community cannot secure aid from its Government to help it construct a sewage treatment or a water plant in order to meet water qualities standards set by the Federal Government, I cannot feel justified in voting away American tax dollars to assist foreign governments.

In a year in which the administration insists on a 75-percent cut in domestic public works and significant cuts in education, housing, and so forth, we cannot justify a 63-percent increase in foreign public works and an increase in the total outlay of foreign aid funds.

I take issue with two statements that have been made in the committee report, justifying the funds that have been proposed. The first statement is that the present foreign aid should be continued at the proposed level because of the successes of the Marshall plan.

Our Marshall plan went to a society that had an ideology and a form of institutions that needed only refinancing. Our aid under the Marshall plan was given to countries where human resources had been developed to such a degree of refinement that the aid would be properly husbanded. These conditions are not present in the many areas which the present assistance is intended to assist. The governments which we have been supporting under foreign aid do not have a history of institutional development, nor do they have an economic climate that need only be primed. In many of these countries there is no faith on the part of the people in the integrity and the stability of our own governments, and in the institutions that are unresponsive to the needs of the people. Too often the American taxpayers' money is funneled into countries where the ruling elite merely invests the money into easily liquidated assets.

The second statement with which I take issue is that the funds proposed constitute only one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product—GNP. The committee states that in 1949, during the Marshall plan, economic aid was close to 3 percent of our GNP. Yet the committee fails to state the fact the GNP of our Nation 20 years later is due, in large part, to inflation. In terms of true standards of production; the funds we are asked to spend are much higher than one-half of 1 percent.

As in all areas of Federal funding, the charge is leveled against opponents of bills that to oppose a program is to care little about the peoples designed to be benefited. How wrong this type of thinking is. I stand for the economic and political development of all individuals as a basic ingredient in developing human institutions. The way to accomplish this is to afford assistance in order that the individual may maximize the capabilities he has, and thus the capabilities of the nation in which he lives. This does not mean, however, that I must accept any proposal that is offered as a tired animal, one that has been promising to run, and which has never succeeded in solving the problems it was intended to solve. Especially when the cost is exorbitant.

A vote against this program will not bring assistance to a grinding halt.

Everyone knows this. The simple truth is that if this multibillion-dollar program is defeated, the committee can, and no doubt would, come before this body with a more realistic program based upon a more conservative allocation of funds.

The program under consideration is not all bad. There is much good in it and there exist many possibilities for new and better programs. Yet, in my estimation, it is too big in scope to expect our taxpayers to dig into their empty pockets for an increase in taxes in the face of inflation that has already wiped out many of the possibilities of solving our own problems of hunger, pollution, and education.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, for nearly a dozen years I have supported foreign aid legislation. For the most part I did so with great reluctance but with the sincere belief that despite glaring reports of misuse and squandor, it probably was accomplishing some good. I also had another reason which, to my thinking at least, was tremendously cogent. If I had voted "no" and a "no" vote prevailed then we would have cut our strings with over 100 countries in the world which now accepts our largess. This would mean, of course, that Russia or any other potential enemy of this country could pick and choose whatever and whichever strategic country might best serve her purposes. In due time this country would become her ally. Cuba is a good example. Within a matter of days after the Congress declined to extend the sugar quota, Cuba became a Russian satellite 90 miles from our shores.

These reasons for supporting foreign aid are still valid but they are not strong enough for me to vote for this legislation again this year.

The President has declared that this Nation must tighten its economic belt. With this, I agree, but the degree of "tightness" is a matter of great concern to me. If the belt is too tight it could kill or damage the body it binds.

In implementing this financial crunch we have seen prime interest rates rise to the point where there is practically no homebuilding in our country; we have seen defense cutbacks in personnel and facilities which seriously jeopardize the fiber of our national security; we have seen important public works projects deferred or canceled; we have seen an increase in joblessness—and we still have inflation.

Now we are asked to support a foreign aid authorization of something over \$2.1 billion.

We have had a foreign aid program for the past 23 years. During the course of the annual appropriations tremendous sums of money have been backlogged, some obligated, some not. This is what we call money in the pipeline—appropriated but not spent. Some estimate this to be as much as \$18 billion.

So, while I am voting "no" for the first time on this foreign aid bill, my hope is that the experts will deobligate these huge sums in the pipeline for purposes and programs which will prove most effective and will be in the best interests of our country.

As a nation, we cannot live in isolation from our neighbors. Our neighbors, how-

ever, cannot expect the same generosity from us at a time when we are on short rations.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. And I find it ironic that those Members of the House who have spoken out for the need of aid on the domestic front now speak for this bill which would send more than \$2 billion abroad.

And I am equally surprised that the administration has asked for almost \$1 billion more than the Congress appropriated last year. I am pleased to see that the committee has at least cut that amount, but it still represents an increase of \$400,000.

Last year I proposed a moratorium on foreign aid for 1 year while the Government gave our entire foreign policy a thorough examination to see where, if indeed we should, help nations and eliminate the millions of dollars which are going to countries which daily make headlines for deriding the United States.

As was pointed out in the committee report, there is presently more than \$19 billion in the pipeline.

Because of our commitment in Vietnam, I think it would be well for this Nation to reexamine our goals and commitments around the world based in part on our foreign commitments and determine the true value of foreign aid.

Our entire foreign aid program has been run in a slipshod fashion. There are no signs that annual evaluation has taught us anything. We still give millions to the same nations that we have in the past without regard to existing situations.

Indeed, the program is run in such an un-businesslike manner that if we were conducting this program on a domestic basis it would be immediately investigated. Interest rates are given which are denied to U.S. citizens. And in the end, it is the American citizen who pays for this through his tax dollar.

In a time when taxes are so high here, money is so tight and the cost of living is increasing so rapidly, I think we should practice some economy and cut foreign aid spending drastically.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 14540, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969. I do so with the knowledge that there are a great many forces competing for appropriations this year, more perhaps than any other year in recent memory. Funds are short, demands are great, and the specter of inflation hangs over every dollar of Government spending. In light of our continuing expenditures in Vietnam and the need to meet our problems here at home, the voters in each of our districts will be watching our vote on this measure with an extremely wary eye to see how it is that we assess our national priorities. They will be asking us: Is a vote for the Foreign Assistance Act a vote in their best interest? And, can we afford to give this assistance?

Many find themselves in opposition to the foreign aid program because they are under the impression that aid is a one-way street, just a big giveaway program pouring American dollars down a foreign rathole. Even those who support the objectives of the AID program do not

realize what direct benefits AID spending can mean to their districts back home. I would like to take this opportunity to attempt to dispel some of the popularly held misconceptions, at least in my district, about our foreign assistance program, and to show that a vote for this bill is definitely a vote in the direct interest of our constituencies, and to show that the United States can afford the program.

Few of my constituents seem to realize that over 90 percent of all foreign assistance funds are spent in the United States for goods procured from over 4,000 companies and for services obtained from some 1,000 private institutions, firms and individuals all over the country. In the State of Washington alone, during this last fiscal year from July 1968 to June 1969, over \$27 million were spent on goods purchased for AID programs. In Pierce County in my district, \$1,390,584 was expended in this past fiscal year. The following companies have benefited directly from the program up for consideration today:

In Tacoma: American Plumbing & Steam Supply, American Smelting & Refining Co., Central National Corp., Globe Machine Manufacturing Co., Hooker Chemical Corp., Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Pennsalt Chemical Corp., St. Regis Paper Co., and Wilkins & Associates, Inc.

Such expenditures at the local level create jobs at a time when local employment is again becoming worrisome. Further, almost 70 percent of American goods shipped abroad in this program are transported in American bottoms, and its continuance is of major assistance to our faltering merchant marine. However, there are further considerations which indicate that the foreign assistance program deserves our support.

Over one-half of the AID program is in dollar repayable loans. The bulk of the remainder is for technical assistance and for security-oriented aid to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

How does aid affect our balance of payments?

Because purchases under AID programs are "tied" and require that all commodity purchases be made from U.S. sources, the AID program does not have any net adverse effect on the American balance of payments. In fact, more dollars come back to the United States in interest payments and capital repayments on previous loans under AID and food-for-peace programs than leave the country. In fiscal year 1970, the net inflow of dollars under these programs is estimated at \$197 million.

In addition to the American goods which are purchased and sent abroad under the foreign aid programs, a great part of aid is spent on American technical assistance.

AID funds go to pay the salaries of American experts, both those who work directly for the government and employees of American labor unions, business firms, cooperatives, and universities that carry out technical assistance programs abroad on contract with the Agency.

To cast further light on the question

CXV—2219—Part 26

of whether we can afford the AID appropriation recommended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I cite the following: The authorization request for fiscal year 1970 now stands at \$2,189,000,000.

This figure is—

Less than 1 percent of the Federal budget;

Only about one-fourth of 1 percent of our gross national product—GNP;

Over \$100 million below the request for fiscal year 1970 by the previous administration;

The lowest such request in 10 years.

How does this compare with other developed countries in regard to their programs?

Seven other countries, Portugal, France, Australia, the Netherlands, West Germany, Belgium, and the United Kingdom in 1968 provided a greater percentage of their GNP than we did for official economic aid programs.

As Dr. John A. Hannah, AID Administrator, has pointed out:

Even if all forms of private investment are counted, the United States now is devoting less than two-thirds of one percent of our gross national product to economic aid, while other countries are moving toward or have already reached, the one percent of GNP which the United Nations has established as a desirable goal.

In his presentation of this bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) explained how the committee reached the figure it has recommended. Cuts of nearly \$441 million were made. Not because the administration request was excessive, but because the committee felt it necessary to balance the need of this vital program against the funds required to meet the demands of the far reaching social changes taking place at home.

In assessment of our national priorities we cannot afford to ignore what is happening beyond our shores. To cut this program further or to suspend it entirely, as has been suggested, could lead to consequences which we would all regret and which could be very expensive to remedy.

Unpalatable as this program may seem to many people, the pressures throughout much of the world of hunger, overpopulation and of burgeoning communism pose a need on the one hand and a threat on the other which we cannot afford to ignore. In the last analysis, the question of the amount of aid which we authorize today comes down to the question of whether we can afford to do less than the bill proposes.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the last few years, one of the most exciting and productive features of the foreign assistance program has been the establishment of cooperatives throughout the world through contractual agreements.

We all know that cooperatives have played an important developmental role in the history of the United States. Through the foreign aid program, the American "co-op" is now being introduced to millions of people in other countries still struggling for economic fulfillment. There are presently 45 American inspired co-ops operating in 30 different countries.

In Brazil, co-ops are helping subdue

the jungle. In the Dominican Republic, co-ops are building union housing. In Peru, co-ops are marketing the handicrafts of primitive Indian societies.

India is building a cooperative plant to produce fertilizer for its agricultural revolution and is supplying electricity to its rural areas through a national cooperative to help speed agricultural modernization.

Vietnam is using co-ops to distribute new breeds of pigs to its farmers. Uganda is expanding an education program to improve the performance of its farmer cooperatives. Korea has organized a cooperative marketing center to market its fish.

While other kinds of economic assistance may trickle very slowly to the people at the bottom levels of society, cooperatives reach the low-income levels without delay. Of equal importance is the fact that co-ops directly involve the peoples of the less developed countries in the democratic procedures that best secure their future in a free world.

With these objectives in mind, the Agency for International Development has lent nearly \$50 million to more than 50 countries to help develop cooperative enterprises. More than 250 cooperative experts from the United States are now at work on cooperative enterprises overseas.

Joining in the cooperative development program are the peoples and governments of the nations being assisted. In almost every case, there is local capital and local initiative sharing the task of development.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no other form of economic assistance that so accurately reflects the democratic way of life. For that reason alone—for the best interests of free world development—I urge this Congress to continue generous U.S. support for cooperatives abroad.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I can never be sure whether the figures furnished me on foreign aid are accurate or inaccurate. From the best information I can secure, we have given away about \$120 billion of the money of our hard-pressed taxpayers since 1946 when the great foreign aid giveaway began.

If that were the only cost of the foreign aid program it would be bad enough. The facts are it has been money we did not have but had to borrow in order to give away. We have spent billions and billions on interest alone on the borrowed \$120 billion we have given away. One estimate is the total interest payment runs as high as \$50 billion.

Our money has been given to all but 14 countries on this earth. We have even included in our bounty some countries that were not in existence at the time we opened the gates of our Treasury in the effort which some critics have described as the great foreign aid frolic.

A good question to ask ourselves as we consider this authorization is what good has foreign aid brought us. We seem to be experts at scattering to the four winds of the world our substance, but in terms of real, meaningful accomplishment, just what lasting benefits have come from this spending? One result has been to build up competition in the world which is now

challenging the United States in the world market. We have equipped so many countries so well and given them the know-how so expertly, they are now actually our economic enemies.

One example comes to mind. All the countries we have helped with machinery to go into the footwear business are now producing thousands upon thousands of footwear which are exported to this country for sale. Many of these firms were put into business with U.S. dollars. Today these foreign competitors put in peril the jobs of my constituents in the five shoe manufacturing plants estimated in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri, and the workers in the districts of many other Members.

This bill authorizes another great giveaway of the wealth of our Nation. With such a broad statement as that, I think I should best say that while I have been critical of foreign aid, my opposition is not based on foreign aid as a concept. The Marshall plan was an inspiring act of constructive statesmanship. However, in recent years, foreign aid seems to be living on its past laurels. There has been little sense of purpose and far too much drift.

I have also wondered whether our help to the new emerging nations has really helped them to stand on their own two feet. Who can forget all the scandals in these new nations that have been publicized about what happens to our foreign aid money?

Mismanagement and maladministration seems to be more common, even if unintended, than good management in the foreign aid program. I was interested in the last listed pages of the minority views attached to the report. It was pointed out we had provided funds for some countries which then lend the money by some procedure to the United States at 6-percent interest. We should take a closer look at this kind of thing. In order to have any foreign aid money our country had to borrow from our own people and, assuming we pay 5 percent on U.S. savings bonds, if we borrow some of this money back through some kind of foreign aid operation from recipient nations and pay them 6-percent interest, who can deny the Government is paying 11-percent interest on these particular funds? And who can say any kind of good is accomplished by funds which are provided another country when we immediately borrow back the money?

In my opposition to the foreign-aid program I have argued that economic aid and military assistance should be separated and put into two bills. If that were accomplished there could be some areas in which military assistance would be of benefit to our country. It would mean we could send equipment rather than send our men. It could well mean the avoidance of another quagmire like Vietnam. But that separation has never been accomplished and on balance the economic assistance is so maladministered that it so frequently outweighs or undoes the good that we have tried to accomplish by military assistance.

There are many things wrong with the foreign-aid program that should be cataloged. We have either loaned or given \$77 million to Ceylon. To show their ap-

preciation they expropriated the oil properties owned by the U.S. taxpayers who had provided these millions to them. In the case of Guatemala we have given or loaned over \$240 million. Has any of us forgotten that Guatemala seized 240,000 acres of lands owned and used by our fruit growers? The reason for seizure is said to be to provide employment for Guatemalans. If this is true, Guatemala should certainly not have as much future need for American generosity.

Turning to the case of Peru which uses vessels loaned by the United States under the military foreign assistance program, it is a fact that country is actually using these ships to chase down our American fishing boats far outside her continental waters. Besides the loan of these vessels we have given Peru about \$270 million. But Mr. Chairman, some of us who serve on the House Armed Services Committee only this week have considered doing something about these vessels that are in the hands of Peru. As to some of these, the loan agreement has expired and has not been extended and it may very well be we will have to send down and actually take these vessels out of their hands. Certainly, it must be done if they continue to use these ships to harass our American fishermen.

Brazil has received \$3 billion, Bolivia \$300 million and Argentina hundreds of millions. Yet each of these countries has taken U.S.-owned property without compensation. If we send emissaries down to inquire, our people have overripe fruit and other missiles thrown at them. Such treatment has been experienced by some friendly Americans whose purpose had nothing to do at all with the seizures of our property.

During my first year in Congress I was told it was our Nation's responsibility to eliminate poverty and hunger all over the world. I do not disdain the moral qualities of our people to think they are helping other human beings all over the world. But herein lies the great fault with the economic aid portion of the foreign aid program. In our zeal to be helpful we go into remote corners of the world to construct homes with fixtures unfamiliar to the occupants. We put in plumbing, wiring and fixtures where there is no water or sewer system and no service of electricity.

Our country does not have unlimited resources. At a time of fiscal stress when we are having to retrench in our own domestic program I cannot support a foreign aid program. I know where \$39 million is badly needed for VA hospital facilities. This is at the very moment we are being called upon to turn over \$200 million to such recipients as corruption-ridden India.

If foreign aid is such a success why is it these recipients of our bounty have not appreciated the help from the United States? Why is it they act like they really dislike us?

All of our billions for foreign aid programs all over the world has not bought us one single friend. Moreover, I am not sure one hungry person has been fed who would not have been better satisfied if his own government had not become so dependent upon the United States.

Finally, one question: When we have spent ourselves to the point of insolvency by such extravagance as foreign aid, which of the hundreds of countries which have benefited by our giveaways will move in to help us defend ourselves against the rest of the world and to put us back on the road to economic good health?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have always tried to support foreign aid proposals before this Congress and make them as wise and prudent as possible.

I believe we have to be a good neighbor and express our Nation's concern over the problems of hunger and distress which afflicts so much of our world. I believe we must help developing nations. Conflicts within nations and between nations stem in great measure from these afflictions.

However, I cannot support additional military assistance in the sum of \$54½ million for Chiang Kai-shek as proposed in the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable ROBERT SIKES.

Nor can I support legislation which refuses to provide the developing nations with the kind of help which allows them to develop and retain their self-respect. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR), to strike development loans funds is adopted, I feel the legislation has been fatally damaged and represents a wrong turn in American foreign policy.

Today, I was shocked to hear the President's Latin American envoy, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, state his support for Latin American military dictatorship before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This represents a further bad turn in foreign policy.

These new directions in foreign policy do violence to our moral responsibilities in the world. They ignore the lessons of Vietnam and promise little hope for new and positive directions in our foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair. Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 707, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Sikes amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 64, line 3, after the letter "(d)", add "and (e)" and after line 10 add a new subsection (e) as follows:

"There is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this part in the Republic of China, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purpose, not to exceed \$54,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. 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, 175, nays 170, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—175

Adair	Gallagher	Nichols
Anderson, Calif.	Gialmo	O'Konski
Andrews, Ala.	Goldwater	Passman
Annuozio	Gonzalez	Patten
Arends	Gray	Pelly
Ashbrook	Gubser	Pettis
Baring	Gude	Philbin
Beall, Md.	Hagan	Pickle
Bennett	Haley	Pirnie
Berry	Hall	Poff
Betts	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Blackburn	schmidt	Price, Tex.
Boggs	Harsha	Quillen
Bow	Hastings	Randall
Bray	Hays	Rarick
Brinkley	Hébert	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Henderson	Rhodes
Broomfield	Hicks	Rivers
Brotzman	Hosmer	Rogers, Fla.
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Ichord	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Jarman	Sandman
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Satterfield
Caffery	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Casey	Jonas	Schadeberg
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Chamberlain	Kee	Sebellus
Chappell	Keith	Shriver
Clancy	King	Sisk
Clark	Kleppe	Slack
Clausen, Don H.	Kluczynski	Snyder
Collier	Landgrebe	Springer
Cowger	Landrum	Steed
Cramer	Latta	Steiger, Ariz.
Cunningham	Lennon	Steiger, Wis.
Daniel, Va.	Long, La.	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Lujan	Stuckey
Derwinski	Lukens	Sullivan
Donohue	McClory	Symington
Dorn	McClure	Taylor
Dowdy	McKneally	Teague, Calif.
Downing	Mahon	Thompson, Ga.
Duncan	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Eshleman	Mann	Waggonner
Fallon	Marsh	Wampler
Fascell	Michel	White
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Whitehurst
Fisher	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Flood	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Flowers	Mize	Winn
Ford, Gerald R.	Mizell	Wolf
Foreman	Mollohan	Wylder
Frey	Morgan	Wyman
Friedel	Morton	Young
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Fuqua	Myers	Zion
	Natcher	
	Nelsen	

NAYS—170

Adams	Gaydos	Olsen
Addabbo	Gilbert	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Goodling	Ottinger
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	Pike
Barrett	Griffiths	Podell
Biaggi	Gross	Preyer, N.C.
Blester	Halpern	Pryor, Ark.
Bingham	Hamilton	Purcell
Blanton	Hanley	Quie
Boland	Hansen, Idaho	Rees
Bolling	Harrington	Reid, N.Y.
Brademas	Harvey	Reuss
Brasco	Hathaway	Riegle
Brooks	Hawkins	Robison
Brown, Mich.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rodino
Broyhill, N.C.	Heckler, Mass.	Roe
Burlison, Mo.	Helstoski	Rogers, Colo.
Burton, Calif.	Hogan	Rosenthal
Button	Hollifield	Roth
Byrne, Pa.	Horton	Roybal
Cahill	Howard	Ruppe
Carey	Hungate	Ryan
Carter	Hutchinson	St Germain
Celler	Jacobs	St. Onge
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Clay	Karth	Schneebeli
Cleveland	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Cohelan	Kazen	Shipley
Collins	Koch	Skubitz
Conable	Kyros	Smith, Calif.
Conte	Lloyd	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	Lowenstein	Smith, N.Y.
Corbett	McCloskey	Stafford
Coughlin	McDade	Staggers
Culver	McDonald,	Stanton
Daddario	Mich.	Stokes
Delaney	McEwen	Taft
Dennis	McFall	Tierman
Dent	Macdonald,	Udall
Diggs	Mass.	Ullman
Dingell	Madden	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Martin	Vander Jagt
Dwyer	Matsunaga	Vanik
Eckhardt	Mayne	Vigorito
Edwards, Calif.	Meeds	Waldie
Erlenborn	Melcher	Watts
Esch	Meskill	Weicker
Evans, Colo.	Mikva	Whalen
Farbstein	Minish	Wiggins
Findley	Mink	Williams
Fish	Monagan	Wilson,
Foley	Morse	Charles H.
Ford,	Mosher	Wright
William D.	Moss	Wyatt
Fraser	Nedzi	Yates
Frelinghuysen	Nix	Yatron
Galifianakis	Obey	
	O'Hara	

NOT VOTING—87

Abbt	Edwards, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.
Abernethy	Edwards, La.	O'Neal, Ga.
Albert	Eilberg	Patman
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Pepper
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Poage
Andrews,	Fountain	Pollock
N. Dak.	Fulton, Tenn.	Powell
Ayres	Garmatz	Pucinski
Belcher	Gettys	Railsback
Bell, Calif.	Gibbons	Reifel
Bevill	Griffin	Roberts
Blatnik	Grover	Rostenkowski
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Roudebush
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Wash.	Scherle
Buchanan	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Burton, Utah	Kirwan	Stephens
Byrnes, Wis.	Kuykendall	Talcott
Cabell	Kyl	Teague, Tex.
Camp	Langen	Thompson, N.J.
Clawson, Del	Leggett	Tunney
Colmer	Lipscob	Utt
Corman	McCarthy	Watkins
Daniels, N.J.	McCulloch	Watson
Dawson	McMillan	Whalley
de la Garza	MacGregor	Widnall
Dellenback	Mathias	Wold
Denney	May	Wylie
Devine	Mills	Zwach
Dickinson	Montgomery	
Edmondson	Moorhead	

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Lipscob.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. May.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Wold.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Corman with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Flynt.

Messrs. O'KONSKI, RHODES, QUILLEN, PETTIS, FREY, COWGER, MICHEL, and BROCK changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. PURCELL and O'NEILL of Massachusetts changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOGAN changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR
Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 14580) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Page 8, beginning in line 20, strike out "\$475,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$475,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—185

Adair	Flowers	Mizell
Addabbo	Foreman	Myers
Anderson, Tenn.	Frey	Natcher
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Pa.	Nichols
Arends	Galifianakis	O'Konski
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Passman
Baring	Goldwater	Pelly
Barrett	Goodling	Pettis
Beall, Md.	Gray	Pickle
Bennett	Gross	Pirnie
Berry	Hagan	Poff
Betts	Haley	Price, Tex.
Biaggi	Hall	Pryor, Ark.
Blester	Hanley	Purcell
Blackburn	Hansen, Idaho	Quillen
Bow	Harsha	Randall
Bray	Harvey	Rarick
Brinkley	Hastings	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Hays	Rhodes
Brotzman	Hébert	Riegler
Brown, Mich.	Henderson	Rogers, Colo.
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Rogers, Fla.
Burke, Fla.	Hosmer	Roth
Burleson, Tex.	Hull	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Ruth
Bush	Hunt	Sandman
Button	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Saylor
Caffery	Jarman	Schadeberg
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebell
Casey	Jonas	Scott
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Sebellus
Chamberlain	Kazen	Shipley
Chappell	King	Shriver
Clancy	Kleppe	Skubitz
Clausen, Don H.	Landgrebe	Slack
Cleveland	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Collins	Lennon	Snyder
Conable	Lloyd	Springer
Corbett	Long, La.	Stanton
Coughlin	Long, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
Cowger	Lujan	Steiger, Wis.
Cramer	Lukens	Stubblefield
Cunningham	McClure	Stuckey
Daniel, Va.	McDade	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	McDonald, Mich.	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Thompson, Ga.
Delaney	McKneally	Thompson, Wis.
Dennis	Macdonald, Mass.	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	Mahon	Waggonner
Dorn	Mann	Wampler
Dowdy	Marsh	Watts
Downing	Martin	White
Dulski	Mayne	Whitehurst
Duncan	Melcher	Whitten
Erlenborn	Meskill	Wiggins
Eshleman	Michel	Williams
Fallon	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Fish	Minshall	Wyatt
Fisher	Mize	Wydler
		Wyman
		Zion

NAYS—157

Adams	Dwyer	Hechler, W. Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Eckhardt	Heckler, Mass.
Annunzio	Edwards, Calif.	Helstoski
Ashley	Esch	Hicks
Aspinall	Evans, Colo.	Hollfield
Bingham	Farbstein	Horton
Blanton	Fascell	Howard
Boggs	Feighan	Jacobs
Boland	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Bolling	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Brademas	Foley	Karth
Brasco	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Ford, William D.	Kee
Broomfield	Fraser	Keith
Broyhill, N.C.	Frelinghuysen	Kluczynski
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	Koch
Burton, Calif.	Gallagher	Kyros
Cahill	Garmatz	Lowenstein
Carey	Gialmo	McClory
Celler	Gilbert	McCloskey
Chisholm	Gonzalez	McFall
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Madden
Clay	Green, Pa.	Mailliard
Cohelan	Gubser	Matsunaga
Conte	Gude	Meeds
Conyers	Halpern	Mikva
Culver	Hamilton	Miller, Calif.
Daddario	Hammer-	Minish
Dent	schmidt	Mink
Diggs	Harrington	Mollohan
Dingell	Hathaway	Monagan
Donohue	Hawkins	Morgan
		Morse

Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Qule
Rees

Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schwengel
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stokes
Stratton

Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Tiernan
Udall
Ulman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Welcker
Whalen
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

Mr. Grover for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Roubush for, with Mr. Gibbons against.
Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Railsback against.
Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Belcher with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Denney with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Langen with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Scherle with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Talcott with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Mathias with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Wold with Mr. Whalley.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Steed

NOT VOTING—89

Abbutt
Abernethy
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, N. Dak.
Ayres
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bevill
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Camp
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Corman
Daniels, N.J.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Edmondson

Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Jones, Tenn.
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Kyl
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McCulloch
McMillan
MacGregor
Mathias
May
Mills
Montgomery

Moorhead
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pepper
Poage
Pollock
Powell
Pucinski
Railsback
Reifel
Roberts
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Scherle
Sikes
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Utt
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wold
Wright
Wylie
Zwach

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Albert against.
Mr. Montgomery for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.
Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Daniels of New Jersey against.
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Eilberg against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Edmondson against.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Pucinski against.
Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. McCarthy against.
Mr. Alexander for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.
Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Tunney against.
Mr. Abbutt for, with Mr. Wright against.
Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Moorhead against.
Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Pepper against.
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Corman against.
Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Widnall against.
Mr. Lipscomb for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Leggett against.
Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.
Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Messrs. SHIPLEY, FISHER, and HANLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT). If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 14580 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, beginning in line 20, strike out "\$475,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$475,500 for the fiscal year 1971" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and \$425,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 163, answered "present" 4, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—176

Anderson, Calif.	Carey	Fish
Anderson, Tenn.	Cederberg	Flood
Annunzio	Celler	Ford, Gerald R.
Arends	Clark	Ford,
Aspinall	Conable	William D.
Barrett	Conte	Fraser
Beall, Md.	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Biaggi	Coughlin	Friedel
Blester	Culver	Fulton, Pa.
Bingham	Cunningham	Gallagher
Boggs	Daddario	Garmatz
Boland	Davis, Wis.	Gialmo
Bolling	Dennis	Gilbert
Brasco	Dent	Gonzalez
Brooks	Diggs	Gray
Broomfield	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Dulski	Gubser
Burke, Mass.	Dwyer	Gude
Bush	Erlenborn	Halpern
Button	Esch	Hamilton
Byrne, Pa.	Fallon	Hanley
Cahill	Farbstein	Hanna
	Fascell	Hansen, Idaho
	Feighan	Harrington
	Findley	Hathaway

Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kyros
Lloyd
McClory
McCloskey
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Maillard
Mann
Matsunaga
Mayne
Melcher
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan

Morgan
Morse
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Johnson, Calif.
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirmie
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan

St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Weicker
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—163

Adair
Adams
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Caffery
Carter
Casey
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Conyers
Cowger
Cramer
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Derwinski
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eshleman
Fisher
Flowers
Foley
Foreman
Frey
Galifianakis

Gaydos
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
King
Kleppe
Koch
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McClure
McDonald,
Mich.
Marsh
Martin
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Myers

Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Obey
O'Konski
Olsen
Passman
Pettis
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Roe
Rogers, Fla.
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scott
Sebellius
ShIPLEY
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Winn
Wyman
Yates
Zion

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Chamberlain
Evans, Colo.

Goodling
Steed

NOT VOTING—89

Abbutt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.

Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ayres
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bevill

Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.

Cabell
Camp
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Corman
Daniels, N.J.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Gibbins

Griffiths
Grover
Hansen, Wash.
Jones, Tenn.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McCulloch
McMillan
MacGregor
Mathias
May
Mills
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pepper

Poage
Pollock
Powell
Pucinski
Rallsback
Reifel
Roberts
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Scherle
Sikes
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Utt
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wold
Wylie
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mr. Buchanan for, with Mr. Goodling against.
Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.
Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Montgomery against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Cabell against.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey for, with Mr. Griffin against.
Mr. Eilberg for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.
Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Gettys against.
Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Bevill against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Alexander against.
Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Fuqua against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Abbutt against.
Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Stephens against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Jones of Tennessee against.
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. McMillan against.
Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Flynt against.
Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Fountain against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Pollock against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Camp against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Dellenback for, with Mr. Belcher against.
Mr. Rallsback for, with Mr. Roudebush against.
Mrs. May for, with Mr. Langen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Bell of California with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Wylie with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Denney with Mr. Mathias.

Messrs. BROWN of Michigan and OTTINGER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT). If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN). If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL). If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3666. An act to amend section 366(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;
H.R. 4284. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act;
H.R. 13949. An act to provide certain equipment for use in the offices of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 14195. An act to revise the law governing contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12829) entitled "An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12964, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with

Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, FLYNT, MAHON, BOW, LIPSCOMB, CEDERBERG, and ANDREWS of North Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. 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, H.R. 14580.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE REPORT ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on H.R. 12321, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 944, PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow night, November 21, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 944) to increase rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized military personnel.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13018, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1970

Mr. RIVERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-679)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference,

have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$4,316,000.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Community facilities, \$145,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Community facilities and utilities, \$1,539,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, \$1,825,000.

Fort Hancock, New Jersey: Utilities, \$625,000.

A.P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$364,000.

Fort Holabird, Maryland: Administrative facilities, \$489,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$4,006,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,845,000.

Fort Monroe, Virginia: Utilities, \$534,000.

Fort Story, Virginia: Training facilities, \$430,000.

Fort Wadsworth, New York: Utilities, \$545,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Utilities, \$2,391,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,760,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$1,176,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$10,286,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Troop housing, and utilities, \$12,372,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$8,316,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Training facilities maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,309,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$21,050,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Utilities, \$378,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Training facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,067,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$738,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$6,865,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$4,120,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Medical facilities and troop housing, \$502,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Utilities, \$1,957,000.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$2,210,000.

(Sixth Army)

Presidio of Monterey, California: Troop housing, \$2,125,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Community facilities, and utilities, \$745,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort McNair, District of Columbia: Training facilities, \$929,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and utilities, \$2,312,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$1,178,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, \$1,053,000.

Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia: Supply facilities, \$572,000.

Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin: Utilities, \$203,000.

Charleston Army Depot, South Carolina: Utilities, \$143,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, \$4,070,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Operational facilities, and research, development and test facilities, \$420,000.

Granite City Army Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$237,000.

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee: Utilities, \$344,000.

Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa: Utilities, \$503,000.

Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois: Utilities, \$4,643,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,457,000.

Michigan Army Missile Plant, Michigan: Utilities, \$354,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Research, development and test facilities, and community facilities, \$1,778,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$560,000.

Picatunny Arsenal, New Jersey: Utilities, \$989,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$1,026,000.

Radford Arsenal, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$1,641,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,396,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational facilities, \$425,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Utilities \$274,000.

Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas: Utilities, \$251,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico Research, development, and test facilities, \$3,218,000.

Fort Wingate Army Depot, New Mexico Utilities, \$217,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona: Research development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$734,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

United States Various Locations: Operational facilities, \$27,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Vint Hills Farms, Virginia: Utilities, \$136,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing and community facilities, \$3,740,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, and community facilities, \$17,421,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Training facilities, \$9,891,000.

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Production facilities, \$776,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$134,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey: Utilities, \$1,134,000.

Military Ocean Terminal, Kings Bay, Georgia: Utilities, \$177,000.

Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina: Operational facilities and utilities, \$1,871,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska: Utilities, \$743,000.

Fort J. M. Wainwright, Alaska: Training facilities, \$322,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Community facilities, \$1,524,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$23,678,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,756,000.

UNITED STATES SAFEGUARD COMMAND

Kwajalein Missile Range: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$3,273,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations: Operational facilities, \$2,951,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$22,323,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Taiwan, Formosa: Operational facilities, \$154,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives,

immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, Less Army Materiel Command (Fourth Army)" with respect to "Fort Sam Houston, Texas", strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,510,000".

(b) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$260,925,000" and "\$317,786,000" and inserting "\$261,135,000" and "\$317,996,000", respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading, "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Dix, New Jersey", strike out "\$2,585,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,471,000".

(2) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Lee, Virginia", strike out "\$1,646,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,727,000".

(3) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort George G. Meade" Maryland", strike out "\$4,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,198,000".

(4) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Military District of Washington)" with respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia", strike out "\$1,680,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,935,000".

(5) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois", strike out "\$320,000" and insert in place thereof "\$492,000".

(6) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Detroit Defense Area, Michigan" strike out "\$130,000" and insert in place thereof "\$201,000".

(7) Under the subheading "CORPS OF ENGINEERS" with respect to "Army Map Service, Maryland", strike out "\$156,000" and insert in place thereof "\$201,000".

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE" with respect to "Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina", strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$138,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$282,359,000" and "\$385,752,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$284,625,000" and "\$388,018,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Knox, Kentucky" strike out "\$727,000" and insert in place thereof "\$888,000".

(2) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to "New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania", strike out "\$638,000" and insert in place thereof "\$811,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 101 under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY" with respect to "Various Locations", by striking out

"\$5,386,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$6,928,000".

(c) Public Law 90-408 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$363,471,000", "\$85,610,000" and "\$449,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$363,805,000", "\$87,152,000" and "\$450,957,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$7,905,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, \$685,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, \$2,113,000.

Naval Underwater Weapons Research and Engineering Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Research, development and test facilities, \$754,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, \$1,063,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Utilities, \$303,000.

Naval Hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Utilities, \$214,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Ships Parts Control, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$215,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, \$10,828,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$222,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$834,000.

Naval Damage Control Training Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$1,210,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$47,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, and utilities, \$13,209,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, \$3,591,000.

Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Carderock, Maryland: Utilities at Annapolis Division, \$186,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$493,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$2,308,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,319,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing and community facilities, \$4,848,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$9,303,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$111,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$1,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$1,686,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$1,135,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville Florida: Utilities, \$2,060,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities and training facilities, \$251,000.

Naval Station, Key West Florida: Troop housing, \$2,130,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida: Training facilities troop housing, and utilities, \$12,909,000.

Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$857,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, \$1,321,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida: Utilities, \$923,000.

Naval Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities and real estate, \$349,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Training facilities, \$808,000.

Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia: Training facilities, \$2,920,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$252,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$11,988,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Supply facilities, \$277,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,932,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$5,233,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities, \$544,000.

Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$2,769,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Utilities, \$496,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,876,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities, \$1,060,000.

Naval Avionics Facility, Indianapolis, Indiana: Research, development and test facilities, \$157,000.

OMEGA Navigation Station, La Moure, North Dakota: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$5,690,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Utilities, \$1,793,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Utilities, \$511,000.

Navy Fuel Depot, San Pedro, California: Utilities, \$90,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$554,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Fort Huene, California: Troop housing and utilities, \$2,254,000.

Naval Hospital, Camp Pendleton, California: Hospital and medical facilities, \$19,805,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$9,390,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, \$1,335,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$3,335,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Center, San Diego, California: Research, development and test facilities, \$6,400,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$6,007,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,094,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Utilities, \$74,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities at Hunters Point Site and at Mare Island Site, \$12,494,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Troop housing, \$3,463,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$7,467,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities \$5,101,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,557,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities, \$6,519,000.

Naval Facility, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$2,467,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$4,087,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Naval and Marine Corps Air Activities: Operational facilities, \$766,000.

Various Naval Communication Stations: Utilities, \$2,030,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia: Troop housing, and utilities, \$1,711,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Bogue, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$620,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,415,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,983,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, \$256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Troop housing, \$5,943,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,418,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$4,150,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Community facilities, \$2,536,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$5,601,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities, \$460,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$2,898,000.

Naval Facility, Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$65,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Troop housing, \$3,995,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$87,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Facility, Eleuthera, Bahama Islands: Community facilities, and utilities, \$283,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland: Community facilities, \$2,834,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

OMEGA Navigation Station, Bratland, Norway: Operational facilities, \$2,954,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$1,422,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, \$4,419,000.

Naval Hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands: Hospital and medical facilities, \$1,354,000.

Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan: Hospital and medical facilities, \$746,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,062,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Utilities, \$1,770,000.

Naval Station, Sangley Point, Republic of the Philippines: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Naval Air Activities: Operational facilities, \$235,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of \$10,810,000.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 204. (a) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND (Field Support Stations)" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, by striking out "\$1,466,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$1,861,000".

(b) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$118,769,000" and "\$142,932,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$119,164,000" and "\$143,327,000."

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Amphib-

ious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, and the Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$6,220,000" and "\$65,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$6,456,000" and "\$97,000", respectively.

(2) Under the subheading "SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$4,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,058,000".

(3) Under the subheading "NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$6,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,760,000".

(4) Under the subheading "ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Stations, Yuma, Arizona, and El Toro, California, strike out "\$2,133,000" and "\$4,918,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$2,179,000", and "\$5,410,000", respectively.

(5) Under the subheading "THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Navy Supply Depot, Seattle, Washington, and the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, strike out "\$252,000" and "\$2,626,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$645,000" and "\$3,122,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, and the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "\$7,636,000", "\$2,554,000", and "\$1,170,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$8,121,000", "\$3,268,000", and "\$1,619,000", respectively.

(7) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS GROUND FORCES FACILITIES" with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "\$12,507,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,754,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, by striking out "\$6,283,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$8,181,000".

(c) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in clause (2) of section 802 by striking out "\$415,108,000", "\$39,515,000", and "\$461,407,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$422,599,000", "\$41,413,000", and "\$470,796,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$13,356,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,687,000."

(2) Under the subheading "ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, California, strike out "\$5,674,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,517,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in clause (2) of section 802 by striking out "\$229,726,000" and "\$236,591,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$234,900,000" and "\$241,765,000."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AERONAUTICAL CHART AND INFORMATION CENTER

Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Utilities, \$357,000.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$225,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Hospital facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$4,647,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, \$303,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, \$20,800,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, \$157,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Administrative facilities and troop housing, \$1,992,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,540,000.

Volk Field, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, \$208,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Research, development, and test facilities, \$315,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, \$525,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,385,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Administrative facilities, \$835,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,086,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$2,575,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$4,825,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, \$1,440,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, \$736,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational and training facilities, \$394,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,897,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,741,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,903,000.

Los Angeles Air Force Station, Los Angeles, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, \$781,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,108,000.

Eastern Test Range, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, \$43,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Operational facilities and utilities, \$1,021,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, \$635,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,139,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Training facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,118,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,107,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, \$496,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and troop housing, \$1,771,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$8,241,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$2,223,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$816,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,151,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$954,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$4,167,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Administrative facilities, \$152,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, \$435,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Administrative facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$4,462,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Utilities, \$578,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,528,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$6,370,000.

HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE RESERVE

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities and real estate, \$957,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities and utilities, \$813,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$5,358,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,192,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities and real estate, \$7,519,300.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,699,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,664,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$1,021,000.

nance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,134,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$329,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$11,865,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, \$209,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, \$549,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Maintenance facilities, \$126,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$236,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Troop housing, \$597,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,459,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities and utilities, \$1,028,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Community facilities, \$587,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$5,236,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, \$178,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$231,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, \$186,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$800,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational facilities and utilities, \$284,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, \$265,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,532,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$263,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$174,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Utilities, \$394,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$488,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Administrative facilities, \$157,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$415,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$1,847,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities and community facility, \$939,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$1,372,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,608,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,234,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Troop housing, \$198,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-

ginia: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, \$560,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,636,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$642,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop housing, \$231,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,476,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,514,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$2,097,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$137,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,835,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$551,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,324,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Troop housing, \$957,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, \$407,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Western Test Range: Research, development, and test facilities, \$2,292,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Utilities, \$287,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$7,904,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,265,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$5,730,000.

United Kingdom: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$9,040,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$678,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,246,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$300,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisitions, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$29,234,000.

Sec. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installa-

tions and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "\$2,523,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,507,000".

(2) Under the subheading "PACIFIC AIR FORCE" with respect to Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, strike out "\$2,566,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,034,000".

(3) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$1,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,628,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "\$2,243,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,744,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Goose Air Base, Canada, strike out "\$90,000" and insert in place thereof "\$136,000".

(c) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 802 "\$312,050,000", "\$26,904,000", and "\$398,376,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$314,578,000", "\$26,950,000", and "\$400,950,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$495,000.

Manzano Base, New Mexico: Utilities, \$36,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Supply facilities, \$300,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$318,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Supply facilities, \$827,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah: Supply facilities and utilities, \$1,052,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities and utilities, \$468,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas: Utilities, \$39,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$603,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy, California: Utilities, \$882,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland: Troop housing facilities and utilities, \$4,678,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$1,000,000.

Classified Location: Operational facilities, \$3,564,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Johnston Island: Operational facilities, \$1,903,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 403. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 401 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY" with respect to Fort Meade, Maryland, by striking out "\$2,121,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$2,609,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in clause (4) of section 802 by striking out "\$81,696,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$82,184,000."

TITLE V

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Family Housing units—

(a) The Department of the Army, twelve hundred units, \$25,060,000:

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, one hundred units.

Fort Carson, Colorado, one hundred and fifty units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred and forty units.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, two hundred and sixty units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, two hundred and fifty units.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, one hundred units.

(b) The Department of the Navy, one thousand nine hundred and fifty units, \$47,517,000:

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, one hundred and two units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, one hundred and ninety units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, one hundred units.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia, forty-eight units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, two hundred units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, ten units.

Naval Station, Guam, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred units.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, one hundred units.

(c) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand six hundred and fifty units, \$33,855,000:

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, three hundred units.

Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, one hundred and fifty units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, two hundred units.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, three hundred units.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, one hundred units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, three hundred units.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, two hundred units.

SEC. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed \$21,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$40,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$32,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. Except as provided in section 504 of this Act, and notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not here-

before repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 504. Nothing contained in this Act and nothing contained in section 603 of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 388) shall be deemed to affect the cost limitations provided in subsection 602(d) of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 388) with respect to construction of family housing units at George Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) for the Department of the Army, \$2,101,000.

(b) for the Department of the Navy, \$4,500,000.

(c) for the Department of the Air Force, \$4,500,000.

(d) for the Defense Agencies, \$439,000.

SEC. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, or otherwise acquire, in foreign countries, thirty family housing units. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land and interests in land, and shall be limited to such projects as may be funded by use of excess foreign currencies when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts. The authorization contained in this section shall not be subject to the cost limitations set forth in section 502 of this Act: *Provided*, That no family housing unit constructed or acquired pursuant to this authorization shall cost in excess of \$60,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 507. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352) as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1969 and 1970" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970 and 1971", (2) inserting "and the Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia," immediately after "Kansas," in the last sentence, and (3) adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "In no case may any housing unit be leased under authority of this section at a monthly rental in excess of \$250, including the cost of utilities and maintenance, and operation."

SEC. 508. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326) as amended, is amended by striking out "1969 and 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1970 and 1971".

SEC. 509. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to relocate four hundred and forty-four family housing units to military installations where there are housing shortages, from installations as follows: two hundred relocatable units from Kincheloe Air Force Base, Michigan; eighteen relocatable units from Sundance Air Force Station, Wyoming; and two hundred and twenty-six United States manufactured units from a classified overseas location: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the proposed new locations and estimated costs, and no contract shall be awarded within thirty days of such notification.

SEC. 510. (a) Section 7574 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsections (a), (d), and (e) may be increased up to 15 per centum if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that such increase is in the best interest of the Government to permit award of a turnkey construction contract for family housing to the contractor offering the most satisfactory proposal."

(b) Sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by adding

the following new subsection at the end of each:

"(h) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsections (a), (f), and (g) may be increased up to 15 per centum if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that such increase is in the best interest of the Government to permit award of a turnkey construction contract for family housing to the contractor offering the most satisfactory proposal."

SEC. 511. The third clause of section 501(b) of Public Law 87-554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) as added by section 606 of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 304), is amended to read as follows: "and (3) notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of debt service, proceeds of the handling and the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense, including related land and improvements, whether handled or disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal Agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485(b)), to remain available until expended."

SEC. 512. Notwithstanding any other provision of law limiting the term of a contract, the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may enter into contracts for periods of not more than 4 years for supplies and services required for the maintenance and operation of family housing for which funds would otherwise be available only within the fiscal year for which appropriated.

SEC. 513. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$10,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110 as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, one unit, \$11,000.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, thirty-nine units, \$513,200.

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, twenty units, \$232,000.

Marine Corps Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, four units, \$108,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, one unit, \$14,100.

SEC. 514. Subsection 601(b) of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 387) is amended by striking out "\$15,725,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,000,000."

SEC. 515. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$125,833,000, and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$563,685,000.

TITLE VI

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 601. Section 701 of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 306) is amended by changing the semicolon to a period after "\$27,000,000" and deleting all language thereafter.

SEC. 602. Section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290) is amended as follows:

(a) In the third sentence of subsection 1013(c) after the word "installation" delete

the phrase "and prior to the one hundred and twentieth day after the enactment of this Act."

(b) At the end of subsection 1013(d) delete the period, substitute a colon therefor, and add the following: "Provided further, That no properties in foreign countries shall be acquired under this section."

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended 31 U.S.C. 529 and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$175,853,000; outside the United States, \$104,135,000; or a total of \$279,988,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$271,251,000; outside the United States, \$24,244,000; section 202, \$10,810,000; or a total of \$306,305,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$208,611,000; outside the United States, \$31,149,000; section 302, \$29,234,000; or a total of \$268,994,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$41,165,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, \$689,518,000.

SEC. 703. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based on bids received, for the construction of such project

exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

SEC. 704. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts awarded by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 705. (a) As of October 1, 1970, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of July 21, 1968, Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before July 22, 1968, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in these Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1970, and authorizations for appropriations therefor; and

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 805(a) of the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 390), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1971:

(a) utilities in the amount of \$1,800,000 at Fort Richardson, Alaska, that is contained in title I section 101 of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 281).

(b) operational facilities and utilities in the amount of \$846,000 for the United States Army Air Defense Command in CONUS Various Locations that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 281).

(c) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$528,000 for Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 285).

(d) supply facilities in the amount of \$110,000 for Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 286).

(e) maintenance facilities in the amounts of \$260,000 and \$585,000 for Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, and Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, respectively, that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 287).

(f) utilities in the amount of \$612,000 for Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND" of the Act of October 12, 1967 (81 Stat. 279).

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date; and

(2) notwithstanding the repeal provision of section 805(b) of the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 391), authorizations for two hundred family housing units at George Air Force Base, California, and for two hundred and fifty family housing units at Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, that are contained in the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 387); and

(3) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

Sec. 706. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction cost index is 1.0:

(1) \$36 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) \$9 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$2,750 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$10,000 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That

notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 707. Section 607(b) of Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by deleting the words "December 31, 1970" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1975".

Sec. 708. Notwithstanding the restriction imposed by section 809 of the Act of October 21, 1967, Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 309), the Secretary of the Army is authorized to make available to the Post Office Department for postal services only a site on Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, located northeast of Kalia Road and not to exceed one acre, for the construction of a post office, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army deems necessary.

Sec. 709. The President is authorized to establish and conduct an International Aeronautical Exposition (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "exposition"), with appropriate emphasis on military aviation, at a location of his choice within the United States. The exposition shall be held at such time, but not later than 1971, as the President may deem appropriate.

For the purpose of conducting the exposition, the President is authorized—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as he may deem appropriate, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

(2) to obtain temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem in the case of any individual;

(3) to charge and collect admission, exhibition, and other fees;

(4) to accept donations of money, property, or personal services;

(5) to request the head of any department or agency to detail personnel to assist in the conduct of the exposition, and the head of each such department or agency is authorized to detail personnel for such purpose, with or without reimbursement;

(6) to acquire (by purchase, lease, or otherwise), construct, maintain, and improve real and personal property and interests therein;

(7) to enter and perform, with any person or body politic, contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions on such terms as he may deem appropriate, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) and section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b);

(8) to establish and prescribe the functions of such advisory committees as he may deem appropriate; and

(9) subject to such supervision and review as he may prescribe, to delegate to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, or to such other person he may select any of his authority under this Act.

No officer or employee appointed to a position under this Act shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of chapter 53, of title 5, United States Code, as amended, nor shall any such officer or employee receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate payable under the General Schedule to an officer or employee in a position of the same level of difficulty and responsibility.

Individuals appointed under this Act to

positions in recognized trades or crafts, or in unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual labor occupations, shall receive compensation in accordance with prevailing wage board rates at the location selected by the President.

Any property acquired under this Act and remaining upon the termination of the exposition shall become the property of the Department of Defense or such other Federal department or agency as the President may direct.

The net revenues derived from the exposition, after payment of the expenses of the exposition, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

To the extent that appropriations made to any Government department or agency are available for such purpose, such department or agency is authorized to participate in the exposition, as an exhibitor or otherwise.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$750,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

Sec. 710. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1970."

TITLE VIII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 801. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$10,950,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$6,000,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves: \$8,500,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,500,000;

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$4,000,000.

Sec. 802. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by a gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 803. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, under such terms as he deems appropriate, the one hundred and ten acres, more or less, together with the improvements thereon, in the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, which is presently licensed to the State of Texas, for the use of the Army National Guard, subject to the condition that said city provide alternate facilities for the Army National Guard in accordance with Department of Defense criteria, title to which alternate facilities shall vest in the State of Texas: *Provided*, That such alternate facilities be constructed without additional cost to the Federal Government: *And provided further*, That should the fair market value of the said one hundred and ten acres be in excess of the actual cost of design and construction of such alternate facilities to said city, exclusive of any contribution made

by the State of Texas, the city shall pay to the Federal Government an amount equal to such excess.

SEC. 804. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under such terms as he deems appropriate the forty-three acres, more or less, together with any improvements thereon, formerly known as the Air Force San Patricio Fuel Storage site, subject to the conditions that the Commonwealth provide new facilities for the Army National Guard in accordance with the Department of Defense criteria, title to the facilities which vest in the Commonwealth Government: Provided, That such facilities be constructed without additional cost to the Federal Government: And provided further, That should the fair market value of said forty-three acres be in excess of the total cost of design and construction of such facilities to the Commonwealth, exclusive of any contribution which would normally be required to be made by the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth shall pay to the Federal Government an amount equal to such excess.

SEC. 805. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Washington all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this section, in and to a certain parcel of land located in the city of Seattle, King County, Washington, containing fifteen acres, or less, together with all buildings and improvements thereon, being part of property known as the National Guard facility, pier 91, Seattle, Washington, as shown more particularly on a map or file in the office of the district engineer, United States Army Engineer District, Seattle, Washington.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be in consideration of and subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) The property to be conveyed shall be used primarily as a site for the construction of a nine-unit or larger National Guard Armory and related facilities for National Guard training and other military purposes, and in the event construction of the armory is not completed within five years from the date of the conveyance, or if, thereafter, the property conveyed hereby ceases to be used for National Guard purposes during the period of twenty-five years from the date of the acceptance of the completed armory, title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and all improvements made by the State of Washington during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(2) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this section shall be reserved to the United States.

(3) The Secretary of the Army shall reserve from the conveyance such easements and rights-of-way for roads and utilities as he considers necessary for the operations of the military facilities in the vicinity.

(4) In time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency declared by the President, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property, or any part thereof, is useful or necessary for national defense and security, the Secretary of the Army on behalf of the United States shall have the right to enter upon and use the property or part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State, for a period not to exceed the duration of such war or emergency and six months. Upon termination of such use, the property shall revert to the State, in equally good condition less wear and tear, together with all improvements placed thereon by the United States and subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations on use and disposition previously imposed. Such use by the United States

under this provision shall be without obligation or payment on the part of the United States.

(5) The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to include in the conveyance such other terms and conditions as he may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, the State of Washington shall construct an armory on the property to be conveyed under this section without contribution of Federal funds therefor, in lieu of paying monetary consideration for said conveyance.

(d) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the grantee.

(e) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this section and any related documents.

SEC. 806. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1970."

And the Senate agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
O. C. FISHER,
ALTON LENNON,
SPEEDY O. LONG,
RICHARD C. WHITE,
L. C. ARENDS,
DURWARD G. HALL,
CARLETON J. KING,
ED FOREMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN G. TOWER,
PETER H. DOMINICK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The Managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On July 23, 1969, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 13018, which is the Fiscal Year 1970 military construction authorization for the Department of Defense and Reserve Components.

On November 10, 1969, the Senate considered the legislation, amended it by striking out all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

COMPARISON OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

H.R. 13018, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided construction authorization to the military departments and the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 1970 in the total amount of \$1,547,215,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate provided authorizations in the amount of \$1,642,051,000, (including deficiency authorizations)

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

As a result of a conference between the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 13018, the conferees agreed to a new adjusted authorization for military construction for Fiscal Year 1970 in the amount of \$1,626,920,000.

The Department of Defense and the respective military departments had requested a total of \$1,893,300,000 for new construction authorization for Fiscal Year 1970. The action

of the conferees, therefore, reduces this departmental request by \$277,400,000.

The total construction authorization recommended by the conferees of \$1,626,920,000 is \$156,000,000 less than the amount authorized last year and \$277,400,000 below the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

DEFERRALS AND BASE CLOSURES

In initially approving the bill, the House Committee deferred many items it indicated were necessary but which it felt could be safely deferred at this time because of inflationary pressures.

Subsequent to passage of the bill by the House, the Administration announced that approximately 75% of the construction program would be deferred for an indefinite period. Therefore, the conferees were agreeable to restoration of many of the originally deferred items in the bill which will eventually be required. It is considered desirable to have the authorizations available now since the delay proposed by the Administration would negate what would otherwise have been an adverse budgetary situation and having the authorization will provide the flexibility to proceed in the most economical manner.

On October 29, 1969, the Department of Defense announced a series of consolidations, reductions, and closings at various installations throughout the United States. As a result of these actions, many of the items included in the House version of the bill were determined to be no longer necessary and could, therefore, be safely eliminated.

This announcement was made prior to the Senate action and these previously-mentioned projects were, therefore, eliminated from the Senate version of the bill.

This situation accounts for the elimination of more than 20 projects.

TOTAL AUTHORIZATION GRANTED, FISCAL YEAR 1970

Brief of authorizations

Title I (Army):	
Inside the United States...	\$175,853,000
Outside the United States...	104,135,000
Total	279,988,000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside the United States...	271,251,000
Outside the United States...	24,244,000
Sec. 202.....	10,810,000
Total	306,305,000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside the United States...	278,611,000
Outside the United States...	31,149,000
Sec. 302.....	29,234,000
Total	268,994,000
Title IV (defense agencies)...	41,165,000
Title V (housing).....	689,518,000
Title VIII (Reserve components):	
Army National Guard.....	10,950,000
Army Reserve.....	6,000,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	8,500,000
Air National Guard.....	11,500,000
Air Force Reserve.....	4,000,000
Total	40,950,000
Grand total of authorizations granted by titles I, II, III, IV, V and VIII	
	1,626,920,000

TITLE I—ARMY

The House had approved construction in the amount of \$246,358,000 for the Department of the Army. The Senate increased this

amount by \$28,253,000, which resulted in a new total of \$274,611,000.

The conferees agreed to a new total for Title I in the amount of \$279,988,000.

The following items, originally deleted by the House, were restored by the conferees:

U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York—Cadet Activities Building—\$16,814,000.

The House action deleted the \$16,814,000. A Cadet Activities Building has been needed at the Military Academy for many years to provide adequate facilities for lectures, assemblies of cadets, ceremonies, and social events. The House had deferred the item for one year for reasons of fiscal restraint.

The conferees, after thorough discussion, agreed to inclusion of the building.

The conferees were unanimous in wishing to bring to the attention of the Department of the Army their very earnest recommendation that this building could most appropriately honor the memory of the late President, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the Academy's most distinguished graduates. Therefore, the conferees strongly recommend and expect that the building will be named "Eisenhower Hall."

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas—Administration and Classroom Building—\$9,891,000.

The House Committee had deleted the Administration and Classroom Building at Brooke Army Medical Center with the understanding that the project could be deferred for an additional year.

The conferees agreed that the project was needed for the Medical Center and that authorization is desirable at this time.

Fort Hood, Texas—Tactical Equipment Shops—\$5,680,000.

Fiscal considerations were stressed in the House's initial deletion of the Tactical Equipment Shops at Fort Hood, although the Committee recognized these as important requirements for their contribution to the efficiency and readiness of troop units at Fort Hood. After full discussion, the conferees agreed to restoration of the authorization.

Fort Rucker, Alabama—Aviation Maintenance Instruction Facility—\$3,636,000.

Deferral of this project by the House was related to fiscal considerations rather than desirability of the project and the conferees agreed to its restoration.

Fort Knox, Kentucky—Armor and Reconnaissance Instruction Facility—\$2,830,000.

The conferees agreed that the construction of this facility will reduce appreciably the need for tanks and other tracked vehicles, thus releasing this critical equipment for other use.

Major projects initially included in the House version of the bill and deleted by Senate actions, but on which the Senate conferees receded, were as follows:

Fort Bragg, North Carolina—Academic Building Addition—\$2,845,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama—Warrant Officer Career and Advanced Courses Facilities—\$1,293,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana—Vehicle Driving Range—\$216,000.

SAFEGUARD

The conferees deleted \$12.7 million for construction of R&D facilities on Kwajalein for the Safeguard system. These funds, which were originally included in the House version of the bill, were placed by the Senate in the Military Procurement Authorization Bill and were retained in the conference report on that legislation. Therefore, authorization was no longer required in the present legislation.

TITLE II—NAVY

The House approved \$264,574,000 in new construction authorization for the Department of the Navy.

The Senate approved \$266,619,000.

The conferees agreed to a new total in the amount of \$306,305,000.

Resolution of major differences is discussed below:

Gulfport, Mississippi—Naval Construction Battalion Center—\$11,988,000.

After completion of the House action on the bill, one of the most devastating storms ever to strike the Western Hemisphere came ashore at Gulfport, Mississippi. Because of the presence in that port city of the Naval Construction Battalion Center, several small towns were saved from complete destruction. The Battalion had on hand necessary equipment to begin clearing away the debris, rescuing stranded victims and start rehabilitation work in the stricken area. Many of the facilities of this Battalion were completely destroyed by the storm. The Senate considered some of the items which must eventually be restored at this installation and approved an authorization for restoration of an enlisted men's barracks, supply and warehousing facilities, a fire station, and utilities. The House conferees concur in the Senate action.

U.S. Naval Academy—Library and Education Facility—\$9,741,000.

The House version of the bill had provided this much needed library and educational facility. The item was deleted in the Senate version of the bill. The House conferees were able to convince the Senate conferees of the importance of this item to continue the quality of excellence of the academic program at the Naval Academy.

Camp Pendleton—Hospital—\$19,805,000.

The House had approved a new hospital at the Marine Corps facility at Camp Pendleton. The item was deleted by the Senate.

After full discussion, the conferees agreed that the hospital was essential since present facilities are inadequate, extremely expensive to maintain, and hazardous due to the age and deteriorated condition of the wooden buildings. The conferees unanimously agreed that we could not refuse to provide the best hospital possible at this facility which accommodates a large number of Vietnam returnees.

Naval Underseas Warfare Center, San Diego—Underseas Technical Facility—\$6,400,000.

The House had approved an Underseas Technical Facility at the Naval Underseas Warfare Center at Point Loma, where much important R&D work is being undertaken. The Senate had eliminated the project. The Senate conferees recede.

Sewell's Point, Norfolk, Virginia—\$20,000,000.

The conferees gave especially serious attention to the Navy's proposal to acquire the approximately 510 acres of land in the Sewell's Point area of the Norfolk Base from the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company. The original submission requested \$20,000,000 in authorization for the purchase of this tract of land. The House denied this authorization.

During the Senate hearings, based on an opinion from the Department of Justice, the Navy reduced the request from the original \$20,000,000 to \$12.7 million. The conferees, after considering all factors, including a substitute railroad classification yard, have serious doubts that the land can be acquired for the amount requested. Therefore, the Senate receded and the Conferees strongly urge continued negotiations between the Navy officials and railroad officials to arrive at a firm figure for this property which the conferees agree is needed by the Navy.

Marine Barracks, District of Columbia—Land Acquisition—\$651,000.

The request of the Marine Corps for authority to acquire certain real estate on Eye Street, between 8th and 10th Streets, S.E., in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of permitting expansion of the Marine Barracks, has been deferred for the present. The acquisition of this small piece of real estate will

result in displacing several families now residing there and thus creates a serious problem. A letter is being directed to the Secretary of Defense requesting that he instruct the appropriate Naval authorities to work with the community and the District of Columbia housing authorities to see that those persons forced to vacate the housing now located on such real estate are promptly found living quarters comparable to, or better than, those which they will be forced to vacate. This action must be taken promptly since the House conferees agreed to the temporary deferral of this acquisition with the understanding that it will be included in the House bill for FY 1971.

The conferees approved the following items, previously in dispute, for the welfare and morale needs of Naval and Marine Corps personnel:

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Recruit barracks, \$8,285,000 and Mess Hall, \$2,023,000.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Enlisted Men's Club, \$402,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Barracks, \$3,481,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C., Barracks, \$359,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif., Barracks, \$5,601,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The House authorized new construction for the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of \$261,445,000.

The Senate increased this authorization to \$277,657,000.

The conferees agreed to a total of \$268,994,000.

Many of the Air Force items originally approved by the House were subsequently withdrawn following Department of Defense actions on base consolidations, reductions, and closures.

The following major items initially disapproved by the House but added by the Senate were agreed to by the conferees:

Lackland Air Force Base, Texas—Composite Recruit Training Facility—\$7,789,000.

The Senate conferees were adamant in their position in regard to the Lackland Air Force Base projects and pointed out to the conferees that the projected number of inductees in the Air Force, even after Vietnam, would require this recruit training facility. Lackland is the only induction station of the Air Force. The House conferees also recede on the authorization of \$693,000 for a data processing plant at Lackland. These facilities are necessary to house equipment that has already been approved for procurement.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado—Technical Training Facility—\$2,377,000.

The conferees agreed this facility was necessary to expand the Air Force Technical Application Center at Lowry.

George Air Force Base, California—Dormitory—\$1,950,000.

The initial request was for \$2,046,000. The House conferees recede and agree to the authorization, but with an amendment reducing the total to \$1,950,000. The final figure agreed on was a result of a reduction from the Department request of \$2,900 per man down to \$2,750 per man.

The conferees agreed on other major items as follows:

Rhein Main Air Force Base, Germany—Passenger Terminal—\$2,110,000.

This item, approved by the House, was deleted in the Senate version of the bill. The House conferees were able to convince the Senate conferees of the importance of this facility to the Air Force in Europe. The project would provide a badly needed facility for processing passengers using large capacity aircraft and, by making possible the use of large jets, considerable cost savings could result. Passenger fares can be reduced to the extent that the project will eventually pay for itself.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.—
Materials Laboratory—\$9,555,000.

This facility was added to the bill by the Senate after having been disapproved by the House. After considerable discussion, the Senate conferees agreed that the project could be safely deferred at this time.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

The Administration requested \$72,500,000, of which \$47,500,000 was to provide for the construction of new facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities for the Defense Agencies. \$25,000,000 is for emergency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense.

The House approved \$15,220,000 in new construction authorization for the Defense Agencies and \$25,000,000 for emergency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense.

The Senate approved \$44,897,000 in new construction authorization for the Defense Agencies.

The conferees agreed on a total of \$41,165,000.

The Defense Intelligence Agency had again requested authorization for a new headquarters building at Arlington Hall Station in the amount of \$28,238,000. The House deleted this request and it was restored in the Senate. In conference the House conferees pointed out that the House Armed Services Committee is undertaking a complete review of our intelligence community and, pending a complete review of our intelligence requirements, this item should be deferred.

The Senate recedes.

TITLE V—FAMILY HOUSING

The Administration had requested authorization for 4,800 units of new family housing at a cost of \$108,332,000. The balance of the request for new authorization in Title V, \$586,086,000, was for improvement to adequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, debt payments, and mortgage insurance premiums. Further, the Administration requested that the cost limitation of \$19,500 per unit be increased to \$21,500 per unit. The House had approved the \$21,500 figure. The Senate approved a new average cost limitation of \$21,000. The House recedes.

The House had approved a new maximum limitation on an individual unit of \$40,000, as requested by the Department of Defense. The Senate bill had retained the present \$35,000 maximum. The Senate recedes.

Section 509 of the House-passed bill was deleted in its entirety. It would have provided certain housing for Japan and the Philippine Islands on a pay-as-you-go basis over a 15-year period. The approval of such a procedure would have created a contingent liability of considerable magnitude in areas where troop strength and the tenure of the military is in doubt.

After thoroughly discussing the matter the conferees agreed that some approach to overseas housing must be found that will avoid the creation of such contingencies. The liability of considerable magnitude in areas is recognized. The Department of Defense will be expected to continue to study this and other alternatives until a satisfactory solution is found.

The House bill had granted authority for contracts for maintenance and operation of family housing for up to 5 years, as requested by the Department of Defense. The Senate had set a limit of 3 years. The conferees agreed on the four year limitation.

The Senate bill had denied authority for the repair of permanent quarters at certain locations in amounts in excess of \$10,000 per unit. The House bill had contained no such restriction. The Senate recedes.

The House had originally approved 150 units of housing for the Army at Fort Leav-

enworth. Subsequent to House approval of the bill but not prior to consideration by the Senate, the Army requested that the 150 units of housing be deleted from Fort Leavenworth and that in lieu thereof 150 units be included for Fort Carson, Colorado. The Senate approved the Army request. The House recedes and concurs in the provision of 150 units for Fort Carson, Colorado.

The Defense Department requested extension of the domestic leasing program through Fiscal Year 1971 and requested exception to the provisions of PL 90-110 to permit continued leasing in two localities. The conferees felt that there was no housing shortage in the area of Colorado Springs and, therefore, did not approve the requested exception for ARADCOM in that area. The House recedes.

In addition to the present average cost per unit limitation of \$175 under the domestic leasing program, the Senate placed an overall ceiling of \$250 per month as the maximum that could be paid for any one unit. The House recedes.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 703

Section 703 is a revision of language traditionally contained in construction authorization legislation to allow the Secretary concerned to increase the amount of authorization by 5% for bases inside the United States, other than in Alaska, and by 10% for bases outside the United States and Alaska when he determines that such increases are required because of unusual variations in cost which could not have been anticipated at the time such project was submitted to Congress. These percentage limitations have been applied to base totals rather than individual projects. The Senate rewrote this provision in an attempt to bring about more accurate cost estimates and to improve Congressional control over cost overruns. As rewritten, the provision would do the following:

It will preclude the Department of Defense from placing under contract any individual project costing \$250,000 or more, if the current working estimate exceeds the amount authorized by 25% or more, prior to giving 30 days' notice to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate.

It will require an annual report on all projects under contract where the current working estimates exceed the amount authorized by 25% or more.

It will require a report on all projects where the scope and cost have been reduced to permit a contract award within the authorized amount.

It will permit the Secretary concerned to exceed the amount authorized, if need be, by 25% in those cases where only one line item is authorized at a given base.

The House recedes.

SECTION 704

Section 704, as approved by the House, was identical to the provision carried annually in the construction authorization legislation providing that contracts for construction were to be executed by the Army Engineers or Naval Facility Engineering Command, unless the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that such procedure is wholly impracticable.

The Senate revised this provision to permit the Secretary of Defense to assign such construction to any Department or Government Agency to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction authorized. The purpose is reduced cost through reduction of overhead and design expenses. The Senate conferees stated their belief that this provision will lead to a reduction of overhead, inspection, and design costs.

The House recedes.

SECTION 707—BOLLING/ANACOSTIA

The House added this provision to the bill to extend to December 31, 1975 the prohibition against disposing of any part of the Bolling/Anacostia military complex. The Senate amended the provision to extend the prohibition for only three years, or until December 31, 1973.

The conferees agreed to an amended version extending the prohibition to January 1, 1975.

SECTION 708

Section 708 of the House bill would have amended Title 18, Section 1507, United States Code, to make it unlawful for anyone to picket or parade in the Pentagon Building or on Federally owned property appurtenant thereto, if by his actions that person intends to interfere with, obstruct or impede the administration of defense affairs. A full discussion among the conferees resulted in the House conferees agreeing to recede.

In agreeing to the deletion of Section 708, the conferees agree there is an urgent requirement for a full report to be made to the Congress with respect to the adequacy of laws that seek to prevent the unlawful interruption of the decision-making process in national security affairs and in other vital areas of our national defense.

While there may appear to be a distinction between the inviolacy of the judicial process and the security of the United States, nevertheless, it is obvious that the administration of justice, so far as the survival of the nation is concerned, is not paramount to, but dependent upon, the existence of the nation. Thus, the conferees, in agreeing to the deletion of the House provision dealing with this matter, request all agencies and departments of government who deal with vital security matters to report forthwith to the Congress on the adequacy of existing laws and regulations to protect their ability to perform these functions.

In other words, at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a complete appraisal of all existing laws and regulations, state and federal, which seek to preclude the disruption of the functions of the agencies and departments of government charged with the responsibility of assuring the security of the nation.

SECTION 709

Section 709 of the House bill, authorization for the President to establish and conduct an international aeronautical exposition, was deleted by the Senate. The House conferees prevailed in the discussion and the Senate receded.

The Senate added a section to their bill (Section 708) which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to make available to the Post Office Department two acres on Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, for the construction of a Post Office. The House conferees were opposed to this section but agreed with the Senate on compromise language which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to make available one acre on Fort DeRussy for "postal purposes only."

TITLE VIII—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

The House added \$2,250,000 to the bill for the Army National Guard to provide for exchange of lands with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for new facilities for the National Guard. The Senate deleted the funds but added necessary language to accomplish the transaction in section 804 of the bill. This language authorizing the exchange of lands will accomplish the purpose intended and additionally it has been determined that the actual funds are not required. Therefore, the House recedes.

The Senate added a new section 804 to this title of the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain real property to

the State of Washington in lieu of a monetary contribution for the construction of a National Guard Armory. The House recesses.

L. MENDELL RIVERS,
O. C. FISHER,
ALTON LENNON,
SPEEDY O. LONG,
RICHARD C. WHITE,
L. C. ARENDS,
DURWOOD G. HALL,
CARLETON J. KING,
ED FOREMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished chairman would explain the conference report, inasmuch as it has just been ordered to be printed, and give the Members a few words as to the conclusions arrived at during the conference between the two bodies.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the conference on the military construction bill and if the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to inform the House as to just what the bill contains.

The conference report before you today authorizes a total of \$1,626,920,000 for military construction.

In January, when the Johnson administration forwarded to the Congress their request for military construction, it totaled \$2.5 billion. The present administration, after studying the earlier submission, sent a revised request to the Congress in April of this year. This revised request totaled \$1.9 billion.

A subcommittee of your Armed Services Committee, held hearings on the request of the Nixon administration and completed its hearings in early July. The action of the House resulted in a further reduction in the administration's request of \$346 million. The action of your conferees, which report is before you today, resulted in a final figure which is \$277 million \$400 thousand below the revised administration request and \$156 million below the amount authorized last year.

After the House acted on this bill, the Department of Defense announced that approximately 75 percent of the military construction program would be temporarily deferred for an indefinite period. Later, on October 29, the Department of Defense announced a series of consolidations, reductions, and closings at various installations throughout the United States. As a result of these actions, many of the items included in the House version of the bill were determined to be no longer necessary and could, therefore, be safely eliminated from the bill.

Therefore, this military construction authorization bill has been in a state of turmoil for 11 months.

Many projects—worthy projects—were omitted from the report before you. However, I earnestly believe that we have done the best we know how and in our judgment present to you a bill today which we hope will satisfy some of the more critical facilities problems now existing in the military departments.

You are probably wondering why we bring a bill before you in the face of the administration's announcement of the 75-percent deferral policy. The Secretary of Defense has indicated that this deferral is temporary in nature and it is hoped that the large majority of the projects authorized in this bill will be placed under contract prior to the end of the fiscal year. I believe this to be true and urge you to favorably consider your conferees' report.

Mr. HALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Is it not true that this bill is less than was authorized 1 year ago and is less than was appropriated 1 year ago?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is \$150 million below the authorization and \$50 million, in round figures, below what was funded last year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For the conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that on Monday, in the special orders to be taken by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and myself, the subject will be the elevation of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), who has been elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that any American has ever held this position, and it is going to be our purpose to give the proper recognition to a great

American, our colleague, the new Chairman. We would like everyone who can possibly attend to be present.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(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 whip the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, it is my intention to ask that we go over until Monday next upon the completion of our business for this week, and we have completed our business for this week.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there are three bills:

H.R. 11193, National Capital Transportation Act of 1969;

S. 2056, to amend survivor annuity provisions of District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act; and

H.R. 9528, to require protective devices for eyes in certain activities in schools.

After the completion of these bills we plan to call up H.R. 14916, the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

For Tuesday and Wednesday:

H.R. 14741, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1969, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate;

H.R. 14227, to provide an improved formula for future adjustments in military retired pay, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 944, also subject to a rule being granted, to increase rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, at the close of business on Wednesday next, November 26, it will be our intention to go over until Monday noon, December 1.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order

under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4293, EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight, Friday, November 21, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 4293, the export control bill.

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

There was no objection.

DECLINE IN HOUSING STARTS

(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, Tuesday, the Commerce Department announced that housing starts in October had declined to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,342,000. This represents a 12-percent decline from September. We have witnessed a precipitous drop in housing starts since last January when they stood at a 1.9 million level. The future appears to be even bleaker. Building permits, the most reliable projection of future housing activity, are off drastically from a year ago. Statistics also released Tuesday show that building permits issued by the 13,000 localities requiring them fell to a 1.1 million annual rate in October, sharply down from a level of 1.4 million a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said on several previous occasions. The economic policies of the administration, reflected in housing construction statistics, are placing this country in dire peril of a recession. Current tight money policies are a carbon copy of those pursued in 1957 under Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey. Then, as now, we experienced a sharp decline in housing construction. The economic ill health foisted on the housing industry by the

Republican administration then fed back into the general economy and resulted in the 1958 recession, our sharpest post-World War II economic setback.

Unemployment, I will remind you, reached a rate of 7.6 percent in the summer of 1958. Given the size of our present labor force, today the same percentage would mean well over 6 million people unemployed. It is obvious that the current Republican policies are taking us down this same dismal road once again.

I would also remind my Republican colleagues that the 1958 recession was the major factor in the loss of 49 House seats sustained by their party in November of that year. I would strongly urge my friends on the other side of the aisle, therefore, in the interest of their political self-preservation if nothing else, to join me in urging an immediate reversal of current economic policies being pursued by the White House.

ARTHUR BRITTON EDWARDS

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest success stories I have ever known is the life story of Arthur Britton Edwards, who was one of the founding fathers of my hometown of Sarasota, Fla. Mr. A. B. Edwards was affectionately known as "Mr. Sarasota." He served as our first mayor and he contributed more to the sound growth and development of Sarasota County than any other man.

A. B. Edwards passed away on November 14 at the age of 95. Born on the shores of Sarasota Bay when Ulysses S. Grant was President and at the time when Florida was in the Reconstruction Era, still occupied by Federal troops, he lived to see men rocket from Florida soil to walk upon the moon.

Orphaned at age 14, he assumed the responsibilities of his younger three brothers, and through hard work and diligent effort he became a man of substance. His qualities of leadership were great and his influence upon all who knew him was profound and wholesome. Throughout his lifetime he remained a modest and unselfish man. His life was an inspiration to all who knew him. He was active long past the time when lesser men would have retired. His great role in the development of Sarasota and Florida and his contributions to the stability of their economic life were well recognized by his fellow citizens who honored him in every way. His life was the life of Sarasota.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the last tributes he received, an editorial eulogy which appeared in the Sarasota Herald-Tribune on November 17, 1969:

A. B. EDWARDS

Sarasota says "Goodbye" today to A. B. Edwards, who died Friday at the age of 95.

It's a time of sadness for his family and friends, but it should also be a time of proud memories, for it is given to few men to have such a profound influence on the destiny of their community as did Arthur Britton Edwards.

He has been called "Mr. Sarasota" for more

years than most of us have lived here. A. B. Edwards was here even before this was a city or before Sarasota County was Sarasota County.

He was born here, on the mainland shore of Sarasota Bay near the area that is now New College. Ulysses S. Grant was President. General George Custer was still chasing Indians out in the West.

Orphaned before he was 15, Edwards cared for his three younger brothers in a land that was not much more than frontier. There was very little luxury living in Florida then.

He was the first mayor of Sarasota when the city was incorporated in 1914. He was a moving force in many of the events which are landmarks in Sarasota history. He helped persuade Mrs. Potter Palmer to buy thousands of acres of land and build a home here. He helped locate winter quarters in Sarasota for the Ringling Bros., Barnum & Bailey Circus. He helped bring Myakka State Park to reality.

To say that barely scratches the surface. He was a leader in the first bank, the first insurance firm, the first real estate office, the first abstract company, the first fire department, the first theater. The story of his life is the story of Sarasota. Within the last decade, he helped to establish New College, being one of the signers of the original college charter.

He was active long past what we usually call the retirement age. The last years of his life brought a succession of honors and awards. If he ever made enemies, if he made mistakes, they have long been forgotten. What is remembered is his record of accomplishment, his public service, his matching of vision with action.

When he was born, Florida was in the Reconstruction era, still occupied by Union troops. He lived to see men rocket from Florida soil to walk on the Moon. The years of his life were years of great change in the world, in the nation, the state and in Sarasota.

For Sarasota, A. B. Edwards was one of the moving forces in change and growth. Few men did as much and none has done more to shape this city and county.

So, if there is grief, as there is, there is also remembrance. And it is the memories which will endure.

COAL MINE HEALTH, SAFETY AND COMPENSATION

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, coal mine health and safety remains the No. 1 national priority. The impetus which propelled coal mine health and safety into the public mind occurred 1 year ago today at Farmington, W. Va., where 78 men died in Consol No. 9 mine.

Today we observe the first anniversary of that tragedy. We do so in grief and sorrow. We grieve for the men who were taken prematurely to their deaths. We grieve for their widows and orphans, 76 of whom still wait for their men to be brought for the last time from the mine in which they have given their lives. We grieve for the more than 200 men who have died in mining accidents since Farmington. We grieve for the thousands of others who have been injured in work-related accidents in the past year.

Mr. Speaker, the time has now arrived when the Congress must pass needed reforms in the Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952. Both Houses have passed separate bills dealing not only with the problem of

safety—but also have established for the first time legislative language covering the problem of health in the coal mining industry. These bills are good bills. They are responsive to the needs as has been so tragically illustrated at Farmington and at the other places where men have died. They will, if enacted, and more importantly—if enforced—reduce the terrible toll in human life which is now a part of the price of producing coal.

Today the conferees are meeting to determine the final language in the conference report. I know of the intense interest and concern that the conferees have for the lives and safety of coal miners. I know, too, of the work that many of these conferees have done on these bills from the earliest days of hearings right through their passage by the House and by the Senate. Therefore, I would urge that now is the time for haste. The relevant problems have been thoroughly discussed in committee hearings. Now is the time for speed. Delays can only add to the grim toll of men who have given their lives in coal mines. Delay can only mean further anguish, further grief, further heartbreak for the widows and orphans of men who will die because of the weak laws covering health and safety in the mines. I most sincerely urge that the differences which exist between the bill be ironed out, the disputes settled, and a strong coal mine health and safety bill be brought to the floor of the House and to the floor of the Senate, where it may be finally enacted and sent to the President for his signature. This, Mr. Speaker, will represent a permanent memorial to the victims of Farmington and to the men who through the years have given their lives in our coal mines.

Mr. Speaker, let us fulfill our sacred obligation to these brave men who labor in the coal mines of America and their families—let us fulfill our sacred obligation to those who have given their lives in the production of coal for the advancement of America.

PHILADELPHIA AND ERIE, PA., AGAINST POSTAL CZAR

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit at this time for the RECORD two resolutions by city councils in the State of Pennsylvania against the Postal Corporation legislation and in support of H.R. 4, the Dulski bill, which preserves for the American people their right to have a public postal service.

I commend these gentlemen for expressing the will of the people of Philadelphia and the city of Erie, Pa. We have been bombarded with advertisements by the Corporation advocates of a Postal Corporation in the name of those who believe that the Congress should get Government out of Government.

The only way I know of for the American people to improve the postal service to all Americans, in the rural areas, in the ghettos of our cities, and our new suburbs, is by being able to demand such service, rather than pleading with a post-

al czar who is responsible to no one. I would also point out to the big mailer corporations that if they are successful in creating a Postal Corporation run by a postal czar, that they may not be satisfied with the result and in that event there would be nowhere to take their complaints.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present the two resolutions at this time:

OCTOBER 20, 1969.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I am enclosing herewith a certified copy of Resolution No. 170, entitled: "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 4, in its entirety which provides for the modernization of the Postal Service and continuing it as a regular governmental agency."

This Resolution was adopted unanimously by the Council of the City of Philadelphia at a meeting held October 16, 1969.

Very truly yours,

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President, City Council.

Same letter and enclosure sent to Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, House of Representatives, Senator Hugh D. Scott, Senator Richard S. Schweiker.

All congressional delegation from Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; i.e., Messrs. William A. Barrett, Robert N. C. Nix, James A. Byrne, Joshua A. Eilberg, William J. Green, Gus Yatron, Lawrence G. Williams, Edward G. Biester, Jr., J. Robert Watkins, Joseph M. McDade.

Daniel J. Flood, J. Irving Whalley, R. Lawrence Coughlin, William S. Moorhead, Fred B. Rooney, Edwin D. Eshleman, Herman T. Schneebell, Robert J. Corbett, George A. Goodling, Joseph M. Gaydos, John H. Dent, John P. Saylor, Albert W. Johnson, Joseph Vigorito, James G. Fulton, Thomas E. Morgan, Frank M. Clark.

RESOLUTION 170

(Council of the city of Philadelphia, office of the chief clerk, Room 402, City Hall, Philadelphia)

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 4 in its entirety, which provides for the modernization of the Postal Service and continuing it as a regular governmental agency

Whereas, The postal corporation idea contained in H.R. 11750 considers the Postal Service a business and not a service to the American people; and

Whereas, H.R. 4, introduced by Congressman Dulski, Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will by law provide for modernization of the Postal Service, thereby improving postal service to the public by continuing the department as a regular governmental agency with the Post Master General a Cabinet Member; and

Whereas, Adoption of H.R. 4 would establish a better transportation system for handling mail; establish a building program; establish a Commission on Postal Finance and set up employee labor-management procedures; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 4 in its entirety which provides for the modernization of the Postal Service, continuing the department as a regular governmental agency; and

Further Resolved, That we declare our opposition to passage of H.R. 11750 which would create a Postal Service Corporation.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President Pro Tem of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the United

States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the entire Congressional Delegation from the Commonwealth.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the sixteenth day of October, 1969.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SAWYER, JR.,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

THE CITY OF ERIE,
Erie, Pa., October 16, 1969.

MR. FRANK PRUVEADENTI,
President, United Federation of Postal Clerks, Local 269, Erie, Pennsylvania.

DEAR SIR: We herewith forward for your information two (2) certified copies of a resolution enacted by the Council of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania, endorsing the provisions of H.R. Bill No. 4.

We trust that this action will prove helpful.

Very truly yours,
EUGENE GRANNEY,
City Clerk,
(On behalf of the City Council, City of Erie, Pa.)

RESOLUTION, CITY COUNCIL, ERIE, PA.

(By Mr. Walczak, seconded by Messrs. Brabender, Cappabianca, Glowacki, Harkins, Orlando, and Scheffner)
Resolved, by the Council of the City of Erie, That

Whereas, the Council of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania does herewith officially endorse H.R. Bill No. 4, introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States under the sponsorship of Thaddeus J. Dulski, because they are of the firm opinion that the necessary adjustments and modernizations of the Postal Services can best be effectuated by the provisions of the said act, and

Whereas, the Council of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania does further note that workers of the government in such borderline areas, postal retainers require and are entitled to direct contacts and negotiations with their employers to arrive at fair working standards with proper and adequate recompense, so

Therefore, be it resolved, that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Frank Pruveadenti, President United Federation of Postal Clerks, Local 269, Erie, Pennsylvania; Mr. Joseph Travers, President National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 284, Erie, Pennsylvania; Mr. Edward Cassano, President National Association of Mailhandlers, Local 239, Erie, Pennsylvania; and the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of Congress.

JOSEPH A. WALCZAK, JR.,
President, City Council of Erie, Pa.

Attest:

EUGENE GRANNEY,
City Clerk, City of Erie, Pa.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago 78 men died in the northern West Virginia coalfields. Consol No. 9 became a household word and marked yet another tragedy in a long series of tragedies in the coal mining industry. In response to the horror of No. 9, Congress has considered and both Houses have passed strong coal mine health and safety bills. The House bill contains needed revisions in the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952. In it also are health standards

which are designed to reduce the terrible ravages of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. The bill also contains a provision for compensation for the victims of black lung who would not otherwise be covered by applicable State compensation statutes. The Senate has passed a similar bill.

The two bills now rest in a conference committee where the differences between them must be accommodated and a final bill sent back to both Houses for passage.

Mr. Speaker, American coal miners have suffered for years because of the inadequacies of the applicable Federal and State health and safety statutes. They have paid a tragic price; a price measured in human health; a price measured in grief; a price measured in blood. They have died by the tens and the hundreds. They have been maimed by the thousands and the millions. They have seen disease disable men long before their time. American coal miners are impatient as Congress temporizes on the final stages leading to the passage of a coal mine health and safety bill. I know, Mr. Speaker, that both committees and the Members of this body have devoted a great deal of time and effort on this bill. I know that the conferees themselves and the staffs which support them have given innumerable hours to the task at hand. But, Mr. Speaker, even as we are talking, men are risking their lives in coal mines. In the year since Farmington more than 200 men have died in coal mine accidents. Their passings were little noted except among their friends, families, and loved ones.

So, it is that we must understand the growing clamor in the coal fields for this legislation. We must understand that speed is needed, promptness is dictated by the chilling reality that every day these inadequate laws cover health and safety conditions in mines, men run a greater risk of dying or being injured or contracting coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

So it is, Mr. Speaker, that I urge the Congress on this day to expedite the legislative process, to cut through the remaining redtape and to bring to the floor of this body, as well as to the floor of the Senate, a strong and effective and far-reaching coal mine health and safety bill. We can do no less and we must and we will carry forth the mandate of the men who have died and the men who will die unless this legislation is made effective immediately.

LEADERSHIP OF HAROLD BERTSCH

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, in the winter of 1961 Howard Bertsch came home determined to open new frontiers for rural America. He had spent the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration with the Ford Foundation in Iran and, because of his tremendous efforts, had been awarded that Nation's highest honor by the Shah: the Order of the Crown.

Mr. Bertsch was hardly in this coun-

try, however, before he suffered a massive coronary attack—his second. But he fought his way to recovery because there was a job he wanted to do: he wanted to make rural America a genuine alternative to urban America—an attractive, healthy, and prosperous part of this Nation.

Howard Bertsch knew that the depression-born Farm Security Organization, renamed the Farmers Home Administration, for which he had given the early years of his career, had atrophied during the 1950's. He believed that it was now time that Farmers Home be infused with fresh vision and vigor.

Appointed National Administrator by the late President John Kennedy, Howard Bertsch spent the next 8 years working long hours to enable Farmers Home to fulfill this role.

Authority was gained for a series of valuable new programs—including loans to rural communities for water and sewage systems and to families living in communities of under 5,500 for the construction of modest homes. Older programs were expanded enormously.

In total, the volume of dollars loaned under his direction increased over the 8 years from \$307 million to \$1,400 million—or 342 percent. Further, defying Parkinson's law, the number of Farmers Home employees increased by only 37 percent.

This growth was largely a result of the leadership of Howard Bertsch, one of the most conscientious, able, and understanding public servants I have ever known. Howard Bertsch passed away a few days ago. We will miss him greatly, but we must carry on what he began. There is much yet to be done in rural America. The challenge remains and must not be dropped.

POLICY ON AMERICAN FLAG DISPLAY AT THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the reason I take this time today is to raise certain questions as to what is the national policy in reference to flying of the U.S. flag in the Nation's Capital. I refer specifically to the display of the flag at the Washington Monument which is considered by Americans to be one of our country's most symbolic shrines.

Around the base of the monument are 50 standards from which it is customary to fly, as I understand, during the normal hours for display, 50 U.S. flags. I further understand that when certain national flag courtesies are observed, such as flying at half-mast, these flags are similarly flown.

It is significant also to note that on Veterans Day, November 11, when ceremonies were held on the monument grounds, these flags were clearly displayed.

However, the thing that concerns me is that for some reason, these flags were not displayed this past Saturday—the date that marked the moratorium observances on the Washington Monument grounds. The fact that they were not displayed was mentioned in the press and it was also noted by various people who

were present at the monument grounds, and their absence can be noted in photographs taken on that day.

I further understand that the flags had at first been raised on the customary standards, but at the direction of certain officials, I assume of the National Park Service, on Saturday the flags were lowered by monument personnel and removed from the masts.

I believe that this was done for fear by some that the presence of the flags might either precipitate an incident or possibly lead to some desecration or disrespect of the flag.

It is hard to understand this logic, and this is the reason for my bringing the matter to the attention of the House now, because I believe in the future that we should take those steps necessary at public shrines where there is displayed the national colors to insure their protection.

It seems to me that in the present instance, the National Park Service or others in the Federal Government, had some concern about a capability to protect our flag. The fact there is concern that its display might precipitate some disorder indicates, however, that steps be taken to provide adequate protection rather than, in effect, striking the colors.

It is further regrettable that as an aftermath to this decision—which I think was unwise—according to the account of eyewitnesses, on some of these empty flag standards were raised banners or other flags.

As we were aware, many of the leaders of the moratorium effort had denounced and disclaimed violence which would be precipitated by some of those who came to Washington to protest.

Certainly, no one wants to see violence arise from any protest or assembly, and I am pleased that the assembly at the Washington Monument was a peaceful one.

I believe it would have been peaceful had the American flags remained on their standards, but if there is any question in the future on this issue, I hope the Park Service will resolve it on the side of what I believe is the overwhelming opinion of the American people, and that is to provide sufficient protection to keep the American flag displayed according to its normal custom.

I am sending a copy of this statement to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Director of the National Park Service, asking them for an explanation of this matter, as well as for their policy in the future when the Monument or other Federal grounds under their jurisdiction are used by large groups for public assembly.

RAILROAD STRIKE PENDING

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 2 weeks from now, this Nation may once again face a crippling railroad transportation strike between the Shopcraft unions and some six railroad companies. On December 3 or 4, the time for negotiations expires under the

Railroad Labor Act and there is no indication that a settlement is near. The clock keeps ticking away and it is questionable if anyone is taking positive steps to stop a national transportation paralysis from setting in.

The administration earlier steadfastly refused to come down from Olympus and get involved in this or other disputes. They have said they did not want to jaw-bone on labor disputes. Lately, however, we are seeing some cautious approaches from the White House that border on temerity. This distant jawboning from one side to the other will not get the job done.

The point is—we are working on a difficult problem with antiquated tools and a leadership vacuum, and that involves Congress.

Two years ago, I introduced a bill designed to improve our methods of settling transportation strikes. Earlier, this February, I introduced similar legislation in the hopes it might provide the basis for consideration of legislation that would prevent this Nation from being tied up in a series of devastating transportation strikes.

I realize that on a controversial matter of this nature, the people who voice a suggestion may well be the ones to bear the brunt of criticism from both labor and management. But leaders are not afforded the luxury of avoiding the issue. Therefore, I urge the administration to get involved. I urge labor and management to show some initiative in finding some answer to this question which is so basic to the survival of our free enterprise system.

I would caution all my colleagues not to get too full of turkey and dressing over the Thanksgiving holidays—I imagine we will have another transporting problem—a tough past turkey trot when we return.

OBSERVANCE OF A TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, today we observe a tragic anniversary. One year ago on November 20, 1968, a devastating explosion and fire killed 78 coal miners at the Consol No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va.

This disaster reawakened the American public to the horror and the tragedy of death in coal mines. It brought forcefully to the attention of every concerned citizen the stark reality of death and injury which is the daily lot of the men who toil underground. It brought into sharp focus the inadequacy of the Federal laws governing health and safety regulations.

No. 9 brought public pressure upon Congress to update the woefully inadequate Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952. In addition, the scourge of black lung, or coal workers' pneumoconiosis, became evident and visible to a public appalled by its ravages.

Happily, Congress reacted to the public demand and insistence that coal mine

health and safety become a No. 1 national priority. Through the long months between the opening of the congressional session in January and October 29, 1969, when the House passed a strong coal mine health and safety bill, congressional activity was feverish. Extensive hearings were held. Language was drafted and redrafted to translate into a statutory framework effective coal mine health and safety regulations.

Today that bill rests in a conference committee. Before it is enacted into law the differences between H.R. 13950 and the Senate bill S. 2917 must be worked out. These differences are not insurmountable. The disagreements are not wide. Instead, what is needed is a continuation of the zeal and the dedication which both Houses have shown as they went through the long and tortuous process of drafting their respective versions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

This is a fitting day to renew that dedication and to provide the needed push to bring out a bill from the conference committee that is strong and will be effective. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this will be done and the coal miners of the future can work with the assurance that their lives and their health will be more adequately protected than has been the case to date.

REGRETS HE CANNOT CAST A VOTE FOR HAYNSWORTH

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, if ever there were a time that I wished I was a Member of the other body rather than the House, this is one of those occasions. I wish it were possible to cast a vote in favor of Judge Haynsworth's nomination to the Supreme Court.

The nit-picking, biased examination of his record has been nothing short of disgraceful. The bulk of his opposition comes from unjustifiable prejudice against his southern birth and his pro-Constitution views. The flimsy charges against him have proved to be the products of innuendo, unsupported suspicion, and a distortion of the facts. If every member of that Court were as honorable as Judge Haynsworth, this Nation would not now be at the mercy of criminals, subversives, and ivory-headed social planners.

Three items which have appeared in Louisiana newspapers recently have caught my attention and I would like to include them in today's RECORD in the hopes that they might have some influence on those in the other body prior to tomorrow's vote.

The first two are from the Shreveport Times and the third from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and they follow: MOST REPULSIVE SMEAR CAMPAIGN IN THE SENATE'S HISTORY

President Nixon's nomination of federal Fourth Circuit Court Judge Clement F. Haynsworth of South Carolina to the U.S. Supreme Court should come to a vote in the Senate in a few days. Right now confirmation

or rejection by the Senate is believed to hang by a thread so slender that no one can judge which way it may swing.

Regardless of how the decision goes, the campaign to prevent confirmation, instigated in large part by the AFL-CIO and Democratic Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana, certainly should go down in the records as—politically speaking—the “bloodiest” and most repulsive organized campaign of character assassination involving the Senate or the federal Judiciary in many decades.

If Judge Haynsworth is not confirmed, then the American people may well turn to a statement a few days ago by retired Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker of Missouri that Senate rejection “would be a travesty on the Supreme Court, the Senate and the federal Judiciary.”

Senator Bayh reportedly was selected by the AFL-CIO to be its guillotine operator because of his “labor record.” He is known as “George Meany’s man” (Meany is president of the AFL).

Official House of Representatives federal campaign contribution records (required by federal law) show that organized labor gave Bayh \$68,000 last summer for his campaign for re-election to a second term in the Senate, with no records required for reportedly heavy expenditures in his behalf by Indiana union locals.

Senate records show that 97 per cent of Bayh’s votes on labor and other legislation during his first term as a Senator were cast as organized labor wanted them cast.

“TEDDY” KENNEDY ALSO

Among those backing up Senator Bayh in his reckless and ruthless attacks on Judge Haynsworth is Senator Edward M. “Teddy” Kennedy of Massachusetts. In 1961, Senator Kennedy, according to published statements sought to get his brother, President John F. Kennedy, to nominate one Frank Morrissey of Boston, a sort of hip pocket political hanger-on of the Kennedys generally in the 1960 presidential campaign, to be a federal District Judge.

President Kennedy refused. But, after he was assassinated, President Johnson, in 1965, nominated Morrissey for a Boston federal judgeship to please “Teddy.” However, the late Senator Everett Dirksen produced an avalanche of evidence against Morrissey and an official representative of the American Bar Association (Bernard G. Segal, Chairman of the ABA Judiciary Committee) told a Senate committee under oath that “from the standpoint of legal training and legal experience and legal ability we have not had any case where those factors were so lacking” (as in Morrissey).

In 1934, Morrissey got a law degree from a Georgia “diploma mill” which had a two-member faculty and gave degrees in a few months at a cost of \$250. He later flunked twice at a small law school in Boston, finally getting a degree and becoming a city judge. “Teddy” Kennedy praised his abilities, his character, his qualifications for the Supreme Court to the skies in Senate speeches, but finally was forced by Dirksen to recommit the nomination to committee—which meant to kill it.

Our point is that certainly a man—Kennedy—holding such a person as Morrissey in such idolatry as the Massachusetts Senator expressed for Morrissey on the Senate floor in 1965, and with other questions of personal credibility in which he has been involved more recently, hardly is one to judge the integrity and judicial qualifications of such a man as Clement F. Haynsworth.

Most of the AFL-CIO-Bayh allegations about Haynsworth have been proven false, or inferentially misleading, or to be only part of the easily obtained truth. But no one was prepared for the quick wholesale hatchet swinging against Haynsworth that came and

it took weeks of professional study of his lifetime record by his friends to bring forth the whole truth. In the meantime there seemed to be no defense being made for him until very recently.

It was true, for example, as the AFL-CIO-Bayh charges said, that Judge Haynsworth "had owned stock" and "had drawn dividends" (note the word "had" as applying to an unstated past time) from a company on whose case he sat as a federal Circuit Judge. But the facts—brought out later—were that he once bought one share of stock for \$21 in a local Greenville, S.C., company formed to give the city a good hotel so that he would be eligible for its board of directors, as his friends wanted. But that was BEFORE he became a federal judge. The "dividends" were one dividend of 15 cents, which he returned. That was BEFORE he went on the bench. When he went on the bench, he withdrew from the company entirely. He got \$21 for his share of stock. Three years later a minor case involving the company came before the Fourth Circuit Court. That is what the AFL-CIO-Bayh charges call an instance of lack of ethics and conflict of interest. All of it was in 1950s.

Then there's the charge that there were 10 Fourth Circuit Court opinions in which he concurred, and which were said by the AFL-CIO-Bayh propaganda to be "antilabor" actions by Judge Haynsworth, which "were reversed by the Supreme Court." If true, that would not necessarily make him or the Fourth Court wrong, or make him antilabor. And none were actual "reversals." Two were not even labor management cases. His attackers forgot to say that he was on the labor side in 45 Fourth Circuit Court decisions, writing eight of them personally.

HIGHLY RESPECTED FAMILY

Judge Haynsworth's family law firm is five generations old, highly respected wherever known. His case has been given independent professional study and investigation with a resulting 54-page single-spaced report made public by Senators Cook of Kentucky and Hruska of Nebraska. It riddles to pieces every AFL-CIO-Bayh charge.

Sixteen past presidents of the American Bar Association (ABA), endorsed him for the Supreme Court after the charges came out. So did all his Fourth Circuit co-judges. He was cleared by the Department of Justice and the FBI.

The ABA Judiciary Committee endorsed him unanimously and then endorsed him again after all the charges had been aired and investigated. The Senate Judiciary Committee endorsed him after hearing all the charges with witnesses under oath.

The Washington Star made an independent investigation of every charge against him and cleared him of wrong. Howard Mollenkopf, Pulitzer prize winning investigative reporter for the Cowles newspapers in the past and recently made Deputy Counsel to President Nixon, made a similar inquiry and proved the major charges against him false. So did the Scripps-Howard coast-to-coast newspapers, with the same result. Each inquiry was fully documented. The Times has studied them carefully.

But, he is Southern; he is conservative in a middle-of-the-road way; the liberals are still choking on the Abe Fortas case and want "revenge." He doesn't take orders on court cases from labor leaders or Negro leaders. He is not only Southern, but "Southern-Nixon." Those are the real and chief reasons for the attack on him.

BOBBY KENNEDY OKAYED HAYNSWORTH ACTION IN CHIEF "SMEAR" CASE

The opponents of Senate confirmation of President Nixon's nomination of federal Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Clement F. Haynsworth of South Carolina to

the U.S. Supreme Court pretend in most instances that they are acting because of his "lack of ethics" or "conflict of interest" in some cases on which he sat as an appeals court federal judge.

There is nothing in the well publicized records of the investigations of Judge Haynsworth to substantiate such charges.

Further, the U.S. Attorney General at the time was Robert F. Kennedy, brother of the then President. Chief Judge Sobeloff of the Fourth Circuit at that time personally investigated the case and held that not only was Judge Haynsworth not disqualified to sit on it, but that he had a duty to sit on it. The Sobeloff opinion was sent to Attorney General Kennedy and he reviewed it and approved it, according to Judge Sobeloff.

The character assassination drive against Judge Haynsworth was instigated by the AFL-CIO, which claimed that the judge held financial interest in cases in which he ruled.

Negro leaders claim he has been an anti-civil rights Appellate Court judge. They overlook the fact that half a dozen professional and impartial analyses of every civil rights case in which he has participated show no pattern pro or con on issues involving race; that his most noted case in this field—a decision he personally wrote—forced the Virginia Dental Association to admit to membership a Negro dentist it had barred.

These investigations show that he never has sat on any Appeals Court case involving a company in which he held financial interest at the time.

THE SUPPOSED REVERSALS

The AFL-CIO allegations that Judge Haynsworth is "antilabor" name a fireworks manufacturing company as part of their supposed documentation of the charges when that company never was before any court of which Judge Haynsworth was a member in any kind of case. The AFL-CIO later admitted this and apologized.

The AFL-CIO charges there were 10 cases of "Supreme Court reversals" of Fourth Circuit Court labor rulings but does not say that two of the cited cases were not labor-management cases in any way; nor did the Supreme Court state that it was "reversing" in any of the 10. In one it said it was acting on laws created after the Circuit Court ruling had been made and was not criticizing the Fourth Circuit ruling. Most of the remainder were purely procedural matters involving the National Labor Relations Board.

Dan Thomasson, Washington reporter who made an investigation of all the charges against Haynsworth for the Scripps-Howard national newspaper chain, found them false, or incorrect factually, or creating wrong inferences, or unsubstantiated. He stated that Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana, the spearhead for the AFL-CIO and others against Haynsworth, told him privately that the labor case against the judge had turned out to be "very weak." But he still uses this "very weak" case for his own smearing of the judge and to influence other superliberal senators (Labor gave Bayh \$68,000 for his reelection campaign last summer.)

Behind this type of leadership are various leftist liberal senators of both parties who might be described, politically speaking, as curtsying whenever organized labor or Negro power asserts itself in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Bayh, using AFL-CIO documents as his "proof," centers on six Fourth Circuit decisions in which Judge Haynsworth took part as indicating antilabor bias, overlooking 45 pro-labor rulings in which he took part, writing eight of them himself. The "big" case in the AFL-CIO-Bayh anti-Haynsworth printed or mimeographed documents distributed around the nation is known as the Deering Milliken case, in which Judge Haynsworth was one of a 3 to 2 majority permitting the company to close its Darlington plant. Let's look at it and the others:

NEVER OWNED STOCK

Judge Haynsworth never owned a share of stock in Deering. All Fourth Circuit judges joined Chief Judge Sobeloff's opinion, as approved by Attorney General Kennedy, that Judge Haynsworth should sit in this case. So did former federal Judge Lawrence Walsh, chairman of the ABA Judicial Selection Committee. The present ABA judiciary committee had all the facts on this case when it gave a second endorsement to nomination of Judge Haynsworth. So did the Washington Star, Human Events (a Washington weekly magazine), the Senate Judiciary Committee, which approved the Haynsworth nomination, as did retired Supreme Court Justice Whittaker and others who spoke up. All said he had no alternative but to sit on the case—it was his duty as a judge.

Judge Haynsworth did hold some stock in Carolina Vend-A-Matic, which did vending machine business with two or three of Deering's subsidiaries and with other industrial companies by supplying vending machines. Alex Kiriakides, operating head of a vending machine company in hot competition with Vend-A-Matic, voluntarily sent the Senate Judiciary Committee a letter denouncing the allegations against Judge Haynsworth in this case as "absolutely false" and stating that the judge had never done anything unethical or had any conflict of interest in any vending machine case. There never was a bigger "bust" than the AFL-CIO-Bayh allegations about Judge Haynsworth on this case.

Another of the "six big cases" used to try to assassinate Judge Haynsworth's character is known as Kent Mfg. Co. vs. Commissioner of Revenue. The AFL-CIO-Bayh forces distributed documents saying that this company did \$21,323.63 worth of vending machine business with Vend-A-Matic and that Judge Haynsworth sat on this case in the Fourth Circuit Court. This company never had any case before Judge Haynsworth. A company named "Kent" did; it's rather sloppy investigating, and disgusting action by Senators and a great labor organization, to assassinate a man's character through such carelessness of inquiry.

There are three Deering Milliken cases in the "Big Six" cases. Judge Haynsworth wrote the decision against Deering Milliken in one case, concurred with the majority in the other two.

Two other "Big Six" cases cited against Haynsworth actually involve him in no ethics and in no conflict of interest. One of these two cases dealt with whether sewer connections should be provided in a building. The other was simply procedural—a decision to withhold Fourth Circuit ruling until a similar case in Massachusetts had been decided.

SENATOR STENNIS MENTIONED AS HIGH COURT TIMBER

(By Edgar Poe)

WASHINGTON.—How would some of those northern senators, who have been so vehemently opposed to Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., for associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, vote if President Nixon nominated one of their own southern colleagues for the nation's highest tribunal?

It would depend on the nominee, of course. Then how would they (those opposed to Haynsworth) vote on confirmation if the President nominated Sen. John C. Stennis of Mississippi?

Sen. Stennis is one of the most highly respected men, among both Democrats and Republicans, to sit in the senate. This is indisputable.

HIGH COURT TIMBER

Senator Stennis, a circuit judge of Mississippi for 10 years, is a conservative and

would add conservatism to the Supreme Court. It is obvious that a mighty cry would go up from certain areas of the country against his being confirmed. The White House probably would be bombarded with opposition telegrams.

Meantime, the United States Senate would be almost certain to confirm him by a near unanimous vote, despite the fact he is a Southerner. The senator is known to be a stickler for the Constitution of the United States.

The late President Eisenhower regarded Sen. Stennis as Supreme Court timber. One day former Louisiana Gov. Robert F. Kennon had a conference with President Eisenhower at the White House. Later the governor told some friends privately that the President told him he had a man from his neighboring state who could make a good jurist for the Supreme Court. His name was John Cornelius Stennis.

CUM LAUDE GRADUATE

Knowledgeable people on Capitol Hill, including some members of the Senate, stoutly maintain that the real reason Judge Haynsworth is being opposed is because he is a Southerner. However, none of the opponents of Judge Haynsworth are likely ever to admit that bias against the South was the paramount reason for their opposition against confirmation.

Sen. Stennis, now 65 years, who graduated cum laude from the University of Virginia Law School after first obtaining his academic degree at Mississippi State University, might not accept a place on the high court bench if a place were offered. Of course, the odds are heavily against him being tapped, but some of the senator's colleagues say the President would make no mistake looking in Stennis' direction, should the occasion arise.

The only Supreme Court judgeship nominee in history who was turned down by the Senate was a Southerner. He was Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina, a member of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, the same circuit of which Judge Haynsworth is now the chief judge. Like Judge Haynsworth, Judge Parker was nominated by a Republican chief executive, President Hoover.

SUSPEND DRAFT CALLS UNTIL NEW LOTTERY SYSTEM IS MADE EFFECTIVE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Senate's action yesterday in passing the lottery bill already approved by this House there is on the desk of the President the very bill which he requested authorizing him to initiate the lottery with a random system of selection of draft-eligible young men. At the same time, there are an estimated 9,000 men who will be drafted in December and another 20,000 who will be drafted in January under the present system already described by the President as unjust.

Today, 37 Members of this House and I have joined in sending a letter to the President urging him to suspend draft calls until the lottery system is made effective. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has already publicly stated that the lottery system could be introduced by January.

I hope that other Members will consider making the same request of the

President. A copy of our letter with the names of the signators follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On October 30, 1969, the House passed H.R. 14001 authorizing the establishment of a random system of selection of inductees, and yesterday the Senate gave its approval to this bill.

We therefore urge you to request the Selective Service System to suspend its draft calls immediately (including those already issued for December) under the present system and delay and future calls until they can be made under the new "lottery." Secretary Laird has estimated that the new system can be put into operation sometime in January 1970.

For too long men have been asked to risk and lose their lives under a system riddled with inequities. With both the House and Senate having acted, it would be a tragedy to subject one more man to an inequitable draft under the old system.

In this Thanksgiving season and in the forthcoming Christmas and Chanukah holidays, there is no greater gift the President could give to a family having a father, son, or husband subject to the draft than having the more equitable system apply to him instead of one which you yourself have described as unjust.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Addabbo of New York, Mario Biaggi of New York, Jonathan Bingham of New York, Garry Brown of Michigan, Phillip Burton of California, Daniel E. Button of New York, Shirley Chisholm of New York, William Clay of Missouri, John Conyers, Jr. of Michigan, Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut, John H. Dent of Pennsylvania, Charles C. Diggs, Jr. of Michigan, Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York.

Florence P. Dwyer of New Jersey, William D. Ford of Michigan, Thomas S. Foley of Washington, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, James G. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Michael J. Harrington of Massachusetts, Margaret M. Heckler of Massachusetts, Henry Helstoski of New Jersey, William L. Hungate of Missouri, Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin, Edward I. Koch of New York, Richard D. McCarthy of New York.

Abner Mikva of Illinois, Patsy Mink of Hawaii, William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Lucien Nedzi of Michigan, Richard L. Ottinger of New York, Edward J. Patten of New Jersey, Bertram L. Podell of New York, Adam Clayton Powell of New York, Ogden R. Reid of New York, Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey, John V. Tunney of California, James H. Scheuer of New York.

POSTAL STANDARDIZATION IS NEEDED MORE THAN CORPORATION

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, with all the furor and publicity, pro and con, on the conversion of the Post Office to a corporate concept, I believe some of the most urgent needs of the Department are being overlooked or entirely forgotten.

One of the most imperative needs of the Post Office is that of standardization of the mail—and a penalty in postage for pieces that are mailed that do not conform to standard sizes.

As I review the history of our country, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no private industry anywhere, at any time, the size of the Post Office that has been successful until it standardized its product. When such standardization was accomplished, the business could plan effectively, bring about changes gradually, and engineer and tool to mass produce or speed up material handling. And, after all, the business of the Post Office, with its growing annual volume, is to speed up the handling of letters and packages to the place where greater volume will mean greater profit—in the American tradition of mass production—rather than a deficit that mounts in proportion to the volume.

Henry Ford pioneered and proved the value of mass production. American Can, generally, manufactures only a few sizes of cans. Of the 24 Bell telephone companies and the 1,972 independent telephone companies operating in America, practically every one of them purchases its equipment from one source and brings standardization to this entire, complicated communications web that, only through standardization, manages to link together practically every household and business in this country, and, indeed, in many parts of the world.

In drastic and unfortunate contrast the postal system absorbs almost any item from keys to ski poles, chicks to soap samples, mini greeting cards to huge mail order catalogs. And, that system handles more than 80 billion pieces a year.

I think it is a tribute to the dedicated postal workers of our country that they receive and send out each and every day more than 375 million pieces of mail, especially when we understand that it is done with little or no standardization and only a minimal amount of processing by machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, that be it Government bureau or Government Corporation, no organization will handle the varied and staggering volume of mail in years to come without standardization, sophisticated mechanization, and extra charges on nonstandard, nonmachinable pieces.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, in his recent trade message, the President put his administration on the side of a freer trade. I am proud of this decision. We should not turn our backs, particularly in inflationary times, on an historic policy which has worked so well for both America's producers and America's consumers.

A fundamental precept of our foreign trade policy virtually from its beginning has been that the benefits that lib-

eral trading provides for the entire nation should not also mean hardships for the few. We have long provided relief for those for whom import competition rose too quickly to permit adjustment, for those whose jobs might be lost, and for entire industries which might be adversely affected.

In 1962, the Congress added necessary underpinning to the philosophy of free trade. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 broke into new ground by providing a system of assistance to individual firms and groups of workers affected by imports. In so doing, Congress intended both to increase our competitive ability as well as to mitigate hardship for workers through better training for greater skills and higher paying jobs. The act sought to encourage affected firms to improve their productivity, acquire new equipment, and, if necessary, shift to more promising activities.

Regrettably, these provisions have not worked. The proof required was too stringent. Since 1962 no industry has qualified for relief, no firm has received the assistance intended, and only within the past month has any group of workers been helped.

This situation must and can be corrected. In the Trade Act of 1969, which he has now submitted to the Congress, the President makes long overdue and highly commendable recommendations for change in our basic statutes. He would provide relief and assistance on a fair and reasonable basis—to industries, to firms, and to groups of workers. These recommendations merit the careful and considerate attention of the Congress. I am sure they will be so treated.

MR. GROSS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM IOWA—HIS LACK OF LOGIC

(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, it seems that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), has seen fit once again to attack the bipartisan Citizens Committee for Postal Reform—and also to take a snide poke at me in the process.

It seems that I had asked Mr. Gross to display some of his crusading zeal in looking into the finances of the postal unions. Sleuthing seems to be an avocation of my distinguished colleague (Mr. Gross). I merely request that he apply the same yardstick to reporting about the postal unions as he has to the citizens committee.

In response, Mr. Gross questions my "logic." The fact is that logic is the science of correct reasoning. I doubt, therefore, that my colleague knows too much about logic since it involves "correct reasoning"—a thought process somewhat unfamiliar to my distinguished colleague.

Nevertheless, since Mr. Gross finds himself in the position of fronting for the postal unions he is close enough to the union leadership to ask them exactly how they spend the \$15 million received in dues checkoffs every year.

In particular, I would suggest that Mr. Gross delve into the finances of the National Association of Letter Carriers and the United Federation of Postal Clerks, the two largest postal unions.

In last year's lobbying reports, the Letter Carriers reported receipts of \$2,152,570 and the Clerks an even larger amount—\$2,488,547. Nearly \$5 million taken in by just two of the several postal unions.

I again urge Mr. Gross, because of his closeness to the union leadership, to put the heat on. Where is that money? How has it been used? How much money do they really spend for food, lodging, traveling, and entertainment—and for whom do they spend these sums? And precisely how many dollars have they been spending on receptions and dinners? Why do the unions not report this money in their lobbying reports?

Surely Congress, self-appointed watchdog of fiscal integrity, is up to the task. All of us—the public and the postal workers—are concerned about where this kind of money actually goes and for what purposes it is used.

Sleuthing is the game of Mr. Gross. Certainly, he must be up to this job. Or could it be that he is beginning to slip a little. For shame. Ten years ago he would have tackled such a job with vigor.

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE POWER OF THE NETWORKS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night, Vice President AGNEW brought the attention of our Nation to the question of communications and the power of the networks. Today I would like to try to put his comments into perspective.

If we listen to the network presidents, the National Association of Broadcasters, or Broadcasting magazine, we would surely feel that we have reached the culmination of broadcasting in America. If we listen to Vice President SPIRO AGNEW, one would feel we are now at the bottom of the well in this field. Mr. Speaker, I feel that neither of these arguments is accurate. The Vice President and the network chiefs are forcing the Nation and the Congress to polarize themselves on the issue of communications. According to their arguments, you are either with the Vice President and the administration, or with the networks.

This is grossly incorrect and we cannot afford to allow the people of the United States to be forced into these two corners. The reality of the situation is that the Vice President was correct in saying the networks news teams do have an enormous amount of power to affect what 40 million Americans learn from television each day. He was incorrect in accusing the majority of these people of releasing their hostilities toward the administration through the improper use of the media.

The fault lies not so much with those licensees, but with those of us here in Congress and with the Federal Com-

munications Commission, which was set up specifically to regulate against any undue media concentration or breaches of the public trust. Unfortunately, they have not been very successful. It is up to us, as duly elected Representatives of the people, to reverse this trend. We must begin to re-evaluate communications in America and to insure that the airwaves are used in the public interest.

Communications has come a long way since the Radio Act of 1927. Each year we reach into new areas of this fascinating field of endeavor. But in many areas of broadcasting, we have been negligent. Since 1934, we have operated solely on the basis of the Communications Act. Today and in the next session of Congress, we must bring this act up to date and match it to the realities we have before us.

Our colleagues in the 73d Congress formulated a bill—the Communications Act of 1934—based on the general idea that broadcasting should be licensed and regulated with the public "interest, convenience and necessity" as the overriding factors. They established the Federal Communications Commission to insure that the public was served, by providing that the airwaves would be utilized not for profits or power, but for service to the public. The 73d Congress designed a far-sighted bill at a time when there was no television, no FM radio, and only a handful of radio stations. In 1969, this 35-year-old law is increasingly showing the strains of age, for it must now deal with a multibillion-dollar industry and thousands of licensed outlets. Today we have 856 television stations and 6,679 radio stations. It is of the utmost necessity that we update this 1934 law and cope with the problems that it could not foresee or failed to deal with.

I am here today to introduce the first of a series of bills aimed at restructuring and revitalizing the Communications Act so that it will efficiently meet the needs of today's public. If we diligently work on these bills and adequately restructure communications in America, then we will take the inordinate concentration of power away from certain broadcasters and give it back to the people, where it belongs. Each of my bills is designed to put the public back into the priority position in the eyes of Congress, the Federal Communications Commission, and most of all, the licensees of broadcast stations. I am not waging a vendetta against the networks or the top 10 or 20 markets, but I am seeking to reverse the unfortunate trend that has taken place since 1934, of overconcentration of the media in the hands of a few.

We must heed the words of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Red Lion Case if we hope to act on behalf of the people. The Court forthrightly pointed out:

It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount. It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of that market, by the Government itself or a private licensee.

I am introducing legislation today that will give the Federal Communications

Commission the power to charge broadcasters license fees that are commensurate with the profits they reap from this valuable franchise. At present, broadcasters pay only \$150 for a television license and \$75 for a radio license, while some of them are earning upwards of \$3 million a year for their holders.

Under my bill, the FCC would continue to offer the license to new stations, and stations operating at a loss, for the nominal fee. The bill would then graduate the price upwards on the basis of 1½ percent of income before taxes per station. By basing the license price on the percentage of income before taxes, we would not be penalizing a station which is getting started. We may even encourage some stations to plow money back into operations or programming rather than claim it as profits. The nonprofit educational broadcasting outlets would not be affected.

It should be noted that the FCC has the power to make this change in fees now, but has not acted in this area. This bill would eliminate their discretion in this matter by making it law.

My bill would insure that the public is receiving an adequate franchise fee from these broadcasters. It seems foolish to me that we should allow broadcasters to get this license at such a nominal fee at a time when the budget is tight and the Federal Communications Commission is in dire need of increased funding and staffing. In addition, hundreds of groups would like to have the opportunity to have one of these licenses. Let me quote to you the views of two Indians in the Midwest:

Broadcasters do not care—they dare not care—that others won't have the chance they had—to go through that same hard work, to achieve those same ends. They do not want to move over and share their slice of a limited crowded world. The spectrum is full—just as the frontier is gone; the land is occupied wherever there is water. But those who were born too late seem to feel that, because they came to birth in the same manner as others, they have some kind of "divine right" to a piece of earth on which to stand, air to breathe, a chance to earn bread and even, a means to communicate their own thoughts—a piece of the limited spectrum to reflect their viewpoint, their values. The black haired peoples of this Nation want a chance to speak their ideas, revel in their culture and even, perhaps, a chance at that most lucrative of investments—a television license.

Is it just that a station earning over a million dollars a year in one of the top markets should be paying the same sum as a licensee who is struggling to break even in market 98 or further down? We should graduate the license fees so that those who can afford to pay more for their piece of the broadcast spectrum, do so.

My bill is in no way meant as a penalty to broadcasters, but an attempt to insure that they will pay their fair share for getting to use this lucrative franchise. It is a chance for Congress to re-evaluate the entire license-rate structure so that we will not continue to give the public airwaves away for relatively nothing. Lord Thompson of Fleet is often quoted as saying that "a television

license is a license to print money." Unfortunately, he was not far off the mark for many stations in the top markets.

The truth of the matter begins to come to light in works like "Television Today," put out by the Institute for Policy Study. In this publication, Ralph L. Stavins, contends:

The TV industry, compared to all other American markets, experiences the highest rate of return on its capital investment per annum. Over the last ten years, TV has regenerated itself 100% on its depreciated property investment per year.

Federal Communications Commission figures show that the broadcast industry income in 1967-68 was over \$608 million before taxes. Is it asking too much for this very lucrative industry to pay a meager 1½ percent, a fair share for this franchise? The average TV station profit in a market like Los Angeles is \$3.36 million. Presently the owners of those stations pay only \$150 and yet reap these million dollar profits.

The idea of charging percentage of profits for licensees is by no means unique. Commissioners at the FCC have spoken of it and advocated it. Members of Congress have suggested it. Studies have recommended it. Now we have talked enough; it is time to act.

I am sure that some will raise the criticism that this bill would overburden the FCC with figures and computations that would hinder their other activities. I have checked with officials at FCC and they inform me that these figures are already sent to them with license applications and would not require that much extra manpower.

I feel constrained at this time to add one further note. Many of my friends who are involved with broadcasting have warned me ahead of time that this bill will guarantee for me and anyone who signs it, the wrath and displeasure of the broadcasting industry of America. This thought does not rest lightly on my mind, for I fully realize just how powerful the broadcasters are in the determination of public policy and certain electoral votes. Many have told me that a bill concerning broadcasters will never pass this or any future Congress if the broadcasters are against it.

Earl K. Moore, a lawyer who has been active in aiding citizen groups in contesting license renewals, has said:

I do believe that 7,200 station staffs and numerous affiliated newspapers, located in every Congressional district, have the capacity to organize overwhelming support for an unsound bill. There is no comparable group to argue for the public interest.

I feel this may be an overstatement, for I know that Congress will act in the public interest on this and any other matter, regardless of the power of the broadcasters—real or imagined. I am sure that we will not cast our votes against the public interest merely because of fear of reprisals from the broadcasters.

I urge each of my colleagues to place these bills into the perspective of the last 30 years of the 20th century and realize that what we do today will have its effects into the dawn of the 21st century.

We are just beginning to learn how potent the broadcast media is and will become.

As the President's Task Force on Communications Policy makes eminently clear:

Modern methods of communications can be instruments of enlightenment, or tools of tyranny. They can make the best and the worst in man instantly available to everyone.

The choice is ours.

MONTANA GRIZZLIES—UNQUESTIONABLY NO. 1

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, lately I have been subjected to a lot of nonsense about how great the Ohio State football team is or how the University of Texas eleven is the top college team in the country. All of this is mere idle chatter. As any denizen of Missoula, Mont., will tell, and correctly so, the Grizzlies of Montana University are the very best team in the land.

Now all of these other schools have excellent football teams. I mean to take nothing away from them. However, when you look at Montana's record of 10 wins and no losses and their invitation to meet the second-best small college NCAA team, North Dakota State, in the Camellia Bowl in Sacramento on December 13, there can be no question in any body's mind as to which team ranks No. 1.

Actually Head Coach Jack Swarouth, who has done such a marvelous job in molding this great Grizzlies team, would rather have played Ohio State but the Buckeyes were restricted by Big Ten rules from taking part in any postseason game this year. That confrontation, fortunately for Ohio State, will have to take place at some later date.

Of course there are some folks who are not sports fans and, incredible as it may seem, they are unaware of Montana's accomplishments. For those among us who have not been properly informed I would like to highlight the Grizzlies' season. Besides going unbeaten and untied in 10 games they also set 39 school records and tied another 13; this is also the first time the Grizzlies have gone unbeaten or received a bowl bid. And, of course, they will win their 11th game of the year on December 13.

Enough cannot be said about Coach Jack Swarouth and his assistants. They have taken the Grizzlies to the pinnacle of success, to heights heretofore undreamed of. Certainly Jack deserves to be selected as the "Coach of the Year" among small colleges.

Finally I want to offer my heartfelt condolences to my dear friend and colleague, MARK ANDREWS, in whose district the North Dakota State Bisons reside. I certainly hope that the mauling the Grizzlies administer to the Bisons will not alter the relationship that the distinguished gentleman and I now enjoy.

I include here the 1969 record of the University of Montana Grizzlies:

Montana 24—North Dakota 10.
 Montana 31—South Dakota 20.
 Montana 52—Northern Arizona 7.
 Montana 20—Weber State 17.
 Montana 34—Idaho 9.
 Montana 46—Idaho State 36.
 Montana 49—Portland State 14.
 Montana 7—Montana State 6.
 Montana 14—California Poly 0.
 Montana 58—South Dakota State 0.

TIME TO CALL A HALT

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, what we are considering today as the 1969 Foreign Aid Appropriations Act is a tiresome and repetitious example of the same old reckless grab-bag, giveaway program. This method of purchasing the friendship of other nations has often proved tragically ineffective in the past, yet the Foreign Affairs Committee would have us dole out even more money next year for foreign assistance.

Such an incongruous proposal as this is singularly ill-timed and inappropriate not only as an unproductive means of foreign aid but also as an unjustifiable burden on an already overworked budget and taxpayers.

Here we are trying to curb inflation; cutting back on much-needed domestic programs such as water and air pollution control and aid to education; delaying social security increases and other things vitally needed here at home, and the committee is asking the American taxpayer to shoulder an even higher foreign aid program than last year. Last year's foreign aid bill was fixed at \$1.7 billion, the lowest in the 20-year history of the program. To now ask for \$2.1 billion when the taxpayer is paying the highest Federal, State, and local taxes in history is what I call being out of touch with the electorate. The inflationary situation and economic situation today is worse than when Congress enacted last year's bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not stingy. Since 1949, they have sent abroad roughly \$122 billion through the foreign aid program. Further, we have even gone into debt to give away, and the taxpayers have paid more than \$60 billion in interest costs on these vast amounts. Unfortunately, with the exception of the Marshall plan, the program's failures far outweigh its successes, and its sum total is a dismal flop. Countries which have received the largest amounts include France, Brazil, Pakistan, India, and Communist Yugoslavia, none being a striking example of a close friend or a bulwark of freedom. Also questionable is the apparent lack of discrimination for distribution of funds. The oppressive dictatorship of Duvalier in Haiti is slated for still more funds, as are the belligerent U.S. property-seizing governments of Peru and Ecuador.

Furthermore, I find it both ironic and shocking that three countries which have received substantial U.S. aid, Korea, Thailand, and Taiwan, are now loaning money back to us at a 6-percent inter-

est. It seems rather ridiculous to debilitate our own economy in such a manner and then pay these countries more money to keep our own economy solvent.

In summation, I find that the foreign aid program administered by the Agency for International Development is bankrupt of ideas and persists in following the same sterile policies of useless giveaway. I urge the Congress to abandon the expensive boondoggle of misspent, misplaced, and mismanaged dollar throw-away which goes by the euphemism of foreign aid.

COAL MINERS' MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to designate November 20 as Coal Miners' Memorial Day.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today 78 men lost their lives in the explosion and fire in the Mountaineer No. 9 coal mine at Farmington, W. Va. This was a tragedy which shocked the Nation. November 20 has a special meaning for the 78 widows and the 142 children left fatherless by this terrible event. It is tragic but true that out of the pain and sorrow of many disasters has come the stimulus for social progress.

OUT OF TRAGEDY COMES PROGRESS

As in the case of the Triangle Waist Co. fire in New York on March 25, 1911, which took the lives of 146 women, yet resulted in an end to the sweatshop conditions, so did the Farmington disaster produce a national demand for protection of the health and safety of coal miners.

I believe that November 20 marks the dawn of a new era in the man-killing and man-crippling coal mining industry. I hope that November 20 will be observed to honor those brave men who died at Farmington, and we can honor them best by resolving that the living deserve to live, breathe and work as human beings. At 10 a.m. today the conference committee on the coal mine health and safety bill met. I am confident that a strong bill will result from their deliberations.

For the first time, we are acting to limit the level of coal dust in mines, and protect the health as well as the safety of those who dig out the coal in the bowels of the earth. One year ago, when President Johnson sent up his recommendations on coal mine safety, only three Members of Congress introduced legislation to implement the President's recommendations. They included the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), and myself. Now the legislation has almost unanimous and enthusiastic support in Congress, and the legislation goes far beyond what was recommended prior to the Farmington disaster.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

Our work is not finished just by the passage of this legislation. I am not

one who feels that legislation is the complete answer to any problem. I am concerned about how well this legislation will be administered. Will the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior aggressively enforce the law? I felt that the authority for enforcement should have been lodged in the Department of Labor, which is employee-oriented, rather than in the production-oriented Department of the Interior. I hope that events prove I was wrong, and that we do obtain aggressive enforcement of the law by the Department of the Interior.

ATTITUDE OF UNITED MINE WORKERS

A second and equally important question involves the top leadership of the United Mine Workers of America. Up to the time the competition of the December 9 election began to stimulate the UMWA to take a more active role on behalf of the rank and file of the miners, we saw a long period of somnolence and torpor in the UMWA. If this legislation is to be effective, it will need a far more active attitude on the part of the UMWA leadership, and less of the "footsie" relationship which has all too often grown up between the UMWA leadership and the company hierarchies. I would hope that those administering the law, and the coal operators themselves, are confronted by a more critical attitude on the part of those who speak for the miners, to insure that the health and safety of the miners is protected to the maximum extent.

COAL OPERATORS AND MINERS

Third, there must be a genuine change of heart on the part of many coal operators and miners themselves if there is to be marked and permanent improvement in the conditions in the mines. The coal operators have frequently professed deep interest and intent to work for greater health and safety protection, yet when the chips are down they have usually fought every step of the way against meaningful health and safety provisions. The coal miners themselves have all too often in the past accepted substandard conditions with a kind of fatalism which has snuffed out opposition to these conditions. Now that the miners have discovered that an outspoken attitude produces improvements, we should hope that they have abandoned fatalism once and for all.

Finally, I trust that the general public will continue to focus attention on the plight of the coal miner and the necessity for constant vigilance to insure that the coal miner be reated and protected like all human beings.

COURAGE OF THE COAL MINERS

Each miner in his own way, fighting the hostile environment underground, is every bit as courageous as those astronauts who go into space and today walk on the surface of the moon. Last year in West Virginia, one out of every 10 men who went down into the mines was injured seriously enough to lose working time, and one out of every 300 men who went down into the mines was killed.

By honoring these men on November 20 each year, the Nation is expressing its

determination that this slaughter in the coal mines must stop.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF TWO GREAT AMERICANS

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to note that today is the anniversary of the birth of two of America's greatest sons, Norman Thomas and Robert F. Kennedy.

Their presence made their country and this planet a warmer, more hopeful place. They are sorely missed by all who love justice and mercy, and who yearn for a world where men can live at last in freedom and at peace.

THE HOLDING COMPANY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, the House of Representatives passed a series of amendments which greatly strengthened the 1956 Bank Holding Company Act and brought one-bank holding companies under regulation for the first time.

The action of the House clearly separated the business of banking from non-banking and assured thousands of small businessmen protection from unfair competition. The House passed a very good bill and I am hopeful that we will have early enactment of this much-needed law.

Mr. Speaker, since passage of the bill on November 5, there have been questions about the legislation and the amendments adopted on the floor. On Tuesday of this week—November 18—I spoke to the National Association of Independent Insurers and discussed the holding company legislation at length. Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of this speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS

Thank you very much for inviting me. This is, indeed, an impressive gathering. Insurance is one of the most important segments of our business community and as leaders in this great industry, you have much influence on the progress of the nation. I'm happy to have this opportunity to visit with you.

The title of my speech, "Law and Order for the Big Bankers, Too" sounds pretty imposing. I'm sure it mystifies the banking community which simply doesn't believe that the ordinary rules—law and order—apply to its activity.

Many of the banks—and this really applies primarily to the large money-center institutions—take the attitude that the public—society as a whole—has one set of rules and the banking community another.

This attitude has been demonstrated repeatedly through the years. Many of you probably remember the great bank merger battle of 1965. That was a classic example of the banks' moral position. They came running to Congress crying that the nation's antitrust laws shouldn't apply to the bank-

ing industry. These laws—the very backbone of our free enterprise system—were inhibiting the growth of the big banks and they simply wanted the Congress to give them an exemption from the law. It was all right, they told us, for these laws to apply to other businesses . . . they just didn't want them enforced against banks. Law and order for others, but not for the big banks.

In fact, some of the banks had already been held in violation of the antitrust statutes and were actually asking Congress to over-rule the court decisions and grant them retroactive exemptions from the law. One of these was the giant Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company of New York, a ten billion dollar bank and the nation's fourth largest financial institution. They had been held in violation of antitrust laws in District Court in New York and faced a court-ordered divestiture. But they lobbied through a Congressional pardon.

I cite this case simply as one example of the banks' double standard on the law.

The examples of this type of "double think" are numerous. Last summer, the District of Columbia banks came to Congress with the suggestion that it legalize 16 per cent interest rates. The banks' reasoning was very simple—they had been charging 16 per cent interest all along despite a D.C. law which prohibited any charges above 8 per cent. The banks had been charging an effective rate of 16 per cent through various shell games known as "add-ons" and "discounts" which kept the true interest charges hidden from the unsuspecting consumer.

Now that the truth-in-lending laws were requiring them to tell the consumers the truth, the banks wanted Congressional sanction for the 16 per cent. And they wanted this sanction to go back far enough to block any lawsuits by consumers who had been charged illegal interest rates.

This was a pretty blatant bit of nonsense and the Congress—thoroughly fed up with high interest rates—rejected the 16 percent interest rate on a 356 to 19 vote. And they rejected the idea of giving the banks special protection from lawsuits. In other words, they'll have to face the consequences of law violations just like any one else and this fact is a shocker for the banks.

The banks invariably come to Congress with the attitude that they have some divine right to special treatment . . . that somehow they are above and beyond all other businesses.

This attitude probably reached its peak this year in the long and bitter fight over the bank holding company legislation. What began as a simple effort to bring all bank holding companies under the same standard of regulation turned into a legislative donnybrook with the banks once again muddying the waters with their blatant demands for special treatment and special exemptions. For a while it appeared that the special interest forces—the big bank lobby—were going to win this fight hands down. The banks succeeded in ramming through the House Banking and Currency Committee a weak watered-down holding company bill which really regulated no one. That bill, had it been passed by the House, would have been one of the most damaging blows ever suffered by the American free enterprise system.

It would have concentrated thousands of businesses in holding companies dominated by large banking institutions. It would have been highly destructive to the future of the Nation's economy.

Despite the defeat in the Committee, we kept on fighting in the Congress and on November 5, the full House of Representatives accepted a series of amendments which greatly strengthened the bill. In the end, the House passed a very good bill that brings all bank holding companies under regulation

and prevents their run-away raids on other business enterprises throughout the economy.

This fight on the House floor was won against great odds—some of the longest odds that I have ever seen in my 41 years in Congress. This bill will prevent the banks from grabbing off insurance companies, insurance agencies, travel agencies, data processing firms, equipment leasing enterprises and other non-banking businesses. In short, it will assure that banks remain in the banking business and that they are not given any Congressional license to swallow up other businesses.

But, my friends, we did not fight for these strengthening amendments for the benefit of the insurance business, the travel agencies, or any other special segment. I am glad that the House-passed holding company bill affords the insurance business protection against take-overs, but the legislation is much broader than that. The legislation, as passed by the House, is in the broadest public interest. It assures a competitive enterprise system.

The fight over the holding company bill is now nearly a year old, but few members of the national press have grasped the basic economic issues involved. Without regulation of holding company activities, the banks would be able to completely turn around the American economy and place most of the economic power in the hands of a few financial giants.

As many of you remember, the Congress adopted a law to regulate multi-bank holding companies back in 1956, but left the holding companies with only one bank untouched. At that time, these one-bank holding companies were very small outfits and posed no real threat to the economic structure of the nation. Since that time, however, the big banks have spotted the loophole and moved rapidly, and are today engaged in hundreds of non-banking activities ranging from pizza parlors to manufacturing corporations to insurance empires. There are few business activities that have not felt the predatory embrace of these holding companies. Hardly a day goes by when there is not an announcement of the formation of a new holding company or the acquisition of additional non-banking enterprises.

Today, more than 40% of all the commercial bank deposits in the entire United States are held by one-bank holding companies. Nine of the twelve largest commercial banks in the United States have converted to one-bank holding company status.

Why is the holding company such a danger to the American economy?

As the prime source of credit, commercial banks are in a unique position. No other business activity can exert the type of pressure available to a bank through its loan-making powers. Clearly the banks are in a position to engage in unfair competition when they move into non-banking businesses.

Obviously, there is the real danger of loan discrimination by banks in favor of enterprises which are part of their own holding company. Businesses attempting to compete with these holding company enterprises are out of luck when they seek credit. There is also the very real danger of banks forcing borrowers to buy services and goods from subsidiaries of the one-bank holding company. In other words, the bank that is part of a holding company operation is in a position to demand "tie-ins" as part of every banking service.

Also, it is a fact of life that the banks obtain a great deal of confidential information in the normal course of doing business. Obviously this information is a great competitive advantage to the bank holding company's subsidiaries. These are not theoretical problems. The Banking and Currency Committee has received information of specific

examples of the use of pressure and the misuse of confidential information to gain an unfair competitive advantage.

In addition, there is always a possibility of unsound lending decisions by banks attempting to save a failing subsidiary of a holding company.

The weight of evidence is heavily in favor of keeping banks in the banking business and out of these non-banking enterprises. There is no way for banks to get into the non-banking areas without creating an unfair competitive situation and a dangerous concentration of economic power.

Since the passage of the Legislation in the House on November 5, many news reporters and columnists have been trying to figure out what happened. Many of them have been expressing great disbelief that the House could have passed such a good bill under the circumstances. The banking lobby has been described as "shocked", "outraged", and "groggy" as a result of the action by the House.

Frankly, I am surprised that so many people are surprised. I don't think that these news men and financial columnists have been watching the mood of the House of Representatives very closely.

The votes in the House this year—and the speeches on the Floor—indicate that the Members are losing some of their awe about the banks. The House is beginning to realize that the banks may not be the final and best arbiters of the shape of the American economy. The House no longer is so tolerant of the shenanigans of the big banks and this includes everything from the predatory operations of the holding companies to the jacking up of interest rates to unconscionable levels.

In fact, I think it would have been surprising—as well as tragic—if the House had played dead on the holding company issue and allowed the banks a free run to absorb all of the non-banking enterprises in sight. I never did think that the House of Representatives was prepared to change the American economy and allow it to be centered around a handful of big banks. The Congress is not about to allow a fascist-style of economy to be established in this nation voluntarily.

It is probably true that the banking lobby is "groggy" and "shocked" by what happened. They had spent a lot of money, time, and work in a massive lobbying campaign to push through a "no regulation" holding company bill. The lobbyists filled row after row in the House galleries, and they watched while the overwhelming majority of the House stood up for the public interest. November 5 was a great day for the House of Representatives. It is a day in which the public interest overcame the special interest.

While the bank lobby may be "groggy", it is far from dead. It is moving rapidly in an attempt to discredit the House-passed bill. In fact, the Members had not left the House Chamber on November 5 before the bank lobbyists were spreading the word that the amendments had been "excessive" and that the House had gone too far. This line is slipping into various publications in an attempt to scare the Senate and the Congress into watering down the final version of the holding company bill.

All this talk about the House-passed bill being a radical measure is just so much hogwash. The bank lobbyists know that but they will keep on trying to sell this distortion. The House-passed measure is a reasonable bill and it is the minimum needed to provide effective regulation in this area.

It is "startling" only when it is compared to the "nothing" bill which was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee last July. A soaking wet dishrag would have been stronger than that bill.

Any objective analysis must compare the House-passed bill with the measures which were introduced by myself on February 17 and by the Administration on March 24. The amendments offered and accepted on the Floor brought the bill back in line with these February and March proposals. It put back in the bill the things that had been so strongly supported in week after week of hearings last spring. Looking back on these hearings and the bills that were before the Committee at that time, the House bill must be regarded as a "moderate" measure.

There has been a lot of talk about the effective date of the legislation—the so-called "grandfather clause." The banking industry has been incensed by the fact that the House moved that date back to May of 1956—the date of the enactment of the original holding company bill. Personally, I would have preferred no grandfather clause, but I am willing to accept that 1956 date. The banks wanted the outrageous date of February 17, 1969. And there were rumors that they had planned to push for a date of enactment clause. In other words, the banks wanted to be allowed to hold on to everything they had acquired so that they could keep right on operating hundreds of non-banking enterprises.

A grandfather clause is difficult to justify under any circumstances and the February 17, 1969 date would have given the House of Representatives a tremendous black eye.

The banks are claiming that the divestiture of these non-banking enterprises will create chaos and cause great hardships in the economy. This is just a great big propaganda smokescreen. The banks will be given ample time to divest themselves of these non-related businesses and no one will suffer any loss whatsoever.

We had the identical arguments in 1956 when we passed the holding company bill for the multi-bank companies, then we were told that the banks would have tremendous difficulty unscrambling their holding company subsidiaries. At that time, the Congress rejected this "hardship" argument and ordered divestiture—there was no grandfather clause. I had my staff look back over this situation and we discovered that no one suffered from these divestitures. In fact, most of the companies and banks involved have prospered greatly since the divestitures.

An example that may be of particular interest to you was the split-off of the insurance company activities—Occidental Insurance Company—from the Trans-America Bank holding company following the passage of the 1956 Act. The banks and the insurance company are now separate operations and, as you know, all these corporations are doing very well. The divestiture did not create any economic injury.

The grandfather clause is just one part of the issue. The bill, as amended in the House, also spells out the areas which are off-limits for bank holding companies. This list is extremely important and it specifically prohibits the banks from engaging in either insurance agency or insurance company activities. The list also prohibits or limits bank holding company operations in the underwriting, sale, or distribution of securities, including mutual funds or participation shares; travel agency activities; professional accounting and auditing activities; data processing activities; and equipment leasing activities.

The bill also does away with the absurd fiction of what constitutes actual control of a bank in a holding company. Under present law, "control" is not recognized until the holding company has at least 25 per cent of the bank's stock. This loophole has enabled some holding companies to acquire 24.9 per cent of the stock of several banks and still escape regulation. Under the House-passed

bill, the Federal Reserve may determine that "actual" control exists even if the stock ownership is less than 25 per cent.

The bill also clarifies and strengthens the application of antitrust laws to the holding company operations and it brings banks controlled through partnerships under regulation for the first time. It also wipes out the exemption for holding companies in the labor and agricultural fields. They will face the same regulation as any other holding company.

Overall, the legislation requires that the activities of a bank holding company be "functionally related to banking" and spells out guidelines for the Federal Reserve in determining what is "functionally related."

In short, the bill—with a minimum of ifs, ands, and buts—clearly separates the business of banking from other businesses.

My friends, I do not think that any objective person could argue that any of these provisions are "excessive" or "radical." This is a simple bill to do simple justice.

The bill of course does provide your industry protection from take-overs by the banks. It also provides great protection for the insurance agents who have been plagued by the one-bank holding companies. But I hope you will look beyond your own industry at the broader implications for the entire economy. It is here where the bill has its greatest impact, not only for the insurance industry, but for the future of the entire nation.

The bill is now in the hands of the United States Senate. It would be improper and non-productive for me to speculate on what the Senate Banking and Currency Committee might do, but I am very hopeful that we will have an early resolution of this most pressing economic question. Delay in enactment of a strong and effective holding company bill will create lasting damage to the economy and will make more difficult the establishment of effective regulation. The House has spoken in overwhelming and very plain terms in favor of strong regulation.

This is one of the biggest challenges we face and I hope that on final enactment this legislation will go down as one of the great milestones of the 91st Congress . . . one of the great victories for the people.

The victory in the House was aided by many groups and people who saw the holding company dangers clearly. I want to thank everyone in the insurance industry who participated in this fight.

And I want to thank you very much for inviting me here today.

INTEGRATION OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOLS

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, as a result of the decision of the Prince Georges County School Board to accept HEW's school desegregation proposal, many citizens have asked me what can be done to prevent this ill-conceived proposal from being implemented.

I have repeatedly made clear my opposition to this plan but, at this time, my hands are tied. By accepting the HEW proposal for the Prince Georges County school system, the school board has capitulated to HEW's demands and has eradicated any possibility of further Federal-county negotiation.

Since 1968, when HEW officials in Charlottesville first released a plan to county officials, I have been embroiled in

this dispute and have made every effort to exert influence to break the deadlock in favor of a reasonable and acceptable solution. We were instrumental in getting the original proposal withdrawn because it was based on inadequate data. I have met with the parties involved, individually and collectively. I, or my staff assistants, have attended numerous meetings with county and Federal officials in an effort to resolve this dispute. I have sent letters to various authorities challenging various points. I have made speeches soliciting the involvement of school groups and civic organizations in this problem. I have met with parents, teachers, and other concerned individuals.

Mr. Speaker, on September 17, I called to the attention of my colleagues, Vice President AGNEW's speech before the Conference of Governors in Williamsburg when he enunciated administration opposition to the use of busing to artificially achieve racial balance in our schools.

In light of this statement, I called upon the White House to communicate this policy to those in HEW who are responsible for devising school plans. The White House confirmed that AGNEW's statement reflected the administration's policy. HEW is still violating this guideline.

In April of this year, the Health, Education, and Welfare Regional Office in Charlottesville, Va., issued an ultimatum to the Prince Georges County School Board to integrate all schools in the county or lose all Federal aid. At that time, I opposed the proposal because I failed to see how the proposal could be implemented without busing.

In spite of the official position of the Nixon administration, faceless bureaucrats are able to flout the President's wishes and the wishes of the American people. The American voters elected Richard M. Nixon because they supported his policies as he enunciated them during the campaign. They did not elect these faceless bureaucrats.

I will continue to do everything in my power to see that the plan accepted by the board is never implemented but my options have been closed by the board's decision. Nevertheless, I do intend to speak again with Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch about this reprehensible plan which will seriously disrupt the education of our children.

My most fundamental and often-stated objection to the HEW plan is that it responds only to a short-term problem while it does not even take into consideration the resolution of the long-term problem of education in our county. I have stated time and time again that, while I am vigorously opposed to school segregation, I am also equally opposed to interfering with the education of children to artificially achieve integration through busing.

The long-term problem is the underlying social malignancy of racial prejudice. It makes absolutely no sense to mix education with racial prejudice. It is grossly unfair to the children to bus

them from an all-black neighborhood to an all-white school for the purpose of bringing the races together, when, at the end of the school day, the Negro children are bused back into the all-black neighborhood.

We must solve the overriding societal problem of eradicating the all-black neighborhoods and the flight of the whites deeper into suburbia, rather than gloss over this problem with a short-term school desegregation proposal. We must solve the problems of the communities, of housing, of job opportunities, as well as the problem of integrating our educational system.

School Superintendent William Schmidt, in comments before a recent meeting of Prince Georges County elected officials, cited research which alleges that once the racial balance in a school community is above 50 to 60 percent it will rapidly become 100 percent Negro. This is the racial makeup of the Prince George's system and we simply must tackle this factor before we radically change the educational system. Through this current school plan, we are, in other words, treating the symptoms of the problem rather than the cause.

Although HEW officials stated that they would only provide technical assistance to the Prince George's School Board, it is clear that they foisted their integration proposal on the board. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is, of course, obliged to carry out the Supreme Court decisions on school integration. I question, however, their interpretation of these decisions and their methods of complying with them.

Fairmount Heights Senior High School was originally established as a Negro institution under a Maryland State law which required a separate school system for the two races. As such, the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown against the Board of Education, et. al., issued the mandate that all such de jure segregated schools must be integrated. At Fairmount Heights, the de jure situation is an abandoned concept but the segregated pupil attendance at present results exclusively from the living patterns in the Fairmount Heights attendance zone, thereby making Fairmount Heights, in effect, de facto segregated school. HEW officials, however, will not accept this distinction and continue to argue that the abandoned de jure concept still falls within the purview of the civil rights law which must be implemented. I do not agree.

Ironically, Mary McLeod Bethune Junior High School has been lumped into the same category with Fairmount Heights because of its unracial student body. Bethune, however, was not a part of the separate school system and therefore does not, per se, fall under the Supreme Court integration edict by any stretch of the imagination. Bethune, like Fairmount Heights, is therefore de facto segregated, but again HEW officials assert that the education of those students must be disrupted by busing in order to artificially achieve integration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a never-ending

numbers game, with the children being the unfortunate pawns. Drawing up a busing plan on the basis of black-white ratios today does not solve the problem for next year, when the rapidly changing housing patterns will re-create racially unbalanced schools. To conform to the HEW Alice-in-Wonderland logic will require an entirely new busing schedule next year. The parents have every right to be vehemently upset about this non-sensical scheme which interferes with the education of their children.

These facts, combined with the actions of HEW and the school board, make it evident that there is very little possibility for reversing this idiotic plan. Now that the Prince Georges County School Board has accepted the HEW ultimatum, past endeavors have been made futile, and avenues of rebuttal have been closed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is reprehensible for these callous, faceless bureaucrats to be so insensitive to the chaotic results of their ivory-tower bungling with the education of children.

LET US ACKNOWLEDGE THE TIES OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to this House—in the wake of last weekend's massive "peace march" and rally—that the greatest hope now for a rational assessment of our national policy in and for Vietnam lies in acknowledging the ties of peace that unite all Americans, rather than in igniting further the fires of hysteria and disunity.

It is not my purpose, through these remarks, to discourage constructive criticism or peaceful expressions of public dissent within the law—nor the President's understandable urge, indeed his need, to go on defining and defending his plan for ending our participation in the tragic war in Vietnam.

However, in this welter of marching and countermarching—in this developing mood of shouting at one another "You are wrong, and we are right!"—there is, as I see it, a grave danger that the obvious divisions in this Nation over how best to wind up this war can only continue to widen into bitter extremism.

There may be some who will say the Nation has already become polarized over this issue.

Personally, I do not believe that to be the case—but there are signs that the poles, on either extreme, are being radicalized, and this is not as it should be. It surely is not as President Nixon intended it to be.

Reviewing the events of the past 2 weeks—including therein as the two major incidents both the President's address on Vietnam and last weekend's antiwar demonstrations here in Washington—I suspect it can rightfully be said that both sides to the ongoing national debate over Vietnam have picked up strength.

The quarter-million Americans who

braved Friday's wind and rain and then Saturday's biting cold in their "march against death," gained further respectability for the antiwar movement despite the violent side events precipitated by a militant minority of window-smashing "crazies," Vietcong flag-carrying "yippies," and revolutionary-minded SDS types who came seeking a public confrontation—and violence—and found both.

It is one thing to publicly question the patriotism of this element within the present antiwar coalition—for such citizens have no patriotism and are appropriate targets of placards reading: "Our Country—Love It Or Leave It!"

But it is quite another thing—and, I submit, would be a tragic mistake—for those of us who believe President Nixon is on the right track in his plan for bringing this war to an orderly end, to succumb to the temptation to label all those other young people who, last weekend, sang: "All We Are Saying Is, Give Peace a Chance," or those thousands of their older brothers and sisters, or fathers and mothers, who soberly and sincerely joined them in public witness of their yearning for peace as, somehow, equally unpatriotic.

Senator McCARTHY, who stood in the midst of these thousands of Americans on Saturday, reportedly told them they were "better witness than the 52,000 telegrams," the White House supposedly got expressing support of President Nixon's policies after his November 3 speech.

That claim, I suppose—in the context of what has been going on around us—is, at best, arguable. For, as all of us here well know from our own experience, it is always far easier to get people to write, to protest, and even to march "against" something, than it is to encourage evidences—let alone public demonstrations—of support—"for" something.

The President—properly intent not only on gaining time within which to hopefully work out his plan for ending the war but also, and most importantly, anxious to preserve both his authority and prestige without which that plan cannot be made to work—has sought to stir up the so-called "silent majority." Based on my own constituent mail which, since November 3, is running steadily at a better than 2 to 1 support level for Mr. Nixon, and based, too, on such as the Gallup and recently released Sindlinger public-opinion polls, I am happy to be able to report that the President evidently has a substantial majority of Americans behind his efforts to resist any speeding-up of our disengagement from Vietnam beyond the point of "orderliness," on which more in a moment.

Thus, there clearly appears to be a no-longer-so-silent majority of Americans willing to give Mr. Nixon the further time he says he needs to wind up this war after his own fashion—and I say that even in the face of such evidence to the contrary as the petitions addressed and delivered to me last weekend as a part of the moratorium exercise, which petitions carry the signatures of some 6,000 persons in the Ithaca, N.Y., area of my district, all in support of the Goodell

resolution in the other body which calls for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam before December 1, 1970.

This is impressive evidence of the same kind of support the Gallup poll found for Senator GOODSELL's idea—even though I have since had a few letters from Ithacans who signed the petition saying, now, they are being used in a manner they had not contemplated, and asking to have their names removed therefrom. In any event, I am impressed, though I must still ask to what extent—appreciable, I suspect, if undeterminable—these petitions merely bear evidence of the fact that most Americans are fed up with this war and simply want disengagement as soon as possible.

Even so, such petitions—like Saturday's demonstration—serve as a chastening reminder to the President, and to his supporters, of how limited the time he may have gained really is. Mr. Nixon would appear, therefore, to still be engaged in a race against the clock of public opinion—a race I think he deserves to win, but one which, to my mind, he can only win by keeping the American people fully informed about his efforts, and their effects, and by so modulating his voice, and the voices of those around him, as to do nothing to further deepen the divisions in our midst.

This, then, would be at least one measure of the President's continuing responsibility. But what, now, of the antiwar movement, itself—or, at least, the more responsible elements therein?

Moratoriums, marches, and public demonstrations, we all agree, add up to an appropriate and, if nonviolent, lawful method for shaping public opinion and the governmental policies that eventually reflect the same. However, there is one salient trouble with such a method—at least in the present situation—and that is, it has nowhere, evidently, to go but up. Each month from now on—that loose coalition that presently directs the antiwar movement holds to its developing pattern—the latest protest will have to be aimed at somehow outdoing its predecessor, both in numbers of people involved and in drama, or else the appearance of a weakening and waning effort. As the New York Times recently noted editorially, in connection with this, "ever larger demonstrations against ever stiffening official resistance will eventually lead to violence—and—the cause of peace will not be served if disagreement over how to end the war in Vietnam is allowed to degenerate into conflict in the streets of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I believe there to be an increasing danger, stemming from the planned, built-in escalation of the protest movement as it as so far developed, that ought to be so evident to the responsible leaders thereof as to cause them, at once, to begin to focus their energies on some more manageable forms of protest, of which numerous possibilities would seem to be at hand.

And this, then, would seem to be, at least, one measure of such leaders' continuing responsibility.

To which measure I would like to add

a need for them to consider ways to disassociate themselves from—if they can no longer control—that radical, violence-prone minority of dissidents they find, uncomfortably, in their midst. I recognize the fact that the loose antiwar coalition that has been formed has grown rather "like Topsy," but I do not accept that form of apology for its undesirable elements which merely argues that the way to end this war is to so act as to bring together all who wish it to end, whatever the ulterior motives of a few.

Tom Wicker, writing in the Times this week, Tuesday, argued that the protest movement is "not a fringe group of violent extremists—not a small and unreasonable minority—but a serious, sizable, sustained element of American politics that while it may not be a majority, is active, growing, determined and here to stay."

That may be true, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest one of the best ways for establishing it as such would be for the leaders of that vocal minority to end, now, their association with Vietcong flag-carrying extremists who can offer no better argument against the Nixon disengagement policy than endless chants of "Ho, ho, Ho Chi Minh."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, as this developing drama continues to unfold around us here in the Congress, where the dominant note of the moment seems to be one of increasing support for the President—as may soon be evidenced by House passage of a brief resolution to such effect—let us see, if we can, whether or not the issues that separate the President and his supporters from the antiwar protestors are not fewer in number than they seem and, thus, the gap dividing so many of our citizens with different points of view over how best to end this war less wide than it seems.

I believe this to be the case, even despite the surface signs of polarization—a mood based on mutual misunderstanding compounded by emotions—and it is this theme I would like to try to develop during the balance of these remarks.

There are two major complaints about the President's policy that are common in what I am hearing from my constituent protesters.

The first is that, despite what President Nixon has said and done about Vietnam, nothing has really been changed; that, in other words, he has merely adopted the Johnson policy, thus making this now "Nixon's war," and that we are nowhere nearer the end of it than we ever were.

The second relates to the troubling questions we all have about the Thieu-Ky regime—questions that, I am sure, are shared by the President, and which the antiwar movement would resolve by simply having us withdraw our support from that government, arguing that this is required if the war is ever to end.

Let us examine each of these questions further.

Vermont Royster, writing in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal, has said with relation to that first question:

One of the interesting things about great tidal events is that the sweep of them often

changes long before those caught up in their midst are aware of it. This is particularly true of wars, where only retrospect shows that the tide turned at Gettysburg or Midway. But it is also true in political tides, where the turmoil of the day obscures the deep movements that have already altered the flow of events.

Thus it is possible, and I think it quite likely, that the turn in American policy toward Vietnam has already come. That is to say, we are now in the process of liquidating that war. More, that the end is going to come faster than the hawks fear or the doves hope.

Mr. Speaker, as I have been saying for months, Mr. Nixon has one goal in mind—and could have no other—and that is, to bring this war to an end as soon as possible, but also under the best possible circumstances, keeping in mind—as he should—the posture and commitments of the United States not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in the world.

To those who were disappointed in what the President said—or did not say—about all this on November 3, let me suggest their consideration of the fact that the President's actions are more important in this respect than his words.

And those actions include, among other things, the first withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam since our involvement in the conflict began.

Those troops withdrawals have been substantial—from a top of about 550,000 men in Vietnam as of several months ago to 489,200 U.S. forces on duty in Vietnam, according to the Department of Defense, as of this November 13, with another 5,200 men to be redeployed from Vietnam by December 15 to meet Mr. Nixon's goal of 484,000 troops left on duty there by that date.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in this connection that I am amazed at how many persons, confused by the ongoing rotation policy of Vietnam forces, somehow think Mr. Nixon is putting troops back in Vietnam faster than he is taking them out, for that simply is not true as our forces in the war zone are now at their lowest level since the end of 1967. Perhaps it would help if the Pentagon would keep the public better advised than it has been about what is being accomplished in this respect.

In any event, by adopting a policy of "protective reaction," the President—as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces in Vietnam—has created a situation amounting to an informal cease-fire in Vietnam, something clearly reflected in the declining numbers of U.S. casualties.

And let us not forget, in urging as some now do a more formal cease-fire upon the President, that the United States and the South Vietnamese Government accepted more than a year ago the cease-fire proposals as made by the United Nations' U Thant, and have advanced such proposals regularly since then, in the Paris talks and elsewhere, only to have them regularly and categorically rejected by Hanoi.

Beyond these actions, Mr. Nixon has wisely been pressing the rapid "Vietnamization" of the war—expediting the equipping and training of South Viet-

nam's own forces so as to enable them, as they have been doing, to take over an increasing share of the burden of combat in a war which is still "their war"—and thus reversing the terrible blunder we made in early 1965 in assuming we, somehow, could "win" that war for them.

Now, of course, the antiwar protesters say this cannot work—that a South Vietnamese Army that has not fought well before cannot be expected to do so on its own now. But, in so arguing, they ignore the fact that, once we mistakenly took over this tragic war, for months and months we never even gave the South Vietnamese Army a chance to see what it could do—and precious little training and equipment—a situation that takes time to reverse.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker—the President does not know—if "Vietnamization" of the war now will work.

Surely, it cannot be made to work by a specific deadline—whether the same is merely carried in the President's head or is imposed upon him by an impatient Congress that has been lead to believe by the antiwar movement that, if we will but just quit the war, our agonies will cease.

As to that thought, Mr. Speaker, let me return for a moment to Vermont Royster's words from that same column I referred to earlier:

What we have to face now as a country is what men sometimes have to face in their private lives, an agony for which there is no balm. We are going to withdraw from the war in Vietnam not because it is a good solution but because we cannot do otherwise.

So be it. But those who tell us there is no better or worse way out, that we should just quit without trying to make the best of the worst, those people, it seems to me, do us no service. Surely it would be better to leave behind a South Vietnam with a chance of surviving on its own than to leave only chaos.

That might not be "victory," since it would still leave much in the balance. It would not remove others' doubts of our resolution; it would not end the divisiveness within. But it would not be total "defeat" either; none at all if a viable South Vietnam survived, since our original objective was simply to prevent the take-over of South Vietnam by force. Anyway, it is worth a try. The measurement of us as a nation, as of a man, is not that we avoid all blunders but how we meet adversity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Royster has summed up for me why I find myself in President Nixon's corner. Not out of simple patriotism. Not to "save face"—because we have very little of that left to save, now, in Southeast Asia. And surely not for political reasons.

But, purely and simply because I believe what Mr. Nixon is trying to do is the right thing for this Nation to try to do in the terrible dilemma in which it finds itself.

Now, then, if we hold to this course—which means if American public opinion will permit the President to do so—what are the chances for negotiating a political settlement of the war that would cut short the time we need to "Vietnamize" it?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to say.

Hanoi's intransigence has become a familiar part of the record—and it is Hanoi with whom we really must deal rather than the Vietcong or its political arm, the NLF.

It is increasingly clear—at least to me—what Hanoi really wants.

And that, I think, is not simply the "unconditional American withdrawal" from Vietnam that it demands at Paris—a demand seconded by most of the antiwar protesters—but an American withdrawal accompanied by the imposition of a "coalition government" on the people of South Vietnam; something that clearly ties in with our antiwar protesters' argument that this misbegotten war cannot end so long as we continue to support the Thieu-Ky regime.

I think it is beginning to be obvious that the Vietcong-Hanoi axis is not interested in "free elections" of the sort we have repeatedly offered them—even as arranged through a "coalition electoral commission" of the type we and President Thieu have repeatedly offered them under which they would have a say about who would vote and how the votes would be counted, which is an all-important factor in Asian attempts at the democratic process. And I think it is equally obvious that they lack confidence in their popular support and their political organizations in South Vietnam under the conditions now pertaining there; so much so, that they want the United States to do the ultimate job for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say again—if I need to—that neither South Vietnam's President Thieu, or its Vice President Ky, fit my ideal of what popular, democratic leaders ought to be. As we know, their sharper critics here at home have far unkind words for them than that—"corrupt" and "unrepresentative" being among the least of them—and indirectly advance the thought that, somehow, just as Hanoi has always claimed, the NLF is "the sole, legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people."

I find this latter thought, Mr. Speaker, very difficult to accept—whatever deficiencies there may be in the Thieu-Ky regime's claim to political legitimacy, there are far more in the NLF's competing claim; all of which leaves me convinced that the antiwar movement must offer us some more useful suggestion for our getting around the reality of Thieu and Ky than simply abandoning them, and the South Vietnamese people, to their fate.

On last October 6, Tran Buu Kiem, chairman of the Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Student's Union, wrote an open letter to the organizers of the October 15 "moratorium" here, stating among other things that the only way to end this war was through responding "to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional government—the NLF—by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam, without imposing any conditions, and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Ky-Khiem administration, leav-

ing the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs."

If we did not decide to do just that, Tran Buu Kiem then said we would be "entering a new seething and violent struggle phase."

It would be my judgment, Mr. Speaker, if we were to do what Tran Buu Kiem thus suggested, that we might well be "out" of this war, but the people of South Vietnam would thereupon automatically enter upon "a new seething and violent struggle phase"; and that hardly seems in line with the responsibility we have accepted, no matter how unwisely. In saying this, let it be understood that I am not equating "responsibilities" with "commitments" in this connection, tending to agree with George F. Kennan's recent suggestion that we surely are not committed "to holding the South Vietnamese regime up by the scruff of the neck like a limp puppet forever."

Mr. Kennan—first director of the State Department's policy-planning staff and a long-time critic of our involvement in Vietnam—was reported as having "attacked" the Nixon Vietnamese policy in these comments of his from which the above quotation was taken. But a fuller reading of what he said on this occasion makes him out as advocating, only, a speedier withdrawal from Vietnam, during the course of which he says:

Let us do all we can to prepare the South Vietnamese regime for its additional burdens, giving it whatever it needs in the way of military equipment and training to meet the political competition it has to face. But then let us really withdraw. What remains is their task, not ours.

I certainly do not disagree with this analysis of what we should do—nor, I suspect, would President Nixon for it seems to me that this is precisely what Mr. Nixon has in mind, and that this is what "orderly withdrawal" means.

Besides which, please note—and it is a warning I would wish to echo—Mr. Kennan said:

But withdrawal from Vietnam is at best a delicate operation. The only person who can arrange and direct it is the President.

Now, does this emphasis on "orderliness" means—as one of South Dakota's Senators in the other body recently charged—that we are saying we are willing to turn "the war over to the South Vietnamese only if we are certain that they are able to carry the load—which is the same as proposing that we stay in Vietnam indefinitely?"

Not at all, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker—although I must admit the President's speech on November 3 might be read in different ways in this connection, giving evidence, I suppose, of his understanding of the fact that he knew he was speaking to Hanoi as well as to the American people on that occasion. Now, surely, some fuzzing of this question was appropriate, for Mr. Nixon must want Hanoi to be uncertain of America's ultimate intentions in South Vietnam since Hanoi, evidently, has long felt that American public opinion would even-

tually force their President, whoever he was, to end the war on Hanoi's terms, and Hanoi's terms only. And Hanoi's willingness to negotiate anything in earnest with us depends, for the future, on a substantial majority of the American people being willing—as I believe is now the case—to give the President time within which to work out his "Vietnamization" policy, and our withdrawal from combat, to whatever ending that policy may, for better or worse, produce.

Whether that end result will be "better" or "worse" is something no one now can predict. It depends on many, many factors—not the least of which, I think, from the standpoint of making the best we can out of a bad situation, is an American President with all his options open, and with the widest possible public support he can muster behind him.

And it is more important to watch what Mr. Nixon does from now on than to listen to what he may say—or feels he has to say—and thus what the antiwar protesters might now try to understand is that he has put us on an irreversible course leading to the end of this war; that the first withdrawal of our troops, as ordered by Mr. Nixon, if not the end of this war for us, was far more than an end to the beginning, but the beginning of the end, and that we can come out of this agonizing period we are going through a wiser Nation, even a stronger Nation, if we now meet it well.

Thus, to sum up, Mr. Speaker, both sides to the currently intensified public debate over how best to end this war are, to a certain extent, right; both carry heavy public responsibilities; each owes the other a larger measure of respect than has so far been granted, and their two major points of difference—when considered objectively—are far less substantial than they have been made to seem.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has raged in Minnesota over the authority of the pollution control agency of the State of Minnesota to set stricter standards regarding radioactive pollution than that set by the AEC. Technical advice was provided to the pollution control agency by Dr. E. C. Tsivoglou. An interesting exchange of correspondence has occurred between Mr. H. J. Dunster of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority. In order that my colleagues might have the benefit of this exchange I now provide these letters:

A MODERN POLICY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PROTECTION

(By E. C. Tsivoglou, professor civil engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology)

Until a year or so ago I could appear before a group of people secure in the knowledge that some were friends and some were strangers, but that strong emotions regarding my work were quite scarce if not completely absent. This seems not to be the case any longer.

About a year ago I undertook an assignment for the Pollution Control Agency of the State of Minnesota, namely, to advise the Agency regarding the control of radioactive pollution from the first major nuclear power plant in the State, at Monticello, Minnesota. Last February I delivered my report on this matter to the State. Since that time I find an increasing number of individuals, within the State and without, who seem to feel very strongly about my work and about me as an individual—even though most of them are not really familiar with the work in Minnesota and are not acquainted with me. As reported recently in Life Magazine, on the one hand I seem to be regarded as a conservationist who is trying to impede the development of the nuclear power industry, while on the other hand there are those who seem to regard me as some sort of industry representative who is trying to whitewash the nuclear power industry, and permit it to ruin our environment. I like to think that this contrast of extreme views may be the best evidence that we are succeeding in Minnesota in developing a rational and modern policy for the control of radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants.

I mention this situation because in its way it illustrates the nub of one of the real problems facing us in any attempt to establish a rational policy for the control of any kind of pollution, radioactive or other. In essence, we tend to be extremists of one kind or another—we seem to have to choose sides—the good guys and the bad guys—instead of seeking the truly moderate, rational solution that can provide positive protection for both the environment and industry.

To define these extreme views a little better, on the one hand we have the traditional industrial representative who takes the position that industry must not be required to waste its wealth on pollution control unless we can prove beyond all shadow of a doubt that the pollution has damaged someone or something. A friend of mine used to call this "the dead body in the morgue approach." On the other hand there is the extreme conservationist who refuses to be satisfied with anything less than pristine purity of the environment—for him, absolute zero is the only acceptable goal of pollution control. Of course, a large number of people are not extreme in either sense—but they also are less vociferous.

We have found both extremes in Minnesota, to say the least. I suggest that both provide a service to society, in that together they tend to force the choice of reason and moderation. But the extremists, in their zeal, also tend at times to becloud the issues, to perpetuate doubt beyond the limit of reason, and thereby to delay real progress.

Simple observation tells us that the general quality of our environment has been in a phase of gradual deterioration for some years now. It requires no elegant or sophisticated scientific analysis to demonstrate this—only the simple reactions of our senses of sight, smell and taste are needed. The facts tell us that our recently expanded federal and state pollution control programs have as yet failed to reverse this trend of deterioration—we seem unable even to keep pace with the ever-widening problem of environmental contamination. Even a cursory examination of the recent history of environmental pollution shows that a more positive and better coordinated approach to the whole problem of air and water pollution control is a necessity if we hope to adequately protect the public and to preserve the environment in a desirable condition.

I would like now briefly to review the approach to pollution control that has been traditional in this country for many years,

and to analyze it in terms of its consequences, as a means of understanding how the current situation has come about and as a means of seeking a more effective solution.

THE TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO POLLUTION CONTROL

The traditional approach to pollution control in this country has been defensive and negative. This approach has developed over a period of 60 years or more from an initial, basic, philosophy of using the environment to its maximum capacity to carry away wastes. The environment has been thought of as having a "self-purification capacity" that can and should be legitimately used for waste disposal. In this way, of course, the costs of waste control and disposal could be minimized, and it has been an accepted idea that to require additional waste treatment would be to place an unreasonable economic burden upon industry and to prevent the legitimate development of industry. "Dilution is the solution to pollution" was therefore the watchword not too many years ago. So long as no obvious damage could be shown, wastes from communities and from industry could be released to the environment without further justification.

It thus became the practice to establish environmental and human protection criteria that were based upon a concept of obvious or provable harm. For instance, limits on the concentrations of toxic metals in streams are established on the basis of preventing fish kills. Once such limits are established, of course, they become "dumping limits" in the traditional sense that the costs of pollution control are customarily minimized by releasing the maximum amount of waste that can be released without exceeding the established limit in the stream. This procedure takes maximum advantage of the capacity of the environment to dilute and disperse wastes. Quite obviously, it also results in the maximum tolerable pollution of the environment.

In the earlier part of the century, this developing approach to pollution control did not cause too much concern. Industrial plants were fewer then, and smaller, and if the stream flowing through a factory town was too polluted, trout could be found in another stream just a few miles away. The kinds of waste were simpler, and the quantities smaller. The occasional fish kill was isolated, relatively small, and not very widely publicized. If the local factory occasionally released a noxious waste from a low stack, people could get used to the smell and could escape to the nearby cleaner countryside without much difficulty. In brief, the situation was generally tolerable, and for a time, no doubt, dilution did seem to provide an adequate solution to pollution.

This situation has changed radically in the past 20 to 30 years, and in attempting to predict the future I find it helpful to identify the reasons for this change. Three factors in particular seem to have combined to create the current problem—they are, first, the great technological advances that have been made since World War II, secondly, the concurrent major population expansion, and, thirdly, the fact that this has in truth been an affluent period. American industry is now capable of developing new useful products for society at an ever-increasing rate, and little time is now lost between discovery and production in very large quantities. Highly effective sales campaigns can now be waged through the communications media, and "instant demand" can be developed. At the same time, an increasingly affluent public has quickly accepted and purchased products such as pesticides, sugar substitutes, weed killers, detergents and automobiles in tre-

mendous quantities, and the population "explosion" has added to the demand.

This combination of circumstances has introduced two additional factors that must be considered in any attempt to develop a more rational and effective pollution control program. First, the time gap between initial development and subsequent widespread use of such new products has virtually disappeared, in the sense especially that the new product now becomes available in great quantity long before any associated harmful human or environmental effects can be fully evaluated for proper control. The development of the pesticide industry, the quick growth of the diet soft drink industry, and the more recent development of the new enzymatic washing compounds provide excellent examples of the speed with which new products can come into wide use.

Secondly, the wastes produced by modern industry are more varied and complex, and we have seen the emergence of a new class of environmental contaminant that is the least obvious and yet potentially the most harmful. This class includes contaminants such as radioactivity, chemical carcinogens, pesticides, and cumulative poisons, for example. Chronic human exposure to apparently quite low concentrations of such contaminants, over long periods of time, may cause harmful effects that are subtle and difficult to perceive, yet real. Such effects may include the causation of specific diseases such as leukemia and various other cancers, lung and respiratory disorders, and mutagenic changes, as well as heightened susceptibility to a variety of human diseases and shortening of the potential life span. That such harmful effects may be difficult to identify and demonstrate does not prove that they are insignificant. On the contrary, the very fact that they are not obvious or readily demonstrated makes the potential hazard from these contaminants all the more insidious.

It seems eminently clear that the traditional defensive approach to human and environmental protection is a dismal failure in these modern times. This is amply demonstrated by an increasing series of unfortunate examples such as the gradual ruin of one of our five Great Lakes, the great fish kill a few years ago below a pesticide production facility on the Lower Mississippi River, the smog-related ailments that have been associated in good part with the exhaust fumes from automobiles, the patches of denuded countryside, and the air and water that just smell and taste bad. We should not ignore, either, the mounting evidence that some persons are more susceptible to harm than other, as shown by the recent history of problems associated with drugs like thalidomide and food additives like the cyclamates, and even vitamin pills.

Such examples from the past clearly foretell the future. Dilution is not the solution to pollution, and pollution control after the fact doesn't work. To perpetuate the old concepts of maximum use of the environment for waste disposal and of environmental limits that become "dumping limits" is to guarantee the further steady deterioration of the environment. This old approach leads inevitably to what I call "the barely tolerable environment." We may learn to tolerate it, and most of us will undoubtedly survive it, but very few of us will enjoy it.

A MODERN POLICY FOR HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Any modern policy for the protection of the public and the quality of its environment must satisfy certain requirements if it is to be a successful and effective policy. In the first place, it clearly must be a policy of preventing excessive pollution, rather

than trying to clean it up after the fact. We have learned, for example, that an aquatic environment, once destroyed, takes many years to fully recover. The same is true of a denuded countryside. Clearly also, to be effective, a modern policy must be capable of reversing the current trend of steady deterioration. Its principal goal must be an enjoyable, desirable environment. With all due respect and admiration for our capitalistic society, the main goal is not how much can I save for the stockholder—let us remember that these days the public is the stockholder.

In particular, a fully modern policy for protection of the public and the environment must protect the weak as well as the strong. These who are, by circumstances of fate, more susceptible to harm are not expendable, and no policy that fails to protect them can be successful in any long term sense. Thus, the concept that is prevalent in the nuclear industry of protecting "statistical man", or the average man, is not acceptable over the long haul. I think that we must do better than just protecting the average man!

Furthermore, any modern policy for effective pollution control must solve the problem of multiple sources of pollution in a river or air drainage basin. It is not enough to control environmental contamination from one source at a time—the whole effect of a group of varied sources must be controlled, otherwise life in our urban environments will fast become untenable, and our rivers will simply accumulate wastes as they proceed to the sea. Nor can an effective pollution control policy continue to ignore the synergistic effects of different pollutants.

A really effective environmental pollution control policy must also recognize that the environment has no "self-purification capacity" for many of the wastes that we release to it today. The "hard" detergents of a very few years ago provide an excellent example. Some of our wastes, once released, will simply circulate indefinitely throughout the air, water and terrestrial worlds, without being appreciably diminished in quantity. They will thus accumulate indefinitely.

Finally, if we are to have truly effective protection of the public and its environment, we must be willing to admit that our real level of knowledge regarding the collective and cumulative effects of many of the wastes we produce today is pitifully weak. I do not seek here to minimize or to deprecate the knowledge that has been earned by the many researchers in this field. On the other hand, I think we must face the fact that there still are a great many.

What have I described by way of a modern policy for human and environmental protection? In its very essence, I have described a policy of minimizing rather than maximizing pollution of any sort. This is a policy, then, of how much can I hold back, rather than how much can I dump, of how clean and desirable can I keep this world, rather than how much contamination can I endure. Platitudes such as the benefit vs. risk philosophy so widely quoted in the nuclear industry have no place in such a policy—not only do we have no way of evaluating either benefit or risk with any meaningful degree of accuracy or precision, but the very philosophy implies a willingness to tolerate any level of risk if there seems to be an associated substantial economic benefit.

I trust that I have now left you with the feeling that I, too, have presented you with a platitude, namely, to minimize rather than maximize pollution. Simply said, but how to accomplish such a goal? Although the following procedure is not regarded as perfect or complete, it does seem to satisfy most

of the requirements of a modern pollution control policy.

Rejection of the old concept of environmental dumping limits implies control of pollution at the source as the only practical logical alternative. There must always be general limits that cannot be exceeded in any event, and these will depend, ultimately, upon the effects of pollution in the environment. However, such limits are not easy to establish, and it must be recognized that they are usually quite imperfect especially because of our lack of knowledge of the ultimate effect of long term chronic exposure. Hence, such general limits can only be maxima, and it must be understood that it is highly undesirable for pollution to reach such levels. Control at the source, then, means minimizing the amount and concentration of pollution in plant effluents in every practical way, so as to keep environmental pollution as far below those ultimate limits as possible.

This means also that each source of pollution must be regarded as individual, as one plant will be able, in a practical way, to do a better job of minimizing pollution than another of similar type. It means also, then, that there can be no single or general effluent standard for all sources of pollution or even for all plants of similar type, say, paper mills. Instead, it means that we need to determine the practical minimum release on a source by source basis. It should be noted here that recycle of waste waters and complete containment of plant wastes is not always a practical impossibility, as an increasing number of industrial plants accomplish this now.

In determining the practical minimum release at any plant, it appears that only two questions need be answered. The first, "Is it technologically feasible to reduce effluent waste content?", will usually have an affirmative response. The second question then must be "Is it economically reasonable to do so?" This is the question that has always been difficult, and I can offer no easy solution. However, it seems obvious that this question of cost must be answered if there is to be any hope at all of establishing a modern and effective pollution control policy. This question cannot be and should not be evaded. The oft-heard responses "It would put us out of business", or "We will have to move our plant to another state", cannot be accepted. In the final analysis, the responsibility for a decision on the question of cost must rest with the public agency, usually at the state level, that is responsible for the regulation of pollution. It is vital that this pollution control agency be both firm and moderate in meeting this responsibility. Hopefully, in doing so the agency will have the real cooperation of industry, but the responsibility must be met with or without such cooperation if the pollution control policy is to be truly effective.

Clearly, if the answers to both of the foregoing questions as to technological feasibility and reasonableness of cost are affirmative, the problem is solved. In accordance with the policy of minimizing pollution, the waste treatment and control procedure in question should be required.

As I indicated earlier, the foregoing procedure for pollution control is not regarded as perfect or complete. However, I believe it offers a practical beginning, and a very necessary one, if we are to reverse the trend of the times and establish a modern policy for the protection of the public and its environment.

APPLICATION TO THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

In point of fact, the policy for pollution control that I have just outlined has been developed in part from the approach recommended for the nuclear industry by the ICRP and other responsible sources. The two ap-

proaches are not identical, although they contain many common features. I should emphasize, however, that they are in complete agreement on the point of minimizing human radiation exposure and radioactive contamination of the environment, as there seems to be some confusion on this matter. There are those who prefer to work only with numbers, i.e., the MPC's, recommended by the ICRP, and to completely ignore the ICRP admonition that the numbers must be treated as maximum rather than dumping limits. This can only be regarded as a plea to retain and perpetuate the old approach to pollution control—the approach that leads to the barely tolerable environment.

It should be emphasized that there is nothing magic in numbers like the MPC's. They have been lowered in the past, and some of them will undoubtedly be lowered again in the future. So there is no real comfort in knowing that a particular MPC has not quite been exceeded. The only real security lies in knowing that such a number has not even been approached.

The ICRP does not advocate the use of effluent limits, at least directly, whereas the policy that I have proposed does include this primary means of positive control at the source. The only alternative, control based upon environmental monitoring, is not only more costly, but is also decidedly less certain. It leads too strongly toward the old idea of environmental dumping limits. Finally, any improvement that may prove necessary must be effected within the plant process, and must be based upon accurate knowledge of effluent quality. Hence, for a variety of reasons it appears to me that control and regulation must be based upon effluent quality, before dilution and dispersal in the environment, if such regulation is to be effective.

There is some tendency in our nuclear industry to look upon the numerical limits contained in the AEC Regulations on Licenses (10 CFR 20) as dumping limits. Indeed, a careful reading of the language contained in 10 CFR 20 does indicate clearly that the individual numerical limits will be treated as environmental dumping limits. Even though I accept the public assurances of the AEC that its real policy is one of minimizing radioactive pollution, I regard it as extremely unfortunate that the legally binding 10 CFR 20 contains the opposite, old policy. Among other things, that old policy neglects and avoids the direct guidance of the Federal Radiation Council, which has stated in quite emphatic language that the policy of all federal agencies shall be one of minimizing radiation exposure.

Let us now consider the Monticello, Minnesota, nuclear power reactor as a case in point. This is a 550 megawatt-electric boiling water reactor, the first large reactor to be operated in the state. It is scheduled for full power operation next spring. It is located some 30 miles or so northwest of the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, on the Upper Mississippi River. The river downstream provides the water supply for the Twin Cities. Other nuclear generating plants planned for this area include plants at Prairie Island, south of the Twin Cities, and an additional tentative site under consideration by the power company would locate a plant more or less west of the metropolitan area. The total electric generating capacity of this group of plants surrounding the metropolitan area would be 3,000 megawatts or more.

A permit for its Monticello plant has been issued to the power company by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. The permit contains numerical limits on radioactive releases to the environment. These limits are considerably more stringent than might otherwise be allowed under the current AEC regulations. Certain of these limits, particularly those pertaining to liquid

effluents, are based in good part on statements that have been made by the power company in its Final Safety Analysis Report and elsewhere. In those cases, the concentrations and quantities expected by the power company were sufficiently low as to be entirely safe, and were presumably practically achievable limits by the company's own statements. In addition, the permit requires certain further waste control procedures, and specifies relatively extensive effluent and environmental monitoring programs. In brief, the permit that has been issued represents a sincere effort on the part of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to minimize radioactive pollution of the environment while not working an unreasonable hardship upon the industry.

From the plans for a group of nuclear generating plants around the Twin Cities, it seems clear that adequate pollution control measures cannot be designed by blindly considering one reactor at a time as though the others had nothing to do with the problem. The power company has requested an AEC operating license that, were it granted, would permit the Monticello plant alone an average stack release of more than 40,000 curies per day, every day. Taken alone, this seems to me to be a lot of radioactivity, even if much of it is relatively short-lived. Considering the potential group of reactors, the discharge from the Monticello plant could represent as little as a tenth of the combined release from all plants.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has decided, via its permit, that an average daily release of 40,000 curies is not necessary and should not be allowed. It has allowed a fraction of this amount, and has steadfastly resisted the very strong public efforts of some individuals to force a zero release permit.

Various public comments have been made by a number of individuals about the action of the State of Minnesota in this case. Some of the comment has been acknowledgeable and some has not. Some has been favorable and some has not. The power company has filed suit in federal court to show that the state has no legal authority to regulate waste discharges from the plant, and that suit is still pending.

The Pollution Control Agency has requested several times now that the power company provide the Agency with any factual information that the company cares to submit to show that any part of the permit is unreasonable or impractical. As of this date, the power company has submitted no such evidence whatsoever for the Agency's consideration.

SUMMARY

The great technological area of the twentieth century has been accompanied by a traditional policy of maximum use of the environment for dilution and dispersal of the wastes that have been produced by industry and man. This old approach of trying to clean up after the fact of pollution has proved to be incapable of keeping up with our ability to produce wastes of an increasingly complex character and in rapidly increasing amounts. This traditional approach to pollution control leads inevitably to a "barely tolerable environment."

It is proposed, therefore, that a modern policy for environmental protection is now a pressing social need. In its very essence, such a policy must be one of prevention rather than cure, of minimization rather than maximization of environmental contamination. This more modern approach can be quite practical, as evidenced by application to the nuclear industry. It can signal, hopefully, a transition from the current era of technology to a new and greater era of man.

RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION DIVISION,
HARWELL, DIDCOT, BERKS, ENGLAND,
August 20, 1969.

Dr. E. C. TSIVOGLOU,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR DR. TSIVOGLOU: Dr. Sowby has sent me a copy of your final report on "Radioactive Pollution Control in Minnesota" because I was chairman of the ICRP Task Group that prepared ICRP Publication 7. I regret the delay in writing to you, but I had some difficulty in finding time to study the report in adequate detail.

Prompted by *Science*, 7th March 1969, and reading between the lines of your report, I came to the conclusion that there are some special political difficulties associated with pollution control or the introduction of nuclear power into Minnesota, which would make a logical programme limited to genuine needs unlikely to be acceptable to the legislators. I thus read your report in the context of an attempt to get as close to a logical solution in the face of difficulties of this character. Even so, your proposals seem somewhat extreme and could certainly not be related to the recommendations of ICRP.

The following comments are of a more detailed nature and the references are to your page numbers.

16. The central paragraph on this page struck me as being an excellent statement of policy, as did the remark about question and answer on page 20. It did not seem to me, however, that the recommendations of the report were based on these excellent principles.

27. I do not think I agree with the last three lines of this page, in particular with the reference to effluent concentration. I do not think standards for human radiation protection can in principle be related to effluent concentration in any but the most unusual circumstances, when members of the public are directly exposed to undiluted effluent. In all other situations, it seems to me it is the rate of discharge in units of activity per unit time that is related to human protection. A concentration in waste can be halved by doubling the flow of diluent but the dose to people in the environment will usually not be significantly affected by this change.

31 and 34. Both of these pages contain references to the complexity of controlling environmental situations, but I am satisfied that a programme of environmental measurements based on the recommendations of ICRP Publication 7 would require less routine effort and expense than the programme you have suggested and would give a genuine assurance of safety. It would, however, require more effort at the design stage. Nevertheless, I do not necessarily disagree with your argument that the primary standards should be those of effluent discharge. If these are properly assessed and based on discharge rate rather than concentration, they can, and in your circumstances would, give complete control of safety. The monitoring could then be confined to the effluent discharges, apart from some confirmatory checks on possible critical pathways during the first year or so.

42. The ICRP quotations on this and subsequent pages are seriously out of date. In my view, they were never particularly sound and the replacement material in ICRP Publication 9 (paragraphs 44 and 74) and ICRP Publication 7 (paragraphs 14-17) express the policy much more clearly. The earlier approach and your material fail to take into account the effect of critical pathways other than those through air and water. Further, the individual limit of 1/10 was always, in practice, the limiting case. If individuals, including children, are limited to 1/10, then the average population dose is always much less than 1/30 of the relevant dose limits. I think from your text that you are suggesting

applying the 1/30 figure to the concentration in the air and water, expressed as an average over a local population, and not over a national population. You are then apparently hoping that this will protect the individual within the distribution of exposures in the local population. This has never been the way ICRP intended these numbers to be used. They were intended as separate limits, both of which had to be considered, and, at the time, the Commission believed that there might be circumstances in which the average population dose was the limiting one rather than the dose to individuals. The situation has been further confused by the use of the same factor of 1/3 for providing protection to individuals when monitoring was done by sampling over broad averages, e.g. over whole milk sheds. It is now clear that the figures of 1/10 and 1/30 used for individual and population limits are not both necessary. In any event, they can only be applied to genuinely critical pathways, and if applied to air when inhalation is not the critical pathway, as with iodine, they are demonstrably dangerous.

57. I like the second and third lines of this page and can only regret that you have not achieved your intentions. I can say categorically that the radioactivity standards you have recommended are not based on ICRP recommendations.

59. I must take exception on behalf of ICRP to the first sentence of your item (5). ICRP limits for continuous occupational exposure are expressed in terms of concentrations in air which is breathed or water which is to be consumed or, more fundamentally, in dose to individual organs of the body.

It is a travesty to use these as a basis for limiting the concentration in an effluent, unless the effluent is directly consumed or directly breathed and these are genuinely the critical pathways concerned.

This is not to say that discharge limits cannot be derived from ICRP recommendations. They can and should, but the methods involve assessing a relationship between the discharge or discharges and the doses to critical and other groups. The dose level selected as a basis for control can then be the ICRP dose limit or a lower figure chosen as a compromise based on keeping doses "as low as is readily available, economic and social conditions being taken into account" (ICRP Publication 9, paragraph 52). The needs of the operator and his economic pressures can be considered also at this stage. The final doses to people and the concentrations in air, water, foods, etc. in the environment will not then be directly related to any numerical recommendations of ICRP, but the control structure will be in accord with the general policy expressed in the Commission's recommendations. These methods have the additional advantage of flexibility, in that the numerical limits applied to one operator can logically be made different from those applying to another whose discharges behave differently in the environment. The basic standards are the same, the practical standards can take into account the different environmental situations, and the different compositions of the wastes. Indeed, this flexibility can even be carried to the lengths of expressing the discharge limits in terms of concentration in circumstances where the total volumes discharged are known to be limited and where the quantity to be discharged is very small. A typical example might be a concentration limit applying to hospitals other than those using radioisotopes for therapy. The appropriate limit would be derived on the principles outlined above and would not necessarily bear any relationship to the MPCs for drinking water recommended by the Commission.

61. In your item (c) there seems no justification for discussing concentrations. If an

individual assessment is being made in a claim for variance, there is surely no reason why the basis of the claim should not be expressed in terms of dose to individual members of the public rather than in terms of concentration. In any event, you should surely specify concentration in what.

89. I find it difficult to agree with the last few lines of this page because it seems extremely unlikely that an offsite monitoring programme of the type you recommend will contribute anything to elucidating the remaining areas of uncertainty.

112. The first sentence of the paragraph starting in the middle of this page is not convincing to me in regard to the proposed reactor and is demonstrably false in respect of the final few words. There are gaseous wastes from hospitals and other licensed users of small amounts of radioactivity but it is certainly unnecessary to conduct environmental monitoring programmes in relation to these wastes. They are too small for this to be required. Even for the liquid wastes from these users environmental monitoring is usually unnecessary, though many be adopted in areas of high concentrations of licensees. ICRP Publication 7, paragraph 1 makes it clear that the Commission does not expect environmental monitoring programmes round the majority of installations.

135. The recommended programme in this summary table is not consistent with ICRP recommendations. If it is adopted, it will involve the citizens of Minnesota in higher taxes and higher charges for nuclear electricity than necessary. They may wish to incur this additional expense and this is of course their inalienable right. However, I am convinced that they will be getting value for money and am certain that the expense cannot be laid at the door of ICRP.

I am sorry to have expressed these criticisms at such length, but a considerable amount of effort and discussion went into the formulating of Publication 7. It has subsequently been criticised as doing little more than state the obvious, but I am now convinced even more of its importance. I am sorry to see that it has not had the expected impact in Minnesota.

Yours sincerely,

H. J. DUNSTER,
Deputy Division Head.

ATLANTA, GA.,
September 22, 1969.

Mr. H. J. DUNSTER,
United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority,
Authority Health and Safety Branch,
Radiological Protection Division,
Harwell, Didcot, Berks, England.

DEAR MR. DUNSTER: This is in response to your letter of August 20, 1969, regarding your review of my report on "Radioactive Pollution Control in Minnesota". I supplied that report as a courtesy to Dr. F. D. Sowby earlier, after receiving a request for it from him, and he then informed me that he had sent it to you.

Before responding in detail to your letter, I should first inform you that at a public meeting in Burlington, Vermont, on September 11th, Commissioner Theos Thompson of our Atomic Energy Commission announced his possession of a copy of your letter to me, and had public comment to make regarding its contents. As you are aware, your letter to me is strongly opinionated. As of September 11th I had not had time to respond. Nor did your letter note that a copy had been sent to our Atomic Energy Commission. At this point, then, I can only wonder whether in fact a multitude of copies of your letter have not been quite widely distributed by you.

Taking these circumstances together, I can only regard your actions as a discourteous and highly unprofessional abuse of a cour-

tesy that I extended to Dr. Sowby. I had thought that such sophomoric methods of personal attack were a thing of the past in our field. Under these circumstances, I have no choice except to send copies of this response to persons whom I know or suspect to have received a copy of your letter. I shall do you the courtesy of listing their names at the bottom of this letter.

I do hope that the recipients of this letter and yours to me will in the future demonstrate more respect for the privacy of such correspondence, and not further publish or distribute or publicize such material without the permission of the writer.

It is eminently clear from your letter that we disagree strongly regarding the desirable basic approach to radioactive pollution control. It is evident from your remarks (page 3 of your letter) that you feel that industry should be permitted to make radioactive releases to the environment with complete freedom so long as it cannot be proved that the ICRP dose limits have not been exceeded. Of course, as we both know, in most cases involving ingestion or inhalation and real members of the public, the actual dose can only be calculated, not measured. This approach that you advocate leads directly to the old "numbers game" that has been played for too many years now, to the use of environmental limits as "dumping limits", and to a policy of maximum use of the environment for waste disposal. Your approach would perpetuate the complex play with numbers that involves a mystique that only the "experts" can follow. That approach has led to a great deal of confusion and justifiable mistrust on the part of our public, who, quite understandably, desires a pollution control policy that is both readily understood and effective.

My own approach is quite different from yours, and is, I believe, quite clearly stated in the report that you have read. I prefer to pay more attention to the admonitions of both the ICRP and American authorities such as the Public Health Service and the Federal Radiation Council, all of which have urged that all radiation exposure should be minimized. This leads to a straightforward and readily understood pollution control policy and to a program that minimizes the use of the environment for waste disposal. The basis for my approach has been admirably stated, for example, by the ICRP as follows (see page 44 of my report, and page xxi of the ICRP Report of Committee II on Permissible Dose for Internal Radiation, 1959):

"It is emphasized that the maximum permissible doses recommended in this section are *maximum* values; the Commission recommends that all doses be kept as low as practicable, and that any unnecessary exposure be avoided."

If we are to heed this admonition, it follows quite obviously that any radioactive pollution abatement procedure for nuclear power reactors that is both technologically feasible and reasonable in cost should be *required*. Otherwise, we would be in the position of advocating radiation exposure that is unnecessary. That is the position in which you appear to have left yourself.

In your letter you refer to the above ICRP quotation (and others) as "seriously out of date," and indicate also that in your view it was "never particularly sound". I must respect your right to an independent personal opinion, even though you apparently attempt to discredit the ICRP also. This example alone adequately demonstrates that your comments represent your personal opinions, rather than an accurate interpretation of the ICRP reports. I disagree with you strongly. In my view, the above quotation from the ICRP is extremely clear, is *very* sound, and will never be out of date.

I will now turn to your more specific comments. On page 1 of your letter, referring to page 16 of my report, I have noted that you did find something in the report with which you could agree, namely the statement of policy regarding surveillance. Apparently we disagree, however, on the procedures by which that policy is to be made practical. I will comment further below on the monitoring programs.

Referring to page 27 of my report, you state that you "do not think" you agree with the reference to effluent concentrations. Aside from that apparent uncertainty, you further state: "I do not think standards for human radiation protection can in principle be related to effluent concentration in any but the most unusual circumstances, when members of the public are directly exposed to undiluted effluent." You imply here, of course, that without further justification or discussion people can properly be exposed at the ICRP limits, and the environment can properly be used to its full capacity for waste disposal within that dose limitation. As I have indicated above, I disagree strongly with this approach, and note also that it clearly violates the above principle of minimizing exposure that has been called for by the ICRP.

In your last sentence on page 1, and in your comment on page 2, top, you appear either to ignore or to have missed the several statements in my report that *quantities* discharged, as well as concentrations, must be specified and limited. See, for example, lines 4 through 6 on page 101 of my report, and item (d) on page 103.

In your reference (page 2 of your letter) to pages 31 and 34 of my report, you state: "The monitoring could then be confined to the effluent discharges, apart from some confirmatory checks on possible critical pathways during the first year or so". This implies that environmental monitoring can largely be dispensed with as unnecessary and wasteful. I disagree. In the first place, I am not at all satisfied that the so-called "critical pathways" can be adequately defined before plant operation begins. Nor do I expect them to be necessarily the same at different locations, or to be unchanging over the years. After an initial year or so of extensive monitoring at a specific location and the development of specific relationships between effluent and environmental radioactivity for that plant in that location, then it should be possible to monitor with increasing selectivity and thereby minimize the whole monitoring effort. That is the intent of the monitoring program outlined in my report, namely to develop the most efficient monitoring effort on the basis of real experience rather than so-called educated guesses. You may be interested to know that one quite independent estimate of the first year cost of the monitoring program that I have outlined is \$100,000. In view of the capital cost of the installation (\$100 million), I regard the estimate of \$100,000 as a very small cost of doing business during the first year, a cost that is quite insignificant in terms of the consumer cost of electric power. It should also be noted that our public increasingly requires a *demonstration* of safety and is not now in the habit of blindly accepting the assurances of a handful of wise men.

Your reference to my page 42, on page 2 of your letter, has already been answered in good part. In the first place, you seem to freely disparage and discredit those statements by the ICRP with which you happen to disagree, hence I cannot regard the statements in your letter as anything more than a biased interpretation of the ICRP documents. Secondly, as I have pointed out clearly in the report, I regard the distinction that you wish to make between local and national populations as a rather devious way of saying that people who live near a facility

should be looked upon as a little more expendable than people who live elsewhere. I do not like dual standards for the same public, even though I am well aware of the statistical theories involved. My position on this point is clearly stated on pages 57 and 58 of my report.

Your reference to my page 57 (page 2 of your letter) is noted. You may say "categorically" whatever you like—so far as I am concerned, the recommendations referred to are in fact *based* upon the ICRP recommendations, as I interpret the collection of all ICRP recommendations. Let it be understood clearly that I have not said that my recommendations are necessarily identical with those of the ICRP—in point of fact, I suppose they may be regarded as somewhat more restrictive, especially if one chooses only to look at the numbers in the ICRP reports and to ignore the admonition to minimize exposure. I prefer to emphasize that principle of minimization of dose. In brief, my recommendations are designed to provide for the maximum practical degree of protection, rather than the minimum.

Your comment regarding my page 59 (pages 2 and 3 of your letter) is the clearest evidence of your approach, namely to maximize offsite dose and to maximize the quantities of radioactivity that may be disposed of to the environment. Your comment is obviously based upon the premise that the public can be dosed up to the ICRP-recommended limit with impunity, and that curtailment of waste releases need be practiced only if people would be exposed beyond those limits. I do not agree, as I have indicated earlier both here and elsewhere. Nor do I think that the ICRP would buy that premise.

You remark on page 3 of your letter that in order to derive discharge limits from the ICRP recommendations "the methods involve assessing a relationship between the discharge or discharges and the doses to critical and other groups". Have you ever calculated the cost of accomplishing such an analysis *with accuracy*? I do not refer here to educated estimates, but rather to accurate measurements—we can all make estimates at the drop of a hat, but then who will accept them? If you will refer to my earlier work on radioactive pollution of the Animas River you will find that a very limited series of accurate environmental measurements cost about \$50,000. I shudder to think of the real cost of a serious attempt to make *accurate* assays of the radiation dose to the population of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area as well as to those living in the near vicinity of the Monticello reactor. My recommendations for minimization of radioactive releases from the power plant are designed to eliminate the need for such extensive survey work by demonstrating the absence of significant or measurable exposure even near the plant. I assure you it will be less expensive.

Your comment regarding my page 61 (your page 3) goes back again to your desire to base control on dose, when we both know that dose can largely only be calculated, not measured. My specification of concentration rather than dose represents the difference between something that can be measured and something that must be guessed at—I prefer my procedure.

Your reference to my page 89 clearly requires no response on my part except to note that we disagree again.

As for your comment regarding page 112 of my report, I have taken it to be obvious that the necessary extent of monitoring in any case depends largely on the nature and magnitude of the source. Hospitals normally represent a very small source compared to a 550 megawatt electric power plant. On the other hand, it does not always follow that examples involving considerable carelessness with small sources. Your comment that "the

Commission does not expect environmental monitoring programs round the majority of installations" seems to have very little relevance to the problem at hand—we are discussing large nuclear power facilities, not hospitals and not sundry trivial sources.

With reference to my summary table, page 135, I think it more accurate to state that the recommended program may be somewhat more extensive than the specific ICRP recommendations on monitoring around reactors. It is not correct to state that the recommended program "is not consistent" with the ICRP recommendations. In any event, far be it from my mind to "lay the additional cost of monitoring at the door of ICRP", as I gladly accept this responsibility myself.

I am pleased to note from the very end of your letter that you do understand that the citizens of Minnesota may have something to say about what they want, and that they do have the right to decide. It is unfortunate that you have not had the opportunity to hear them at public meetings on this matter—you would find some very strong disagreement with many of the opinions that you have expressed in your letter. In America decisions such as those we have been discussing are ultimately made by the public, even though this process may in some cases take years.

There is no reason for you to be "sorry to have expressed these criticisms at such length". I have never expected unanimous agreement with my approach. As you obviously feel so strongly, I can only point out that in this country our public is now widely insisting on a higher degree of protection of its environment. We want to minimize pollution, not maximize it. It seems that we are more and more willing to pay the cost for this. If England or other countries wish to travel a different route, that is, of course, their privilege.

Your sincerely,

ERNEST C. TSIVOGLOU.

ATLANTA, GA.,
November 8, 1969.

Mr. H. J. DUNSTER,
United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority,
Authority Health and Safety Branch, Ra-
diological Protection Division, Harwell,
Didcot, Berks, England.

DEAR MR. DUNSTER: This is in response to your letter of October 10, 1969, in which you respond to my letter to you of September 22.

Your apology regarding the subsequent hidden distribution of your initial letter to me (dated August 20, 1969) has been noted. To be certain that we understand each other, I agree that my earlier report to the State of Minnesota has indeed become rather public, but this has nothing to do with the public distribution of your private letter to me without my being informed. It is the latter action to which I have taken strong objection in the interests of professional courtesy and propriety.

You indicate in your last letter: "There has been no other unstated distribution of my letter beyond our local files here." Perhaps you are unaware of the subsequent use of your letter for propaganda purposes by your "colleague" in our AEC. Permit me to put you in the picture. As of this date, your initial letter to me has been used publicly by our AEC Commissioner Theos Thompson and by Representative Craig Hosmer (Calif.) of our Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; it has been published in the Newsletter Environmental Clearing House (October 13th issue); it has been made a part of the permanent record of current hearings before our Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; it has been sent to a number of influential members of our Health Physics Society. I have no doubt that it has been surreptitiously distributed elsewhere by your highly active "colleague" in our AEC.

I must say that I do not envy your having such "colleagues". I feel quite fortunate that I have none who would embarrass me in such fashion. Mine are the kind who let me know where your letter is currently making its appearance, as they cannot stomach such behind-the-scenes activities.

I trust that the foregoing brief outline adequately informs you of the activities of your American friend in our AEC. I accept your implied statement that you have had no knowledge of these matters before now. However, there is no room for doubt any longer regarding either his hidden activities or his motives. Therefore, I believe that decent professional procedures now requires that you reveal his name so that we can all know who he is. If you refuse to do so, I can only assume that you concur in his surreptitious actions.

I have also noted your statement in your most recent letter that "It appears that you and I differ not in policy but only in the techniques giving the best balance between costs and benefits." I am glad to learn that you do not really favor maximum use of the environment for radioactive waste disposal. As for techniques, it is my view that the only practical means of assuring control is to regulate it at the source itself, by the application of effluent limits. I do not expect universal agreement with this view, and never have. However, it seems clear from your most recent letter that, despite all of your protestations regarding the primary importance of limiting the radiation dose, you too, conclude that in practice the effluent radioactivity release is what must be regulated. Hence, in point of real fact you do not appear to differ much even with the techniques applied in the Minnesota situation. I take it, then, that you must actually agree with my observation that the radiation dose cannot serve as an adequate basis of regulation for the simple reason that the dose is not measurable. As regards the actual numerical effluent limits that you and I might select, I should also note that in America our concept of the "best balance between costs and benefits" is apparently not the same as yours in England.

As for ICRP Publication 9, let me assure you again that I read it long ago. Just as the idea of limiting the radiation dose is fine in theory but not very practical as a regulatory technique, so also the concept of the critical group has serious practical limitations as a regulatory device. This should be especially obvious when one attempts to apply the critical group concept to a nuclear plant that has not yet even begun to operate! Even after plant operation begins, the actual selection of a critical group is no simple matter, as there is little room in America for personal or subjective judgments in choosing a group that is "small enough to be homogeneous with respect to age, diet, and those aspects of behavior that affect the doses received."

Therefore, it has not been my feeling that ICRP Publication 9 has really added substantially to or greatly modified earlier basic approaches, especially in that it has re-emphasized the principle that all unnecessary exposure should be avoided (paragraph 52). I note again that our concept of what is "necessary" seems to differ significantly with yours, and this is really the crux of the matter.

As regards your repeated insistence that the 10-year old Report of Committee II is outmoded, perhaps the rest of the world should also be thus informed. The MPC's, etc., from that report are still used everywhere, by our own AEC among others. If the ICRP actually wishes to repudiate that 1959 report, then it should do so clearly and publicly, without equivocation. It will also need then to replace that report with some-

thing more modern that can be understood and put to practical use by everyone, as ICRP Publication 9 does not adequately qualify. Until this happens, it appears safe to assume that the 1959 report will continue to be regarded by most of us as a basic guide. Frankly, it would be quite interesting to observe the procedure by which the ICRP repudiates its own earlier work.

I feel certain that you must recognize that our basic problem in America is not a technical one. The real problem lies in the dual role that is played by our AEC of both promoter and regulator of our nuclear industry. The conflict of interests involved is painfully obvious even to the most uninitiated, and this conflict of responsibilities has led to what many of us refer to as AEC's "split personality." It has been my view for many years that the AEC should be relieved of any such regulatory function or authority, in keeping with our American tradition of checks and balances, and that the responsibility for protection of the public health and the environment can properly rest only with our appropriate state and federal health and conservation agencies. Until the authority for regulation of wastes from our nuclear industry is thus properly delegated, such conflicts as the present one between Minnesota and the AEC are inevitable, and will undoubtedly continue to occur throughout our country.

I should inform you that in view of the widespread distribution of your initial letter to me I have no choice except to now release my responses to you. No doubt they, too, will become part of some public record here. I do hope that this can bring an end to this distasteful publicity, but so long as you continue to send copies of your letters to your "colleague" in our AEC, and refuse to reveal his identity, it appears clear that we will be unable to continue our correspondence, if any, in decent privacy.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST C. TSIVOGLOU.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman initiated the Point Four effort in 1950, he pictured a "bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

Since then, four Presidents, including President Nixon, have put their efforts into achieving those goals.

Today—nearly 20 years later—I can tell this Congress that those goals for U.S. technical assistance are being accomplished.

India is now meeting most of its basic food requirements for the first time with the help of American technology; Iran is reaching thousands of illiterate nomads with U.S. educational know-how; Nigeria has freed its citizens from the scourge of malaria with U.S. medical equipment, and Pakistan is gradually putting the brakes on the disastrously high growth of population with the help of family planning experts from the United States.

What does technical assistance mean to the Indians, to the Iranians, the Nigerians, and the Pakistanis?

In India and Pakistan, the high-yield wheat and rice seeds mean salvation from hunger for millions caught in the cen-

turies-old grip of malnutrition. In Iran, the U.S. "tent schools" have meant new job opportunities in the cities for rural illiterates.

In Nigeria, health programs have freed the diseased and unemployed for important jobs in national development.

Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of American cooperation of the grassroots level. A growing share of U.S. technical assistance today is carried out by private organizations and individuals working under contract to the U.S. aid program.

One out of every three technicians now at work overseas under that program is from the private sector. Private groups hold more than twice as many contracts today as they did at the beginning of this decade.

The technical experts behind our foreign aid effort come from our universities, our labor unions, our thrift associations, our business firms. They are teachers and doctors, engineers and agronomists, tax consultants and legal advisors—experts from every field of economic and social endeavor.

This kind of assistance has proven its value, and the President has directed that its emphasis within the foreign aid program be increased. AID has been reorganized to reflect the increase in emphasis on technical assistance. It is the right direction in which to move, and I ask—I urge—this Congress to concur in that judgment by its support of the foreign aid program.

MEN KILLED IN THE FARMINGTON COAL MINE DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, following is a list of names of the men killed in coal mines since the Farmington disaster, November 20, 1968. This list is not complete. Twenty-one of the names were not reported to the Federal Bureau of Mines at the time the list was compiled.

This list has been provided to me by the United Mine Workers of America, who are carrying on the fight for coal mine health and safety legislation in the best tradition of that great union.

I do not introduce this list to create maudlin sentimentality among the Members of this body. Rather, I introduce it to show that even now as we consider coal mine health and safety legislation men are dying in the Nation's coal mines. It is true that we have not had a major disaster since Farmington. But, as this list tragically points out, men have been dying in ones and twos in the coal mines. More importantly, until we pass strong and effective coal mine health and safety legislation men will continue to die.

It has been the United Mine Workers of America which has led in the fight for this legislation. It has been W. A. "Tony" Boyle, the president of the United Mine Workers of America, and his able safety director, Lewis Evans, as well as the director of the Department of Occupational Health, Dr. Lorin E. Kerr, who have provided the drive, the innovation

and the initiative to keep constantly before Congress the need for proper coal mine health and safety legislation. This action on the part of the United Mine Workers and its president is in keeping with the long tradition of the coal miners' union. For, it has been the coal miners' union through the years which has continually petitioned the Congress and continually lead the fight to insure that the lives, the limbs and the health of the coal miners were better protected. Most of us here remember the epic struggles to enact a proper coal mine health and safety bill in 1941 and again in 1952. That struggle was carried on by the late and brilliant president, John L. Lewis. The present union administration under the able leadership of W. A. "Tony" Boyle has carried on these efforts to enact meaningful health and safety legislation which began with the foundation of the union in 1890.

We of the Congress saw representatives of the United Mine Workers of America almost daily during the debate and the drafting of the legislation. We also saw the membership of the United Mine Workers of America who came to Washington to tell us in person of the need for a stringent and effective coal mine health and safety bill.

Mr. Speaker, the union of the coal miners has asked that this Congress pass a strong health and safety bill. I feel it is essential that we honor this request and that we give to the membership of the United Mine Workers of America, as well as to coal miners everywhere, the strongest possible product that we can. I also suggest that this Nation and its coal miners owe a debt of thanks to W. A. "Tony" Boyle and to the able staff of the United Mine Workers of America for bringing to the attention of the Congress and for helping the Congress to write a meaningful coal mine health and safety bill in 1969.

Thank you.

MEN KILLED IN COAL MINES SINCE FARMINGTON DISASTER, NOVEMBER 20, 1968

N. G. Horsley, Ala.
Mike Baker, Va.
Onorio Fillangl, Colo.
Paul Hunley, Ky.
Garrett Sergeant, Ky.
Gary A. Greer, Ohio.
Kenneth Wadding, Pa.
Louis Gocek, Pa.
Ronald J. Clark, W. Va.
Elmo Dunbar, W. Va.
Frank Collins, W. Va.
Jackie Cook, W. Va.
John Knaus, Pa.
Henry A. Heiser, Pa.
Peter Lohenitz, Pa.
John Lovich, Pa.
Andrew Csarak, Pa.
Ronald S. Kunsman, Pa.
Edward Manchias, Jr., Pa.
Nick Brosick, Pa.
George A. Carter, Pa.
Denver H. Butcher, W. Va.
Forrest Vernon Martin, W. Va.
John Thomas Hall, W. Va.
William A. Pellen, W. Va.
James Paisley, Ill.
Jake Burnett, Ill.
Glen Greenwood, Ill.
Ralph Taylor, Ill.
William A. McNeill III.
Charles Hubbard, W. Va.

Alva S. Fillinger, W. Va.
Aubrey R. Sands, W. Va.
George E. Sutherland, W. Va.
Thomas Craig, W. Va.
Edward L. Smith, W. Va.
Argus Ferrell, W. Va.
David R. Snodgrass, W. Va.
Eugene Griffith, Ky.
Wiley H. Parsons, Ala.
Lemuel A. South, Ala.
Nick Ciran, Okla.
Jesus Flores Lopez, Utah.
Paul Eugene Burnette, Ky.
J. L. Osborne, Ky.
James C. Hylton, Va.
Eli Sutherland, Va.
Thomas Scarberry, Va.
Clyde Fuller, Va.
Charles E. Smith, W. Va.
John A. Gretchen, Ohio.
Edward Burton Tingle, Ala.
Lonnie Mullins, Ky.
Carl Sizemore, Ky.
Harry G. Mortimer, Ohio.
Arden E. Mills, Ohio.
Vincent Natale, Pa.
Elmer R. Jones, Tenn.
Earl Akers, W. Va.
James Lynn, W. Va.
Archie Adams, W. Va.
Nicholas D. Teodorowicz, Pa.
Walter Balsavage, Pa.
Louis Gonzalez, Pa.
John Smith, Pa.
Clarence W. Watson, Pa.
Steve Kovach, Pa.
Joseph Martina, Pa.
John P. Gamon, Jr. Pa.
Thomas P. Shaynak, Pa.
Adam F. Petrisek, Pa.
John Fodor, Jr., W. Va.
Wilbur J. Wiggins, Sr., Ohio.
John P. Cuskey, Ohio.
Joseph Dzatkowicz, W. Va.
Harvey E. Courtney, Jr., Ill.
Gerald W. Patterson, Ill.
John C. Rodden, Ill.
William Kirby, Sr., Ill.
Eloy Hurtado, Colo.
Bobby D. Powell, W. Va.
Doff Nathan Brown, W. Va.
Lewis F. Shockey, W. Va.
Clarence E. Allen, W. Va.
William Bachtel, W. Va.
Joseph H. Menaghini, Jr., W. Va.
Ira Kirk, W. Va.
Ernest L. Browning, W. Va.
Quillie Smithson, Ky.
Fred Higginbotham, Jr., Ala.
John Henry Bell, Okla.
Bill G. Puckett, Okla.
Lorenzo Varela, Wyo.
Jimmy G. Cartwright, Ky.
Irvin Napier, Va.
Franklin L. Ring, Va.
Larry Douglas Collins, Va.
Ed Ashworth, Va.
Shirley G. Mills, W. Va.
Willis Tipton, W. Va.
J. C. Angel, W. Va.
Jack Lindy Moye, W. Va.
Estel Ray Mullins, W. Va.
Iidon McMillion, W. Va.
Arthur J. Turner, W. Va.
Robert Bowles, W. Va.
Earnest Hunt, Ky.
Delmar Hall, Ky.
John R. Toborkey, W. Va.
Steve Bobish, W. Va.
Robert L. Bates, W. Va.
Steve Ceplocha, W. Va.
John Morton, Jr., W. Va.
Leon Jarvis, W. Va.
Mark Shade, Pa.
Willie Ray Thacker, Ky.
Oscar Ricketts, Jr., Pa.
John H. Kitchens, Colo.
Melvin Absher, Va.
Ralph Braden, Ky.
Albert Bush, Pa.

Clyde Millsap, Tenn.
 Robert O. Carlson, Jr., Pa.
 Charles Arbus McClung, W. Va.
 Mack Bennett, Tenn.
 David C. Bower, Pa.
 Clarence M. Martin, Pa.
 Raymond O. Emler, Ohio.
 Kenneth Begley, Ky.
 Claude Weese, W. Va.
 Frankie D. Rose, Va.
 Douglas Bennett, Ohio.
 George Potter, Ky.
 Ronald Phillips, Ky.
 Earl Smith, Ky.
 Estil Harvey Sullivan, Ky.
 Andrew Claud Harvey, W. Va.
 Donald Gay, Pa.
 Kenneth Klinger, Pa.
 Andres Kosinko, Pa.
 Franklin Ladd, Ky.
 Grat C. Fox, W. Va.
 Charles W. Harris, W. Va.
 Charles H. Bays, W. Va.
 Oscar Hamlin, Sr., W. Va.
 Cloyd W. Combs, W. Va.
 Leo Williams, W. Va.
 Darb Stephens, Ky.
 Paul Frame, W. Va.
 Walter Amos Moore, W. Va.
 Halbert L. North, W. Va.
 Jesse W. Baldwin, W. Va.
 Daniel M. Cooper, W. Va.
 Paul Thobosis, W. Va.
 George Burton Harris, Colo.
 Jennings Hamrick, W. Va.
 Robert L. Rothey, W. Va.
 Albert Lyons, W. Va.
 Elvin Johnson, Tenn.
 Ronald Adkins, Va.
 George H. Ball, Ohio.
 Robert Kerry, Pa.
 Marvin Shadle, Pa.
 Kenneth B. Wallace, Va.
 Veltile Bailey, Ky.
 Louis Thomas, W. Va.
 Cecil Wilson, W. Va.
 Vernon Rummel, Pa.
 Adrain Metcalf, Ky.
 James Keen, Va.
 Theodore A. Miller, Pa.
 Fred Starnes, Ky.
 Ross Hogue, Ohio.
 J. B. Nash, Ky.
 Virgil Townsend, W. Va.
 Anthony V. J. Wanat, Ohio.
 Rickey Lee Dalton, W. Va.
 James W. Siegel, Pa.
 William Kapes, Pa.
 W. M. Baker, Ky.
 Edward Franklin Bennett, Ky.

WADE O. MARTIN, JR.—25 YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I rise to commend one of my distinguished constituents, Louisiana's secretary of State, the Honorable Wade O. Martin, Jr., on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his service in that office to the people of my State.

This Saturday, Mr. Martin will be honored at an appreciation banquet in Baton Rouge not only for his outstanding accomplishments as a public official over the last quarter of a century, but for his exemplary leadership in community affairs in his role as a citizen.

I include in my remarks at this point a brief summary of the achievements for which Mr. Martin is recognized:

WADE O. MARTIN, JR.: DEAN OF LOUISIANA ELECTED STATE OFFICIALS

THE RECORD 1944-69

First elected secretary of state—1944. Re-elected: 1948; 1952 (unopposed); 1956; 1960; 1964 (unopposed); 1968 (unopposed).

EX-OFFICIO STATE BOARD AND COMMISSION OFFICES

Louisiana Commissioner of Insurance—1944-1956.

Chairman, Louisiana Insurance Rating Commission—1944-1956.

Louisiana custodian of voting machines—1944-1956.

Chairman, State Archives and Records Commission—1956 to date.

State Bond and Tax Board—1944 to date.

Louisiana Tourist Development Commission—1964 to date (chairman, 1964-1967).

Liquefied Petroleum Gas Commission, 1944 to date.

State Advisory Board—1944 to date.

Louisiana Office Building Corporation—(president 1965-1967).

Louisiana Teachers' Retirement System—1944 to date.

Louisiana School Employees' Retirement System—1947 to date (chairman, 1947-1967).

Administrator, Division of Recorder of Documents, 1948 to date.

Member, Council for the Development of French in Louisiana, 1968 to date.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

As chairman of special committee, National Association of Secretaries of State, drew up uniform State legislation reducing residence requirements and providing special ballots for voting for U.S. President and Vice President. Drafted and sponsored the Louisiana constitutional amendment on this subject which was approved by legislature in 1968, and by our voters the same year.

Directed research, drafting and sponsored enactment of:

The Louisiana Insurance Code, 1948.

Law numbering candidates in primary elections, 1952.

Law creating Louisiana's modern archives and records commission and service—1954-1956; enacted, 1958.

Law creating a separate tourist development agency for Louisiana, enacted 1964.

Sponsored enactment of law providing indemnity payments by State to widows and children of peace officers killed in performance of their duties, 1964.

Co-sponsor with Louisiana Association of Legislation creating a recorder of documents, enacted 1948.

General Chairman of Louisiana Bar Association's Special Committee, and co-sponsor with bar association of Louisiana's modern corporation law, enacted, 1968; effective, 1969.

Cooperated with National Association of Secretaries of State, Department of National Defense and other Federal agencies in drafting and enacting Louisiana's laws for special treatment of election ballots for military personnel, 1958.

Cooperated in project now pending for drafting of a Louisiana election code, 1966.

Sponsored numerous other election laws.

VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES

Chairman, Louisiana Cancer Crusade, 1953; reappointed, 1954.

State chairman, Louisiana Highway Safety Commission, 1954; reappointed, 1955, State government chairman, United Givers' Fund, 1957.

Chairman, Charles Hurt fund (to provide indemnity payments by State to widows and children of peace officers killed in performance of their duties), 1964.

Cited for distinguished service to Civil Defense, in construction and maintenance of emergency operating centers.

Continued to follow his father's pioneer work in Louisiana Flood Control and Water Navigation.

Named Member Advisory Board, American Automobile Association, 1965.

Recognized for leadership in the preservation of Louisiana historic monuments, with special reference to old mint building.

Director, Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, Inc.

Co-founder and Charter Member, Lovely Louisiana Tourist Association, 1963. (Now Louisiana Travel Council).

State Chairman, Radio Free Europe Fund, 1969.

Chairman, Louisiana Hurricane Task Force, 1969.

Entrusted with annual legislature appropriations for use of Louisiana Historical Association.

Provides information to elected officials at all levels, and to the public, on request, for both specific and general information.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Only Louisianian elected President, National Association of Secretaries of State, 1948.

First Louisianian elected President, National Association Insurance Commissioners, 1952.

Honorary member of Baton Rouge Association of Life Underwriters, 1952.

Named member of Federation of Insurance Counsel, 1953.

Received Axton-Choppin award "For distinguished service in the cause of public health" from Louisiana Public Health Association, 1955.

Cited for "Outstanding Service" by American Red Cross for production of TV film used to coordinate relief activities and obtain contributions for victims of Hurricane Audrey, 1957.

Recipient, American Heritage Foundation Award for "Outstanding Citizenship", 1957.

As Secretary of State, Recipient Special Citation by U.S. Secretary of Defense for "Long and effective support" given the Armed Forces absentee voting program, 1958.

Given award for service against aggressive communism from Crusade for Freedom, 1958.

Recipient 6th Annual Civil Service Personnel Management Conference Award for superior personnel program, 1958.

Recognized for continuous 15-year membership in Young Men's Business Club, 1960.

Received Boswell Institute's degree of doctor of wordly wisdom awarded in recognition of "significant contributions as a public servant of Louisiana", 1961.

Awarded certificate of merit by Lovely Louisiana Tourist Association, 1963.

Recipient, appreciation award as member of Board of directors, Greater Baton Rouge Cancer Society, 1965.

Recipient, Monte M. Lemann award for "unselfish devotion to good government," 1966.

Awarded certificate of appreciation by Louisiana Civil Defense Agency for "providing leadership and guidance in civil defense emergency operations center construction program," 1966.

Made associate member, International Institute of Municipal Clerks, 1967.

Awarded certificate of merit, Louisiana Tourist Development Commission, 1967.

Awarded outstanding membership certificate, National Association of Secretaries of State, for leadership as chairman in consideration of proposed amendments to electoral college system, 1969.

The long list of distinguished Louisiana citizens who have joined together to arrange the appreciation banquet speaks eloquently for the high esteem in which Mr. Martin is held in our State.

An exceptionally capable individual,

Secretary of State Martin has been untiring and unflinching in his dedicated leadership in grappling with vital issues as evidenced by the following letter to the President:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Baton Rouge, September 6, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is an urgent message, and in the hope that it will reach your personal attention without delay, I am sending it by Certified Airmail.

It has been my pleasure to have met you in person, and I am sure you know who I am. Nevertheless, because of the importance of this communication concerning the school situation in Louisiana, and other communications which I expect to send to you in the coming weeks on other subjects of state and national interest, I feel it is in our best interest to refer briefly to a few salient facts concerning my background in government.

While you know me as Secretary of State of Louisiana, you probably are not aware of the fact that I have held this distinguished elective position many years longer than any previous Secretary of State of Louisiana, and that this year I became the dean of the elected officials of Louisiana in my 25th year of service. In national government circles, I am past president of both the National Association of Secretaries of State and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

In all humility, I believe it can be said that the people of this state have confidence in me by virtue of my election and re-election every four years, several times without opposition from Democrats, Republicans or Independents.

My father before me served with distinction as an elected official for some 40 years. Both of us are well known for our interest and participation in all matters of public concern for our state, in major flood control, disasters, education, aid to the poor, the sick and the indigent. As an attorney and former Assistant Attorney General of the state, I participated in the drafting, advocating and enactment of many laws in conjunction with others interested in the welfare of our state, many of which laws originated in Louisiana and are now a part of the federal governmental system.

My wife and I are the proud parents of six children, ranging in age from 28 to 8 years. So, we have with us a wonderful span to help us "bridge the gaps" that are so frequently referred to today.

Politically, I am a registered Democrat and like most Louisianians I participate as a member of that party in purely Louisiana elections. From the standpoint of national politics, I have consistently voted for and sometimes publicly supported and campaigned for the candidates for President and Vice President of these United States whom I felt were best qualified to serve the interests of the nation and the free world. My interest and participation were evaluated in each election, and in recent years, I have voted for and actively supported three Democrats and three Republicans. My most active participation in my career for President and Vice President was in 1964 when I was state campaign manager for the Republican candidates.

With this brief background, which will suffice for this and future communications, I will proceed to do that which we in Louisiana urge all citizens to do, namely to communicate with our officials and give them our ideas on matters which concern them, their state and their nation.

I feel particularly encouraged and confident that you are indeed interested in Lou-

isiana and its people. Among other manifestations, we were extremely gratified at your thoughtfulness in sending Vice President Spiro Agnew and Secretary George Romney to inspect and report first-hand to you on our sad calamity in the aftermath of Hurricane Camille.

If you are not persuaded by my statements in this communication, I hope that you will come to view our present dilemma in person, or that you will send some one else to report on the situation, which eventually could be more serious than the worst hurricane to hit the western hemisphere in the history of mankind.

We in Louisiana have difficulty, Mr. President, in understanding the acts of your administration in this present school crisis. Our Governor and Lieutenant Governor have in the last few hours issued a joint statement declaring their helplessness and the helplessness of the state in this crisis. Their reference, of course, was in relation to the state government of Louisiana. I feel that we are not helpless because this matter can be resolved by you and your administration, if you understood it as we do and were disposed to assist before the "hurricane" hits, instead of endeavoring to patch things up after the damage is done.

Of prime consideration, Mr. President, is the fact that the people in Louisiana have made more progress in the integration of public schools than most other areas of the nation. In the September 8, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report, at page 36, it is reported from governmental officials that in the 11 states of the old South, which includes Louisiana, more than 1/4 (maybe as many as 40%) of all negro pupils will be attending classes with white pupils this year. The report states that last year 20% were in mixed classes—only half as many as are expected this year—and only five years ago it was just 1.2%.

This may not be a good record in the eyes of some, but if these figures in this article are correct, we in Louisiana and in other states of the South, the North, the East and the West, both black and white, have in our opinion reasonably agreed and accepted the fact that in our country and others of the world, no one should be barred from going to the school of his choice because of his race. We feel that great progress has been made in Louisiana and in the South. This has been predicated, at least in part, on the acceptance of reasonable integration and opposition to unreasonable discrimination.

But while our people object to discrimination as to race, we must likewise object to discrimination based upon geographical location in this country. We must ask, Mr. President, why the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is given such tremendous power and authority, and I must add to you, Mr. President, let there be no mistake, in the eyes of the people of our state "H-E-W" is "Y-O-U".

So, the question we need to put to you is first, do you understand that people can and do accept the abolition of discrimination which creates a burden on a race of people—white, black or yellow—and are willing to accept the right of any one to a reasonable freedom of choice? Do you understand, also, that whatever expense is necessary to accomplish this is felt by many of us to be justified? But if you do not understand the two following points, it is my purpose to make them very clear.

Louisiana, like many other states, is in dire need of money for education and all other state services and programs. We can barely pay now the tremendous cost of transporting children to the schools closest to their homes. Why then should it become necessary for the state and local governments in this financially plagued state to add to their financial burden the tremendous extra costs involved in moving pupils away from

their neighborhood schools into far distant communities? Could it be simply that HEW or someone else may say that in this nation although you have complete freedom of choice in attending any school you desire, we want it said that in no school district will we permit predominantly "white" or predominantly "black" schools?

Projecting this to a nationwide operation, this so-called "goal" could never be achieved without the establishment of a busing system from one state to another. Some states have practically no negroes. There are very few states which have almost as many negroes as whites. Why this must be done and is being done in Louisiana is not at all clear. If you and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare claim that you are doing this in Louisiana because it is in the interest of the nation, then why is it being done in the small State of Louisiana and not in any of the larger states of the nation?

There is not too much difference in your age and mine, nor do I believe there was too much difference in our teaching while we were in law school. I am sure we both learned that any laws of the United States should be uniform in application to all the people of the nation who are citizens of this great country. Could it be that HEW and you believe that what you are doing is good for the nation while meticulously enforcing the busing procedure in the little State of Louisiana while leaving so-called "racially unbalanced schools" running peacefully and tranquilly in the great states of Illinois, Michigan, New York, Virginia, California and in the District of Columbia?

Yes, Mr. President, if we are with you in endeavoring to reasonably prohibit racial discrimination, why cannot you be with us in trying to prevent geographical discrimination? I mentioned frustrations brought about by this situation. One of the objects which people strive for is culture. Negroes, whites, Orientals all strive, not only for material but cultural benefits for themselves and their children. They move to neighborhoods with people of like cultural background. While there is a gradual change going on, even with all the millions being spent in the ghetto areas to improve them for both white and black, it would be a frustrating experience for you, HEW or any authority to require them to move into the ghetto with its different culture, and different level of personal and property safety.

In the event you are not aware of it, buses and bus drivers have been threatened and are in extreme danger when these buses transport children either from negro districts to white districts or from white districts to negro districts. Parents are concerned for the very lives of their children when they are bused from one area to the other.

In the event you are not informed on the subject (partly because the news media has not fully publicized the fact), there are negro boycotts and demonstrations against the actions of HEW just as there are white boycotts, demonstrations, etc.

Insofar as the law is concerned, we must wonder again why this is happening in Louisiana while, as reported in the same article in U.S. News & World Report, "eight out of 10 negro public school children in Michigan attend predominantly black schools. More than one-half—56.3%—of the white pupils attend all white schools. Detroit has 19 all black schools and 17 all white * * *. Chicago has 98 schools with no white pupils; 41 with no negroes."

If this is good for Louisiana, and you and HEW cannot immediately remove this threat of violence and property damage along with the destruction of our school system and the deprivation of an education for our children, then why is this not discrimination geographically against the State of Louisiana?

One thing more, Mr. President, as a matter of law, if Congress enacted as a part of

the civil rights act a requirement for "busing" of children of different races to obtain equal numbers of children of both races in all schools, why would this law not specifically say it was to be accomplished in the states of Louisiana and Mississippi, and if it was intended on the other hand for nation-wide application, why is this not being done?

You see, we in Louisiana know and approve of your practice and that of other Presidents of sending messages and recommendations to Congress. I admire greatly your recommendation to Congress that all states be required to come under the regulation that illiterates be allowed to vote, instead of the requirement that only Louisiana illiterates and those in a handful of other states be marched to the polls and voted by representatives of the federal government. This certainly demonstrates your attitude that what is good for some states should be good for all, and what is bad for some should be bad for all.

We would like, therefore, if you would to send a message to Congress pointing out this geographical discrimination in the language or interpretation of an Act of Congress, in order that they might on your recommendation suspend the operation of such an inequitable law and avoid loss of education, personal and property damage and other loss in our state. Or, even simpler, if you and your administration feel that this is the wrong application of a law, then we would request that you communicate with the officials of HEW and call this matter off, as we understand that the courts are acting at the request of HEW.

Another inconsistency, Mr. President, is very evident to us and it is our hope that you will give consideration to it as well. It was my pleasure to have been in the Louisiana Governor's official party to meet our distinguished Vice President and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on their recent trip to Louisiana following Hurricane Camille.

In a press conference at New Orleans, a reporter asked the Vice President for comment on a published report that HEW had announced that no school in the hurricane ravaged area of Mississippi would receive any federal aid whatsoever unless HEW was satisfied in its discretion that that school had fully complied with desegregation policies or instructions proclaimed by HEW. We were most gratified when the Vice President replied in effect that he certainly hoped the pain, suffering and mental anguish of hurricane victims and their children would not be utilized by HEW as an instrument to either penalize or as a wedge to force integration.

To our regret, so far as we know, the Vice President's humanitarian and compassionate attitude is not being shared by agencies of your administration and we understand that the "penalty" or "wedge" is indeed being applied and now on an extended basis to apply to businesses and other institutions. It would seem to us that the federal government has enough facilities at its command to enforce integration without compounding the misery, desolation and suffering of parents, school children, teachers and business people who contribute so much to the economy of this nation by subjecting them to cross-examination on their integration policies before allowing them the help which Congress and the people of this nation intended them to have following such a disaster.

It is our hope that Vice President Agnew reported his attitude to you and that you and HEW may agree with him and so many of your fellow citizens in Louisiana who share his attitude on this subject.

Some of our schools opened a few days early, and if the troubles and difficulties in the great majorities of our schools which will

open next week are in any wise comparable, your immediate consideration of this situation is urgent, and if you decide to take any action we hope that it will be taken without delay in order that all of us may have time to give more consideration to the laws and equities involved.

If this emergency relief is not forthcoming, it is our sincere hope that we can have an immediate explanation of why these drastic steps are being taken in Louisiana and Mississippi and not in Secretary Romney's state of Michigan, Vice President Agnew's state of Maryland, or your own state of California.

We believe in you and your administration, and so I have no hesitation in asking you to consider this matter as extremely serious and that you take such action as you may deem appropriate.

Without extensive elaboration on the seriousness of the situation, I enclose copy of the front page of the Baton Rouge State Times newspaper of September 5, 1969, with news article and accompanying pictures.

I am sure that we would be happy to assist you in any way possible in solving this, as well as other problems confronting our state and our great nation.

Sincerely yours,

WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

HON. EMILE SIMARD: A VETERANS DAY ADDRESS

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the Honorable Emile Simard of Manchester, delivered a fine address at Veterans Day ceremonies in Nashua in my district. He urged citizens to give their solid backing to President Nixon in his efforts to win peace with justice in Vietnam.

Mr. Simard is the Veterans' Employment Representative for New Hampshire with the U.S. Department of Labor and is a former member of the Governors Council. He was an alderman in the city of Manchester for 14 years and also served two terms in the New Hampshire House.

I am pleased to place his remarks in the RECORD and commend this forthright statement by a patriotic public servant:

VETERANS DAY 1969

Veterans Day is a day for all Americans.

It is a day to pause in observance. It is a day to start again—fresh with dedication. It is a day to sharpen memories of past glories. It is a day to dream dreams of future triumphs.

Veterans Day is a day to honor those veterans sacrificed in struggle. It is a day to respect those who survive.

It is a day to mark the silence that came over the Western Front on that November 11 of fifty-one years ago. It is a day to celebrate the bright victories that grew from dark battle in that and other wars.

Veterans Day—as we observe it—often has the face of strife, of suffering and bloodshed, of horror, of destruction and mutilation—of death.

But—and we must never forget this—Veterans Day is really a day of peace.

And it is a day of peace that we should celebrate—a day that in its initial observance was marked as a day that would end all wars. Although the promise was faulty and the prophecy unfulfilled, the idealism that

proposed man's rising above his primitive and cruel proclivity to armed combat must not be forsaken.

The main conflict of the Vietnam war has shifted from the hills of Vietnam and the halls of Paris to the streets and campuses of America.

How our domestic struggle between anti-war youth and the President comes out will affect the fate of 17 million South Vietnamese and the position of the United States in Asia.

American student radicals who met with North Vietnamese military officials in Havana this summer, without doubt, are well aware Hanoi and their Soviet backers are counting on an anti-war victory in the U.S.

Five years of war have taken their toll of North Vietnamese, Viet Cong and the revolutionary infrastructures in South Vietnam. Equipping, supplying and training of South Vietnamese (ARVIN) forces also is starting to show results. Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, said on Oct. 1 that the military forces of South Vietnam and some other Asian countries can now take over the active defense of South Vietnam's independence.

The proviso is that Asians themselves can take up the slack if withdrawal of American forces is not too rapid. That's why Hanoi and Moscow favor an effort to stampede our government into immediate and complete withdrawal of forces.

The spearheads of the "Bring the Boys Home" movement are student radicals. We've already had the Oct. 15 Vietnam moratorium. The second round escalation will come with mass demonstrations and marches in a number of major cities of the United States.

The primary demonstration slated for Washington, D.C., is planned to include "tens of thousands" of clergymen, pacifists, anti-war demonstrators and student radicals who want not only to end the war in Vietnam but to close down the institutions of our free society.

Agitate the discontented, merge the destructive emotions of the mob with the calculating destructiveness of the intelligent vanguard. That was Lenin's formula for insurrection and revolution. Will it work in America? Will it overheat and stampede public opinion? Will people then demand an act that will both destroy our credibility and our power in the world and bring closer a direct conflict between the major powers?

Your greatest weapon is to create first, a groundswell of public opinion supporting America's ideals and our commitments to defend independence of peoples. Their continued independence is a guarantee of our security.

Second is to have a groundswell of opinion condemning the "radical disruptors," the "Typhoid Marys" who want to infect the entire nation with their sickness by "the use of mass intimidation in the name of legitimate dissent and protest."

What better time to start making these points than Veterans Day, November 11?

We have over 27 million living American veterans. Living veterans and their families plus living dependents of deceased veterans represent half of the population of the United States.

As veterans let us pledge today—on Veterans Day, November 11—we call on millions of Americans to join us, letting the world know that we stand squarely beside our elected President in his efforts to secure a just and lasting peace in Vietnam.

The Vietnam dissenters have already broken one President's heart. May God give President Nixon strength and courage to achieve his goal—peace throughout the world, especially in Vietnam.

Today let us show our true patriotism to our country. Let us write today to our President, Congressmen and Senators that we

support President Nixon and his efforts to achieve a lasting peace in Vietnam and throughout the world.

We have heard from the loud minority—now let's hear from the silent majority.

AGRIBUSINESS: PROSPECTS FOR KANSAS

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was fortunate to receive a new publication from the Agricultural Experiment Station at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kans. Entitled "Kansas' Investment Opportunities or Where the Economic Action Is," this important work was authored by Dr. Lowell Brandner, redactor of agricultural sciences at KSU. Dr. Brandner has spent most of his life in Kansas, including more than 20 years at the university. His message is important to the future prosperity of Kansas and of equal importance to other agricultural regions. I believe it should be shared with the Congress and the Nation.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

One significant thing about Dr. Brandner's report is that it does not "white-wash" the difficulties Kansas must endure, nor does it seek to minimize the challenges ahead if the State is to prosper with the Nation as a whole.

Kansas has been known since it was settled as the "Wheat State." Wheat is still of commanding importance, but Dr. Brandner suggests that Kansas is perilously close to losing a competitive position in wheat production. The world yield record is 216 bushels per acre, achieved in the State of Washington by a new variety called Gaines. Indiana's best farmers expect to get 90 bushels per acre from Arthur, while Blueboy has yielded over 100 bushels per acre in North Carolina and is being distributed throughout the Southern States. Michigan crosses have yielded 90 bushels per acre.

Much of the research that has resulted in these new varieties and bumper crops has been the work of Kansas scientists—yet there has been no satisfactory variety that will produce comparable yields in Kansas itself. As Dr. Brandner puts it, "Kansas has bred the dwarfing trait into hundreds of wheats but has not yet found one that outyields the wheats she has."

"Miracle wheats" have proved to be a blessing for India and Pakistan; both reasonably expect to become self-sufficient in wheat within a decade or less. Other countries, such as Mexico, have become exporting nations, while Turkey, Israel, and other semitropical areas have had spectacular results from the new crosses.

While these dramatic developments have been recorded worldwide, Kansas yields have remained relatively static. Increases in per acre production in the past 2 years have been largely the result of favorable weather conditions. If Kansas does not produce a "miracle wheat" suitable for local growing, she will surely be unable to compete as new varieties become widespread in use elsewhere.

The prosperity of the wheat industry in Kansas, therefore, does not depend upon the Congress in the immediate future. Nor does it depend upon the farmer himself. It depends upon the dedicated scientist working in his laboratory and on his test plot. We must provide him with whatever support he needs in this important undertaking.

MILK AND BEEF

Much of the Report is devoted to the dramatic advances made in Kansas through acceptance of hybrid milo. The "milo belt" is fast overtaking the "corn belt" as the primary center of the fed-cattle industry. Milo and beef now represent the number one economic activity in Kansas, surpassing wheat, oil and gas, aerospace, and all the rest. Without the development of hybrid milo in the 1950's, most of this success would have been impossible. Cattle sales now represent a \$600 million per year business in Kansas, while meat packing and processing represents another \$600 million in economic activity. By comparison, crude oil and natural gas mining provides less than half a billion in annual economic activity.

Just as the scientists have developed an alternative to corn that will grow without irrigation throughout Kansas, they will develop a wheat that should permit Kansas to reassume her historic role in this vital commodity. I am confident of that. With additional research, a highlysine, high-tryptophan milo and a high protein wheat can be developed that will permit Kansas to retain the advantage over the corn belt that milo has provided for the moment.

Kansas has an almost untapped potential to produce finished pork—the milo that has proved so profitable for beef production has a similar potential to produce pork competitively.

The demand for red meat, both in the United States and elsewhere, increases faster than the population. As people become more affluent, their demand for meat increases rapidly.

The Soviet Union has bred, and successfully marketed, a very high quality sunflower oil. Our own State flower, growing wild everywhere in Kansas, has become a multimillion-dollar industry for the Russians. It is taking a significant portion of our soybean market from us at the moment. Potentially, Kansas could counter this Soviet commercial venture with sunflower oil of its own.

Soil and plant scientists, working principally at Kansas State University, have been responsible for much of the development that Kansas has enjoyed in past years. Now, perhaps more than ever, we depend upon them to provide our farmers and businessmen with the competitive advantage that only their technology can bring in this most competitive business.

SAFETY FIGURES ARE GRIM

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from President Howard Pyle of the National Safety

Council. With it, he included a compilation of accident statistics for the 10 years of the 1960's to date.

It is staggering.

Accidents on our highways, in our homes, working places and in public places took more than 1 million lives during the sixties.

Motor vehicle accidents head the list. Some 475,000 persons were killed in motor vehicle accidents and the rate increases.

Mr. Pyle makes an excellent point when he states:

It's a strange paradox that we can be so properly concerned about Vietnam, and violence in the streets, and so unmoved when accidents in the decade of the sixties killed more than a million men, women and children—injured 103,000,000—and accounted for \$180 billion in economic waste.

I urge my colleagues to study this letter and the accompanying table. We must act so that Mr. Pyle forecast that the seventies may be even worse, does not come to pass.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL,
Chicago, November 19, 1969.

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND: Public and official preoccupation with other crises continues to obscure the bitter tragedy and awful cost of accidents on our highways, in our homes, in public places and at work.

Herewith is the National Safety Council's Report to the Nation 1969. It is not encouraging because there is so little about which to be encouraged.

Particularly depressing is the fact that so many of government's promises of assistance have fallen so far short of fulfillment.

It's a strange paradox that we can be so properly concerned about Vietnam, and violence in the streets, and so unmoved when accidents in the decade of the sixties killed more than a million men, women and children—injured 103,000,000—and accounted for \$180 billion in economic waste.

The seventies will be even more disastrous if we don't decide to do something about it and act accordingly.

Your help would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

HOWARD PYLE.

Motor vehicle accident toll in the 1960's

Dead	475,000
Permanently disabled	1,500,000
Temporarily disabled	16,000,000
Partially disabled	15,000,000
Vehicles in accidents	250,000,000
Cost	\$90,000,000,000

Source: National Safety Council estimate based on reports from state motor vehicle departments. National Health Survey.

COMPREHENSIVE SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM BILL

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a comprehensive social security reform bill which is designed to meet head on the tragic problem of economic privation which is hurting so many of our senior Americans.

Today, over 92 percent of those reaching age 65 are eligible for social security benefits. Yet, despite this broad coverage

on paper, this major program falls far short of meeting the minimal needs of our senior Americans.

The facts are that today over one-half the recipients of social security are totally dependent on these payments. With a single person receiving approximately \$100 a month, and a married couple receiving about \$150 a month, it is clear that this amount is not adequate to meet minimum human needs. Statistics indicate that nearly one-third of all Americans above age 65 are living in poverty. We must face the terrible fact that older Americans constitute the largest group on the poverty rolls today, making up about 20 percent of our Nation's poor. It is even more distressing to learn that this percentage of senior citizens who are poor is on the increase.

And it should be made crystal clear that much of the poverty that afflicts senior Americans today is due to a history of inept fiscal management by the Federal Government. Inflationary policies, pursued and encouraged for years by the Federal Government, have served to rob senior Americans of the buying power of their personal savings by constantly driving up the cost of living. If the Government had worked harder to maintain the value of the dollar, most of today's senior Americans would be able to live adequately on their savings, pensions, and social security payments.

Thus we see that events and circumstances, too long ignored, are today shunting many of our elderly out of the vital mainstream of American life onto the dead end sideroads of poverty, isolation, and despair. The "war on poverty" answer for these people is not better education programs or more training programs and jobs. The answer must be more adequate dollar benefits.

We in the Congress, and all Americans, have a responsibility to see that our senior citizens are not left alone to lead lives of deprivation and desolation. I believe that my bill is a minimum first step toward bringing these people back into the mainstream of America's promise.

TWENTY-PERCENT BENEFIT INCREASE

First, I wish to commend President Nixon for his initiative in asking for a 10-percent social security benefit increase and other needed changes. However, it has been some time since the President has called for this percentage increase, and since the last social security increase in February 1968 the cost of living has gone up almost 10 percent. Therefore, I feel a larger increase is needed at this time in order to substantially improve the lot of our elderly. I am recommending a 20-percent increase to be effective at the end of 1969. Further, I strongly feel the present minimum monthly benefit of \$55 for a single person is totally inadequate, and I am urging its increase to \$80. Under my bill, then, the new minimum for a single retired person would be \$80 and the new maximum would be \$198. For a married couple the new minimum would be \$120 and the maximum \$297.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE

Second, we can no longer let inflation outdistance our efforts or wait for a bi-

or tri-annual social security review by the Congress. Therefore, I am recommending, as I did in 1967, that future increases should automatically be tied to the cost of living. We provide this type of certainty for our Federal and military employees, and I certainly think it is about time we applied the same principle for the security of those receiving social security. This would not, of course, preclude us from increasing benefits even more should our economy or a different social security financing system permit.

INCREASE THE CONTRIBUTION BASE

In order to cover the cost of these increases, I recommend that we raise the contribution base from \$7,800 to \$12,000. I feel we must do this to strengthen the system and to keep future benefits related to increases in wages. Just as we raise benefits to realistically meet rises in the cost of living, so should we raise the taxable base as wages increase.

LIBERALIZE THE RETIREMENT TEST

One premise of my bill is that senior Americans need not be wards of the Government. These people prize their independence, yet we have acted arbitrarily to restrict their initiative and erode their self-sufficiency by placing a very low income limitation ceiling on their earnings. Our benefits are too low and we should make it possible for a senior citizen to be able to earn more and augment his income without a loss in social security benefits. Hence, I am recommending that the income limitation ceiling be raised from \$1,680 to \$3,000.

SPECIAL TAX EXEMPTION

Related to my above proposals to substantially improve a senior citizen's financial situation, I am also proposing that we make tax-exempt the first \$5,000 in income of a person 65 and over. I cannot believe the Federal Government needs this money more than our senior citizens do or could spend it more wisely in our national interest.

PROTECTION OF VETERANS' PENSIONS

My bill would protect veterans' and widows' benefits from deductions related to these increases in social security. As one constituent wrote to me in 1967, "I receive \$133.80 social security and the 12½% (social security) increase, if passed, would amount to approximately \$16 per month and my personal income would exceed the \$3,000 (Veteran's) limitation, thus depriving me of the \$48 per month (Veteran's) pension. In other words, my income would be \$32 per month less than it is at present." I know that this situation happened to many people in my district and I would urge that the Congress take immediate action to safeguard them from such adverse affects.

IMPROVE WIDOWS' BENEFITS

I am also making several recommendations which would assist widows. Today, six out of 10 widows living alone have incomes below the poverty line. This is deplorable. Widows have the same expenses as their husbands—food, shelter, clothing, child care—yet, unlike their husbands, they have greater difficulty in going out to earn supplemental income. So I am recommending that

rather than provide a widow with only 82½ percent of her husband's benefits, she should receive the full 100 percent.

Further, I believe widows should receive these benefits at age 62 instead of age 65. I am also asking that women who have qualified for social security benefits on their own earnings also be allowed to receive full benefits at age 62.

The 1967 social security amendments contained a major benefits breakthrough—for the first time it provided benefits to totally disabled widows and widowers. But these benefits only begin at age 50 and they are substantially reduced. It's clear to me that the needs of a disabled widow under 50 years of age are as great as the needs of a disabled widow over 50. Also, total disability incurs great medical expenses and precludes additional earned income. Therefore, I am recommending that we eliminate the age limitation on these payments and provide 100-percent benefits of spouse's entitlement.

BENEFITS FOR THE DISABLED

I think there are several ways in which we can improve our disability insurance program. First, I urge that we make medicare benefits available to all those receiving disability benefits. There is no doubt that disabled persons have at least as great a need for medical care as do our senior citizens. Medical costs are high and if a disabled person is dependent on social security for income, then his income is surely too low to cover adequate medical care. And the Social Security Administration estimates that at least 50 percent of the disabled receiving benefits are without some kind of health insurance.

In addition, we should reduce the waiting period for receiving disability insurance from 6 to 3 months and eliminate the 12-month durational test.

People who are disabled need benefits immediately. Thus, all we are required to do is establish the character and assurance of this disability. A delay in benefits can add unnecessary hardship to the individual and his family, and further complicate his disability and rehabilitation.

AGE 62 COMPUTATION POINT FOR MEN

This section of my bill, as urged by the President, would set up a more equitable system of determining benefits payable on a man's earnings record. Under present law, if a man retires at 62, he must include in his computation for earnings the 3 years between ages 62 and 65 when he did not work. This greatly reduces his retirement benefits. Under my proposal, only the years up to age 62 would be counted, and 3 higher earning years could be substituted for low-earning years.

LUMP-SUM DEATH PAYMENT

We also need to increase the lump-sum death payment. The present maximum of \$225 was set in 1952 and since that time funeral and other related expenses have substantially increased. We must realistically revise this payment and I am proposing an increase to \$500.

BENEFITS TO CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Because of certain oversights in our past laws, certain people who I feel are

in need of social security benefits are not now receiving them. Today, we provide disability insurance to dependent children under 18. I propose that we revise this age limitation to cover a disabled dependent child who is still in school until he reaches age 22.

Also, we provide benefits for aged parents of a deceased worker. I propose that we extend these same benefits to aged parents of retired or disabled workers.

These, then, are my proposals. I recognize that they are ambitious and costly—but I feel they are a minimum requirement. Our senior Americans and our totally disabled citizens are understandably frustrated, and we must act positively so that they can maintain their dignity, independence, and participation in our society. We must make this a bipartisan effort for there is no alternative. This fight can—and must—be won.

COLLEGE TUITION RELIEF

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to provide tax relief for parent taxpayers who send their children to institutions of higher learning. My bill, fashioned after the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act, allows parents to set up a special college education fund. Contributions made to the fund, within specified limits, would be deductible from the year in which the contribution was made. The bill contemplates that parent taxpayers will anticipate future college costs and set up the funds when their children are very young. Under the bill, contributions can be made to the fund anytime from the birth of the child up to his or her 19th birthday.

A qualified education plan, funded by insurance or other funding media, under the provisions of the bill, is one created solely for the purpose of defraying the costs of room, board, and tuition at an institution of higher learning, of one or more beneficiaries. The bill allows annual contributions to be made to the fund of \$500 for each beneficiary, aggregating no more than 10 percent of the parents' gross income per year, and in no event to exceed \$2,500 per year. The deduction will be available to persons in all tax brackets.

The need for some relief in this area is obvious. Current and projected college costs are exceeding income growth. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that tuition at private and public schools has increased 20 percent in the last 2 years. The average tuition in a public school is \$414 per year and \$1,691 per year at private colleges. The Office of Education projects an increase for public and private school costs through the 1976-77 academic year of 37.4 percent for non-public schools, and 23.9 percent for public institutions. Even those large increases are conservative estimates. If the present inflationary trend of 3 percent a year continues, the increases for 1976 would be 67.4 percent and 54 percent respec-

tively. Certainly these staggering increases point up the need for some consideration for parents who will be attempting to meet the increased costs.

Families in lower income brackets have little or no alternative in meeting college costs. Most of their income is quickly exhausted in meeting the day to day expenses of raising a family. Children of parents who are in low income brackets unfortunately must either forego a college education due to a lack of finances, or rely upon scholarships or some type of guaranteed loan.

To increase the educational opportunities for persons in low income brackets, the Federal Government in cooperation with State and private financial institutions has responded with a variety of work study or guaranteed student loan programs.

I do not dispute the presumption of the Federal loan programs that middle and upper income taxpayers are more financially able to meet college costs than parents in low-income brackets, but I would like to call attention to the fact that the middle-income taxpayer is bearing the greatest burden of financing the costs of the Federal Government while disqualified from receiving financial aid to help meet college expenses. Where more than one child is in school and no funds are available due to the parents' income bracket, the presumption that funds will be available to defray college costs is unrealistic.

My bill does not cut into the financial aid programs tailored to meet the requirements of low-income taxpayers. Those programs are beneficial, they are needed, and they should be retained.

What my bill does do, is to bring assistance to the great silent majority of middle-income taxpayers who, at considerable sacrifice, pay the staggering college costs while also bearing the brunt of financing the Federal Government.

I think this is a most equitable and long awaited measure.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT OF 1954

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. All Americans are becoming increasingly concerned, and justifiably so, over the protection of our natural resources of land and water.

It is ironic, but true, that one of the major sources of destruction of some of our most beautiful and natural forest areas is being done under the misnomer "conservation." The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 has noble purposes, and without question, large areas of our country have benefited from projects carried out under the provisions of this bill.

Unfortunately, while this act has resulted in much good, it has simultaneously resulted in considerable harm. The harm has resulted not because of any

insensibilities or bad motives on the part of those administering the act but because those administering the act have not always had available the opinions of our fish and wildlife experts throughout the country.

I think the worthwhile purposes of flood prevention and water storage for agricultural, recreational, and municipal uses can be carried out as intended without the necessity of "channelization" of many miles of natural stream beds.

What my legislation seeks to accomplish is to bring in at the planning stage the advice of those persons charged primarily with the duty of preserving our natural streams and forest areas. A brief summary of the provisions of my bill follows:

First. The first provision of this bill prevents the exploitation of the soil bank program by local sponsors. Specifically, the bill requires that if 25 percent or more of the land along the works of improvement is under the Federal soil bank program, the project cannot be considered for Federal funding. The reason for this provision is to make sure that private landowners will not encourage the Government to make this expenditure in order for them to receive more soil bank subsidies from the Agriculture Department.

Second. The second provision requires that for any watershed project, copies of the plans must be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army for their approval. If either Secretary objects, an agreement must be then worked out between the Secretaries. In the event of the failure to resolve the differences of opinion, the objections shall be transmitted to the Congress to be resolved.

Third. The present Executive order governing this program requires that a public hearing be held. However, these hearings have been onesided and dominated by the project sponsors. Under my bill hearings shall be conducted under the auspices of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army. Their representatives shall make sure that all interested parties are allowed sufficient time to present their views and submit statements.

Fourth. No project shall use the techniques of channelization until a thorough study of the damage to the ecology and the environment of the project area has been completed, and it is found that there are no other economically justifiable or technically feasible alternatives.

Fifth. This section creates a State watershed control board. This board is established to give fish and game commissions as well as individual conservationists some control over watershed projects. Specifically, this board shall review and recommend for approval all projects affecting the State. The board shall be composed of two members appointed by the State soil conservation committee, two members appointed by the State fish and game department, and three persons from the general public who are to be appointed by the other four members and who are knowledgeable in the areas of agriculture, fish, and wildlife conservation and environmental

protection. The board shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor of the State.

I suspect that in addition to consultations by game and fish conservationists, changes are desperately needed in the method of computing the cost-benefit formula which can spell the birth or death of a project proposed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. It is my understanding that the Water Resources Council has conducted hearings on the problem of changing this formula under which such projects are computed. This is certainly a salutary move on the part of the Council.

It is my thought that if the Council does make meaningful changes in the formula, then a figure can be agreed upon whereby acreage left in its natural state can be considered as a "benefit." Thus, in seeking to justify a project under the act it would not be necessary to destroy natural stream beds in order to justify a project on the rather questionable theory that acreage has been improved by channelization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to review this legislation and the Field and Stream article to become more familiar with the reason for its need.

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY—A GREAT NATIONAL LOSS

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the news of the passing just a short while ago of our outstanding Massachusetts native son, leader, and friend, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, one of the great national and world leaders of our time.

He was a man of superlative gifts, talents, and abilities, endowed with immeasurable enthusiasm, energy, and drive, a great achiever in many fields, a man of superb benevolence and charity, and a philanthropist of unbounded generosity. His extraordinary career was one of massive accomplishment and the fulfillment of almost all his cherished goals and ambitions. As an individual, he had few, if any, equals in the world of American business and finance.

No task, even the most difficult, seemed beyond his power to perform. No concept, however impossible at first blush, too difficult for him to perfect and implement.

His striking successes in the business world were innumerable and brought him greatest renown, respect, admiration, and wealth impossible to calculate, which he utilized in large increments for many commendable human and public purposes.

Everything this great man did seemed to be crowned with success. At his magic touch, prosaic ventures turned into a stream of gold, and with seemingly little effort on his part, although there must have been much.

Over a relatively short period of time, this great American business genius was able to amass one of the largest, individual, personal fortunes of our times, or indeed of any time, and he achieved

this end largely through his own ideas and efforts, even as he surrounded himself at times with able men to counsel and assist him.

He came from a famous Boston family that had a flair for business success in their blood, and early in life, Joseph joined the ranks of bankers and financial wizards who, in a real sense in their day, made some modern financial projects seem picayune.

No doubt, Joseph inherited his talents in business, his zest for politics, his passion for big deeds and big deals and his determined purpose to serve, and have his family serve, the Nation.

He was exceptionally well trained and attended the best schools. He was graduated from Harvard, where he was a high-ranking student and made his mark on the baseball team as a fine athlete.

Early in his career, he developed his own ideas on how to handle intricate business affairs. He was a bold innovator, a skilled planner, and he formed his own judgments, carrying out his plans with truly fabulous energy, precision, and speed of execution.

When a young man, he involved himself in finance, in the stock market, in big business, and in a host of activities, most of which gained him fortune. But politics was in his blood too, because he inherited that from his father, and absorbed a great deal of it from his brilliant, lovely wife, Rose Fitzgerald, whose able, distinguished, colorful father was a very prominent Mayor of Boston, and one of the outstanding political figures of his time.

I saw this young, vigorous Joseph Kennedy plunge into the famous, first campaign of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for which he raised a great deal of money. He devoted himself feverishly and energetically, as was his custom, to the successful Roosevelt campaign.

I met him early in this campaign in the company of my dear friend and political mentor, the late statesman-patriot, Hon. David I. Walsh, member of the Massachusetts General Court, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and U.S. Senator from Massachusetts for almost 30 years. Joseph deeply impressed me as an eager, aggressive, very capable leader, sure of himself, and intent upon reaching his goals.

In his talk with the then senior Senator, he expressed his determination to put all of his energies into the campaign, and it was obvious that he would exert every effort and devote his time and resources to help make Roosevelt President. What followed was history. His candidate was elected.

In rapid succession, Joseph became head of the Maritime Commission, head of the Security and Exchange Commission, and Ambassador Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the English Court of St. James, so well known but not always particularly appreciated by his Irish forebears.

A predecessor in another position at the English Court was another Boston Irishman, the great Patrick A. Collins, famous lawyer, orator, man of letters, and former mayor of Boston, appointed years before by President Cleveland as

Consul-General of the United States to the Court of St. James.

By this time Joseph's family, that was to play such a great, historic, but tragic role in American political life, was growing and required his attention. While this great man was always busy, he always found time somehow for his loving, devoted wife and his lovely children, who were so bright, charming, and promising. While his affections were centered on his daughters, he loved his fine sons just as much, and his ambitions and his conceptual gifts were directed toward shaping his sons for public service.

The first and eldest named Joseph P., like himself, received his primary, special attention. He was carefully groomed, educated at Harvard, and singled out by his distinguished dad to enter the political arena. This plan was known to many Kennedy friends and political figures around Boston.

However, this fine young man, who seemed destined for a great career in the public service, tragically lost his life during World War II while in the flying, combat service of his country.

Grief stricken, but undaunted, the Ambassador then turned his expert attention to the next of the Kennedy sons, John F., who was selected by his famous dad, not always with the candidate's complete enthusiasm, to aspire for public office and embrace a political career.

After being graduated from Harvard and some newspaper and free-lance writing, and a great deal of training from his dad, mother, and grandfather, the famous John F. Fitzgerald, John was ready to enter the lists. He was to rise to the top in American government and to take his place among the greatest in American history and world history.

I recall something once said to me by the former Mayor Fitzgerald some years ago when I was visiting with him in his apartment in the Bellevue Hotel, Boston.

John Kennedy, then a young Harvard lad, who looked even younger than he was, had come to visit, as I had seen him do before, and the former mayor commented to me:

I want you to note this very carefully. You have had a chance to see and size up this young man, and you know he is a fine student and a wonderful boy in every way. Remember this: One day this boy, John Kennedy, will be President of the United States, and you can take that from me.

The mayor repeated that remark to me on several occasions and I have always remembered his prophetic words, and believed somehow that they would come true.

Mayor Fitzgerald's words came true. Young John Kennedy became one of the youngest Presidents our country has ever had, as well as one of the greatest during the all-too-limited time allotted him before his unspeakably tragic passing at the hands of an assassin.

In John's campaign for the Presidency, the Ambassador possibly reached his greatest heights of political achievement. In fact, he was his great son's campaign manager, counselor, inspiration and general handler. He was involved in every phase of the campaign, the keyman in his great victory.

Morning, noon, and night he worked

tirelessly, never overlooking a single detail of the thousands of things that had to be done to put this historic campaign on the road, so to speak, and set up the smooth, efficiently functioning organization throughout the country that was to take charge of this winning campaign for the Presidency.

I saw and talked with Joseph Kennedy at that time too, in the presence of John and Bobby, and it was evident that the Ambassador took charge of some of the most difficult work of this famous national campaign, not only financial details, but mobilizing friends and workers, contacting the battery of writers, press, radio and television talent that was necessary. On his own he called literally hundreds and hundreds of friends, and other influential people that might even have been total strangers to him, soliciting votes and support for his son for President. This well could be, in his own estimation, as well as ours, his finest hour of all the great ones he had known.

To me, this is one of the great political stories in American history, and I know that many chapters will be written about it.

There was another story that was almost realized during the life of this great leader. That was the election of his third son, Bobby, who, many think, could have been elected President, had the Good Lord spared him.

There is much more to be told of this thrilling story of the life of a great man and the family he founded, and that is not yet ended, since there is still another son to come forward and very conceivably reach the political pinnacle of the American Presidency.

Thus, through the shifting shadows of triumph and tragedy, a great life has ended. But a powerful momentum has gathered, and it will go on through the proud, able, courageous Kennedy-Fitzgerald bloodlines that remain behind, and will carry on in the same invincible, irrepressible spirit to reach the highest goals that Joe Kennedy set for himself and his family and may well be realized again in future years.

The hearts of myself and family go out to this bereaved, great Kennedy family of America with prayers, deepest sympathy, and condolence.

May this brave, beloved widow, who has played such a gallant, memorable part in the life of her husband and her family, her son, our great, beloved Senator TED, and her lovely daughters and dear ones, be strengthened, encouraged, and sustained by the good Lord to bear their heavy burdens of sorrow with true spiritual resignation and firm resolve to carry on in the rich traditions of their proud heritage that will lead them to even greater achievement in the years to come.

A great man has gone to his eternal reward, yet the influence and inspiration of his fine, successful life, so meaningful in terms of achievement, leadership and unmeasured contributions to the cause of God and country and the American people, will be felt in this country for many years to come, to enrich American life and history, and serve the cause of freedom and for peace.

May the good Lord bless and keep him in his eternal home.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for an indefinite period, on account of business in North Carolina beginning departure today at 4 p.m.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for an indefinite period, on account of attending a meeting of the National Advisory Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Mr. CORMAN, for November 20, on account of official business.

Mr. MOSS, from 4 p.m., November 21, through December 1, 1969, on account of official business in district.

Mr. JACOBS, for November 20 through November 28, on account of congressional district business.

Mr. GETTYS (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for November 20 and 21, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS, for 60 minutes, on Monday, November 24.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. RIVERS), for 60 minutes, on Monday, November 24.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAYNE) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLIER, for 30 minutes, on November 24.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 30 minutes, on November 25.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 30 minutes, on November 26.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 30 minutes, on November 27.

Mr. ROBISON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CLARK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN in two instances.

Mr. RYAN to revise and extend his remarks prior to the vote on the amendment to strike section 209 of the foreign aid bill offered by Mr. Gross.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAYNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. RUTH in five instances.

Mr. WAMPLER.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. BUTTON.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. CAREY in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. SIKES in six instances.

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

Mr. KYROS in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in three instances.

Mr. CONYERS in five instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. HAYS in three instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 849. An act to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7066. An act to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site;

H.R. 11612. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12829. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 499. An act for the relief of Ludger J. Cossette;

S. 632. An act for the relief of Raymond C. Melvin;

S. 757. An act for the relief of Yvonne Davis;

S. 2000. An act to establish the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site; and

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to provide for the development of the Eisenhower National Historic Site at Gettysburg, Pa., and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7066. An act to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site;

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

H.R. 14001. An act to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that

I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948; ROBERT A. ROE, Eighth District, New Jersey.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1350. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 17th report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations, for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 806 (81st Congress) (H. Doc. No. 91-297); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1351. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-196); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1352. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the progress of the District of Columbia highway projects listed in section 23(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 803 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-198); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1353. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, to provide revenue sources for these increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1354. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 72, *Absentee Delaware Tribe of Oklahoma, et al.*, and docket No. 298, *The Delaware Tribe of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946, as amended April 10, 1967, 60 Stat. 1055, 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1355. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide increased protection for consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1356. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of Justice during fiscal year 1969 under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1357. A letter from the Commissioner, Im-

migration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 721. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 14741, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to revise the next due date for the cost estimate for the Interstate System, to amend chapter 4 relating to highway safety, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-660). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 722. Resolution for consideration of House Resolution 613, Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam (Rept. No. 91-661). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 110. A bill to amend section 427(b) of title 37, United States Code, to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to a member of a uniformed service even though the member does not maintain a residence or household for his dependents, subject to his management and control (Rept. No. 91-662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOB WILSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 386. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service assigned to Government quarters provided he is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance (Rept. No. 91-663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'KONSKI: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3813. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis (Rept. No. 91-664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6006. A bill to permit National Guard officers to act as inspecting officers under section 710(f) of title 32, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6265. A bill to provide that a headstone or marker be furnished at Government expense for the unmarked grave of any Medal of Honor recipient (Rept. No. 91-666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8019. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officer in a Regular component of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 91-667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8021. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance under certain circumstances, certain reimbursements, transportation for de-

pendents, and travel and transportation allowances under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HICKS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9052. A bill to amend section 716 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the interservice transfers of officers of the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOB WILSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9485. A bill to remove the \$10,000 limit on deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOB WILSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9486. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11265. A bill to provide for crediting service as an aviation midshipman for purposes of retirement for nonregular service under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and for pay purposes under title 37, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14118. A bill to amend section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4574. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-674). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 661. Resolution commending the American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-675). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12941. A bill to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on District of Columbia. H.R. 11193. A bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectiveness of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 863) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324); with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13756. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 13018 (Rept. No. 91-679). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14916. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-680). 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. ADAIR (for himself, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. ROUDEBUSH):

H.R. 14893. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 14894. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 14895. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 14896. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14897. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr.

BLATNIK, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. KEE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CAFERY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SCHWENGL):

H.R. 14898. A bill to establish uniform relocation assistance and land acquisition policies applicable to Federal programs and Federal grant-in-aid programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ROBISON, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14899. A bill to establish uniform relocation assistance and land acquisition

policies applicable to Federal programs and Federal grant-in-aid programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 14900. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 14901. 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. HENDERSON (for himself and Mr. LENNON):

H.R. 14902. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14903. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the United States to cooperate in the construction of the Darien Gap Highway to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway System of South America; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 14904. A bill to enable the citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14905. 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. MONAGAN:

H.R. 14906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 14907. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 14908. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 14909. A bill to improve rice inspection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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. FARRSTEIN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNGA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 14910. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students 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. RIEGLE:

H.R. 14911. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board benefit increase with subsequent cost-of-living increases, to raise the earnings base, to liberalize the retirement test, to increase widows' and widowers' benefits, to improve benefit computation, to increase the lump-sum death payment, to provide benefits for additional disabled children and dependent parents of insured individuals, and to liberalize qualification for disability benefits; to provide medicare benefits for all individuals receiving cash benefits based on disability; to permit increases in social security benefits to be disregarded in computing income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; and to provide a \$5,000 income tax exemption for individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself and Mr. BROWN of California) (by request):

H.R. 14912. A bill to amend section 1777 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize on-the-job training procedures; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHIPLEY):

H.R. 14913. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, in the case of individuals having 40 or more quarters of coverage, the number of years which may be disregarded in computing such individual's average monthly wage, and to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age-62 cutoff (the same as presently provided in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 14914. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, in the case of individuals having 40 or more quarters of coverage, the number of years which may be disregarded in computing such individual's average monthly wage, and to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age-62 cutoff (the same as presently provided in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 14915. 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. NATCHER:

H.R. 14916. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14917. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the Gulf Atlantic Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 14918. A bill to amend the Watershed

Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 14919. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 14920. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the misuse of political campaign contributions received by a Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14921. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code, to provide penalties for the willful giving of false information in registering, voting absentee or voting; for conspiring with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration; and for paying or offering to pay or accepting payment for false registration; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14922. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14923. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 14924. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 14925. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 14926. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include chiropractors' services among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself and Mr. MAHON):

H.R. 14927. A bill to improve farm income and insure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities by extending and improving certain commodity programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. CAFFERY, and Mr. PASSMAN):

H.R. 14928. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14929. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 14930. A bill to authorize loans for study at nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 14931. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide increased

protection for consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 14932. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 14933. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prescribe fees for applications for new commercial television television broadcasting station licenses and for renewal of such licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14934. A bill to amend title 5, section 8340, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOWERS (for himself and Mr. NICHOLS):

H.R. 14935. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 14936. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.J. Res. 994. Joint resolution to provide collective bargaining rights for employees of food service facilities at the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.J. Res. 995. Joint resolution designating November 20 of each year as Coal Miners' Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 996. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 723. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 724. Resolution to promote peace and security in the Far East by establishing certain conditions precedent to any transfer of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 14937. A bill for the relief of Miss Carolina Rigor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 14938. A bill for the relief of Jerry L. Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

336. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Concerned Students for Peace of Caldwell College, Caldwell, N.J., relative to a cease-fire and withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.