

the bottom of the schedule would be paying \$28 less in taxes for each exemption claimed, while taxpayers at the high rates would be paying \$140 less for each exemption. Thus the real result of the allegedly progressive amendment on exemptions is to give actual relief of perhaps \$112 to a low-income family of four while providing \$560 to an affluent family of the same size. And because of the varying number of exemptions, the amendment certainly shifts more of the tax burden to smaller families and single persons, while affording disproportionate relief to larger families.

One of the more damaging aspects of this proposal, which I do not believe has been adequately examined, is the sizable reduction of the tax base it accomplishes. The committee bill had already trimmed the national tax base by \$22 billion to a total of \$350 billion. The ill-considered change in personal exemptions would remove another \$23 billion from the base, reducing it to only \$327 billion. If, as may well be necessary, future tax increases are approved, relatively higher levies must be placed on this smaller base. Those still in the tax-paying pool will have to pay still greater sums to compensate for this drastic curtailment in the country's taxable income.

These are not easy points to grasp and some people may be deceived into believing that their interest is being served by this superficially attractive measure.

But the fact is that its benefits are illusory and its potential harm to our common well-being, catastrophic.

Mr. President, the distressing thing to me about many of the amendments offered is that they were without question, worthwhile. I would have liked to vote for them. And under ordinary circumstances I would have been among the first to support measures which would lower taxes for individuals, and provide

tax credits for investments which seek to correct our intolerable economic imbalances.

But these are not ordinary times. Our consumer price index is up nearly 6 points over last year. Housewives are paying nearly 12 percent more for meat; prospective buyers find the price of homes has risen 10.5 percent over the last year; medical costs are nearly 9 percent higher than they were just 1 year ago. At this rate, how much will the individual be helped by a \$200 increase in the personal exemption? How much will the small company benefit from a retention of the 7-percent investment tax credit, if the cost of materials and labor goes up 10 percent or 15 percent? These meager benefits can easily be consumed before they ever go into effect by the rising cost of living.

An increase in the personal exemption may look like a boon to the taxpayer. In reality, however, it will put more paper money into the pockets of the consumers while at the same time driving up the costs of the goods they seek to buy.

During the last few days I have found myself asking hard questions, questions which I am sure every Member of this body has been considering: Are the tax reform provisions sufficiently constructive to merit passage of the bill in its present form even in view of its predictable inflationary effects? Is it fair of us to rely on the conferees to delete provisions which we find objectionable, to "save us from ourselves," in effect, and to report back a reasonably clean bill? Are we prepared to reject a conference report which has too many dangerous and inflationary aspects? Are we, in the final analysis, prepared to put aside parochial interests and to perform as responsible national legislators, acting in good faith in the best interests of the country as a whole? Or will we, for the

sake of short-term political advantage, enact a measure which can, in the words of the President, "reduce taxes for some while raising prices for all?"

This is not a partisan issue, though partisanship has been clearly in evidence more often than not in this debate. This is not a regional or sectional issue, nor is it an issue even between conflicting private and public interests. We are dealing with an issue which clearly and deeply affects us all. The question before us is nothing less than the purchasing power of the dollar in domestic and international trade. It is a matter which affects the single taxpayer, the workingman, the welfare mother, the retired pensioner, the small businessman, and the giant corporation all at once.

Inflation may hurt some more than others, but none of us remains untouched.

As much as I favor the tax reform provisions of this bill and as urgent as I consider its social security provisions and related features, I cannot support the bill in its present form. The price is simply too high.

It is my profound hope that the conference committee will preserve the progressive elements of this legislation and produce a measure which Senators can support wholeheartedly. But if the conferees cannot remedy the central defects of this legislation, I will be compelled to vote "no" on the report.

RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 10, 1969, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 9, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

May the Lord make you increase and abound in love to one another and to all men.—I Thessalonians 3: 12.

Almighty and eternal God, conscious of our obligation to the historic past, aware of the opportunities of the present, and with faith in the beckoning future, we humbly join our fathers in the affirmation—"glory be to Thee, O Lord most high."

Thou hast been wonderfully good to us and we are grateful. Thy spirit has led us. Thy hand has supported us, and Thy love has filled our hearts with good will. Make us one with Thee, we pray, as we face the duties of this day.

Standing as Americans together may we lift high the banner of freedom, strengthen the arm of justice, build bridges between races, classes, and nations, and keep ourselves ever mindful of Thy presence and ready to do Thy will.

In the spirit of Christ we 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 had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13767. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 210. An act to eliminate requirements for disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels meeting prescribed safety standards, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9163. An act to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Ga.,

under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

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

S. 1232. An act to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands;

S. 2619. An act to amend section 5723(b) of title 5, United States Code, relating to length of service required by teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools when travel and transportation expenses are paid in first post of duty; and

S. 2940. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical National Park.

The message also announced that Senator GOLDWATER was excused as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 14751), an act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

MASSACRE IN VIETNAM DEPRESSING TO EVERY AMERICAN

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the alleged massacre of civilians by U.S. troops in Songmy, Vietnam, is deeply depressing to every American.

Reactions to the incident point up the deficiency in the training of our combat troops on the proper treatment of civilians. One soldier walking through Songmy afterward asked:

If you can shoot artillery and bombs in there every night, how can the people . . . be worth so much?

A member of Charley Company said:

It just seemed like . . . the natural thing to do . . . My buddies had been getting killed or wounded . . . it was just mostly revenge.

Still another soldier apparently shot himself to keep from participating in the massacre.

Our soldiers have a tough job made tougher by inadequate training.

I have urged Secretary of Defense Laird to upgrade combat preparation by instructing every American soldier on: First, U.S. policy on the treatment of Vietnamese civilians in combat situations; second, how to respond to a command which violates the policy toward civilians; third, how to report an illegal command or action without fearing reprisal; and, fourth, how to insure that unlawful acts will not be tolerated or "hushed up."

Finally, I have urged the Secretary to establish procedures for reporting and fully investigating charges of gross misconduct.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13763, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 13763, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-727)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13763) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, 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 amendments of the Senate numbered 36, 38, 42, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$468,165"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40, and 41.

GEORGE ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MARK ANDREWS,
ODIN LANGEN,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House,

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
WILLIAM PROXMIER
(except on No. 37),
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
NORRIS COTTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendments Nos. 1 through 34, under the "Senate" heading, and Nos. 39, 40, and 41 under the "Architect of the Capitol" heading, relate solely to expenses of Senate operations and activities.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 38, under the "Architect of the Capitol" heading, deal with Senate matters.

Amendment No. 37 relates to the West Front of the Capitol.

Amendments Nos. 1 through 34, and Nos. 39, 40, and 41, relating to Senate operations, are reported in technical disagreement. But in accord with the long practice, under which each body determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs therein without intervention, the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in these amendments.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 38, under the "Architect of the Capitol" heading, relate to appropriations that are joint in nature, but the amounts in conference relate to Senate operations and thus fall in the same category as the above bloc of amendments. The House recedes and concurs in Amendments Nos. 36 and 38.

JOINT ITEMS

Joint Economic Committee

Amendment No. 35 adds \$27,000 to the amount in the House bill, instead of \$35,000 proposed by the Senate.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

West central front of the Capitol

Amendment No. 37, relating to the west central front of the United States Capitol

Building, is reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion incorporating a conference agreement in the nature of a substitute for the House provision and the Senate provision.

The House bill provided \$2,000,000 for preparation of detailed plans and specifications for extending the west central front in accord with extension Plan 2 approved by the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol. The Senate bill, by floor amendment, struck this provision and substituted an appropriation of \$250,000 to be transferred to the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior for use in conducting studies to determine the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front.

The case for extension rather than restoration was stated in some considerable detail in House committee hearings held September 8; in House Report 91-487, of September 11, at pages 19-26; and in House floor debate of September 19. The case for restoration rather than extension was stated variously in Senate committee hearings on the 1970 appropriation bill, in the Senate committee report on the bill, but especially in Senate floor debate of October 21 when the \$2 million extension funds were stricken and the \$250 thousand inserted for a restoration study.

The conference agreement

The conference agreement to be put in the motion of the House managers will, as stated, be a substitute for both the House and Senate provisions. It will provide:

A. An appropriation of \$2,275,000.

B. That the appropriation is to be expended under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol (now composed of the Speaker as chairman, the Vice President, the Majority and Minority floor leaders of the two Houses, and the Architect).

C. That such portion of the appropriation as may be necessary shall be used for emergency shoring and repairs and related work on the west central front. (The Conferees were, very recently, apprised of the results of a periodic but continuing engineering check on the condition of the west front which discloses the need for some emergency protective and maintenance measures.)

D. That not to exceed \$250,000 shall be used for the employment of independent nongovernmental engineering and other services for studying and reporting (within 6 months after date of the employment contract) on the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front, under such terms and conditions as the Commission may determine.

E. That pending completion and consideration of the restoration study and report, however, no further work toward extension of the west central front shall be carried on.

F. That after consideration by the Commission of the restoration study and report, the Commission is to direct the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front in accord with extension Plan 2 already approved by the Commission, unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive,

lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work.

G. In other words, if the restoration study report does not establish to the satisfaction of the Commission that restoration (rather than extension) treatment meets all five of the conditions noted above, then the extension work is to proceed.

H. If, on the other hand, the Commission, after consideration, concludes that the restoration study report meets all five of the conditions noted above, the Commission is then to make recommendations to the Congress on whether to extend or restore the west central front.

In recommending the language to be offered in the motion, the conferees of both Houses are agreed that the nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services engaged by direction of the Commission to study and report on the feasibility and cost of restoration should be, in the Commission's opinion, completely independent, with no previous connection with proposals to either extend or to restore the west central front, including any expressed predisposition for or against the extension or the restoration of the west central front. The conferees are especially anxious that the selection be made from among highly reputable firms or individuals generally noted or regarded for their excellence of ability, to the end that all Members may have confidence that whatever report is submitted is qualitative and impartial in character and content.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Amendments Nos. 42, 43, and 44, make reductions, as proposed by the Senate, in Library appropriations proposed in the House bill, as follows:

Library, salaries and expenses (No. 42)	-\$23,500
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses (No. 43)	-4,000
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses (No. 44)	-3,000

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

Amendment No. 45 reduces by \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation

proposed in the House bill for the Office of Superintendent of Documents.

GEORGE ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MARK ANDREWS,
ODIN LANGEN,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12964, STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of December 8, 1969.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized.

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes contains a total of \$2,354,432,700 in new obligational authority. It also contains an additional \$195,815,000 for liquidation of contract authorizations.

This bill is \$121,271,900 below the total amount of the budget estimates.

It is \$27,922,000 below the bill as it passed the Senate.

It is \$18,798,500 above the bill as originally passed by the House.

However, I must point out that this bill is \$299,759,800 above the appropriations made for these purposes for fiscal year 1969. Practically all of this increase, \$262,587,000 in fact, is for the Department of Justice. The total appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1969 was \$545,582,000. The amount provided in this bill for the Department of Justice as agreed to in conference is \$808,169,000.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record a table showing the actions of the House-Senate conferees with regard to the various departments and agencies contained in the bill:

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970

Department or agency	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Department of State	\$398,091,600	\$408,381,000	\$404,122,600	\$407,174,100	\$404,132,100	+\$6,040,500	-\$4,248,900	+\$9,500	-\$3,042,000
Department of Justice	545,582,000	845,976,000	790,048,000	815,909,000	808,169,000	+262,587,000	-37,807,000	+18,121,000	-7,740,000
Department of Commerce	767,563,000	812,486,000	756,450,000	784,629,000	778,018,000	+10,455,000	-34,468,000	+21,568,000	-6,611,000
The judiciary	109,944,900	125,024,600	121,026,200	121,026,200	121,026,200	+11,081,300	-3,998,400		
American Battle Monuments Commission	2,362,000	2,639,000	2,639,000	2,639,000	2,639,000	+277,000			
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	9,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	+500,000			
Commission on Civil Rights	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000				
Office of Education: Civil rights education	10,817,000	20,000,000	12,000,000	20,000,000	14,000,000	+3,183,000	-6,000,000	+2,000,000	-6,000,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	9,120,000	15,905,000	11,500,000	15,905,000	12,500,000	+3,380,000	-3,405,000	+1,000,000	-3,405,000
Federal Maritime Commission	3,743,000	3,715,000	3,715,000	3,715,000	3,715,000	-28,000			
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	791,000	781,000	450,000	781,000	650,000	-141,000	-131,000	+200,000	-131,000
National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control		500,000					-500,000		
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws	250,000	300,000	250,000	300,000	300,000	-50,000		+50,000	
Small Business Administration	13,414,000	43,757,000	43,257,000	18,257,000	18,257,000	+4,843,000	-25,500,000	-25,000,000	

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970—Continued

Department or agency	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Special representative or trade negotiations.....	482,000	625,000	482,000	559,000	482,000	-----	-143,000	-----	-77,000
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	344,400	365,000	344,400	344,400	344,400	-----	-20,600	-----	-----
Tariff Commission.....	3,850,000	3,950,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	+50,000	-----	-----	-----
U.S. Information Agency.....	176,668,000	177,650,000	173,300,000	175,066,000	174,150,000	-2,518,000	-3,500,000	+850,000	-916,000
United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship.....	-----	1,500,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-1,500,000	-----	-----
Total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,054,672,900	2,475,704,600	2,335,634,200	2,382,354,700	2,354,432,700	+299,759,800	-121,271,900	+18,798,500	-27,922,000
Memoranda: Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.....	(207,485,000)	(195,815,000)	(195,815,000)	(195,815,000)	(195,815,000)	(-11,670,000)	-----	-----	-----
Total appropriations, including appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.....	(2,262,157,900)	(2,671,519,600)	(2,531,449,200)	(2,578,169,700)	(2,550,247,700)	(+288,089,800)	(-121,271,900)	(+18,798,500)	(-27,922,000)

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 43 strike out section 404, as follows:

"None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for the salaries and or expenses of any deputy clerk in any District court clerk's office that does not accept applications for passports except in cities where the State Department presently operates passport offices."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY of New York moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 404. None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for the salaries or expenses of deputy clerks in any office that has discontinued the taking of applications for passports subsequent to October 31, 1968 and has not resumed such service on a permanent basis."

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today the House adopted the Senate-House conference report granting appropriations for ship construction under the Maritime Administration. The conference report appropriates the amount of \$15,918,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The authorization bill, H.R. 4152, approved by the President on October 10, 1969, authorizes \$145 million for the purpose of ship construction. I believe that the authorization was an indication of our concern for the merchant marine and the deterioration of the merchant marine fleet.

The House Committee on Appropria-

tions recognized that funds would have to be made available in order to keep an active merchant marine when they reported H.R. 12964, appropriating \$200 million for the purpose of ship construction. Unfortunately, the \$200 million was deleted from the bill due to a point of order.

Congress is aware of the sad plight of our merchant marine and is prepared to do something about it. The conferees said that they would be "receptive to a realistic substantial request in a supplemental budget for additional funds for ship construction."

The Federal Maritime Administrator has recognized the problem. He estimated "a loss of approximately two-thirds of our entire merchant fleet in the next 4 years—a loss of some 500 to 600 ships." The President has said that "a strong and profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability."

I concur with the Federal Maritime Administrator's estimate. I agree with the President in his remarks.

Now, I implore the President to take the action necessary to help this foundering, but essential, industry. The funds have been authorized. The President, if he intends to reverse the deteriorating situation and to avert the impending disaster of our merchant marine, should request additional funds for ship construction. The Congress has authorized the money—all he has to do is ask for it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15149, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 742

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, 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. 15149) making appropriations

for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 307]

Abbutt	Gallagher	Myers
Anderson, III.	Gettys	Nichols
Blatnik	Gubser	Pepper
Bolling	Hanna	Pike
Cahill	Hays	Powell
Clay	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Cowger	Heckler, Mass.	Reifel
Cramer	Hosmer	Riegler
Cunningham	Kirwan	Ruppe
Dawson	Landrum	Scheuter
Diggs	Lipscomb	Sisk
Downing	McEwen	Taft
Dwyer	McKneally	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Macdonald,	Tunney
Ellberg	Mass.	Utt
Esch	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Flowers	Morse	Wyder
Fulton, Tenn.	Morton	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the proposed amendments which would transfer the responsibilities of OEO to the States. I think we should look at the question in proper perspective. OEO is only a part of the Nation's program for ending poverty. By far the largest program of assistance to the poor—the welfare system—is already administered by

the States. Recognizing this, the President has proposed changes in the welfare system to aid the States in carrying the heavy financial burden of welfare. In addition, his proposed family assistance plan, including aid to the working poor, job training, and work incentives, will greatly expand the role of the States in combating poverty.

In addition, OEO as it is being re-directed is not a "line" agency, but an agency designed to innovate, coordinate, and evaluate a limited range of experimental programs. When programs have been tried and tested, they may be spun off to other Federal departments or to the States. The Job Corps, Headstart, and Upward Bound have already graduated from the trial stage and are being administered by other Federal departments.

This accent on innovation and evaluation is the role the President and the Director conceive for the agency and I think it should be given a chance. If OEO under its new leadership fails to involve the States as Congress has already directed, there will be time to make the sweeping change proposed in the amendment.

I fear, too, that the administrative task of creating a new level of bureaucracy would bring the process of testing new programs to a standstill. The flexibility needed in administering small pilot programs would be sacrificed. A large portion of OEO funds would be diverted away from the program and into administration. From the standpoint of efficiency and economy, we cannot afford a huge antipoverty establishment.

Finally, I think that the administration of the program by the States would retard innovation by making every OEO project a political football. Many of us oppose the Murphy amendment because we realize that there will be strong pressures on our Governors to veto legal services projects which may cost the State money. The proposed amendment would have substantially the same effect on the legal services program as the Murphy amendment, and risks injecting lethal doses of local politics into every phase of this needed experimental program.

In short, I think it is too soon to delegate OEO's responsibilities to the States. We simply cannot expect continued development of an effective poverty program if we hand it over wholesale to State agencies which do not even exist and will have to weather severe political storms like this one as soon as they are formed.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to CXV—2390—Part 28

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 742 provides that during the consideration of H.R. 15149, Foreign Assistance Act appropriations for fiscal year 1970, all points of order against the bill are waived.

Due to the fact that some of the authorizations covered by H.R. 15149, though they have passed the House, have not been enacted into law, the waiver of points of order was granted in order to expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 742 in order that H.R. 15149 may be considered.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that the passage of this resolution is an absolute necessity. As all Members know, the authorization bill has not yet passed the other body and been signed into law. This makes it absolutely necessary to waive all points of order on this legislation.

I should also like to point out to the House that the committee could have reduced the administration's bill just a little more.

In title I, the committee did an extremely good job, in my humble opinion, by reducing the \$2,710,000,000 requested in the budget to \$1,599,000,000, which is a reduction of \$1,110,000,000. There has been no reduction in title II; a slight reduction in title III of \$10,904,000; no reduction at all in title IV; for a total reduction of \$1,121,544,000, making the total amount recommended in this bill \$2,558,020,000 as opposed to the administration's request of \$3,679,564,000.

I feel this is the year this legislation could have been completely omitted.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members will turn to page 5 of the report they will find that there is now in the "pipeline" a total of \$18,708,016,000.

It seems to me that with this amount of money remaining in the pipeline and unexpended from prior years appropriations that this new appropriation is really not needed at this time. However, the passage of the resolution waiving points of order reported by the Committee on Rules is necessary in order to consider the bill and, therefore, I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not to criticize the Committee on Rules. However, I do want to point out to the House that H.R. 15149, an appropriation bill of some 22 pages, one-half of it is authorizing legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that this body operate under the rules of the House. I submit authorizing legislation should remain within the jurisdiction of authorizing committees. The Committee on Appropriations, and certainly the authorizing committees should stay within their jurisdiction. If the House Foreign Affairs Committee dared put an appropriation in an authorizing bill the Committee on Rules would have to grant the Committee on Foreign Affairs a rule waiving points of order. The Foreign Affairs Committee has refrained from doing so.

Therefore, I think it is high time that the Appropriations Committee report a bill dealing only with appropriations. For years we have been trying to correct this situation.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my regret that it should be necessary to waive all points of order, especially since there is legislation of a substantial character contained in this bill. While I am on the subject of this bill, it also seems to me most unfortunate—and I cannot consider it necessary—that we should have to consider this bill on the very same day that the report and the bill itself become available to the Members.

There really is no way we can evaluate the very substantial reductions in a variety of programs that have been proposed to this bill, and there is no opportunity to develop amendments to restore some of these funds. What we are doing is just what we did last year. We are debating the bill without the opportunity to consider it adequately.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, after perusing the bill and the report, I find that there are provisions in certain cases adding additional money. Further there are proposals that the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not have an opportunity to study for which funding is included in the appropriation bill. When the House considered the foreign aid bill 2 weeks ago these proposals could have been brought to our attention through amendments offered on the floor so we could have discussed them.

So, there is in this appropriation bill legislation, Mr. Speaker, if you please, that should have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. I thank my genial friend from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I would like to say also that I am appreciative of the position that the gentleman takes. I appreciate further the fact

that he said he did not intend to chastise the Rules Committee or words to that effect.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Nor criticize.

Mr. COLMER. But the fact remains that that is exactly what is happening. I want to point out to my friend—both of my friends who have spoken on this matter—that I do not like this type of legislating any more than they do. But where is the fault? Whose fault is it? Certainly it is not the fault of the Committee on Rules and I am not sure that it is the fault of the Committee on Appropriations.

The fact remains that the gentleman's committee only recently, after some ten and a half months, or some such matter, has reported its authorizational bill out. The House of Representatives and the Congress are being criticized all over the country, even by the President of the United States, because these appropriation bills are not being enacted. I do not like it. I do not want any part of it. I do not like to waive points of order, but if we are going to get these bills enacted into law then we are going to have to take some drastic action. I just hope that those who are affected adversely by this—and I know there are, and my sense of propriety is outraged by doing these things—but let us take a cue from this and in the next year try to get these bills in a little earlier.

I thank my friend for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

Might I say that I stated to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, when appearing before that august committee, that the reason the Foreign Affairs Committee was reporting the bill at such a late date was because the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not receive the foreign aid message from the executive branch until the latter part of May. Hearings began immediately after the Memorial Day holiday. A very controversial point in the bill—the overseas private investment corporation proposal—necessitated lengthy hearings. It was necessary that we study that proposal in depth. The authorizing Committee on Foreign Affairs had intended and did give every member of the committee an opportunity to present amendments. The Foreign Affairs Committee extended every opportunity to interested Members and private individuals to be heard on amendments and principles contained in the bill.

If there were Members of this Congress who had amendments to the foreign affairs bill we welcomed their proposals. The Foreign Affairs Committee requested a rule as soon as we possibly could. For the purpose of emphasis I shall insert the committee action as listed in the report accompanying the aid bill, H.R. 14580:

COMMITTEE ACTION

On May 28, 1969, the President sent to the Congress a message transmitting proposals

to redirect our efforts in foreign aid (H. Doc. 91-122), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

On June 2, 1969, the Congress received a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "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" (Executive Communication 818, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs).

On that same date, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, introduced the bill H.R. 11792, which was referred to the committee.

Hearings on H.R. 11792 began on June 9, 1969, and continued through August 1, 1969.

The committee met in executive session during August, September, and October to mark up the bill, and on October 30, 1969, a clean bill, H.R. 14580, was ordered favorably reported by a vote of 28 ayes, 8 noes and 2 answering present.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is not blaming the Committee on Rules at all, but I do not believe that the Committee on Appropriations should be permitted under a rule waiving points of order to include legislation in an appropriation bill. This practice must stop. Concerned Members of the House were told it would stop in the last Congress, and in Congresses before. Unless the Committee on Rules denies rules waiving points of order, the Appropriations Committees will continue in their past habits.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I again will say, if the gentleman will yield further to me, that I have great sympathy for his position. I know of but one thing we can do under the circumstances, and that is what I propose to do. I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am tempted to do likewise.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the rule, there are two things that it does: When an appropriation committee reports a bill that is supposed to lay over 3 days, and we have waived points of order on that. The second thing is that we are waiving points of order because the bill has not passed the Senate.

In all fairness to the Committee on Rules, we are only trying to expedite matters around here. The gentleman from Wisconsin, or any other member of his committee, had the right to come before the Committee on Rules yesterday when this rule was presented to us, and make his presentation and his objections at that time.

If criticism is going to be leveled around here then their committee ought to take a great part of the criticism.

Why did they take so long to submit a bill to the floor? Why is it almost the eve of Christmas when we are taking action on this matter, when we should have acted on it a long time ago? It is because the committee members themselves were lagging. Do not put all the criticism on the Committee on Rules.

Further, in that regard, if there are cuts in this budget in which they are not satisfied, there is going to be a time when

the bill is authorized by the Senate, and there will be a conference committee. They can work out and agree on the differences. There will be the opportunity at a later date to go before the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) and ask for a supplemental budget.

But I do not think because this committee took so long that the Committee on Rules should take the brunt of this, or that this House should be in session this long without the committees acting.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me since he mentioned my name?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Yes, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the bill, H.R. 15149, was introduced yesterday, December 8, 1969. The report accompanying it was issued on the same date. The rule was granted on the same date.

How could the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable THOMAS MORGAN, appear before the Committee on Rules in protest of some of the provisions in the appropriation bill? If the gentleman will yield further, I am not solely concerned about the cuts in funding amounts. I am primarily referring to the nine or 11 pages of legislation contained in the bill. Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee did not appear because we were not aware of the legislative provisions in the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in reply, all I can say is when I left the Congress last Friday to return to my home in Boston, I knew at that time that the Committee on Rules was going to meet on Monday morning and I knew that this bill was going to be before the committee.

It seems to me that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have taken cognizance of the fact that the Committee on Rules was going to have a hearing and, therefore, they should have had a Member or a member of the staff there present to see what happened and what was transpiring.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 15149, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself whatever time I may use.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I think we should set the record straight.

There is no legislation in this bill other than legislative provisions that we have carried in the bill in previous years. We have added several new limitations this year which we will discuss later. There are only two exceptions. One is the foreign military credit sales program, which has not been authorized yet, and the committee added \$650,000 for a hospital and home for the aged in Israel, which was not in the House-passed authorization bill.

I do not want to have the Committee on Appropriations assume the blame for consideration of this bill by the House at this late date. We are only 16 days away from Christmas. I know the Members want to go home. I have been cooling my heels around here for some months waiting for an authorization bill. I spent 300 hours on my subcommittee hearings and I concluded them so long ago that I had to go back just recently and read the hearings to realize that this bill is for the fiscal year in which we are operating now.

I do not know why the Foreign Affairs Committee is so sensitive. We are operating under a completely legal rule. These are the procedures we follow when the business of the House gets bogged down. I do not think that that committee is holier than thou; neither do I think the Committee on Appropriations is holier than thou. It is a question of doing the right thing at the right time so that the Members can finish their work and go home for Christmas.

I am going to have to assume that most of the dissatisfaction about this bill is brought about by the very substantial reductions made by our committee. I want to, if I may, read an article from the local press. It is not very complimentary:

Acting with characteristic blind irresponsibility, however, OTTO PASSMAN's aid appropriations subcommittee slashed the figure to \$1.6 billion (against \$1.75 billion finally appropriated last year); the Passman massacre is likely to be confirmed on the floor.

I certainly hope it will be, and if that is being irresponsible, I wish we had more irresponsible committees, because we are spending money we do not have for things which we do not need trying to be

everything to everybody all over the world.

I want to say that it has been my privilege to walk into the well of this House for the 15th year to handle the foreign aid appropriations bill. I am going to give you some information on the first 14 years it was my privilege to handle the bill. The budget asked for \$54,963,341,250. During that same period Congress—and I give the Foreign Affairs Committee credit for making some reduction, but most of the reductions were actually made in the Committee on Appropriations—actually reduced the budget request by \$11,185,185,500, or an average cut of almost \$800 million per year below what the budget had requested, and each and every year, without exception, we left the foreign aid bill overfunded.

There is not a Member on the floor of the House that can refute the accuracy of that statement.

We left the program overfunded and each and every one of those years the program had unobligated funds at the end of the year. And that is also true this year. With all the crying that took place last year about this Committee's recommendation to reduce foreign aid, the program still wound up with a substantial amount of unobligated funds.

Mr. Chairman, this program has been greatly fragmented. The most astute Members of Congress has difficulty in keeping up with the actual amount of money in the foreign aid program. So for the benefit of the membership I am going to go directly to the record and read these figures:

Item 1 this year, mutual security, as we refer to it, or foreign assistance, the budget request was \$2,710,020,000. That is spigot 1.

Item 2. Receipts and recoveries from previous programs, from previous years, \$274,785,000.

Item 3. Military assistance—in Defense budget—\$2,230,900,000, previously carried in this bill.

Item 4. Economic assistance—in Defense budget—\$76,600,000, previously carried in this bill.

Item 5. Foreign military credit sales fund, \$275,000,000.

Item 6. MAAG's, missions, and mil-groups, \$168,800,000.

Item 7. Export-Import Bank, long-term credits, \$1,872,200,000.

Item 8. Export-Import Bank, regular operations, \$570,423,000.

Item 9. Export-Import Bank, export expansion program, \$100,000,000.

Item 10. Public Law 480—agricultural commodities—\$986,600,000.

Item 11. Inter-American Development Bank (FSO), \$300,000,000.

Item 12. International Development Association, request 1, \$160 million.

Item 13. International Development Association, request 2, \$160 million.

Item 14. Asian Development Bank—regular contribution—\$20 million.

Item 15. Asian Development Bank—special funds—\$25 million.

Item 16. Peace Corps, \$101,100,000.

Item 17. Permanent military construction, foreign nations, \$255,300,000.

Item 18. Contributions to international organizations, \$130,187,000.

Item 19. Educational—foreign and other students—\$43,614,000.

Item 20. Ryukyu Islands, \$20,651,000.

Item 21. Migrants and refugees, \$5,511,000.

Item 22. Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, \$41,612,000.

That makes a total of \$10,528,303,000, that has been requested for authorization and appropriation for selected programs of foreign assistance.

In addition to that staggering total of over \$10.5 billion, the President has sent a request to the Senate asking for an additional \$890 million for the Export-Import Bank, which would bring the total aid program up to \$11,400,000,000. This listing includes grant aid, sales, credits, and other programs. That is the grand total.

Now let us go over some of the items in this bill alone, which is indeed frightening. I want the Members to listen carefully, because this is a statement of fact. Last year the requests came in for approximately \$10.5 billion for the 22 spigots of foreign aid.

We had in this country what we referred to as the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act. While we were cutting back expenditures in America by closing down projects all over America, and causing some small contractors to go into bankruptcy—some of them had contracts for projects which were 75 percent completed and the funds were impounded and the contractors could not proceed under these contracts—do the Members realize that not one single project of the 4,408 projects and subprojects in the AID program, in 99 nations and five territories of the world, was cut back as much as one dime?

This year, while we are again considering making available the aggregate sum of \$11.4 billion, we have a freeze on 75 percent of all new Federal construction in America. I am not fighting that, but I want Members to understand that we are discriminating against our own people in favor of many of the recipient nations of this foreign aid program.

What are we confronted with? We have permitted something to grow up in our Government over which we have lost control. We have 51,936 individuals drawing monthly stipends from the AID Agency—U.S. personnel, foreign nationals, and participants.

This means there are 51,936 ambassadors for more foreign aid who are scattered in 99 nations of the world, with the support of all the ambassadors in those nations.

It is almost impossible for a small committee, spending part time, to stay on top of this mammoth program. I was in hopes that the Foreign Affairs Committee this year would come in and congratulate the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations for going into this program and ascertaining the actual need, and not appropriating just what some bureau or bureaucrats downtown wanted. Evidently we are not going to get that commendation.

Let us go into the details of this wild and woolly foreign aid program. Let us take worldwide technical assistance. This year there is an authorization of \$200 million. Our committee recommended

\$150 million. Why did we recommend this reduction? One of the factors was because upon examination we found one consultant was getting \$260 a day, in addition to all his expenses. There is only one other individual in Government drawing a larger salary, and that is the President of the United States.

We found another one drawing \$250 a day with all his expenses paid. We found three drawing \$200 per day. A listing of these consultants can be found on pages 311 and 312 of part 2 of the printed hearings.

Then the Agency comes along and says they want to allocate this money under a different system. They want us to permit them to go to the universities and the colleges and enter into a contract and give them a certain amount of money to do a job. In my opinion that would deprive our committee of the right of examination to determine how many they have under a contractual basis, how many they have on another basis, and what they are paying them.

While we do not think too well of this new proposal, we are going to let the Agency have a pilot program on that proposal.

There is an awful lot of feeling about another program which the administration says we have underfunded. But we are guilty of overfunding the supporting assistance program last year. Last year the budget request for supporting assistance was \$595 million.

After a long and difficult time, we were able to reduce the request by \$230 million, allowing \$365,000,000, and of course, the Agency screamed bloody murder that this cut would destroy the program, that this money goes to Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Korea.

What are the facts? They came in this year, and upon examination this is what we found out: they actually needed only \$241,394,000 last year. We gave them \$365 million. We found on June 30 they had \$55,680,000 on hand unobligated that lapsed because they had no use for it. In addition to that, we found that they had obligated \$57,926,700 for projects on which they had not submitted one iota of supporting assistance program justification material.

In addition, we found that they ran a ghost project in South Vietnam. They discovered they would have to use legal bribery and pledge in advance to the Saigon legislature, "If you will pass a land-reform bill, we will give you \$40 million." So, lo and behold, on June 27, 3 days before the funds would lapse, they had so much unneeded money, they allocated \$10 million to a purely nonexistent ghost project.

I asked the Secretary of State, when he came before our committee, "Is the legislature in Saigon in session?" He said, "Yes." I asked, "Do you know whether or not they have passed this legislation?" He said, "I do not think so." I can assure the Members that he said, "I do not know whether they ever will pass legislation."

Yet these people allocated \$10 million to a ghost project so as to obligate a lot of this supporting assistance money.

My friends, there has been much feeling about the supporting assistance program. What did the committee do this

year? I want the Members to pay particular attention to this, so they will know we may have again overfunded this program. The committee recommended \$300 million in new funds, and also recommended the reappropriation of the \$55,680,000 in unobligated funds.

Also, they have another little trick known as obligating funds and then at some subsequent date, when we are home trying to seek reelection, they deobligate those funds and start new projects. This year, if you please, they are going to have \$35,910,000 of deobligated funds.

So I say that we are going to allow in this bill funds in the amount of \$391,590,000.

Listen to the record. The so-called deobligated \$35,910,000, in all probability, will go to \$100 million when we go home for a brief Christmas leave, because in supporting assistance in fiscal 1968 they came up meekly and said, "Yes, we are going to deobligate \$18,850,000." What did they finally deobligate? \$90,669,000.

In fiscal 1969 the estimate of deobligated funds originally was \$29,400,000. What did they subsequently deobligate? \$61,022,000.

I could go on for hours on this bill, pointing out its weaknesses, and I do regret that my good and able friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee do not have the time to go into the details as we do and establish for the record the actual need and not agree with the wish of some bureaucrat or some bunch of bureaucrats downtown.

The only apology I have is the fact that without exception during my 14 years serving as chairman of this subcommittee we have overfunded the entire program.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I will not yield to the gentleman at this time. I am stating facts and I ask the gentleman to challenge them. I shall not yield until I finish my statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at another bogeyman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman referred to me, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I have not used your name. You are only one member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, are you not?

Now, Mr. Chairman, some of us must assume the responsibility of facing up to the serious situation that we have in America, a public debt of \$1,650 billion, when you include the borrowed money and the statutory obligations which say we are going to give you in subsequent years for some services you have previously rendered, and we have created no reserves for these statutory obligations.

Mr. Chairman, every man, woman, and child in this country is in debt to the extent of \$8,250 because we do not have the time during which to go into these bills in great depth as is needed to be done rather than taking the recommendations from the bureaucrats downtown.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss one item which is the \$75 million request which the committee did not approve for

the new Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC. What are the facts?

This is a reserve to guarantee credits to people who make investments abroad if their property is expropriated or if the currency is devalued. In other words, it is a guaranteed investment. This idea is 20 years old. About 8 years ago they came in and said, "We need \$180 million for the Guaranty Fund and we must have it. It is important. We need to impress the American businessman to make investments abroad." I asked the question, "Is it not true that the full faith and credit of the United States backs up these loans?" They say, "Yes, that is correct, but it would be more attractive if we had the money appropriated."

As I said, they asked for \$180 million. We gave them \$30 million. We cut the request \$150 million. Now, this year for some reason or other, they got the Foreign Affairs Committee to authorize \$75 million for this account. I decided to do an examination on this particular account. We found we had appropriated \$57,422,000 and they had collected as of December 31, 1968, \$62,950,000 and as of October 31 they had collected an additional \$9.6 million. So, they have \$129,972,863 in that kitty.

What is the loss record? During the 20 years of its existence, they have paid out \$11,820,000 in claims. So, they have sufficient funds on hand at this time to fund this program for 258 years and 4 months—I repeat, 258 years and 4 months. Despite that loss ratio they said, "We want the \$75 million. We are not going to spend it. But if we put it in the fund then it will make it more attractive to businessmen who want to go abroad and make their investments."

If the \$130 million were to revert to the Treasury, the investment guaranty program would still have the full faith and credit backing of the United States of America.

Let us go to another item in this bill. You have 39 different agencies and bureaus, not counting all the commercial banks, where American businessmen can borrow money to invest. They can go to three windows of the Export-Import Bank. The Alliance for Progress loan fund is available for up to 50 percent for that type of loan. The same thing is true of the development loans.

More importantly, of course, would be the fact that the American businessmen have the necessary capital and do not need to borrow from the Federal Government. But for some reason or other—and we hope to find out why some day—AID has come up with a proposal now that they will transfer \$20 million per year for 5 years out of the repayments to the two Development Loan Funds, to set up a new lending program in OPIC.

This is just another little lending agency being created in the so-called Overseas Private Investment Corporation. There is absolutely no justification for it in my opinion, although there are some Members who feel there is.

Let us go a little bit further—and if you think you can keep up with all these people are doing, you had better have another think about it. There has been complaint about the multilateral organization technical assistance program.

This year we have recommended \$88.8

million for this purpose, the same amount that was made available last year for this purpose. As mentioned in the committee report, the committee felt the request for the UNDP—an increase of \$29 million—was excessive, so we reduced the total amount requested for this purpose.

For the Indus Basin they have asked for \$7,530,000. We have set that out in a separate paragraph of the bill. So they are getting what they asked for.

American schools and hospitals abroad, the committee felt that it should recommend the entire amount.

We get down to the contingency fund. Last year the Congress appropriated \$5 million, this year your committee recommends \$10 million. This is double what we appropriated last year.

Alliance for Progress loans—at this stage last year we recommended \$200 million; that is the identical amount we are recommending in this bill at this time for fiscal 1970.

For worldwide development loans, last year at this stage we recommended \$265 million, and you voted for what we recommended. We are recommending this year the same amount, \$265 million.

If you look at the actual record you will find that in all probability this program is going to be overfunded, because as of the first 5 months of the fiscal year they have committed themselves to only \$217 million. And if you look at the two accounts it adds up, at this stage, to \$465 million.

Again, we are not criticizing the great Committee on Foreign Affairs. But some individuals always worry about whether there is a budget request for a certain item.

We do not feel that way—because we are not holier than thou.

In the appropriation for American schools and hospitals abroad, there is a variety of projects numbering about seven. There are no budget estimates for those projects. The great Committee on Foreign Affairs put them in its authorization bill. They put them in without budget justification. We say they are good and we support them.

There are four or five schools in Israel and, of course, the prototype desalting plant where we recommended \$20 million to provide enough funds to initiate planning, design, and prepare specifications. The committee will take a good look at this project next year to see how it is progressing.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the honor to chair this committee for 15 years. I am not smart, but I do follow the facts as they are. I would not want to do otherwise anyway.

There are a lot of things in this bill that in my candid opinion, if I were to go into them, we may not get a bill through the House. But I think I should state to the committee that the budget request for spigot No. 1 only, title I of this bill, the so-called foreign aid program, is \$2,710,020,000. The bill before you, including the reductions the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommended, recommends a total reduction of \$1,110,640,000 less than the budget estimate.

This is just about the same percentage cut we have made in prior years and with-

out exception left the program overfunded.

We are recommending a reduction of \$674,140,000 below what was authorized by the House when it passed the authorization bill on November 20.

You know, and I know, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs knows, that this bill has many more stations to pass before it finally comes back to this floor. It would please me very much to be able to say we will bring it back just as we are passing it. But I think it is only proper to call the attention of the committee to the fact that notwithstanding the fact that there is \$10,528,000,000 in total foreign aid requests, there is a supplemental estimate for the Export-Import Bank for \$890,338,000 over and above that \$10.5 billion figure.

I would point out that there is a pipeline of unexpended funds from prior years programs of about \$18,708,016,000.

If you want to get a general idea as to how much you have in the pipeline for some of the recipient nations, I respectfully refer you to page 5 of the committee report. Some of these nations have almost a half billion dollars in the pipeline to their credit.

I would respectfully refer you now to page 6 of the report and then you will get a general idea of what overspending in the foreign field has done to this country.

As I stand here talking to you, I can assure you that the deficit in the U.S. international balance-of-payments account in the past 19 years amounts to \$36,896,000,000. We only had a surplus in 2 of the 19 years.

In 1956 we had a surplus of \$500,000,000. Last year we had a surplus of \$93,000,000. But we did not create a surplus by increasing our exports. Last year we had the black satchel man looking into the treasuries of the nations throughout the world, and every time we found a nation, whether it was one of the old aid recipients or one of the new ones, because this country borrowed money to pay for the commodities we gave them, we permitted them to build up a substantial foreign exchange surplus.

So the black satchel man arrived in those countries and said, "We want to borrow some of that money."

Our man arrived in Bangkok, Thailand, and said: "We have given you a billion dollars, but during that same period you have built up a surplus foreign exchange amount of over a billion dollars. Now we want to borrow back from you \$250,000,000."

This is the way that works. We are going out and borrowing American tax dollars to ship the commodities to them and letting the U.S. Treasury pay the bill. That saves the foreign exchange they earn and permits them to build up their foreign exchange account.

We told Thailand we want to borrow \$250,000,000. They said "No," but after a lot of pleading they agreed to let us borrow \$100,000,000."

What are the terms? We will pay it back to them in 4½ years at 6-percent interest.

I am not going to go into all of that. I want to counsel with you. Our Nation gives them a billion dollars in aid which permits them to build up a billion dollar

surplus foreign exchange. Then we go out and borrow it from them, but we have to pay it back in 4½ years plus 6-percent interest.

This is the way that program operates. If I were to go any further into it, you may defeat the bill. There is a lot of information in this committee report, and if you read it, this committee may have your commendations and not your criticism.

My friends, I am the biggest hawk on the Hill. When my country is at war, I support it. We are in trouble, and you know that we are in trouble, in many spots around the world.

Several years ago I made up my mind that I would be a hawk. I remember we lost 30,000 young men in Korea, and we have lost 40,000 in Vietnam. We have a few allies around the world. I think we are committed in Korea, where it cost us \$2.5 billion to win the war. The figures are classified, but we have thousands of American soldiers there today.

In my candid opinion, if the doves, the hawks, or even the hummingbirds would read the secret reports I am going to make available, they would be here seeking to help correct this deficiency. It is tremendous.

If we consider Nationalist China, I can assure you that they are today spending tens of millions of dollars to purchase military hardware from us. This year they are going to spend some \$50 million cash in the United States. You and I know that I cannot reveal top secret information. But I want the hawks, the doves, and any Member to come and read these secret letters. If they do, I do not believe they could possibly support an amendment to take the \$54.5 million out, unless it is done on a personal basis, and I trust it shall not be. I want to debate the question on its merits. I do not want to hear the statement that there was no budget request. The policy in the Far East has been fixed, and it has been fixed for many years. The only thing we must do now is to decide at what level we shall replace obsolete equipment. The budget is nothing more than a guide. There is nothing sacred about that budget. I should like to ask those who argue that there is no budget request, about the other bills, covering some \$2,985,000,000, that they increased without any budget request whatsoever.

And I want to discuss another project if you are going to get into the subject of budget requests. It will touch on a sacred agency, and we will have some warm debate. I ask you to take into consideration the direction in which we are traveling and how hard your committee has worked for many years and has now saved in excess of \$12 billion.

Mr. Chairman, since the creation of this foreign aid program it has gone into 121 nations and seven territories of the world at an aggregate cost of \$182,583 million. That figure itself should be convincing that we have gone too far afield with the foreign aid program. We have brought all the nations of the world in but 14, and some of the nations that we were once fighting, are getting money out of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I refer the members of the committee to the printed report of the committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would like you to clarify the explanation of the \$12 million for the United Nations Children's Fund, found on page 13 of the committee report. Is it not true that this amount is a "floor" and not a "ceiling" for the Children's Fund?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. In previous years we had funded the U.N. Children's Fund at \$12 million.

Last year we increased it by an additional \$1 million because it was an anniversary, so they got \$13 million. This year we thought we would return to the original figure, that no less than \$12 million would be available, but there is no limitation. If the Department should decide they need \$15 million, of course, then the legislation is broad enough to take care of it.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for the great contribution she has made for funds for the Children's Fund. She has interrogated on this item every year and has made very sure that this item was adequately funded. I am very pleased the gentlewoman did ask this question so we could make this legislative history.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not rise at this time to take issue with the gentleman's figures.

Mr. PASSMAN. I commend the gentleman for modifying his feeling, and he will wind up supporting my bill, I hope. Does the gentleman have a question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I know figures can be juggled.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman is making a statement that I juggled the figures, I can assure him I did not.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I did not as yet accuse the gentleman of juggling anything.

Mr. PASSMAN. I hope the gentleman makes sure he defines what is being juggled. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman referred to the 22 foreign aid facets, listed on page 4 of the committee's report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I know the gentleman is very influential. Would the gentleman advocate the authorization of the funds for the 22 items listed on page 4 should be placed within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee? The gentleman from Wisconsin would like to point out that some included in the list should not be included as foreign aid. Specifically the Migrants and Refugees, Ryukyu Islands, Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, and the Export-Import Bank, are not foreign aid programs. On the other hand since the gentleman has mentioned other programs such as Public Law 480, Inter-American Development Bank (FSO), International Development Bank, for example, would the gentleman use his influence to see that the authorization for these programs be placed in the Foreign Affairs Committee? The

Foreign Affairs Committee could then take a look at all of these programs as the proper legislating and authorizing committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am so pleased the gentleman brought up that question. If I go any further into this bill, we may wind up without a bill. The people downtown are specialists in fragmentizing and hiding foreign aid. Does the gentleman realize that they proposed that only a small part is to be handled by the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Here is something I just want to whisk over, because we do not want to go into too much detail. This has grown up in the past few years. We have in this bill, not even included in the \$2,710,000,000 estimate, an amount of \$665 million for three banks. Let us take the International Development Association. This year there are two requests for \$160 million each, totaling \$320 million. What are the terms for IDA loans? Here are the terms: Fifty years, no interest, with a 10-year grace period, then 1 percent per year repayment of principal for 10 years, then 3 percent a year for the next 30 years. There is only three-fourths of 1 percent service charge for handling the loan.

IDA was created, I assume, because they detected other types of aid would go down, so they started creating these banks. If the gentleman will look at the total bill, he will find items totaling \$665 million for these three banks which are also foreign aid and assistance but which are not included in title I of the bill, the so-called foreign aid program. So the gentleman is correct. This is only a small part. But the recapitulation is correct.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am not questioning the recapitulation. I am questioning whether some of the programs and agencies mentioned should be considered as foreign aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. I believe I can give the gentleman a better explanation. May I explain it so we can all understand it?

I have a friend in Monroe, La., who was an alcoholic. I went down and asked about him, and they said that old John had given up whisky. He had been on that stuff so long I did not think he would ever reform. Then, 3 months later, I went down and asked about old John. They said he was in the hospital. I asked, "What is the trouble?" They said, "Alcohol." I said, "I thought he gave up whisky." They said, "Yes, he did. But he is now on vodka."

That is the way this program is. They switched to a different brand, but it is still foreign aid.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Not being a drinking man, I would not know the difference.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not drink, either.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman's story reminds me of an earlier reference of the gentleman from Louisiana. In his opening statement the gentleman insisted that this bill does not contain any legislation except in two little instances. That is like being just a little bit pregnant.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me repeat what I said. This bill does not contain any legislation. It includes only limitations we have been carrying in this bill for years

and years. The only two exceptions would be the foreign military credit sales program and a small project in Israel, plus, of course, some new limitations the committee felt was necessary.

The other provisions we have carried in this bill year in and year out. Technically, I could say perhaps everything in the bill, if you want to get technical, the Foreign Affairs Committee should have looked at.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to compliment the gentleman—

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank you for the compliment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. For striking out the \$75 million for OPIC.

Mr. PASSMAN. I knew the gentleman wanted it out, and that is why we took it out. I had reason to believe that, and we were glad to take it out for him.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. May I ask one final question?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As the gentleman from Louisiana knows, the gentleman from Wisconsin is deeply interested in the military assistance program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The authorizing committee did include \$50 million for Korea.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And on the floor of the House during the consideration of the foreign aid bill \$54.5 million was added for Taiwan. I noticed the Appropriations Committee has stricken the \$50 million for Korea but has retained the \$54.5 million for Taiwan. Would the gentleman enlighten the House, the members of the committee the justification and the logic for the committee's action? What was the reasoning? Did the Appropriations Committee hold hearings on these items?

Mr. PASSMAN. If you start using logic you are really going to embarrass me, because I am afraid we do not use too much logic in considering both the authorization and appropriation bills for foreign aid.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Undoubtedly the gentleman would agree, however, we ought to return to logic?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am just as strong for the \$50 million for Korea as I am for the \$54.5 million for Taiwan. I pleaded with the members of my subcommittee not to take out of the \$50 million for Korea. I supported it in my subcommittee.

We move on to the full committee. Again I supported an amendment for \$50 million for Korea. I turned to my distinguished chairman yesterday, when it was defeated, and I said, "I must reserve on this, and if the rules will permit, if there is an amendment offered to put \$50 million back for Korea, not only am I going to support it but also I am going to speak for it, because I know you know this is a very small percentage of the amount needed over there if we are going to protect our boys."

I support you. I have supported you. I have supported you at every station. I am going to support you if an amendment is offered to put it back.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note that when the Secretary of State appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body a few days ago, he said "we appear to be cutting back on our share of the job." In other words, we are not carrying out our share of the foreign handout load. Would the gentleman care to comment on this statement?

Mr. PASSMAN. The Secretary is a very personable type of fellow. This is standard. He picked it up. It was put in the direction books some 15 years ago. I am very fond of him.

This is the same type of statements they have made in previous years. I have reported this bill in my committee, and I have seen the white envelopes slipped under the door to my chairman, not to my present chairman but to a previous chairman, and to the ranking minority Member, saying, "Do not cut it. There are grave consequences."

So this does not cause me any alarm. That is the stock answer, the stock justification.

Mr. GROSS. And, I note that the Director of the foreign give-away outfit, Mr. Hannah takes the same view.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is the stock line.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman has ever inquired into the amount of money that has been allocated to Michigan State University and to the University of Michigan through the years? This so-called foreign aid program has been a bonanza for those two institutions. I tried to get together some figures for this occasion and it seems to me that it now runs to about \$40 million, and there are open contracts in existence dealing with those two institutions. Dr. Hannah as the former president of one of those institutions had an interest in these lush contracts.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the distinguished gentleman I think Dr. Hannah is one of the most dedicated Christian men I have ever met. I think his integrity is absolutely unimpeachable. I do not believe Dr. Hannah would under any circumstance recommend a contract for Michigan State University that could not be justified as a contract for any other college or university. I feel that way about the gentleman. I do not know that he knows anything about foreign aid. He knows what he is doing in supporting foreign aid and he knows only what we are going to give him.

Mr. GROSS. Anyway, those Michigan institutions have been and still are doing very well on contracts with the AID organization.

Would the gentleman address himself to the proposition of the obligations and commitments of money as of June 30, the last day of the fiscal year?

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, I might say this, that these people get very busy beginning about June 25 and the amount of work they do between June 25 and June 30 would justify three times the amount of salary they are receiving based upon how much money they can obligate in the last few days of the fiscal year. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. They seem to have done an extraordinarily good job in shoveling out the money at the last minute.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is the period of time from which most of your deobligations eventually occur. As I say, I want to be complimentary about this bill because I want to see it passed but if I keep on talking, I might defeat it.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Louisiana has said that his committee has taken a look at the actual need of the various programs prior to making recommendations. I have three questions.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The first question is this: What is the justification for the very substantial cut in the development loan program for Latin America?

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me answer them one at a time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The other question is, What is the purpose for these cuts in the development loans, generally?

Mr. PASSMAN. We are recommending the same amount for Latin America now that we recommended last year and that is \$200 million. We have been into this fiscal year for a total of over 5 months and the gentleman will find that there is a considerable amount of money in that fund. I refer the gentleman respectfully to this report. Last year we recommended \$200 million and this year we are recommending \$200 million in this bill. In addition to that, you may find all kinds of spigots of foreign aid for Latin America. There is a pipeline of unexpended funds of about \$1,162 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is looking solely at the past, and not at this year's request.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am looking at the unexpended funds. After all is said and done, are we ever going to be able to say that now we can start going back the other way? Does this mean that for the remainder of our lives we must dissipate everything we see, hear, and taste? Is there a law that says that we must burn up the entire resources of America? I think they are doing very good to get the same recommendation this time as they did last year, \$200 million. They do not need the \$200 million, but we recommended the \$200 million.

Now, the next question, please.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I assume the answer to the next question will be the same.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am giving you the best answers I have.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But if your same line of reasoning is applied to my question, I think I know the answer.

Mr. PASSMAN. What is the answer? Go to the next one, if you know the answer. I do not want to argue, but I am trying to save time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman would let me ask the question, why was so substantial a cut made in the Development loans, worldwide, not Alliance loans, but other loans? You recommend only 40 percent of what was requested.

Mr. PASSMAN. I can only say this to the gentleman. Development loans, worldwide, again last year we had some \$265 million at this point. This year we are again recommending \$265 million, the same amount we recommended last year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This is simply looking backward.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not know whether you call it looking backward or looking forward, I think it is looking forward because we are borrowing this money to give away and some day we might have to be called upon to pay it back.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know what figures the gentleman is using. The report on page 22 says that \$300 million was appropriated last year, but your recommendation this year is \$265 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have to clarify my answer to the gentleman's question. I said at this time. We came to this floor last year recommending \$265 million. We are on the floor today recommending \$265 million. If it goes over to the Senate, they may increase it, and in all probability there will have to be a compromise.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If I could ask the gentleman one final question regarding the cutback in the multilateral programs: Is this attributable to a feeling that too much is being requested for the United Nations development program?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If that is the reason, why does the committee feel that way?

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman—and I am very fond of the gentleman, I like to kid the gentleman because the gentleman is a good kidder.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment—if it is one.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is a compliment. I am a lover always, not a hater; I am not a great foreign aid enthusiast.

I believe that if you go to page 13 of the hearings you will find the answer where, if you look at the multilateral organizations, we are recommending \$88.8 million. Is that true, or is that what you find? \$88.8 million?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is what the gentleman is saying. However, that is a substantial limitation from the request.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am going to explain to the gentleman what has happened—and I do not believe there are 20 experts in America who can match wits with the 51,000 people, directly and indirectly, who are spending their full time finding ways to give away our money.

First, they have changed its name. The name of it now is Multilateral Organizations, whereas previously it was International Organizations and Programs. The \$88.8 million is recommended in new funds under the new name Multilateral Organizations. There is \$19.6 million carried now under Supporting Assistance, which was previously carried under International Organizations.

In addition to that, last year they requested \$17.6 million for the Indus Basin. They carried that under International Organizations and Programs. This year they deleted that likewise from the new appropriation, and they are

funding that as a separate item, \$17,530,000, as you will find in the report, and we are recommending the full amount.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that the gentleman has not answered my question at all, although he may have made a basis for an answer which he may still provide.

I understand from page 12 of your report that \$122 million is requested, but something like \$88 million is going to be recommended.

That means that something is going to have to be cut very substantially. The fact that certain programs are no longer included among those listed on page 12 is completely irrelevant to my question.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am going to make it abundantly clear that we are funding this program in accordance with the new name, and if you return to the new name the two programs that they transferred out of the old name, then you are going to come up with full funding.

I make that for a statement of fact. Subsequently, if the gentleman will take the time and give me a couple of minutes, I will convince you I am right.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hate to impose on the gentleman's time.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is mixing up the budget request with the authorization of last year's appropriation and what we are doing at this point.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This gentleman is not doing any such thing. I am referring to the figure on page 12 which states \$122,620,000 is needed. I am saying, if you only provide something like \$89,000,000 for these same programs—and not some other programs—I am not talking about any other program—how will there be enough to finance these programs?

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to give you the grand total, so that the gentleman will understand—we are not reducing this from \$126,000,000 to \$88,800,000; am I correct there?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the gentleman is wrong, as I understand him.

Mr. PASSMAN. I can assure you I am not. I will be glad to reconcile this difference later for the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This discussion proves the difficulty of legislating on the floor. I do not think there is any possibility of reconciling this.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will bring this paper directly to you so that you will get the correct record later and say that I was correct.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is as well balanced a bill as you can expect your committee to bring out. I want the committee to understand that the amount of the reductions made this year, percentage-wise, is about the amount of reductions that we have made in prior years—make no mistake about that. Past experience has taught me—and the record is on my side, that we are again overfunding some of the programs.

But there has been so much noise and so much pleading until we were actually afraid to go any lower.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill and I certainly am going to support the amendment to provide the \$50,000,000 for Korea.

I wish, if you would, recognize that this is my job. I spend some 400 to 600 hours

every year on this bill. I think I understand it as well as any Member could possibly understand it.

I hope the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will give this Committee a vote of confidence so that we may in subsequent years, as we have in prior years, continue to work for you and bring information to your attention by mail and on this floor which would justify your full confidence and your enthusiastic support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) has consumed 1 hour.

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

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee held many weeks of hearings on this bill under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

I certainly want to give credit to the members of this subcommittee who have worked along with the chairman and who have heard many, many hours of testimony—reams of testimony. The members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee differ at times and we do not always agree on priorities as to where reductions could be made or increases made in the program. It certainly has been a pleasure for me to sit with the members of this subcommittee and to discuss this program since early in the year—and we concluded our hearings in late July.

Mr. Chairman, your Appropriations Committee has reported to the House the lowest foreign aid recommendation in the history of these programs. While the amounts recommended for the various categories will be strongly debated here today, I would like to take just a few minutes to discuss the long-range significance of our actions on this bill.

Some will say that the primary reason for the \$1.1 billion cutback from the administration's foreign aid request is the lack of a constituency for these programs in an America beset by wartime and domestic priorities. There is some truth to that.

Some will say that the 40-percent cut in economic and military assistance stems from the disillusionment of former supporters of our aid efforts, due to deep involvement in the internal affairs of the recipient nations which accompany such efforts. There is also truth in that.

Others will point out the growing frustration of a generous and charitable people who have seen over \$120 billion of their taxes spent for economic and social development overseas, then have waited with amazing patience for improvements which seldom came. We have all observed this frustration in our correspondence and in our opinion polls.

These practical, political observations will work their will on this bill when the votes are taken. My votes in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, in the full Appropriations Committee, and here on the floor of the House are based this year on an overriding consideration—the future strength and success of our activities in and relationships with the developing world dictate a “bare bones”

cutback in our existing foreign aid program now.

Last February, when I was on a foreign aid inspection trip for the committee, one of our top AID administrators in Turkey made an unusually candid observation to me. He said:

Aid too long continued at too high a level becomes counter-productive.

For years our committee has been told by a steady progression of foreign aid administrators, all dedicated men, that salvation for the developing world depended on ever-increasing appropriations levels for the existing assistance programs. Relatively small amounts of these appropriations were to be spent for evaluations of current efforts, but the resulting reports were generally printed and filed, never to be heard from again.

I am disappointed this year to say that the language of the fiscal 1970 budget request has not changed to any marked degree. However, there does seem to be more willingness on the part of the top administrators and the President to initiate increased discussion of the fundamental rationale of our role in the development process. In his foreign aid message to Congress last May, President Nixon called for “a fresh approach” to the problem.

Late in October, the President called for substantial and promising changes in our relationships with the Latin American nations. He proposed greater reliance on multilateral administration of economic assistance activities, less overbearing “leadership” by the United States, and for more emphasis on the developing potential of trade rather than continued dependence on the artificial foundation of aid. In short, the President advocated a badly needed restructuring of our participation in the Alliance for Progress.

There have been indications that some of these basic changes are being considered in relation to our aid programs in the rest of the world. In addition, this truly could be called the year of the foreign aid studies. The Peterson Task Force, appointed by the President as directed by Congress in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, is to submit its report on U.S. foreign assistance efforts by next March 31. On September 15 of this year, the Pearson Commission on International Development submitted its 400-page report to the World Bank. The private National Planning Association released an extensive report with recommendations on foreign aid policy last March. Several other private and congressional studies are currently in progress, or have recently reported their findings.

I would direct particular attention to committee print issued on March 24 of this year by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled “Staff Memorandum on What To Do About Foreign Aid.” I mention this specific report to point out that some of the questions and recommendations which are now being considered constitute a radical departure from some of our currently held theories about foreign aid.

It is not my purpose to discuss in detail all of the recommendations which are evolving from these studies. In rela-

tion to the bill before the House now which funds our ongoing foreign aid programs for the next 6½ months, it is important only that we acknowledge the existence of these serious efforts to redesign the aid vehicle. Let us remember that if the current foreign aid approach had been successful, these studies would not have been initiated. It makes no sense to continue funding at a high level the ongoing programs which have not worked, and thus add more superfluous projects to a gerry-built aid structure which has proved that it cannot work.

The present administration has determined that continued foreign aid is in our national interest. The appropriation recommended by the committee, with a few exceptions, will provide adequate funding for a low-level program pending the major redirection in our aid programs and a redefinition of the aid process itself which must come early next year.

An exception I have taken to the committee's recommendations concerns the reduction of over one-fourth of the House-authorized amount for the supporting assistance category. In the report accompanying this bill it is stated:

The committee expects that in allocating the funds provided by this appropriation action will be taken to the maximum extent possible to assist in the Vietnamization of our programs in that country.

With the amount recommended, this cannot be done.

The President has pledged to the American people his intention as Commander in Chief to Vietnamize the war and to bring our troops home as soon as this process has succeeded. The original request for the supporting assistance funds deemed necessary for Vietnam in fiscal 1970 was \$440 million. The House, in the authorizing legislation, cut the amount for all supporting assistance by \$100 million, or to a total which is over \$25 million below the amount needed for Vietnam alone.

Other supporting assistance program requests, such as those for South Korea, Thailand, Laos, Nigerian relief and U.N. peacekeeping activities in the Middle East, total more than \$137 million. Even with a carryover of \$55 million in the supporting assistance account, the total amount available for fiscal 1970 would be only \$355 million, or \$85 million short of what is estimated to be necessary for Vietnam.

There is no other item in our economic assistance programs which deals more directly with our own national interests and security than the supporting assistance category. Especially at a time when, by continuing and increasing our financial support for the Government of Vietnam, we can hasten the day when American combat troops will no longer be needed in that tragic war, we must not practice false economy here.

For the most part this is a good bill and I intend to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have

been a member of the distinguished Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for 11 years now. During that time, I have consistently raised my voice in support of effectively planned and efficiently administered foreign assistance programs. I do so again today, and ask my colleagues to take a very careful look at what has happened to these programs.

To cut out foreign economic assistance would be to turn off the lights of the less developed world. That, however, is precisely what this body will be doing if it accepts all of the committee's recommendations.

The House authorized a bare bones budget of \$1.8 billion for economic assistance under title I, and the committee cut those bones up into a thousand pieces. Our recommendation—\$1.2 billion.

This is not surprising to me, but it is still a tragedy. Every time I have called for continued economic aid, that budget has been sliced and the military aid budget has been stuffed in its place.

As my colleagues will note, I filed supplemental views to the committee report. I was joined in them by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN). I strongly recommend that you read them because they raise questions that each of you will have to resolve in your own minds before voting on this bill.

Opposition to foreign aid stems from a variety of factors. One is the failure to distinguish military assistance from economic assistance. The result of this failure is all too clear—the widespread bitterness toward military programs that have tied us down all over the world has carried over to our economic programs.

This is unfortunate because it is through small and calculated economic investments—not large and misguided military adventures—that the best interests of the United States are served.

CONTE AMENDMENT

I have long felt that the United States should not become the weapons arsenal for the so-called free world.

It is bad enough when the recipient can afford our new and shiny weapons. It is even worse when the recipient cannot, and that is precisely why I amended our bill back in 1967 to prohibit the transfer of sophisticated weapons to underdeveloped countries.

In view of current efforts to water down my amendment, I would like to explain what the committee did with it.

You will note that in the second proviso under military assistance, we have retained a general prohibition on the use of aid funds to furnish sophisticated weapons to underdeveloped countries. There are five exceptions—Greece, Turkey, China, the Philippines, and Korea.

We have also retained section 119, the penalty clause. The President must withhold in economic assistance the amount a less-developed country, except the five just mentioned, spends on sophisticated weapons. This is mandatory, unless the President himself determines such purchase is important to our national security and reports such determination to us in 30 days.

The addition of new section 120 does not change what I have said.

In other words, the intent of the committee is to retain the Conte amendment as it was. I certainly support this action because, as I have said many times in the past, these countries do not have the money to waste on elaborate weapons systems.

JETS TO CHINA

By the same token, I do not believe we should give away sophisticated weapons to any nation just because it is excluded from the provisions of my amendment—especially when they are neither requested nor wanted by the President, the State Department, the Agency for International Development, or the Defense Department.

This, however, is precisely what happened in the case of the jets for the Republic of China. Over the strong objection of 169 of its Members, this body authorized \$54.5 million for this outright gift. And the committee, I regret to say, went right along with it.

I strongly oppose this appropriation because there has been no justification whatsoever for it.

To begin with, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that no request was ever made for the planes, and over the circumstances surrounding its unexpected inclusion in the authorization bill. I think by colleagues should be equally disturbed.

Moreover, even during the very limited floor debate on this surprise move, serious doubts were raised about whether Taiwan had any real military need for the jets. One such doubt is that Communist China may very well not have the capability to invade the island republic.

It was also pointed out that Israel, which in contrast to China is faced with daily military threats, paid in full for the jets we sent her. The appropriation we are considering, however, is nothing more than a big fat \$54.5 million handout at the expense of the American taxpayer.

This handout is as unnecessary from an economic point of view as it is from a military point of view. The economy of Nationalist China is booming—triggered in large part by some \$5 billion in U.S. assistance over the last 20 years.

Now I ask my colleagues very pointedly—how do we know whether China needs these jets? Floor debate consisted of some five pages in the RECORD. No supporting material was sent up to Congress. In fact, barely anyone knew anything about these jets until that fateful day in November—the 20th to be exact—when an amendment was offered calling for the expenditure of \$54.5 million of the taxpayers' money.

We are already half-way through fiscal 1970 and at the end of calendar 1969. Why, then, not wait on these jets and consider them at a later date in the new budget, or even now in a supplemental request? I might note that the Appropriations Committee is currently holding hearings on several supplemental budget requests.

Either way, the delay would give us a chance to question the right people, including Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, about the need for them. I urge my colleagues as strongly as I can to adopt a wait and see attitude, and take a very, very hard look at this item.

My guess is that, if we do this, we will knock the money out. This action not only would save the taxpayers something, but also would improve the overall aid program.

For this reason Mr. Chairman, I plan to introduce an amendment at the appropriate time to delete these funds. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting that amendment.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The problem of these jets is tied in with the entire question of what the relationship between economic and military assistance should be. As you can see from the budget, this relationship is just plain lopsided.

The committee recommended nearly \$1.2 billion for economic assistance and \$350 million for military assistance, not including the \$54.5 million for jets to China, under title I of the bill.

Now for one who believes that economic assistance should take priority over military assistance, this all seems reasonable enough. It is not, because this is not the end of the story.

The military appropriation under title I is only a drop in the bucket compared to what we really give out. The fact is that an additional \$2.2 billion comes out of the Defense Department budget to finance free world military assistance forces in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

And this is not the end of the story either. When you add in military credit sales under title II, international military headquarters and agencies, NATO, MAAG's missions and milgroups, the grand total for fiscal 1970 reaches \$3.2 billion—or nearly three times the economic assistance provided under title I.

It is also interesting to note that more than two-thirds of that \$3.2 billion—specifically \$2.5 billion—is funded by Department of Defense appropriations under a separate bill.

Our military interests permeate the far reaches of the earth. We give this money out right and left, often without regard to its need, and sometimes even in spite of the recipient. In the latter regard, I would cite the reported \$40 million we paid the Philippines and the \$1 billion we are paying Thailand to stand by us in Vietnam. It looks like we have to beg these countries to let us "save" them.

In spite of all this, we did not cut one penny from the regular military assistance authorization of \$350 million, or the military credit sales proposed authorization of \$275 million.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

I am sorry the same cannot be said for the economic assistance authorization. However, as I noted at the outset, the committee cut some \$600 million from the title I authorization of \$1.8 billion.

I would like my colleagues to join me now in taking a look at these cuts, and I am only talking about cuts from the authorization—not cuts from the original request.

The committee cut \$108.8 million from the authorization for technical assistance, and recommended only \$313.8 million; or to put it another way, the lights in the less-developed world have been dimmed by that amount.

Technical assistance is the heart of our foreign aid program. It applies American technical and professional expertise to the problems of the developing countries.

It is what you read about when we go into the farmlands of a needy nation and help them produce a new grain of rice or a greater quantity of wheat per acre.

It is the bread and butter of our efforts to improve the basic quality of life in these countries. And it is what the committee has once again cut into a thousand pieces.

The committee cut \$114.6 million from supporting assistance. It just happens that the bulk of this money goes to Vietnam where it is directed to the peace effort, not the war effort. It covers pacification, Vietnamization, land reform, and the like.

Thus, it represents the direction in which we should be moving. Nonetheless, the committee saw fit to cut it by more than 25 percent.

The committee cut \$137.5 million from Alliance for Progress development loans, and recommended only \$200 million. It did this in spite of the Rockefeller report and the crisis we are facing in our relations with Latin America.

The committee cut \$160.5 million from worldwide development loans, and recommended only \$265 million. Thus, it even denied the developing nations the right to borrow—yes, to borrow—enough money for their needs. Incidentally, the administration requested \$675,500,000 for development loans.

The highly acclaimed Pearson Commission report was released in October. This comprehensive study of foreign aid comes at an important time—a time when, the report notes, enthusiasm for foreign aid is dwindling just as the drive for economic development is beginning.

The Pearson report also gives a good answer to the question of "Why Aid?" when it appeals not only to morality but also to enlightened and constructive self-interest.

I want to make it clear that I do not approve of these cuts in the economic assistance program. I am not proud of what the committee has done to the hopes and aspirations of the developing nations, and I do not think my colleagues should be either.

The committee seems to have cut this authorization up with an ax rather than with a scalpel. And like the surgeon who cuts freely with his instruments, we too will be called upon to explain our actions—except we will have to do it before the peoples of the developing world.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The committee cuts did not stop here. It went on to knock out the \$75 million requested for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—even though there was overwhelming evidence to the effect that private investment has a real role to play in the aid program.

This is bad economics. In fact, it is among the worst I have seen on the committee. According to testimony I received from the administrator of AID, Dr. John Hannah, this \$75 million would have generated some \$900 million in new investment.

Or to put it another way, you would get \$12 for each \$1 invested. I think a ratio of 12 to 1 is pretty good, but apparently it was not good enough for the distinguished committee.

I know many of my colleagues share my interest in encouraging private aid programs. OPIC would have done this, and in an extremely businesslike manner. It would have administered two programs—an insurance program and a guarantee program. It also would have made direct loans using repayments from other loans covered by this bill.

But that is all over now, before it even started. The committee saw to it that OPIC would not get the money it needed to carry on these programs.

There is an \$80 million reserve for the \$7 billion insurance program, and a 25 percent reserve requirement for the guarantee program. Some \$85 million is currently available to satisfy these reserves. However, by the end of fiscal 1971, a total of \$165 million will be needed. Without approval of the OPIC request, this requirement cannot be met. In effect, the committee has killed these programs.

The committee has also made sure that the money from other loan repayments would not be available for use by OPIC for direct loans.

The overall impact of these two measures should be clear—no OPIC. Or to put it another way, the committee did not even give the corporation a chance—a chance to save the taxpayers some money and to bring a highly promising innovation to the aid program.

I strongly disagree with the committee on this.

CONCLUSION

The point in all that I have said is that our overall aid program has become self-defeating. Our noble efforts to lift the development burdens of the less-developed nations have been offset by a misguided and unfortunate preoccupation with military adventures—a preoccupation at odds not only with the goals of our economic aid program, but also with the resources necessary to accomplish those goals.

I urge my colleagues to take a very close look at the military assistance program. After you have done that, I urge you to ask yourself whether you think the committee is doing justice to the economic assistance program and the hopes of the developing world.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Was not the gentleman also joined in his views by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES)?

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I meant the subcommittee views.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. Coming out of the full committee I was joined by these two distinguished gentlemen.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I compliment the gentleman for the excellent statement he is making.

I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Now, I voted against the authorization bill because of that and I can tell this subcommittee that there are many people who shared my view in the House and, therefore, that issue before us prejudices the legitimate objectives of the bill.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from California. Certainly, I am not going to threaten this House as to how I am going to vote, but I must say that after giving this a great deal of thought and consideration and after standing in this well for 11 years in supporting the foreign assistance program, much to the dismay of my colleagues on my side of the aisle—supporting it under former President Eisenhower, former President Kennedy, former President Johnson, and now President Nixon—I have made myself about as welcome as a skunk at a lawn party and I am going to vote against the bill if that provision remains in the bill.

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

Mr. CONTE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Did the gentleman's subcommittee have extensive hearings on military assistance?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, we had hearings.

Mr. YATES. In the course of those hearings was there any testimony offered in support of the provision for \$54 million for planes for Nationalist China?

Mr. CONTE. Not a scintilla of evidence, not a scintilla of testimony. This came as a big surprise on the floor of the House during the consideration of the authorization bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, was there any testimony taken in connection with the supplemental bill justifying this appropriation?

Mr. CONTE. No supplemental at all.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is not exactly correct.

Mr. CONTE. I do not yield to the gentleman from New York. I was going to yield to the gentleman—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, please do.

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman wants to discuss some of these other programs in the bill I shall be glad to have a little colloquy with him later.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I do not care to yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield?

Mr. CONTE. I hate to continue to be bothered by the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield, I am just trying to bring out the facts.

Mr. CONTE. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Brooklyn got treated pretty well in the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we are already halfway through fiscal year 1970 and are nearing the end of calendar year 1969. The gentleman from New York is holding up the secret document. The secret document says that should be brought in under a supplemental budget.

But that is the avenue which should be taken. That is what the secret document says—which I am sure is not secret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to have to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has uttered remarks which might mislead the Committee.

The gentleman stated that the Committee on Appropriations, of which he is a member, had no information—not a scintilla of evidence—about these airplanes, these jet fighter airplanes, for the Republic of China Government.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that information is contained in this top secret document dated December 5, 1969, which I hold in my hand and which the gentleman from Massachusetts himself has read, if only within the past hour. He has had the opportunity to read it previously. Any Member of the Committee of the Whole, as you were invited by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) may come over here to the committee table and read this document and see how important these airplanes are—and to whose interest—to the interest of the Government of the Republic of China or to the interest of the Government of the United States? They are in the interest of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to ask whether there had been any testimony on the question of airplanes, and I did not understand the gentleman from New York to indicate—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) has already stated there was no testimony on this subject.

Mr. YATES. I asked that question.

Mr. FRASER. May I pursue another point on the same subject? We had before us Admiral McCain, who has the responsibility for the Pacific Command. He made the statement in his overall posture statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Moving south, another area of Communist pressure is the Taiwan Strait. The Free Chinese defensive forces and the Seventh Fleet would render Chicom attack on Taiwan a foolhardy venture.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The date, please? Will the gentleman tell us the date of this testimony.

Mr. FRASER. The date of Admiral McCain's testimony is June 26, 1969.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This document in my hand is dated December 5, 1969. I should like to point out that it was utterly impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to hold any hearings, because it was only approximately a week ago that the authorization for the \$54.5 million was inserted by the House in the authorization bill.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, it was striking that when this subject came to the floor the other day in the Foreign Assistance Act there was no one who was willing or able to get up and indicate why these airplanes were needed, and I have yet to hear a responsible person say that there is evidence that the Chinese Communists have the seaborne capability of sending enough divisions across the strait to pose a major threat to Taiwan. I might say to the gentleman that I, too, have checked some of the classified information, and I find nothing there that justifies any different conclusion.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thought the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota was a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. All he needs do is read the item appearing on page 51 of the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the authorization bill, dated November 6, 1969, which practically invites everyone to offer an amendment to supply these airplanes to the Republic of China.

Mr. FRASER. I am familiar with that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not know whether the gentleman voted for or against this language in his committee, but the fact is that this is in the report of the majority of his committee. I should like to read briefly a part of this language:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has in past years expressed its concern over the military capability of Nationalist China compared to the ever-present threat from the mainland of China. 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. However, the austere funding of military assistance programs in recent years has limited Nationalist China's ability to improve her air defense capability.

The committee has been heartened—

I take it that that is the majority of the committee and does not include the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota—

by the effort being made by the Department of Defense to contribute to the solution of this problem by developing and procuring aircraft adapted to the requirements of Nationalist China as well as other countries. Until such aircraft can be made available, Nationalist China should be aided in obtaining our most modern fighter aircraft.

Now, this is the gentleman's own committee.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Surely, I yield.

Mr. FRASER. Let me tell you just two things about that statement of the committee report. No. 1, there is no testimony in the record to support that.

Second, that insertion was made at the request of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who went to our committee chairman and asked that it be inserted.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Evidently the gentleman has fault to find with both his own committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRASER. I just wanted to make clear that this was not a genuine product of our committee's deliberations. It was inserted at the request of a member of the Armed Services Committee, and it ought not to be given any more weight than that fact deserves.

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

Mr. Chairman, Members recognize that the China situation is fully covered with a top-secret document. I am not privileged to discuss the contents of this top-secret document but I can assure this committee that the \$54.5 million recommended for appropriation for China is an extremely small percentage of the total program we may have to make available to Nationalist China in the immediate future. I am telling Members that what we must make available in the not-too-distant future is going to be in the neighborhood of \$400 million. If we are not going to recognize the benefit of this appropriation to our own security and to that of our own Armed Forces in that part of the world, then I think we might as well pull out of that part of the world and come home.

Furthermore, as Members well know, Okinawa is now going to revert back to Japan in 1972. What will happen then, we do not know. If Members will have a look at this letter, I do not see how any person—hawk, dove, or hummingbird—could vote to take this money for China out of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for permitting me to speak at this time.

First of all, I want to say I support the committee in its attempt to provide fighter planes for Nationalist China. It is time, in my judgment, that we should make better use of the ready forces on Taiwan, because I believe it to be in our security interest.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Foreign Assistance Act. For 23 years now we have been attempting to buy friends over the bargain counter as we would ordinary merchandise, and we have fewer friends around the world today than we have had in my lifetime. I believe it was Bismarck who said:

The word "gratitude" is not to be found in the international language.

Mr. Chairman, this program started out as the Marshall plan in 1946 and had for its purpose a very noble objective, which was to rehabilitate the war torn countries of Western Europe. The American people were told when this plan was inaugurated that it would last

for 4 years and cost the American taxpayer \$17 billion. It has lasted until now, and as far as we can see into the future, and it has cost us untold billions.

Each President since that time, be he Democrat or Republican, has requested an average of about \$3 billion to carry on this program. In each instance they have predicted dire consequences for the country if all of the amount was not forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really as bad off as all this would seem to indicate, then I suggest that our beneficiaries are about ready to collect on our insurance. What they are saying is that we are safe only as long as we are able to pay protection money. The fact of the matter is that many of our leaders have become so self-conscious of our self-worth that they have developed a pathological passion for giving it away.

This is not to say that a case cannot be made for foreign aid, because it can. This has been true in the case of Greece, Turkey, Korea, and Formosa.

If projects can be brought forth which will serve our national interest, such projects can be funded out of pipeline money which has been alluded to here today.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that this country cannot shoulder the financial burdens of the world, and if in our attempt to do so we allow our level of living to be dragged down to match that what we are attempting to raise then we will have served no man well.

The great tragedy, it seems to me, is that the vast majority of the countries into which we have poured our largess are victims of their own economic systems. What we are doing, in effect, is propping up economies which are rooted in shifting sand.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up on the farm and learned a long time ago that if any living thing is going to forage it must eventually be weaned. It may seem cruel, for example, to take a baby calf away from a mother cow, but it is not, really, because one of these days that cow is going to go dry and the calf, not knowing where else to find food, is going to starve to death.

I suggest to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, that we are not getting a fair return on our investment in foreign aid. The expenditure of these funds are contributing to deficit financing, fanning the fires of inflation, and aggravating our balance-of-payments problem.

This program ought to be phased out and a military assistance program brought to the floor for consideration on its merits.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Louisiana indicated that in the not too distant future the sum of \$400 million military assistance will have to be made available to the Taiwan Government. Has any indication of this been given to the gentleman's Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, I am certainly not going to reply to that question directly. I believe we have probably said far too much already about subjects which may or may not be classified.

I should like to say also, on the basis of what has been said about the money proposed to be made available for planes for Taiwan, that I am glad, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that I voted against that proposal when it was considered under the authorization bill. In my opinion, this is no way to handle a serious problem.

If more money needs to be made available for updating the military equipment of any of our allies, it seems to me we have no reasonable alternative but to use the regular procedure and consider a supplemental appropriation, if necessary. That may well be necessary.

If I had any doubts about the wisdom of the item in this bill, those doubts have been resolved by what has been said already.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly.

I wonder, considering the gentleman's long experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, if he could explain to us why this is being done, when we have so many other sections dealing with strictly military questions?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman that many aspects of the Appropriations Committee actions are incomprehensible to me. I assume the gentleman himself might have a better answer than I as to that.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for the observation he made with respect to the planes for Taiwan.

I agree that perhaps too much has been said already here with regard to top secret items.

I urge all of my colleagues here—I believe what I said on the floor has been misinterpreted, and I urge every one of my colleagues here to go to the table and read this so-called top secret document. I want them to note the first line, which I am sure is not top secret, and that is that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) called them down there and discussed this with them after the authorization bill passed the House, putting the planes in; and the second thing which is very important, and I am sure not top secret, that the author of the letter says this should come up under the supplemental route.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me say also that I compliment him on his initial statement.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Has the gentleman's Committee on Foreign Affairs been given

secret information before in connection with various programs, including the military assistance program, and has not testimony been given to the gentleman's committee in support of such secret programs? Has not the gentleman's committee brought its bill to the floor without revealing such secret information?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is a fact. I might say also that Admiral McCain, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, appeared before the committee some months ago and discussed this area.

Mr. Chairman, apparently we are going through the same spectacle this year as we did last year. It had been my hope that we would not do this another year.

During the course of the debate on the foreign aid appropriations bill in September 1968, I commented on the disorderly manner in which we were proceeding. This year also it does seem to me, as it did last year, that an orderly consideration of this legislation should be possible even though we are nearing adjournment. I know as well as does the gentleman from Louisiana that it is close to Christmas. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I know also that he is going to remind me that the authorization bill only came up for a vote a few weeks ago. However, that still is no excuse for us not to be given a reasonable opportunity to see what the committee's recommendations are. We need to get an understanding and appreciation of the reasons for the cuts, and to have an adequate consideration of a bill of this substance. We need also an opportunity fully to discuss it and to offer amendments.

The rules of the House were disregarded last year, and we are disregarding the rules of the House again this year. Granted the Foreign Affairs Committee has been late in bringing out an authorization bill and I think it is regrettable. Next year perhaps we can be more expeditious in bringing the authorization bill out so we will not share the blame for playing fast and loose with the legislative process.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman, if I may, that we are operating under a proper procedure of the House in handling this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not happen to think it is proper, I might say to the gentleman from Louisiana, even if it is legal, I think it is wrong to use this approach.

As I said last year, and I repeat now, just because we are in a hurry there is no excuse for us to play fast and loose with this kind of a bill. I do not think we should be called upon to accept or reject today the recommendations contained in this bill. We have read in the newspapers what the committee was going to recommend, but I might say to the gentleman from Louisiana that he has provided no enlightenment at all as to the reasons for the substantial cuts in the program. He has apparently been confused by his own eloquence in discussing the bill. I understood him to say, regarding the cuts that have been made in the multilateral

programs, that not one dime has been cut from them.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think I justified completely and fully my position and the committee's position in defending the cuts made by the committee. The gentleman knows very well that we have justified each and every one of these cuts.

I would like to correct a part of the record and I will answer the gentleman by referring to page 13 of the report relating to technical assistance wherein it says:

A large volume of technical assistance and preinvestment activity is handled by the UNDP and the specialized agencies, and they have played pioneering roles in many of the improvements of the past two decades. The world owes them great praise and appreciation for these vital contributions. Their operating capacity now, however, seems strained to the limit.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman but I refuse to yield any further.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman apparently does not want to listen to the facts.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman that all he is doing is reading from the committee report. He is not dealing in facts. The report says that in the opinion of the Pearson Commission the resources of the UNDP are strained to the limit. Yet the solution of the gentleman from Louisiana as to this strain is to cut back substantially on the funds requested.

This is a nonsensical way of treating the President's suggestion for making an improvement of a major multilateral program for development assistance. If we are cutting back on bilateral assistance in line with the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, and if we are also cutting back on multilateral assistance, is it because we are trying to get out of the picture altogether? If we are, why are we not frank enough simply to say we do not believe in any kind of assistance? My point is that if we believe in multilateral assistance, we should surely support the strongest element of that program, the United Nations Development Program. That would not mean a reduction of \$29 million in the funds requested.

I see no other indication as to why there has been this reduction except that some commission says that the UNDP is strained to the limit.

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

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

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

Would the gentleman agree with me that the program under the leadership of Mr. Paul Hoffman at the United Nations is taking steps to expand their resources for operations through the use of agencies not limited to the agencies that they have been using to date?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct. The leadership of Mr. Hoffman has been of great significance, both to our country for providing a man of that caliber, and to the United Nations program which has done so much in so short a time. Quite obviously there

have been problems in experience that the UNDP has experienced. They are providing about four times as much resources now as they were 10 years ago. This speaks well for the value of what the UNDP is doing.

No one is arguing that a look should not be taken at the way in which they are operating, but if we believe in a multilateral approach to aid we certainly should provide money to carry on that program and not cut it back.

That is the only point I was making. The chairman earlier seemed to think that the committee had not advocated a substantial cut in that program. I am glad at least he now recognizes there is a substantial cut recommended in that program.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman again for his contribution, because I think we are clarifying a very important point. At the appropriate time I expect to offer an amendment to restore the funds that were requested. So I thank the gentleman for raising the point he did in connection with the item that was referred to by the Pearson Commission.

In discussing it with the people and the agencies involved, it is very clear they have allowed for an orderly progression because they have been limited by available personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing out this excellent point of his. I wonder if we could ask the chairman of the subcommittee what justification there was, whether there were any hearings, when the Committee on Appropriations decided to put the proviso in the bill as reported on page 13 of the report:

Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available for transfers authorized by section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

This to me appears as legislation in an appropriation bill. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey would care to comment on this proviso?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) that this is legislation in an appropriation bill. It is the kind of thing I do not believe should be permitted. I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations could discipline itself not to include language of this kind, especially if the bill is considered on a basis where we are not able to raise points of order against it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am reluctant to yield any further, because I have some things to say myself.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman would tell us whether he had hearings on that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) for that purpose.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have been in Congress for 23 years, and I must say to my distinguished friend that is the most ridiculous question I have ever been asked—the idea of having hearings as to whether we should place a limitation in the bill. Certainly, we did not have any hearings on placing the limitation in the bill and incidentally it is not legislation, it is a limitation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman sometime ago revealed a reason why a cut was made in technical assistance. The reason seems to me very flimsy. The gentleman pointed out that there were some high paid consultants and this is the only reason he gave for cutting back on technical assistance.

If that is the sole reason, I would say we ought to take a second look at all these requests for cutbacks in these funds. If we believe in foreign aid at all, we would recognize that the knowhow that this country has can be usefully transferred to countries that need it—that is what technical assistance provides.

I would have hoped that we would approve the President's request for funds in this area and not be bemused by the allegation that there may be some high paid consultants.

If there are certain abuses of that kind, then why not check the abuses but not curtail the program?

I asked earlier about the development loan programs, both for the Alliance for Progress and worldwide development loans. There is a very substantial cut in both of these programs, far below the very substantial cuts made in the authorization bill.

It has been said that if we appropriate as much as the committee is recommending this year, we will be as generous as we were last year. My point is that this is not much of a basis to go on. You certainly do not need much intelligence to use as a blind reference point what we actually made available last year. Is it not more intelligent to look, as our Foreign Affairs Committee tried to, at what the money is to be used for this year?

Almost 40 percent of this development loan money is to be used to help people, both in Latin America and elsewhere, to develop their resources or for food so that they can feed themselves. Why should we try to slow down that process of letting these people feed themselves?

As the committee report points out on page 22, at the bottom, the basic purpose is "to finance loans to the less developed countries to provide capital resources needed for growth. The loans finance the commodities and technical services necessary for construction of factories, dams, education and health facilities, and the import from the United States of raw materials and capital goods needed."

Why—if that is what development loans are for—and we agree that these

objectives are good—are we cutting back so drastically?

I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana or anyone else whether there is any reason for the drastic cutbacks other than the fact that only a certain amount was made available last year?

As an example, I point out that we should go along with this level of funding—India alone could use in development loans \$200,000,000 for food programs. If only \$265,000,000 is to be used worldwide for development loans, then obviously India is going to get a lot less from us. Also, if we cut back, it is obvious that other countries that are contributing assistance to India will cut back. Thus assistance to these developing countries will be cut back at a time when the needs are great.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion about cutbacks. I think any of you who heard the President last night say to the underprivileged of America and to those who are on social security, "No, we cannot afford 15 percent for these people who are getting \$50 a month," and "No, we cannot afford an \$800 personal income tax exemption," can understand why there is a problem on cutbacks.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Interior Committee day after day, and day after day there are items before us relative to cutbacks and these are programs as widespread as schools for Indians—food and welfare for Indians and programs that mean development in the economy and of land which belongs to the Federal domain in the United States—some 752,000,000 acres.

I do think it only fair to point out that this House provided \$150,000,000 last year—identical with this year. In the Alliance for Progress funds the House last year appropriated \$70,000,000; this year there is \$75,000,000. In the contingency fund the 1969 appropriation was \$5,000,000; in the 1970 budget it is \$10,000,000. Alliance loans in 1969 were \$200,000,000; 1970 funds are \$200,000,000. Development funds in the House 1969 were \$265,000,000; it is identical this year. Administrative expenses have been cut \$1,000,000 and with justification.

There are problems of inflation and budgetary restraints before each committee. This is no exception.

Now I would also like to point out that I personally have always supported, and will continue to support, technical assistance and economic assistance, and would support increased funds in this area. I think this is the most valuable part of this program, and I think it is something the United States can take credit for.

It is that program which the United States is extending to the less developed countries of the world. We try in this bill to make some contribution to the urgent and sometimes painful cries of help from men, women, and children in dire need of assistance and compassion. People of the less developed world look to Americans for leadership in the fields of health, nutrition, and education, and

in the words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

Each of us should remember our foreign aid technical assistance program is designed to help people—not governments, not economies, not balances of power—but, people. I have no enthusiasm for our foreign military aid enterprises nor will they in the long look build the genuine security that technical and economic assistance will.

As recently as 1880, only 14 percent of all Americans survived the years of working usefulness to reach 65. Every decade previous to 1880 revealed a darker situation. People died because of malnutrition, poor sanitation, and inadequate or unwise medical care. Babies were born weak and sick because of inadequate prenatal attention, and they succumbed to disease because they were too weak to fight it off. Primarily people died because they were expected to die—attitudes toward survival which were only realistic at that time are horrifying to us in 1969. Men married early and took the youngest wives they could find because young girls were stronger and more likely to last. People had six and eight children because they only expected to raise three or four. Epidemics struck communities time after time because no one knew how to stop them; children ate the wrong foods because no one knew what the right foods were, and too often there was no money to buy enough of even the wrong kind. Infant and child mortality was a prime causative factor in the low rate of survival, mortality due in turn to deprivation and lack of care, knowledge, and facilities—all the debilitating effects of economic disadvantage through lack of development. May I add, also, that in the United States, poverty, nutrition, and health require billions to make this Nation completely whole.

HEALTH

However there has been progress. The infant mortality rate in the developed countries of the world is 2.5 percent, and life expectancy is 70 years. Malaria has lost its terrifying aspects, as have pneumonia, influenza, and tuberculosis. Typhoid and small pox are virtually unknown in this country.

The reason for this dramatically improved situation is rooted in our economic and scientific advancement. We know more about the causes and prevention of illness and premature death; but more importantly, we have the means to sustain a healthy, sturdy, and highly productive population if all resources are utilized. We have found specific cures for many diseases traditionally assumed to be incurable, but far fewer people are contracting these diseases, because the population is healthier. And good health is the result of economic development, just as the economic development of a society is dependent upon the good health of its human resources.

The picture is different in underdeveloped areas in which two thirds of the world's population live. There, the infant mortality rate is 11 percent, while life expectancy is an average 48 years. Diseases which we in America long ago erad-

icated still rage in epidemic proportions—not only the traditional killers, but also simple childhood diseases are fatal or crippling. Measles, for example, kills one afflicted West African child in five, while it leaves many survivors blind or deaf. One out of every four Africans stricken dies of smallpox.

The age structure of an unhealthy population may yield twice the number of mouths to feed, as it does hands to work, because of the smaller proportion that survive to enter the productive age. A large percentage of children are fed and housed and educated only to die before reaching an age at which they can contribute to the economy that supported them. This situation is further aggravated by the fact that the productivity of the survivors is reduced by the same diseases or deficiencies that kill their dependents who have never produced.

Therefore, the major contributions of health programs to economic development are to carry the population through the productive years and, at the same time, to increase productivity by the significant reduction of illness and the building of stronger bodies. If the object of our foreign aid is to help weak nations become strong, viable economies, one of our main efforts must be directed toward the support of their irreplaceable human resources. This is why AID has increased its programs of assistance dramatically in the area of health, working for the greater productivity and better life which good health makes possible.

Apart from the major work being done in the field of family planning and population growth, AID's health programs fall into three main categories: First, helping to reduce and ultimately to solve the problem of malnutrition, above all in mothers and children; second, assisting in the control and eradication of communicable disease; and third, helping the poor nations to find and train their own health workers.

NUTRITION

During the past year the world has been horrified by the deaths of 1 million people—mostly children—in the Nigeria-Biafra conflict. These deaths were not the result of bullets or bombs. They were caused by starvation and malnutrition.

And in the United States we have been especially appalled and ashamed by the disclosure that 14 million Americans are malnourished. For this to occur in the world's most affluent nation is incongruous and outrageous.

But malnutrition anywhere is unnecessary—in the 20th century. It need not and should not exist. It will not exist, if we provide the proper support for measures being taken to end malnutrition. We have the means to end it.

It is estimated that throughout the world 10,000 deaths per day are caused directly or indirectly by malnutrition. But the foreign assistance programs aimed at wiping out this statistic are not solely humanitarian—although that would be justification enough. These programs are also a means to an end—economic development.

For malnutrition affects learning ca-

capacity; it reduces productivity; it increases the frequency and duration of illness. It saps the strength of a people, and this retards the pace of economic and social progress.

Nutrition thus extends beyond the province of the dietitian and specialist. It becomes the concern of the economist, the educator, the agriculturist, the doctor, the lawmaker.

The Agency for International Development has recognized this. AID carries on a number of important programs aimed at ending malnutrition. One of these, of course, is the direct feeding of more than 50 million children in 105 countries. These children are not only getting the calories they need through the food-for-peace feeding programs, but through additives such as CSM—corn-soya-milk—they are getting the vital proteins required for health. Other high-protein food blends are being introduced, as, for example, WSM—wheat-soya-milk. And AID has taken the lead in developing FPC—fish protein concentrate—which is even higher in protein content than vegetable products.

AID works with and helps finance voluntary agencies in the school lunch and material feeding programs. AID also is encouraging private investment in the nutrition field, helping American firms develop foods and beverages that use indigenous products in the developing countries.

AID financed research projects are seeking new ways of fortifying foods with amino acids. And, most significantly, AID is helping researchers find ways of breeding strains of wheat, corn, and rice that carry their own high-protein content.

These are exciting programs and projects. They will be of immense benefit to the entire world. They should be encouraged and strengthened—so that malnutrition no longer will be the reason for a child's death, here or in Africa, or anywhere in the world.

DISEASE ERADICATION

Another major objective is the control and eradication of disease. In this area, AID plans to continue working with other government and international health organizations such as WHO and UNICEF, to combat the ravages of smallpox, cholera, measles, sleeping sickness, and other diseases on a worldwide scale. In the hot, often damp climates where most of the people of the poor nations live, disease travels like wildfire, crossing national boundaries and spreading contagion rapidly among hundreds of thousands of people who live in unsanitary, primitive conditions. Hence inoculation on a mass scale must be combined with specific research and technical projects, to identify sources of contagion and then to isolate and eliminate these sources, rather than simply containing them. At the same time, a basic education and information program must be conducted, to instruct real and potential victims in self-protection against future attacks of the same or similar diseases.

Typical of the projects in which AID has been cooperating is the West African vaccination program. The goals of this

program include the immunization of 110 million people against smallpox and the eradication of rinderpest among cattle in the region.

These are only a few of the better known epidemic diseases which AID is fighting. Many people have never heard of the others, but among them are some which have far more severe economic effects on the less-developed countries than diseases like measles. Onchocerciasis, or river blindness, alone infects 20 million people and prevents the settlement of some of the most fertile river valleys in Africa.

At the same time, enteric diseases are a major cause of death in developing countries, resulting from contaminated water and poor sanitation. Supplies of drinkable water and adequate sewage disposal are the only effective and economical solutions to this problem. AID has been working with the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, and international lending agencies and banks, to install or expand community water supply systems in a number of countries, and to train professional waterworks operators to maintain them.

MANPOWER FOR HEALTH

In regard to AID's third major health goal, it is clear that if health is a key to sound and rapid development, well-trained manpower is the key to effective public health systems. In the past 10 years, AID's efforts in the health manpower field have concentrated in higher education, facilities for producing a greater number of doctors and nurses in developing nations, and hospital construction.

But the more critical immediate obstacle to rapid and significant improvement in health conditions is the shortage of auxiliary workers or paramedical personnel, of trained technicians below the professional level, who are sufficiently skilled to be effective, particularly in rural areas remote from cities and doctors. AID has redesigned the emphasis of its assistance to help remove this obstacle, chiefly a problem in organizing and training on a scale commensurate with need. In Laos, for example, where there are almost 26,000 people per doctor, health workers are receiving short-term training as medical aides and in practical skills, enabling them to man health stations in remote rural areas. Mobile teams are an additional feature of similar programs in neighboring Thailand. In addition to providing basic health services, these workers also assist in better nutrition, family planning, and disease control through elementary sanitation.

Which brings us to the problem of education.

Americans are frequently being warned these days, "You cannot get tomorrow's jobs with today's skills."

That slogan is quite true of course. But there is another and meaningful message in it that applies not only in our own Nation but to conditions beyond our own shores. We have under training in less-developed nations of the world, many people who do not even have yesterday's skills, the basic skills needed to lift them

above the level of a life of mere subsistence. Many can neither read nor write.

No matter how many dollars we spend helping less-developed countries build up industry and agriculture, without education for their people they can gain no real self-sufficiency, no political stability, no democracy, and no future.

That is why our foreign aid program stresses a continuing spread of knowledge.

During fiscal 1969, AID committed about \$115 million for education and manpower training in developing countries. The Agency is helping to strengthen educational planning and increase and upgrade the supply of teachers and teaching materials. AID is continuing to support development of educational facilities to serve regional and multicountry needs. Strong efforts in this direction are being made in both East Asia and Africa.

Some 430,000 students attended college level AID-assisted schools in fiscal 1969. Over 60,000 teachers complete their courses during the year. Just over 19,000 teachers received inservice training with AID help. Some 22 million students below the college level were enrolled in AID-assisted schools. About 10,000 classrooms were constructed with financial support from AID and over 17 million textbooks and other technical publications were either produced or distributed with AID assistance.

In India and Pakistan, AID continued to encourage science education with special summer science institutes. Over 20,000 Indian teachers at the college and polytechnic levels have received training since fiscal 1964. Six thousand were trained in fiscal 1969. An arrangement with the National Science Foundation is providing information on low-cost laboratory equipment which can be produced within the developing countries.

In support of innovations in education the Agency has provided additional funding for an educational TV project in El Salvador. This pilot project should bring about the most comprehensive reform of education yet begun in a developing country.

AID, in cooperation with the Organization of American States, is developing a series of regional training centers in educational broadcasting. Planning for a similar regional center in Southeast Asia is well advanced. The Agency has also made arrangements for a major feasibility study to explore the use of programmed instruction in India and Pakistan.

In promoting self-help, a plan is now in effect for the Association of African Universities to take over the administration of the African higher education program through which the Agency supports study by African students in selected fields at African universities.

We are not only helping to build both educational structures within the developing countries—AID is bringing promising students to the United States to learn. This year there are about 10,000 foreign students studying in the United States—potential leaders in the fields of agriculture, education, public administration, health and family planning, public safety, and industry and transporta-

tion. Their average age is between 30 and 35. About half come from Asia, one-fifth from Africa, and a third from Latin America, and their average training period in the United States is 9 to 12 months. About half who come here are on academic programs, 25 percent on shorter specialized programs, 15 percent are on-the-job training, and 10 percent on observation training programs.

This is a kind of world university—whose faculty are the training and education facilities of American universities and colleges, American industry, American labor, American cooperatives, American foundations, American farmer associations, American government; an international university—whose students come from about 70 developing countries; and whose administration is handled by AID in cooperation with about 35 other Federal agencies and hundreds of private institutions across the United States.

There remains much to do in expanding, and giving greater priority to cooperative Government-private sector endeavors in "closing the worldwide learning gap."

This program combines low cost to the U.S. taxpayer and a potential for highest benefit to every country involved.

It is a program which can over the years do much to increase political and economic stability and well-being in the emerging nations of the world.

The argument that foreign aid technical assistance is a giveaway which hurts the U.S. economy is not true. The foreign assistance program pumps money into our economy and buys American goods and services which are sent abroad while the money stays home.

Except for assistance to Latin America, AID regulations require that almost all commodities financed by AID development loans and supporting assistance loans or grants must be purchased from U.S. sources. As a result, about 98 percent of the commodities financed by AID in fiscal 1969 were purchased from U.S. manufacturers. The total amount of money which these manufacturers received was well over \$887 million.

These funds purchased such varied products as fertilizer, industrial machinery, steel, paper, tractors, oil, and textiles. American shipping lines earned millions of dollars from carrying these products to their destinations. One result of all this is the creation of permanent markets for future cash exports.

AID's technical service contracts give a further boost to our economy. As of December 31, 1968, AID had in effect over a thousand technical service contracts with private American institutions, companies, and individuals. The value of these contracts was \$508 million.

Dollars return to the United States in interest payments and capital repayments on loans made in the past. In the current fiscal year, it is estimated that this net inflow of dollars under the AID program will total \$197 million. The inflow will increase as receipts from interest and repayments continue to rise.

The U.S. economy benefits in another way from the AID program. Poor countries are poor markets for American

exports. International development greatly expands the base of foreign trade. U.S. exports to Iran, Israel, and Taiwan—countries on the AID roles just a few years ago—doubled between 1963 and 1968.

In conclusion, the foreign economic and technical assistance is part of our national concept of decency and Christianity, we help the sick, the malnourished, the poor, and oppressed. In this Christmas season it seems fitting to remember Christ's words:

As ye have done unto the least of these, ye have done it unto Me.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to put some questions to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, concerning the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

From what I read and understand, I take it that it is the will of the subcommittee that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation be not established. Would the gentleman comment upon that?

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, the subcommittee and the full committee have provided for the Agency to be established, but we did not provide the \$75 million requested for the Guaranty Fund. I can tell you why, and I am sure this was never brought to the attention of the gentleman from Indiana.

The agency has been attempting to promote this particular account for many, many years. A few years ago they came before the committee and stated they needed \$180 million. They actually made a very poor case for the \$180 million, so we cut them \$150 million and gave them \$30 million.

Since the creation of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation the amount of appropriated funds and fees collected gives the agency an amount on hand at this time of \$129,972,000. They have paid out in claims during that entire 20-year period only \$11,820,000. So on the basis of the record, they are presently funded for a period of 258 years and 4 months. They said to us that they would not spend the money but if we would appropriate it, it would look more attractive to American business people who wanted to invest abroad, even though all the accounts would already be guaranteed by the faith and credit of the Federal Government. That is in the hearings.

Furthermore, the second part of it, they wanted to transfer \$20 million per year for 5 years out of repayments to the development loan funds so as to create a \$100 million lending agency. We felt that inasmuch as we had 39 other agencies attempting to make loans for overseas investment and recognizing that under the Alliance for Progress and also on the development loan program 50 percent of the total funds can be used for this purpose alone, that there was no need for the additional \$75 million.

For that matter, if we run the gambit we will find out there are 39 different sources of revenue for people who may

want to invest in businesses overseas. Experience certainly teaches, and the record backed us up in prior years, that most businesses have their own capital. We found that some of the applications were from businesses who were semi-insolvent, and in all probability should not go overseas anyway. So for many reasons the committee did not recommend these funds. But in a subsequent year, if there could be established the types of businesses and the type of credit and the type of security and the type of need, if I am still on the committee, whether I am chairman or not, I would be very happy to consider anything the gentleman recommends.

Mr. ADAIR. Let me put the question to the gentleman in a different way. Is it not true that the action of the committee has made impossible the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation?

Mr. PASSMAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. ADAIR. That is, as provided in the authorizing legislation?

Mr. PASSMAN. No. If the gentleman will turn to page 4 of the bill, beginning on line 8, he will see that the agency has been authorized. It is in the bill itself, not in the report.

Mr. ADAIR. Then is it true that all funds have been denied to that agency?

Mr. PASSMAN. At this time. That is, the guaranty fund of \$75 million.

Mr. ADAIR. So at best what we would have would be an agency without any funds with which to operate.

Mr. PASSMAN. They have \$130 million, and under this legislation there are certain ways to use it, and inasmuch as they have 258 years' supply of money, we just did not feel like loading the account with any further funds.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana his interpretation of the effect of section 122 of the bill, on page 15.

Mr. PASSMAN. Under this section, it was intended to establish \$100 million as a revolving fund, to be funded out repayments to the development loan fund, and to transfer \$20 million per year over to this new revolving fund.

Mr. ADAIR. We provided 2 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that not true?

Mr. ADAIR. The proposal was for five, and we provided two.

Mr. PASSMAN. We did not feel the witnesses made any reasonable justification for the fund. Therefore, the committee, by a very one-sided vote, denied it, and the full committee also denied it.

Inasmuch as we have so many lending agencies, and inasmuch as the President is impounding 75 percent of all funds for new starts, it would appear to me this new lending agency could be postponed until we do have better conditions in this country, and not create a brandnew agency overnight to do what other agencies are already doing. If we had any justification as to what types of loans and what businesses and in what amounts, we could have given some consideration to it, but these people did not know anything about it whatsoever.

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I make

the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

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

[Roll No. 308]

Abbitt	Fuqua	Nichols
Addabbo	Gettys	O'Hara
Brademas	Gray	Ottinger
Broyhill, N.C.	Gude	Powell
Broyhill, Va.	Hays	Reid, N.Y.
Cahill	Hébert	Reifel
Carey	Hogan	Riegle
Celler	Hosmer	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Jarman	Ruppe
Clark	Kirwan	Scheuer
Clay	Kyl	Taft
Cowger	Landrum	Tunney
Cramer	Lipscomb	Utt
Dawson	Macdonald,	Vander Jagt
Downing	Mass.	Whalley
Eilberg	Maillard	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	Charles H.
Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.	Wylder
Flowers	Myers	Young
Fulton, Tenn.	Nelsen	

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. 15149, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 376 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to add to your store of knowledge but to explain that the remarks which have been made by our distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts and New Jersey, I share them completely.

In relation to the report, I would hope that the members of the committee will take the time to read the additional views of our colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), a member of the committee, who speaks to the general problem of foreign aid and where we are going.

I will say to the Committee that I have learned a great deal while serving on this committee under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana. Much which the gentleman has said about this bill is unfortunately quite true. It has become a bag of worms.

I am very happy that the Rudy Peterson Commission headed by the distinguished chairman of the Bank of America is currently studying the foreign aid program. I feel confident, on the basis of the conversations which I have had with some of the people involved in that study, that we will come out one of these days, hopefully, with a development loan program and an assistance program that will be directed solely to the problems of developing nations. In addition it is my hope that military assistance will be transferred to the Department of Defense where it belongs. If this is done we would not be involved in the kind of hassle we are having here today over proper legislative methods.

It seems obvious to me that there should be a supplemental appropriation where at the end of the year we could have hearings. Or better still, it could be put over until next session. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot do this in an orderly legislative manner. Then there would be no doubt about whether or not this is a required military program.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. I want to say to the gentleman that not too long ago and during the discussion this afternoon there was reference to the secret report on China and it was alleged that this report gave support to the idea that we needed this \$55 million for Taiwan.

I want to advise the gentleman that I for one have read the report and find that the report does not support the \$55 million for Taiwan for jets. If one reads it one will find that other items are given a higher priority than the jets authorized or contemplated in the bill now pending before us.

I do not know if the gentleman from California has had the time during which to read the report, but I would recommend it to him.

Mr. COHELAN. I have heard of the report in the committee and I have had the opportunity to listen to the distinguished gentleman, but I am much less impressed by supporting arguments—I only wish I had heard a little from Mr. LAIRD and Mr. ROGERS on it. This whole thing has been so informal that it is shocking.

May I say to the committee that I am not against military assistance if we can justify it. Certainly there may be a case for it.

With reference to the Korean situation there has been some discussion with men whom I greatly admire about the Korean item. I have been to Korea enough times to know that there has been an argument going on for some years about whether or not we ought to keep 60,000 troops in Korea. As the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) points out in his separate views, we had better commence "Koreanizing" there as we are "Vietnamizing" in Vietnam. Instead we have this amendment dropped in our lap. The question of deleting \$50 million by subcommittee action, in striking it out, was more than justified. I am merely arguing on a procedural basis that the money for Korea and Taiwan was not adequately justified because I do not have enough time to develop the foreign policy questions thoroughly.

Might I say in one final pleading comment, this bill is measured far too much on the basis of our feelings about an ad hoc Taiwan amendment and I would hope that we can defeat the amendment at the appropriate time and go ahead and pass the other important provisions contained in the bill.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to ask the

members of the committee to give me your attention for just 1 minute. I intend to propose at the appropriate time a restoration of the funds which have been cut from the UNDP program. The committee report refers to the Pearson Commission and it points out the fact and says that this program is being operated at too tight a pace.

At the appropriate time I will give you the explanation for this. I have discussed it with the authorities, and they told me what is going to happen if we cut this International Organization's item by \$34 million. We will, of course, seriously cripple one of the most important programs in the foreign aid bill if we sustain the cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out in regard to the claims again, and again I urge everyone in the House to read this so-called secret document. There you will see that the author of the letter, at the request of the chairman of our subcommittee, who called him by phone, stated that that should come through the supplemental process, and he makes no mention of this.

Also I might point out that there is an article in the Washington Post of November 25 by Warren Unna, wherein he says that Rogers and Hannah "reserved judgment on an added \$54.5 million, which Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, a major general in the reserve, had succeeded in tacking onto the House foreign aid bill to authorize granting a squadron of F-4D fighter jets for Chiang Kai-shek's government on Taiwan."

Also, I think it is no secret, it is just unfortunate, this document has been floating around the House all day long, but there is nothing in there about F-4D's, is there?

Mr. COHELAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to what the gentleman said. I think, if I may say this, that it will be a grave error for us to get involved in this at this time. I plead with the Members to go through the regular process. It seems to me it is vital to get supporting testimony on this. We have not heard from the State Department officially. A number of us have heard from them unofficially.

It should be no secret about what is happening in the new administration in its formulation of its foreign policy for the Far East. We are taking another look at our posture. There are a number of changes that are pending, and they are long overdue. The whole question of Okinawa, the recent Sato agreements, are very important developments, and it probably is the first step in what is eventually going to be the low posture that many of us have been talking about.

So that, when we take precipitous action on the spur of the moment on the floor because some people genuinely feel

there is a need for jets for Taiwan, I think we make a terrible mistake; I think it is bad legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to spend the rest of my time on this item of the United Nations development program. I am going to ask for your support. I have talked to the parties involved, and they explained to me that there were two major studies; they are over 3 years old, but they find an enormous need for these programs. And what Mr. Hoffman has done is to keep manning his programs at an even pace and he is not going too fast. However, if we are going to cut this program, it will seriously cripple one of the best programs in the whole foreign-aid bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the executive branch of the Government establishes its foreign policy, and military assistance is a part of it. When that policy has been established then the level at which we shall fund the military assistance is a prerogative of the Congress. I make that as a statement of fact.

We have heard remarks about no justification for this small amount of money but this is only a very small percentage of the amount needed to update the military forces in China.

Some of the speakers gave a lot of support to amendments of as much as a billion dollars in one bill without any justification whatsoever. The total amount put in the President's budget without any justifications in other programs amounts to in excess of \$2 billion.

Now I would never recommend for this Committee's consideration anything that was not supported with facts. This top secret document has material in it that I cannot use—and Members know that. But I am going to say again, upon my own honor, and I shall not give the source, that the need for China is almost \$400 million—immediately—and not \$54,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot go any further into detail because this top-secret document was sent to me. If we had hearings, it could not have been put in the record.

If we are going to fuss about not any hearings on something that is badly needed, I am wondering why that criteria did not apply to all of these other items when they were loading up this bill.

There are about seven projects in this bill that were put in by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We had not one word of testimony before our committee for these programs. But we put them in because the Committee on Foreign Affairs felt those projects were needed.

So I ask you to follow the recommendations of the committee. The subcommittee put it in—the full committee put it in—and the House put it in a few days ago simply because we had proof then that it was needed and we have more proof now that it is very badly needed.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope the Members will back the committee up in its recommendations.

Mr. PASSMAN. How much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) 3 minutes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COVERAGE OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, in a few weeks, if our present plans materialize, the special subcommittee of the Committee on Rules expects to come to the floor with a bill which would provide among other things for opening the House to radio and television coverage.

I expect to be arguing at that time in defense of the electronic media, but in fairness to the House I feel it is incumbent on me to call to the attention of the House those instances in which I feel the broadcasters for one reason or another have strayed off the reservation.

Last week it was my privilege—and I use the word advisedly—to have some fun with the Rowan and Martin "Laugh-In" show.

This week I call to your attention what I believe to be an unwarranted insult to the entire membership of the House of Representatives which occurred on the "Huntley-Brinkley Report" last Saturday. During a segment of less than a minute duration, Mr. Brinkley reported on the action of the other body in amending the tax reform and commented on the possibility that the President would veto the bill in the shape it was in at the time. He pointed out the bill would have to go to conference with the House and then stated that since "the House seems more determined to bleed the taxpayers than the Senate does" some of the Senate benefits would no doubt be removed from the bill.

We requested a copy of the script for the show to make sure we heard it correctly, and on examination of this script, I am unable to find anything in it which would justify a comment that the House of Representatives, or the other body either for that matter is inclined to "bleed the taxpayers."

Let me make it clear that I defend Mr. Brinkley's right to accuse the Congress of bleeding the taxpayers. He can take the whole half-hour show to do it, or he can do it in a 2-hour special in prime time if he chooses. But it seems to me that if he is going to do so, he should give his viewers some examples of House actions which lead him to that conclusion or in some fashion indicate why he believes the House is guilty of bleeding the people of this country. That way the viewers would be at least partially equipped to evaluate the validity of the conclusion reached.

This statement appears to be entirely gratuitous. It is unrelated to anything that preceded or followed it in the Saturday night newscast. It cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called an analysis of the news because no action of the House relating to tax matters is

reported or analyzed or examined in depth or in any fashion at all.

I consider this statement an insult to the House and to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

All of us, of course, recognize that the tax reform bill which passed the House is not perfect, but it represents a substantial improvement over the present tax laws and in some respects goes further to help the "little guy" than the Senate bill does.

I never really realized the impact of national network television until I had an encounter with the "Laugh-In" show. As a result of that brief encounter I have received more mail than I received following President Nixon's October speech on Vietnam. Most of it is critical, and some of it is highly abusive. In my judgment, Mr. Brinkley's unjustified attack on the integrity of the House does a great disservice to all of us and I for one resent it.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD at this point the script of the portion of the Huntley-Brinkley Show to which I refer:

EXCERPT FROM REPORT

The Senate spent all day Saturday voting amendments to the so-called tax reform bill . . . including some the Treasury says will cost the government too much money.

In fact, it says the benefits put in by the Senate this week will cost the government 12 billion dollars.

And so there was some talk President Nixon might veto it . . . on grounds it wouldn't give the government enough money to spend.

Senator Williams of Delaware even said they ought to change the name of the bill and call it The Christmas Tree Act of 1969.

But . . . before any of this becomes law it all has to go to a conference with the House . . . and the House seems more determined to bleed the taxpayers than the Senate does . . . and a lot of the benefits now in the bill may then be removed.

And so there is some doubt in the Senate that when it's all finished, the President will veto it.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is not alluding to the fickle finger of fate, is he?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman can make up his own mind.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the term "foreign aid" for this legislation is a huge fraud, and any resemblance between the objectives of this bill and the overall long-range needs of developing nations must be the result of some mistake.

With this bill as a guide, America's commitment to helping developing countries becomes a mockery—both in its degree and in its direction.

For example, in a report published in September by the prestigious Committee for Economic Development—which was distributed to all Members of this body by my friend from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN)—the following analysis was made dealing with capacities of de-

veloped nations to supply assistance to developing economies:

The capacity to provide assistance is generally related to some measure of the capital-supplying countries' total income. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964 recommended that the combined public and private flows from advanced countries should equal at least one per cent of their national income. Then in 1968 it increased the target to one per cent of gross national products, or by more than one-fifth.

Although both formulas are completely arbitrary, they are easily understood visible targets and are the only ones on which the agreement of the capital-supplying countries could be reached. The formulas would moreover, produce the \$15 billion to \$20 billion of requirements estimated for the early 1970's. The first figure corresponds roughly to one per cent of the anticipated national income of the non-Communist industrial countries in the early 1970's and the second to one per cent of their GNP.

By comparison, the total net flow (public and private) in 1968 was 0.97 per cent of combined national income and 0.77 per cent of GNP for the 16 member countries of OECD's Development Assistance Committee. The United States ranked thirteenth among the DAC countries in 1968 in terms of the percentage of national income flowing to developing countries in the form of net official (governmental) flows and private investment. Our outlays for space exploration are substantially greater than official expenditures for economic assistance, and our outlays for national defense are over 20 times those for such foreign assistance.

We believe that a good basis for planning the future annual flow of official and private assistance of the advanced countries including that of the United States would be one per cent of national income initially, and ultimately one per cent of GNP. By 1970, an increase from the 1968 level of 0.79 per cent of national income to one per cent should be feasible for the total flow from the United States. Beyond 1970 the flow of resources to developing countries should increase at a rate that would permit the target of one per cent of GNP to be met by 1975.

A one per cent target would not imply a tax burden on the United States equivalent to the full amount of resource transfers. For one thing, more than a third of current resource transfers from the United States are in the form of private investment. For another, the bulk of the official flows is in the form of loans that will ultimately be repaid and some of which are financed not through taxation but through borrowing on the private capital market.

Mr. Chairman, if we take the Committee for Economic Development recommendation as the minimal level of U.S. development assistance, this bill should be asking for appropriation of at least \$9 billion—instead of the measly \$1 billion of this legislation which might be primarily for economic development purposes.

Such neglect by this country is shameful. Virtually every other developed nation in the world devotes more of its resources on a proportional basis for development than we do. And, of course, the situation becomes even more ludicrous when we realize that our foreign aid development commitment continues to decline year after year.

I stress development because it is obvious that this "foreign aid" bill has so little to do with development—at least in economic terms. Instead—and once again—the establishment tacks the "aid"

label onto its schemes of military support and adventurism throughout the world.

It does not surprise me when this body slashes away at development aid at the same time it adds on new weapon giveaways for some of our entrenched totalitarian "friends." I am not surprised, but I am depressed.

America's commitment to the third world is in urgent need of major revision. My vote today against this appropriation is aimed at the structuring of our aid program—not because I am opposed to assisting development, but because I strongly believe our present attempts are patronizing and ill conceived.

As long as the practice continues of including military aid in with economic assistance, I shall not support any foreign aid legislation. Congress must realize that massive military aid programs rarely are positive actions toward economic development in recipient countries. Military aid tends to reinforce misallocations of resources away from areas of infrastructural economic growth and into wasteful assemblages of military paraphernalia.

As an alternative to the type of "aid package" we are considering today, I would prefer much more emphasis on multilateral assistance, and greater help in the key area of population control and family planning.

I certainly would vote for this bill if I thought it was in the best long-range interests of both the United States and the developing nations. It is not and I will not.

This is another legislative tool of the military complex and their friends, and I refuse to support their dangerous and tragic policies.

I am for foreign economic development aid, but this is not it at all.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15149, the foreign aid appropriations bill. Normally, my support for this legislation would be strong; but I find it difficult to applaud a bill which sets a new low of \$1.6 billion or less than 0.25 percent of our gross national product for the U.S. foreign assistance program.

Yesterday, this House passed by an overwhelming margin a bill appropriating a total of nearly \$70 billion to the Defense Department. Of that \$70 billion, \$1.5 billion—or roughly the amount we will be spending for foreign assistance in this fiscal year—is earmarked for Marine personnel alone. For "operations and maintenance," in the Defense Department, we will be spending more than \$20 billion—or 12 times the amount we have allocated for foreign aid in the coming year. I submit that this investment in war rather than constructive economic assistance programs is just one more indication of the upside priorities of this body.

Three aspects of the measure we are considering today are, in my judgment, cause for considerable concern. The most disturbing cuts in the bill were those made in the programs of the Alliance for Progress, through which we assist our neighbors in Latin America in the development process. In the early years of the

Alliance, this country allocated approximately \$1.1 billion annually to investment in the nations of this hemisphere. In 1967, following the Conference at Punta del Este, President Johnson requested that that amount be increased by \$300 million annually, to a total of roughly \$1.4 billion annually. The bill we have before us today provides a mere \$275 million—roughly one-fifth of that amount—for loans and grants for the Alianza in fiscal 1970.

It is true that the United States contributes to development in Latin America through programs other than those contained in this bill, including the food-for-peace program and loans made through the Inter-American Development Bank. But it remains true that U.S. assistance to Latin America has shown a catastrophic decline in recent years, a decline which will surely hold back developments in agriculture, education, and family planning—areas in which multilateral organizations provide little assistance, making the U.S. contribution increasingly important. The President has called for "action for progress" in the Americas. Are we, the Congress, to preclude the action needed in the coming decade by refusing to provide the necessary funds? I would hope that we will not fall back on our commitment in this manner.

Another distressing cut is that made by the Appropriations Committee in the U.S. 1970 contribution to multilateral organizations. As my colleagues may recall, this body authorized a total allocation of \$122,620,000 for multilateral organizations, of which it was expected that \$100 million would go to the United Nations development program. The committee in its wisdom has cut the total appropriation for multilateral organizations to \$88.8 million, with \$12 million of that amount earmarked for the United Nations Children's Fund—UNICEF. It is currently estimated that the U.S. contribution to the U.N. development program will therefore be held to the fiscal 1969 level of \$71 million.

In my judgment, it would be a tragic mistake not to restore full funding for U.S. contributions to multilateral organizations and thus make possible a contribution of the full \$100 million to the UNDP. According to Mr. Paul Hoffman, administrator of the program, the U.S. contribution of \$71 million in fiscal 1969 helped trigger additional contributions of approximately \$425 million from other sources. It is estimated that a U.S. contribution of \$100 million for fiscal year 1970, along with the \$138 million already pledged by other donor countries and the \$20 million expected from interest payments and other sources, could generate \$500 million—funds which could have an important impact on the development of the 122 countries which participate in the program.

In my judgment, the United Nations development program is playing a vital role in economic modernization of many countries of the world. Certainly I think any serious student of the UNDP would dispute the Pearson Commission report's statement, with regard to the UNDP and the specialized agencies, that—

Their operating capacity now . . . seems strained to the limit.

Mr. Hoffman and his staff appear to be doing a superb job, and I would hope that the Members will support the amendment being offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) later today, which would restore full funding for this program.

My colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), and the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) have already called the other major problem to your attention in a letter to all the Members. That is the inclusion of \$54.5 million for the gift of jets to Nationalist China—a gift which has been neither requested nor justified by the President, the State Department, AID, or the Defense Department. Furthermore, it is my understanding that none of the agencies involved desires that these jets be given to Nationalist China, and in view of that fact, I would hope that my colleagues will support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) to strike the appropriation for this gift from the bill.

I recognize the futility of the attempts to restore funds to H.R. 15149, and I therefore urge the Members to support the bill in its present form, without any additional cuts. However, I would hope that the Congress will act more responsibly next year and once again begin to meet the Nation's obligation to the less developed countries of the world.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this foreign aid bill because it fails to meet a minimal standard of morality and decency in American foreign policy.

I have been a strong supporter of foreign aid in the past. It was my hope that we would develop a prudent program which would clearly express our Nation's commitment to help developing countries help themselves. It was my hope that America would take world leadership in preventing starvation, poverty and the desperation which would ultimately lead to violence and war.

It was also my earnest hope that our foreign aid program would be utilized to actively support freedom and free governments. From what I can determine, the overwhelming portion of these foreign aid funds are destined for military dictatorships and antidemocratic governments. Foreign aid funds should be used to inspire freedom and free enterprise and not to smother it.

This bill is fatally defective in appropriating \$54½ million to provide an additional squadron of jet fighters for Chang Kai-shek and his government of Taiwan. The American people should seek to learn more about the combination of forces, foreign and domestic, which skillfully organized such a coup at the taxpayers expense.

On the other hand, a decent and proper move to increase development loan funds to provide dignified self-help was quickly turned aside. Where have our priorities gone?

Last night, President Nixon, in a matter-of-fact tone, admitted that our country was paying for the services of "volunteers" from Thailand, Korea, and

in South Vietnam. These "volunteers" are hired mercenaries and "hired" allies.

My fear is that most of the revenue appropriated under this bill will be diverted to the war effort rather than to urgent human needs. If foreign aid is to be war aid, it belongs in the defense budget.

The time is at hand for a complete review of the foreign aid program and its place in American foreign policy. The administration of foreign aid must meet our moral responsibilities in the world rather than offend them.

Our experience in Vietnam should have set new and positive directions in our foreign policy and the aid program which brings it life.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with the possibility that funds contained in this bill for multilateral organization may ultimately be allocated to hostile Communist nations, including Hanoi. To me it would be an inexcusable act to tax Americans to pay those who kill, maim, and imprison American youths. I trust that the committee has explored this possibility and has provided safeguards to insure against such an actuality.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 authorized \$40,000,000 for the U.S. share in the development of a prototype desalting plant for Israel as part of a dual-purpose power and desalting project.

The authorized amount of \$40,000,000 was determined after full consideration by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and in the light of the recommendation for \$40,000,000 made last January by the Department of the Interior.

I regret that the foreign assistance appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970 has cut the authorization by 50 percent—to \$20,000,000.

I believe that the desalination plant should be funded to the full level. The proposed plant is important, not only to the immediate water needs of Israel, but also to the development of facilities and techniques for dealing with the problems which have to be solved in order to use sea water to make up for the water shortage in many areas of the world.

The concept of such a project has had support since 1964, when President Johnson announced a joint United States-Israel program of research and development. A year later, the American-Israel Desalting Board reported that a facility was technically feasible, and that it could produce the water and electricity needed by Israel.

In 1967 I first introduced legislation to authorize such a project.

In January 1969, President Johnson promised Premier Levi Eskol support for the plant's construction, and on January 17, 1969, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Max Edwards sent a bill to Congress similar to mine and recommended \$40,000,000.

Although my original bill had proposed a plant which would be capable of producing 100 to 150 million gallons of fresh water daily, the plant authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 will produce 40 million gallons a day, which will surpass any desalting plant in existence

today. There is no desalination plant with a capacity over 7.5 million gallons daily, although there is one under construction which will be able to handle 20 million gallons daily.

Both Israel and the United States will benefit. It will aid Israel to cultivate land which presently lies arid; it will contribute toward a stable Middle East by creating more arable land and by producing jobs, and it will enable Israel to maintain her industrial and economic growth in the 1970's.

At the same time our own saline water conversion program will benefit from the development of this plant. Techniques for desalination will be developed at a reasonable cost.

Full funding of the authorization is in the public interest, and I hope the other body will vote the \$40,000,000 which has been authorized.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I would first like to say a special word of commendation for our subcommittee's distinguished and dedicated chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), and our extremely able ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), for the capable leadership they have afforded our group as we have endeavored to evaluate and assess foreign assistance requests for fiscal 1970. In view of the enormity of our Nation's aid commitments throughout the world—to 99 countries and five territories in 1970—and the increasing domestic needs here at home during a period when it is necessary to curtail Federal expenditures wherever possible because of continuing inflationary pressures, this annual reappraisal has been a most difficult task, to say the least; and we are fortunate to have the special knowledge and experience these gentlemen contribute to this discussion. I believe that the hearing record this year as well as the committee report gives all of us a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of our foreign assistance program. I consider it an honor and a privilege to serve with anyone on the subcommittee.

Few Government programs over the past 20 years have aroused as much controversy both in and out of Congress as foreign aid, and this year is certainly no exception. At a time when we are being called upon to provide more Federal aid to support educational needs, to provide help in curbing pollution of our streams and rivers, and to help solve a myriad of problems such as housing, welfare needs, hunger, manpower training, and means of mass transportation that plague our own cities and rural areas, it behooves all of us to take a long, hard look at any request for additional foreign aid funds. I did not support the Foreign Assistance Act authorization bill when it was passed by the House of Representatives on November 20 because of urgent domestic needs and the fact that I am sincerely concerned about our budgetary problems in this country and the need to reduce expenditures in order to help curb inflation

and provide relief for our overburdened taxpayers.

A main question raised is how far our Nation should go in continuing to share its resources with the world when our own public debt now stands at more than \$361 billion, which is some \$57 billion more than the combined public debts of all the other countries. Through June 30, 1969, the United States has extended economic and military assistance, in one form or another, amounting to a net total of \$122 billion—of which only \$27.5 billion is in loans, with the remainder being in grants. In view of the fact that we have had a surplus in our administrative budget only five times since the end of World War II, it has been estimated that it has cost an additional \$60.5 billion in interest on the money we have borrowed to assist other countries. Ironically, three countries which have received substantial U.S. aid—Korea, Thailand, and Taiwan—are now loaning money back to us at a 6 percent interest rate.

An example of the failure of the goals of the foreign aid program can be seen in the case of India. Since 1952, the United States has given this massive and strategic Asian nation more than \$9 billion—about two-thirds of its entire outside assistance. During this time an increasingly militant brand of socialism has continued to squander the aid. The masses of Indians are poorer than ever, industry languishes and an increasing trend toward nationalization does not improve the outlook for the future. At the same time, India consistently opposes the United States in the United Nations and is talking about raising its relations with North Vietnam to the ambassadorial level after a break of seven years. Furthermore, the Indians see nothing wrong in using U.S. funds to reinforce their own multi-million dollar foreign aid programs which gives assistance to such countries as Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Indonesia, Ceylon and Burma, while millions of its own citizens are jobless, homeless, and starving. We should ponder what we have actually achieved in our own national interest by supplying two-thirds of India's foreign aid in the last two decades compared to what Communists have achieved on the basis of the U.S.S.R. supplying 5.5 percent of that same total.

Testimony presented to our committee shows that this year's request for the economic and military assistance program is the lowest since the program began.

However, bits and pieces of both the economic and military programs have been transferred to other departments and agencies, and new agencies and programs have been created over the past several years that now handle programs that were formerly funded by the Foreign Assistance Act or its predecessor acts. A compilation of the various budget requests from January 1, 1969, to the present totaled over \$10.5 billion for foreign assistance in the form of loans, grants and credits—and this scattered throughout the budget.

The bill before us today would provide new budget obligational authority for

foreign assistance activities in the amount of \$1,599,380,000. This is a cut of \$1,110,640,000 from the budget request, and it is \$156.2 million less than the 1969 appropriation of \$1,755,600,000—which to date was the smallest amount since the program began. Certainly the reductions recommended by our subcommittee are giant steps in the right direction, but the fact remains that further cuts could and should be made. Also, there is an estimated \$18.7 billion of unexpended balances in the pipeline available from prior years' appropriations.

On September 24, 1969, President Nixon named a Presidential task force of 16 private citizens, headed by Mr. Rudolph A. Peterson, the president of the Bank of America, to review the foreign aid programs. This action was taken pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, which requested the President to make a thorough and comprehensive reappraisal of U.S. foreign assistance programs, and to submit to the Congress, on or before March 31, 1970, his recommendations for achieving such reforms in and reorganization of future foreign assistance programs as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in the national interest in the light of such reappraisal. In my judgment, pending the report of this task force, we should not appropriate any additional funds because of the backlog of over \$18 billion in the pipeline.

In view of past failings of our foreign assistance programs, I would hope that the task force will come forward with constructive recommendations. I believe that this is a time to unwind the program as we have known it for the past two decades. It seems to me that with the availability of substantial funds in the AID pipeline, it would not seriously jeopardize any essential foreign commitment of our country. Obviously, it may require additional special legislation to deobligate and reprogram some present commitments so that necessary assistance in some areas—particularly to Vietnam—would not be interrupted.

While I support the efforts of my Foreign Operations Subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations to reduce foreign aid spending this year, I personally feel that the fiscal crisis in our own country—which made it necessary for the President to ask for a 75-percent cut in domestic public works projects as well as curtailments in other vitally needed programs—makes it imperative that we go even further in redirecting this program and setting new priorities—so for these reasons, I shall not vote for the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 15149, the foreign assistance appropriation bill for 1970, for substantially the same reasons that I have opposed this same appropriation bill in former years.

While it is true the bill, as reported, carries an appropriation of something over \$2½ billion, this figure is still far out of proportion to any benefit the American taxpayers can receive from such an appropriation. It is true this appropriation bill is over a billion dollars

below the April budget request, meaning the Nixon budget, and is nearly \$400 million below the figure in the authorization bill, and about \$375 million below the appropriations for last year, being fiscal year 1969.

Notwithstanding, the facts are that through June 30, 1969, foreign aid had cost the American taxpayer \$122 billion. It is argued that about \$30 billion of this is in the form of loans and therefore, may at some time be repaid. The facts are, however, that there is no information whether any of these loans have been partially repaid or whether they are being repaid. Just about any way you can slice it, the U.S. taxpayers have been out of pocket a net of nearly \$95 billion for foreign aid since 1948. But that is not all of the story. The really disturbing fact is that in interest alone the cost of the program has been over \$60 billion.

For years I have opposed foreign aid because of its maladministration and the repeated instances of waste of these funds. I have repeated in the past, and I can now reassert that even if there could be established a good case for foreign aid, there is no justification for this appropriation bill because there is an unexpended balance of previously appropriated moneys in the pipeline of approximately \$18 billion. Of course there are those who will offer a rebuttal to this contention by saying that all of these funds are committed. It may be true that they have been earmarked for certain projects but the money has not been actually spent and surely in this year when fiscal restraint is most needed, we could declare a recess for foreign aid appropriations for at least such period of time until these committed but unexpended funds could be used.

As in former years, there are some worthwhile items in the overall foreign aid package. I have always supported the Peace Corps, and there is money in this bill for the Peace Corps, but it is a very small overall percentage of the total. If this bill should be defeated I am sure there would be some type of separate or supplemental appropriation bill to provide for the Peace Corps, and it would receive the support of the majority of the Membership of the Congress.

Again, there is some money which will go to Vietnam as assistance for that country. This, too, should be considered in a separate appropriation and it would undoubtedly receive the support of the Congress. As it is we are not talking about either the Peace Corps or assistance for Vietnam. Instead, in the fiscal 1970 foreign aid appropriation bill, there are funds going to 99 countries.

For those who may be depressed that \$2½ billion is an insufficient sum for foreign aid, their spirits can be revived by the knowledge that this appropriation bill certainly does not include all the bills for foreign aid programs. As it is today, foreign aid has been fragmented and scattered throughout several executive departments. When the funds contained in this bill are included with all of the other separate appropriations for foreign aid, the total will be about \$10½ billion for fiscal 1970. Put in different terminology, there is \$8 billion for foreign aid

outside or beyond that appropriated by H.R. 15149.

Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the hard-pressed American taxpayers, and in further consideration of all our other priorities, the foreign aid appropriation bill for 1970 should be voted down.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against the foreign assistance appropriation bill today for the first time since I have been in Congress.

I oppose the bill, not because of its basic provisions appropriating funds for economic assistance, the United Nations, the Peace Corps, the Asian and Inter-American Bank, IDA and other worthwhile programs of assistance to the developing nations of the world. Quite the contrary, I feel the appropriations for these purposes have been cut shamefully, so far as to endanger the future security of the United States. Assistance to the less-developed nations is the constructive part of our foreign policy. It holds out hope to the deprived people of less-developed nations that their aspirations for a decent standard of living may be achieved under a free society. Today, our accent in approaching these people is far too heavily on threats and use of military force. The drastic cuts in the bilateral economic assistance and international assistance programs leave the United States looking at the rest of the world down the barrel of a gun, virtually eliminating the constructive tools of foreign policy, and leaving us only with military tools.

I oppose the bill today because of the series of amendments and legislative provisions that have been added to it that shift its emphasis from economic assistance to military assistance, from constructive help to free nations aspiring to stand on their own feet to an instrument in the cold war.

I particularly oppose the appropriation of \$54,500,000 to the Republic of China for the purchase of modern war planes not requested by the administration and for which no justification has been made. Indeed, it is only on hearsay from individual Members that there is any evidence of departmental support for the planes at all, and the debate in the House indicates that the State Department has not declared itself at all on this question. No hearings have been held. No apparent justification exists. How and where are these planes to be used? The crucial question remains unanswered.

I oppose military and supporting assistance to dictatorships in Spain, Greece, Haiti, and various less-developed countries. While we are fighting in Vietnam ostensibly to defend the South Vietnamese right of free elections and self-determination, it seems anomalous to donate American treasure to the aid of Government systematically oppressing their citizens and this is particularly wrong in the case of military aid.

I oppose the large amounts in this bill for various aspects of the Vietnamization program in South Vietnam, feeling that support is being given to the repressive military regime of Generals Thieu and Ky without adequate insistence on elimination of corruption, broadening the base of that government, ending the imprisonment of political opponents, and

assuring agricultural and other economic reforms. Every day we are treated to new revelations of how our assistance to that government is diverted into private pockets and Swiss bank accounts. The policy of bolstering the Thieu-Ky regime without insisting on political and economic reform is a bankrupt policy that will result in prolongation of the war.

Finally, I oppose the entire series of legislative restrictions in this appropriations measure. The appropriations committee is supposed merely to fund the programs authorized, not to legislate in the guise of fixing limitations on the use of funds. Various restrictions placed in this bill are likely to require termination of assistance to countries like Pakistan, Burma, Cambodia, Thailand, and the Philippines which will jeopardize our relations with these countries and the stability of Southeast Asia. Other restrictions tie the hands of the administration in its efforts to normalize relations with China. They seek greater efforts to tie U.S. assistance to purchases in the United States, whereas we should be seeking to untie our assistance in conjunction with other developed countries. The tying provisions of our aid cost the recipients dearly. In many cases if agreements could be reached for mutual untying with other developed nations, untying could be accomplished without any adverse balance-of-payments consequences or any diminution of purchases of U.S. goods and services. The legislative restrictions in this bill also wrongly inhibit the freedom of the administration to try to exploit differences between Communist nations and to try to encourage these nations to exercise greater freedom from the Soviet Union and China.

Considering all these factors, I have come to the conclusion that the bad features outweigh the good in this bill and thus, reluctantly, have decided to oppose it. I earnestly hope that these bad features will be eliminated in conference and that I will be able to support the bill as it finally emerges.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, as my voting record over a 12-year timespan in this House will prove, I have always supported our programs of foreign assistance of one kind or another. This support has not always been politically easy to give, since my own constituents—like those, I suppose, of many of my colleagues—have tended to be disillusioned with foreign aid, as such, concentrating on its manifold and spectacular failures more than they have on the realities of global poverty, and the constant threat to world peace that lie inherently therein.

We must, of course, concentrate on our own problems. The same are widespread, complex in nature and costly of solution.

And, yet, we would ignore only at our peril the fact that there are, in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, hundreds of millions of poor people—people who live with hunger and often die of it; people who are pinned down by ignorance and cannot escape from it; people who are open to attack by every form of killing and crippling disease; people whose homes are rural

shacks or urban slums; people whose children move in appalling numbers directly from the cradle to the grave.

The growing frustrations felt by these global poor constitute an explosive force on the world scene greater in potential, one must believe, than even the atomic terrors we have learned to live with should a conflict break out leading to the use of such weapons of warfare.

Throughout my years of service in this body, and my efforts to communicate at least a bit better understanding of this peril to those I endeavor to represent here, I am pleased to have noted what I have felt to be a softening attitude on the part of my constituents toward the necessity for continued programs of foreign assistance in the fields of economic and developmental aid, technical cooperation, and the like. My last district questionnaire indicated, for the first time, that a slim majority supported such programs—and, apparently, understood the reasons why they should be supported—to which support, though not expressly stated, one has to assume those so voting attached a hope that such programs would be more carefully administered and parceled out than they had been in past years.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the moneys as contained in this bill for such programs have been cut to a bare-bones state—substantially below President Nixon's budgetary requests for the same. This was, perhaps, a defensible decision in view of our own economic problems and the urgency of our own domestic problems that concurrently cry out for solution. At least, for me, it was an acceptable decision and, until a few moments ago, I had fully intended to vote for this bill.

However, in the past few hours it has become clear that the mood of the House is a continuing one—that has been exhibited all too often in past years—of preoccupation with our military ventures or interests abroad. Not only is the unasked for money for jets for the Republic of China evidently going to stay in this bill, but also, apparently, an additional \$50 million in military assistance for the Republic of South Korea is going to take its place alongside that dubious item.

In short, Mr. Chairman, what we seem to be producing here is a sort of "supplemental" defense appropriations bill. I could swallow it, perhaps, if we were just considering the extra money for Korea, but I can see at the moment no justification—and possibly some future trouble for us—in the \$54.5 million in the bill for jet aircraft for China. This last item came out of nowhere as the authorization bill passed this body a few weeks ago. I voted against it then, as I intend to do again tonight. It may, possibly, be a justifiable item, but I would like some proof of that before voting for it, and I have not yet seen such justification.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support a so-called foreign aid program under which the sum total of our efforts to combat global poverty, and hunger, ignorance and disease, continues to shrink, while programs of military assistance of one kind or another—especially when one adds in the dollar total of such assistance as provided through

other vehicles than this one—continue to burgeon and grow.

And, quite frankly, I am more than somewhat weary of watching my colleagues who are so inclined—though I surely do not question their motives in doing so nor their right to do so—vote, year after year, to turn this from an economic assistance program that holds some hope out to the underdeveloped world, and, I believe, gives some future hope for conditions conducive to world peace, into what is more and more a military assistance program that could lead us into further misadventures like that in Vietnam, while counting on Members who feel as I do to carry such bills through on final passage.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote "no" on final passage of this measure, breaking a 12-year string of "aye" votes in doing so, but believing that, in good conscience, I cannot do otherwise.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

(3) Multilateral organizations, \$88,800,000 (section 401(a)(1)): *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate any project or activity which has not been justified to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available for transfers authorized by section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: Page 2, line 14, after "(3) Multilateral organizations", strike out "\$88,800,000" and insert "\$122,620,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment which will restore the fund to international organizations. The program that will be most affected by this huge cut—\$34 million—will be the U.N. development program—UNDP—which is headed by the able Mr. Paul Hoffman. The committee cut this category which will adversely affect the desirable work of the UNDP. The committee report states that the Pearson Commission Report on the International Development states that the operating capacity of UNDP and other specialized agencies "seems strained". What the committee report fails to mention is that the U.S. contribution is the "lynch pin" of UNDP effort.

I recently spoke with Paul Hoffman and he said these cuts by the subcommittee would have a dire consequence on the orderly planning for UNDP. This organization has projections to expand at the rate of 15 percent per year. Mr. Hoffman assured me that this expansion would be

orderly and not impede the quality of the work of UNDP. It was on this basis that UNDP has now solicited over \$150 million from other nations for 1969. The United States is pledged to a \$100 million contribution—a pledge that can never be fulfilled if this House allows this cut to stand. It should be noted in this regard that 62 countries have increased their 1969 pledges over 1968. It seems in the best interest of encouraging international self-help to fund UNDP at \$100 million.

The need is painfully apparent. Two major studies, although 3 years old, came to the same general conclusions—that the need for UNDP projects—surveys to explore latent natural resources, work to strengthen educational and training program facilities for disseminating and applying new technologies, furnishing advisory personnel—was well over \$400 million.

The need for these projects has grown considerably in recent years. Although there is this tremendous need, the UNDP moved at a fixed and orderly pace. As I have mentioned there was to be a 15-percent increment per year. This pace would enable the judicious and expert utilization of available resources. Now we are faced with a drastic reduction. It is argued that we are only appropriating what we did last year. Such an attitude leaves no hope for expansion and indeed in the inflated money market it means we have regressed.

In answer to the charge that UNDP is strained within its existing budget, I want to point out again that there is an orderly plan for a 15-percent increase in UNDP effort. This can be appreciated when the area of personnel is analyzed.

There will only be 62 additional staff at the New York headquarters to handle increased projects, a total of 479 people, and there will be a field increase of 195, a total of 2,305 staff. These field personnel will run the gamut from manual workers to economic planners. Of more importance is the plan for an increase of 1,400 expert man-years—EMY—over the next 5 years, to a total of 6,200 EMY. This concept of getting expert personnel to give guidance to the development effort represents the backbone of the UNDP effort. Thus, UNDP has planned for an orderly expansion. I feel that this is the correct direction in which to move, and I feel that with this orderly planning, the organization can relieve the strain, as charged in the Pearson report, and get on with its vital work.

It cannot do this with the existing cut. The increase recommended, \$29 million, was to handle this increase in needed manpower and increased projects. Now we are asked to cut them.

This cut comes at a time when UNDP efforts are bearing fruit. For example, the Director announced that by the end of 1968, capital investment commitments of \$2.8 billion had resulted from or were related to the findings of projects assisted by UNDP.

I want to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this is a fight to save the priorities of your administration. The increase of \$29 million for UNDP was done at the direction of President Nixon who wanted increased

emphasis on the technical assistance and the channeling of funds through multilateral agencies.

This then is Nixon priority—and it seems not a little strange that we on our side of the aisle are required to bear the burden, with some notable exceptions for the Republican side, for these Presidential priorities. For myself, I feel the President, in this instance, has made a wise choice. The UNDP shows how U.S. funds can be used not only to accelerate development but to encourage other nations to take up their burdens. It is important to keep this in mind. Every \$4 donated by the United States generates \$6 from other donors, and in addition, an equal contribution to their projects by the recipient developing nation. Now we are asked to regress. I do not think this is the time for the United States to back out of this effort—and this is exactly what will happen with this \$34 million cut.

Given the Presidential support for the objectives for UNDP and the fact that most Members support the concept of self-help in international development and are increasingly accepting the multilateral approach as a valued tool, we should not allow this productive agency to be subject to the Procrustean approach—we should not negate its efforts with a sense of futile economy and at the same time give away funds to other questionable efforts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that for this account, the international organizations and programs, as it was previously funded, as of June 30 had \$171,740,000 on hand unexpended. Under the new budget request, they are asking for \$122,620,000. However, as in previous years, we make reductions, but in this particular account on comparable programs last year we appropriated \$88,800,000. That is the same amount we are recommending at this time—\$88,800,000. I want to refer to the Pearson Commission report. I do not know why we just blind ourselves to the facts of life. This is from the committee report:

The Committee is of the opinion that this proposed increase of approximately 41 percent in our contribution to the U.N.D.P. is excessive and notes that the recently released Pearson Commission Report on International Development stated, with reference to the technical assistance activities of the United Nations:

A large volume of technical assistance and preinvestment activity is handled by the U.N.D.P. and the specialized agencies, and they have played pioneering roles in many of the improvements of the past two decades. The world owes them great praise and appreciation for these vital contributions. Their operating capacity now, however, seems strained to the limit.

There is absolutely no justification for increasing this program by one dime. There was no justification before our committee which would warrant increasing this account.

In voting, I hope the Members will take into account that we travel this same road every year. The Committee on Appropriations makes adjustments. Always those who are for the high dol-

lar come in and offer amendments. Some of us must be responsible and realize that we are closing down projects in America. Seventy-five percent of all new starts will be closed down. Last year it was necessary to impound funds.

On that basis I ask Members to support the committee. This item has cleared the subcommittee. It has cleared the full committee. I certainly hope that the committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The dollar amount is small, \$34 million. However, as the gentleman from California has so eloquently stated, it is for a very good purpose. The committee itself recognizes the basic reason for the increase in the funds for the United Nations development program. It says, quoting from page 12:

This increased estimate reflects the President's decision to increase emphasis in the overall aid program on technical assistance and on channeling of funds through multilateral organizations.

This emphasis would be possible if we would provide the \$100 million which is being requested for the UNDP.

If I could borrow a couple of expressions from the gentleman from Louisiana, but not his argument, let us not blind ourselves to the facts of life, and let us remember that somebody must be responsible.

The facts of life are that multilateral organizations can do a meaningful job in assisting developing nations. One of the ways we can assist in that effort is through such programs as are financed by the UNDP. This involves not only contributions from the United States, but also contributions from other nations, which total already about \$140 million and may go up to \$150 million.

If we cut back because of an insistence on looking backward instead of at what the needs are today, we cannot expect other countries to come forward and help pay the bill. On the other hand, if we modestly increase our assistance there will be some solid benefits both in the field of technical assistance and in the channeling of funds for programs which are needed to help these developing countries.

I do hope we will recognize there is something of substance here. No case has been made for a reduction of these funds except for the blind fact that we did not utilize more money last year.

The UNDP has grown. As I said during general debate, four times as much is now available than was available in 1959. It is because this program has grown, and is increasingly useful, that we need to increase our emphasis in this area.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that this type of program, which Mr. Paul Hoffman has been in charge of for a number of years now, is truly a seed money kind of program? It concentrates either on training, such as vocational training, or on the type of

investment that brings private investment and other investments afterward.

Over the years the total amount of investment produced as a result of these preinvestment activities, surveys and the like is truly enormous.

Would not the gentleman agree that it would be false economy to cut back on this program where we are getting big contributions from other countries relative to their strength and we are also getting such large total investment added to the projects after they are completed?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I say to the gentleman from New York I agree with him. If we do decide to cut back on the bilateral assistance, we should be wary of also cutting back on multilateral assistance. It does seem to me that when you have a relatively small but expanding program such as this that we should continue with it. We should accept the fact that the President is requesting more and honor his request.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN). Because the hour is late, I shall not take the full 5 minutes. However, there are one or two points I would like to make. The United Nations Development Fund basically is a fund that supports an expanding world economy. It is in the interest of U.S. trade. It provides basic seed money for development, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) pointed out. Last year, in 1969, the UNDP was working in 122 countries and 71 million U.S. dollars resulted in the generation of additional contributions of \$400 million to \$425 million for effective economic development.

It is estimated by Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of the UNDP, that if the House did restore the funds for multilateral organizations to the \$122 million requested in this amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN), which I support, the \$100 million U.S. contribution to the UNDP would make it possible to generate some \$500 million in additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that to date the United Nations development program has engaged in 1,100 projects resulting in \$3 billion—\$3 billion—in capital investment. Of the \$500 million expected to be generated in 1970, it is anticipated that 40 percent of the funds will go to agricultural projects; 20 percent to investigations of various kinds; 20 percent to vocational training—for example, India, which once had a shortage of plumbers, now has 25 institutes to provide training to meet the demand in this field—and 20 percent for miscellaneous projects.

The most impressive feature of the UNDP is perhaps the multiplying value of its projects. A project to modernize a country's agriculture, for example, results in increased productivity of farmers and workers. With increased crop yields, the farmers have increased income; this leads to a market for industrial products—everything from farm

implements to bicycles. When industry expands, more people move to the country's cities, creating a demand for services. Therefore, a project which begins as an effort to improve a nation's agricultural techniques may in the end result in the modernization of that nation's economy and expanded world trade as that country begins to buy goods on the world market. The UNDP therefore works to the advantage of the developed, as well as the less developed, nations of the world to the extent that it contributes to expansion of the world economy.

One very specific example that could be mentioned that this provision for contribution to the UNDP would now do is to provide support to the Mexican Institute, which is on the verge of a breakthrough in placing more protein into cereals. With this breakthrough, it would be possible to double the world's food supply and provide a better diet for some 250 million children aged 2 through 5 whose growth otherwise could be seriously stunted without this breakthrough with reference to an adequate diet.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the best investments we can make. A small amount of U.S. funds triggers vast additional resources and energizes the best kind of resource development.

I would say, finally, that Mr. Hoffman is not unmindful of the reference in the Pearson Commission Report and the feeling that fact that he is under some strain in this area and he has a problem of how more effective use can be made of UNDP resources. He is, indeed, currently engaged in a study to identify any existing problem areas and find solutions for the problems. It would be surprising, given the progress that has been made, if there were no strains—for strains and progress go hand in hand in this world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe for the small amount of money involved, this represents one of the best investments we can make—an investment in resource development, vocational training, higher crop yields, and a fundamental increase in productivity and trade.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Knowing the gentleman's interest in the Middle East, I think it might be worth pointing out to the Committee that this amendment does not involve in any way whatsoever the funds for the Arab refugees with which some of us have great concern, in that camps for Arab refugees may be under the control of terrorists. I spoke on this the other day and have great concern about the way the UNRWA program is being run.

The Cohelan amendment concerns a totally different program. There is no money in this item we are talking about for the Arab refugee program. This is an area where the United Nations work is widely acclaimed. The UNDP is doing a splendid job, and needs the kind of support that the full request from the administration would present.

Mr. REID of New York. The gentleman is correct. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this program is essential to help countries identify their own resources, train their own people, and achieve the higher productivity fundamental to the third world and to U.S. trade as well. Take, for example, Nigeria, where a dam is under consideration, and might be built. If it is built, it will provide a lake 15 by 70 miles providing hundreds of thousands of acres with irrigation, and would also provide for an inland fishery industry that would produce the protein that is so important here.

I believe this to be a self-help program that helps the developing nations, and for which we provide modest resources.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that in our interest the House will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when the United States is being questioned around the world we find the committee is recommending that we turn our back on one of the most important multilateral programs that we have in the economic development field.

Mr. Chairman, up until a year ago the United States was making good on its pledge to put in 40 percent of the funds that were being spent through UNDP. Last year, because of the drive for economy, our share fell to something like 33 percent—the first time the United States has turned its back on meeting the commitment of 40 percent which it has had for so long.

Now, if this committee recommendation is sustained by the House our share will drop to 30 percent, or very close to that figure.

I think this is terribly important; that the United States show that it is prepared to sustain its commitments to these international programs. I cannot believe that it will reflect credit on this House to say that in a time when the United States is attempting to disengage from an unpopular war, to say that at a time there is danger of America turning isolationist, to say at a time when those who are criticizing the Vietnam war are the neoisolationists, that we shall draw back and reduce our support for those peaceful, constructive international programs to which we have been committed for so many years.

If we put the money in that this amendment calls for, it is a very small amount when you compare it to the totality of our defense and international programs where we are spending between \$70 and \$80 billion a year. This amendment calls for \$20 or \$30 million to redeem our commitment to the United Nations. I really think this is one place where the administration—and an administration I would be proud to support as it moves to give support to the United Nations—this is one place where we can help the administration show that America is not turning its back on the world; that we are prepared to do our part, and that we are not in the name of economy going to cut back and reduce the support

that we have pledged for so long in these international programs.

I really think, Mr. Chairman, this is a very small amount of money to maintain the good name of the United States in its willingness to stay involved and committed around the world today.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the previous speakers have discussed the fact that the committee has cut back our support on multilateral international organizations. I fail to see that there has been any cutback—not from that which was appropriated in the prior year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Kansas yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) with regard to the \$88,800,000 at page 2 of the pending bill, how this amount compares with the amount appropriated for the same purpose in fiscal year 1969, the previous fiscal year?

Mr. SHRIVER. It is the same amount. It is the same amount that was appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to the fact that \$17,600,000 was transferred and has been provided for the Indus Basin and a multilateral project of \$19,600,000 for UNRA and the U.N. peacekeeping force in Cyprus.

There has been no cutback. This has been a continuation of the efforts of this body to support at the same level as they did in the prior year.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, in my basic arguments in support of my amendment, I made the point on the authority of the distinguished gentleman from the United Nations himself who has indicated that these funds are badly needed and for the reasons I described.

Of course, so far as the price level alone is concerned, it would be very clear that the full amount is needed.

Mr. SHRIVER. I understand that the amendment before the committee is for a 41-percent increase over the existing present year's appropriation. We have not increased other items in this bill or in other bills by this large of a percentage. In fact, there are many cutbacks as far as that is concerned.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that on page 12 of the committee report that the Pearson Commission which was selected to study the foreign assistance programs around the world made this report to the committee.

The Committee is of the opinion that this proposed increase of approximately 41 percent in our contribution to the U.N.D.P. is excessive.

The significant statement of the Pearson Commission report is:

Their operating capacity now, however, seems strained to the limit.

Do we need any further justification?

Mr. SHRIVER. That comment was in the Pearson report that their operating capacity now, however, seems strained to the limit. So the committee has offered the same amount.

Mr. PASSMAN. The AID justification itself shows that that was the amount that was appropriated last year for this purpose.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee did not mean to mislead the committee to the effect that the statement he quoted from the bottom of page 12 was from the Pearson Commission report.

That is the statement of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a committee statement. The Pearson Commission report statement is on page 13 of the committee report.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have the report in front of me, but the chairman did quote the statement that—

The committee is of the opinion that this proposed increase of 41 percent * * * is excessive—

As if that were the Pearson Commission's report.

That is not the report of the Pearson Commission.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that the Pearson Commission report stated that the U.N. agencies' operating capacity seem strained to the limit? Is that not part of the current situation?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Now if they are strained to the limit of \$88,800,000, then they cannot possibly use additional money.

Mr. SHRIVER. I repeat there is no cutback.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes—but just to continue this colloquy for a minute, I think those of us who have read the Pearson Commission report—and I have read a good part of it—recognize it as a very splendid report, the entire thrust of which is that the developed countries are doing far too little today about the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations of this world.

The Pearson Commission report makes a most eloquent case for increasing technical assistance and economic assistance to the developing countries of the world.

If we are going to cut back on the bilateral programs, as apparently we are doing, then it becomes more important than ever that we transfer as much of the responsibility as we can to the multilateral operations where other nations are helping to carry the load.

As to the Pearson Commission's statement about capacity being strained, as one of the gentlemen pointed out earlier,

this merely means that the international organization needs additional resources to improve its capacity. They are beginning to use additional organizations. They are not going to limit themselves, as they have in the past, to the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, and the others, as the only operating agencies to do the work. They are doing some of this under contract, and that means they will increase their capacity.

So I think it is quite clear that we should not take this one sentence out of the Pearson Commission report and use it as an excuse to cut back on the tentative commitment we made in the negotiations that have taken place at the U.N. We have solicited increased contributions from many other nations and 45 of them, according to the recent report from the UNBP, have agreed to increase their contributions.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. In an attempt to clarify the situation, am I correct that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would restore this fund to the level requested by the administration?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REID of New York. There has been some reference to the phrase "strained to the limit." I would say to the gentleman that I have just talked with Mr. Paul Hoffman on this point. He said, "Of course, we are somewhat strained", but I think the remarkable thing is the multiplying effect the UNDP has had and the accomplishments they have succeeded in generating." However, Mr. Hoffman has set up a committee to identify any points of strain and to seek promptly to remedy them. But my point, which I think is also the gentleman's point, is that we should be grateful for the vast amount of progress that has been made; for the resources identified, for increased productivity, for increased investment and trade. If there was not some strain, they would not be doing their job.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

It seems to me we might as well say that because the Post Office is strained today to handle the volume of mail, we should deny it funds to increase its capability.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that there is \$171 billion on hand in the pipeline unexpended?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will take the gentleman's word on that.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is enough money for 2 full years without any additional appropriation; is that no so?

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman well knows—and this is something that he has been interested in for many years—there are always funds in the pipeline for

this type of operation. I have sat in the Economic and Social Council as the U.S. representative at the United Nations. I know these are very difficult and complex programs to work out. It involves working with other nations, and using technicians from all parts of the world who speak many different languages. The UNDP does not rush into things. They wait until they have requests. So it does take time to negotiate. Unless they have the funds assured, they cannot negotiate for the projects, and it always takes time to work them out.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

One thing I want to make clear. I do not know whether the chairman acknowledges this or not. Last year we gave the UNDP \$71 million. Under the bill before the House, that would drop to \$66 million. I checked this with the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations as recently as 2 hours ago, and you can get the same figures by doing your own calculations from the committee report. The point I want to make is that we are moving backward at a time when all other countries are moving forward. This is not the time for the United States to go back.

Mr. PASSMAN. That assumption is not correct. They could get the entire \$88.8 million, if the Executive so desires.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe the chairman would want to create the impression that there is a pipeline of funds available for contributions to the United Nations. I am sure he must know these funds are not available, in the sense that a way could be found to make an increase in the U.S. contribution to U.N. agencies over the amount that would be available in this bill. That surely is not the situation.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the floor.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield for a correction?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I said there was \$171 billion in the pipeline, unexpended, that will be disbursed in subsequent years. I rest on that statement, because it is in AID's own justifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COHELAN) there were—ayes 53, noes 75.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COHELAN and Mr. PASSMAN.

The Committee again divided, and the

tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

American schools and hospitals abroad:
For expenses authorized by section 304(b), \$24,050,000, to be used solely for the following institutions or programs:

American University of Beirut, Lebanon	\$9,490,000
American Farm School, Thessaloniki, Greece	100,000
Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey	2,300,000
American University in Cairo, Egypt	200,000
Escuela Aricola, Panamericana, Honduras	200,000
Admiral Bristol Hospital, Istanbul, Turkey	75,000
Project Hope	500,000
Weizmann Institute, Israel	3,000,000
Merkez Lechinuch Ichud, Israel	1,900,000
Amana Ulpenat B.A., Israel	600,000
Hadassah (expansion of medical facilities in Israel)	5,000,000
Hospital and Home for the Aged, Zichron-Yakov, Israel	650,000
Program Support	35,000

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at H.R. 14580, and nowhere can I find in the foreign aid authorization bill an item in this legislation which deals with the expenditure of \$650,000 for the construction of a nursing home in Israel.

Can some member of the committee tell me how this got in the appropriation bill, not having been authorized? Are there any other items in this list to be found on page 3 that have not been authorized?

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. This is the only item in the bill that is not authorized, with the exception of the foreign military credit sales program. We can certainly justify this project, so we included it in our bill in the subcommittee, and it was approved by the full committee.

This is the only item in the bill of this nature.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying I came in late or something? I do not understand how this item got into the bill, and who is responsible for it.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman can get it considered under the foreign aid program and come in and request it, we will give it consideration.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I expect it is I to whom the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is referring. This is my project. It is for a hospital and home for the aged in Israel and was inserted in this bill at my request. We expected it would be inserted in the authorization bill. Unfortunately, although it is a most deserving item, it was not.

Mr. GROSS. What am I to think in this situation? Am I to think that every one of the 435 Members of the House can walk in to the Appropriations Com-

mittee or any other committee and get their personal projects put into a bill?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think so, at all.

Mr. GROSS. What has the legislative process degenerated into, anyway?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think so, at all.

Mr. GROSS. This seems to be a first-come-first-served procedure, or something of that kind.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The difficulty here was the lateness. It should have been included in the authorization bill. Fortunately, we were able to catch up with it in this appropriation bill. This is a very worthy project which is in the best interest of the American people.

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid I do not have a good explanation yet for this item of \$650,000.

I will say to my friend from Missouri, Dr. HALL, that one of his favorites and mine is about to be brought to the attention of the House. I understand a message is coming down from the White House asking for some \$40 million for the good old arts and humanities.

If we are going to build nursing homes and homes for the aged all over the world, from Timbuktu to Afghanistan and back again, I wish the gentleman from Missouri would tell me where it is proposed to get the money.

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

Mr. GROSS. And take care of special projects for each one of the 435 Members of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Perhaps the arts and humanities request does not have an Israelite flavor.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that could be as good an explanation.

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. I do not intend to spend my time on this particular question. I have a question which I would like to ask the chairman on another matter.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not have a good answer on this and I doubt if I ever get an answer. But just remember that any Member that has a project that he wants to construct somewhere in the world, should go to the Appropriations Committee and expect to get it.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, and if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I would like to learn the rationale which the committee used to arrive at the figure of \$265 million in the development loan program worldwide. That is, did you come in with a figure of \$265 million, because this was the figure the committee came in with last year, did you study the projects, project by project, or does this figure represent a percentage cut?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, we try to be as reasonable as we possibly can in marking up this bill. We look at the justifications and we look at the commitments and obligations. Then on a subsequent day we spend many hours

going over the testimony and we try to recommend a reasonable figure.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, pursuing this subject further, would the gentleman from Louisiana care to respond further?

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield? Then based upon the projects presented to our committee we reach what we think is a proper level to fund these programs. In many instances we cut them because there is no justification for the level requested.

For instance, on this particular item I want to point out to the gentleman on two programs, the Alliance loans and the development loans, there is a total of \$465 million in the bill. We feel that is adequate. However, before this legislation finally becomes law it could be lower than that or it could be higher than that or it could be this figure. But based upon their commitments thus far we believe this is ample funding.

Mr. ICHORD. Is the gentleman saying that you look at the program project by project and the justification just happened to be \$265 million, the same figure which you came in with last year?

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I can assure the gentleman it is not that scientific. Possibly, we could have come in with \$245 million or \$275 million. Nothing in this bill is so pinpointed in the justifications. We do not know the exact amount of money they need. This entire program is an "illustrative" program. They say, "We think we will need money for projects in these countries" and based upon our experience in handling this bill and looking at the amount of money they obligated last year and where they obligated that money, we felt that \$265 million was the amount we should bring to the Floor at this time. The appropriation a year ago was \$300 million and not \$265 million.

Mr. ICHORD. Well, of course, the gentleman well knows if we again send over \$265 million to the other body, we will probably end up with a figure again of \$300 million which will constitute no cut at all.

I might say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I am quite put out with having a figure in this bill representing only a 61-percent cut from the amount requested by the administration when we had to experience a 75-percent cut on domestic Federal construction projects.

I am wondering if the committee has cut enough when it has only cut 61 percent from the figure requested by the administration.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the budget request was much higher than that. Also, the authorization bill that passed this House called for \$425 million. So, we have actually cut it very substantially when you consider the authorization bill that approved \$425.5 million and we are only coming in with \$265 million which represents a very substantial reduction.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

Development loans: For expenses authorized by section 203 (e), \$265,000,000, together with such amounts as are authorized to be made available under section 203 (f), all such amounts to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: On page 4, after line 7, and before line 8, insert the following new paragraph:

"Overseas Private Investment Corporation: For purposes of section 325 (f) to remain until expended the sum of \$75,000,000."

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to put back in the amount requested by the administration to get the new Corporation launched that is going to help promote private investment overseas, the so-called OPIC. This is the amount of money which enables the OPIC to expand its loan guarantees and insurance programs so that investors who invest in other countries can have some protection against the contingency of expropriation, or loss from civil strife or inconvertibility, and so on.

This amount, which is the amount requested by the administration, would enable OPIC to get underway and to move as the Committee on Foreign Affairs hoped it would move in promoting the development of private investment in the developing world.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to know that almost every study of development that has taken place in recent years has laid great stress on the role which private investment has to play. I think this provision would help get OPIC off the ground, and I would certainly hope that we could support this amendment. While I have, myself, some uncertainty as to how it will fare, I think, it is important that if we have this program that we should launch it with the kind of support which will give it the best possible chance to prove itself.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Am I correct that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota would place the appropriation at the level requested by the administration?

Mr. FRASER. That is right.

Mr. FINDLEY. Further, am I not correct that the OPIC provision is one of the main, if not the main, new elements injected or placed in the foreign aid program this year, at the urgent request of the Nixon administration?

Mr. FRASER. That is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his amendment. I do so because the one new program and the one new

concept, which was discussed at great length in the committee, is the OPIC corporation. If we fund it adequately, we will find it will be of great help in getting the private sector to invest in developing countries.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I do hope the Committee will give favorable consideration to the amendment. This matter was discussed at great length in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is one of the major new provisions in the foreign aid bill, and it does seek to help private investors to invest in these developing countries.

If we can induce private investment in these countries, we will at least save the taxpayers more money. So I think it is one amendment that deserves the support of the entire Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, the investment guaranty program, as I said earlier today, has been in this bill for 20 years. During the 15 years that it has been my privilege to be chairman of the committee, the bureaucrats downtown have been trying to pyramid this account.

A few years ago they came in and wanted \$180,000,000 added to this account. Upon examination, we could not find where they had adequately justified that amount. We gave them \$30,000,000. We cut it by \$150,000,000.

Now by any fair analysis, it simply means, if you did not provide one additional dime—and if the experience of the losses in subsequent years are in accordance with the losses during the past 20 years, then they have sufficient funds to carry on the program for 258 years and 4 months.

What justification would there be for putting an additional \$75 million in this fund when you have \$129 million in the fund at this time?

Mr. Chairman, these people say that they do not actually need the money and they are not going to spend the money, but believe if they can build this account up, it will look attractive to Americans who may want to invest their money abroad.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly must always yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the gentleman will recall, I discussed with him this fund problem as well as a limitation under section 122, on page 15.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Now as I understand the gentleman from Louisiana, he says that there is \$129,000,000 available in a revolving fund for OPIC.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC fund, if you want to put it that way.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the limitation on page 15, section 122, it precludes OPIC from utilizing any of the \$129,000,000 in the revolving fund for any of its set forth purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not correct.

But if the gentleman will permit me to say—this organization has not yet come into being because they just desire to set up an agency within this insurance program and they have been trying to do this for many years. The committee found out that there were 39 agencies that these business people can borrow money from.

I might say that \$130,000,000—and I am using round figures—is not available for loans. If you approve this amendment for the \$75,000,000 addition—that will not be available for loans.

That is only so that American businessmen can look up and say—Well, there is a lot of money in this fund.

Now the revolving fund has to do with another section of the bill and that is they want to be able to accumulate up to \$100,000,000, that was the request, \$20,000,000 per year out of repayments to the development loan fund until they build up to \$100,000,000 in the revolving fund.

I believe under the amended House resolution, it would be 2 years.

But there is no justification for it, I will say to the distinguished gentleman. They made no case whatsoever for a dime of this money other than that they want to give a job to some bureaucrat and set up another lending agency. The committee left the language in the bill in the event a case could be made subsequently, giving the names of the types of business, how much they would be financed for, and on what terms. Then we would have the basic legislation to back up the request if and when it could be justified, whether that would be this week or next week.

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

(On request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD and by unanimous consent, Mr. PASSMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask this question: Is the \$75 million included in this amendment roughly in the same category or could it be used for the same purpose as the \$130 million in the revolving fund?

Mr. PASSMAN. Identical. Identical.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me ask if this is true—

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true, I repeat.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I accept that. I see no need under the current circumstances for the additional \$75 million if the \$130 million in the fund is available for OPIC's use.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is available.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is not available, as I understand it, because of section 122 in the bill on page 15. Is that correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I straighten this out. The \$130 million is additional insurance funds. The \$75 million would likewise become available to the insurance fund. That is to guarantee overseas investment. We gave the basic language that would permit setting up the fund, hoping that at some subsequent time, if it could be justified, we could make funds available through whatever means Congress in its wisdom should dictate. It may come this week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the gentle-

man will yield further, you have given them the right to operate, on the one hand, but then, on page 15, under section 122, you would in effect say that they cannot do it. I am against the \$75 million amendment if you will give them the authority to use the \$130 million in the fund. That is my point.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is an extremely complicated account. They come in with one approach and on a subsequent day they come in with a different type of approach. It is almost impossible for the members of the committee to know just what they have in mind. We went through the record to discover what they have on hand. We discovered the \$75 million was to guarantee overseas investments, not to make loans. As I understand it, what they really want is the authority to transfer from the Development Loan Fund \$100 million with which to finance loans abroad. It has no connection with this guaranty fund.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What I am concerned about, if the gentleman will yield again—and I want to make this point clear—if there is an amendment to or if there is a deletion of section 122, then I am against the \$75 million, because I do not believe it is needed, as long as there is \$130 million in the guaranty fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. That is why the committee cut it out.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. All right. What worries me is that you give them the authority to use the OPIC program, but then you turn around on page 15, section 122, and say they cannot use the revolving fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. As I understand it, in their presentation they did not ask for the right to use the fund for loans. The fund was to insure loans made abroad by businesses.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If they have \$130 million in that kind of insurance backup, I do not think they need the \$75 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is exactly why the committee did not allow it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Then, Mr. Chairman, why do you put the limitation on it so they cannot use the \$130 million? That is what bothers me.

Mr. PASSMAN. The limitation has nothing to do with this particular guaranty fund. It has only to do with the proposed revolving fund. This money is available for use. The \$129 million is available to pay claims if they should come. The \$75 million, if it is appropriated, would likewise become available to pay claims.

As I understand it, the way the legislation is written, the loans would be made out of the \$100 million we would set up in a revolving fund out of repayments to the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It seems to me by the language of section 122, we preclude them even from using any money that is in the bill—if there is any—and we also limit the authority to utilize the revolving fund, and I think that is the wrong approach.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PASSMAN

was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with two separate and distinct funds. The \$75 million has no connection whatsoever with section 122 as it applies to loans.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It seems to me then I had the wrong impression from my own understanding and what the gentleman said earlier when he said the two were one and the same, or they had one and the same purpose. That was the impression I got from the questions I asked.

Mr. PASSMAN. The \$75 million and the \$130 million, they are the same, identical, and for the same purpose—not for loans, I can assure the gentleman. It is for guarantees only, not for loans.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I must confess that still leaves me confused.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down, because the \$75 million will only load up this insurance account.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me speak briefly especially to my colleagues on the minority side of the aisle about this particular aspect of the bill.

The one principal innovation that the administration came forward with this year was the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. The purpose of this particular proposal is to stimulate and to inspire greater private foreign investment, to accommodate the declining public appropriations that have been made for foreign aid.

The Republican Party—indeed all Americans—talk about the role of private enterprise. We are proud of the fact that we are a private enterprise economy. The provisions of this bill which the committee has recommended would prevent this administration from prompting greater participation by the private sector, so as to reduce the strain on the public accounts for foreign aid.

There has been for many years in AID an Office of Private Resources. It has had two kinds of activities, one an insurance program which guarantees against specific risks such as expropriation, unconvertibility, and war or insurrection, and an extended guarantee program which even guarantees against commercial risks.

The reserves of which the chairman of the subcommittee spoke are modest and relate only to the minimal program that has been able to function under the Office of Private Resources. This administration wants to expand this kind of activity, and to do so we need the additional funds for the reserves for the two programs—one, insurance, and the other, guarantees.

The other authority the administration has requested is merely the authority to take from repayments to development loans the amounts of \$20 million a year for 5 years—from repayments to development loans—in order to provide a revolving fund which would permit the new corporation to do its work.

This is the one most important creative

departure that the Nixon administration has advanced in the field of foreign assistance, and I think it is incumbent upon all of us to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the colloquy that took place earlier between the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) and the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) does section 122 on page 15 then provide what the administration asks for, that \$20 million a year be made available for these purposes?

Mr. MORSE. It does for all practical purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It does?

Mr. MORSE. It does.

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

I am afraid that this amendment, which is really exceedingly simple and can be explained simply, has been confused all out of proportion.

Whatever moneys were originally authorized for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for lending purposes have been stricken from the bill. There is no money to lend at all.

All this amendment seeks to do is to permit additional guarantees to be purchased by investors in undeveloped countries. In other words, today all guarantees have been used up. There has to be at least a 25-percent reserve. If this \$75 million were added to the bill it would just extend the guarantees, so that this corporation could sell additional guarantees to the extent of \$300 million. That is all it does.

It has nothing at all to do with any loans. It has nothing to do with any other funds, because no other funds can be used.

The only thing this does, I repeat, is to permit additional guarantees to be used. Incidentally, as a result of guarantees heretofore sold the Government has made very substantial sums of money. I cannot understand why anyone would object to adding the additional \$75 million in order to extend additional guarantees, from which we are making money.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true in this fund they have \$130 million now unobligated?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not know what they have unobligated, but it is restricted as a result of the bill presently before us.

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true this is merely putting \$75 million more into an account where they already have \$130 million and the loss has been only \$11 million in 20 years? This is not a loan

fund. This is merely to guarantee investments made abroad, is that right?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. All that this does, I repeat again, is to provide for guarantees. The reserves have been used up. They cannot guarantee any more, because they have to have at least 25 percent of the money to guarantee in the "kitty." The "kitty" has no money. This would put an additional \$75 million in.

Mr. PASSMAN. They have only used up \$11 million and they have \$130 million on hand unobligated. Let us not leave the RECORD showing they have used the money. They have \$130 million, enough to last for 238 years.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee is absolutely right. What is being attempted here is to fund a brandnew empire, another layer of bureaucratic fat in the Government. That is what this Overseas Investment Corporation is going to provide.

Mark well what I tell you here today. This will be the end result if you put any money back in. This Corporation will probably have to have a country club and golf course, as the International Monetary Fund has nearby in Maryland, at a cost of several million dollars.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Is it not correct that in this reserve fund they now have \$130 million surplus?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. PASSMAN. And the losses have been only \$11 million in 20 years?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. PASSMAN. If we put in \$75 million they are only going to sweeten this account with funds they do not need and will not spend.

Mr. GROSS. It will become a bureaucratic empire.

Mr. PASSMAN. Did they not say they would not spend the money; that they only want it to look more attractive?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

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

Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE)? Mr. MORSE, may I have your attention please? In order to clarify my very low level of understanding on this thing, permit me to propound a couple of questions to the gentleman.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) said that there is \$130 million of unobligated moneys available already for this organization. As I understand it—and please correct me if I am wrong—the way this program operates is that it guarantees loans, but the loan requires that it have 25 percent of the money in the kitty for the loan support guarantee; is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is absolutely right.

Mr. HANNA. Now, let me ask the gentleman the second question.

The gentleman from Louisiana has indicated that they have only spent \$11 million since its inception. Is that how much of the total amount of loans that

the insurance company has had to pick up?

Mr. MORSE. Precisely.

Mr. HANNA. If we leave it like it is, it would seem to me that Mr. PASSMAN has told the truth but not the whole truth and nothing but the truth, because it is true that this money which they have not spent is necessary under the law to support what has already been guaranteed and they cannot guarantee any more. The fact that they have only lost \$11 million indicates that they have operated in an efficient manner in extending credit, but they cannot make another loan unless we make some more money available; is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman is absolutely correct in every particular. Let me underline what he said. What we are talking about is \$75 million which is the subject of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to increase the reserve fund.

Mr. HANNA. Then, you will be able to make four times as much money available to qualified borrowers in private loan commitments guaranteed with the reserve of 25 percent?

Mr. MORSE. A guarantee of 25 percent investment on the part of the U.S. economy in the development process which is now going on abroad.

Mr. HANNA. The money discussed in the \$130 million is guarantee money, not loan money. The 75 million suggested is guarantee money not loan money. In other words to make a loan of 100 percent they have to have a reserve of 25 percent in order to encourage someone to make the loan in the first place?

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement. These moneys are not available for expenditure by the OPIC or the Office of Private Investments. They are reserve funds. The fact that they did not have but only \$11 million in bad loans testifies to the efficiency of this operation.

Mr. HANNA. And this was precisely anticipated when the law was created in the first instance; is that right?

Mr. MORSE. That is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement today and to also ask him if I am correct in my understanding, as the bill now reads, OPIC simply cannot operate?

Mr. HANNA. That I think is the answer, that they would not be able to make another guarantee of another loan under the existing legislation.

Mr. FINDLEY. So, if Members are determined to get OPIC out of the Foreign Assistance Act, the item that President Nixon wanted in it, the thing to do is to vote against this amendment?

Mr. HANNA. I am not arguing for or against it, but I would like to see some clarity with reference to it.

Mr. FINDLEY. In other words, those who want OPIC ought to vote for the amendment?

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

(By unanimous consent (at the re-

quest of Mr. PASSMAN) Mr. HANNA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no legislation requiring a 25-percent reserve on these overseas investments at this time. It is presently in the authorization bill, but it has not yet become law. This program has been going on for 20 years. These are the facts and I want to state them concisely.

The so-called OPIC \$75 million appropriation has no relationship to any revolving fund for making loans abroad. The \$75 million is to be added to the \$130 million presently on hand and unobligated. If we should at some subsequent date enact into law what the Foreign Affairs Committee has already proposed, creating a 25-percent reserve fund then, of course, in a few years we might use up the \$130 million and we would have to provide additional funds. But at this time you have no such law, you have no such assurance that you will have any law requiring a 25-percent reserve. As of this time, they have only used \$11 million to pay claims while they have \$130 million on hand.

If the gentleman will yield further, has the gentleman ever associated himself with anything more confusing than this amendment?

Mr. HANNA. I have not associated myself with anything but the confusion. I would like to finish with this comment, Mr. Chairman: that as I see it, whether you have a law or you do not have a law, I should imagine that any person who goes to a bank for a loan to cover activities in an underdeveloped country would not be successful absent a program behind it with at least a 25-percent reserve.

So I think you can be assured that the bill as now written would take out of the very business community to which you wish to tie the program, the incentives which the guarantees have provided.

I suggest, if I may conclude, that it would be misleading to say that the \$75 million is to be loaned any more than the \$130 million is to be loaned; it is to guarantee loans to business establishments.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman will yield further, that is correct.

However, I would just like to take issue with the language of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in talking about the expenditure of these funds. These funds are not loaned, and are not intended, and cannot be loaned; they are for the purpose of guaranteeing. The mere fact that the programs have not worked on occasion does not indicate that the program is not successful.

The way the gentleman from Louisiana speaks, it seems to me that he would be happier if the businesses were going broke.

Mr. HANNA. Speaking for myself, I think if this program will encourage private money to get into the expansion of economies of underdeveloped countries. We ought to continue it that way, and hope the money will not get spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman the committee knocked out the \$75 million requested for the Overseas Private Investment Corp.—even though—and I am directing the attention of the Members to the hearings—even though there was overwhelming evidence to the effect that private investment has a real role to play in the aid program.

But that is all over with now, even before it got started. The committee saw to it that OPIC would not get the money needed to carry on these programs.

Let me tell you there is \$80 million reserve for the \$7 billion of insurance programs here, and a 25-percent reserve requirement for the guarantee program. There are two programs here, the insurance program and the guarantee program. Some \$85 million is currently available to satisfy these reserves. However, by the end of fiscal year 1971 a total of \$165 million will be needed. Without approval of the OPIC request, this requirement cannot be met.

In effect, what the committee has done is kill the whole program that the President wanted.

Now the committee has also made sure that the money from the other loan repayments, from the development loan repayments, would not be available for use by OPIC for direct loans.

The overall impact of these two measures should be clear—no OPIC. Or to put it another way, the committee did not even give the corporation a chance—a chance to save the taxpayers some money, and to bring a highly promising innovation to the aid program.

Therefore I favor giving OPIC \$75 million. I offered an amendment in the committee to give them money in order to meet reserve requirements in both the insurance and the guarantee programs. I might note that in the case of guarantees, there is a 25-percent reserve requirement, because lenders must have assurance of prompt payment upon default. Lenders do not doubt the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government, but they do doubt our ability to act fast.

I also propose to give substance to section 322 of the Foreign Assistance Act by permitting the transfer of aid loan repayments to OPIC. And when we come to that part of the bill, section 122, I will move that that section be stricken.

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

Mr. CONTE. Yes, I am glad to yield to my leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the gentleman knows, I have had a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and by inference then I said I would oppose the \$75 million. But I was very concerned about the limitation contained in section 122 on page 15 of the bill.

I am delighted that the gentleman from Massachusetts has just said that he is going to offer a motion to strike section 122 and I will support that—even though I oppose the amendment

to add \$75 million. I think it is a responsible position to take, to give them the availability in the revolving fund. I think that is sensible and right.

If you do that, then I think you can vote against the \$75 million being added to the bill.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. I might point out that they will not need any new appropriation, and I would like to read from a document from the President of the United States—a message to the Congress on May 28, 1969. The President said:

A FRESH APPROACH

This Administration has intensively examined our programs of foreign aid. We have measured them against the goals of our policy and the goad of our conscience. Our review is continuing but we have come to this central conclusion:

U.S. assistance is essential to express and achieve our national goals in the international community—a world order of peace and justice.

But no single government, no matter how wealthy or well-intentioned, can by itself hope to cope with the challenge of raising the standards of living of two-thirds of the world's people. This reality must not cause us to retreat into helpless, sullen isolation. On the contrary, this reality must cause us to redirect our efforts in four main ways:

We must enlist the energies of private enterprise, here and abroad, in the cause of economic development. We must do so by stimulating additional investment through businesslike channels, rather than offering ringing exhortations.

We must emphasize innovative technical assistance, to ensure that our dollars for all forms of aid go further, and to plant the seeds that will enable other nations to grow their own capabilities for the future.

We must induce other advanced nations to join in bearing their fair share—by contributing jointly to multilateral banks and the United Nations, by consultation and by the force of our example, and by effective coordination of national and multilateral programs in individual countries.

We must build on recent successes in furthering food production and family planning.

To accomplish these goals, this Administration's foreign aid proposals will be submitted to the Congress today. In essence, these are the new approaches:

1. Enlisting Private Enterprise

I propose the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The purpose of the Corporation is to provide businesslike management of investment incentives now in our laws so as to contribute to the economic and social progress of developing nations.

The majority of the Board of Directors including its President, will be drawn from private life and have business experience.

Venture capital seeks profit, not adventure. To guide this capital to higher-risk areas, the Federal government presently offers a system of insurance and guaranties. Like the Federal Housing Administration in the housing field here at home, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation will be able to place the credit of the United States Government behind the insurance and guaranties which the Corporation would sell to U.S. private investors.

The Corporation will also have a small direct lending program for private developmental projects. It will carry out investment survey and development activities. And it will undertake for A.I.D. some of the technical assistance required to strengthen private enterprise abroad. The financial per-

formance of OPIC will be measurable. It is expected to break even or to show a small profit.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will give new direction to U.S. private investment abroad. As such, it will provide new focus to our foreign assistance effort.

Simultaneously, I propose a mandate for the Agency for International Development to direct a growing part of its capital, technical and advisory assistance to improving opportunities for local private enterprise in developing countries—on farms as well as in commerce and industry.

We do not insist that developing countries imitate the American system. Each nation must fashion its own institutions to its own needs. But progress has been greatest where governments have encouraged private enterprise, released bureaucratic controls, stimulated competition and allowed maximum opportunity for individual initiative. A.I.D.'s mandate will be directed to this end.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: Page 4, line 5, strike out the figure "\$265,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$168,875,000."

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: My amendment is very simple. It cuts the loan development program—worldwide—to 25 percent of the amount requested by the administration. The 25 percent of the \$675,500,000 requested by the administration is \$168,875,000, which represents a total cut of 75 percent, the same amount by which Federal construction projects were cut back earlier this year.

A few minutes ago, I inquired of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana as to the rationale used by the committee to arrive at the figure of \$265 million. Whether this was the amount which the committee found to be justified after considering the program on a project to project basis; whether the committee intended to keep the development program at the same level as the \$265 million is the same figure the committee brought to the floor last year; or whether the figure represents a percentage of the amount authorized by the Foreign Affairs Committee on the amount requested by the administration. It was not clear to me what rationale the committee employed. The rationale of my amendment is clear. I do not believe that the Members of this House want to appropriate the same amount this year as they did last year when our own domestic development projects are being deeply cut. Last year we sent \$265 million to the Senate and I think it would be safe to predict that the figure will be returned to the House somewhere near or in excess of the \$300 million finally appropriated for the 1969 fiscal year.

The time is past when the United States can continue to play Santa Claus through its foreign aid programs. If our own economy is to survive, this huge and unmanageable program must come to a halt, at least until such time as we get

our own fiscal affairs in order and Federal spending more in tune with total incoming revenue. A government, like an individual or business, reaches a point of "no return" when year after year after year spending exceeds income. If the United States would eliminate the entire system of foreign assistance, including disguised programs such as Public Law 480, Alliance for Progress, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Development Association—the latter three are destined to receive \$480 million under H.R. 15149—and all others in which millions of American dollars are sent outside our country to "help" underdeveloped nations, we could, I am convinced, formulate government spending programs to operate "in the black" for a change.

The present foreign aid program, I firmly believe, is in serious need of new direction if it is to be continued, however. It is foolhardy to continue operating a program designed a quarter of a century ago and which, in many instances, has had entries in the record showing dismal failures and prime examples of exorbitant waste exceeding our wildest dreams. Despite my objections based on failures of the program, if we are to have foreign aid, new guidelines should be developed toward the establishment of an effective program, one which would help underdeveloped nations to help themselves through teaching and training by example, not by sending a check or money order or even sending supplies or goods. We should put into practice the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln:

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

I submit that we should not let our own urgent needs at home go unattended while we send millions of dollars overseas, many of which could be put to much better and more practical use at home. For instance, let us look at the community development program of the Farmers Home Administration and compare it with the development loan program of the foreign aid program. The FHA community development program is designed to provide assistance to rural communities of less than 5,500 population for public utilities such as water and sanitary facilities. This program is without doubt one of the greatest boons to rural area development since the REA was formed. The 1970 appropriation of \$78 million for the FHA community development direct loan program for operating in 50 States is a mere pittance in comparison to the foreign aid development loan program. The committee recommendation of \$265 million is completely out of proportion to the amount of help we are offering to our own rural towns and cities. This huge appropriation will be used for loans to foreign countries for area development on 40- to 50-year terms at varying rates of interest from three-fourths of 1 to 3 percent while FHA insured loans for rural area development bear an interest rate of 5 percent.

It is difficult for me to explain to the

officers and anxious subscribers of about 12 water or sewer districts in my own district that there is not enough money available to fund these vital community facilities while we are sending \$1.6 billion overseas for less important purposes. Matter of fact, the FHA recently sent me a notice of the projects in my district which can be funded during fiscal year 1970 based on established priorities along with a list of those project applications which cannot be funded and were rejected solely for "lack of funds." It was interesting to note that only one-third of the FHA project applications in my district could be funded.

It is further distressing to me to see all this money going overseas when our own medical research programs are being drastically reduced because of budgetary problems. The Director of the National Institutes of Health is reported to have stated that 20 percent, 19 out of 93, of our governmentally supported experimental clinical research centers will have to be closed next year because of the announced policy of the administration to reduce operational costs of Government. He also reported, I understand, that a 4- to 10-percent slash in health research will be placed in effect at the National Institutes of Health, including current research projects and studies and impending new project research.

How foolish can we get to turn our backs on our own vital health services and then turn around and send a couple of billion dollars overseas, much of which will be wasted or will fund much less vital programs for people, many of whom really do not appreciate our gratuities.

And to add fuel to the foreign aid controversy, we are having to cut back 75 percent of our own Federal construction program, and this plan of action also affects a public works project in my district; namely, the flood control development in the Meramec Basin in south central Missouri. I am sure the reservoirs already in early stages of preconstruction planning and land acquisition could move along at a more accelerated pace if it were not for the foreign aid commitments.

I call the attention of the Members to certain figures on page 5 of committee report 91-708 which reveal the so-called "pipeline"—moneys appropriated in previous years which still remain unexpended—the total amounts to \$18,708,016,000. Particularly interesting to me was the revelation that India still has to her credit in our foreign-aid pipeline \$536,190,000. Yet, in H.R. 15149, the giveaway artists propose that we give India another \$385 million in the 1970 program. Likewise, Brazil has \$404,051,000 in the pipeline and we are to give her another \$174 million as proposed in H.R. 15149. These are only two startling examples of the fact that we are giving money away faster than it can be spent.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman the bulk of our money is going for vast military hardware expend-

itures. Does the gentleman believe that all which is spent for military hardware is justified?

Mr. ICHORD. I would say it is a matter of priority. Of course, we all see our priorities differently. But I say to the gentleman he should also be interested in the amount going into our health research plan. I am sure the gentleman is.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is quite right. I would only suggest the United States has always been the leader in international development, but it now ranks eighth in international development aid. If this bill becomes law, we will drop to the basement. Does the gentleman think this is the role the United States ought to be playing in the world community?

Mr. ICHORD. I would say to the gentleman the United States is in a very serious financial condition, and if the gentleman wants to, he can vote for the same amount in this Development Loan Fund, and accept only 25 percent in our own construction programs, but I am not willing to do so. I put this on a basis of priority. If I can save money here, then I can have more money for our own construction and development projects. For that reason I hope the committee adopts the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAREY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAREY to the amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: Strike "\$168,875,000" and substitute "\$425,500,000".

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for permission to revise and extend my remarks, but not to revise and extend the amount in my amendment, because this gives a chance for a clear dichotomy to be set forth in this Chamber at this time.

The amount is not new. All I am recommending is the amount that President Nixon asked for to continue the program on the basis of his estimates. I think I heard rightly when I heard my President state that around the world we were going to use a different kind of quiet diplomacy that meant something to all the people of the world, and I do not know anything that means more to the people of the world in which we live than the maintenance of human life.

I know no program that goes more toward the maintenance of human life than the development loans we are using to try to shore up the living quality in the developing nations.

On page 23 of the report there is pointed out what the loans are used for: Dams, factories, education, and health facilities.

Take health facilities: I read the other day that we had achieved "the millennium," that we had vaccinated or immunized against malaria the 100 millionth African. It sounds like a great goal and a great achievement. In actuality, all we have insured is that one out of two children born in Africa or in

the troubled areas of Latin America or Asia will now live to age 7 instead of age 5 and die from something besides malaria.

Instead of dying from yellow fever or malaria they will now have the opportunity to die from diphtheria or amoebic dysentery combined or the river disease or scarlet fever or the measles or any of the diseases that we have cured in this country. Years ago, after the Louisiana Purchase, we had the courage to go forth into what a doctor by the name of Jackson called "those aboriginal areas" of the Louisiana Purchase to drive malaria and yellow fever and all those diseases out of Missouri and Tennessee and those aboriginal lands that were suffering from all the diseases we now find in Africa and in Asia.

All I am trying to do on the basis of 1970 dollars is to give the same opportunities under my President to the children who will be born in Africa and Asia which we formerly gave to those territorial citizens of Missouri so that they could live and bring up their families and see the day when they would be ready to develop their areas for urban and suburban assistance such as my colleague from Missouri is requesting now.

I have also heard that one of the big objectives in the administration—and I support this—is family planning and program assistance for birth control in these areas. This is in the development loan program. We are never going to get any kind of effective family planning until they develop a health system to deliver family planning adapted to the traditional systems of health which exist in Africa, South America, and Asia.

So if the Members are not prepared to deal with a population crisis, if they insist on the propagation of afflicting diseases in the underdeveloped world, then they will vote for the gentleman from Missouri or the committee sum. But if they are prepared to back President Nixon in 1970, to make this meager contribution to the wealth and the health of the world, then they will back my amendment, which is the President's authorization request.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I commend the gentleman. I want to say I strongly support his amendment. His enlightened self interest, demonstrated here, reflects the statesmanship he has always shown in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAREY. May I make one final point.

I checked with the House surgeon. I found out it is a most painful, painful experience for a Member to go abroad as a Member of the House if he has never gone abroad before, because he has to go into the House surgeon and request a full series of shots. He has to get yellow fever, malaria, tetanus, diphtheria—right down the line. When he comes out he should get a Purple Heart for the way his arm looks after this series of shots.

Do Members know why they have to get those shots? It is because there is not

an area of the world they can go today to check on this program where they do not have to adopt a defensive health mechanism so they can live through the areas where people are dying.

If we pass this development loan program we can stamp out yellow fever, malaria, and all killing and crippling diseases which used to exist in this country, and we will never have to go to that surgeon again and defend ourselves with a puncture in the arm against the diseases we find around the world when we go to inspect these programs.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, let us discuss the position that we find ourselves in at this particular time. The administration or administrations requested \$675.5 million. The authorizing committee reduced that to \$425.5 million. The Committee on Appropriations dealing absolutely on facts and statistics reduced it to \$265 million. Now we have an amendment to reduce it to \$168,875,000 and you have a substitute to move it back up to \$425.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that we had to impound funds last year and slow down projects where you had 4,408 projects in 99 nations and 5 territories of the world and not a one of them lost a single dime. But with privileges come responsibilities. I must be a responsible Member. There is no justification for the \$425 million and you would wreck the program if you cut it back to \$168,875,000. So, I certainly hope that the Committee will vote down the substitute and, of course, vote down the amendment based upon these actual facts that at this time last year for development loans your committee recommended \$265 million. When it went to the other body they increased it to a higher figure, but the final appropriation was \$300 million and that proved to be excessive.

Mr. Chairman, your committee believes that the \$265 million that we are recommending is fully the amount needed to fund this program. We are now 5 months into the new fiscal year and they have only authorized and obligated \$122,575,000. So based upon the obligations so far in these 5 months, they will have ample funds in this Development Loan Fund to take care of all the programs.

Further, may I call to your attention again that buried in this bill in the different titles is some \$655 million in different banks such as the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Bank and in IDA, and I can assure you that this year as in the previous 14 years that it has been my privilege to report this bill, that we are not underfunding these programs. We are overfunding these programs.

So I plead with you that based upon the facts and statistics the \$265 million is ample to fund this program. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Members will vote down both of these amendments and

stick with the committee that has been handling this successfully for so many years.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get something straight, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) who made quite an issue of the fact that he had to see a physician before he could take a junket overseas because he had to get shots or something of that nature.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute and then I will yield to the gentleman. What happens is you go to the physician and get your shots and then go overseas. Who do you see about your shots overseas or do you not get any shots overseas?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished colleague will now yield, I said I referred to the records of the House physician and found that this represented quite an expenditure for shots for Members going overseas. I did not identify myself as one of those Members. But I understand those shots are quite painful and expensive as well to the House of Representatives. I indicated that you needed shots here in order to defend yourself against germs from overseas. Once you get overseas you can get a shot for anything you want, if you can afford to pay for it.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if those shots you got overseas are painful or pleasant.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. If you get a shot from the House physician, it will take you all the way over and back without a secondary booster.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield? I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, just one moment. I did not yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman from Iowa mentioned—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to properly identify the gentleman from New York who I am sure does out more money for more representation allowances than any other chairman of a subcommittee in the House, who probably has in his jurisdiction more booze and entertainment funds than any other chairman in the House.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, if he will yield at this point, that for over a quarter of a century I have found that the overseas shots are less painful than the shots downstairs in the Capitol physician's office referred to by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. GROSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with a few facts of life.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) mentioned Africa several times. Through the dispensation of the tax

dollars of the American taxpayers, and the Lord knows they are burdened enough, this handout program set out to create in Nigeria the showcase of all Africa. In Nigeria they have taken care of the diseases and the afflictions of children in a down-to-earth way. Thousands of children have been massacred in the war in Nigeria, the AID showcase, or have died of starvation. Yes, they really get down to earth to take care of the children in Nigeria, and by the thousands.

It makes little difference how much this \$200 or \$300 million is increased. There is little accomplishment except to add to the burdens of American taxpayers.

I discovered a day or two ago that this U.S. Government is financing in Tunisia the buying of crude oil. The chief export of Tunisia is oil.

Can the chairman of the committee give me any reason why this AID outfit should finance the buying of crude oil for Tunisia, from Libya?

Mr. PASSMAN. I cannot give the distinguished gentleman from Iowa an answer. I do not know what he is talking about, to be completely honest with him. We have never discussed Indonesian oil before my committee.

Mr. GROSS. Tunisian oil.

Mr. PASSMAN. Oh, Tunisia?

Mr. GROSS. That is where some of this giveaway money is going.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would answer the gentleman by saying I do not know anything about it.

Mr. GROSS. Here is Tunisia, a country whose chief export is oil, and we provided money for them to buy oil from Libya.

And how about the expenditure of funds from this foreign aid program to train bartenders?

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I must admit that in this bill you may find money to train bartenders, I must admit that. There are some programs much more foolish than that. And that is one of the reasons I have made my criticisms rather mild, so as to not kill the bill. But we had no information whatsoever about this country buying oil from Tunisia, or any other countries.

I can assure the gentleman from Iowa, and I can answer him seriously, this is the first time that I heard that we were buying cheap oil from Libya, and sending it to Tunisia. And I am just as opposed to it as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I could get unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes, I would read the President's message that is to come up, I guess, tomorrow noon—is this the 9th or the 10th of December? It will call for \$40 million for the arts and humanities. I think we ought to interrupt this session for the reading of President Nixon's message so that everyone could be put on notice that \$40,000,000 should be cut from this bill to finance

the President's request for that amount to take care of the arts and humanities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ICHORD), there were—ayes 29, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative expenses: For expenses authorized by section 637(a), \$50,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAREY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAREY: On page 4, line 17, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$52,250,000".

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I seek support for this amendment in a sense in order to pay my respects to the people who have been managing the AID program.

I have had occasion to look into this program as much as it is possible to do so without looking at the program in person around the world. That is why I have not needed to take the immunization shots to see the on-site developments of this program.

But I have been convinced by the statistics that have been shown to me and by pictures that I have seen and developments that I have been able to witness secondhand from my discussions with representatives of foreign countries who have benefited from this program. I think we ought to second the President's request in asking for the full amount of management funds for this program so that it can be properly managed.

I would like to ask the Committee of the Whole to recognize that what I am seeking here is money to manage the program which the gentleman from Iowa has indicated needs good management. This is just a few dollars less than we are willing to commit to the Chiang Kai-shek government in Formosa to manage world security by use of our latest model jet airplane.

In our system of priorities, it is far more important that we back the Agency for International Development which is our agency, managed by our people in the State Department, to carry our message around the world than it is to put ourselves on record for the Formosan government to take care of mutual security needs of this and other countries around the world with our airplanes.

I want to see where our system of values is in the committee today.

I want to see if we are going to back an American agency which has gone forward in the most trying areas of necessity in the world and which has mounted the programs in Asia, Latin America, and South America and in Africa against the most challenging conditions to try to

bring the message of America into these lands in situations that are almost of indescribable in terms of human needs.

I wish the gentleman from Iowa would continue the colloquy with me that he raised before in connection with shots and the need for immunization and what it does for the people who are receiving this aid from America. The malaria program, I indicated, resulted in the immunization of at least 100 million Africans; and yellow fever, 25 million Africans. This means we have reached about 10 percent of those who might benefit from this program which would give them a chance at life. The reason we cannot go further with the program is that the agency itself lacks the manpower, lacks the capacity in terms of management, lacks the means, and lacks the clear requisite means to go ahead with this program that would save literally millions of lives by the expenditures of relatively few dollars.

I came across this, which I would like to check with the chairman of the subcommittee. I know he knows this program firsthand. We heralded this new gain for America when we proclaimed that it immunized the 100 millionth African from yellow fever and the 25 millionth African from malaria. I asked how it is possible to accomplish this modern miracle of immunization. I was told that we had developed a new kind of vaccination technique, an immunization technique—an argun which would project into the arm of the patient at a rate of 1,300 jets per minute, an immunization agent which rendered him, as I have said, free from the danger of yellow fever or malaria.

Then I asked, what about the other vaccines? What about measles? What about scarlet fever? What about diphtheria and all the things that save children from dying in this country? Why did we not do the same thing for each patient at the same time? And I was told the money was not there to do it.

I am wondering, as we talk about this program, how we can justify a program that, in one sense, saves a child from one killing disease but leaves him exposed to all others for the sake of a few million dollars.

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

I do not think you want to vote until we give you an explanation. The gentleman has talked about a limitation. We are talking about administrative expenses. It takes more personnel to run a \$5 million business than it does to run a \$2 million business. The budget requests \$2.71 billion, and they asked for administrative expenses of \$51 million to administer \$2.71 billion. In all probability, Congress somewhere along the way will provide \$1.75 billion, which means the appropriate amount for this would be \$37.5 million.

In our committee we have one distinguished member that wanted to cut it to \$40 million. Finally he said he would compromise at \$45 million. We insisted on keeping it at \$50 million. But there is absolutely no justification for an increase over and above the \$50 million,

and I trust the committee will vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance: For expenses authorized by sections 504(a) and 504(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including administrative expenses and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside the United States, \$404,500,000, of which not less than \$54,500,000 shall be available solely for the Republic of China: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available for the purchase of new automotive vehicles outside of the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to furnish sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile system and jet aircraft for military purposes, to any underdeveloped country other than Greece, Turkey, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea, unless the President determines that the furnishing of such weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the military assistance program for any country shall not be increased beyond twenty per centum of the amount justified to the Congress, unless the President determines that an increase in such program is essential to the national interest of the United States and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within thirty days after each such determination.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On line 17, on page 5, delete "sections" and substitute "section". Line 18, on page 5, delete "and 504(e)". Lines 21 through 23, page 5, delete "404,500,000, of which not less than \$54,500,000 shall be available solely for the Republic of China:" and substitute "\$50,000,000:".

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to strike \$54.5 million for jets to China.

I do not think the United States should be the weapons arsenal for the so-called free world. The less developed countries cannot afford bright and shiny new weapons systems, and this is precisely why I amended our bill in 1967 to prohibit the transfer of sophisticated weapons to them.

By the same token, I do not believe we should give away sophisticated weapons to any nation just because it is excluded from the provisions of my amendment—especially when they are neither requested nor wanted by the President, the State Department, the agency for International Development, or the Defense Department.

This, however, is precisely what happened in the case of the jets for the Republic of China. Over the strong objection of 169 of its Members, this body authorized \$54.5 million for this outright gift. And the committee, I regret to say, went right along with it.

I strongly oppose the appropriation

this amendment would knock out because there has been no justification whatsoever for it.

To begin with, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that no request was ever made for the planes and over the circumstances surrounding its unexpected inclusion in the authorization bill. I think my colleagues should be equally disturbed.

Moreover, even during the very limited floor debate on this surprise move, serious doubts were raised about whether Taiwan had any real military need for the jets. One such doubt is that mainland China may very well not have the capability to invade the island republic.

It was also pointed out that Israel, which in contrast to China is faced with daily military threats, paid in full for the jets we sent her. The appropriation this amendment would delete, however, is nothing more than a big fat \$54.5 million handout at the expense of the American taxpayer.

This handout is as unnecessary from an economic point of view as it is from a military point of view. The economy of nationalist China is booming—triggered in large part by some \$5 billion in U.S. assistance over the last 20 years.

Now I ask my colleagues very pointedly—How do we know whether China needs these jets? Floor debate consisted of some five pages in the Record. No supporting material was sent up to Congress. In fact, barely anyone knew anything about these jets until that fateful day in November—the 20th to be exact—when an amendment was offered calling for the expenditure of \$54.5 million of the taxpayers' money.

We are already halfway through fiscal 1970 and at the end of calendar 1969. Why, then, not wait on these jets and consider them at a later date in the new budget or even now in a supplemental request? I might note that our Appropriations Committee is currently holding hearings on several supplemental budget requests.

Either way, the delay would give us a chance to question the right people, including Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, about the need for them. I urge my colleagues as strongly as I can to adopt a wait and see attitude by approving this amendment. My guess is that, if we do, we will see that these jets are not needed and that this money should, therefore, not be thrown down the drain.

Mr. Chairman, again I repeat, neither the Pentagon nor the Defense Department has asked for these planes. There never have been any committee hearings before our committee or the authorization committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, for these planes. There has been no evidence presented or testimony presented to any committee in the Congress, and the Senate just knocked the planes out of their bill last week.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I voted on the authorization bill I did not have available to me the document which the chairman of the subcommittee has presented to us in general debate, which is labeled "top secret." Therefore, I was somewhat

concerned when I heard that this document was in existence. The able chairman, however, has made the document available to me, and I must say that my fears with respect to my first vote against the \$54.5 million for planes for Taiwan have been greatly relieved.

However, I have not yet been able to peruse with any care the document labeled "top secret." Of course, I am not in a position even to say here what I noted in that document.

There is a second letter. First, I will ask the chairman if it is permissible for me to refer to its date and to the signature on the letter only? I do not want to violate the "top secret" nature of the letter.

Mr. PASSMAN. Revealing any part of this document which is stamped "secret" would be violating rules of handling classified documents. Nothing can be said without violating security.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I certainly have the highest respect for that limitation and shall entirely abide by it, but I wish to submit to the Members of the House that when such a "top secret" letter is not presented to the committees there is no way we can evaluate the letter to determine whether or not it should prevent us from voting for this amendment at this time. Unless the committees consider the letter there is no way the letter may be properly evaluated.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I can reveal that the letter was dated December 5 in the year of our Lord 1969.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Then I suppose it would be permissible for me to note that the previous letter in the file was dated November 19, 1969.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. These terrible secrets that are being released to the public astound me and concern me. I have looked at hundreds of secret letters and documents, but this is the first time I have ever been told that the date of a letter is to be considered secret.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I would in conclusion like to submit to the House that it would be proper to vote down the \$54.5 million increase and, if these letters in fact convince any committee of this House that the \$54.5 million is needed then there can be a supplemental appropriation to take care of it.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I respect the gentleman very highly.

The executive branch establishes our national policy. That policy says we will provide military equipment to our allies, including Korea and Taiwan. But it is also a prerogative of this Congress to decide the amount of the aid we shall furnish, just as we did in other bills that were passed by this House. There were

\$2 billion of unbudgeted items contained in bills passed by the House. I did not hear the gentleman argue then about the need for justification.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Let me reply to that. I respect this House greatly. I respect the judgment of this House as superior even to the judgment of the committees. But I do not believe that this House can make a judgment without being able to see the letters on which the judgment is based.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I was curious as to whether the gentleman has any idea about who it is the Taiwanese Air Force is supposed to fight with the planes we are asked to give them?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I might answer that, but I would be afraid I would reveal the confidence of the "top secret" letter.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Maybe we could discuss this question if we do not mention any specific country. Of course one country, perhaps the chief country, that the Taiwanese might be expected to fight is not supposed to exist at all, so maybe that would make it easier to discuss it without naming it. But my problem is that I want to understand the implications of giving a country an air force. Surely it is not unreasonable, if we are to give a country an air force, to have some idea of what that air force is supposed to be used for. Even if we were only selling someone an air force that question would interest me.

Since the planes we are being asked to give Nationalist China are bombers, presumably they will have to be used to drop bombs, or they will not be very useful. But once we give these planes away, presumably we also give away any control over whom they might be used against. Now, if Nationalist China used these planes to bomb the noncountry we cannot name, does the gentleman know if we would be expected to defend Nationalist China against retaliation? Are we going back in the unleashing China business again. Or perhaps the gentleman can suggest some other potential target for Nationalist Chinese bombers, one that has not occurred to others of us?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I can only say to my colleague that I am not at liberty to discuss the contents of the letter and I must confine myself to what has been prescribed by the chairman of the committee in revealing such information. Were I permitted to see this secret information I think I would be in a position to explain why I do not believe the letter compels me to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I appreciate the great discretion of the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I trust I will be giving away no secrets if I confess that none of the secrets of the secret letter have persuaded me that we should give away these airplanes. But then, very few facts, however secret, would persuade me that it is in the interest of the security of the United States to give an air force to Nationalist

China. For that matter, I am not sure I would favor giving anyone an air force at this time. And what I find especially disconcerting is this procedure of giving one away rather casually, sort of as an afterthought. For all we know, we may be more or less whispering ourselves into a new and totally unexplained commitment, a commitment of which this appropriation is clearly only the first installment. What a strange way this is to do something that is, at best, unexplained and dangerous.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 5, in line 18, insert "Sec. 504 (d); and in line 21, strike "\$404,500,000" and insert "\$454,500,000"; and, on line 23, after the word "China", add the following: "and \$50,000,000 for the Republic of Korea."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

(By unanimous consent Mr. BROOMFIELD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today because of my deep concern about the need for increased military assistance to the Republic of Korea and in order to provide an opportunity for the Members of the Committee of the Whole House to express themselves on this vital issue.

As the Members of this body will recall, the foreign assistance authorization bill approved on November 20 contained language to provide \$50 million in fiscal 1970 and \$50 million in fiscal 1971 for the modernization of South Korea's armed forces. This language originated as an amendment I offered to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and it received broad support among the committee's members.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. PASSMAN) has in his possession intelligence information underscoring the urgent need for this appropriation.

There are a number of important factors to be weighed in consideration of this amendment.

As we are all well aware, the United States has maintained a large military contingent in Korea since the Korean armistice of July 27, 1953. That contingent now numbers over 50,000 men.

It supplements a well trained and extremely loyal South Korean military in excess of 600,000.

Together, this combined force confronts an increasingly bellicose and militant government to the north, one which almost daily renews its threats to reunite Korea by armed aggression.

That threat is supported by both word and deed. North Korea is a stable, solidly industrialized, hard-line police state with a military establishment far in excess of normal defense needs for a country of its size.

Five percent of North Korea's peo-

ple—more than 400,000—are in the armed forces. In addition, it has a popular militia, exceeding 1 million in strength.

In terms of U.S. population, it is as if we had 10 million men in our regular military forces backed by 20 million in the National Guard. Nearly 40 percent of North Korea's annual budget is devoted to the support and maintenance of these forces.

All branches of North Korea's military are well-equipped with modern Soviet and Chinese weaponry, especially the Air Force which exceeds South Korea's both in quality and quantity of equipment.

By contrast, South Korean forces have very little sophisticated weaponry, most of it at least of Korean war vintage. Virtually all of our aid has gone for the repair and maintenance of that equipment, very little toward modernization.

War by miscalculation is a very real peril against this sort of backdrop. And, North Korea has shown no sign that it wants to avoid such a disaster.

Since 1965, the north has embarked on an overt and increasingly aggressive policy of harassment and infiltration aimed at disrupting the South Korean Government and establishing guerrilla bases in the south.

At first, infiltration was confined to the demilitarized zone, but later in 1966 and at an increasing rate since, the north has also launched a campaign of infiltration by sea.

The latter tactic has placed particular stress on the South Korean Navy which is badly underequipped and lacks the high speed patrol boats necessary to cope effectively with this threat.

In 1967 and 1968, the North continued to increase its already high-level of activity and in early 1968 staged two spectacular acts of belligerency.

On January 21, a specially trained team of 31 commandos attempted unsuccessfully to assassinate South Korean President Park and 2 days later North Korean patrol boats seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

In November 1968, in the largest North Korean intrusion since the Korean war, 120 heavily armed commandos landed at points near Ulchin on the east coast. South Korea responded by mobilizing 40,000 militamen to track down the intruders and by strengthening security measures at threatened installations. By the end of the year most of the invaders had been killed or captured.

Major incidents have continued to occur each year until late in the fall when intrusions usually decline because of cold weather and the disappearance of foliage which provides cover for the infiltrators.

This constant and intensive probing by the North will quickly uncover and capitalize on any weakness in the South.

Because of our heavy commitment and preoccupation in Vietnam, the United States has tended to downplay the real potential for armed conflict in Korea and hope for the best. This is a policy which ultimately will lead to difficulty.

It is in this country's interest to maintain a strong counterforce in South

Korea both for the short- and long-range future. For the present, weakness is only an invitation for even greater harassment from the North and a heightened potential for U.S. involvement in another conflict.

For the long range, we can only hope to consider a reduction of U.S. forces in Korea—and I do not foresee that in the near future—after we have embarked on a reasonable military modernization program to preserve the balance of force after we are gone. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge careful consideration and support for this amendment.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan this question:

Do I understand correctly that the gentleman seeks to restore the \$54 million for China, and to add the equipment for Korea as well in this substitute?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. To answer the gentleman, because of the parliamentary procedure, I had to offer my amendment for Korea, otherwise I could be precluded in offering this amendment if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) prevailed.

Mr. MONAGAN. But the net effect is to include both?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. The net effect is to include both.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman in the well for his amendment. It has been my privilege to see at first hand the need of the South Korean forces for this military assistance. I believe that their capability and their attitude create valuable assistance to the peacekeeping program. This will be timely assistance, which can pay dividends for the peace and security of the world. Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his timely motion.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those Members who were not on the floor when I made my earlier remarks, this issue goes back to the argument that I made during general debate. There is absolutely no justification, in my opinion, for either the Korean amendment or the Chinese amendment.

If these military requirements are justified, the arguments that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and I are making are to let it go through the regular legislative channels.

Mr. Chairman, I indicated in the committee at the time we were arguing this matter that this goes far beyond what is

required. Such a serious matter as taking a floor amendment and putting it in on the floor, affects the very foreign policy of this administration. And as I indicated in my earlier remarks, we have not heard a thing from the State Department one way or another. And I can tell you—I assert from the floor of this House—that the problems related to this country's complex and evolving foreign policy in relation to the Far East are at stake. We have the question of Vietnamizing the Vietnam war. There are many people, including some policy planners who for some time have been arguing over the size of our manpower commitments in Korea. And I wondered as I listened to the gentleman from Ohio why it took so long for us to understand that maybe we would have to give military support to the Koreans instead of having 50,000 troops over there all these years. We have been in Korea since 1950. They have 19 divisions. And it is well known by those who are well informed that there has been a very, very hot argument internally over how long and in what number we should keep our troops there.

Now, as our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) said in his separate views—and I urge the Members to read them—if we are thinking about the Vietnamization of the war in Vietnam, we had better start thinking about the Koreanization of the Korean operation. I am not against military assistance to Korea, but I say that it is dead wrong to do it this way. I am more interested in what we should do on this bill as it pertains to helping developing nations.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be made clear first what the parliamentary situation is here.

I have offered an amendment to strike out \$54,500,000 for jets for the Republic of China.

The gentleman from Michigan now moves a substitute adding \$50,000,000 to the bill for military assistance to Korea.

If this substitute prevails, this bill will be inflated by \$50,000,000 for Korea and planes for Taiwan. Therefore, the parliamentary situation is we have to knock down his substitute and then vote on my amendment.

I might say that we have worked very hard, the both of us, and the chairman of this committee, in helping Korea down through the years.

We did not need anybody to get up here on the floor with an amendment. We have given Korea \$7.4 billion.

Now we did not need any generals on this floor to come in here and tell us what the new policy should be in Korea or Taiwan.

Mr. COHELAN. In addition to a lot of other supporters—as a matter of fact, and I am sure the gentlemen on the Committee on Foreign Affairs know on both sides of the aisle, this has been one of our stunning economic aid successes. I want to continue that, but I suggest to you the issue here is—how

are we going to do this? As I said earlier in my remarks, let this be done in the proper way. Let it be done through the regular foreign policy and military channels—but keep it out of the AID program because as long as you get it all mixed up with this, we will be prejudicing this bill.

I want to say again for the benefit of the gentleman from Ohio, in my earlier remarks I tried to make it clear that you have already seen the House vote on this measure. There is a great deal of opposition to adding this item in this way, and you are prejudicing your own administration's Foreign Assistance Act. I plead with you to defeat this amendment. I support the foreign assistance development loans, technical assistance, and even supporting assistance. I supported the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) in the full committee on supporting assistance for the reason I want to Vietnamize that war as rapidly as possible and I want to get our men out of there as I want eventually to get them out of Korea. I will say to the gentleman, that I believe they have been there in divisional strength far too long. I would much rather see those two Korean divisions in Vietnam up in Korea where they belong and where they would be operating in defense of their own country. This certainly does not preclude adequate military assistance by the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will make it possible to vote for funds, badly needed funds for a measure of modernization of weapons for Korea and to retain funds for a squadron of modern aircraft for Taiwan.

There are some publications which have insisted day after day that the administration opposes this proposal—and this is not true; that the State Department opposes it, and that is not true; and even that the Department of Defense opposes it. It has been amply demonstrated here on the floor today that the Department of Defense supports what is proposed.

There are those who have said that the administration should ask for money for modernization of weapons for our friends, and that Congress should not take the initiative. But there have been many cases where the Congress has wisely acted on its own responsibility and has taken the initiative. We should act whenever we see a need. We are not an appendage of the White House or of the State Department or of any other department of Government. This bill contains unbudgeted programs for Israel, and I am glad it does. But no one has raised a question about that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those who see through rose tinted glasses the prospect of a world in which we will live happily side by side ever after with Communist China—and apparently we have some here—will do well to take another look.

Red China is strengthening its defenses. It has a fleet that contains over

1,200 vessels including 36 submarines—and here in my hand is a listing of the numbers and the categories.

Its air force contains, within striking distance of Taiwan, over 1,400 jet aircraft. Many of them are modern Migs and Red China is manufacturing its own modern Migs.

Red China is promoting revolution all around its borders. Red China is the principal supplier of conventional arms to North Vietnam. Did you know that? I repeat, Red China is the principal supplier of conventional weapons to North Vietnam.

(On request of Mr. RIVERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SIKES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is not a bright new weapons system for Taiwan. It will provide one squadron of 18 aircraft, not even the most modern aircraft in our inventory, but aircraft that are less costly than our most modern aircraft, and aircraft that are a match for the MIG's that Red China has. One squadron, 18 aircraft, to help replace some of the obsolete aircraft on which Taiwan must now rely for protection—F-86's, F-100's—absolutely incapable of withstanding an attack by Communist MIG's. No match for them.

Of course, the aircraft are needed. They are needed if Taiwan is to have a chance to survive in case of attack.

Why do we want to help them? Because they have demonstrated staunch friendship. They offered troops for South Vietnam. There can be no greater test of dependability in time of crisis. The offer was rejected, and many of us think this was a mistake. But they were offered.

Taiwan is a brake on Red China, a needed brake on Red Chinese aggression. Taiwan provides one of the best and surest forward bases now available to us in the far Pacific. Okinawa has been frittered away, making a mockery of the American lives lost there. We are now in the process of downgrading our base structure on Okinawa by making the weapons that we store there subject, to all intents and purposes, to Japanese control. This means Taiwan is doubly important as a secure forward base for U.S. and friendly forces.

As a part of the package which is offered by the substitute, we would be restoring to the bill the funds for Korea which were provided in the House authorization bill. Korea has troops in South Vietnam. They have made the most meaningful contribution of any nation other than our own forces and the South Vietnamese. They have weakened their own forces at home to help us.

Please remember also that U.S. forces along the DMZ between North and South Korea are exposed almost daily to harassment. American lives are being lost all too frequently there through enemy action.

The arrogant hostility of North Korea, her callous brutality toward American personnel, have been demonstrated time and again. There was the *Pueblo*, the EC121. The United States has literally

been made to crawl when these incidents occurred. It would be folly to fail to help to strengthen South Korea's defenses to the point that enemy aggression can be thwarted. Here is an instance where American lives are going to be directly on the line if war breaks out. There are 50,000 U.S. troops in South Korea today. They will be directly and immediately involved in the event of hostilities and many more will be required. The funds contained in this bill are very small payment indeed for helping to avoid such a situation.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I take this time only because I have just received a letter—and I think the gentleman from Michigan received a similar letter—from the Secretary of Defense strongly urging the adoption of the amendment relating to South Korea. The Secretary points out that South Korea is one of the most valiant allies of the United States. The letter is marked secret, so, if the gentleman will bear with me, I will merely summarize it.

It points out that the North Korean air and naval forces are more formidable than those of South Korea and that these forces are hostile, hard in position, and remain deployed to strike as in 1950 without warning. Of immediate concern are the actual hostilities that North Korea currently conducts throughout South Korea. The South Korean Government has taken the most resourceful and positive measures with some success but still requires substantial assistance from the United States to demonstrate conclusively its will and ability to resist aggression.

Then the Secretary states that the need for funding the \$50 million authorized is urgent and has been stated to be such by the United Nations command, the Commander-in-Chief in the Pacific, and our Joint Chiefs of Staff, an opinion which, he says, "I share." The \$50 million authorized would materially assist in meeting the needs of this area.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished majority leader indicated, not only he but I have received a letter from the Secretary of Defense, our former colleague, Melvin Laird.

This is a very persuasive document. Those of us who have had some background in the effort South Korea has made, an effort they are continuing to make, to be on our side, the willingness on their part to help in meeting the challenge in Southeast Asia, will be convinced as I am beyond any doubt that we ought to approve the substitute amendment.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the Korean conflict is a United Nations obligation. Despite this, Korea has sent over 50,000 of their crack troops to Vietnam, never once questioning the fate of these men, and they have not asked yet that the men be withdrawn. They are face to face with the most insidious enemy civilization has ever known. Have we forgotten the *Pueblo* and what that crowd will do to civilized people? Have we forgotten the EC-121 that was shot down? Have we forgotten the countless hundreds of our helicopter pilots who have been trapped over the DMZ and shot down by this crowd of savages?

Are we going to walk out on Korea, one of the greatest allies we have ever known?

Take Nationalist China: Let us not forget that is one of our two allies. They are tying down 19 divisions of an enemy which is on the threshold of an intercontinental ballistic missile. We discussed that in connection with the ABM.

Are we going to walk out on these people to whom we are bound by the SEATO Treaty?

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is senseless to drag the red herring of Israel into this debate about Nationalist China. We are bound to these people by treaty, by the SEATO Treaty.

We know good and well there are plenty of us who have and will come to the aid of Israel. Nobody is going to accuse me of not having an affectionate and favorable regard for the existence of Israel. I have gone on record for that.

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot and must not walk out on people who are committed to bringing the American boys home—and that is all these allies are asking of us. Korea has said time and time again: "Give us the guns. Take your boys home. We have the manpower and the will and the dedication."

Ask anybody who has been there about the Korean army. It is a carbon copy of the American troops—Army, Navy, Air Force, WAC's, WAVES, and everything—and they will die if necessary.

Now, let us get to Nationalist China. Nobody has asked them to come to Vietnam. Had anybody asked them, they would have been there.

Across those straits, as the gentleman from Florida has stated, stand these new MIG airplanes that not only do they possess but they manufacture, and they are committed to destroy this island of Formosa and hence envelop the rest of Asia and ultimately land on the doorsteps of Hawaii.

Are you going to help them?

Are you going to back out on them? That is left to you. I am not.

I agree with what has been said by some of these gentlemen, that this military assistance should be under the Armed Services Committee. But it is not, and I am not going to complain about that, because the great chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has seen his responsibility and he has fulfilled it. I believe we could handle the military assistance, but I am not here to debate that.

I know that the gentleman who is going to ask me a question—and I am just about to yield to him—would not vote to take that away from the Foreign Affairs Committee and to vest our committee with jurisdiction over military assistance. I know he would not do that, but if it were there we would be in the same position.

I do not believe this Congress is going to turn its back on the two tried-and-true friends we have. If it is, God help the sacred signature of America and the pledged word of my country.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely remind the gentleman, having had the great privilege of serving with him on the Armed Services Committee, I am well aware of the courage of our allies, the South Koreans. But I should like to say to the gentleman that I have never been in favor of maintaining the strength we have in Korea at this time. It comes as passing strange to me that, considering our involvement in Korea since 1950, we are suddenly presented with this tremendous need for these airplanes.

Mr. RIVERS. They need them.

Mr. COHELAN. We have had a military assistance program there all this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Why do they need this now?

Mr. RIVERS. Let me tell the gentleman. There was a fellow named McNamara who had a policy of not giving them anything new. When the *Pueblo* was taken we had just three planes there. We did not have them. They have been begging plenty of times, begging us to give them the guns, the planes, the tanks and all this stuff to relieve these 50,000-odd men. We just have not done it.

This is a United Nations thing. We did not go there on our own. It is a United Nations force. Truman woke them up in the middle of the night, and told the United Nations to protect them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The gentleman from Florida made reference to the fact that this question was considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That is true. It was given a detailed and lengthy consideration as to the need for it, as to the amount that could be properly used, and as to the ef-

fect that it would have on other parts of our program.

Having in mind especially the increased activity in North Korea it was determined, and if my memory serves me correctly by a rather substantial vote, that this amount of money was required and could be put to good use.

Therefore, I would urge the committee that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) be accepted.

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

I regret that this question cannot be divided. Under the parliamentary procedure it cannot be.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan it really is a substitute for the Conte amendment. It provides for both the \$54.5 million for planes for China and \$50 million for Korea.

I support the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan with reference to Korea and I agree with the contents of the letters which were read by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader with reference to Korea. I think we should have the opportunity to vote on that amendment alone, and if so, I would vote for it. But I am not going to vote for the substitute now. I am going to vote against the substitute. I will vote for the Conte amendment. There has been some expression here to the effect that we will spend \$54.5 million for one squadron of planes for Nationalist China. That is only a down payment. The justification for planes for Nationalist China was made on this floor on November 20 and my friend and knowledgeable colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), indicated that his amendment of \$54.5 million would provide one squadron of the F4-D planes. If that is so, that is a real bargain basement price, because the cost of a squadron of F4-D planes is \$108.1 million. The breakdown for a squadron of such planes runs \$83 million for the aircraft, \$18.3 for avionics and other gear and \$6.8 for spare parts.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to defeat the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I say it regretfully because I do support his effort to assist Korea. What has been said about the need of additional military assistance in Korea is absolutely correct. I am not going to take a justification made on the floor of this Congress for \$54.5 million when the Foreign Assistance bill was considered and vote for it. The justification for Korea was made, as the distinguished ranking Republican, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR), of the Foreign Affairs Committee, stated in the committee as a result of serious thought and consideration. However, that was not done with reference to the item for planes for Nationalist China. Therefore, insofar as I am concerned I am going to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan and I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I certainly want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), and join with him in expressing the wish that this issue could be divided. The gentleman from Florida came down in the well of the House and talked about these planes in Taiwan becoming obsolete. Did they they become obsolete overnight? If they had become obsolete then why did not the administration come before our committee with reference to this situation?

Mr. Chairman, I have never voted once against military assistance. I joined with my minority leader and Melvin Laird in fighting for more funds for military assistance right in the well of this House. Now, I have to have someone come in here who is not on the committee, with no hearings, no evidence that the administration did ask for this, but they come in here and tell me that we have to do this, we have to give \$54.5 million to Taiwan or else we will be knocked off overnight by mainland China. This is fishy and I do not like it. And, if it stays in the bill, for the first time since I came to the House I may vote against the entire bill.

Mr. BOLAND. May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that these planes as I understand it—and I use the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Florida—are in inventory. We have them as I understand it. Well, if we have them we can have hearings on these by way of a supplemental. This matter can be taken care of in the proper way—by detailed hearings and justifications. The House will be back here early in January, hopefully the third week in January. There is no great rush about these planes. We can give them to them if they justify the need. The fact of the matter is that they have not been justified. This is not the way to legislate. Therefore, I hope the Committee votes down the substitute amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I think it is rather obvious what it is all about by this time.

The Foreign Affairs Committee brought in a bill authorizing \$50 million for Korea. There has been strong evidence given to many members of the Armed Services Committee as well as the Appropriations Committee indicating the need for Nationalist China being far greater than that for Korea and therefore the House of Representatives voted for the \$54.5 million for Taiwan.

The subcommittee that I have the honor to chair considered this matter and kept in the money for Taiwan, but over my protest took out the money for Korea.

The bill moved on then to the full committee. The full committee supported the subcommittee and kept the money in

for Taiwan, but did not provide money for Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I fought for this all the way through, but evidently the subcommittee and the full committee felt that the requirement for China was greater than that of Korea. I think they are equal.

Remember, we lost 33,000 Americans in Korea, and at this particular time the people to the north can strike with not a moment's notice. Those people know this. It is important that we put the money in for Korea, and keep the money in for China.

If there is a need for one, then there is the need for both. I can tell the Members without violating any secrets given to me that the requirements for Nationalist China are not \$54 million, they are in the neighborhood of \$400 million, immediately—not something next year or 2 or 3 years from now—and we are going to have to give consideration subsequently to about \$400 million. And when you move into Korea, the same thing is true. If you are going to update their forces, you are going to have to have this money.

Mr. Chairman, I am always trying to cut bills. I am not trying to increase bills. My record speaks for itself. But when my country is at war, I am going to support my country.

This money is needed. I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that I fought his battle in the subcommittee, I tried to hold the money in for Korea. I did the same thing in the full committee, and I can tell you on the floor of this House I am just as interested in the money for Korea as I am for Nationalist China. So let us stop playing personalities with the security of our country, and vote this amendment the way that it should be voted so we can provide the funds for both.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, can we fix a time on this debate? I think we can conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am making a unanimous-consent request that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On this paragraph of the bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, that is correct, on this paragraph of the bill.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, on this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if he said on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. PASSMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To this section of the bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. To this section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that all debate on this section of the bill, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) has 5 minutes, the gentleman having been recognized prior to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the question here really is not whether or not we recognize that a threat exists to this country in Southeast Asia. I was in Korea 3 weeks ago and I am aware of the military facts of life there. We all recognize that. The real question is how we are going to handle this matter as a matter of procedure.

We do have committees here in the House. We do have set procedures that have been established over the years because we believe that that is the best way to winnow the programs that are presented, and to determine what is the best thing for us to do for the Nation.

Now I regret, as the gentleman from Massachusetts also expressed his regret, that the parliamentary situation is what it is. I did support in the authorizing committee the authorization for the Korean military assistance. But we are now presented not only with that but also with the additional appropriation for the military assistance to China which was not presented to the authorizing committee.

If this is so urgent and so necessary, why was it not presented to the committee? It is only a few weeks ago that the committee on Foreign Affairs was sitting and that the committee presented its final legislative offering to the House.

Surely the facts of these situations could have been presented at that time and the legislative committee could have worked its will on mature consideration. Undoubtedly, such support would have been forthcoming if adequate proof had been provided.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been some confusion—and I want it to be clarified—about whether or not there were hearings held on the Korean question. Can the gentleman enlighten us on that?

Mr. MONAGAN. The matter of Korean assistance was discussed in the committee.

Mr. COHELAN. But there were no hearings.

Mr. MONAGAN. I have no recollection of any hearings.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman that I have discussed this with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) who is the subcommittee chairman on the Far East, and he advised me that the State Department gave no testimony on this issue. I merely want to say that I agree with the gentleman that this should go through the proper channels. If this is found to be justified, I would be more than willing to support it.

Mr. MONAGAN. I think all of us would. All we are suggesting is that the proper procedures should be followed. I have no recollection of the hearings. But at least this program was authorized by the legislative committee in contrast to the Chinese planes.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I am very disappointed that we do not have a chance to vote separately for money for Korea and money for China. Since the two are coupled in the substitute, I am going to vote against the substitute—even though in committee I voted for the authorization for funds for Korea.

It seems to me that this whole debate about assistance for both countries demonstrates the necessity of a more orthodox procedure than we are using with respect to these countries. It is not a question of turning our back on our allies. If hundreds of millions of dollars more need to be spent to protect our friends in Asia, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs should immediately get down to business. We should use the regular process for considering the requests for additional funds.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation and I fully agree with what he has said. Of course, the easiest way to prove the attitude of the committee is to point to the amount that we in the legislative committee actually authorized. This amply demonstrates the support that the committee has given this year, and also as you know has given in the past, to the military assistance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) has expired.

At the time the unanimous-consent request to limit debate was agreed to, the Chair observed the Members standing.

Each Member will be recognized for about 1 minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the Conte amendment, which in effect negates the Sikes amendment—and I am also going to vote against the Broomfield amendment.

The procedures in each case do violence to a logical legislative process. The emotional atmosphere that exists here tonight and that existed at the time the Sikes amendment was adopted is not

conducive to deliberate consideration of such important matters. It is much preferable that the arguments for these proposals be first considered in the calm that exists in the committee chambers.

By acting so hastily here we are playing into the hands of those who are critical of our priorities and of our legislative process.

Both here, in our country, and abroad, those who read the record of this debate will get a poor impression of how this House functions.

I would hope that the House in the future will pursue the more orderly procedure that brings measures to the floor in a way that assures logical debates and more informed decisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment, particularly against the provisions providing for the squadron of fighters for Nationalist China. It is my understanding that this is an appropriation for 18 Phantom attack bomber aircraft. The Phantom is an inferior aircraft to the Mig-17 with American pilots in it in a low altitude. It is an inferior aircraft to the Mig-21 at a high altitude. And the only possible purpose for which we could be buying these aircraft and giving them to Nationalist China would be to substantiate or possibly to carry on an attack against mainland China. It has no other purposes as a fighter aircraft. If American fighter pilots have to run with this kind of equipment, certainly Taiwan pilots would be in no better position. So I urge defeat of the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute and urge its adoption by the committee. I am confident that both of these allies need more in terms of military assistance, not less than that provided in the substitute. If we are ever to reach the position in which we can meet the concern expressed by so many Members of this House that American forces not be engaged in land wars in Asia, it will require more military assistance and more economic assistance to such allies. I urge adoption of the substitute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLTON and Mr. LOWENSTEIN yielded their time to Mr. FRASER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I regret the parliamentary procedure that we find ourselves confronted with now. I have drawn an amendment which I will offer if we defeat this substitute which will provide in effect that the Korean money would be authorized in place of the money for the Republic of China. There is no credible threat today against the Republic of China. Admiral McCain testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and said it would be foolhardy for mainland China to attack Taiwan. I have in my hand a statement

of the military balance published by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London, which is a very reliable authority on the forces of the various nations of the world. You cannot find in a statement of forces available to mainland China the sea-borne capability which would enable mainland China to mount a successful attack on Taiwan, which was precisely the point Admiral McCain made to us. The secret letter which has been circulated here today does not support this request. The secret letter, if anything, suggests that there are other priorities for Taiwan than the jet aircraft which this amendment seeks to provide. I think we could make a much better case for Korea where there are American troops stationed, where there is always a threat of attack from North Korea into South Korea, than we can for Taiwan. Taiwan is relatively immune today from attack. Taiwan enjoys the protection of a bilateral mutual security agreement with the United States. Any sense of reason or perspective or balance suggests that this money should not go to Taiwan at the present time, certainly not under the kind of shortcut procedures that we have today.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Korean money in committee. At least we had an opportunity to discuss that problem.

It is true the record itself and the testimony taken do not support the Korean request, but we did spend a great deal of time considering the question during the markup hearing, so there is some justification for that additional amount of money, and I would be prepared to see the money now going to China go instead to Korea.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota. This is no way to legislate. I resent this confrontation of the Members with mysterious secret documents and a belated letter from the Secretary of Defense. This matter should have been considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs so that justifying testimony could have been offered for committee evaluation.

I shall follow the advice of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and vote accordingly.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, if this money goes to Korea, my own position on the total bill may change from the position I have taken in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize there are some people who do not consider Red China as a military threat to the peace and security of Southeast Asia or the Pacific or even the United States in the years ahead. It happens I do not share that viewpoint. That is the real issue involved here. In my judgment Korea and the Republic of China, the

two countries that are under the gun as far as Red China is concerned, are the two countries that should receive full support from this country, as they have in the past. If anything, the support should be increased. This policy contributes directly to the future peace and security of Southeast Asia. And it contributes to the security of the United States. The need for these funds is urgent. I urge the approval of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely reiterate what I said in my remarks in the general debate. I protest the method of bringing this before the committee. I feel strongly, and I could possibly vote for military assistance to both Korea and Taiwan if there was justification for it. I think it is absolutely shocking that there has been no testimony from the State Department even in the discussions we have had today.

As I said in my main remarks, I have been in contact with the people downtown, and there has been no official commitment in any way. We have heard from the military types, but we have not heard from the foreign policy types. It seems to me most essential for us to do this.

Mr. Chairman, if we confuse the object of this bill, which is basically development assistance for developing countries with all this military assistance, I think we are making a great mistake.

I have indicated that I protest what is happening because I think it can be done in the proper way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I reject the implications of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) to the effect that those who are going to vote against this amendment are in any way not cognizant of the threat in the Far East. All of us are aware of that threat, but the fact that such a threat exists does not obviate the need to show the bans for this amendment. That has not been done. There has been sufficient explanation to justify a vote against the substitute and against the delivery of the planes to the Chinese. I, for one, am going to vote against the substitute and in favor of the Conte amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROOMFIELD yielded his time to Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, again I reiterate that I hope we will vote down the substitute and will vote for the

amendment to knock out the \$54.5 million for the jet planes for the Republic of China.

I repeat I have the highest regard for the gentleman who offered the substitute amendment. The gentleman does not serve on our committee. There has been no testimony before our committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee for this money for these jet planes.

Again I reiterate I have never voted against the military assistance program, and if we had hearings, I might be on the floor defending this particular item. I just do not like the procedure used here. I want the administration to come down and make a case for this, and I will not buy a pig in a poke as a floor amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the substitute will not prevail, and I hope the amendment I have offered will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate I said this was no way to legislate. Developments since that time have proved that is the case.

I regret, as I said earlier, that there is not an opportunity to vote separately on funds for Korea and funds for China. Under the circumstances I shall vote against the substitute and vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I might add also that I am considering voting to recommit the bill before the final vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Broomfield amendment for two good reasons.

First, I am convinced that the military aid and assistance for South Korea is essential because of the previous recommendation of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. That Committee with strong bipartisan support recommended this amount on this Korean program in the foreign aid authorization bill. I believe that is good evidence we ought to approve the Broomfield amendment.

Second, I am convinced that we should support the Broomfield amendment because of the communication received from the Secretary of Defense, the communication which was addressed to the majority leader and myself by our former colleague, Mel Laird.

For those two reasons I believe we ought to support the Broomfield amendment.

Let me make an observation, if I might, concerning the effort on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts to delete the \$54.5 million for the government in Taiwan. The same person who wrote to the majority leader and to me about the \$50 million for South Korea military assistance communicated with me on his own initiative the day of consideration of the foreign aid authorization bill and said that the Department was not objecting to the proposed amendment of \$54.5 million military assistance in the

authorization bill for the Republic of China. Now, if his testimony is good in a letter in reference to South Korea his views to me personally on behalf of military aid to the Republic of China is also a good recommendation.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I appreciate this. This is the first time I have heard this. It really is.

Is this not an odd way to legislate? Why not come up to our committee? Why not say something to our chairman? Why not say something to the ranking Republican member? Why not send up a supplemental? We would have passed out a supplemental like that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I cannot give the gentleman the answer. I know he called me personally the day of the foreign aid authorization and indicated he did not object to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Broomfield amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS yielded his remaining time to Mr. SIKES.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we hope to change our policies and to be able to achieve a situation where friendly nations can stand on their own feet. We are going to have to provide them with modern weapons if they are to do so. We have been too complacent about this. I believe it is preferable to send weapons, rather than having to send American boys, as we have had to do so many times in the past. That is why I support the substitute amendment. It will be a beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) to close debate on the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PASSMAN yielded his time to Mr. HALL.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am not noted as a big spender or as going against the rules of procedure, but I am strongly in favor of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

I am a little tired of hearing those who decry military assistance and still insist upon keeping it as a sweetener for those who would disburse economic assistance around the world.

If this is a question of military intelligence versus State Department viewpoint, I, for one, having investigated the EC-121 incident and the seizure of the *Pueblo*, to say nothing of military assistance around the world, am going to make any error on my part in favor of protecting allies who come to our aid.

The question is not if, but when will we be sucked in to a "slaughter alley"? When will we be sucked into an incident like we were off North Korea when EC-121 was seized? It can happen in many places around the world and I do not want our men or our tried and true allies in any such "turkey shoot."

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Michigan. I served in the military during the Korean conflict. I saw then the dedication and the devotion which the members of the military of the Republic of Korea and its people had for the cause of freedom.

To this day I still communicate with one of those gallant soldiers. They are our staunch allies, we have no better friends. I have visited their great country not too long ago, and have seen the tremendous progress which they have made. I have had the honor to visit with their President, with their legislative leaders, with their businessmen, and with many of its people. They all expressed to me their feelings of solidarity with our country. They all expressed to me also their concern over the rapid development of the war machinery of North Korea. I saw evidence of the desires and aims of North Korea and it was not that of a peace loving group.

I have also visited with our Armed Forces in Vietnam and while there had the honor to also visit with our allies from the Republic of Korea. It was an honor to do so, and if I had to go into battle, I would be proud, very proud to have by my side any member of that group.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me speak to the matter of Taiwan. Here again, Mr. Chairman, we have a great people, perhaps the greatest example in modern times of a freedom loving people who would not be conquered and would not surrender to Communist aggression. In that tiny island they have shown the world the strength and the determination to live as a free people while so many of their brothers, our brothers suffer the agony and the pain of Communist oppression.

I personally look forward to the day when they shall again return to the mainland and reunite all their people under a free and democratic government.

But until this is done, we must help them maintain their position in Taiwan. We must also help them, I believe, Mr. Chairman, for this other reason. While they hold out and live under the threat of the Communists, they still share their knowledge and their energy with others. They help the developing nations. I am well acquainted with the assistance they give in the field of agriculture to African nations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I very respectfully state to you and my colleagues that we have no better allies, we have no better friends, the world has no better example than these two nations of how a freedom loving people will survive and how they will resist with their last ounce of courage the Communist foe. We must stand by them, for in their own way, they stand with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 113, noes 77.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PASSMAN) there were—ayes 119, noes 82.

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 9, line 14, strike the period and insert a comma and add the following words: "or to Communist China."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph to which I have offered this amendment would read as follows:

No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam. . . .

And I add the words "or to Communist China."

Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me that if this language is to be used elsewhere in the bill, precluding dealings with Communist China, that it certainly ought to be in this paragraph.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for myself, and as far as I am personally concerned I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I have not checked this with the committee, but personally I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment it would preclude the granting of any economic assistance to any country that might have trading relations with mainland Red China. Is that the intent of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. FRASER. Could the gentleman tell us what countries would be affected by this amendment?

Mr. GROSS. I do not care how many are affected by it. If the Communist Chinese are going to continue to supply the arms for North Vietnam, I do not care how many countries are affected.

Mr. FRASER. The country of Pakistan has had relations with Red China, and

I expect it may carry on some trade with it.

We have given Pakistan both military and economic aid for many years.

I am wondering if the gentleman is looking at this in our national security interest. We may suddenly find ourselves unable to maintain any kind of aid relationship with the country of Pakistan. I am sure the same problem arises in connection with other countries. This is one of those emotional, demagogic kind of amendments that does not do any credit to the House if it should be adopted, and I hope it will not be adopted.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman calling me a demagogue?

Mr. FRASER. No, I am calling the amendment that kind of an amendment. I think the gentleman is a very articulate and able gentleman and has done very well here in the House, as I have observed him.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that is really substantive legislation and ought to be considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is ill-conceived. It could destroy aid relationships that we might have with any country trading with Red China and there might be a few we do not know, at this point, how many do carry on some kind of trade relationship with Mainland China.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 83, noes 54.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have resorted to the pro forma amendment in order to save some time.

I want to point out to the committee that this section—General Provisions title, beginning on line 18, page 6 through line 2, page 16, provides for some 22 sections. Six of them are clearly legislation.

Very wisely the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has preceded most of the sections with the technical term "None of the funds here appropriated" or "None of the funds made available" and thereby technically qualifying them as limiting amendments.

But I still want to point out there are six sections that are pure and simple legislation. As I have stated in the colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) during the debate on the rule, that a rule providing waiving points of order is not the proper way to legislate.

There is no point of having authorizing committees if the Committee on Appropriations will legislate in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to submit six amendments as follows:

On page 7, line 4, strike out section 102, providing for reporting engineering and architectural fees and services at least twice a year.

On page 7, line 22, strike out section 105, reiterating opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime.

On page 8, line 14, strike out section 106, a sense of Congress on attempts by foreign nations to discriminate because of race or religion.

On page 9, line 15, strike out section 108, providing for reporting of overseas procurement of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000.

On page 14, line 10, strike out section 119, withholding economic assistance to any underdeveloped country purchasing sophisticated weapons systems.

On page 14, line 20, strike out section 120, providing reporting by the President before furnishing development loans, Alliance loans or supporting assistance after taking into account certain policies of recipient countries regarding military purposes.

I might point out that some of the provisions I happen to agree with, but again I submit such language should not be contained in an appropriation bill. In order to expedite consideration of the six amendments, I intend to ask unanimous consent to consider the six amendments en bloc.

First, I wish to point out they were not explained by the chairman of the subcommittee. They were not even touched upon. And I doubt whether some of them could be explained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does not the gentleman's offer come too late, since we have already passed page 9, line 9?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had read through page 9, line 14. Any amendment up to line 15 would not be in order at this time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I wish to offer an amendment on page 9, line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 108. Any expenditure made from funds provided in this title for procurement outside the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported to the Senate and the House of Representatives at least twice annually: *Provided*, That each such report shall state the reasons for which the President determined, pursuant to criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended that foreign procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: Page 9, line 15, strike out lines 15 through line 2 on page 10, section 108.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was on the telephone and I was not aware that the Clerk had read through page 9, section 107. Thus I am precluded from introducing three of my amendments. The pending amendment strikes the language of section 108. This section as well as all the sections of the bill the gentleman from Wisconsin intended to amend by striking other language in the bill constitutes legislation on an appropriation measure. The other sections to which I referred earlier would be subject to a point of order if the rule waiving points of order had not been granted by the Rules Committee. Mr. Chairman, if this House is going to follow orderly procedure and if we are going to avoid some of the situations we have witnessed today, I submit that the rule should provide in order a point of order when there is legislation in an appropriation bill.

Section 108 provides:

SEC. 108. Any expenditure made from funds provided in this title for procurement outside the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported to the Senate and the House of Representatives at least twice annually: *Provided*, That each such report shall state the reasons for which the President determined, pursuant to criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that foreign procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin desires to point out that these reports were not made available to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Certainly the authorizing committee should have these reports if they were requested in the past. Therefore, I suggest to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the provision in this section and similar such provisions should not be included in appropriation measures.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This provision has been carried in this bill for years. All we do is require any bulk purchase over \$100,000 made outside the United States be reported to the committees twice annually.

What is wrong with having these people report to the committees of the Congress twice annually on these bulk purchases? I trust the Committee will vote it down and not start taking out provisions of this type which protect the Congress of the United States and the American taxpayers.

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

The amendment was rejected.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, how far has the Clerk read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read down through line 2 on page 10.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the attention of the chairman of the committee for an explanation with respect to the language that appears in subsection (b) on page 9 of section 107. I do not understand the intent of that language, which says:

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime. * * *

Mr. Chairman, does this mean, sells ships or furnishes ships or permits any ships—what does the language mean?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my friend is a very able attorney, and I am only a layman. The provision means just exactly what it says, no more and no less. If the gentleman will read it again, he can convince himself there is some sense to it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I point out again the preceding subsection itemizes a number of items which relate to items which are listed as indicating items that cannot be sold or transferred or carried. This section does not.

Mr. PASSMAN. Now the gentleman understands it, does he not? It means just exactly what it says.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask another question?

Mr. PASSMAN. I will answer it the same way, but certainly.

Mr. YATES. Then there is no sense in asking another question.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. YATES. That is right under the present circumstances.

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

Mr. Chairman, I very seldom use any of the time of the committee or of the Congress, but I am disturbed about some things that are in this bill.

I should like to direct the questions I have to the chairman. I might say he probably knows more about the foreign aid program than any 100 Members of the Congress. He studies it, I believe perhaps more than he should sometimes, and I am certain he is well qualified to give answers as to what this program will do.

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed this program ever since I have been in the Congress. I will continue to oppose it. I will oppose this bill.

I believe we have disbursed \$182.5 billion of the wealth of the people of this Nation on the theory that we may buy friends. We cannot buy friends. They are either our friends because of their interest or they are not.

I believe this program should rapidly come to a conclusion. Originally, as Members well know, it was started under the so-called Marshall plan, for 5 years

and \$15 billion. We are now way up and past that.

I do not believe that this program is doing anything toward bringing us any real friends for the United States.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is any money in this program for the nation of Thailand?

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

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the distinguished gentleman that in the foreign aid bill the appropriations are made on an "illustrative" basis. Under the legislation they can ask for funds for a hospital in Brazil and take that money and use it to build a summer resort in Morocco and be within the law. That is a statement of fact. It is all on an "illustrative" basis.

According to the presentation to the committee there are substantial funds in this bill for Thailand in several different sections. The amounts go into tens of millions of dollars. I would have to do some research to be able to tell the gentleman the total amount of money in this bill for Thailand.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman talks about spigots. I believe we will open another spigot with what I am about to bring before the House.

Is there any money in here for South Korea?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. There is substantial money in here for South Korea.

Mr. HALEY. What about Nationalist China?

Mr. PASSMAN. There is no economic aid in this bill for Nationalist China, but I may say to the distinguished gentleman there is a return aid program now, because Nationalist China is one of our cash customers. I believe in 1968 they purchased a net of about \$68 million in the United States. Now money is coming in from Nationalist China.

Mr. HALEY. Of course the gentleman is well aware of the fact that we recently borrowed from Thailand \$100 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Repayable at 6 percent interest. We also had borrowed from South Korea last July \$15 million. And we have obtained a loan from Nationalist China in the amount of \$20 million at 5½ percent interest.

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

Mr. HALEY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say this about Nationalist China. Uncle Sam's man was going around the world trying to borrow money to build up a surplus in our international balance of payments account. They finally offered to make this loan. They should not have, because it just about emptied their Treasury.

I am not a foreign aid enthusiast. I will give the membership the fact that we gave Thailand over a billion dollars during that same period when Thailand built up its foreign exchange reserves in excess of \$1 billion.

We borrowed \$100 million of it back from Thailand.

If I told you the whole story—the vote

would not be unanimous on this bill. But I have to be responsive to these questions when they are asked as the gentleman is asking them now.

Mr. **HALEY**. However, the chairman of the subcommittee will then agree with me that what we have done here is this: We have advanced this money from our own Treasury of the United States and we have given them this money and based upon the interest that we are going to have to pay, we are subsidizing them really to the extent of \$40 million, which is going to be put on the backs of the taxpayers of the United States.

So I say to the gentleman from Louisiana you open up another spigot here because we have taken money that we must go out and borrow at 7 percent or 7½ percent, our own money, and we are borrowing it back and the taxpayers must pay \$40 million interest for their own money. That is what it amounts to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time during this debate today. As a matter of fact I have not been in the well of the House for some time. However, I sense a feeling in the House that there are a lot of people concerned about this bill and many are going to vote against it who had previously voted for it because there are certain things in this bill which are not to their liking. I hope as one who has seldom supported this legislation and I have been more often in opposition. May I say to those of you who have been of like mind to me over the years who have voted against the bill, remember this: Remember that supporting assistance for the Vietnamization of the war in Vietnam is contained in this bill.

If you think we can turn this bill down and carry on the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, you are wrong. This is one of the reasons that I am going to support this bill this year.

Mr. Chairman, there are many parts of this legislation that I do not like. But I think the No. 1 priority in America today is to support the President of the United States in his desire to get our troops out of Vietnam and to turn it over to the South Vietnamese, this is needed to do it. You cannot do it without the supporting assistance to Vietnam which is contained in this bill.

Now, I know a lot of people who have always voted against this bill will continue to do so. I am one who is going to change. I know a lot of people on that side who have always supported this bill but because there are some jets to go to Formosa, people who are going to hang their hat on that are going to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States held a press conference last night. He indicated in that conference that there is a possibility he may within a few weeks be able to announce a further withdrawal of our troops in Vietnam.

I say to you if the House of Representatives turns this bill down today for whatever reason you want to use, I do not think the President of the United

States will be able to make that announcement until this issue is resolved.

Now, there are plenty of things in this bill that I do not like. But I believe very sincerely, very sincerely, that if we are going to proceed with the Vietnamization of the war we had better support this legislation and take some of the things we do not like and get on with the job of trying to withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 119. The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country other than Greece, Turkey, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea, unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **ZABLOCKI**: Page 19, line 10, strike out lines 10 through line 19 (Section 119).

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin is a realist. This is another instance of legislation on an appropriation bill. I know that my amendment to strike the language will not prevail, and the legislation will remain in the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin takes this time to point up again that this section and the next section immediately following constitute legislation. As I said, I am a realist, and therefore I will not call up the amendments. The gentleman from Wisconsin wishes to reiterate that there are six sections to which I had intended to offer amendments. I had hoped that the subcommittee chairman would have explained the reasons why they are in the appropriation bill.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. I will be glad to yield to my esteemed and beloved colleague.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my esteemed and beloved colleague—

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Will the subcommittee chairman explain the reasons why the various sections, 22 in all, were included in the bill.

Could the gentleman explain specifically why section 119 was included in the bill; similar if not identical language is in the authorization act.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. The gentleman would like to know why we put it in?

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Was the reason merely to duplicate language in the Foreign Aid Act?

Mr. **PASSMAN**. It was simply because the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are so very busy, and their bill is so voluminous, many times they have overlooked these items and we have included them in our bill.

This is known as the Conte-Long-Passman amendment. I am glad the gentleman recognizes the necessity of it, and I am glad he is willing to leave it in.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Sections 119 and 120 of the bill before us, the so-called Conte-Long-Passman amendments, are in the Foreign Aid Act in the authorization bill.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. But it does not hurt to repeat it, it is just like making love to your sweetheart; you just tell her you love her over and over again. It will not do any harm.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Then why not repeat everything in the authorization act in the appropriation bill?

Mr. **PASSMAN**. If the gentleman is recommending that, we will.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. I do not recommend it. I wish to reemphasize this procedure is not good and proper legislation. It is a violation of the House rules. Therefore, I submit in the future appropriation bills should not come under a rule providing points of order.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. I will try to be careful.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. **ZABLOCKI**) to withdraw his amendment?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 122. None of the receipts from loans made pursuant to sections 203 (e) and 204 (b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, or from loans made under the authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or from loans made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 322 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (relating to the transfer of loan receipts to the Corporation).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **CONTE**: On page 15, strike out lines 19 through line 25 and on page 16 strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Chairman, my amendment quite simply would permit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to use the money from loan repayments associated with the Alliance and Worldwide Development Loans in order to make direct loans itself.

The committee bill prevents these transfers from taking place. Thus, it prevents OPIC from making direct loans.

Earlier today, I spoke at greater length about the programs that OPIC would administer. As a result of the committee action, and the floor action in defeating an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota (Mr. **FRASER**) OPIC will not be able to engage in the insurance or the guaranty program. The reason is simple—there will not be enough money to satisfy the reserve requirements for these two programs.

I hope at least by this amendment to give OPIC part of the chance I think it deserves. Let us give it a try and see how

direct loans work out under this businesslike operation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this amendment.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. PASSMAN. I think we should make a little legislative history on this item. This is not the reserve fund—the \$75,000,000 account that we had so much confusion on today.

This limitation simply prevents the creation of a special revolving loan fund of \$100,000,000 to be funded out of the development loan fund receipts. I believe the first slice is \$20,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. CONTE. That is correct. Mr. PASSMAN. I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished minority Member.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is acceptable to him and I have no objection to it.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been discussed with the minority and we are in agreement on it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for once taking a piece of legislation out of an appropriation bill.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is not legislation. This is a limitation. Let us have that understood.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to find out if I can from the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. PASSMAN) whether this puts the Overseas Investment Corporation on the road. Does this get it started?

Mr. PASSMAN. OPIC was created by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, this bill must go over to the other body. I do not know what they are going to do. By removing this limitation, it simply means OPIC can draw \$20,000,000 from repayments to the development loan funds. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware of the fact and I am aware of the fact that the Committee cannot have its way every time. We have to compromise and I think we have been very fortunate today not to load up this bill. Certainly, I agree; I do not think this new lending agency is needed. I hate to see it started. I think it is completely unnecessary, but since there seems to be some rather deep feelings about it, I decided that in this one instance I would go along and not object taking this limitation out.

Mr. GROSS. All right, I have supported in my feeble way as have other Members supported every move to hold the line on this bill and cut it if possible, and I intend to continue to do that. But now I must ask the question—the \$64 question—is this bill going to conference and be loaded up?

Mr. PASSMAN. I can only say to the gentleman that we have never loaded up this bill in conference. You can look at the record—those of you who may be concerned about it—we do not agree to that. If the other body loads this bill, we just do not buy it.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have that assurance from the gentleman because with capitulation on this amendment, I am really beginning to wonder.

Mr. PASSMAN. I can assure the gentleman that when we go to conference, we are not going to capitulate. I do not want to give any statistics for the past 15 years because Members of the other body may read the RECORD, but history records what we have been able to accomplish in conference in upholding the position of the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the justification in the bill for providing \$1,500,000 for supporting assistance for Haiti, one of the most repressive dictatorships in the world.

Mr. PASSMAN. That amount is in the budget and the budget is on an "illustrative" basis. It is going to be used entirely for eradication of malaria that we have been successful to some extent in eradicating in other countries around the Caribbean area and we do not want malaria to get started again in that area.

Mr. OTTINGER. I ask the gentleman whether that would come from supporting assistance.

Mr. PASSMAN. It comes out of supporting assistance.

Mr. OTTINGER. Does supporting assistance not have to do with military support?

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say that even though most people are under the impression that supporting assistance is given entirely to nations where they have a military force, that is not so. They can go into any country with supporting assistance.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are fighting in Vietnam supposedly for the principle of self-determination and then we are turning around and aiding one of the most oppressive dictatorships that has ever existed in any part of the world.

Mr. PASSMAN. If I had my way, I would keep it as intended, but it has been based on an "illustrative" basis. They do not program all of these things. They say, "We may spend it here." You could actually insist that they come before our committee and justify funds for hospitals in the field. But I have never been afraid to tell the truth. And they say, "It is true, we are not going to do that." It is on an illustrative basis. I agree with the gentleman that there are some things about this bill I do not like.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I wonder if I heard the gentleman correctly. Did he say there was \$150 million?

Mr. OTTINGER. I did but corrected myself thereafter indicating the amount was \$1,500,000.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Was it \$1.5 million?

Mr. OTTINGER. That is correct. I was in error.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONTE. Has the committee voted on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. I was just about to put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 91, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON PROGRAM ACTIVITY

Not to exceed \$2,537,343,000 (of which not to exceed \$1,972,200,000 shall be for equipment and services loans) shall be authorized during the current fiscal year for other than administrative expenses.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are at a critical time in this session. We are under a heavy mandate to finish our business before Christmas, and we are now moving along rather well. This is the last regular appropriation bill to be considered by the House for the current fiscal year. We will have a final supplemental, which will be reported Thursday of this week, and should be on the floor perhaps Friday, or certainly early next week. That will end the appropriations business of the session except for conference reports on the unfinished bills.

It would just be tragic, if by reason of misunderstanding, or otherwise, we did not pass this bill today and send it over to the other body and move toward a settlement of what shall be done about this bill. We could not afford to continue to operate on a continuing resolution.

I will say this is the lowest bill we have ever had for foreign aid. It is drastically reduced. It is reduced far below what the President had requested and not low enough in some respects. We have got to have a bill.

As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) pointed out so well, without this legislation the President would be drastically restricted in his effort to try to do something about Vietnamization—about transferring more and more of the war effort to the fighting men of South Vietnam and from our own servicemen.

I earnestly hope there will not be a motion to recommit. If the bill were recommitted, it could throw a monkey wrench into the plans for adjournment of this session of Congress. We must move this bill to the other body for a final settlement in this session.

Mr. Chairman, this is a minimum bill. Although it contains some things I do not approve of and would not support if

brought up separately—nobody is totally pleased with it—we do have to have a bill of sorts before we adjourn, and it seems to me this is the best we are capable of doing at the moment. This is the 9th day of December, I just hope that, under all the circumstances, we will pass this bill today and send it to the other body for consideration.

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

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the Chairman and the House that there will be a motion to recommit. It will be a motion to recommit with instructions, and I would like to advise the House what it will be.

On page 18, line 17, I will move to strike "\$87,282,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$87,000,000."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I am reducing the bill by \$282,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the circumstances, this seems to be a reasonable approach to the problem which confronts us.

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

Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is that the motion to recommit with instructions, as stated by the gentleman from Ohio, confirms the description by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), that this is "a bill of sorts."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 15149) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all other amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Broomfield amendment, providing \$50 million for Korea and \$54.5 million for Taiwan.

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 5, in line 18 insert section 504(d) and in line 21, strike "\$404,500,000" and insert "\$454,500,000" and, on line 23 after the word "China", add the following: "and \$50,000,000 for the Republic of Korea."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 250, nays 142, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—250

Abbutt	Evins, Tenn.	Minshall
Abernethy	Fallon	Mize
Adair	Feighan	Mollohan
Albert	Fisher	Monagan
Alexander	Flood	Montgomery
Anderson,	Flynt	Morgan
Calif.	Foley	Morton
Andrews, Ala.	Ford, Gerald R.	Murphy, Ill.
Andrews,	Foreman	Murphy, N.Y.
N. Dak.	Fountain	Myers
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Natcher
Ashbrook	Frey	Nelsen
Ayres	Friedel	Nix
Baring	Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara
Barrett	Fuqua	O'Konski
Beall, Md.	Galifianakis	O'Neal, Ga.
Belcher	Gallagher	O'Neill, Mass.
Bell, Calif.	Garmatz	Passman
Bennett	Gialmo	Patman
Berry	Gibbons	Pelly
Betts	Goldwater	Pepper
Bevill	Gonzalez	Perkins
Blackburn	Goodling	Pettis
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Boggs	Griffin	Pickle
Bow	Grover	Pirnie
Bray	Gubser	Poage
Brinkley	Hagan	Poff
Broomfield	Haley	Pollock
Brotzman	Hall	Preyer, N.C.
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Broyhill, Va.	schmidt	Price, Tex.
Buchanan	Hanna	Pryor, Ark.
Burke, Fla.	Harsha	Purcell
Burke, Mass.	Hastings	Quie
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Quillen
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Randall
Byrnes, Wis.	Hicks	Rarick
Cabell	Hull	Reid, Ill.
Caffery	Hunt	Rhodes
Camp	Ichord	Rivers
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Casey	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Jones, Tenn.	Rostenkowski
Chappell	Kazen	Roth
Clancy	Kee	Roudebush
Clausen,	King	Ruth
Don H.	Kleppe	Sandman
Clawson, Del.	Kluczynski	Satterfield
Collier	Kuykendall	Saylor
Colmer	Langrebe	Schadeberg
Corbett	Langen	Scherle
Crane	Latta	Sebelius
Cunningham	Lennon	Shriver
Daniel, Va.	Lloyd	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Lujan	Sisk
Davis, Wis.	Lukens	Skubitz
de la Garza	McClory	Slack
Dellenback	McCloskey	Smith, Calif.
Denny	McClure	Smith, Iowa
Dennis	McCulloch	Snyder
Derwinski	McEwen	Springer
Devine	McKeally	Staggers
Dickinson	McMillan	Stanton
Donohue	MacGregor	Steed
Dorn	Mahon	Steiger, Ariz.
Dowdy	Mann	Steiger, Wis.
Downing	Marsh	Stephens
Dulski	Martin	Stratton
Duncan	Mathias	Stubblefield
Dwyer	Matsunaga	Stuckey
Edmondson	May	Taft
Edwards, Ala.	Melcher	Talcott
Edwards, La.	Michel	Taylor
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Teague, Tex.
	Mills	Thompson, Ga.

Thomson, Wis.	Whitten	Wold
Waggonner	Widnall	Wright
Wampler	Williams	Wyatt
Watkins	Wilson, Bob	Wyllie
Watson	Wilson,	Wyman
White	Charles H.	Yatron
Whitehurst	Winn	Zion

NAYS—142

Adams	Fraser	Morse
Addabbo	Gaydos	Nedzi
Anderson, Ill.	Gilbert	Obey
Annunzio	Gray	Olsen
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Ottinger
Aspinall	Griffiths	Patten
Biaggi	Gross	Pike
Biester	Gude	Podell
Bingham	Halpern	Rallsback
Blatnik	Hamilton	Rees
Boland	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Reuss
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Robison
Brook	Harrington	Rodino
Brooks	Harvey	Roe
Brown, Calif.	Hathaway	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Mich.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Broyhill, N.C.	Heckler, Mass.	Roybal
Burilison, Mo.	Helstoski	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Hogan	St Germain
Bush	Hollifield	St. Onge
Button	Horton	Scheuer
Carey	Howard	Schneebell
Celler	Hungate	Schwengel
Chisholm	Hutchinson	Shipley
Clay	Jacobs	Smith, N.Y.
Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Stafford
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.	Stokes
Collins	Karth	Sullivan
Conable	Kastenmeier	Symington
Conte	Keith	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Koch	Tiernan
Corman	Kyros	Udall
Coughlin	Leggett	Ullman
Culver	Long, Md.	Van Deerlin
Daddario	Lowenstein	Vanik
Daniels, N.J.	McCarthy	Vigorito
Delaney	McDade	Waldie
Dent	McDonald,	Watts
Diggs	Mich.	Weicker
Eckhardt	McFall	Whalen
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Wiggins
Esch	Mayne	Wolff
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	Yates
Farbstein	Meskill	Zablocki
Findley	Mikva	Zwack
Fish	Minish	
Ford,	Mink	
William D.	Moorhead	

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson,	Hays	Powell
Tenn.	Hosmer	Pucinski
Brademas	Jarman	Reifel
Cahill	Kirwan	Riegle
Clark	Kyl	Rooney, Pa.
Cowger	Landrum	Ruppe
Cramer	Lipscomb	Scott
Dawson	Long, La.	Tunney
Dingell	Macdonald,	Utt
Eilberg	Mass.	Vander Jagt
Fascell	Mailliard	Whalley
Flowers	Mizell	Wyder
Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher	Young
Gettys	Moss	
Hawkins	Nichols	

So the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Moss with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Young with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Dawson.

Messrs. ARENDS, AYRES, POLLOCK, and MATSUNAGA changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 15149) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 18, in line 17, strike out "\$87,282,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$87,000,000".

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 195, answered "present"—2, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—200

Addabbo	Cederberg	Glaimo
Albert	Celler	Gibbons
Alexander	Conable	Gilbert
Anderson,	Corbett	Gonzalez
Calif.	Corman	Gray
Anderson, III,	Coughlin	Green, Oreg.
Anderson,	Culver	Green, Pa.
Tenn.	Cunningham	Griffiths
Andrews,	Daddario	Gubser
N. Dak.	Daniels, N.J.	Gude
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Halpern
Arends	de la Garza	Hamilton
Ashley	Dellenback	Hanley
Aspinall	Dennis	Hanna
Ayres	Diggs	Hansen, Idaho
Barrett	Dingell	Hansen, Wash.
Beall, Md.	Donohue	Harrington
Belcher	Dulski	Hastings
Bell, Calif.	Dwyer	Hathaway
Biaggi	Edmondson	Hébert
Bingham	Erlenborn	Heckler, Mass.
Blatnik	Esch	Helstoski
Boggs	Evans, Colo.	Hicks
Boland	Evins, Tenn.	Hogan
Bolling	Fallon	Hollifield
Brasco	Farbstein	Horton
Brooks	Feighan	Jacobs
Broomfield	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Brotzman	Fish	Jones, Ala.
Buchanan	Fisher	Kazen
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Kee
Bush	Ford, Gerald R.	Keith
Button	Fraser	Kluczynski
Byrne, Pa.	Frelinghuysen	Kyros
Byrnes, Wis.	Friedel	Lloyd
Cabell	Fulton, Pa.	Long, Md.
Carey	Gallagher	McCarthy
	Garmatz	McClory

McCloskey	Patten
McDade	Pelly
McEwen	Pepper
McFall	Perkins
McKneally	Philbin
MacGregor	Pickle
Mahon	Pike
Mann	Pirnie
Mathias	Podell
Matsunaga	Preyer, N.C.
May	Price, Ill.
Madden	Pryor, Ark.
Mayne	Purcell
Melcher	Quie
Miller, Calif.	Railsback
Minish	Reid, N.Y.
Mize	Rhodes
Monagan	Rivers
Moorhead	Rodino
Morgan	Rogers, Colo.
Morse	Rooney, N.Y.
Morton	Rosenthal
Murphy, Ill.	Rostenkowski
Murphy, N.Y.	Roth
Nelsen	Roybal
Nix	Ryan
O'Hara	St. Onge
O'Neill, Mass.	Sandman
Passman	Schneebeli
Patman	Schwengel

NAYS—195

Abbutt	Foreman	O'Konski
Abernethy	Fountain	Olsen
Adair	Frey	O'Neal, Ga.
Adams	Fuqua	Ottinger
Andrews, Ala.	Gallifanakis	Pettis
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Poage
Baring	Goldwater	Poff
Bennett	Goodling	Pollock
Berry	Griffin	Price, Tex.
Betts	Gross	Quillen
Bevill	Grover	Randall
Blackburn	Hagan	Rarick
Blanton	Haley	Rees
Bray	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Brinkley	Hammer-	Reuss
Brock	schmidt	Roberts
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Robison
Brown, Mich.	Harvey	Roe
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Roudebush
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Ruth
Burke, Fla.	Hull	St Germain
Burleson, Tex.	Hungate	Satterfield
Burlison, Mo.	Hunt	Saylor
Burton, Calif.	Hutchinson	Schadeberg
Burton, Utah	Ichord	Scherle
Caffery	Jarman	Scheuer
Camp	Johnson, Pa.	Sebellus
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Casey	Jones, Tenn.	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Karth	Slack
Chappell	Kastenmeyer	Smith, Calif.
Chisholm	King	Snyder
Clancy	Kleppe	Staggers
Clausen,	Koch	Steed
Don H.	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Langrebe	Stevens
Clay	Langen	Stokes
Cleveland	Latta	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Leggett	Stuckey
Collier	Lennon	Taylor
Collins	Long, La.	Thompson, Ga.
Colmer	Lowenstein	Thompson, N.J.
Conte	Lujan	Tiernan
Conyers	Lukens	Ullman
Crane	McClure	Van Deerlin
Daniel, Va.	McCulloch	Vanik
Davis, Ga.	McDonald,	Waggonner
Delaney	Mich.	Waldie
Denney	McMillan	Wampler
Dent	Marsh	Watkins
Derwinski	Martin	Watson
Devine	Meeds	Watts
Dickinson	Meskill	Whalen
Dorn	Michel	White
Dowdy	Mikva	Whitehurst
Downing	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Duncan	Mills	Williams
Eckhardt	Mink	Winn
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	Wyatt
Edwards, Calif.	Mollohan	Wylie
Edwards, La.	Montgomery	Wyman
Eshleman	Moss	Yates
Flynt	Myers	Zablocki
Foley	Natcher	Zion
Ford,	Nedzi	
William D.	Obey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bow Jonas

NOT VOTING—36

Brademas	Hosmer	Reifel
Cahill	Kirwan	Riegle
Clark	Kyl	Rooney, Pa.
Cowger	Landrum	Ruppe
Cramer	Lipscomb	Scott
Dawson	Macdonald,	Tunney
Eilberg	Mass.	Utt
Fascell	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Flowers	Mizell	Whalley
Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher	Wydler
Gettys	Nichols	Young
Hawkins	Powell	
Hays	Pucinski	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Riegle for, Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Cahill for, Mr. Jonas against.
Mr. Clark for, Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Fascell for, Mr. Cramer against.
Mr. Pucinski for, Mr. Mosher against.
Mr. Eilberg for, Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Kirwan for, Mr. Mizell against.
Mr. Hays for, Mr. Kyl against.
Mr. Vander Jagt for, Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Coughlin for, Mr. Reifel against.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, Mr. Nichols against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, Mr. Flowers against.

Mr. Young for, Mr. Gettys against.
Mr. Hosmer for, Mr. Ruppe against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Powell.

Mr. CABELL, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. LONG of Maryland changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. When the pairs were originally announced, was not the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) announced as being paired?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, in response to the parliamentary inquiry, that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was announced as paired for. The Chair does not take cognizance of pairs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7491, STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-728)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, 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:

§ 1. Temporary amendment of section 5219, Revised Statutes

(a) Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 548) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"5. (a) In addition to the other methods of taxation authorized by the foregoing provisions of this section and subject to the limitations and restrictions specifically set forth in such provisions, a State or political subdivision thereof may impose any tax which is imposed generally on a nondiscriminatory basis throughout the jurisdiction of such State or political subdivision (other than a tax on intangible personal property) on a national bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such tax is imposed on a bank organized and existing under the laws of such State.

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, the legislature of each State may impose, and may authorize any political subdivision thereof to impose, the following taxes on a national bank not having its principal office located within the jurisdiction of such State, if such taxes are imposed generally throughout such jurisdiction on a nondiscriminatory basis:

"(1) Sales taxes and use taxes complementary thereto upon purchases, sales, and use within such jurisdiction.

"(2) Taxes on real property or on the occupancy of real property located within such jurisdiction.

"(3) Taxes (including documentary stamp taxes) on the execution, delivery, or recordation of documents within such jurisdiction.

"(4) Taxes on tangible personal property (not including cash or currency) located within such jurisdiction.

"(5) License, registration, transfer, excise, or other fees or taxes imposed on the ownership, use, or transfer of tangible personal property located within such jurisdiction.

"(c) No sales tax or use tax complementary thereto shall be imposed pursuant to this paragraph 5 upon purchases, sales, and use within the taxing jurisdiction of tangible personal property which is the subject matter of a written contract of purchase entered into by a national bank prior to September 1, 1969.

"(d) As used in this paragraph 5, the term 'State' means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective from the date of enactment of this Act until the effective date of the amendment made by section 2 (a) of this Act.

§ 2. Permanent amendment of section 5219, Revised Statutes

(a) Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 548) is amended to read:

"Sec. 5219. For the purposes of any tax law enacted under authority of the United States or any State, a national bank shall be treated as a bank organized and existing under the laws of the State or other jurisdiction within which its principal office is located."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective on January 1, 1972.

§ 3. Saving provision

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, prior to January 1, 1972, no tax may be imposed on any class of banks by or under authority of any State legislation in effect prior to the enactment of this Act unless

(1) the tax was imposed on that class of banks prior to the enactment of this Act, or

(2) the imposition of the tax is authorized by affirmative action of the State legislature after the enactment of this Act.

(b) The prohibition of subsection (a) of this section does not apply to

(1) any sales tax or use tax complementary thereto,

(2) any tax (including a documentary stamp tax) on the execution, delivery, or recordation of documents, or

(3) any tax on tangible personal property (not including cash or currency), or for any license, registration, transfer, excise or other fee or tax imposed on the ownership, use or transfer of tangible personal property,

imposed by a State which does not impose a tax, or an increased rate of tax, in lieu thereof.

§ 4. Study by Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

(a) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") shall make a study to determine the probable impact on the banking systems and other economic effects of the changes in existing law to be made by section 2 of this Act governing income taxes, intangible property taxes, so-called doing business taxes, and any other similar taxes which are or may be imposed on banks. In conducting the study the Board shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury and appropriate State banking and taxing authorities.

(b) The Board shall make a report of the results of its study to the Congress not later than December 31, 1970. The report shall include the Board's recommendations as to what additional Federal legislation, if any, may be needed to reconcile the promotion of the economic efficiency of the banking systems of the Nation with the achievement of effectiveness and local autonomy in meeting the fiscal needs of the States and their political subdivisions.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
BILL BROCK,
DEL CLAWSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIER,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
JOHN TOWER,

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. 7491) to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a new text. The conferees agreed to a substitute for the entire Senate amendment.

Under the conference substitute, the House passed amendment to section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, with no change whatever in substance, will take effect on January 1, 1972. The only difference in form is that under the bill as passed the House, it was stated that for the purposes of State taxation, a national bank "shall be deemed to be" a State bank, whereas the conference substitute provides that a national bank "shall be treated as" a State bank. The change is totally without significance as to the effect of the legislation on State tax laws. The only purpose of the change is an attempt to avoid any expression of congressional intent as to whether the Federal instrumentality doctrine still has any viability as applied to national banks.

Under the bill as passed the House the amendment to section 5219 would have taken effect on January 1 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of enactment. As noted above, under the conference substitute, this amendment will not take effect until January 1, 1972. The reason for the delay is the fact that the tax laws of some of the States are built on the foundation of section 5219 as now in effect, and the delay will enable the legislatures of those States to make such changes as they deem appropriate.

In the meanwhile, section 1 of the conference substitute makes a temporary amendment to section 5219 which permits any State or political subdivision thereof to "impose any tax which is imposed generally on a nondiscriminatory basis throughout the jurisdiction of the State or political subdivision (other than a tax on intangible personal property) on a national bank having its principal office within such State in the same manner and to the same extent as such tax is imposed on a bank organized and existing under the laws of such State." In other words, the State in which a national bank's principal office is located may tax it substantially the same as a State bank, except that intangible personal property taxes may not be imposed. For the purposes of this provision, of course, the term "intangible personal property" includes cash and currency.

As previously mentioned, the tax laws of some States are premised explicitly or by implication on the present provisions of section 5219. For example, there may be a general tax of a type prohibited by section 5219, and instead of an express exemption of State-chartered banks from this type of tax, there may be a provision stating that State-chartered banks need pay no taxes not applicable to national banks. The State law may then further provide additional taxes (of a type permitted under section 5219) applicable only to banks. Thus the repeal of the prohibitions in section 5219, without any compensating action by the State legislature, would have the effect of substantially increasing the tax burden on the banks in that State. To avoid this result, while at the same time very firmly committing to the several States responsibility for their own tax policies, the conference substitute includes a saving provision to the effect that

except for sales taxes, documentary taxes, and property taxes, a tax may not be applied to a bank after the enactment of this legislation unless either the tax was applicable before the enactment of this legislation, or the State legislature authorizes its imposition by affirmative action taken after the enactment of this legislation. This saving provision is effective only until January 1, 1972.

As to taxation of a national bank by States other than the one in which its principal office is located, the temporary amendment to section 5219 made by the conference substitute limits the permissible types of taxes to sales and use taxes, real and personal property taxes, documentary stamp taxes, and license taxes, all of which are more fully and precisely described in paragraph 5(b) of the temporary amendment of section 5219 as set forth in the conference report. This temporary amendment is effective only for the period from the date of enactment to the taking effect of the permanent amendment to section 5219 on January 1, 1972.

On the latter date, States will become free to impose intangible property taxes on national banks just as they have always been free to impose such taxes on State chartered banks. Likewise, any State will be free to impose taxes on income derived within its borders by the operations of a bank having its principal office in a different State, regardless of whether the foreign bank is State or national. This has always been the law with respect to State banks. Some apprehension, however, has been expressed as to whether the expanded taxing powers might be used in a way which could impair the mobility of capital or the economic efficiency of the banking system. For this reason, the conference substitute includes a section requiring a study by the Federal Reserve Board "to determine the probable impact on the banking systems and other economic effects of the changes in existing law to be made by section 2 of this Act [the permanent amendment to section 5219] governing income taxes, intangible property taxes, so-called doing business taxes, and any other similar taxes which are or may be imposed on banks."

The Federal Reserve Board is required to transmit its report of this study to Congress not later than December 31, 1970. Thus, if the report should disclose a serious danger or deficiency in the amendment to section 5219 to take effect in 1972, the Congress would have a full session in which to take remedial legislative action. The conferees from both Houses were agreed that their respective committees would give prompt and serious consideration to any recommendations transmitted by the Federal Reserve Board as a result of its study.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
BILL BROCK,
DEL CLAWSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NEW ERA OF FLIGHT

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the winds of change are once more upon us. A giant, new commercial air transport—the Boeing 747—has just made its transcontinental press-preview flight and will soon be operated by Pan American Airways over the air routes of the world. Many of us can reflect on the impact the

first-generation jets, the 707's and DC-8's, had on air travel when they were first introduced 12 years ago. The debut of the super jet—the Boeing 747—by Pan Am on its maiden commercial flights heralds nothing less than a revolution in travel, a second coming of the jet age.

The 747 has truly been an American miracle in commercial development. Conceived only 3 years ago, the super jet became a reality when Pan American ordered the first 25. And today, under the dynamic leadership of the president and recently appointed chief executive officer, Najeeb Halaby, Pan Am has ordered eight more 747's in anticipation of growing public demand. Mr. Halaby, well known to us as former Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and a pilot in his own right, has summed up the merits of the new 747 quite simply, "It will be a strong, safe, reliable airplane."

I would like to include in the RECORD a recent article by Charles Yarbrough in the Evening Star describing his impressions of the 747 in flight. And, from what he relates, this new super jet is quite an airplane and will bring improved travel benefits to all of our citizens. The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 3, 1969]

WORLD'S LARGEST AIRLINER OPENS A NEW ERA OF FLIGHT

(By Charles Yarbrough)

NEW YORK.—Maybe a prophecy was being written as the Great Flying Machine's contrail traced a long, following shadow across the solid cloud deck 5,000 feet below.

And perhaps there was a symbol as the largest commercial airliner in the world rose through Seattle's opaque morning toward the dazzling sunshine of 33,000 feet and into a new jet generation.

Those are impressions from the flight of the Boeing 747 in its first transcontinental press preview—almost 600,000 pounds of vibrant machinery and its fuel; man, his baggage and his sustenance hurtling easily eastward at 90 percent of the speed of sound.

It was only 12 years ago that some of us sped across the continent in the Boeing 707 prototype's demonstration and assumed it to be the ultimate.

FLIGHT INTO NEW DECADE

Yesterday, as one of the 190-plus passengers aboard the 747's flight into the new decade, Boeing's Board Chairman William Allen said he had no such misconception about the old 707.

"We never achieve the ultimate."

Up until now, the awesome size of the new 747 had to suffice for most of us. Today, its comfort, performance and passenger compatibility outboggle its magnitude.

It is an airplane that can cure high-level claustrophobia without leaving the feeling you're flying in a stadium. It is also an airliner, that, with a saturated capacity of almost 500, can bring woes to airports and ground transport systems.

The arrival at Kennedy airport here was enough to bring out Charles A. Lindbergh, first man to fly the Atlantic alone and now a Pan American consultant.

Here is an airplane which turns seeming incongruities into actualities.

Twelve laps through its widened aisles equals a mile.

A dozen passengers in the forward first class section get to their destination before the pilot because the flight deck above them is behind their seats in the nose.

The Wright Brothers' first Kitty Hawk flight could have been performed within the length of the 747 fuselage, but six functional and decorative galleys serve as "room dividers" to minimize its eye-straining length.

A veteran airline passenger, publisher Wayne Parrish, who averages 75,000 miles a year, was graphic enough:

"I am happy to be one of the few people in the world who sat in the 60th row of anything that can take off."

IN SERVICE SOON

The cabin of this plane is 20 feet wide, about twice that of the Boeing 707 and the DC-8. Seating is in clusters of three, four and two.

Pan American is scheduled to put the first one into service within a few months.

Beginning our Seattle-New York flight yesterday, man and machine weighed 589,630 pounds—200,000 of it fuel and 7,000 the carry-on luggage in attractive locker-type overhead racks. An official announcement on the public address system said there were 192 passengers aboard.

The sound system called frequently for someone to meet someone "in the lobby at the foot of the forward stair"—an arty spiral going to the upper deck lounge. Boeing points out that it has possibilities as a business office, a private stateroom, a private stateroom—or a luxury-lined lounge.

EYES POPPED AT PARIS

The preview airplane is the same one which brought eye-popping to the Paris Air Show a few months ago and paused at Dulles Airport long enough to permit hundreds to walk through.

Though most of yesterday's passengers were aviation oriented, it is highly probable that those who aren't quickly will become un-awed by the 747 width and walking room, or the presence of six galleys and 12 toilets.

The preview airplane (number 004 in the Boeing books) is the first of an eventual 33 on order by Pan American and a forerunner of 185 ordered by 28 of the world's airlines at more than \$20 million each.

At the huge, sprawling Boeing plant near Seattle, there were 24 of them in neat array in various airline paint (350 pounds of it per plane).

"Oh, Oh Four" cruised across the Nation at 33,000 feet, countering some clear air turbulence even at that altitude and, about an hour before beginning the descent into Kennedy airport, reached a peak ground speed of 722 miles an hour.

NO RECORD SOUGHT

The flight took 4 hours and 5 minutes. It is not a record, nor was one sought. But the 747 likely will make the trip about 45 minutes faster than a 707.

Down and rolling at Kennedy (with four hours' fuel still in the tanks the behemoth settled softly, drawing an armada of official cars out of taxiways. Workmen along its taxi route stood, stared and waved.

There was a record set: "The most miles walked in any airplane in the world."

A Pan American spokesman made a play on the company slogan as the 747 rolled to a stop: "Pan American just had another experience and we thank you for sharing it with us."

EFFORTS TO CONTROL INFLATION BY MONETARY POLICY

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the

House a very significant situation that I think is definitely debilitating any attempts that we have thus far made to control inflation by monetary policy.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago there was a little over \$3 billion worth of commercial paper that was operative in the money market. Today there is over \$32 billion of commercial paper in the money market.

Of this, \$3 billion is due to the actions of the bank holding companies, and over \$28 billion is because the corporations of America, the large corporations, are going to the money market rather than to the banks to get their money. The result is that they are bidding up the cost of money in the money market—the cost of money which the United States has to pay when it goes with its securities into that same market.

The cost of money to the States, to the municipalities, and to the various districts that are in your particular congressional districts, is going up. The result of this is that there is a shift of dollars from depository institutions into direct investments which yield more money at these high-bid prices. The result of this is that there is less money in the banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations. The pressure is being applied by the customers of these depository intermediaries to go to the euro dollar market for the money which cost them more, which means the prime rates are being pushed up.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are only 20 or 30 brokers who handle these issues, and there are only 200 major corporations in America bidding for the money. Let us examine the consequences of their actions which have, in the last 3 years, resulted in a 1,000-percent increase in the amount of commercial paper outstanding.

First, what are the restraints on the issuance of commercial paper by major corporations?

Theoretically, the competitive marketplace imposes a restraint on the price corporations can pay for money. This restraint is far more impressive in theory than in practice. This is so because of the lack of any meaningful price competition in most major product markets. The oligopolistic position of major producers means that they, not the market, fix prices. Their position of market dominance means that they can pass on the price of borrowing to their consumers without any reduction in corporate profits. Hence, corporations experience no meaningful restraint on their ability to pay whatever price is required to acquire the money they need. The Government now owns no ability to control the volume or rate at which corporations can issue corporate paper.

In view of the absence of effective restraints, the corporations' natural profit motives stimulate them to seek out the money they need. The aggressive and unrestrained efforts of corporations to raise the money required to meet their needs has placed great pressure on the Federal Reserve established ceiling on the rates paid by banks on large certificates of deposit. It also exerts immense upward

pressure on the prime rates fixed by banks and applying to corporate lending. By depriving the depository institutions of money they might otherwise receive, the issuers of corporate commercial paper tend to motivate the banks to ration credit through price increases which feed inflation. In addition, the competition of commercial paper issuers causes increases in the price of money to competitors, including Government issues, municipal bonds, Federal agency issues, and the instruments offered by State governments.

In short, the advent of large-scale offerings of commercial paper has significantly contributed to—in fact fed—the inflation which plagues our economy. It is ironical that this factor, so inimical to our national interest in price stability, is made possible by forces set in motion by the Federal Government. It is encouraged by a Federal tax structure which allows the corporation to use interest expenses to reduce the amount they would otherwise have to pay in Federal taxes. The use of commercial paper is also encouraged by the fact that the issuers need not admit to the same kind of rate controls imposed on significant competitors in the market, the depository intermediaries.

In a real sense commercial paper is unique. Unlike instruments issued by banks to attract funds, it need not submit to a ceiling on the rate the issuer can pay. It is also different from instruments issued by government which must—in one manner or another—pass the test of rate reasonableness. The only test on commercial paper is that of the marketplace. Such a check is, as indicated earlier, ineffective because the issuers, not the free market so dear to economic purists, control the price at which goods and services will be sold.

I suggest that this situation must be dealt with through effective Government action.

I suggest that the Federal Reserve Board should be empowered to control corporate participation in the market just as they are proposing to control the bank holding companies issuance of corporate paper to raise money in the money market.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will follow my lead and support forthcoming legislation to give power to control this inflationary practice.

FOREIGN TARIFF RESTRICTIONS

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there was a historic decision made last week by the Labor Department in which it approved the payment of import damages to some 5,000 steelworkers at the rate of 65 percent of their normal week's pay. This will cost the taxpayers of the United States, not counting fringe benefits, but strictly on a wage base percentage and not counting losses to the social security system—will cost the

Federal Government or the taxpayers \$3,642,000 next year.

On top of that, 650 glassworkers were recently laid off, charged to the importation of glass; and the Tariff Commission also rendered a historic decision saying that it was because of imports, so they will be eligible for benefits at a cost of another \$4 million this year.

The difference between exports of steel and imports of steel at this time is 17 to 18 million tons. At 7,000 men per million tons production we are faced with a possible cost of some \$885 million for 1 year for over 126,000 steelworkers who have been put out of their jobs by imports.

The Germans have announced a decision on chickens that might put all the poultry growers and feed grain growers under this same type of subsidy assistance. They have announced that no chickens can be sold in the German market that have been slaughtered more than 1½ days. It takes 5 days to deliver chickens from the United States. Germany is setting the pace for our largest single market for chickens. They continue to go the route of NATO, but also they are going the route of enacting new protective actions through new nontariff barriers, and these emphatically and forcibly have barred U.S. poultry growers from shipping any chickens into West Germany.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time we are at this moment boycotting chrome and other ores from Rhodesia. The American steel producers in the United States today are paying as much as three times the price of a pound of chrome because we are buying it on the black market, and much of it from Russia.

The Russians are buying Rhodesian chrome and selling it to the United States through their agencies at black-market prices.

The price of nickel alone is going to cost the American steel plants many millions of dollars.

One steel plant in my community has already figured that their cost of production next year because of the black-market prices is going to cost them a million dollars more than they spent this year for their ingredients.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his statement and point out that the Russians have increased the price of their chrome 81 percent since we started buying from them.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is exactly right.

NIXON PRESS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the last Sunday edition of the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune, which has a Christmas story from Washington, D.C., under the following headline: "White

House Decorations Go Up, Nixons Plan Big Christmas."

Over 25,500,000 Americans receiving social security will not have such a happy Christmas if the President carries out the threat against Congress which he made over the networks last night to the American people.

Additional millions of taxpayers will not have such a happy Christmas if he carries out his threat to the Congress that he will veto the meager \$200 additional tax exemption which the Congress has enacted to aid the wage and salary earner during these days of rising prices, high interest, and fabulous tax exempt profits of big oil, big foundations, big real estate, and so forth. The President last night seemed to be more worried about diminishing the meager buying power of millions in this country to the excuse that the Government needs more tax money to carry out its domestic and international obligations. This administration's policy of curtailing appropriations for education, health, housing, funds for water and air pollution, highway construction, post office construction, Federal building construction, and so forth, is bringing about a premature expansion of unemployment, scarcity of buying power, and it seems we are on our way to another good old Republican depression.

You younger Members of the Congress, if you review the 12 long years of Republican administration in the 1920's, will find that these same reactionary policies of drying up income and purchasing power of millions brought on the biggest depression in our history in the early 1930's. Thirty years later, during the Eisenhower-Nixon administrations we had three major depressions which were not as serious as the early 1930's because of the avalanche of progressive legislation of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Truman and Democratic Congresses which reestablished our prosperity through social security, wages, retirement funds, pension systems, millions of independent homeowners, and protection of bank deposits.

An economic catastrophe was averted during the Eisenhower period by reason of this financial cushion of prosperity enjoyed by millions of wage and salary earners throughout the country which did not exist in 1930 to 1933.

The President's veto threat speech last night on turning the clock back by a veto threat reminded us of the old days when three Republican Presidents served under the Nation's No. 1 banker, who was Secretary of the Treasury, Andy Mellon. Under President Eisenhower we had the great banker and super-industrialist from Cleveland, George M. Humphrey, who conducted our Nation's economy and gave us three depressions with their accompanying period of unemployment and discontent and misery to millions throughout the country. When the President threatened the Congress last night with a veto of the 15 percent social security increase and the \$200 increased tax exemption it could not help but remind we older folks that the Republican

leaders have not learned of the failures, or else have forgotten, the old reactionary Republican policies that have proven disastrous to our economy over the last half century.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS: THE THREAT OF EXTINCTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in 25 years, "somewhere between 75 and 80 percent of all the species of living animals will be extinct." That is the personal estimate of S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and a scientist in his own right.

When I first heard Dr. Ripley's statement, I thought he had gotten his figures mixed up. But no. He assured me he meant exactly what he had said: At the rate we are destroying our natural resources and pushing animals from their natural habitats, in 25 years, most animal species in this country will be extinct.

I was inclined to be skeptical at first. I asked for more information, which I have just received and which I intend to put in the RECORD. It is not the whole picture, but it is enough to realize that no one can afford the luxury of being skeptical. Twenty-five years is not a very long time.

What I think is most frightening, in terms of the challenge we have to face in order to prevent this prophesy from coming true, is that we do not have 25 years to do something about it. If 80 percent will be extinct by then, how many will be extinct in 5, 10, 15 or 20 years? Obviously, if Dr. Ripley is right, we do not have time even to be frightened.

What we are faced with is a calamity from which there is no recourse. Once a species becomes extinct, there is no regeneration, no bringing it back to life. Of course, this threat is nothing new. Conservationists have been warning us for years about the dire consequences of upsetting the balances of nature. Long ago they held forth the specter of a bleak landscape presided over by deadly silence. But that possibility seemed too distant, too incomprehensible. Not so any longer. Now the next generation, those being born today, faces the possibility.

Americans must be warned. For years we have gone about our lives, planned our futures and our children's futures under the assumption that the countryside with its mountains, forests, lakes and animals will always be there. That assumption is no longer valid. We must now realine our thinking. Once we struggled against nature; today we must struggle to preserve it.

There must be a line between "using" natural resources and "destroying" them. It is probably an invisible line, which makes it difficult to tell when it has been crossed. Unfortunately, I think we have crossed it too often in the last

few decades, and now we are paying the penalty. Air and water pollution are good examples. I see nothing intrinsically wrong with drawing out natural resources to create a rich promise for a satisfying and comfortable life for Americans. But not if the bargain is trash dumps swelling and multiplying across the landscape; cities smothering in smog; lakes and waterways rendered lifeless by industrial poisons and oil leaks; and most irreplaceable of all: the species of animals being pushed to extinction.

There is nothing so valuable about the present that warrants destruction of the future. That is something we realize when we work for our children's futures to provide them with an education and material wealth. That same concern ought to extend to the condition of the land we bequeath them. If we leave them a wasteland of trash-scarred landscape, foul air, stagnant water, and no living animals aside from maybe rats, the other things we pass on are that much less attractive. That could be one big reason why today so many youths are rejecting so much of what their parents worked so hard to achieve.

Already, there are stirrings on American campuses that students are upset with the condition of our environment. I welcome their concern and applaud their awareness. One day the responsibility for running this country will be theirs, and I can think of few things I had rather see than a new generation fully conscious of the value of their natural surroundings and of the need to preserve them.

Still, there is the present to contend with: the threat of extinction of animal species and the destruction of our natural environment. We need thorough solutions, not temporary stopgaps. They must be as timeless as the laws of evolution.

Fortunately, concern is growing over the damage that has already been done to natural resources and animal life. Many dedicated people are working hard to save them, and equally hard to warn the public about the threat.

But it is an immense job. Dr. Ripley says neither the Smithsonian nor any other Government agency is equipped right now to mount the kind of program necessary to warn the American people. The alternative is chilling.

Maybe we can get by without wolves, pumas, beavers, ducks, eagles, and a lot of other species. If survival of the fittest is the rule to follow, then I fear for them—for it is clear they are not fit to live in the world we are creating. As a species I have begun to wonder if even we humans are going to survive in it.

THREAT OF EXTERMINATION FACING MUCH OF THE EARTH'S ANIMAL LIFE

Virtually all extermination of animals in historic times has been caused by man's activities. The animals either have been killed directly, or their habitat has been so altered that they could no longer survive in it. The rate and the impact of these activities has increased more or less in direct proportion to the

increases in the human population and the level of its technology. Industrialization, agriculture, lumbering, livestock grazing, air and water pollution, and other forms of environmental change are constantly and irrevocably altering what was the natural environment, even in areas not directly occupied by man. For example, penguins and seals in Antarctica, and frogs living over 11,000 feet up in the Sierra Nevada Mountains now have significant amounts of DDT in their body tissues. As a consequence of these factors, the rate of extermination has increased almost geometrically, and the rate is accelerating each year.

Since the time of Christ, man has exterminated about 3 percent of the known species of the world's mammals. However, over half of these losses have occurred since 1900. During the past 150 years the rate of extermination of mammals has increased fifty-five fold. If exterminations continue to increase at that rate, in about 30 years all of the remaining 4,062 species of mammals will be gone.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—maintains Red Data Books on species of living things which are rare and in danger of extinction. Today about 8 percent of the world's mammals appear in their Mammal Red Book, but the IUCN points out that for most of the world their information is so meager that they have only listed the large and conspicuous creatures, and if the information were available, the true figure would doubtless be many times 8 percent.

Information on rare and threatened species is most complete from the United States. In the "U.S. Red Book of Threatened Species," compiled by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 60 species of mammals are listed, which amounts to about 15 percent of the 395 species of mammals found in the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii, and in the surrounding waters. However, even here the information is far from complete, especially for the nearly 60 species of marine mammals, most of which do not appear on the red list but which are thought to be in danger.

The above figures refer only to mammals. Birds have certainly fared no better. The IUCN Red Book lists 320 kinds of birds on the danger list today, with the same caution that the information is insufficient and were it more complete the list would doubtless be many times greater.

Although mammals and birds often are conspicuous and are relatively well-known, new species still are being discovered. Our knowledge of the reptiles, amphibians, and fishes is far less complete, and our knowledge of invertebrates is only fragmentary. Scientists believe that only a relatively small percent of the world's invertebrates have been discovered or described as yet. According to one highly respected scientist's estimate, using current taxonomic standards, there are probably about 10 million species of organisms in the world, of which the

world's scientists have described only 10 to 15 percent. This refers to plants as well as animals, but it does illustrate the state of our knowledge.

Further, given the present rates of extinction and increasing rates of pollution, it is estimated that most of the 80-odd percent of undescribed species will be exterminated before scientists have a chance to identify them. Examples include the estimated million species of mites, possible similar number of ichneumonid wasps, and unknown numbers of flies.

By far the largest number of existing kinds of animals are invertebrates. Although the vertebrate animals are highly vulnerable to extinction, the invertebrates are far more so. As far as we know they do and will continue to comprise the far greater proportion of animals exterminated.

Consequently, unless effective action is taken, both to protect those species and habitats directly threatened, and to avoid or reduce pollution and other forms of environmental modification inimical to animal life, a very large percentage of the world's remaining animal life faces extermination during our lifetime.

FREEDOM FROM FORCE FOR STUDENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today is December 9 and I have taken the liberty of deliberately attempting to arouse the curiosity of the Members over the past week as to this date in order that they would give more than passing attention to one of the most important measures confronted by the American people: the freedom from force bill.

Some are familiar with the chaos brought about in the southern schools due to the arbitrary and sometimes abusive tactics of HEW in enforcing racial balance under the guise of desegregating the schools. I have identified more than 356 schools which have been closed due to the desegregation activities of HEW and the courts. Many of these schools are practically new. The waste to the taxpayers runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. I sincerely believe that there will be no peace in our school system so long as the rights of the children to attend their neighborhood schools is arbitrarily denied them due to their race, creed, or color, whether this decision be to promote segregation or to promote racial balance. It is just as wrong, Mr. Speaker, to force a child out of his neighborhood school and into a school more distant to promote segregation as it is to force a child out of his neighborhood school and into a school more distant to promote racial balance. Freedom to Americans, even American students, is precious.

The measure I have asked my colleagues to cosponsor will in effect eliminate the race of the student as a factor in his assignment to a school. It is time,

Mr. Speaker, that we stop referring to our schoolchildren as black children and white children but simply as students. Each student, of course, should be treated equally and without discrimination. My bill does this.

The law as related to nondiscriminatory education is being unequally applied and enforced in the South and not in the North. For example, in some of the counties in southern Georgia where the racial makeup of the faculty is 70 percent black and 30 percent white, the courts have ordered that this same exact ratio shall prevail in all of the schools. Yet here in Washington where more than 99 percent of the students attend segregated schools the standards established by HEW of such requirement is not enforced. The effect of such arbitrary requirements as this, as relates to the pupils and teachers, is resulting in great numbers of resignations by white teachers and white students fleeing into private schools. The private schools oftentimes are greatly lacking in facilities. Yet the students do not like being forced out of their neighborhood schools and into other schools. As a way of showing resistance to pressure and force in their desire for freedom from coercion they have chosen to leave the public school system. This, Mr. Speaker, is a travesty on the educational system and will be very detrimental, in my opinion, to the future of the country due to the probability of an inferior education for want of adequate facilities.

Mr. Speaker, in short the measure which I have proposed will eliminate the requirements of HEW that there be no racially identifiable schools and will simply state that there should be no discrimination against any students and all shall be treated equally. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I do not accept the premise made by many that a black child in a black environment receives an inferior education and that it is impossible for him operating in such an environment to receive an adequate education. I reject this, Mr. Speaker, because to accept it is to accept the premise that the black American is an inferior American. Rather I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to black education lies in being absolutely certain that if there is a school that is all black due to the neighborhood in which it is located, the students in this area are perfectly capable of obtaining the same quality of education as a white student in a white environment so long as the facilities, instruction, and effort by the teachers is equal. Let me make one point very clear. This is not to say that there should be separate but equal facilities for black but simply that if due to the neighborhood patterns, there is a black school it does not necessarily follow that this is an inferior school for as stated before to accept this premise is a slur on a great number of Americans. In closing, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my fellow Congressmen will support this measure which I call the "Freedom From Force" bill and recognize that the rights of students not to be shoved about as pawns by social planners is every bit as dear to the students as freedom of speech is to adults.

A DIFFERENT VIEW: ONE HOUSE-WIFE PRESENTS A CONSIDERED AND DOCUMENTED LOOK AT FOOD PRICES

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following excerpt from the December 1 issue of the Council of California Growers' Newsletter relating to food prices:

Hardly any of the nation's food buyers . . . and certainly none of those who have been critical of food prices . . . have the clear insight . . . and good records . . . of the lady who recently wrote a letter to an Iowa newspaper.

"My recent grocery bill was over \$24." But after she had deducted "59 cents, dog food" . . . "\$1.79, bug spray" . . . "29 cents, paper napkins" . . . "89 cents, fabric softener" . . . "\$1.59, band-aids and shampoo" . . . "\$3.75, Thermos bottle and light bulbs" . . . she said that "deducting these, my groceries cost less than \$16."

Examining her grocery store . . . the lady wrote that she "was amazed to discover that one fifth of the area was used for what I call luxury and prepared foods. We, the consumers, pay for this preparation and we should not include the wages of a hired girl in the cost of food as such."

She said another two fifths of the store area was filled with non-food items . . . and added that "this leaves only two fifths devoted to plain foods."

This perceptive lady went on to say that she also used "prepared foods, snacks, pop and candy, and non-food items." But when she does . . . she takes the items home and then "I break the bill down into the proper categories before listing it in the household account book which I have kept since 1959."

Looking back into this excellent record . . . she wrote that "this book shows that my food bill for 1960 was \$971.57 . . . and the household items, \$347.98. For 1968 food cost \$975.65 and household items, \$752.82."

So . . . the normal shopper . . . who may keep records but does not allocate her expenditures . . . would see that her bill to the supermarket has risen 30 per cent in the nine year period. But this Iowa lady's records show that her food bill was up only \$4.08 over nine years . . . while the non-food bill was more than double.

If some of our members have similar records . . . it would be interesting to make a comparison. Drop us a note.

DICK ALLISON DAY

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1969, Neville Island of Pittsburgh, Pa., honored Dick Allison, often called the Patriarch of Neville Island. Neville Island is a fine industrial community on the island in the Ohio River, specializing in boat and barge building, steel fabrication, refining and chemicals.

Dick Allison celebrated his 86th birthday and has been a resident of Neville Island for 63 years. The whole town turned out to celebrate.

I am glad to bring to the attention of

the Members of Congress and the American people the story of this fine patriotic and civic-minded man who has done so much for the citizens of Neville Island, our community, and our western Pennsylvania country as well.

It is a pleasure to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the newspaper article from the Pittsburgh Press of July 8, 1969, as well as a copy of the resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of the township of Neville.

I am also placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the contents of the book, "This is your Life, Dick Allison," which was presented to Dick Allison by the Neville Island citizens.

I recall, with such pleasant memory, the wonderful day August 3, 1969, when the whole town of Neville Island turned out on a sunny, bright day for games, speeches from the bandstand, and tributes from everybody, young and old, to good-humored, healthy Dick Allison.

There were lots of long wood picnic tables on the field, row on row, filled to capacity with golden agers, fathers and mothers, a jillion kids, U.S. flags, as well as lots of dogs, bicycles with decorations, pretty little girls, and babies in their mothers' and dads' arms. Boy! Fried chicken, school band music, chocolate and vanilla cake, ice cream and watermelon. What a wonderful day and celebration.

NEVILLE ISLAND SAYING THANKS TO DICK ALLISON

It's like everyone on Neville Island owes 86-year-old Dick Allison a tip of the hat.

So the tight little isle is planning to honor its "patriarch," a friend of three generations of children, with a "Dick Allison Day" on Aug. 3.

"I feel as though I've helped raise half the kids that grew up around here," he said.

Dick, of 205 N. Hubert St., is a graduate pharmacist who spurned his profession to become "a people-contacting storekeeper."

ONCE PRODUCE CENTER

"When I first came to Neville Island more than 60 years ago, there were swimming beaches along the Ohio River and the place was just one big truck-farm producing vegetables for the Pittsburgh market," he recalls.

He opened a combination barbecue-gas station back in 1926, then switched to a confectionery store later.

"I was Neville Island's penny-candy purveyor for years," he chuckled. "There's no better way to get to know young people than meeting them every day at the bubble-gum counter."

The Aug. 3 tribute is going to be a communitywide "thank you" for all the nice things Dick has done over the years for Neville's youth.

"You name it and he helped organize it," Francis Williams, a Neville resident and "Dick Allison Day" planner commented.

PRIME YOUTH ORGANIZER

"He formed the island's first Boy Scout troop, organized the high school band, and set up the youth group at the Neville Presbyterian Church."

Dick founded the Neville PTA and served 16 years on the school board.

That's just a starter.

During the Depression, he organized the island's Goodwill Club, which raised money to buy food for the needy.

"We used to sneak the food baskets into homes after dark," he recalls. "People were down on their luck but they were proud. They didn't want their neighbors to know they were accepting handouts."

Youngsters without shoes got jobs at Dick's business establishment and he persuaded other merchants to hire the needy to handle all sorts of chores.

During World War II, he founded the Servicemen's Club on the island, an organization that played host to Navy personnel which came to Neville's shipyards to pick up LSTs.

SAILORS ADOPTED

"We treated hundreds of sailors just as though they were our own sons," he said. Who founded the Little League on the island? Of course, it was Dick Allison.

Turnabout is fair play so there'll be every thing from commemorative Little League games on "Dick Allison Day" to a parade featuring the high school band the old-timer helped form.

"Kids grow up, you know, and a lot of us adults remember everything Dick did for us in bygone days when we were young," said Mr. Williams.

Dick's current interest?

"I'm president of the Coraopolis Golden Age Club," he explained. "Gosh, I guess that means I'm getting old."

NEVILLE DECLARES AUGUST 3 DICK ALLISON DAY

The Neville Township Commissioners at their regular monthly meeting, Thursday, June 12, adopted a resolution honoring Ennis W. "Dick" Allison and declared August 3, 1969 to be known as "Dick Allison Day" in Neville Township.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION 241

It is the desire of numerous citizens of the township of Neville to honor one in our midst; namely Ennis W. "Dick" Allison; by declaring a day to be set aside for this purpose: the board as the official delegate of the citizens wishes to accede to the request.

Whereas, Ennis W. "Dick" Allison has given unselfishly of his time and effort in serving the citizenry of Neville Township; and

Whereas, he has also for many years served as Chairman and worker for countless Community activities; and

Whereas, he has further devoted his energies to the school and its many programs and activities, one of which was in help to found the PTA; and

Whereas, he has inspired our children through example, word of mouth and good deeds and has taught good sportsmanship in all his activities; and

Whereas, for his many contributions for our well being we do hereby declare August 3, 1969 to be known as "Dick Allison Day" in Neville Township.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Commissioners on behalf of a truly grateful citizenry extend to Mr. Allison its sincere gratitude and deep appreciation for his untiring and diligent efforts to make Neville Island a better and happier place to live.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this Resolution be a part of the Official Records of the Township of Neville.

Adopted this 12th day of June 1969.

Board of Commissioners, Township of Neville.

GUIDO BATISTA,
President of the Board.

Attest: Margaret Selzer, Secretary.

BOOK: "THIS IS YOUR LIFE, DICK ALLISON"
(Presented by grateful Neville Island Citizens)

On July 30, 1883 you were born in the little town of Fairview, West Virginia. You were the only child of Waitman C. and Margaret E. Allison.

Your father passed away in 1934 at the age of 82 and your mother in 1949 at the age of 89.

You attended a one-room country school in Gas Valley, known as Pittinger School.

Every day you rode your pony to school and back, a distance of seven miles. Every once in a while your pony would get a little peeved at you and throw you, and you would find yourself walking home from school.

As there were no high schools then, you went to Frankfort Springs Academy for two years—1896 to 1898. Two of your classmates at the Academy, Anna Krause and A. Dungan, still reside in this part of the country.

Your family moved to Coraopolis, Pa. in June of 1900 and resided at the corner of Fifth and Mulberry Streets. You were 17 at the time and drove a team of horses for Pugh and Curry. Then you went to work at Coraopolis Pharmacy for \$2.00 per week as a delivery boy.

In 1904 you graduated from the Western Pennsylvania University as a registered pharmacist. In partnership with Dr. W. J. Stewart of Coraopolis, you bought a drug store on Fifth Avenue and went into business.

On June 20, 1906 you married Edith Gertrude Kleinman, an Island girl, and went to live at 6008 Grand Avenue, Neville Island, where with the exception of about six months, you have lived until this year—63 years in the same house.

At this time, along with the drug store, you also had a hand in drawing the first foamy root beer through a fountain. You advertised for a name for it but got none, and the next year Hires came out with the Root Beer Barrel.

You made the first ice cream cones in Coraopolis. You had a partner and a dozen girls rolling cones in the cellar. While you were on your honeymoon your partner and the cone machines disappeared and you were out of the ice cream cone business. You sold the drug store in 1907 to John Oellig.

Speaking of honeymoons, you and Edith had quite a send-off on yours. We understand some people even took the same train as you and Edith all the way to Youngstown Ohio, just to make sure you two were taken good care of.

You and Edith became the parents of three children: Edward Waitman, Harold Wayne, and Margaret Emma Allison.

You worked at Burns Pharmacy in Butler as a registered pharmacist for the sum of \$37.50 every two weeks. From there you went to Chester, West Virginia, where you purchased a drug store and also managed a theater.

While living in Chester, your second son, Wayne, was born in February of 1912. Six months later you and your family moved back to the Island, to 6008 Grand Avenue.

You were sure a busy man thereafter. Upon coming back to Neville Island, you went to work at Sytes Pharmacy at Center and Heron Avenues in Pittsburgh.

After that, you operated an agency for a "tire patch" and then ended up in the used car business at 5919 Penn Avenue with Automobile Securities, the first firm to lend money on used cars. You took on an agency known as "Allison's Hills Motors" but that didn't last very long and you went to Bennett Wreckers and then back to the drug store business in Aliquippa for A. D. Klein. After that you worked for C. P. Sims, Ford dealer in Aliquippa, Pa.

In 1926 you opened the Red, White and Blue Filling Station and Barbecue Stand on Grand Avenue, Neville Island.

Your son, Edward, attended Coraopolis School and then went to Perkiomen Academy and Massanutten Military Academy.

Wayne graduated from Coraopolis High School in 1931 and went to work at Pittsburgh Screw and Bolt Corporation on Neville Island immediately after graduation.

Your daughter, Margaret, graduated with the first class from Neville Township High School in 1937 and attended Grove City College for four years.

In the early thirties you organized the Good Will and Moni Clubs. These organiza-

tions were formed to provide food for needy persons on the Island. Mrs. Frank Parsons was the first president of the Good Will Club. Some of the other members at that time were Mrs. Jake Esau, Mrs. William Rushby, Mrs. Ralph Moore, Mrs. Lewis, Mrs. Virginia Hinkle, Mrs. William Waters, Mrs. William Easton, Mrs. Beatrice Brough, and Messrs. Frank Parsons, James Woods, John Worgan, and Edward Martin. You were also a President of this Club.

Members of the Moni Club included James Woods, John Worgan, Frank Parsons, Alex Henk, Edward Martin, and E. J. Clancy.

At that time money was very scarce. There was none even for school picnics and a group of men and women would meet at the school at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning before the picnic and pack lunches for the children to eat at the park.

Then came the great 1936 flood. The water rose to about eight feet in your first floor. Grand Avenue in front of your house was just like another river. In fact, the only way anyone could get on or off the Island was by boat. After the high water receded, you will remember that a truck load of food was sent here from a little church back of Sewickley and with the help of several school girls, you supervised the distribution of this food to those who needed it. At this time you were Custodian at Neville School and supervised boys from the school moving everything from the shop and basement to higher ground for 25¢ an hour.

You were a member of the School Board when the new High School was being built and fought for Neville all the way. You were a member of the Neville Township School Board for sixteen years.

Your daughter, Margaret, was Valedictorian of the first class to graduate from Neville Township High School.

Then came World War II. You didn't work for three years at this time but helped raise money to send packages to local boys in the service. You belonged to an organization known as the Service Men's Association, along with Mrs. Grace Ridosh, Mrs. Jack Wiley, Mrs. Julia Bereza, Mrs. Virginia Hinkle, Mrs. Steve Kosko, Mrs. William Easton, and Benny Reuben. Every week this Association sponsored card parties to raise money to send candy, etc., to boys in the service. After the war the money remaining in the treasury was used toward engraving names of service men on the monument here on the Island.

Your son, Edward, served with the Military Police Platoon in the Third Army in France and Luxemburg and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroic service while overseas.

Your son, Wayne, served with the U.S. Army Air Force and was stationed on the Island of Guam.

It was a happy day in your life when both boys returned home safe and sound.

For many years you were a member of the Boy Scout Committee with Vern Gillock as Scout Master. All your life you have enjoyed working with and for the younger generation. The young girls and boys seem to have a special place in your heart.

You helped found the P.T.A. on Neville Island and were instrumental in seeing that the Neville School Cheerleaders had their first uniforms. These were hand sewn by Mrs. Sidum. While a member of the P.T.A. you supported them in influencing both the School Board and the Township to work toward supervised recreation in the summer months. This was the first supervised play program on the Island.

While a member of the School Board you were responsible for getting the students to work at the school in the summer instead of contracting the work to outsiders.

You also helped with the program of getting our football squad to Camp.

You have been an active elder in the Neville Island Presbyterian Church almost continually since 1932.

At one time the Church sponsored a soft-

ball and basketball team. After the regular basketball season was over, you sponsored, on your own, a team in the Tri-State Tournament in East Liverpool, Ohio. You took care of all the expenses and even though your teams never won the championship they were always in the semi-finals.

You have been active in all civic affairs on the Island for many, many years. Even today, you attend all school functions and can be seen at all football games.

You were a member of the first Planning Committee organized for zoning Neville Island.

On November 28, 1952 your family suffered a great tragedy. Your daughter, Margaret, her husband Sam, and your grandson, Sammy, were killed in a plane crash at Tacoma, Washington, while enroute home from Fairbanks, Alaska, where they had been stationed in the service. Crushing as this blow was, you were still able to bounce back and keep going, perhaps because of your great faith in the One above, and the fact that you were so active in everything that went on in this community helped you through this trying time by keeping your mind on others and their problems rather than your own.

On June 20, 1956 you and Edith celebrated your Fiftieth Wedding Anniversary with a family dinner and Open House. Many of your friends stopped by to extend their good wishes. It was a day to remember.

In June 1965 another sorrow had to be borne by you. In that year your beloved wife, Edith, passed away. Here again, however, you realize that life must go on regardless of what trials await us and you forced yourself to keep active and interested in your surroundings.

At the present time you are President of the Golden Age Club of Coraopolis; active in Boy Scouts; a committee member of the P.T.A.; an active elder in the church; and an Honorary member of the Lions of America.

You now reside at 205 N. Hubert Street, having had to vacate your home (after 63 years) because of the new bridge being built over the Island. The wheels of progress keep turning and we must move with them.

Your son, Edward, lives with you and is a Deputy Sheriff for the County of Allegheny, working out of the Pittsburgh Office.

Your son, Wayne, is married to the former Grace Bennett, and they have one daughter, Linda, who is 14. Wayne works for the U.S. Corps of Engineers on Neville Island and he and his family reside at 211 N. Hubert Street.

Your grandson, Eddie, and his wife, Josephine, and their two children, Alicia and Eddie, Jr., live at 207 N. Hubert Street. You have three great grandchildren living in San Francisco, California—Kenneth, Cynthia, and David.

We believe you are a fortunate man, Dick, to have practically all your family living near you right here on the Island—2 children, 2 grandchildren, and 5 great grandchildren in all.

CELEBRATION IN HONOR OF DICK ALLISON— SUNDAY, AUGUST 3, 1969

(Excerpts from Sunday program of The Neville Island Presbyterian Church, First Street, Neville Island, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15225: *Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass—Ps. 37.5. Enter to Worship—Depart To Serve*)

The Chancel Flowers are in honor of Mr. Ennis W. Allison for "Dick Allison Day" today, proclaimed by the community. Flowers are from the Session, the Allison Family, Church Organizations and friends.

Congratulations are extended to Mr. Ennis W. Allison on this particular day by the members of the Session. We thank you for your many years of being a member of this church and for the many years of being an Elder. Your faithful service is acknowledged

and greatly appreciated by the congregation. God Bless You, "Dick Allison."

The Community has planned a Parade and other events throughout the day and all are invited to participate in the celebration of "Dick Allison Day" today.

The Chairman of the General Committee for "Dick Allison Day" is Mr. F. C. Williams. Chairman of the Church Committee is Mrs. Richard Davis with Mrs. Grace Allison's assistance and cooperation of the Elders.

MORNING FESTIVITIES

11:00 A.M.—Church Service at Neville Island Presbyterian Church, Rev. Austin V. Hunter.

12:15 P.M.—Closed Luncheon for Allison Family, Clergy, and invited guests.

Special groups attending Church Service include

Coraopolis Womens Golden Age; Coraopolis Mens Golden Age; Neville Island Boy Scouts Troop 533; Neville Island Cub Scouts Pack 373; Neville Island Board of Commissioners; Neville Island School Board; Neville Island Police, and Neville Island Firemen.

AFTERNOON FESTIVITIES

1:30 P.M.—Form Parade at Dravo Light Metals Plant Parking Lot, South Side Grand Avenue.

Free Balloons & Stickers.

2:00 P.M.—Start Parade to Neville Island Recreation Hall, Neville School Marching Band.

Dignitaries in cars: N. I. Fire Fighting Equipment; Civil Defense Aux. Truck; Friends Marching; Ballons Flying.

Everyone Singing "For He Is A Jolly Good Fellow", "Happy Birthday".

2:30 P.M.—Three Inning Ball Game Upper N.I. vs. Lower N.I.; Footraces—Relay Races; Wheelbarrow—Shoe Races; Three Legged—Piggyback Race, and Softball Throw.

4:00 P.M.—Concert Neville Island School: Stage Band; Boat Parade; and Greater Pittsburgh Aquatic Club.

EVENING FESTIVITIES

5:00 P.M.—Picnic Supper: Share your table and food with friends and neighbors of Dick Allison.

6:00 P.M.—Presentations to Dick Allison. Welcome: F. C. Williams.

Resolution: Guido Batista.

Civic Presentations: Boy Scouts of America; Lions Club, etc.

Short Congratulatory by Dignitaries.

"This Is Your Life", Reading by Michael Raddick.

Closing Song & Prayer by All.

The "Dick Allison Day" Committee thanks everyone who participated in this wonderful celebration. Those who served in any capacity deserve a special thanks, they were so numerous we can't possibly list them all.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS TITLE II REPEAL

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed welcome news that the Nixon administration announced its support for legislation to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

This favorable nod by the administration gives added impetus to the move to expunge the disgraceful Emergency Detention Act from our law books. The Senate Judiciary Committee has already reacted by reporting favorably on the Inouye bill to repeal title II. Favorable floor action by the other body is expected within this week.

I know that the more than one-fourth of the members of this House who have joined with me in cosponsoring similar legislation to repeal the concentration camp authorization law, now join me in urging early hearings on this legislation by the House Internal Security Committee. There is no legitimate reason for any further delay.

NEW MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have expressed my grave concern about the activities sponsored by the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe. On November 4, 1969, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a staff study prepared by the House Committee on Internal Security which I chair. The study disclosed that the leadership of the New Mobe is top-heavy with known Communists and their sympathizers, including members and partisans of both the Communist Party, USA, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and the Communist youth front, the Young Socialist Alliance. The conspicuous Communist presence at major planning sessions of New Mobe indicates Communist manipulation, exploitation, and subversion of the protest movement against United States involvement in Vietnam. Further, the study disclosed that several national leaders of the New Mobe were among the delegates to the World Peace Assembly held in East Berlin during June 1969. That Assembly was sponsored by the World Peace Council, an international Communist front financed from Moscow.

The Communists are thriving on the aid and comfort realized from supporters in the United States and other Western countries. Spokesmen for Hanoi and the Vietcong have been hailing the so-called progressive elements in this country for launching a broad and powerful offensive to demand that the U.S. Government put an immediate end to the Vietnam war. As our enemy, they have every right to be grateful.

Now, the New Mobe has called a meeting of its leaders for Cleveland, Ohio, this weekend to discuss plans for future activities. New Mobe, which was organized in Cleveland last July 4, originally was intended to disband after the November mass march on Washington, D.C. However, dissatisfaction with the lack of militancy and vigor of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee apparently has persuaded the New Mobe to remain active. It is expected that at the meeting this weekend, set for December 13 and 14, the members of New Mobe's steering committee will ratify a decision by the group's executive committee that New Mobe be continued. Also to be discussed are detailed plans for new antiwar demonstrations. Among the possibilities that are to be discussed are "decentralized" demonstrations directed toward industrial suppliers of war materiel.

Another example of the closing of the

ranks of New Mobe and the Communist Party, USA, took place at a New Mobe leadership meeting held in New York City on November 22, 1969. At that time Arnold Johnson, the national public relations director of the Communist Party, USA, was named to the executive committee of the New Mobe. Johnson had been a member of the steering committee of the New Mobe since its inception.

Meanwhile, the efforts by some groups to show their support for our enemy in the guise of seeking "peace" continues unabated.

On November 29, 1969, Cora Weiss, one of the cochairmen of the New Mobe, left the United States en route to Hanoi. Traveling with Miss Weiss are Madeline Duckles of Berkeley, Calif., and Ethel Taylor of Philadelphia, Pa., both of whom are leaders of the Women Strike for Peace, an organization represented by Miss Weiss on the steering committee of New Mobe. It is significant to note that Dagmar Wilson, a leader of the Women Strike for Peace, has publicly proclaimed her sympathy for the North Vietnamese forces.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think that among the many individuals participating in the activities sponsored by the New Mobe are those who would withdraw if they knew just how much they are aiding Hanoi and the international Communist movement.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME FOR TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the question of the "guaranteed annual income" is in the news again this week, both from the White House and from the other body.

First, the current White House Conference lived up to its advance publicity by recommending a guaranteed annual income—sometimes referred to as a negative income tax—of something like \$5,500 for a family of four. The President, demonstrating his essential conservatism, recommended to the Congress a much lower figure of only \$3,900 per annum.

Second, the other body amended our tax reform bill to increase the personal and family exemption, over a period of 2 years, from \$600 to \$700 then to \$800. For a family of four, this would mean an increase from the present \$2,400 to \$2,800 in 1970 and to \$3,200 in 1971. The President, again demonstrating his essential conservatism, let it be known that such a drastic tax reform would be highly inflationary and could well result in his veto of the whole tax reform measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of a guaranteed annual income for productive Americans.

I will support legislation guaranteeing to such citizens total freedom from Federal seizure of as much as \$4,800 of their earnings each year. I have introduced legislation to that effect earlier in this Congress.

I am unalterably opposed to a guaran-

teed give away to the relief rolls, whether it is called an annual income or a negative income tax.

The American people, who are carrying the load, have a very clear understanding of two simple facts, which I call to the attention of this House.

First, if the spending of a dollar is inflationary, it makes no difference who spends it. The argument just will not sell that to take that dollar away from the man who has earned it and give it to the man who has not works some kind of black magic so that its spending becomes noninflationary.

Second, the finest kind of guaranteed income would be a very simple guarantee that the Federal Government would keep its hands off—would cease confiscating—enough of a man's earnings for him to make at least a minimum decent provision for his family. If it is proper to present to the nonproductive a gift of either \$3,900 or \$5,500 per year for a family of four, it is certainly proper to keep our hands away from the same amount of money earned by the productive citizens.

If fear of swelling inflation is grounds for denying the working taxpayers a long overdue exemption increase, how can the President overlook the inflationary effect of his guaranteed minimum income program?

NATION'S SYSTEM OF MILITARY JUSTICE—PARTICULARLY WEAKNESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WHALEN, Mr. Speaker, the military court-martial held at the Presidio and the aborted Green Beret proceedings in Vietnam have served once again to bring to the attention of Congress this Nation's system of military justice, particularly its weaknesses. No doubt the court-martial stemming from the alleged Pinkville massacre will accentuate further the need for reform.

Gen. George Decker, former Army Chief of Staff, has stated:

No single factor has a greater tendency to destroy public confidence in the (court-martial) system than allegations of command influence

As you will recall, this charge of "command influence" was present not only in the Presidio and Green Beret cases, but also there are indications that it may have prevented the Pinkville massacre allegations from surfacing for more than a year and a half.

Because it was my constituent who was killed at the Presidio, I was deeply involved in that case. As a result of that involvement, I became very familiar with many of the deficiencies of the present military justice system. Fortunately, the Secretary of Defense already has appointed a group to study stockade practices. However, it is the responsibility of Congress to revise the court-martial code, the procedures through which servicemen are confined to stockades.

It is for this reason that on Novem-

ber 26 I introduced H.R. 15016. This measure is designed to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial. First, it removes defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial. Second, H.R. 15016 creates an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings.

Last year Congress enacted Public Law 90-632 which requires each service to establish separate commands for military judges. H.R. 15016 incorporates the military judges command into the Military Trial Command which also has divisions for defense counsels and court members. The Command will be divided geographically into judicial circuits, each of which will be headed by a circuit judicial officer. The bill further stipulates that members of the Command will be under the supervision, direction, and control of only the superiors within the division, the circuit judicial officer, and the Judge Advocate General. In addition, the prohibition which prevents the convening authority or any member of his staff from preparing or reviewing any report concerning the effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency of the military judge is extended to defense counsels.

While the assignment of judges and court members by the circuit judicial officer is applicable only to general courts-martial, the bill provides that, subject to regulations of the Armed Forces Secretaries, the circuit judicial officer also may assign them to special courts-martial. Defense counsels will be assigned for both general and special courts-martial.

However, this legislation will not interfere with the convening authority's control over the prosecution of a case.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as General Decker stated, that command influence can destroy public confidence in the courts-martial system. H.R. 15016 will be a first step in preventing this, and hopefully, it will restore faith in the system.

On December 3 the distinguished Member from Illinois (Mr. PRICE), with whom I serve on the Armed Services Committee, introduced H.R. 15074, a bill identical to H.R. 15016. Today 26 of my colleagues are cosponsoring this legislation. In listing their names here, I would like to thank them for their support. The cosponsors are: Congressmen ASHLEY, BIESTER, BINGHAM, BOLAND, BURTON, CONYERS, DIGGS, EDWARDS of California, LEGGETT, LOWENSTEIN, McCLOSKEY, MIKVA, MOSHER, MOSS, OTTINGER, PUCINSKI, RAILSBACK, REES, ROSENTHAL, ST GERMAIN, SCHEUER, STAFFORD, STOKES, TAFT, CHARLES H. WILSON, and YATES.

Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with several of my colleagues to introduce a bill designed to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by, first, removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by second, creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence

or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings.

The commanding officer's control of the court-martial proceeding is the factor in the court-martial system which is most likely to produce an actual obstruction of justice or to scar the appearance of justice. As past Army Chief of Staff Gen. George H. Decker has stated:

No other single factor has a greater tendency to destroy public confidence in the (court-martial) system than allegations of command influence.

The cogency of General Decker's observation was vividly illustrated by the recent public and congressional outcry caused by the suggestion that the court-martial proceedings in the case of the Green Berets were laden with command influence. One might recall that the Green Berets defendants charged that their impending trial could not be conducted in a setting free from bias because of the commander's personal interest in the outcome of their case and petitioned to have their trial removed from his command.

Moreover, the implications of command influence in the recent Presidio mutiny trials produced a similar public reaction including a petition to the Secretary of the Army signed by 45 members of the Harvard Law School faculty asking "whether the intense command interest in prosecuting these soldiers for serious crimes and the unusually severe sentences indicate that the court-martial proceedings did not result in a fair and impartial trial."

Opportunities for a commander to unfairly influence the course of a military trial are inherent in the nature of the military system. The commanding officer who convenes a general court-martial not only has the power to select the counsel for the prosecution but also the power to select the counsel for the defense and the members of the court as well. Moreover, because he selects these participants from his own command, he retains over them the awesome power to affect their efficiency reports, duty assignments, promotions, and transfers.

Surely such singular control over both sides of a criminal case as well as over the triers of fact is inconsistent with the basic principle of judicial impartiality as applied to our civilian courts.

While I firmly believe that this power is rarely abused, the basic structure of court-martial machinery remains an incubator in which improper court-martial influences are innocently and inadvertently bred. So long as the commanding officer retains his appointive and career determining powers court-martial personnel will remain sensitive to the practical realities of military life. As the Court of Military Appeals has noted:

Courts-martial are manned by officers whose opportunities for advancement and promotion are controlled largely by their commanding officers and it is no reflection on their honesty and integrity to conclude that they desire to make a fine record.

In the same vein, court-martial participants are not oblivious to the risks

inherent in performing in a manner which displeases or is not in accordance with the interest of their military superiors. In this atmosphere, rumors, however unfounded, of the commanding officer's desires in the matter are not likely to go unheeded. And even when the commander in no way seeks to influence the participants, their court-martial performance may well be affected by a conscious or subconscious desire to do that which they presume will please the commander.

Recently, the American Bar Association, the American Legion and the American Civil Liberties Union have called for changes in the court-martial structure that would insulate key court-martial personnel from the influence of the commanding officer and erase the appearance of one-sided partiality.

The calls for reform have not gone unheeded by Congress. In 1948 Congress enacted legislation which criminally proscribed attempts to coerce or unlawfully influence actions of a court-martial. Further, in the Military Justice Act of 1968, Congress established an important safeguard against command influence by creating an independent judiciary of military judges who are completely insulated from the control of the local commanding officer.

Yet the problem of command influence over court-martial proceedings remains in the commander's power to select the defense counsel and his power to appoint and affect court members.

Command authority over the defense counsel represents the most serious weakness of the military judicial machinery. The basic problem is that the defense counsel operates in the same office as the prosecutor and under the direction and control of the staff judge advocate, whose primary responsibility is to assure that the interests of the commander, including his disciplinary interest, are preserved.

So long as the defense attorney remains a part of the military hierarchy responsible for preserving military discipline, he will be deprived of his traditional freedom of action in preparing a client's defense—and that freedom is the best assurance of fairness in any criminal proceeding.

The second obstacle to court-martial fairness is the commander's authority to handpick the members of the court. The inherent vice of this system is that it creates an appearance as well as the occasional fact of the commanding officer stacking the court with members who he believes will support his disciplinary policies and convict the accused.

Any system inviting abuse is as inimical to the appearance of judicial impartiality as an actual showing of abuse. If trials are to be impartial and to appear so, the selection of court members must be removed from the control of the commander and vested in an independent authority.

It is for all the above reasons that I am introducing this bill to prevent command influence or the appearance thereof from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings. The bill would remove defense counsel and court member selection from the control of the

military commander who convenes a court-martial and place these functions under the control of an independent trial command, along the lines of the independent judiciary which was created by the Military Justice Act of 1968.

I think that the bill strikes a balance between the legitimate interest of the military in preserving discipline and the interest of procedural due process. Thus, while the bill removes defense counsel and jury selection from command control, it does not interfere with the convening authority's control over the prosecution of a case.

With the implementation of this system, defense attorneys and court members will join military judges as independent operators in a court-martial proceeding, responsible only to their superior officers who are not responsible to the commanding officer who convenes the court-martial.

I firmly believe that this system will go a long way toward extending to our fighting men the democratic principles that they are so bravely fighting to preserve. I urge the Committee on Armed Services to give this proposal the closest scrutiny at the earliest possible time.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, those of us who support the President of the United States in his efforts to bring about a just peace in Vietnam, end inflation and reduce crime and drug usage here at home are encouraged to find that as the days go by increasing numbers of Americans join in that support.

I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the results of a Columbia Broadcasting System poll. The poll, conducted by telephone, found that 81 percent of the people are satisfied with the way the President is handling his job.

Eighty-eight percent identify with the silent majority on the issue of Vietnam, 73 percent approve of his efforts to end inflation, 77 percent like his law enforcement efforts, 73 percent agree with him on his handling of urban problems and 74 percent are in accord with his actions on race relations.

It is polls like this and like the recent Gallup poll which showed his popularity at 68 percent that perhaps have led a leading Democratic authority to predict an overwhelming victory for President Nixon were he to seek reelection today.

Richard Scammon, one of the Nation's top experts on polling and public opinion and a former Census Director, says Nixon would carry 48 States. James McCartney, writing in the Miami Herald, quotes Scammon as saying "right now Nixon has a massive majority behind him on Vietnam. And I choose the word 'massive' with care. Nixon would win by a larger margin right now than Lyndon Johnson had in his landslide victory over Barry Goldwater in 1964."

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the country has indeed rallied around the President.

LIEUTENANT CALLEY AND THE INCIDENT AT PINKVILLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. Speaker, already the slow, premeditated trial of Lt. William L. Calley and his men has begun. Testimony is being heard. Eyewitnesses are being questioned. The jury—in this case, the American and world public—is deciding the case. And yet, the court has not even convened.

I am not going to pass judgment on the guilt or innocence of the lieutenant here today. I do feel, however, that a protest must be raised over the premature trial and verdict of a man who, by all standards of American jurisprudence, is still innocent until proven guilty by a court of law.

The headlines in the papers use such as "Viet Killings" and "Massacre" without any prefix such as "alleged." Radio and television commentaries talk about the massacre in a Vietnamese village or the killing of unarmed citizens, but not about the possibility that it might have been a legitimate act of war, an attack on a Communist stronghold. If the press is not careful in its zeal for the spectacular, it will have this case decided before it ever gets to trial.

The South Vietnamese Government has conducted an investigation and found the charges to be incorrect. But in the eyes of some, the South Vietnamese, who are our allies, are not to be trusted. Yet, we must remember that those in Vietnam who are yelling the loudest and charging the United States with the greatest guilt are the Communists—North Vietnam and the Vietcong. "Pinkville," as it was called, was well known as a Vietcong stronghold. So let us be cautious in throwing charges at our own boys until we know all the facts.

Statements by men of Calley's platoon, some of whom admit a dislike for the lieutenant, receive big play at the hands of the news media men. They seek out a controversial news story regardless of the possible cost to a man's reputation and a country's credibility. Many of these men, who were asked to refrain from commenting on the case by the Department of the Army for the sake of conducting a fair military trial, have disregarded this basic precept of American law.

Frankly, I question the motives of an Army photographer who allegedly sold Army photographs to the highest bidder.

Why are these people so quick to assume the worst? So quick to assume that the alleged atrocities must have been committed? We must question all of the circumstances surrounding the attack. We must not be too quick to condemn. We must search out all of the evidence. We must not conduct a kangaroo court in the front pages of the papers and during the prime time of the television and radio news shows.

The press has a great responsibility in reporting the news. Not only should the news be properly reported, but it must be done, in my opinion, in such a way so as not to prejudice a defendant's case.

When a hot issue such as this comes along, responsible journalism is really put to the test.

Consequently, the prudence of some headline writers and some headline seekers must be questioned when they bypass the normal American manner of trying a person by court of law. The facts must be fairly given and all stories should be thoroughly checked out.

Above all, we must not forget, as Gen. William T. Sherman said, that "war is hell." Neither can we forget what the Communists in Vietnam have done to thousands upon thousands of community leaders, and innocent civilians, men, women and children, over the last few years. It has been Communist policy to kill innocent civilians, to terrorize the populace into supporting the Communist cause. This is not the policy of the American Government, or our Armed Forces, and it never has been our policy. All of this should be reported so that we can maintain a proper perspective as we consider the actions of some of our men in Vietnam.

Freedom of the press is as American as apple pie. But so is responsible use of that freedom.

Lieutenant Calley and any others charged must be granted a fair, unbiased hearing in a proper court of law. Once the trial is concluded, then the press is free to condemn the man's guilt or acclaim his innocence as the case may be—but not until then and in any case, we must not tolerate a condemnation of our whole country for what may have been the act of a few.

BILL TO SET REASONABLE LIMITS ON ACCEPTABLE MARKET PENETRATION BY IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENDEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, with some reluctance, I introduce today a bill which seeks to set reasonable limits on the acceptable market penetration by imports so as to prevent them from overrunning our industry.

The Fair International Trade Act of 1969 which I am introducing today, will accomplish this objective, and will at the same time guarantee to foreign manufacturers an opportunity to participate in any future growth of our domestic consumption.

The problem of competition from low-cost goods manufactured in countries having low wage scales was brought to my attention forcefully by one of my constituents, long a manufacturer of work gloves within my district. It was called to my attention that imports of leather-palm work gloves, made of leather and canvas, have grown so steadily during the past 5 years that in 1968, such imports represented 34.8 percent of the domestic shipments of the same gloves. Back in 1964, imports of these gloves amounted only to 5.7 percent of the domestic production of the same gloves. And this trend has continued into 1969. Imports of these gloves during the first 8 months of 1969 were 83 percent higher

than they were during the first 8 months of 1968.

I cannot help but sympathize with a situation such as this. During the last war, gloves were placed on the critical list, and there were not enough to supply the industrial and farmworkers. The War Production Board allocated gloves to important industries, leaving the consuming public practically without any supply.

Gloves are still on the critical list, and if this industry were to be destroyed by this low wage competition which is impossible to compete against, we could find ourselves in a difficult time during another emergency. I am, of course, interested in maintaining international trade on as free a basis as possible. But survival of these industries producing critical goods are definitely a matter of grave importance to the citizens of our country. Consequently, I am introducing this fair international trade bill and I join my numerous colleagues who have already introduced identical bills in asking support of a bill which might well be called a live and let live bill.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, although the United States is not the only or even the oldest federal union of states in the world, is the first to operate successfully a federal system on a large and continental basis. This has been one of America's major contributions to the art and science of government.

TELL IT TO HANOI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, this week one of the finest organizations of young people in this country, the Young Americans for Freedom, is carrying out a major, nationwide counterattack on the so-called Vietnam war moratorium.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of how many well-meaning, Christian citizens may participate in these moratorium activities—and I know there are many who fit that description—the organization effort behind these demonstrations comes basically from disruptive and destructive Communist and leftist-oriented individuals and groups. Regardless of their good intentions and regardless of the unfortunate fact that it leaves precious little opportunity for any legitimate protest of present policies, those who participate and lend their aid to the moratorium effort are aiding and abetting the enemies of this country and of free people everywhere.

If I may digress for a moment on this point, I am becoming very alarmed by the usurpation of patriotic and religious symbols for political purposes, and it is happening on both sides. I resent the prevailing attitude that automatically

categorizes anyone who displays the American flag as a war hawk. Likewise, I resent the use of the dove—a universal symbol of peace as old as Genesis—to represent the very special views of "peace" essayed by the "peace" demonstrators as if to say that anyone who is not with them does not love peace.

But I think, more than anything else, I resent the most recent usurpation by the supporters of the moratorium of the ancient tradition of caroling at Christmas. I understand that a part of the moratorium activities for December includes caroling. The carolers will be all decked out in armbands and other paraphernalia of the movement and will carol for the purpose, supposedly, of dramatizing the Christmas season as a time of "Peace on Earth—Goodwill to Men" as opposed to the prevailing atmosphere of war in Vietnam.

Whoever has trained the leaders of this movement in propaganda techniques certainly knows his business. I do not believe I have ever encountered a propaganda effort so diabolical and revolting—or so arrogant. It is diabolical because it is so emotion-oriented and therefore so potentially effective. It is revolting because it "uses" mankind's deep desire for peace in a twisted way to promote a chimerical peace—a peace which would be here today, only to be swallowed up in a tomorrow of wider war or peace enforced with chains and slavery. And it is rudely arrogant because it appropriates for a selfish political purpose a universal and beautiful custom and stigmatizes it for the many who would seek to bring happiness to the sick and afflicted by caroling the joy of Christmastide but wish in no way to be identified with the political cause of the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, the theme of the effort by the Young Americans for Freedom will be "Give Peace a Chance—Tell It To Hanoi." I believe this effort deserves the support of every Member of the Congress and every citizen of this country who wants, with our President, a genuine and lasting peace for all men everywhere.

It is somewhat puzzling to me that the event now being characterized as "the massacre of Mylai" is receiving so much coverage in the news media and is being stamped into the national conscience as an unrivaled atrocity, before the facts are even in. Yet the experiences of a heroic young Army major who escaped as a prisoner of war from his Vietcong captors and who has some very enlightening information about the effects of the anti-war propaganda and activities in this country on our POW's morale, and on Hanoi's will to continue fighting, has received scant attention. It has, indeed, been attacked by some Members of Congress who have been quoted as calling this decorated Vietnam veteran, Maj. James N. Rowe, "a puppet of the Pentagon propagandists," and describing his questioning of the war critics in Congress as "unmitigated effrontery."

I have talked with this young man personally at some length. If some of the "authoritative" war critics had gone through what he went through, I might be more willing to give their views more

consideration. But I prefer to listen to a man who knows whereof he speaks. Major Rowe suffered much because of his devotion to his country and the cause of freedom, and he was betrayed by "peaceniks" in this country who nearly cost him his life while he was a captive. He has as much right to speak his views and have them heard as any Member of Congress—perhaps more. And I deeply resent the unwillingness of major news media outlets to give his story the fair and equal coverage it deserves.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, let me point out—as the Young Americans for Freedom will be doing this weekend—that we all are for peace. The question is, how to achieve peace. This Government has repeatedly made concessions to the Communist regime in North Vietnam, and those overtures for peace have been coldly and systemically rejected by the north. Look at the record:

The administration has set in motion the return of 60,000 troops from Vietnam.

The administration has given top priority to turning the war over to the South Vietnamese, allowing them to protect themselves when we withdraw.

The administration has offered to negotiate a cease-fire under international supervision and has declared that we will retain no military bases in South Vietnam after the war.

The administration has offered to negotiate everything except the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future and has done so not only in the formal Paris peace talks but in informal, unpublicized contacts directly with Hanoi and through a number of intermediaries.

And what has Hanoi done to end the war in Vietnam? Nothing.

This is the message the Young Americans for Freedom carry to the country this week. It is a message all of us should bear in mind—along with the Vietcong atrocities against their own people as well as our young fighting men—along with Hanoi's flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions regarding the treatment of prisoners of war.

Yes, it is long past time to tell it to Hanoi—and to tell it like it is.

RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY

(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, our Nation's waters are a resource available for many purposes. They offer a man one of the few remaining natural frontiers which challenge his resourcefulness and excite his imagination. As the pressures of our complex society make their burden felt, we seek release in some form of recreation. Today, one such form of release is recreational boating—a recreation growing in popularity with amazing speed, so that on any given weekend during the boating season one can find more than 40 million Americans sailing or cruising on the Nation's waters.

It has been predicted that by 1975—just 5 years from now—at least 50 million people will be enjoying recreational boating. By 1980, with greater leisure and

disposable income, coupled with more available water recreation areas, as we build more dams to save this precious resource, it is entirely likely that more than 60 million Americans will have discovered the pleasures of recreational boating.

But the growing popularity of this sport has brought with it many problems. There have been increasing numbers of deaths due to carelessness in the operation of these boats; increasing numbers of personal injuries, increasingly costly property damage. It also has brought a host of problems to confront the U.S. Coast Guard, which has responsibility for all boating on the navigable waters of our Nation.

The Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has held several hearings in the past to evaluate the Coast Guard's administration of its statutory responsibilities for boating safety. These hearings have convinced me—as I know they have convinced the Coast Guard—of a need to require safer boats, more uniform regulations, and some form of compulsory seamanship education for boat operators.

The number of recreational boats on our waterways now approximates almost 9 million, and this figure is increasing at about 200,000 annually. Our bays, lakes, rivers, marinas, and launching ramps are being heavily used. As more and more people engage in this sport, the danger of accidents resulting in loss of life, injury, and property damage increases. Thus, every person who enjoys boating must accept his share of responsibility for minimizing the dangers to himself and his fellow boatmen.

But the boatman is not and should not be alone in carrying out this responsibility. It is and should be shared by government—Federal, State and local, and by the boating industry as a whole.

The Congress has not been indifferent to the problems of recreational boating safety. Back in 1940, when recreational boating was a sport only afforded by our most affluent citizens, Congress passed what has been since known as the Motorboat Act of 1940. This act dealt with specific items of safety equipment required to be carried in such boats. It was later amended to give the Coast Guard penalty procedures which could be invoked against the operator of a motorboat for negligent operation. These penalty procedures, I am sorry to report, have proven to be cumbersome and often ineffective—a fact which was clearly brought to the fore several times during hearings before our subcommittee.

In 1958, the Congress passed the Federal Boating Act. For the first time, State and local jurisdictions were involved in the problem of recreational boating. There was recognition at the Federal level of a need for both uniformity and reciprocity among Federal and State boating laws.

Today we have a situation in which the Congress has previously moved to establish two basic principles: First, that the Federal Government does not have exclusive interest in recreational boating safety, but must share this interest with the States; second, that reckless boat operators should be punished.

However, the hearings before my Special Studies Subcommittee have established the need for congressional enactment of a few more basic principles, foremost of which is the establishment of Federal safety standards for recreational boat manufacturers and producers of associated equipment.

Under the Federal Boating Act of 1958, the injunction that uniformity and reciprocity among and between Federal and State jurisdictions are essential continues to be a clear guidance for future action. Responsibility for safety on our waterways is logically assigned to the Coast Guard. However, the State can assume those safety functions that require direct contact with the boatman when the State has agreed to take on this responsibility in local navigable waters. At the same time, there should be Federal preemption where boating safety standards are concerned. This is necessary for achieving uniformity of standards, rather than having States formulating standards of their own.

I therefore propose a bill to correct the deficiencies in the present recreational boating laws which hearings before my subcommittee have uncovered, and to recognize the future implications of the continuing rapid growth of recreational boating, the amazing development of our technology, and the changing nature of Federal-State relationships.

The purpose of my bill is to broaden the Federal authority to establish minimum safety standards for recreational boats and associated equipment, while encouraging through financial assistance greater State participation in the boating safety programs of law enforcement and education. In the latter instance, it is more cost effective for State and local law enforcement officers to enforce boating safety laws on internal waters of the United States than it is for the Federal Government to do so.

More specifically, my bill would:

Update and consolidate the Federal Boating Act of 1958 and the Motorboat Act of 1940, as amended. The latter will remain in effect for all vessels other than noncommercial craft less than 65 feet in length. Present provisions of the Motorboat Act of 1940 relating to recreational boats would be issued as regulations.

Give broad authority to the Secretary of Transportation, together with the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, to establish minimum safety standards, safeguarded by a provision for mandatory consultation with a boating safety advisory council. The Commandant would also be able to consult with this council on other boating safety problems. Advisory panels to the council on enforcement and education matters, as well as safety standards, would be an expected development.

Provide authority for the Coast Guard auxiliary to assist State officials on waters under their sole jurisdiction at their request. This is in line with encouraging greater State participation in boating safety matters.

Provide for a 5-year financial assistance program to the States at a \$5 million per year level of funding.

Protect the boatman who goes to the

aid of his fellow boatman in the form of a "Good Samaritan" clause.

Improve accident and casualty reporting.

Establish improved penalty provisions for the reckless and negligent boat operator, and permit the use of the new system of Federal magistrates to hear their cases.

As I have stated before, the hearings before my Special Studies Subcommittee have convinced me that enactment of this bill will reduce boating accidents, and make recreational boating a safer and more enjoyable pastime for the growing millions of Americans who pursue this activity in their leisure hours.

One of the benefits which I hope will result from passage of this legislation will be the certification of all operators of recreational boats subject to licensing. This one factor alone, I believe, would substantially reduce the present high death and accident toll on our waterways.

CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES

(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, on the night of August 20-21, 1968, the Soviet Union led hostile forces of Warsaw pact countries in an invasion of Czechoslovakia. Soviet troops and those of associated nations occupied the land.

Today, over 17 months later, there are over 70,000 Soviet occupation troops in Czechoslovakia. The action of the Communist Party in deposing Dubcek and Smrkovsky and sweeping out factions of the Communist Party opposed to the hard line continues to emphasize the suffocating effect of this military occupation.

Under the pressure of Soviet force, tens of thousands of Czechoslovak people have been forced to flee their homeland. Denied their basic human and civil rights they have fled the tyranny and oppression of an alien occupation and a subservient regime. These brave people are now attempting to make a new life for themselves in other areas of the world. In this endeavor they need all the help they can get.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States instruct the U.S. Representative to the United Nations to do whatever is necessary to have the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees assist the Czechoslovak refugees and to provide the facilities and assistance required to enable them to find new homes. The world which wept at the rape of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, must be willing to help the Czechoslovak refugees to build a new life for themselves.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS—NATIONWIDE CONSUMER ROBBERY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, America's oil industry approached the Eisenhower administration with a

unique request. It was for Executive action to prevent cheap foreign oil from entering the United States—to be accomplished by establishing what we now recognize as the oil import quota system. Their request was quietly granted, and the oil import quota system remains clamped like a financial yoke on the neck of every American consumer who must buy oil and gasoline products. Take a close look at those pump prices or your home heating bill next time, and ponder on how much is pure, usurious profit, over and above a fair markup. Never let it be said that the oil industry ever misses a chance to bury the switchblade—in the consumer's wallet.

These import quotas are in force today, and estimates of what they cost us range from \$3.5 to \$8 billion annually. Suffice it to say that every American consumer pays twice the going world rate for oil and gasoline products. A barrel of sweet east Texas crude costs \$3.98 delivered by tanker to New York. That same barrel from abroad costs \$2 at the same place, until the quota system doubles its price—to you. The oil industry obviously believes cash broadens the soul—their souls.

The free world today is practically swimming in a glut of cheap foreign oil controlled almost entirely by major American oil companies. These same organizations made approximately 30 percent of their profits here and 70 percent abroad before the oil import quota system was established. Since then, as mass importation of cheap foreign oil has been dammed up, their profit sources have been almost exactly reversed. Most American oil companies now make about 70 percent of their profits domestically and only about 30 percent abroad. It is in their private vested interest to maintain U.S. prices artificially high through the quota system. Beside what they rake in from this privilege, the chicanery of the 27½-percent depletion allowance is petty larceny. This year, however, has been one of indignant outcry over tax reform. In the process, at last the rock was lifted and the Nation had a chance to see what our oil industry has been concealing. We began to understand the oil import quota system, which has been revealed for what it is—the most effective way of plundering the public since John Dillinger was forcibly retired from his labors.

It has been quite a year for oil stories. There is the major strike in Alaska, which insures us a major supply of cheap petroleum, although the oil industry would have us believe otherwise. Occidental, heretofore a smallish oil company, suddenly found itself sitting on an ocean of cheap crude oil in Libya, and no significant place in the lucrative American market to sell it. So it was willing to pass on to consumers some of the profit in return for a chance to sell it here. Establishing a free trade zone and refinery at Machiasport, Maine, would have turned the trick, allowing energy-poor New England to enjoy cheaper fuel costs. But then every part of the Nation would demand a Machiasport. Couldn't have that. So of course the oil industry fights it tooth and nail. Meanwhile, America's consumers pay ever higher costs for their fuel, as the oil industry has raised gasoline prices alone twice this year. Never

let it be said that these boys were ever guilty of generosity or compassion. Cash is their middle name.

The present administration, as we all know, is not happy about erosion of oil industry profits and tax privileges. There is a lot of campaign money in them tar hills, pardner. It has already grumbled over congressional action cutting the depletion allowance. But the cat is already out of the bag. Therefore, we have had establishment of a cabinet-level task force on oil imports, which is due to report shortly to the President. Now whatever will it say? Millions are a-quiver in anticipation of their revelations. Billions may be at stake.

Hopefully, the task force will recommend to President Nixon that he favorably consider action which would allow cheaper oil into the Nation. Industry's national defense argument is so much hogwash, containing about as much truth as the latest U.N. resolution.

The industry bellows about becoming dependent on foreign oil sources. Yet these same sources are totally unsafe in case of world crisis. Better use them now than not at all. This industry has been getting away with perhaps more unadulterated commercial piracy than any other except auto insurance and drugs. Now is the time to make a first gaping slash in their lush private preserve. They plead "poverty" and "national defense" so often, they ought to pay these words overtime wages.

In some circles this is akin to committing treason, assaulting great-grandma, and knocking poor old General Custer. Clutching stock certificates and dividend checks, oil industry defenders will weep of the Battle of New Orleans, Barbara Fritchie, and give us a moving rendition of "America" on a convenient calliope. It will be termed a threat to the unborn, Old Faithful, and highway improvements. It is all specious.

The President may, by Executive order, undo what was done originally by Executive order. The immediate effect of allowing cheap foreign oil in would be to lower energy prices and make our oil industry truly competitive, which it now is anything but. If the task force recommends a system of tariffs and increased quotas and the President ignores their findings, America's consumer will know who to thank for ever higher fuel prices. "Blessed are the biggest contributors, for they shall stand first in line."

THE MORALE OF OUR SERVICEMEN

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, over the recent past, considerable publicity has been given to statistics showing the number of men in the uniformed services who have gone AWOL or have deserted. Some have already played on these statistics for their own partisan purposes alleging that they illustrate a deterioration of morale among our servicemen, particularly in connection with our involvement in Vietnam.

To be sure, the uniformed services are no less vulnerable to the infiltration of dissident elements than any other or-

ganization and, in some respects, are more so because access to vital security information can be especially damaging to our national interests. Thus, the efforts of some to undermine the morale of personnel from within the organization of the services is a problem requiring the utmost vigilance in the face of the protection of expanding individual rights, regardless of an individual's affiliation.

While I would observe that the penalties imposed on those who have gone AWOL or have deserted have been extremely lenient, perhaps negating the affect of such penalties as a deterrent, I was pleased to note the recent observations of Vice Adm. Isaac C. Kidd, Jr., U.S. Navy, who puts the AWOL and deserter statistics in their proper perspective. Admiral Kidd, whose comments were carried in the November issue of the Officer, the official publication of the Reserve Officers Association, notes the following information which is unclassified and a matter of public record:

Less than 5-percent of U.S. servicemen ever go AWOL;

Ninety-nine point nine percent of our men in uniform do not seek asylum in Sweden;

Since September 1965 to the present, some 47,000 Navymen have volunteered for duty in Viet Nam;

Since September 1966, 100,000 Navymen stationed in Viet Nam have voluntarily extended their tours for six months or longer;

Thirty-three thousand of our incomparable Marines in Viet Nam have done the same. (Emphasis added.)

I am sure a review of the record will reveal proportionately comparable figures for the other services. The great majority of our servicemen who have selflessly and with dedication done their jobs well, under the most adverse of circumstances and at the sacrifice of the lives of thousands among them, deserve the highest praise and gratitude of this Nation. This fact should not be tainted or diminished by the few who, for whatever reason, fail to live up to their responsibility.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that one of the high schools in the State of New Jersey has instituted a voluntary prayer exercise, consisting of a reading of the Chaplain's prayer appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day the Congress is in session, subsequent to a ruling by State Attorney General Arthur J. Sills, in connection with another school—whose school board has since voted 7 to 1 to continue the prayer exercise—that such practice is unconstitutional.

How ironic it is that we in the Congress should be privileged to partake of the spiritual heritage of this Nation at the commencement of each daily session while, in the great State of New Jersey, Attorney General Sills has arrogated to himself the authority to declare this constitutional prayer exercise unconstitutional if undertaken in a public school

with the blessing of the local school board. Heretofore, I had believed that such supreme authority rested in the U.S. Supreme Court, and only after litigation in a particular case.

It is to be noted that the high school in question instituted the prayer exercise on a strictly voluntary basis before regular school hours. At the first session, it is reported that 400 of the school's 580 students were in attendance.

I commend the school officials for undertaking this congressional prayer exercise and I encourage all public schools to consider doing likewise, despite whatever threat or intimidation might be forthcoming from the attorney general's office. In my estimation, it would be a very healthy thing to get this issue before the Supreme Court once again since, with its new constituency, the result might well be the restoration of some sanity to the Court's prior prayer decisions, a result that would certainly be in accord with the overwhelming majority of the American people. I look for New Jersey to be a leader in this cause and trust that the insistence of concerned parents will not permit the few to deprive their children of the right to participate in voluntary prayer in the public schools.

DECLARATION FOR A REVISED AND UPGRADED NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the recent declaration for a revised and upgraded national maritime policy, and because of the current intermodal and joint rate endeavors by our transportation regulatory agencies, I bring to the attention of the Congress a speech recently made before the National Defense Transportation Association's Container Seminar by Commissioner George H. Hearn of the Federal Maritime Commission, stating some very important facts concerning our merchant marine and that of international maritime powers, as well as the cooperative manner in which the FMC is attempting to help the shipper by allowing joint or intermodal rates to be filed. The manner in which the Federal Maritime Commission is cooperating on this important procedure should be a good example to all regulatory agencies which function, as we all know, as arms of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to place Mr. Hearn's speech in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN

Upon receiving your invitation to address this Container Seminar, my first thought was of the N.D.T.A. conventions, both here in the United States and abroad, that I have had the pleasure and privilege of participating in. I immediately called my old friend, Chuck Brazie, for a rundown of the event and when I heard that Irv Roth, the Director of the Bureau of Economics, of the Civil Aeronautics Board was also appearing on this panel, I was honored to have been invited. I am also happy for you since, in my opinion, he is eminently knowledgeable in not only aviation transportation, but in all aspects of this great transportation industry.

Although the topic of the panel is "Single

Factor Tariff Rates", I thought that in addition to discussing that current important issue I would bring to the N.D.T.A.'s attention several facts concerning protectionism, maritime policy and national flag participation in foreign waterborne commerce by international maritime nations today. I would like to develop that topic rather than just make you aware of the current worldwide situation, but I leave that for a later talk at possibly another forum since "Single Factor Tariff Rates" are the order of the day here. For now I will make some brief comments concerning nationalism and protectionism in foreign commerce.

Recently we heard a plea from England which called for a reduction in government control over maritime affairs. It was alleged that the growth of nationalism and protectionism in shipping is affecting the ability of efficient ship owners to operate as cheaply as possible. The result, it was said, will be a rise in the cost of transportation.

Aside from these generalities, a specific charge was directed at the United States. It was contended that substantial subsidization and protection for a modern United States fleet would be disastrous for other flags.

These statements, I believe, lack a firm foundation in fact. There is no doubt that nationalism and protectionism is widely practiced in marine industries. A recent Maritime Administration publication, *Maritime Subsidies*, reveals that of 49 maritime nations examined 47 engage in some form of subsidization. Such practices take many forms. They include flag discrimination, direct subsidies, tax preferences, bilateralism and other devices.

All such practices should not, however, be condemned in toto. There must be a recognition of the purpose of the particular form of national protection for each country. The merchant marine industry does not play the same role in the economy of all maritime nations. I find surprising, therefore, the allegation that a maritime program in the United States designed to improve our fleet will have disastrous consequences around the world.

The crux of the complaint may be that the efficiency of some ship owners will be threatened by the more modern and more efficient fleets of other shipowners. My view is that if one country, such as the United States, can find a way to build a very modern and efficient merchant marine, other nations will be encouraged to meet the competition. And as it is so often said: in a service industry like transportation, competition is the name of the game.

The meaning of the challenge of competition can perhaps be seen in certain foreign trade figures. According to the latest available information, of the total foreign waterborne commerce of the United Kingdom, 37% is carried in British flag vessels. The comparable percentage for some other leading maritime nations is Norway—43%, Japan—46%, Greece—31%, West Germany—30%, Sweden—30%, France—48%.

In the United States the picture is quite different. While the United States ranks first in the value of its total foreign trade, our flag vessels carry only 6% of the cargo moving in our waterborne commerce.

This country cannot, therefore, be faulted for trying to revitalize and modernize its merchant fleet. The figures I have cited belie the charge that a modern and efficient United States fleet will be disastrous to world shipping when it is seen that some countries carry almost 50% of their ocean commerce, while we carry only 6%.

One further important point must, however, be borne in mind. While a subsidy program may rebuild and modernize our merchant fleet, it will be to no avail if American flag carriers do not increase their share of our ocean commerce.

If the United States is to improve its posi-

tion in waterborne commerce, a modern fleet is not enough. Among the crucial factors, within the United States the government and industry must be attuned to modern developments in transportation. One of these developments is joint rate and through route transportation systems.

In order to help bring the government into a concerted effort with industry, the Federal Maritime Commission is seeking to overcome regulatory inhibitions to the establishment of joint rate systems. I would like now briefly to indicate the steps that we have taken.

Revitalization by subsidy is fine but if American flag carriers are not carrying more of our cargo we will be in trouble and our fleets beyond help.

The entire subject matter of joint rates has been clouded over by doubts and confusion within the transportation industry and the shipping public. The source of the problems relating to joint rates is the fact that different modes of transportation subject to different regulatory agencies, are involved. All three of our transportation agencies are concerned—the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Maritime Commission. I will speak, however, only of the efforts being made by the Federal Maritime Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In August of this year the I.C.C. published a rule setting forth the requirements for the filing of joint rates with that agency. The immediate reaction of the Federal Maritime Commission was to request the I.C.C. to delay implementation of its rule pending consultation with the F.M.C., representatives of the industry and the shipping public.

The F.M.C. took that position because it is the agency which is responsible for the regulation of ocean transportation which forms a significant—if not dominant—part of joint rate systems. Thus the F.M.C. has a vital interest in any rule or regulation which affects ocean transportation. We wished to provide the I.C.C. with the best thinking of the agency having expertise in the field of ocean transportation in order to carry out and coordinate the desires of both agencies to facilitate the development of through intermodal transportation. The F.M.C. is desirous only that the I.C.C. and F.M.C. work hand-in-hand so that joint rate transportation develops with a strong foundation.

In response to the F.M.C. plea for delay, the I.C.C. did postpone the implementation of its rule and asked for comments on the rule from interested parties. The F.M.C. filed comments with the I.C.C., and also initiated its own rule-making proceeding. These two actions by the F.M.C. are intended to insure a coordinated and effective control over through international rates.

The F.M.C. supports the intention of the I.C.C., but we believe that their rule in its proposed form is inadequate to carry out its purposes and might actually hinder them. If these shortcomings are not eliminated the proposed I.C.C. rule will have a number of undesirable consequences. I will briefly mention a few of these.

First of all, the rule as proposed does not distinguish between the portion of a joint rate which represents the inland carrier's participation as opposed to that of other participants. The failure to make that distinction will have several unfortunate ramifications.

Without the ability to determine the inland portion of a joint rate, the I.C.C. will be unable to determine whether a change in a joint rate is attributable to carriers subject to its jurisdiction. Thus, without a division of the rate in the tariffs, the I.C.C. might engage in inadvertent and unauthorized investigations into the lawfulness of ocean carrier rates. Furthermore, the legislative history of the Shipping Act of 1916 clearly indicates a Congressional intent that rates in foreign commerce should not be subject to suspension. The I.C.C. rule, as proposed, might cause confusion in this regard if the

I.C.C. does not require that its regulated carriers separately state their portion of joint rates.

Without such separate statement, the I.C.C. might also disapprove an ocean rate by disapproving an entire joint rate. This should not be permitted because disapproval of an ocean carrier's rate is an action for which no standards exist under the Interstate Commerce Act. Standards for disapproval do exist in the Shipping Act of 1916.

Also, under the Interstate Commerce Act, the I.C.C. could not administer Shipping Act provisions such as the Section 17 prohibition against undue prejudice to exporters in our foreign commerce. The inability of the I.C.C. to apply such sections, together with the lack of separate identification of the inland carrier's rate, might appear to remove the protection which Congress intended the American exporter to have.

Other protections cast into doubt by the I.C.C. rule are those relating to dual rate contracts. Section 14b of the 1916 Act entrusts the F.M.C. with the responsibility for approving such contracts and insuring that the contracts contain statutorily required safeguards for shippers. The failure of the I.C.C. rule to distinguish between the ocean and inland carrier's participation makes uncertain the availability of the system itself and these safeguards.

Another problem involves the portion of a joint rate attributable to the foreign inland leg of the service. Unless the I.C.C. requires a break-out of the segment subject to its jurisdiction, there is no way the F.M.C. can identify the foreign inland portion. This will be true even though the F.M.C. already requires ocean carriers to separately state the port-to-port portion of their rates in tariff filings.

A second undesirable consequence is that the I.C.C. rule, as written, does not identify the carrier responsible for filing. This could lead to controversy as to whether the I.C.C. intends to require F.M.C. regulated carriers to file at the I.C.C., and I do not think the I.C.C. has the power to require and accept such filings.

Third, the rule as proposed is unclear as to whether conferences of ocean carriers may participate in joint rate tariffs filed with the I.C.C. Such conferences are the dominant factor in ocean commerce and should not be precluded from participation.

To avoid these shortcomings the F.M.C. has included in its comments to the I.C.C. suggested modifications of its rule. We have suggested that the rule require identification of the portion of the rate to be collected by the I.C.C. regulated carrier, that the rule provide specifically that the I.C.C. regulated carrier is the participant responsible for filing the joint rate with the I.C.C., and that conferences of ocean carriers be permitted to participate in joint rates filed with the I.C.C.

As I said earlier, the F.M.C. has submitted its comments to the I.C.C. in a spirit of cooperation. We, therefore, have made no suggestions to the I.C.C. which we are not prepared to implement within the scope of the regulatory activity of the F.M.C. Evidence of this is in our own rule-making proceeding which the F.M.C. initiated concurrently with the filing of our comments with the I.C.C.

By our proposed rule we would require carriers subject to F.M.C. jurisdiction—and only those carriers—to file with the F.M.C. tariffs naming through rates. We believe the F.M.C. has the authority and regulatory responsibility to accept such tariffs for filing; but to avoid any uncertainty or confusion, and to establish coordination of regulation, the F.M.C. has initiated a rule-making proceeding in the matter of through rates.

According to our proposed rule, F.M.C. regulated carriers would be required to include in their tariffs a statement of the charges for the entire transportation service offered, a separate statement of the portion

to be collected by the F.M.C. regulated carrier, a description of the service to be performed by each participant in the through rate, and the through route which has been established.

The F.M.C.'s rule would not extend the jurisdiction of the F.M.C. over the rates of carriers not subject to the Shipping Act of 1916. Consequently we would require F.M.C. regulated carriers to disclose their portion of through rates. This would enable the F.M.C. to determine the lawfulness of their portion under the standards of the 1916 Act.

In fact, however, ocean carriers are already required to state separately their portion of through rate arrangements. The failure to do so is a violation of Section 18(b) (1) of the Shipping Act. This requirement was affirmed last year by the F.M.C. in our famous *Container Marine Lines* case (Docket No. 68-8). That case involved tariffs of Container Marine Lines covering transportation between United States ports and points within the United Kingdom. In our decision, accepting CML's tariffs, the F.M.C. required CML to include in its tariffs an identification of the port-to-port or ocean portion of the through rate.

Nevertheless, the F.M.C. believes it desirable to have a rule as we have proposed. Such a rule would enable the F.M.C. to effectively regulate those matters within its jurisdiction and also eliminate misconceptions as to the regulatory authority involved. Hopefully the result will be that a joint rate and an authentic intermodal operation will finally come into play.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE BROCK ADAMS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the November 16 issue of the *Washington Star*. This focused on the consistent and conscientious work of the gentleman from the State of Washington on the District Committee.

All who know BROCK ADAMS are aware of his hard work on a committee which cannot enhance his own political career. Brock has made it plain to all in Congress that he is interested in insuring that the people of the District of Columbia will be given their due consideration by the Congress. Certainly those who live in the District could have no better representative than BROCK ADAMS.

I have worked with Brock on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as well as on other congressional matters, and I concur with the statement made by another member of the District Committee, who said that Brock is "one of the most brilliant and energetic men in Congress."

I am including a copy of this fine article in the RECORD so that all of my colleagues can join me in giving Brock the recognition that he deserves:

BROCK ADAMS—HE'S GOT THOSE LONELY,
LOSING-LIBERAL, HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE-FIGHTIN' BLUES

(By Boris Weintraub)

Congressman Brock Adams is a Democrat who represents that other Washington, the state with the vote, beautiful mountains, and miles and miles of clean air. He is looked upon as the most ardent and effective pro-city advocate on John McMillan's House District Committee.

Adams should have asked Fred Schwengel,

or John Foley, or Abraham Multer, or even Jack Kennedy, what it was like before he agreed to serve under the rural-conservative coalition that rules the committee which more than any other single agency rules the District of Columbia. Actually, Adams probably knew what it was like because he refused the slot during his first term some six years ago. But then, second time around, he accepted, and today he pouts about the repeated frustrations of being a liberal, low-ranking member of a low-priority and low-prestige committee.

Congressman Adams is the inheritor of a long, losing tradition.

Adams is a lean, athletic-looking, youngish congressman (he's 42) in the Kennedy mold. This is not surprising, since then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy appointed him to be a U.S. attorney in Seattle just a short spell before Adams made the run for Congress. Appropriately, his office is studded with Kennedy memorabilia, including a bust of President John F. Kennedy.

And there is another, coincidental, connection to the liberal wing of the Democratic party: Adams sounds remarkably like Hubert Humphrey, or perhaps like David Frey's imitation of Humphrey. He talks with a quivering, high-pitched, bubbling sort of stridency.

In his office, Adams unfolds his limbs around his desk chair, recounting disappointments for a reporter. "Service on the committee is very difficult, very difficult," he says, shifting a leg for punctuation. "We are fighting an established system that's been in existence since 1948. They have done things in the same rather comfortable fashion all that time. They go on the floor on Monday (the House's traditional District Day) with their bills; few members have attended committee sessions, and those were friendly; they passed out bills as they wanted to, and they would put out any kind of bill they wanted to.

"The service can wear you down until you finally say, 'I'm getting off,'" says Adams. "I'm not a contentious person, but there is a constant rolling weight against you until someone has to stand up or violate his conscience."

Unlike those of any other House committee, the District Committee's subcommittees have no names, only numbers. Thus, McMillan has the power as chairman to assign bills as he sees fit, without worrying about whether a particular subcommittee has jurisdiction over the subject matter. In this way, he can carefully guide anything he considers important—or dangerous—to a favored subcommittee chairman like John Dowdy of Athens, Texas, or Thomas G. Abernethy of Okolona, Miss., and keep it away from a unit headed by Charles C. Diggs of Michigan, a liberal Democrat and, for good measure, a Negro.

"The leadership of this committee is such that discussions never really reach the liberal level, they only reach varying degrees of conservatism," Adams says. "Take, for example, increasing the sales tax on food. Around the country, this is no longer an issue; it's been pretty well decided that this is not a good thing. But it's still being debated here."

Getting specific, and sounding increasingly depressed, Adams talks about the parking bill fiasco. To begin at the beginning, he says, you study the parking situation here. Then you conclude that there isn't enough parking space, and that what space there is, is controlled by the big parking lot owners who set rates with no chance for the public to have a say.

As a result of your study, you work with officials and like-minded Senate colleagues and come up with a bill providing for a public parking authority with the power to condemn land for parking, set rates and in other ways work to eliminate some of the problems.

The bill is introduced in both houses. In the Senate, hearings are held before the District Committee, and everybody but the park-

ing lot owners praises your bill. It zips through the committee and onto the Senate floor, where it breezes through on a mumbled, hurried vote of assent. And now it goes to the House and awaits only action there, and now . . .

And now nothing happens. Maybe Chairman John McMillan, of Florence, S.C., sits on the bill for months before assigning it to a subcommittee. And maybe that subcommittee is headed by Rep. Dowdy, who has a long history of opposition to any sort of public condemnation of private property.

So the session ends with no action on the bill, and a new Congress is elected, and the whole process must start all over again.

Adams and a handful of other liberals on the committee, notably Democrats Donald Fraser of Minnesota and Andrew Jacobs of Indiana and Republicans Frank Horton of New York and Gilbert Gude of Maryland, have been trying to shake things up a little, trying to convince the committee leadership that the city needs a little more and a little better than it's been getting. Adams' description of his committee battles is studded with phrases like "Fraser, Andy Jacobs and I" and "Don Fraser called Andy Jacobs and me."

But more than the others, Adams is regarded on the Hill and in the city as the key man—one of his friends on the committee calls him "one of the most brilliant and energetic men in Congress, with an absolute zest for work and natural ability for digging out information, organizing it and following through."

The proposals sponsored by or supported by Adams during his District Committee tenure include home rule, gun registration, the parking bill (twice passed by the Senate and stalled in the House), a constitutional amendment to provide the District with representation in the Congress, the commuter tax and a bill outlawing racial and religious restrictive covenants in the sale and rental of housing.

As befits a former prosecutor, he also has been concerned with crime, though in a different manner than the committee leadership. He has urged what he calls a "massive infusion of time, talent and money" into the police department, an increase in prosecution personnel, the doubling of court staff, a work release program and a big increase in parole and probation staffs to maintain "true supervision."

"This city should be a model," Adams says, sounding the idealistic line that, when you think about it, is responsible for his repeated disappointment. "We have the national treasury here, the attention of Congress, the greatest collection of intellectual talent anywhere. But instead of being a model, instead of being in the forefront of the national debate, we are arguing the concepts of being a small Southern town."

"As long as we won't let the people govern themselves, we should govern well. But we don't. I'm not talking about getting out in front of the nation; I'm talking about just getting even."

The long, generally unsuccessful, history of Adams-like liberals on McMillan's committee dates back to the 80th Congress when John F. Kennedy, a freshman congressman from Massachusetts, became a member. It is not recorded that he took much part in District affairs during his three terms on the committee, but others were pushing for home rule, for instance, even then. Hearings were held in 1949, but no bill emerged. It was to be 10 years later before hearings would be held again, this time spurred by Reps. Foley of Maryland, Multer of New York, two Democrats, and Schwengel of Iowa, a Republican.

But as happens to so many liberals in Congress, District Committee liberals often are from seats that are in jeopardy; if they are re-elected every two years by a "safe" Northern constituency, they move on to better things. Kennedy, of course, went to the Senate. Multer received a New York judgeship, and Foley and Schwengel were defeated in

re-election campaigns, in each case by other liberals. (Schwengel won his seat back, and he even said he wanted back his spot on the District Committee, but he didn't get it.) Unlike some of their predecessors, Adams and his associates are trying to take a more active role in serving the city and fighting the establishment.

At the start of this year's term, Adams promised a fight against the leadership in the interest of cutting down on McMillan's power. He lost on the key issue, having subcommittees with specific areas of jurisdiction, but he won a few bones: the right of every member to question a witness for three minutes, the right to bid for membership on a subcommittee, and the right to be notified of subcommittee meetings and the subjects to be discussed at them. Incredibly, this last was an innovation on the District committee.

On a national level, Adams has passed the litmus test for liberalism—Americans for Democratic Action rated him as 92 percent liberal, with one wrong vote out of 12 last year and 88 percent correct on seven out of eight key votes this year. But he says that back home, he's considered more of a moderate, and faced opposition last year from a Peace and Freedom candidate who thought he wasn't strongly enough against the Vietnam war. Adams prevailed and won his third term since being elected in the 1964 Johnson landslide.

The Seattle district he represents is a heterogeneous one, with a little bit of everything. It has all of the state of Washington's minorities—blacks, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos. It has Seattle's central core city with all the by-now typical problems. It has well-to-do suburbs with \$50,000 homes. And it has the heart of the city's booming industrial area—the giant Boeing Aircraft plant, steel mills, shipyards—with its medium-well-off unionized workers. The people there, Adams says, don't pay much attention to his District Committee work; they're more interested in his service on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Like most congressmen, Adams shunned District committee service when he arrived in 1965. He was approached by some people who had friends he knew in Seattle, primarily by Mrs. Joy Simonson, chairman of the District's Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, but he begged off, citing his lack of knowledge, the difficulty of service because of the committee's reputation, and what he feels is a definite attempt by the congressional structure to keep the District Committee conservative.

But Fraser, among others, kept nagging at him to join the committee—Fraser nagged at Jacobs, too, and got him to accept a spot—and Adams filled a vacancy on the committee after winning re-election in 1966. By that time, two of his four children were enrolled in the District's John Eaton School in the Woodley Park area of Northwest; he and his wife followed activities in the PTA and their church, and there was a definite interest established. "More of these congressmen who are trying to run this city should live in it," Adams says.

He tries in other ways to find out what is going on in the city, what its needs are. He has visited the District jail, both General Sessions and District Courts, many of the schools. He has assigned a staff member, a sideburned young man named Jacques Du Puy, full time on urban problems, reasoning that Seattle will have some of the District's problems in a few years and wanting to have an expert around to help head them off. (This opens the ironic possibility that Adams' District Committee service will pay off—in Seattle.) He has met with city groups and encouraged them to take an active part in committee hearings—"otherwise, you get only those witnesses selected by the committee leadership," he says.

Another source is the District government. Adams says he has a good relationship with

Mayor Walter Washington, but recognizes the "difficult position" the mayor is in:

"He has to deal with the executive branch and the committee, so we have to request the information we want, rather than have them come to us with it. The government is responsive, aware and frustrated. They must have real support from the executive to be effective, and they don't have it now."

If there was a deviation by Adams from what might commonly be thought of as the straight liberal position on District affairs, it was in his role in forcing a rider to the District's revenue bill barring any federal payment until work started on the Three Sisters Bridge.

Adams is no visionary but is a pragmatic politician (a part of the Kennedy tradition often overlooked by haglographers).

"Both parties on this issue had their feet stuck in concrete," he says. "The result was that nothing has happened and a real transportation crisis was approaching. The only way to break the logjam was to tailor a compromise to get the necessary majority. No one is happy about it. I did what was best for the city."

"Sure, I'm worried about what will happen to all those cars when the bridge is built. That's why it's essential to get the subway built at the same time. There is no hope of solving the transportation problem with more bridges and freeways. We should complete what's started, but the only way to solve it is to build an efficient mass transit system."

If discouragement can be defined as being a liberal—or, as Brock Adams would have it, a moderate—on the House District Committee, then Adams most of the time seems the soul of discouragement when District matters are mentioned.

"If I had lost the subway fight, if that money had stayed stuck, I would have felt so compromised I would have gotten off the committee," he says, sighing. "You've got to have some successes."

Adams, of course, is a practical man, not given to vituperative attacks on the committee leadership. "They just don't understand what I'm trying to do," he says, fretfully. "These men have a completely different viewpoint of what a major, heterogeneous metropolitan area should be. They relate to a completely different environment than what you actually have here."

But then there is that other side to Brock Adams, an optimism and prosecutor's combativeness that goes well with the hard, no-nonsense sound of his name. Sprawling in his office chair behind the big congressman's desk, one leg stuck straight out, the other tucked up onto the seat of the chair, he pronounces that "the only hope for change is what the leadership of the national parties will do."

Then, for just a minute, there is the fighter's glint, the quickening campaigner's pace in that Hubert Humphrey voice as Adams continues: "And the only way to change them is to carry the fight to Congress, and we must be contentious. We have to bring amendments, report out bills, get to the membership, and get them to understand."

THE TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members of the House and all those who read this RECORD will be able to feel even prouder as Americans after reading the following statement regarding the Tactical Air Command. "They take the blue from the skies, a pretty girl's eye, and a touch of Old Glory too, and give it to the men who proudly wear the U.S.

Air Force Blue" is part of a song written a few years ago for the Air Force, and it was never truer today. The men of the Tactical Air Command are today among the finest examples of that kind of pride a young man has in the service of his country and his flag, that kind of pride exemplified by the young men of the Tactical Air Command, the 4531st Tactical Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla. The men who proudly wear the U.S. Air Force Blue.

The Tactical Air Command is represented in southern Florida by the 4531st Tactical Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Force Base. This base, although under the control of the Tactical Air Command, is a unique base and known most appropriately as "the All American Base" since it supports units of the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and large elements of military reserve forces, not only on the base proper but as far as 120 miles south to Key West and as far as 140 miles north of Miami. This is an extremely diversified support mission since it encompasses everything from aircraft, missiles, radar installations, administrative supplies, and special support for the President of the United States.

About 18 months ago, the command jurisdiction of Homestead Air Force Base was formally transferred from the Strategic Air Command to the Tactical Air Command; receiving command of Homestead Air Force Base on behalf of TAC was Col. Wiltz P. Seguirra, 4531st Tactical Fighter Wing.

This changeover was accomplished rapidly and efficiently. The responsibility for coordinating the highly complex job of economically realigning the assets of the previous command and integrating these assets, was assigned to Col. Marion A. Bradshaw, director of material, for the base.

The job of supporting these tremendous projects fell, primarily, to the 4531st Supply Squadron under the command of Maj. E. D. Doran, assisted by Mr. Lyman L. Dukes, assistant chief of supply. This mission was accepted and accomplished in an enthusiastic and professional manner by the highly dedicated members of this supply squadron.

I am most delighted to bring to your attention that as a result of this dedication in the highest traditions in the service of our country, the supply squadron has been officially recognized by the commander of the Tactical Air Command as the "Best in TAC," and as a result, it is now being evaluated by the U.S. Air Force for the award of the Daedalion Supply Effectiveness Award Trophy, awarded annually to the base supply organization with the best supply performance record for the report year.

An honor such as this speaks well, not only for the 4531st Supply Squadron, but for the attitude and teamwork of all other units on this "All American Base." It is gratifying to know that this supply squadron earned for itself the honor of being the best in a major Air Force command.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this outstanding unit should be saluted by Congress and receive the appreciation from our

Nation for a job well done, and for being recognized as the first such organization to be so honored at Homestead Air Force Base.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. BARRETT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. EILBERG (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WHALEN, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. RHODES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS, of Alabama for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BELCHER, for 10 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. KOCH, for 60 minutes, December 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.
Mr. ANDERSON of California following adoption of conference report on H.R. 12964.

(The following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STANTON.
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.
Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. CONABLE.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.
Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. BELL of California.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.
Mr. TAFT.

(The following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOSS.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. YATES in two instances.
Mr. YATRON in two instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. DENT.
Mr. HANNA in five instances.
Mr. FRASER in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
 Mr. LOWENSTEIN in five instances.
 Mr. MIKVA in six instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. HUNGATE.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1232. An act to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2619. An act to amend 5723(b) of title 5, United States Code, relating to length of service required by teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools when travel and transportation expenses are paid to first post of duty; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2940. An act to amend the Act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13767. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, 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, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13767. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 10, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1399. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. assistance of the Kingdom of Thailand, Department of State, Department of Defense, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1400. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Education and welfare services," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1970, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1401. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in setting claims for termination of communications services, Department of Defense, Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1402. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Yavapai-PreScott Community Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 14733. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 14790. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health; with an amendment (Rept. 91-712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 506. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 14289. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1921, to place the counties of El Paso and Hudspeth, Tex., in the mountain standard time zone; with amendments (Rept. 91-714). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13407. A bill to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-715). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 14789. A bill to amend title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 13954. A bill to amend the act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), so as to authorize the Board of

Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and construct museum support and depository facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 13956. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 953; 20 U.S.C. 65a), relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, so as to authorize additional appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for carrying out the purposes of said act; without amendment (Rept. 91-723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 13959. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the many contributions to the founding and early development of the State of Texas and the city of San Antonio by Jose Antonio Navarro; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 14213. A bill to amend sections 5580 and 5581 of the Revised Statutes to provide for additional members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 13448. A bill to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the lands and buildings now constituting the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at New Orleans, La., for lands upon which a new U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at New Orleans, La., may be located; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 13763 (Rept. No. 91-727). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 7491 (Rept. No. 91-728). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Leonard N. Rogers, John P. Corcoran, Mrs. Charles W. (Ethel J.) Pensinger, Marion M. Lee, and Arthur N. Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 65. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to Emogene Tilmon of Logan County, Ark.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 80. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to Enoch A. Lowder of Logan County, Ark.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 81. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to J. B. Smith and Sula E. Smith, of Magazine, Ark.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture.

S. 82. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay and similar materials in certain lands to Wayne Tilmon and Emogene Tilmon of Logan County, Ark.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15151. A bill 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 amend the District of Columbia revenue laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 15152. 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. DENT:

H.R. 15153. A bill to amend the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, as amended, to exempt certain transportation employees of private carriers from the overtime compensation and hours worked provision of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15154. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 15155. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 15156. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15157. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 15158. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15159. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for special project grants for the provision of family planning services and related research, training, and technical assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15160. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act to extend and improve the provisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 15161. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Yavapai-PreScott Community Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15162. A bill to prohibit public officials

from operating dual school systems, and from requiring racial balance in school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 15163. A bill to prohibit public officials from operating dual school systems, and from requiring racial balance in school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 15164. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 15165. A bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 15166. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15167. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide amnesty for certain first offenders under Federal criminal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of social security benefits on a semi-monthly basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15169. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN (by request):

H.R. 15170. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to change the number of members of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 15171. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prescribe fees for applications for new commercial television broadcasting station licenses and for renewal of such licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 15172. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr.

STAFFORD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAFT, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. YATES, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 15173. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.J. Res. 1025. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 1027. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 1028. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning assistance to Czechoslovak refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself and Mr. BIESTER):

H. Res. 745. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 15174. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Robb Frye Harden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 15175. A bill for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15176. A bill for the relief of Miss Ngan Fel Mo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 15177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Arizona to Mrs. Hallie Griffin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

352. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 34th Infantry Division Association, Des Moines, Iowa, relative to equalization of retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

353. Also, petition of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, relative to the repeal of cargo preference; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

354. Also, petition of the executive board, district 5, United Mine Workers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to a report of the U.S. Department of Labor concerning the United Mine Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.