HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, February 18, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jack M. Rosoff, Congregation B'nai Israel of Greater Red Bank, Rumson, N.J., offered the following prayer:

O L-rd, Thou G-d of justice, who art sanctified through righteousness, make Thy presence manifest in the world, arise in Thy majesty, O our King, and let the haughty be cast low because of Thy justice.

עד מתי רשעים ה' עד מתי רשעים יעלזו

How long, O G-d, shall the wicked exult? How long shall evil doers prosper?

They bluster insolently;

They lord it arrogantly;

They flout Thy will;

They torment those who fall into their clutches; they oppress without mercy the weak and the defenseless;

They sit in hiding, conspiring in secret;

They plan to betray the innocent;

They snatch the helpless and despairing into their net;

They say: "G-d will not see, He has hidden His face."

ה' הגנו

O L-rd, here we are, use us. Inspire us, O L-rd, to scatter Thine enemies. Inspire us to defeat bigotry, oppression, and injustice. As smoke is driven away, so let them be driven back. As wax melts before fire, so let them melt before the flame of human love, concern, and determination of Thy servants. Give us courage to champion the right, though many and powerful be its foes. Grant us wisdom to work diligently to combat wrong and evil.

The vision of the messianic era makes us joyful, it portends the triumph of Thy love when men shall banish all hatred from their hearts and all weapons from their hands, and unite in establishing Thy kingdom of peace and justice on earth.

והיה באחרית הימים . . . וכתתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות.

לא ישא גוי אל גוי חרב ולא ילמדו עוד מלחמה.

And it shall come to pass in the end of days, they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more. For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of G-d, as the waters cover the sea.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 9, 1969, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Soon-Hie Cho Young;

S. 85. An act for the relief of Dr. Jagir Singh Randhawa;

S. 109. An act for the relief of Dr. Benito V. Odulio;

S. 112. An act for the relief of Dr. Kenneth Siu;

S. 113. An act for the relief of Dr. Mete V. Altug;

S. 127. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Suarez-Diaz;

S. 129. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge P. Garcia;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos M. Perez-Abreu;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Fernandez-Dominguez;

S. 132. An act for the relief of Dr. José Ramón Fernández-González;

S. 147. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel A. Gomez;

S. 148. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Alfredo Milera;

S. 149. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Garcia Plasencia;

S. 151. An act for the relief of Dr. Fermin Ferro;

S. 153. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Jesus Aguilar Lima;

S. 154. An act for the relief of Dr. Joaquin Francisco Palmerola Cabrera;

S. 155. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ramon Portela y Margolles;

S. 156. An act for the relief of Dr. Aurelio Julian Andres Jimenez Cortina;

S. 157. An act for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan;

S. 256. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren;

S. 319. An act for the relief of Liliana Grasseschi Baroni;

S. 378. An act for the relief of Peter Rudolf Gross;

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura;

S. 490. An act for the relief of Gyorgy Sebok;

S. 495. An act for the relief of Marie-Louise (Mary Louise) Pierce;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Stella Dribensky.

S. 572. An act for the relief of Dr. Cesar Baro Esteva;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Guerra;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Domingo Lamadriz;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue;

S. 678. An act for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre);

S. 682. An act for the relief of Rene E. Montero; and

S. 686. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Lopez.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 16, United States Code, section 715a, appointed Mr. BELLMON as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission in lieu of Mr. HRUSKA, resigned.

DESIGNATION AS OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR THE MAJORITY FOR THE CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I have designated as official objectors for the majority for the Consent Calendar the following Members: The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL).

I have also designated as official objectors for the majority for the Private Calendar the following Members: The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

DESIGNATION AS OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR THE MINORITY FOR THE CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing the official objectors for the Republican Members for the Consent Calendar. They are to be as follows: The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Also, Mr. Speaker, the official objectors for the Republican Members for the Private Calendar are to be as follows: The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

LEGISLATION CREATING DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS FOR PEACE

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join other Members of the Congress in sponsoring legislation creating a Department of Peace and a Joint Committee of the Congress for Peace. I think there is one key reason for establishing such a department and treating this area of our international relations individually. Very simply, the reason is that one needs governmental machinery to carry out a policy if that policy is to have some kind of important priority.

Without specific machinery to carry out an important policy, we have policy as a byproduct. It was not until we established the Arms Control and Dis-

armament Agency that we started on a day-to-day and year-by-year effort for arms control negotiations. I would submit, Mr. Speaker that we will continue to have peace policy as a byproduct to the Defense Department and State Department policy until we create the machinery to work on peace as a day-by-day concern and as its only day-by-day concern.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that some may contend that another department would add further to the confusion and that such a department might speak or work at cross purposes with State or Defense. That may well be so, indeed let us hope that in some cases that would be so. It is very important when dealing with the crucial questions of peace and war that there be a set of checks and balances within governments. Along with developing positive programs for peace, this role of balancing could be the most vital role of the Peace Department.

ATTACKS ON AMERICAN FISHING VESSEL

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent attack on an American fishing vessel by a Peruvian patrol craft was a foolhardy and dangerous act, bound to further impair the already strained relations between our two countries.

According to this morning's newspaper reports, the fishing vessel *San Juan* was hit by gunfire some 50 times, causing damage estimated at $50,000.

Based on available information, the *San Juan* was fishing in international waters—about 50 miles from the nearest land—when the incident occurred. Unfortunately Peru, together with a number of other Latin American countries, maintain that their national jurisdiction over adjacent seas extends 200 miles from shore.

The United States, on the other hand, upholds the 12-mile limit for fishing purposes.

The difference between these two positions cannot be settled by resort to violence and by reckless firing on unarmed fishing vessels.

It should be settled at a conference table by reasonable men trying to find a reasonable solution to an admittedly difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it appeared that we were headed for a meeting between Chile, Peru, Ecuador, and the United States to discuss this particular issue. I would strongly hope that we get back on that track and that the administration exert every possible effort to have such a conference take place without further delay.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION GIVES OFFENDING PLANTS A MAJOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, according to the Washington Post, the Defense Department awarded conracts to three southern textile companies that had been found in violation of Federal regulations barring racial discrimination.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard ordered the awarding of these contracts. He stated he had been assured by the companies that they would act to eliminate discriminatory employment practices.

The companies are Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens, Inc. All three have plants in South Carolina. Contracts are for uniform cloth, and total $9.4 million.

Under the Johnson administration, an Assistant Secretary of Defense ruled against these contract awards to the named companies. His ruling was based on their noncompliance with antidiscrimination regulations. That opinion was shared by the Department of Labor's Office of Contract Compliance, charged with enforcement of a Federal executive order on equal opportunity in employment.

No word has been released of what specific reforms were promised Mr. Packard in order to gain these contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded by this action. It is worth noting that one of these companies, J. P. Stevens, Inc., is one of the most notorious union-hating firms in the United States. Its record of intimidation and fierce resistance to labor would do the last century proud. Hating unionization with a passion, it has been guilty of the worst possible behavior on innumerable occasions. The National Labor Relations Board has cited it again and again for such activities.

My hopes for at least a fair Republican administration have been tested by this latest revelation, and my colleagues and I will be watchful for further lapses into the past practices of rewarding those who flout the constitutional rights of others.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES ON SERIES E GOVERNMENT BONDS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would authorize the President to increase the interest rates paid on series E Government bonds to 5 percent. The current rates on this type of Government security are unrealistic and in my opinion penalize the small investor.

E bond buyers get a mere 4.25 percent after 7 years, while the big financiers and investors who can buy Federal securities in blocks of $5,000 or more, are realizing 6 and 7 percent return on their investment today.

The E bond purchases have been going out of favor with the American public, as evidenced by the fact that in January alone cashing in of E bonds exceeded purchases by $61 million. When people are cashing in more bonds than they are buying, it certainly indicates that the program needs a change. The current "Freedom Shares" program, which requires purchase of E bonds before the higher interest shares can be bought, has been largely unsuccessful. An increase to 5 percent on interest paid to purchasers of E bonds—which can be purchased in amounts as small as $17.50, as you know—would bring the rate more in line with current bank interest rates.

I should say, too, Mr. Speaker, that many Americans who have been buying E bonds for patriotic reasons are disgusted with the spendorama that has marked the past 8 years, and caused the Government to go into the market to borrow so heavily. The best spur to bond sales will come when there is a clear indication that the Federal Government itself intends to get its fiscal house in order.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

FATHER HESBURGH IS TAKING RIGHT TACK AGAINST CAMPUS DISTURBANCES

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend Father Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame University, for stating in no uncertain terms that he is not going to allow any of these campus radicals to upset Notre Dame University. He said very clearly they would be given 15 minutes to meditate and 5 minutes to change their minds, and if they carried their nonsense on after that, they would be expelled.

I think Father Hesburgh is taking just exactly the right position. If more of our heads of colleges and universities would take the same stand, maybe we could restore order to the campuses of our country.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4214, COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4214, the Communications Satellite Act, and such other reports as they may desire to submit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, is it the intention to program this legislation this week?

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request, may I advise Members that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules will call up various investigative authority resolutions tomorrow, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) has advised me he would ask by unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 4214, the Communications Satellite Act, on tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may insert in the RECORD a list of the resolutions from the Rules Committee and the bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will be on the program for tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The lists referred to follow:

Committee on Rules: February 18, to consider the following resolutions:

H. Res. 143, investigative authority, Committee on Foreign Affairs;

H. Res. 131, investigative authority, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries;

H. Res. 200, investigative authority, Committee on Education and Labor;

H. Res. 192, investigative authority, Committee on Science and Astronautics;

H. Res. 127, investigative authority, Committee on Agriculture;

H. Res. 189, investigative authority, Committee on Public Works; and

H. Res. 152, investigative authority, Committee on Banking and Currency, 10:30 a.m., H–313, Capitol.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: H.R. 4214, Communications Satellite Act.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. 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. 15]

Anderson, Ill.	Holifield	Passman
Arends	Howard	Pelly
Barrett	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Bell	Kuykendall	Quillen
Burton, Utah	Landgrebe	Riegle
Carey	Long, La.	Rosenthal
Casey	Long, Md.	Roudebush
Clark	Lujan	Rumsfeld
Davis, Ga.	Lukens	Ruppe
Delaney	McFall	Sandman
Diggs	Macdonald, Mass.	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	Shriver
Feighan	Matsunaga	Smith, Calif.
Flynt	Moss	Stubblefield
Ford, William D.	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Gettys	Myers	Teague, Calif.
Gray	Nichols	Udall
Green, Oreg.	O'Hara	Waldie
Hagan	O'Neal, Ga.	Watts
Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONSUMPTION TAXES ON OILSEED PRODUCTS IMPOSED BY EEC

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a House concurrent resolution expressing the position of Congress in opposition to the imposition of consumption taxes on oilseed products by the European Economic Community.

The EEC is giving serious thought to imposing what they term an internal tax of $60 per ton on imports of soybean oil, and a tax of $30 per ton on soybean meal.

This action would cost our country an export market of nearly $500 million a year at a time when we are endeavoring to solve a serious balance-of-payments problem.

This move would not technically violate the letter of agreements between this country and the EEC. But it would clearly violate the spirit of those agreements.

American farmers have depended on U.S. trade negotiators to provide agreements which result in fair balance of trade for the mutual benefit of the United States and of our close friends in the European Economic Community.

If these agreements are sidestepped in ways such as this the consequences can be serious.

I urge prompt approval of this resolution.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 250) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 250

Resolved, That Shirley Chisholm, of New York, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress this first Report of the National Science Board, "Toward a Public Policy for Graduate Education in the Sciences," together with a companion volume, "Graduate Education: Parameters for Public Policy," which contains information and discussion supporting the basic Report. These documents have been prepared in accordance with Section 4(g) of the National Science Foundation Act, as amended by Public Law 90–407.

Graduate education is a critically important element in the educational process and one which is entering a particularly difficult period. As the Board points out, graduate enrollments are expected to double and the costs of graduate programs are expected to quadruple during the next decade. Thus it is most important that colleges and universities, state and local authorities, and the interested branches of the Federal Government all re-examine their role with respect to graduate education.

On several occasions, most recently when I increased the expenditure ceiling of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1969, I have emphasized our nation's special debt to its scientists and its special responsibility to maintain an outstanding record in both basic research and technological advance. I emphasize here again that education in general and scientific development in particular will be among the highest priorities in this Administration. One measure of the greatness and vitality of a nation is manifested, I believe, in its readiness to explore the unknown.

The National Science Board has rightly concluded that adequate funding for graduate education and for academic science is only one of the problems we face. Of comparable importance is the need to develop a new strategy for that Federal aid which may be required. I have recently instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish an interdepartmental study group to make an overall review of the Federal role in education, including higher education. The Report of the National Science Board will provide a useful resource for that review.

I know that the Congress, like the Executive Branch, will give the Report its careful consideration. I solicit your assistance in developing solutions to the problems which have been identified by this distinguished group of citizens.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1969.*

AMENDING RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO CHANGE NAME OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 89 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 89

Resolved, That rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(1) by striking out clause 19;

(2) by renumbering clauses 11 through 18 as clause 12 through 19, respectively; and

(3) by inserting immediately after clause 10 the following new clause:

"1. Committee on Internal Security.

"(a) Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States.

"(b) The Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make investigations from time to time of (1) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, whether of foreign or domestic origin, their members, agents, and affiliates, which seek to establish, or assist in the establishment of,

a totalitarian dictatorship within the United States, or to overthrow or alter, or assist in the overthrow or alteration of, the form of government of the United States or of any State thereof, by force, violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means, (2) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, their members, agents, and affiliates, which incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism, or any unlawful means, to obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States, and (3) all other questions, including the administration and execution of any law of the United States, or any portion of law, relating to the foregoing that would aid the Congress or any committee of the House in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Internal Security shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Internal Security, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary, Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

SEC. 2. (a) Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(1) by striking out clause 1(s);

(2) by redesignating clauses 1(k) through 1(r) as clauses 1(l) through 1(s), respectively; and

(3) by inserting immediately after clause 1(j) the following:

"(k) Committee on Internal Security, to consist of nine Members."

(b) Clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "Un-American Activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "Internal Security".

SEC. 3. As of the date of adoption of this resolution, all property (including records) of the Committee on Un-American Activities is hereby transferred to the Committee on Internal Security and shall be available for use by the latter committee to the same extent as if such property (including records) was originally that of the Committee on Internal Security.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this resolution shall affect (1) the validity of any action or proceeding of the Committee on Un-American Activities or of the House of Representatives before the date of adoption of this resolution, or (2) the validity of any action or proceeding by any officer or agency of the executive branch of the Government, or by any court of competent jurisdiction, based on any action or proceeding referred to in clause (1) of this sentence. Any action or proceeding referred to in clause (2) of the preceding sentence and pending on the date of adoption of this resolution shall be continued by the officer, agency, or court concerned in the same manner and to the same extent as if this resolution had not been adopted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and pending that use of the time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. For debate purposes?

Mr. COLMER. The rule calls for 1 hour, and it is limited.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules in yielding me this time so that I might explain the purpose of House Resolution 89, a resolution to clarify the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to change the name of the House Committee on Internal Security, a name which I think more clearly indicates the scope of the work of the committee.

House Resolution 89 is identical to a resolution that was reported out by the Committee on Rules during the last Congress. This is a rule that falls within the original jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. It is identical to H. Res. 148 that last year was reported out by the Committee on Rules but which was not taken up during the final hours of the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the charge has been made that this resolution infringes upon the jurisdiction of the great House Committee on the Judiciary. I wish to state at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution is not intended to infringe upon the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary and I state without equivocation or any mental reservation whatsoever that it does not infringe upon the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I think that the need for the resolution is readily apparent by a cursory examination of the present mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The present mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reads as follows:

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this mandate is very vague and ambiguous on its face, and this is the reason why I offered this resolution 2 years ago and reoffered it this session. This vagueness has given some credence to the charge that the committee is not interested in subversive activities but has the power to investigate unorthodox political views and opinions. Also the vagueness has unnecessarily caused the committee to become involved in many legal actions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it possible to accurately define the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities by examining the mandate itself. It is true however that the Supreme Court decisions surrounding the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities have lent some definite meaning to the very ambiguous terms used in the mandate.

The change in the language of the mandate of the new committee, the House Committee on Internal Security, is contained in the last few lines on page 1 of the resolution and the first line on the top of page 2 thereof. It reads as follows:

11. (a) Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States.

Now, this is intended for bill reference purposes only. There are many bills that are introduced in this body dealing with Communist activities. Some may or may not be constitutional; they may or may not be wise and prudent as legislative measures. But this is for bill reference purposes only. There are however many such bills, and, traditionally these bills are sent to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make investigations from time to time of (1) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, whether of foreign or domestic origin, their members, agents, and affiliates, which seek to establish, or assist in the establishment of, a totalitarian dictatorship within the United States, or to overthrow or alter, or assist in the overthrow or alteration of, the form of government of the United States or of any State thereof, by force, violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means.

This resolution if adopted would give the Committee on Internal Security jurisdiction over revolutionary groups which would work toward the change or the alteration of our institutions and systems of government through revolutionary means outside the democratic process. It is not concerned with change through the democratic process which is, of course, inherent in our system of government. But every democratic government has the responsibility to take the necessary steps to preserve and protect itself from unlawful subversion.

Now, it does not give the committee jurisdiction over espionage as such, which is properly lodged within the Committee on the Judiciary. "Espionage" as used in the resolution is merely a modifying word and is used to describe the type of revolutionary activity over which the House Committee on Internal Security will have jurisdiction as distinguished from efforts to change our institutions through the democratic process.

The second part, part (2), reads as follows:

* * * the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, their members, agents, and affiliates, which incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism, or any unlawful means, to obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States.

This is for the purpose of giving the committee jurisdiction over such groups as the Klu Klux Klan and black mili-

tant groups that may not be revolutionary groups in the traditional sense.

What we have attempted to do here—and I submit, do accomplish—is to spell out in clear and precise legal language a limited but very important field of law—criminal subversion.

I think what has happened is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been caught—not only the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but the House of Representatives itself—has been caught up in a battle between two extreme views in this country, the extreme view on the one hand that people with unorthodox political thought, political ideas or political ideologies, should be taken out and eradicated and in some way disposed of, and the equally absurd view on the other extreme holding that Congress has no business legislating or investigating in the very important field of subversion. As I stated before, this is the basic right of every democratic government. Subversion is as old as the history of organized society and the threat may be one form of ism today and a different one tomorrow.

The resolution spells out and gives the House Committee on Un-American Activities the power to make investigations into the matter of subversion, to advise the House of the nature and the extent of such activities so that the House and the Senate can legislate within this very important field and still preserve the constitutional liberties which we all cherish as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House of Representatives will give the new committee and the membership of this new committee a chance to make an effective contribution to the internal security of the Nation.

I ask that the Members of the House vote in favor of the previous question and subsequently thereto in favor of H.R. 89.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ICHORD. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

I ask the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) if the Members of the House of Representatives can understand from the statement of the author of the resolution that it was meant to clarify, but neither to enlarge the jurisdiction of the to-be-created Committee on Internal Security, nor to diminish the jurisdiction so long exercised by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives?

Mr. ICHORD. That is quite true, and I am very glad that the gentleman asked that question in order to properly establish legislative intent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me say that I support House Resolution 89, wholeheartedly even though I would have preferred to have seen the name of this committee remain the same.

At every session of the Congress since I have been a Member, there has been a certain group of individuals who have attempted to bring an end to this committee. This session is no exception.

There have been those who always make attacks on the appropriations for this committee. Today there will be attacks made on this proposed change of name for the committee and for clarification of the responsibilities of the same.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Communist Daily World is against this resolution that we are discussing today—and speaking only for the gentleman now in the well, I cannot think of a better reason why I should be for the resolution.

The purpose of the resolution is to do just as the gentleman who preceded me in the well has stated, and that is to change the rules of the House of Representatives in three instances, each concerning the existing Committee on Un-American Activities.

The name of the committee will be changed to the Committee on Internal Security.

The membership of the committee will remain at nine.

Turning to page 2 of the resolution, let us examine the jurisdictional grant of authority being made to the committee.

Certainly, items (1) and (2) do not necessarily broaden the present powers of the committee to investigate internal subversive and anti-Government activities. But they do clearly spell out specific kinds of activities that fall under the jurisdiction of the new renamed committee.

Subparagraph (3) is merely a restatement of current committee jurisdiction. On page 3 of the resolution there is provision for the granting of subpena powers and the right to hold meetings while the House is in session.

Section 3 and 4 of the resolution are technical amendments to insure, first, that all published documents and so forth of the Committee on Un-American Activities are transferred to the renamed Committee on Internal Security, and second, that the adoption of this resolution will not invalidate or in any way hinder any action or proceeding currently in existence which has been initiated by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Speaking about the duties and responsibilities of this committee during the 91st Congress, let me say that I hope that this committee will go into the matter of SDS activities on our college campuses.

When this resolution was before the Committee on Rules, I asked the chairman of the committee whether or not it was the committee's intention to do this, and I might yield to him now to ask him if it is his intention to investigate the activities of this SDS group which is causing so much trouble on our college campuses.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the honorable and distinguished gentleman from Ohio that at the meeting tomorrow I intend to lay before the committee a proposal to make a study in depth of revolutionary violence within this Nation.

I have publicly stated that if the SDS is conducting classes in guerrilla warfare, the making of molotov cocktails and other explosives, as testified to by J. Edgar Hoover before the House Appropriations Committee—and I have complete confidence in Mr. Hoover's testimony—then SDS should be investigated by a committee of Congress. This matter will be laid before the committee and appropriate action taken.

Mr. LATTA. I wish to commend the chairman for taking this position and for making this statement as I do not know of a more pressing problem than the one dealing with the activities of certain groups on our college campuses.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Would the gentleman say to the Members of the House that it is his opinion and the opinion of the members of the Committee on Rules, so far as he could determine it, that this resolution is without condition, to clarify and not to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on Internal Security which is hereby created nor to diminish the present jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LATTA. In answer to the gentleman's question, I would like to say as the gentleman from Missouri did today that there is no intention to expand the jurisdiction of this committee or any intention to encroach on the jurisdiction of any other committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. If I may pursue that question one step further, as the gentleman from Ohio just said on the question as to whether or not there was any intention to diminish the authority of the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary, and the response was, "No"—likewise this resolution in no way is intended to diminish the jurisdiction of the former House Committee on Un-American Activities; is that not correct?

Mr. LATTA. That is absolutely true and the gentleman in the well would not be for the resolution if he had the slightest thought that it would be diminishing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. WATSON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I wanted to have that clarified in the RECORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose House Resolution 89. I urge my colleagues to join with me in rejecting this resolution irrespective of whether they support or oppose the operations of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Rule XI of the rules of the House contains the jurisdictional charter of each standing committee, marking the

boundaries of its legislative and investigative powers. Such demarkation is essential to the orderly and efficient conduct of the business of the House. A change in the jurisdictional charter of a standing committee should be approved only after the most painstaking and detailed examination and upon a record clearly demonstrating the need for the proposed change. I am not persuaded that such an examination has been undertaken in the case of House Resolution 89.

Before approving an amendment to the jurisdiction of a standing committee, the House should consider the effect of such an amendment on the jurisdictional mandate of other standing committees. Such a comparison is essential to avoid conflicts. A grant of jurisdiction, which, by its terms or by implication, conflicts with another committee's jurisdiction will surely lead to confusion and disputes in the future and may impair the effective flow of legislative business in this Chamber.

We are told by proponents that House Resolution 89 merely intends to "clarify" and not expand the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities. But the present-day intent of any Member cannot protect against broadened interpretations of the committee's mandate in the future.

On January 27, when I learned that House Resolution 89 would be considered by the Committee on Rules, I wrote to Chairman COLMER and urged that no favorable action be taken by the Committee on Rules until the need for the proposed amendment had been demonstrated on the record, nor until the committee had considered whether or not the adoption of House Resolution 89 would result in a division of legislative and investigatory jurisdiction between two or more standing committees of the House.

I would urge the Committee on Rules to reconsider, what must be obvious to all, is a vague and imprecisely drawn amendment to the rules of the House. I also would urge that a thorough and detailed comparison be made between the language of House Resolution 89 and that which is already set forth in the jurisdictional mandates of other standing committees under rule XI, including that of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I am not persuaded that any of these essential studies have been undertaken, and until they are, I would urge my colleagues to vote down House Resolution 89.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who have ranted and railed against the Un-American Activities Committee. But on this occasion I cannot remain quiet because I feel that this resolution poaches on the preserves of the Judiciary Committee.

The gentleman from Missouri makes the assertion that this resolution clarifies the jurisdiction heretofore given to the Un-American Activities Committee. I take issue with that statement. I believe the vague and imprecise wording of the resolution further obscures the judication of Un-American Activities Committee. It creates grave doubt as to what the jurisdiction of that committee really is.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter, to which I have already referred, which I sent to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) under date of January 27, 1969.

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

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my opposition to H. Res. 89, a resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and for other purposes, which is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

The proposed rule would do much more than change the name of the Un-American Activities Committee to the "Committee on Internal Security." It would also describe the jurisdiction of the Committee in broad, vague language whose ultimate consequences cannot be predicted. If all that is intended is a restatement of existing jurisdiction, the amendment is unnecessary and is undesirable because it might create jurisdictional disputes between Standing Committees of the House. If, on the other hand, it is intended to increase the jurisdiction of the Committee and confer investigative authority over subject matter not heretofore covered, the amendment should be opposed because no need has been demonstrated for any such expansion and because the resolution does not make clear what transfer of jurisdiction from what other Standing Committees of the House is contemplated.

In this respect, H. Res. 89 departs from recent precedent. On October 20, 1967, the House, by amendment of its Rules, transferred jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That amendment made perfectly clear the precise impact of the change in the jurisdiction of both Committees. The resolution apparently resulted from the cooperative efforts of the Chairmen of both Standing Committees involved. It was approved without opposition.

Such precedent should be observed whenever changes in the jurisdiction of Standing Committees of the House are made.

Illustrative of the vague and imprecise character of H. Res. 89 is the language authorizing investigations by the Committee with respect to activities involving ". . . violence, treachery, espionage sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means . . ." (p. 2, lines 8–10). A comparison with Rule XI, clause 19, dealing with the present investigative jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that the present jurisdiction is limited to "un-American propaganda." Read literally, the language in H. Res. 89 thus contemplates a substantial expansion of the investigative authority of the Committee.

Further, a comparison with Rule XI, clause 12, dealing with the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary indicates that insofar as espionage is concerned, subparagraph (c) of clause 12 specifically confers such jurisdiction on the Committee on the Judiciary. Traditional practice and custom also indicate that the Committee on the Judiciary, established in 1813, historically has exercised legislative jurisdiction over bills dealing with crime, espionage, sedition and penalties (Hines Precedents, vol. IV, sec. 4069 et seq., Cannon's Precedents, vol. VII, sec. 1747 et seq.). Paradoxically, one consequence of adoption of H. Res. 89 might be a division of legislative and investigatory jurisdiction between two Standing Committees of the House on the subject matter of certain crimes and penalties.

Changing the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities may or may not be appropriate. However, the aggrandizement of that Committee by the delegation to it of jurisdiction customarily exercised by the Committee on the Judiciary is a matter of critical concern to me.

I would appreciate it if you would make this letter part of your Committee's record on H. Res. 89.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. Ordinarily, when the jurisdiction of a standing committee is changed, there is a hearing and a full record developed. There is careful inquiry and investigation made as to whether a change in the rules is justified. But there has been no record made here to support the proposed changes. We are not told even what jurisdiction, if any, would be taken from one committee and granted to another. That question is left unanswered.

As one reviews the history of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he observes that the exercise of jurisdiction by that committee has not been unaccompanied by puzzlement and befuddlement. With the passage of this resolution, and as cases come before the courts, there will be even more befuddlement and more puzzlement and more confusion. I do not think even the distinguished chairman of that committee, for whom I have a deep and abiding affection and a high regard, is going to benefit very much by the adoption of the resolution.

For example, specific mention is made of espionage. Since 1813—for over 150 years—the Judiciary Committee has had jurisdiction over espionage. Espionage is also specifically mentioned in House Resolution 89. It is mentioned along with some so-called clarifying language. If a bill is offered that mentions espionage, what will the Parliamentarian do? What will the Speaker do? Will that bill be referred to this so-called new committee, the old House Un-American Activities Committee? Will it be referred to the House Judiciary Committee? We should not permit that doubt.

That uncertainty will hold good for many of the specific items mentioned in the bill, such as sabotage, insurrection, and so forth.

It is because of such doubts that I raise these questions. Therefore, I hope that the Members of this House, will carefully reexamine this question and reject House Resolution 89.

A change in name is proposed to be effectuated. Although I am not so much interested in the change of name, it is well to make one or two observations with reference thereto.

I remember that Lincoln once asked this question: "If you call a dog's tail a leg, how many legs will the dog have?"

Someone answered, "Five legs."

Lincoln said, "No, the dog would still

have four legs, because calling the dog's tail a leg does not make it a leg."

There is another old adage that is well to bring forward now: "An ass is an ass although his saddle cloth be satin." Whatever the committee is called the important thing is what is being done under the name of that committee. It is well to keep that in mind. It is what the committee has done that has caused all the contention and difficulty.

Therefore, I must perforce indicate my opposition to House Resolution 89.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 89 which I am proud to cosponsor with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from California.

As ranking minority member of the committee, I have given serious thought to the idea of a new mandate for the Committee on Un-American Activities for a number of years, have discussed it with the gentleman from Missouri as well as other committee members, and have carefully studied his proposed new mandate.

Before stating the reasons why I urge adoption of House Resolution 89, I would like to make one important point. I believe it is essential that this point be very clearly stated at this time before, as I hope, the House confers a newly worded mandate on the Committee on Un-American Activities. The point is this:

Neither I nor any other member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to my knowledge, believes that the present mandate is constitutionally infirm on the ground of vagueness or any other ground.

During the 30 years the present mandate has been operative as the authority of the Committee on Un-American Activities, it has been challenged over and over again in the courts of our land—more times than I can remember at the moment. It has survived each and every one of these challenges. Attorneys for the Communist Party and other enemies and critics of the committee have racked their brains for years to find some legal or constitutional point on which they might get the Supreme Court to nullify the present mandate as violative of the Constitution. They have never succeeded. In case after case, they have gone to courts of appeals and then on to the Supreme Court with their claims against the committee's mandate. In not one case have they been upheld.

The landmark Supreme Court decision on the question of the constitutionality of the present mandate is the 1959 Barenblatt case which settled once and for all—by rejecting it—the often heard claim, the one that is so frequently pressed, that the mandate is so vague that it can not be supported under our Constitution. The Supreme Court held, and I quote:

> The rule cannot be said to be constitutionally infirm on the score of vagueness.

I stress the word "cannot."

This tribute to the present mandate should be a part of this record at the hour of what, I believe, will be its retirement. For 30 years, it has served the committee, the House, and the Nation well. The Court's words are a tribute to the judgment of the House. If we are to bury the mandate now—and I think my role as a cosponsor of House Resolution 89 makes me kind of an honorary pallbearer in the ceremony—it should be with respect and with pride. I for one, feel no shame for the old mandate of the committee.

But, why do we need a new mandate if the old one is constitutionally sound? My answer is this. When dealing with subversive activities, we are engaged in more than a purely constitutional and legal battle. We are also involved in a form of political propaganda, and psychological warfare, and in these areas, there are certain disadvantages in the name of the committee and the wording of its present mandate.

Despite the 10-year old Barenblatt ruling, the Communist Party, the fronts it has created to work for abolition of the committee, other Communist groups, and assorted individual, newspaper, and organizational enemies of the committee, still obtain credibility with their claim that the committee's mandate is unconstitutionally vague because of the word "Un-American" in it.

Despite numerous holdings of the courts to the contrary, the same critics repeatedly claim—with some success—that the investigation of propaganda, another word in the committee's mandate, is a violation of the first amendment, an invasion of one's right to speak and write freely and to hold such political views as he chooses.

By their constant attacks on the committee on these two major points, Communists and other committee enemies have scored significant gains in what I have referred to as the political, propaganda, and psychological war this House is engaged in, in its efforts to combat subversion. Specifically, they have raised doubts and concern in the minds of many loyal and decent Americans who have no sympathy whatsoever with those people—Communists, Nazis, Facists, or others—who would destroy this Nation with the help of hostile foreign powers, or even alone if they could. They have raised doubts, I say, in the minds of these people about the fairness and wisdom of the House in creating, and continuing the life of, the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The present mandate, in other words, has a few words and phrases in it that enable the enemies of this country to further their cause by effectively hanging certain "smear America" and "smear the Congress" propaganda operations on them.

Times change. Concepts and ideas, words and phrases, that were politically effective 20 and 30 years ago are not necessarily effective today. Developments in recent years have indicated that a change in the name and mandate of the committee might be advisable. This has been discussed within the committee for a considerable length of time and I know, for example, that the late former committee chairman, Tad Walter, a few years before his unfortunate death in 1963, gave serious thought to this, although he eventually decided not to act upon it.

While on this matter, it should be pointed out that it is not only the enemies of the committee who have been critical of the words and the phrases in its mandate I have referred to. William F. Buckley, Jr., for example, the well-known editor of the conservative National Review, who has also edited a book supporting the committee and its work, as well as some other friends and defenders of the committee, have raised questions about the wording of the mandate.

These are the reasons why, I believe, the House should act favorably on the measure now before us. A reading of the new mandate of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to be renamed the Committee on Internal Security, makes it clear beyond all doubt that, the wording is much superior to that of the old mandate. This is true not only from the legal and constitutional viewpoint, but also from the viewpoint of political reality. It is much more precise in spelling out just what the committee is empowered to investigate. As the gentleman from Missouri has stated repeatedly—and I agree with him completely on this—it does not change the power or the authority of the committee. It retains for it all the authority it has had for the past 30 years under its old mandate, neither diminishing nor expanding it—authority, I should add, which the courts have consistently upheld as constitutional.

Periodically, over the last 25 years, it has been urged by a few Members that the investigation of subversive activities be turned over to the Judiciary Committee. Not once in the course of the 37 years during which the House has been investigating subversive activities, however, has this view been accepted. Time will not permit me to spell out now all the reasons why it would be most unwise to transfer the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee. However, I do ask, Mr. Speaker, for leave to extend and revise my remarks so that this RECORD will clearly reflect why the House on various occasions in the past has not agreed to such a move and why it should not do so now.

I am certain that there is no doubt in the mind of the great majority of the Members of this House but that we should continue our 37-year practice, tradition—and duty—of investigating subversive activities so that the Congress—in the people's interest—will be enabled to take all legislative measures possible to protect the security of this Nation. It is my carefully considered view that House Resolution 89 is the best possible foundation for continuing this vital activity and I join with the gentleman from Missouri in strongly urging that it be passed.

Now I would like to address my remarks particularly to the question that was raised by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary (Mr. MCCULLOCH). He expressed the concern whether or not it was the intention on our part in any way to expand our juris-

diction or invade what might be called the prerogatives of the Judiciary Committee. I would say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that there is no inclination on the part of any member of this committee to do so. It is our belief that there is nothing contained in this resolution which would allow us to do so.

I can say as the ranking minority member, there is no area that we intend to investigate that we could not now investigate. We are simply trying to clarify the mandate of our committee.

The contention that we will be invading the jurisdiction of the Judiciary and that our functions should be transferred to the Judiciary Committee are the basic arguments against House Resolution 89. I do not believe either contention should be accepted by this House.

In his appearance before the Rules Committee on February 4, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) advanced a number of arguments in support of House Resolution 211, which he had introduced to abolish the HUAC and transfer some, but by no means all, of the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee. Inasmuch as the same basic arguments will probably be made a part of the RECORD today, I will make the following observations concerning them.

The gentleman from Iowa said that one of the purposes of his resolution was "to consolidate internal security functions in the one Committee which presently has jurisdiction over espionage as well as the criminal code in general."

Let us examine the two basic points in that argument—those relating to espionage and the criminal code.

We are all agreed, I am sure, that internal security functions should be consolidated in one committee, but why the committee that has jurisdiction over espionage?

It is true that during the 1930's, during the period of World War II, and for some time thereafter, the U.S. Communist Party was deeply involved in espionage. The Committee on Un-American Activities, however, played a major role in terminating its extensive activities in this area. The revelations of Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, and others before the committee in the latter part of the 1940's, along with subsequent committee hearings on the subject—and the trials of the Rosenbergs and others which were based on the work of the FBI—resulted in Moscow's instructing the U.S. Communist Party to divorce itself from the espionage business. Since that time, espionage in the United States has been the province of Soviet military intelligence, the GRU, and Moscow's civilian espionage agency, the KGB.

If it is intended that the House will continue to investigate all Communist and other subversive activities, then the Judiciary Committee's traditional jurisdiction over espionage legislation is no argument for transferring the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to that committee.

The Bolsheviks did not take over Russia through espionage; Moscow did not take over its satellites in Eastern Europe through espionage; the Communists did not take over China through espionage; Castro did not take over Cuba through espionage; and while espionage has been a traditional Communist weapon, the U.S. Communist Party has never hoped to take over this country solely or primarily through espionage.

This House first decided that investigation of communism was called for 39 years ago—in 1930. House Resolution 220 of the 71st Congress, second session, did not provide for an investigation of Communist espionage, however, but of Communist propaganda in the United States. Even then, the House recognized that the major danger in communism was not the theft of some Government secrets, but its attack on men's minds. Pursuant to that resolution, a special committee, since generally referred to as the Fish committee, was established to investigate Communist propaganda.

In 1934, House Resolution 198 of the 73d Congress authorized the creation of a Special Committee on Un-American Activities not to investigate Nazi and certain other espionage, but "Nazi propaganda activities" and "certain other propaganda activities." This was the so-called McCormack-Dickstein committee. It was chaired by the present distinguished Speaker of the House. The name of that committee and the wording of its mandate again demonstrated that, as far back as 35 years ago, the majority of the Members of the House perceived what was the real danger in the foreign "isms" that were trying to gain a foothold in this country.

In 1938, when the present Committee on Un-American Activities was first established as a special committee, it was created not because the House believed that the national problem requiring the attention of a special committee was Communist, Nazi, and Fascist espionage, but rather Communist, Nazi, and Fascist propaganda activities—again, the attacks of these foreign "isms" on the minds of the American people, their attempts to win adherents and agents in this country, to turn loyal Americans into traitors. This is why the original mandate of the committee contained the word "propaganda."

To summarize, the great majority of the Members of the House, during the past 39 years, have exhibited a clearer understanding and comprehension of the evils and dangers of communism than some Members do today. They have realized that the Communist propaganda they have been rightly concerned about could—as it has—create Rosenbergs, Hisses, and Remingtons.

If it is to be argued that the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities should be transferred to another committee, and to a committee which already has jurisdiction over an area in which there is continuing, significant, Communist activity, then it would be far more logical to transfer its functions to the Education and Labor Committee, rather than the Judiciary Committee. I say this because for the past 15 years or so, the Communist Party has been far more active in the field of education and labor than it has been in the field of espionage.

In addition, there are other clearly subversive groups in this country whose activities warrant investigation but which, so far as the public record shows, have never been engaged in espionage. I am referring, for example, to the openly Communist and revolutionary, Peking-oriented, Progressive Labor Party and also to certain black militant organizations which are openly advocating guerrilla warfare and are training and arming their members for this purpose. Nothing in the Judiciary Committee's mandate would justify a claim to jurisdiction over their activties.

The fact that espionage happens to be in the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, therefore, is really—to those who know something about subversive activities in this country—no argument for transferring the broad functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to that committee.

Espionage is as old as governments. It was a problem that existed many, many years before we ever heard of Communists, Nazis, or Fascists in this country. The House did not originally create the Committee on Un-American Activities to deal with any special problem caused by espionage and, although Communist espionage activities have always been recognized as being within its jurisdiction, that has never been considered by informed persons as a major reason for the existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The argument that investigation of subversive activities should be turned over to the Judiciary Committee because that committee has jurisdiction over "the criminal code in general" is equally fallacious. Nowhere in the rules of the House is it stated that the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction, exclusive or concurrent, over all statutes or bills containing criminal provisions. It is certainly erroneous to claim that it has jurisdiction over all such statutes except those assigned to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In addition to the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as examples, have been responsible for the enactment of various regulatory statutes in the area of their jurisdiction which provide criminal penalties for acts committed in violation of the statutes' provisions. No one has ever contended, however, that amendments to these statutes or new bills in these areas are the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

The mere fact that a bill has a criminal provision in it does not mean and has never meant that it is—or should be—referred to the Judiciary Committee. Bills and statutes dealing with subversive activities are generally recognized as being within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, even though they may contain criminal provisions.

The gentleman from Iowa next argued that the committee's function should be transferred to the Judiciary Committee so that investigation of subversive activities would be assigned to Members "who are lawyers and can bring to bear the required judicial temperament in

this highly sensitive area bearing so immediately on constitutional responsibilities and restraints."

As a lawyer myself, with appropriate respect for my profession and its members, I reject the idea that only lawyers are capable of judicious legislative behavior and of sitting in competent judgment on legislation dealing with subversive activities. I have been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities for 6 years and have read its hearings and reports, going back many, many years. Analyzing the testimony received and numerous books on communism which I have read or with which I am familiar, the one thing that is clear beyond all doubt in my mind is that the persons in this country who are best informed about communism, those who are generally recognized as being authorities or experts on the subject, are for the most part nonlawyers.

Expertise on subjects within a committee's jurisdiction is most desirable. But a law degree gives no one expertise on subversion and knowledge of it is essential to effective legislation and investigation. We would be denying the Committee on Un-American Activities valuable members if we were to make it compulsory that all members be lawyers.

There should always be a good proportion of lawyers on the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee does deal not only with highly sensitive, but extremely complicated, constitutional issues. For this reason, I am glad that it is the policy of the Democratic Party to require that its members who are assigned to the Committee on Un-American Activities be lawyers. I believe it would be a grave mistake, however, for the Republican Party to do the same, or to transfer the committee's functions to a committee made up entirely of lawyers.

There is no profession or trade in this Nation that does not have a vital interest in protecting the security of our country and which does not have representatives far better informed about communism and other subversive activities than many lawyers are. To the greatest degree possible, the House committee investigating subversion should be representative of all walks of life, and not merely the legal profession. Breadth of vision, outlook, and interest is most desirable and needed on the committee.

Finally, it is urged that the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities be turned over to the Judiciary Committee in order "to withdraw from this investigative activity the imprimatur of special legitimacy suggested by the designation of a standing committee."

This is asking the House to reverse a decision in which it has persisted—against all arguments—for 24 years. Of course, it is possible that the House could be mistaken in its judgment for such a length of time, but no facts have been presented to indicate that this is so.

And what must we and the American people think of the suggestion that protecting this country and its people from the operations of those who would destroy this Nation and the liberties of its people is unworthy of the same consideration given to problems of transportation, agriculture, veterans' affairs, and other matters which have the "imprimatur of special legitimacy" conferred by the jurisdiction of standing committees?

The Supreme Court itself has stated:

> To preserve its independence, and give security against foreign aggression and encroachment, is the highest duty of every nation.

The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in a decision on the Committee on Un-American Activities, has stated that the Government of the United States, of which this Congress is a part, has "a prime obligation to protect for the people that machinery of which it is a part."

I have no desire to disparage in any way the work of other standing committees of the House, or to underrate the importance of various other areas of our national life, but I know of no court decision which has ever conferred on any matter in the jurisdiction of other committees an "imprimatur of special legitimacy" equal to that conferred on the Committee on Un-American Activities by the above-quoted, and numerous other, Court decisions.

Protecting this country from those who would destroy it from within, whether they be agents of foreign powers or indigenous enemies of democracy, is a vital part of our overall defense effort. For 24 years, the House has taken the position that investigating the activities of such elements has the same legitimacy as its concern with our Armed Forces and the conduct of our foreign policy. No valid reason has been presented for a change in the position of the House on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, there are yet other reasons for opposing this transfer to the Judiciary Committee which has been proposed.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IS ALREADY OVERWORKED

On the average, 40 to 45 percent of House legislation emanates from the Judiciary Committee. In the 90th Congress, more than 38 percent of all bills introduced in the House—and they totaled over 24,000—were referred to the Judiciary Committee.

During the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the present chairman of the Judiciary Committee protested that the reorganization bill would reduce the members on the Judiciary Committee from 27 to 25, even while imposing more work on the committee by giving it jurisdiction previously exercised by four standing committees.

He pointed out that as a result of its "avalanche of business," the Judiciary Committee had already been divided into five subcommittees and all five were then behind in their work because of the "tremendous number of bills" which were continually referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He enumerated the additional duties being imposed on the Committee, their complexity, the hundreds of additional bills it would have to consider each year because of them, and then stated:

> How we are going to do all that work with 25 members is beyond my comprehension.

That, gentlemen, was 23 years ago. What is the situation today as far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned? The committee has had its membership enlarged to 35. Despite this, everyone knows that it is the most overworked committee in the House. It now has seven subcommittees and its jurisdiction embraces 19 different subjects. I can say without fear of contradiction, because it is known to everyone, that it is having difficulty—and has always had difficulty—keeping up with all the work that is assigned to it.

Imposing on the already overworked Judiciary Committee the numerous problems associated with the operations of the Committee on Un-American Activities would mean either one of two things: First, that much less would be done in the field of countering subversion; or second, that other vital matters which are already within the province of the Judiciary Committee would be neglected.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE DOES NOT WANT JURISDICTION

At no time since the Committee on Un-American Activities was created has the Judiciary Committee stated or indicated that it wished to take over the investigation of subversive activities.

At no time during the 20 years he has served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee has the present distinguished chairman of that committee asked or urged that the investigation of Communist activities and subversive activities in general be turned over to his committee. Moreover, over the years, not more than a handful of members of that committee have ever made such a suggestion.

Not a single member of the Judiciary Committee appeared before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress during its 1965 hearings to urge that the Judiciary Committee be granted the authority of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

At no time during the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 did a single member of the Judiciary Committee recommend that the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities be turned over to that committee.

In addition to the fact that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has never asked for authority to investigate subversive activities, prominent members of that committee have consistently and strongly opposed the transfer of such authority to it.

The late Francis E. Walter served as a Member of Congress for 30 years. He was a member of the Judiciary Committee for 28 of those years and, for many years, the chairman of its Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. In addition to being chairman of the Democratic caucus and chairman of the Democratic patronage committee, he served on the Committee on Un-American Activities for 14 years and was its chairman for 8 years.

In February 1963, when the Rules Committee held hearings on a resolution which would transfer the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Walter was in the hospital where he died

a few months later of leukemia. Unable to testify before the Rules Committee, he addressed a letter to Judge Smith, its chairman, in which he strongly opposed the resolution and urged that the Rules Committee reject it. The Rules Committee did so.

Enemies of the Committee on Un-American Activities frequently point out that Mr. Walter had stated some years before that he was not irrevocably wedded to any particular structural organization for the unit of the House charged with investigating subversive activities and that he had said that, in his opinion, when the Committee on Un-American Activities was first established, it should have been as a Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

In his letter to Judge Smith, Mr. Walter pointed out that these earlier statements "were on the purely theoretical level." He added:

> When we consider the advisability of actually transferring the Committee's functions to another committee at this very late date, my experience as Chairman of the Committee for eight years has convinced me that certain very practical considerations arise which strongly militate against such action.

He then listed six compelling reasons why he strongly opposed any move to transfer the authority of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee.

Our recent colleague, Edwin E. Willis, served in the Congress for 20 years. He was a member of the Judiciary Committee throughout those 20 years and, in addition, served as chairman of four of its subcommittees. Moreover, he was a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities for 13 years and its chairman for 5 years. Throughout his congressional career, he opposed and fought every move to transfer the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee.

I submit there are no Members of this body who, by reason of experience, are better qualified than these two men to form a sound judgment as to the advisability of imposing on the Judiciary Committee the duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Tad Walter and Ed Willis were recognized as outstanding Members of the House. They were prominent on both committees for many years and devoted to both committees. They knew the problems of both committees well and, in their wisdom, always urged the retention of the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee.

HOUSE HAS REPEATEDLY REJECTED IDEA AS UNSOUND

It is now being argued that, if the House will only give full and careful consideration to the idea of transferring the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee, it will see wisdom in this step and decide to take it.

This argument deserves careful analysis because the fact is that the House has repeatedly considered the idea—directly or indirectly—over a period of many years and rejected it every time it has been proposed.

Just 3 years ago, in the 89th Congress, a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was established pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, adopted on March 11, 1965. The joint committee held lengthy hearings. It heard 199 witnesses, more than 100 of them Members of the Congress. Testimony received was published in 15 volumes, totaling 2,322 pages.

Two separate recommendations concerning the Committee on Un-American Activities were heard by the joint committee. Representatives of two Communist fronts and a representative of the ACLU urged that the committee be abolished. One Member of the House urged that the committee's functions be transferred to the Judiciary Committee.

On July 28, 1966, the joint committee published a 97-page report. The report rejected both the recommendation that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished and also the recommendation that its functions be turned over to the Judiciary Committee.

In 1963, as previously indicated, the Rules Committee held hearings on resolutions introduced by three Members of the House to eliminate the Committee on Un-American Activities and transfer some of its functions to the Judiciary Committee.

On February 26, 1963, the Rules Committee, after due deliberation, voted 12 to 1 against reporting the resolutions.

In 1945 the House found itself in an unfortunate situation which interfered with, and strongly hampered, its effective operation as the legislative and investigative agency of the American people—that arm of Government which is the most immediate expression of the will of the people in the affairs of our Nation.

The House then had 48 standing committees—far too many. The Members of the 79th Congress wisely decided to do something to correct this situation, to reorganize and streamline this body, so that it could effectively meet the great challenges it faced in the period immediately following World War II.

A Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Legislature was formed. Senator Monroney, then a Member of the House and the vice chairman of the joint committee, described the situation which then prevailed in the House as "a sprawling, overlapping, crazy quilt" that presented the Congress with a "hopeless morass of legislative difficulties."

Five months of hearings followed the formation of this joint committee. These hearings comprised the most thorough analysis and review of the Legislature of this country, its basic and necessary functions, and the type organization needed to carry them out in the most sufficient possible manner that had taken place since our Government was established.

These extensive hearings and debates culminated in Public Law 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which, in effect, established the structure of the Congress as we know it today. Public Law 601 reduced the standing committees of the House from 48 to 19. It eliminated 29 standing committees as superfluous. At the same time, however, it retained the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee even though the committee had enjoyed that status for only a year.

Most significantly, during all the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act, no proposal was ever made that the function of the Committee on Un-American Activities be turned over to the Judiciary Committee. A proposal to abolish the committee mustered only 25 votes.

Now, let us go back to 1930 when the House undertook its first investigation of communism. It could have decided at that time to assign the task of investigating Communist propaganda to the Judiciary Committee. Apparently, however, seeing absolutely no logical reason or justification for doing so, it created the Fish committee, a special committee, to conduct the investigation.

The same thing happened in 1934 when the House, for the second time, decided to investigate subversive elements in this country. No one, apparently, believed there was any good reason to assign the task to the Judiciary Committee, and so the McCormack-Dickstein committee, another special committee, was set up to do the work.

And, of course, the same thing happened in 1938 when the Committee on Un-American Activities was first established as a special committee. This time, with the experience of two special committees behind it, it apparently never occurred to anyone in the House that there was some need, reason, or justification for assigning an investigation of this type to the Judiciary Committee.

In each of the succeeding Congresses, through the 78th, the House, instead of continuing the life of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, could have conferred its authority on the Judiciary Committee. Instead, with due deliberation and thought, it voted in each Congress to renew the life of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Finally, in 1945, the year before the Reorganization Act, the House voted to make the Special Committee on Un-American Activities a standing committee. There was no hue and cry, no urging that the functions of the special committee be turned over to the Judiciary Committee rather than a standing Committee on Un-American Activities.

And so we have a clear and unbroken record of almost 40 years; we have a House tradition; we have a House policy which states, in effect, that on organizational, constitutional, or other grounds, there is no basis for a claim that investigation of subversion should be in the hands of the Judiciary Committee.

How can it be argued, in view of this history, that the House has not given careful thought to the idea in the past? Is it not true that each time the House considered the question of voting on a committee to investigate subversion during the past 40 years, its Members must have given serious thought about how best to do it, which committee and which kind of committee would be best suited to the task? At this point, it appears to me, as I am sure it must to many others, that further consideration of this question would serve no purpose except to waste the time of the House.

As a member of the Committee on Un-

American Activities, I have naturally kept myself informed about the various proposals made affecting it. I have read and listened to the arguments pro and con these various proposals. I must say frankly that in the 8 years I have served as a Member of the House, I have not read or heard a single argument on this issue that provided any logical grounds for changing the reasoned and well-established policy of the House.

NONPARTISAN INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSION DESIRED

The House wisely decided years ago that its investigations into Communist subversion, no matter what form it took, should be as nonpartisan as possible and that, from the organizational viewpoint, steps should be taken to see that investigations would not become political footballs.

For this reason, the House deliberately created the Committee on Un-American Activities with a structure different from that of all other committees, to make it as nonpartisan and nonpolitical as possible. Throughout its life, except for a lapse during the 89th Congress, the House has given the majority and minority parties equal representation on the committee—four Republicans and four Democrats—with the chairman being a member of the majority party.

The record of the Committee on Un-American Activities has been excellent in keeping partisan politics out of its work. But we must all face the fact that if we were to give either party a significant majority on the committee, we would be creating a very real danger that investigations in this field could become partisan.

The Judiciary Committee, like all other committees except the Committee on Un-American Activities, is political, or partisan, in its structure. Its 35 members are now divided between the majority and minority parties on the ratio of 20 to 15.

It is vital that Congress and the American people have full confidence in the activities of the House in this area. They must know that its investigations are not politically inspired. The organizational setup of the Committee on Un-American Activities is designed to give them that assurance; the setup of the Judiciary Committee is not. For this reason, too, it would be an error to transfer the functions of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSION SHOULD NOT BE DOWNGRADED

The Communist Party and other subversive elements in this country have been working for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities virtually from the day it was created. They want it eliminated completely.

Transferring the committee's functions to a Judiciary Committee subcommittee would not completely satisfy the Communists, but it would be a step in the direction they want because it would very clearly downgrade the importance this body attaches to protecting our internal security by thoroughgoing investigation of subversive activities. In this respect, it is most important to point out that not one of the various resolutions introduced over the years to transfer the investigation of subversion to the Judiciary Committee would have conferred on the new Judiciary Subcommittee all the power and authority exercised by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Each and every one of them, in one way or another, would have limited or curbed the authority the Committee on Un-American Activities has enjoyed for 30 years.

This question, therefore, must be examined in its real light. The proposals at issue have not been simply proposals to transfer authority. They have been, and are, proposals to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities, to take away from the House an investigative power it has enjoyed for 30 years and supplant it with a much reduced authority.

HOUSE ORGANIZATION SHOULD NOT BE IDEOLOGICAL

During the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, one Member of the House proposed that the Committee on Un-American Activities be eliminated as a standing committee.

Senator Monroney, the floor leader on the bill as well as vice chairman of the Committee on Reorganization, objected to the proposal on the grounds that it did not concern the "functional reorganization of Congress," but was rather a political or ideological consideration."

Obviously, the House should be organized in the manner best calculated to enable it to carry out its constitutional functions. Its organization should not be based on the ideology of a distinct minority of its Members. During the 30-year existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities, a relative handful of the thousands of Members who have served in the House have urged that its functions be turned over to the Judiciary Committee or that it be completely abolished.

When the arguments these Members have advanced in support of their position are studied, when their comments related to the committee and the investigation of subversive activities in general are analyzed, it becomes clear that their position is designed neither to improve the organization and the effectiveness of the Congress as such, nor to bring about more intensive and forceful effort against subversion in both the investigative and legislative fields. It becomes apparent—though I do not question their motives or the sincerity of their beliefs—that they want less done in this area and oppose the committee because, in their view, it does too much. They feel confident less would be done under the Judiciary Committee.

To put it in a nutshell, their recommendation, as Senator Monroney said of a similar one in 1946, is ideological or political. For this reason, it should be rejected.

HOUSE SHOULD NOT UNFAIRLY ATTACK ITSELF

All proposals to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and/or transfer its authority to the Judiciary Committee have been based on unfounded claims that the committee has continuously operated in an irresponsible, undemocratic manner; that it has failed to abide by rules of fair procedure; that it is a threat to the constitutional rights and civil liberties of American citizens and so on, ad infinitum.

The House has rightly rejected these charges for 30 years. For the House to affirm these unfounded accusations today by transferring investigation of subversion to the Judiciary Committee would be tantamount to admitting that the charges I have referred to have been true all along, that the House has been in error in rejecting them for the past 30 years and that the House has, in effect, condoned, financed and approved what were actually un-American operations by one of its own creatures.

There is no basis for such an admission. The charges are not true and I am certain that the Members of this House will not thus falsely condemn themselves and their former colleagues.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in reading the resolution I see it refers to investigative authority of the committee.

Will the committees under this resolution have authority to originate legislation as well as to investigate?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Our committee has always had authority to make investigations and to offer such remedial steps as are necessary. This may demand legislative action or executive department action. In the past 10 or 15 years, I will say frankly, most recommendations we have made have dealt with steps to be taken in the structure of the agencies of the executive departments of the Government. For example, almost a decade ago when Vernon Mitchell and William Martin defected to the Soviet Union the House Committee on Un-American Activities conducted a thorough investigation. No legislation came as a result of this inquiry which was brought to the House but, even more important, recommendations were made to the President which resulted in a number of significant changes in security practices within the NSA. The late Allen Dulles edited a new book, entitled "Great True Spy Stories," which notes on page 67:

> Investigation revealed that both Martin and Mitchell were sexually abnormal, a situation which should have alerted security agents, but Maurice H. Klein, NSA's Assistant Director and Personnel Chief at the time, insisted the agency enjoyed "as tight a security program as there is in the whole government." Unimpressed Congressional probers discovered it was loose enough for Klein himself to have fabricated some of the records in his own personnel file. He was forced out, and NSA took 22 steps to tighten its vigilance. It fired 26 suspected sex deviates on its roles and in mid 1962 told Congress it had reviewed the security file of every employee.

This example indicates, in answer to the gentleman from Virginia, that our functions have been those of all other committees—investigate, legislate, and oversee. They will continue exactly the same if House Resolution 89 is adopted today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my thought was, can this committee under the authority of the resolution bring matters to the floor of the House just as any other standing committee by its own initiative, or does it merely investigate and then let the regular committee or the other committees of the House bring these matters to the floor?

Mr. ASHBROOK. We can obviously bring matters to the floor at any time, I will say to the gentleman. In sound practice, we are going to investigate the need before we bring a bill out. I do not know of any time that we have brought up a bill without a thorough investigation in advance and being able to show a specific need for the bill. We intend to continue on that exact course of action which we followed in the past.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I also wish to state that the resolution will give the House Committee on Internal Security a threefold function, as any committee of the House has: legislative, oversight, and investigatory. I point out that there are only three permanent investigating committees of the House, that is, the Appropriations Committee, the Government Operations Committee, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question at the close of this debate. I urge this with gratitude to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) for giving this House a much-needed opportunity to consider the vital question of reform of HUAC. However, only if the previous question is defeated will it be possible under our rules to offer an amendment which would cure what, in my judgment, are the serious deficiencies of House Resolution 89.

A large number of Members, including the author of House Resolution 89, are justifiably concerned over the ambiguous language of the present HUAC mandate of authority. Moreover, many Members are concerned over the past excesses of the committee which have fostered excesses on the part of its critics.

The time is opportune to consider anew how the Congress can best discharge its dual responsibilities of protecting the internal security of our Nation and guarding the civil liberties of our Nation's citizens. But we should not set sail here under a false flag—either we are genuinely interested in reform or we are engaging in political public relations.

In my judgment, House Resolution 89 is not reform; further, the measure's attempt at clarification of the HUAC mandate does not constitute a serious effort toward reform.

Meaningful reform in this area must involve a more precise and confining mandate for investigations concerning matters of internal security. Such an effort must at the least, in my judgment, seek to weigh the respective interests of internal security and civil liberty, and mark out as clearly as possible the respective boundaries of each interest, however wide or narrow.

House Resolution 89 fails to attempt such an effort. The author of the resolution has stated that his proposal "will preserve for the committee the full jurisdiction and all the powers it has possessed during the almost 29 years of its operation under the present mandate."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 1, page 725. After careful review, I must agree that his assessment is correct. House Resolution 89, in fact, does not narrow the free-wheeling scope of operation of the proposed Committee on Internal Security in any way.

The difficulty with House Resolution 89, as with the present HUAC, is that the Congress grants investigating powers whose broad sweep is inimical to constitutional principles and unwise as legislative policy. For example, the following questions at a minimum are left unresolved by the proposal:

What does it mean to "incite" acts of "terrorism" to "oppose" the "policy affecting the internal security of the United States?"—page 2, lines 12–16.

What is a group's "character" and what relevance does this have?—page 2, line 1.

What does "treachery" mean?—page 2, line 9.

Moreover, whatever clarity can be distilled from such words is entirely dissipated by subparagraph 3, page 2, line 16—which would retain committee jurisdiction over "all other questions" that in some unspecified way might aid the Congress in any remedial legislation.

But the central weakness of the proposal, wholly apart from these ambiguities, is that once an organization falls within the category of organizations to be investigated, and this I want to emphasize, all activities—innocent ones as well as threatening ones—may be investigated. Such innocent activities are most often those of speech, association, and belief.

The very times in which we live suggest a pragmatic reason why the powers of investigation should be refined, not, as House Resolution 89 would have it, maintained intact. In the past the HUAC has often functioned under its overly broad powers to provide gratuitous publicity to those it purports to oppose. As these groups increasingly seek out rather than shun the spotlight of the mass media, the Congress needs some assurance that its committees will not become unwitting foils for publicity-seeking extremists.

There is another very important point of Congressional organization at issue here. The very attempt of House Resolution 89 to reword investigating authority in the field of internal security in general and espionage in particular raises serious questions of jurisdictional conflict between the successor to the HUAC and the Committee on the Judiciary, which has been so ably covered by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Subparagraph (c) of clause 12 in rule XI explicitly grants jurisdictional authority over "espionage" to the Judiciary Committee. By granting authority over "espionage" matters—page 2, line 9—to another standing committee, as House Resolution 89 would do, jurisdictional conflict between two House committees is made inevitable.

By opening up and making clear for our consideration the possibility of a division of legislative and investigative authority between two standing committees of the House, House Resolution 89, in my judgment, provides the occasion for the House to effect meaningful and sound reform.

A consolidation of both investigative and legislative internal security functions within the Judiciary Committee, which has traditionally handled espionage and sedition matters as well as criminal matters in general, commends itself on grounds of sound congressional administration.

Furthermore, I believe that assignments in this highly sensitive area bearing so immediately on constitutional responsibilities and restraints should go to Members who are lawyers by education and who can bring to bear the required judicial temperament.

I might add that in choosing such a course of action the House would be following the precedent of the other body, as well as heeding the advice of a past HCUA chairman, the late Honorable Francis Walter, who advocated such consolidation as late as 1960. In trial testimony Mr. Walter stated:

> I am one of the 42 men who voted against creating the committee. I thought that its functions should be within the framework of the Judiciary Committee, just as it is in the Senate, where this work is done by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.
>
> Q. Do you still feel that way?
>
> WALTER. *Of course.* (*U.S.* v. *Yellin*, Mar. 9, 1960.)

Therefore, I urge Members to defeat the previous question, after which I would then hope to offer an amendment to House Resolution 89 which would first consolidate all internal security functions in the Judiciary Committee; and second, it would provide for a more precise mandate on the one hand to protect constitutionally privileged activities, and on the other to provide for the internal security needs of our country.

I believe my amendment would allow the House better to discharge its duties in this most sensitive area. But voting down the previous question does not commit Members to my amendment any more than it commits them ultimately to opposition to House Resolution 89.

In conclusion, there is no subject to which we as Members of Congress have a greater obligation than the protection of the very life of our Nation against those who would destroy it, along with the preservation of our constitutional freedoms against those who would defy them.

We should not delude ourselves that the problems spawned by the Committee on Un-American Activities will be solved even in part, if we merely change words

and fail to grip the very serious root issues suggested by those words. So I urge you to defeat the previous question in order that we may consider meaningful reform. Thank you.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice I will support the substitute offered by the honorable gentleman from Iowa, if the previous question is defeated.

I have long believed that the activities and interests of the House Un-American Activities Committee rightly belong under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. The rules of the House and traditional practice have granted the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction over legislation dealing with espionage, sedition, crime, and punishment. The always-too-vague and all-embracing investigative powers of the HUAC have conflicted with that jurisdiction.

The proposed change in the mandate of the HUAC will not make that power less vague or indefinite. What could be more comprehensive than the phrase "all other questions, including the administration and execution of any law of the United States, or any portion of the law, relating to the foregoing that would aid the Congress or any other committee of the House in any necessary remedial legislation."

This mandate grants to the committee what we do not have the constitutional power to grant.

The Judiciary Committee, under its powers to investigate and propose legislation, has always concerned itself with real attempts to overthrow our Government by force. And this committee of able and dedicated lawyers has always weighed constitutional rights and protections in its efforts.

Through the years HUAC has brought disrepute to the House of Representatives. The coverage and elevation of ridiculous and farcial groups has not enhanced the reputation or the influence of the Congress, but has instead made a mockery of the important legislative and investigative powers and responsibilities.

The serious and meaningful work of the Congress is delegated to a lesser position when equal standing and power are given to a committee that exposes for exposure's sake and gives priority to hearings rather than meaningful legislation.

The Congress has been and should be concerned with the legislative process and the protection of constitutional rights. Yet we have allowed this committee, which has only dabbled in legislation and completely ignored constitutional guarantees, to continue unchecked and unabated.

The Judiciary Committee has been and is concerned with threats to the Government and our democratic system. They have been concerned with dangers from organized groups who wish to overthrow the Government by force, and they have been equally concerned with the dangers of slow, steady erosion of our constitutional guarantees. These threats are equally serious. The HUAC, I am afraid, has encouraged the latter in often blind pursuit of the former.

The Judiciary Committee which has demonstrated its concern and knowledge regarding threats to freedom and democracy, should be given full and sole authority over these questions.

We are obligated to consider means as well as ends. If the means are unconstitutional, unfair, and morally objectionable, it matters little how worthy the ends. The Constitution and the Rules of the House have described and restricted procedure as much as substantive content. We should seek a studied, legal, and truly American approach to solving these problems and eliminating these dangers. Such an approach can best be found in the Judiciary Committee.

If the motion of the previous question is not defeated, I will vote "aye" and hope the changing of the name of the committee will help alleviate the stigma the Un-American Activities Committee has placed on the Congress and that the new committee and new members will reverse the policies of the old committee and bring respect and honor to the Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the trouble with some committee members is that they forget they have been appointed and believe they have been anointed. This is particularly true of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Since its origin, a great many members of that committee have assumed a messianic role of defining to the House and the country the limitations of what free Americans may think or say or do.

The letter we received yesterday from the chairman of the committee is a typical example of committee thinking. He writes:

> Most of the opposition to the bill appears to come from the radically extreme left, as evidenced by the enclosed article from the Communist Daily World.

Although couched in innuendo, the intent is clear: If Members of the House dare oppose this bill, they are joining the radically extreme left. I thought the extreme left, being extreme, was as bad as could possibly be. Apparently, "the radically extreme left," to use the chairman's phrase, whatever that means, is much worse.

But, Mr. Speaker, the letter did serve a most useful purpose in making crystal clear that changing the name will not change the committee, for if the committee was known for one thing, it was name calling and guilt by implication. But name calling will not stifle opposition to this bill because it is a bad bill. The same nefarious practices and ambiguities which marked the committee's activities in the past are authorized and approved in this bill.

And changing the committee's name will not help. A bad committee is a bad committee, no matter what its name. Shakespeare said:

> A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

And obvious corollary would be:

> A noxious weed by any other name would smell as foul.

We are all familiar with the legislative nonrecord of the House Committee on Un-American Activities—it has made virtually no substantive legislative proposals in recent years. It has expended more funds with less legislative return than any other committee in this body. In the process of conducting its investigations, HUAC has consistently played the dangerous game of confusing unorthodoxy with subversion and has sacrificed constitutional guarantees by extralegal actions. I would be the last one to suggest that the internal security of the United States is not of the utmost importance, but there is no evidence that HUAC has made any significant contribution to the maintenance of that security.

The time has come for us to repudiate HUAC, not to give it new life. The investigatory mandate of House Resolution 89 is no less ambiguous than that which has guided the uneven course of HUAC since its establishment as a standing committee. There is no reason to believe that a facelift for HUAC will magically endow it with the commonsense and appreciation of fairplay it has lacked for the past 24 years. HUAC as a committee has not served this House well, and House Resolution 89 retains that free-wheeling autonomy that has bred so many abuses in the past.

Many Members, myself included, have introduced legislation that would abolish HUAC and transfer its investigatory mandate to the Committee on the Judiciary, where it should be, because that committee now has jurisdiction under the rules over matters involving sabotage and espionage.

On a strictly procedural basis, the Judiciary Committee is the proper place for inquiries relevant to our internal security. Moreover, the Judiciary Committee is made up of men with the legal expertise necessary to conduct investigations with the proper regard for procedural due process. We could therefore achieve some additional assurance that its investigations would be germane to our internal security and not merely showcases for ideological polemics which breed discord. Moreover, there would be the combined wisdom and proud supervision of the full committee to oversee the actions of the subcommittee to protest against the kind of noxious investigations that marked its predecessor.

The parliamentary situation under which we are considering this legislation does not provide time for the kind of serious consideration necessary in order to make a reasoned judgment on the merits of this resolution. The procedure by which this matter was brought to the floor ought to be of concern to all of us. It is in a sense additional evidence that nothing is really changed by House Resolution 89.

In closing, I want to urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity to repudiate the past actions of HUAC. What is at stake here is nothing less than the constitutional guarantees of the Bill of Rights—not to mention the reputation of this body. I urge you to vote down the previous question and support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) which would transfer the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-Ameri-

can Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the position espoused by our distinguished colleague from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

I have noted with approval that the debate, at least, on our side of the issue today, has not resembled a fictional Al Capp cartoon depicting the Dogpatch City Council meeting to resolve to rename the local skunk works as the Ozark Perfume Factory.

It was Shakespeare who said:

What is in a name? That which we call a rose would by any other name smell as sweet.

The renaming of this committee, if that is all the resolution does, is without purpose. But, if it seeks to enlarge the function and jurisdiction of this committee, it is then unthinkable. To the extent this resolution infringes or seeks to infringe upon or take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees, it should be flatly rejected.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the motion to close debate be rejected so that we may appropriately deal with this committee of the Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 89 would not only change the name of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on Internal Security but extend its jurisdiction into areas of criminal jurisdiction which are the province of the House Judiciary Committee as was so well pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER). Time and time again on the floor of this House, I have pointed out how the House Un-American Activities Committee serves no useful legislative purpose and how it has consistently violated our basic constitutional guarantees of due process, bringing discredit upon the House of Representatives.

House Resolution 89 seeks, according to its principal sponsor, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), "to strengthen the committee in every possible way, clarify its mandate and eliminate any possible misunderstanding and confusion about the specific powers and jurisdiction of the committee"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 18, 1967.

What would the practical effect of the approval of this resolution be? Let me turn first to the proposed change in its name.

During the past several years opposition to HUAC has increased steadily and grown more influential. More and more Members of Congress have begun to publically express, their opposition to the committee, and a distinguished body of lawyers and jurists has urged that the committee be abolished. Larger and larger numbers of citizens are beginning to question the very concepts embodied in its authorizing mandate.

The attempt made through this resolution to cloak the committee's activities in a more euphemistic and respectable sounding name is directly related to this growing opposition. For the name of the committee has itself become a symbol of the vagueness and arbitrariness under which its activities are carried out. A change in name and expanded jurisdiction will create the impression that the committee has been given new certification by the House.

This resolution, which would enlarge the mandate of the present House Un-American Activities Committee, would give the committee significantly broader powers than are presently authorized by rule XI of the Rules of the House. Rule XI currently gives the committee authority to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of 'un-American propaganda' activities in the United States," and to determine the diffusion of "un-American propaganda." Under the provisions of House Resolution 89, the committee's mandate would not be limited to investigation of "propaganda" but would explicitly extend into the activities of "organizations and groups." Contrary to the statements of the sponsors of this resolution, the language proposed in the mandate is no less vague than the language in the present mandate. For example, the new mandate would empower the committee to investigate organizations or groups which seek in the committee's view to overthrow or alter the Government by such means as "treachery." What does "treachery" mean? Beyond that, who establishes which groups or organizations seek to overthrow the Government by force or violence or "any unlawful means?" Will the committee decide what is "unlawful" activity? Again the proposed mandate is open ended.

These changes would give the committee the congressional sanction it seeks to initiate new investigations into civil rights, peace, student and other organizations which the House Un-American Activities Committee has already investigated under its old mandate. None of the committee's previous sallies into the activities of these organizations—which have made a mockery of the value and utility of respectable congressional investigation—suggests this extension of its powers would be in the interest of protecting the "internal security" of the United States.

In addition to broadening the investigatory authority, the proposed changes in the subject matter of the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee would encroach upon powers already delegated to the Judiciary Committee. As the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentlemen from New York (Mr. CELLER), pointed out in his letter to the Rules Committee opposing House Resolution 89, the powers invested in the Committee on Internal Security by paragraphs 11(b)1, 11(b)2, and 11 (b)3 of the resolution clearly overlap the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, which has long had responsibility for investigating matters of espionage, sedition, and the criminal penalties associated with these crimes. If this resolution is approved, a conflict in authority between the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Internal Security will surely result.

Seven other members of the Judiciary Committee, including myself, outlined our reasons for opposing this resolution in a letter which we sent to our colleagues on February 13. Are all of these arguments, which ask only that no other committee of the House be granted powers which infringe upon the mandate of the Judiciary Committee, to be ignored? If there is any reason why the House Un-American Activities Committee is better qualified to carry out the duties already assigned to the Judiciary Committee than that committee, I suggest the sponsors of this bill make their reasons known. The sponsor of House Resolution 89, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), has suggested that Chairman CELLER would not have time to take on the responsibilities outlined in his resolution. However, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has never indicated any lack of willingness to carry out responsibilities already invested in the Judiciary Committee to investigate espionage or sedition. On the other hand, if the intent of House Resolution 89 is to create new areas of investigative responsibility, I would remind my colleagues that as yet no need has been demonstrated for the creation of such additional areas of inquiry. It is important to note that the present Committee on Un-American Activities since its inception has trespassed upon the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee as well as other House committees.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution cannot be considered in isolation from the record of the committee which is the subject of this bill. For that reason, I wish to very briefly discuss in "cost-effectiveness" terms, the legislative record of the House Un-American Activities Committee during the Congress just concluded, the 90th Congress.

In addition to the funds allocated under the Legislative Reorganization Act og 1946, which in past years has averaged more than $150,000, the Un-American Activities Committee received $725,000 in additional funds during the 90th Congress, the fifth largest sum allocated to any committee in the House. The Judiciary Committee, by contrast, received $500,000 in additional funds.

The Un-American Activities Committee also had the fourth largest staff, employing more people—47—on its payroll through December 1968 than all but the Committees on Appropriations, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

However, its budget bears no relation to its legislative productivity. While the Congress as a whole considered 17,180 measures during both sessions of the 90th Congress, only 32 bills were referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The average number of measures referred to each committee of the House, by contrast, was 1,211. Of these 32 bills referred to the House Un-American Committee, 23 were identical or similar to other bills, leaving it with a real workload of nine pieces of legislation. All of these nine bills properly belonged to the

jurisdiction of other standing committees of the House.

Only one bill recommended by the House Un-American Activities Committee was approved by the 90th Congress. The lone bill extended the life of the previously dormant Subversive Activities Control Board, whose record of achievement is, appropriately, comparable to that of HUAC.

That is the record of the committee which House Resolution 89 asks be given new and broader powers of investigation.

One of the sponsors of this resolution, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), in a letter to his colleagues dated February 17, 1967, characterized the opposition to this resolution as coming from the "radically extreme left," which is demonstrated, he says, by the fact that an article in the Daily World criticized House Resolution 89.

If anyone had any doubt about how to vote upon this resolution, it should have been settled by that letter in which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) attempts to equate opposition to House Resolution 89 with support for communism. The circulation of the article illustrates the shopworn technique of guilt by association which HUAC perfected over the years. I do not know whether the letter should be viewed as the last gasp of the old HUAC or the first squeal of the new HUAC. However, whether it is an epitaph or a birth announcement, it is in character.

Mr. Speaker, if any of my colleagues had any illusions that the nature of the committee might improve if the requested revisions in name and mandate were approved, I would only ask them to appraise the character of argument made in that letter. Issues as serious and sensitive as "internal security" require the utmost concern for due process, and this committee should not be authorized to extend its harassing and exposing tactics into new areas of concern. Far from meriting the extension on its life it seeks, it should be eliminated as a standing committee.

I urge that the previous question be defeated. Then it will be in order to consider alternatives to House Resolution 89.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON).

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate—and I favor adoption of House Resolution 89—will be brief and to the point.

On November 12, 1957, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, wrote a letter to the late Francis E. Walter, then chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In this letter he stated:

> Your Committee's role in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen, and real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled by efforts to discredit your vital task.

Two years later, the famed Director of the FBI, who knows more than anyone else about subversive operations in this country and what must be done to cope with them, wrote in part as follows to the late Clyde Doyle, who served as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities from 1951 until his death in 1963:

> The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the work over the years of congressional investigating committees. These committees, day after day, secure information vitally needed in the consideration of new legislation. They are indeed indispensable parts of the American legislative process.
>
> We in the FBI have the highest appreciation for the contributions rendered by congressional investigating committees dealing with Un-American activities. . . .
>
> I feel that both the FBI and congressional investigating committees, in the field of internal security, have important roles to play. We are working for the same goal—protecting our great Nation from enemies who seek to destroy us. Our work is not contradictory, but mutually helpful. That is as it should be.

In 1960, a famed American churchman and patriot, the late Cardinal Spellman, sent a telegram to Donald Jackson, then the ranking Republican on the Committee on Un-American Activities. In his telegram he stated:

> I respect the fact that Congressman Walter, you and other members of your committee have rendered outstanding service in exposing Communist activities.

In August 1955, Bernard Baruch, distinguished elder statesman and adviser to Presidents, appeared at a House Committee on Un-American Activities hearing on Communist infiltration of the theater, which was being held in New York City, to congratulate the committee members for performing "a very difficult and very necessary job."

Mr. Baruch told Representative Francis E. Walter, then chairman of the committee:

> You have a tough task to do and are doing it well. I have great respect for this Committee.

It is significant that, for the most part, these statements were made at times when, if you believe some of the present-day as well as past critics of the committee, the committee itself was engaging in all kinds of horrible and un-American practices.

And let's go back many years more to the days of the Dies committee, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, which has been the subject of so much vilification by self-appointed and self-annointed saviors of America.

The American Federation of Labor, at its 1939 convention held in Cincinnati, Ohio, formally endorsed the work of the Dies committee and urged its continuation. Early the following year, when the House had to decide the issue of whether or not the Special Committee on Un-American Activities should be continued, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, wrote a letter to Members of the House in which he made the following statements:

> I cannot conceive of anyone, other than those who may be exposed through association with Communist organizations and Communist front organizations, objecting to a thorough investigation into the activities of subversive groups by a congressional committee. Those who have no sympathy with these un-American groups, these subversive forces within our social order, who are constantly seeking to change our form of government and to promote revolution, can with perfect propriety give wholehearted support to the work of the Dies committee, and to the investigation it has made and which it can continue to make.
>
> The people of our country are entitled to know the truth. We of the American Federation of Labor want them to know the facts. We want those who are undermining our form of government and those who are engaged in subversive activities to be exposed. Ridicule, denunciation, and sarcasm, all directed toward the Dies committee by those who seek to suppress its activities and prevent it from carrying on its important work, can only be looked upon with suspicion.
>
> We cannot permit those who engage in such tactics to prevent a thorough investigation and a public exposure of the actions and of the activities of individuals and groups who are engaged in un-American activities, and who are seeking either directly or indirectly the overthrow of our Government.
>
> The preservation of freedom and democracy is a matter of vital concern to all those who believe in our form of government. We can protect ourselves if we know who and what it is that is undermining and attacking our governmental structure. Those who are with us need not fear, those who are against us ought to be exposed. The Dies committee is rendering a great public service. It should be continued until its investigation is completed.

I could go on. The words of many other respected and famous Americans could be quoted in praise of the Committee on Un-American Activities. But, it is not necessary to do this. The Members of this House have always voted overwhelmingly in support of the committee.

As J. Edgar Hoover wrote, "real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled" by efforts to discredit the committee.

It is interesting to note that the president of the American Federation of Labor, in his letter, made more than one reference to exposure of the enemies of this country. On more than one occasion, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has stated that exposure is the best weapon against communism. All experts on the subject are agreed on this. One of the most effective weapons of the Communists has been their ability to conceal the identity of their members and agents and also to keep hidden or secret their numerous conspiratorial operations, cloaking them under front organizations. "Exposure," which is no more than revelation or disclosure, strips them of this weapon.

We are all agreed, of course, that exposure for the sake of exposure alone is not a function of a congressional committee, but exposure for legislative purposes—the type the Committee on Un-American Activities has engaged in—is specifically a function of the Congress and all its committees.

Of course, exposure has become in recent years a nasty word in the American language—largely because of a continuing, intensive Communist and leftwing campaign against the Committee on Un-American Activities, a campaign that has had the purpose of ending the numerous valuable exposures of Communist operations by the committee because they have done so much damage to the Communist Party.

Unfortunately, there is something of a double standard existing on this question of exposure. On February 2 of this year, the Washington Post featured an interview with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER). The article mentioned the Judiciary Committee's forthcoming hearings on business conglomerates and it quoted the gentleman from New York as saying that these hearings "will focus the pitiless light of publicity" on questionable practices of large corporations.

There was no Washington Post or New York Times editorial denunciation of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his statement that he was going to expose questionable practices of business conglomerates and that he intended to discredit them with the American people by "the pitiless light of publicity."

But what if the chairman, or a member, of the Committee on Un-American Activities had said that that committee was going to "focus the pitiless light of publicity" on Communists and others in this country who are engaging in traitorous activities and trying to subvert our Constitution? It is my guess that he would be denounced from one end of the country to the other in major editorials published in many of our so-called best newspapers.

It should be stressed that the courts have consistently upheld the type exposure carried out by the Committee on Un-American Activities. An effective answer to the exposure charge which is so often launched against the committee was presented by Ed Willis, former chairman of the committee, in a statement which he submitted to the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress on April 1, 1966. The text of his statement was as follows:

And what about the charge of "exposure"? In democratic societies, legislatures have an informing or educational function which is an integral part of, and basic to, their lawmaking function, Woodrow Wilson, a recognized authority on political science and constitutional law, who taught at Princeton University before his election to the Presidency of the United States, believed that the informing function of Congress was even more important than its lawmaking function. In his book, "Congressional Government," he wrote:

" * * * even more important than legislation is the instruction and guidance in political affairs which the people might receive from a body *which kept all national concerns suffused in a broad daylight of discussion* * * *. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

All congressional committees, through their hearings and reports, perform an informing function, educating the American people about the major problems confronting the Nation and the means, legislative or otherwise, which might be used to solve them.

The important role this function plays in strengthening and preserving a democratic society is not open to question.

Curiously, however, when this committee carries out its informing function, certain people immediately accuse it of "exposure." But this is no more than a smear word for a legitimate and necessary congressional duty. "Exposure" is disclosure, revelation, informing the people about what they must know to govern themselves intelligently and preserve the Government which they have created for their own protection.

Supreme Court and court of appeals decisions upholding the rights of Congress to compel disclosure of Communist organizations and the activities and identities of individual Communists both by legislation and investigation were quoted in my reply to the last allegation (No. 3).

Last year the Supreme Court pinpointed the value of disclosure or "exposure" hearings by all governmental agencies in a decision upholding the right of the Federal Communications Commission to hold a public rather than closed hearing on a matter of public interest. The Court noted:

"The Commission observed that, in addition to stimulating the flow of information, public hearings serve to inform those segments of the public primarily affected by the agency's regulatory policies and those likely to be affected by subsequent administrative or legislative action of the factual basis for any action ultimately taken—a practical inducement to public acceptance of the results of the investigation. Also implicit in the Commission's discourse is a recognition that publicity tends to stimulate the flow of information and public preferences which may significantly influence administrative and legislative views as to the necessity and character of prospective action. The Commission further pointed out that public disclosure is necessary to the execution of its duty under section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 48 Stat. 1068, 47 U.S.C. section 154(k) (1958 ed.), to make annual reports to Congress. Significantly, this investigation was specifically authorized by Congress so that Congress might 'draw upon the facts which are obtained.'" (*FCC* v. *Schreiber*, 381 U.S. 279.)

A very telling statement on the role informing, revelation and disclosure (or "exposure") play in handling problems in a democratic society was made by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights:

"The principle of disclosure is, we believe, the appropriate way to deal with those who would subvert our democracy by revolution or by encouraging disunity and destroying the civil rights of some groups * * *.

"Congress has already made use of the principle of disclosure in both the economic and political spheres. The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and the Pure Food and Drug Administration make available to the public information about sponsors of economic wares. In the political realm, the Federal Communications Commission, the Post Office Department, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Senate—all of these under various statutes—are required to collect information about those who attempt to influence public opinion. Thousands of statements disclosing ownership and control of newspapers using the second-class mailing privilege are filed annually with the Post Office Department. Hundreds of statements disclosing the ownership and control of radio stations are filed with the Federal Communications Commission. Hundreds of lobbyists are now required to disclose their efforts to influence Congress under the Congressional Reorganization Act. In 1938, Congress found it necessary to pass the Foreign Agents Registration Act which forced certain citizens and aliens alike to register with the Department of Justice the facts about their sponsorship and activities. The effectiveness of these efforts has varied. We believe, however, that they have been sufficently successful to warrant their further extension to all of those who attempt to influence public opinion.

"The ultimate responsibility for countering totalitarians of all kinds rests, as always, with the mass of good, democratic Americans, their organizations and their leaders. The Federal Government ought *to provide a source of reference* * * * where private citizens and groups may find accurate information about the activities, sponsorship and background of those who are active in the marketplace of public opinion." (Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947, pp. 52, 53.)

Laws are essential to any well ordered society. But in a democratic society, laws are not enough. Alone, they rarely eliminate any problem. An informed public is needed to supplement, by public discussion, debate *and action*, the sanctions imposed by law on the enemies of society.

For those Americans—and they number in the millions—who want "accurate information about the activities, sponsorship and background" of the subverters of freedom and democracy who are "active in the marketplace of public opinion," the House Committee on Un-American Activities has provided a reliable "source of reference" for 28 years.

In doing so, it has helped preserve the democratic process and prevent its corruption and debasement by those who, with totalitarian ends in mind, give only lip service to the principles of democratic society.

The court decisions referred to by the distinguished past chairman of this committee when he said he quoted them in reply to another allegation about the committee are as follows:

U.S. Supreme Court, the Communist Party case, 1961:

"Where the mask of anonymity which an organization's members wear serves the double purpose of protecting them from popular prejudice and of enabling them to cover over a foreign-directed conspiracy, infiltrate into other groups, and enlist the support of persons who would not, if the truth were revealed, lend their support, it would be a distortion of the first amendment to hold that it prohibits Congress from removing the mask." (367 U.S. 1.)

Justice Douglas, for the dissenting minority—except Justice Black—in the above case:

The Bill of Rights was designed to give fullest play to the exchange and dissemination of ideas that touch the politics, culture, and other aspects of our life. When an organization is used by a foreign power to make advances here, questions of security are raised beyond the ken of disputation and debate between the people resident here. Espionage, business activities, formation of cells for subversion, as well as the exercise of first amendment rights, are then uesd to pry open our society and make intrusion of a foreign power easy. These machinations of a foreign power add additional elements to free speech just as marching up and down adds something to picketing that goes beyond free speech.

U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Barsky against the United States, 1948:

"The prime functions of governments, in the American concept, is to preserve and protect the rights of the people. The Congress is part of the Government thus established for this purpose.

"This existing machinery of Government has power to inquire into potential threats to itself, not alone for the selfish reason of self-protection, but for the basic reason that having been established by the people as an instrumentality for the protection of the rights of people, it has an *obligation* to its creators to preserve itself. * * * We think that inquiry into threats to the existing form of Government by extra-constitutional process of change is a power of Congress under its *prime obligation* to protect for the people that machinery of which it is a part * * *.

"If Congress has power to inquire into the subjects of communism and the Communist Party, *it has power to identify the individuals who believe in comunism and those who belong to the party.*

"* * * it would be sheer folly as a matter of governmental policy to refrain from inquiry into potential threats to its existence or security until danger was clear and present. * * * How, except upon inquiry, would the Congress know whether the danger is clear and present? *There is a vast difference between the necessities for inquiry and the necessities for action.*" (167 F. 2d 241, 246.) [Emphasis added.]

U.S. Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration, 1954:

"Committees of Congress must function in a world of realities. What might have been classified decades ago as private opinion of no concern to Congress, takes on a different connotation in the light of world events whose impact Congress may not disregard. The global Communist apparatus is neither a study group nor a debating society. It is an engine of destruction. Cunningly fashioned, its component parts are artfully disguised when disguise carries advantage. It is no answer to its challenge to say that the beliefs and associations of its members or suspected members are 'private,' and thus beyond the scope of legitimate inquiry by Congress.

"* * * we believe that Congress * * * has a legitimate function to perform in this field—that of informing itself and the public of the nature and extent of Communist penetration into our free institutions." ("Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees," Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, 84th Cong., 1st sess., Senate Rept. No. 2, pp. 9, 10.)

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

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) I ask unanimous consent to put the letter that I circulated to the Members in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing derogatory at all in that letter. I did not and do not mean it to be derogatory. I stand behind each and every word that is stated in the letter. Further, let me point out to the gentleman from New York City that even if the House Committee on Un-American Activities had twice the bad name that he thinks it has and if the gentleman from New York City was 10 times more adamantly opposed to the committee than he is, I would still offer this resolution for the reasons I mentioned on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1969.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Scheduled on the Calendar for consideration tomorrow is House Resolution 89, to clarify the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities under the name of a new committee—the Committee on Internal Security. I am joined in the resolution by the ranking minority member, Mr. John Ashbrook and Mr. Del Clawson. H. Res. 89 is identical to H. Res. 148 which I introduced in the 90th Congress and which was reported favorably to the House by the Rules Committee last year, but was not considered during the rush of adjournment. It has again been considered by the Rules Committee which has original jurisdiction and reported favorably in the same form.

Interestingly enough, opposition to the change has been centered in both extremes of the political spectrum. No doubt, you have received mail from champions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities urging you to oppose this so-called liberal attempt to abolish HCUA. Presently, most of the opposition appears to cor- from the radically extreme Left as evidenced by the enclosed article from the *Communist Daily World*, the successor of the *Communist Daily Worker*. They apparently wish to retain HCUA with the hope of winning crippling law suits in the courts and eventually its abolition, leaving no committee of the House to function in the field of communist subversive activities.

H. Res. 89 spells out in more clear and precise, legal language what constitutes subversive activities and gives the committee the usual legislative jurisdiction and the investigatory powers that have been exercised by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I realize there are some members of the House (few in number, I believe) who would abolish the HCUA outright and transfer its jurisdiction to the Committee on the Judiciary. This could be done, but I seriously question whether our venerable Chairman, Mr. Celler, could possibly find time for his committee to perform these additional duties in view of the burdensome duties already imposed upon the Judiciary Committee by the rules. In this respect, may I say that it is the intent of H. Res. 89 to give the Committee on Internal Security only the authority that has traditionally been exercised by the present Committe on Un-American Activities. I assure you, as I did the members of the Committee on Rules, that it is not intended to infringe and *does not infringe* upon the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Because the mandate of HCUA is admittedly vague on its face resulting in varying interpretations of its present jurisdiction, there seems to be some confusion surrounding my statement that H. Res. 89 gives the Committee on Internal Security only the authority possessed by the HCUA. I believe that the language of H. Res. 89 is sufficiently clear, but if you have any questions about the reach of the resolution, please feel free to give me a ring.

I hope you will see it proper to vote for the previous question and the adoption of the resolution when presented this week. The resolution is very much needed in order that a committee of the House can make an effective contribution to the internal security of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

[From the Daily World, Sept. 18, 1968]

BILL WOULD ADD POWER TO HUAC

WASHINGTON, September 17.—A dangerous resolution to re-name and thus perhaps to deodorize the House Un-American Activities Committee is before the House.

The bi-partisan measure, known as House Resolution 148, would give the inquisitorial body the less offensive name of Committee on Internal Security. It is sponsored by Reps. Richard Ichord (D.-Mo.) and Del Clawson (R.-Calif.).

The resolution would substitute for the current description of HUAC's duties more sophisticated language permitting the same—if not more serious—violations of First Amendment rights which HUAC has been committing for years.

The proposed new wording of HUAC's mandate is specifically designed by the sponsors of the resolution to "preserve the full jurisdiction and powers" of the investigatory body.

The Emergency Civil Liberies Committee has urged all those concerned for civil liberties to write or wire their Congressman now to oppose passage of H.R. 148, and urge complete abolition of HUAC.

Mr. WATSON. May I say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the position of the chairman and his determination to be fair with all Members.

As I recall the letter that he circularized, it simply stated that the Communist Daily World or Worker back in September opposed this very same resolution. Why are some of the opponents so upset about letting folks know that the Communists oppose this resolution. It is a rather simple proposition; I welcome their opposition and because of that fact any support of H.R. 89 is all the stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and I hope we will overwhelmingly vote up the previous question and pass this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out at this point that should the motion to order the previous question be defeated, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) and I shall introduce an amendment to the present resolution which would abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities completely.

The text of the amendment is at the conclusion of my statement.

Mr. Speaker, since the Committee on Un-American Activities was given permanent status by this body on January 3, 1945, its checkered history has been an anathema to every true advocate of American jurisprudence.

The Dies committee, as it was then known, recommended dismissal of approximately 3,800 Government employees on grounds of disloyalty to their country. After a careful Department of Justice investigation only 36—or less than 1 percent of those denounced—were found to warrant dismissal. The some 3,764 unjustly accused have for the most part lived under a cloud of suspicion to this day. While some have been fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to vindicate themselves beyond a scintilla of doubt, others less fortunate have died or are living under the long shadow of the Dies committee.

Through the years the committee, in more or less flagrant fashion, has retained its shotgun approach to un-American attitudes and has besmirched the lives of many citizens without due process of right of appeal to higher authority. Being outside our judicial system

the committee intrinsically lacks the fundamental safeguards of human rights built into that system from our magistrate courts to the Supreme Court. Furthermore, the committee serves no purpose which cannot be better served by our judiciary and executive branches and in ways which are entirely consistent with our constitutional heritage.

We have grown too mature as a nation and a society to need such an organ of government. We have become too well able to cope with internal security threats to require such activities on the part of a House committee.

Further extension of its prerogatives is a travesty upon this House and a shameful waste of Federal money, particularly in these times.

Mr. Speaker, the test of any government of free men is its ability to place internal challenge in perspective. Either a society is viable, commanding the respect of its citizens, or it loses their loyalty and must become a police state in order to maintain itself.

I believe we are a successful pluralistic society, standing firm upon the principle of participatory democracy. This House and its very essence are testimony to the vibrancy of our heritage and its meaningfulness to most Americans through our history. There is no need to rely upon such a broken crutch as the Un-American Activities Committee to keep America strong, safe, or free.

Thomas Jefferson placed his faith in the people and their institutions. In a time when institutions are under fire and the people seeking light, let us show the strength and freedom of this institution by abolishing this committee.

These words are uttered without malice. Nor are they designed to cast any aspersion upon any Member of this body. Rather they are a reaffirmation of my faith in our system and this institution.

Let us act to strengthen our institution, rather than allow such a shadow to continue to blot out the light that must come from this place to all our people.

Mr. Speaker, this committee, by any other name, would smell as it has these many years. I call today, therefore, for its abolition as a committee of the House of Representatives by amendment to House Resolution 89, as follows:

Amendment to House Resolution 89, as reported, offered by Mr. PODELL: strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That clause L(s) of rule X and clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are repealed, and all references to the Committee on Un-American Activities contained in any other provision of the Rules of the House of Representatives are hereby deleted."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask one question of the author of the resolution. On page 2, line 16, item (3) in its original form provided: "all other questions, in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

In part the language added was "or any committee of the House," after the word "Congress." That would indicate to me, at least on the face of it, that the committee would have authority to investigate matters that other committees would have authority to initiate legislation on. I hope that that is not the intent. I hope that the language intends to be the same thing as provided in the original item (3) and there is no intention to enlarge the authority of the committee so as to give investigatory authority in areas where other committees have substitute authority.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. There is no intention whatsoever to enlarge the jurisdiction of the present House Committee on Un-American Activities. I would point out to the gentleman that a great deal of the difficulty lies in the ambiguous language of "the House Un-American Activities Committee."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the same old fight that we have been going through here since 1938 when the Committee on Un-American Activities was set up as a Select or Special Committee, and before it became a permanent committee by action of the House in 1945. There has been a constant fight made against the continuation of the committee.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how those who object to the passage of the resolution can explain their opposition other than upon one basis, and that is they are opposed to the concept of the committee itself.

I have heard a great deal said here today about voting down the previous question so that amendments can be offered. I have heard no one say, until the very last minute when I yielded to the gentleman from New York, just what amendment they expected to offer if the previous question was voted down. Finally, the gentleman from New York let us know. They would offer an amendment to abolish the committee—the same thing they have been trying to do since 1938.

The distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) the able gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) the astute gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) and the friendly gentleman and my good friend from New York (Mr. CELLER) says the resolution intrudes on the jurisdiction of his committee.

I have been here almost as long as the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has, and I am sorry my friend is not here now, because I do not want to say anything in his absence that I would not say in his presence, but I have never known the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) to get excited about subversion or anything else in that field.

There is no conflict of jurisdiction here. This committee which the opposition would destroy, looks into subversiveness, This committee discovers and investigates the subversive agents that are operating throughout the country in an effort to destroy the Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this committee makes its recommendations, and the Judiciary Committee is in a position to make its own recommendations. They can bring in any legislation they see fit within their jurisdiction.

This committee serves a good purpose. It is difficult, I repeat, to understand why the very people who have been opposing this legislation all of these years would not want the language clarified, when they have been hollering to high heaven in the past that it was too vague and too cloudy in its definition.

I have stated in the well of this House since 1945 that I was more apprehensive—and I repeat it here today—about what is going to happen to this glorious young Republic of ours from within than I am about what is going to happen to it from without. I am more concerned about communism in this country than I am about a Communist invasion from without.

Today these people are working among and with the young minds of this country, in the colleges and in the universities and even in the high schools. We need some watchdog, some committee to keep them under observation.

I hope this House will say by an overwhelming vote that they have confidence in this committee and that they have confidence in its able new young chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD). I can assure you that the objectives of the committee are in good hands under his leadership. DICK ICHORD is not only an able man—he is honest, conscientious, and dedicated. I predict he will do a good job as its chairman and will reflect honor and credit on the committee and the Congress.

Mr. MILLS. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, and again this year, I have joined with my esteemed colleague from Missouri, the present chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, RICHARD ICHORD, in the sponsorship of legislation which I believe will heighten the effectiveness of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The fact that the committee is not popular in certain areas of American political thought is being cited as both a reason for continuing the committee and a reason for discontinuing it, or curtail-

ing its powers, depending upon the point of view of the many authorities who are always ready to dictate to the House of Representatives how the troublesome problems of subversion and organized anarchy should properly be treated.

But I would like to emphasize the very real need to have a standing committee of the House with a continuing mandate in this field, and to remove obstacles to effective committee functioning. By perpetuating and strengthening the committee the House will serve notice that the Members of this body are aware of the continuing nature of the subversive forces in U.S. society, well organized either in fomenting disturbances or in turning turbulent events to their own destructive purposes. Vigilance in the face of this acknowledged activity is no more than prudent. It is but the execution of our obligation as members of the legislative branch of this Government to insure that the forces which attack our system are exposed to public view, so that effective remedies may be sought under the law to guard the internal security of this Nation.

It would be comforting if there were any discernible lessening of pressure, if there were reason to believe that the fanatic enemies of U.S. constitutional government had given up the fight. But they are to be observed on every college campus, clothed in righteous indignation over the prevalent disruptive issue, or donning the martyr's hair shirt as they are carted off to jail from the flag burning or the protest against the aspect of U.S. policy which seems to provide the most vulnerable target for invective at the moment. We are denied that comfort at this point in history. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the previous question and support the resolution on final passage.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the inescapable problem with the House Un-American Activities Committee is that it is basically an un-American instrument of government. No name change or hollow public relations attempt to spruce up its image can alter the fact that HUAC has not and cannot, in the future, under any name, function effectively in the democratic system.

Nor can a name change alter the fact that the business of internal security is the business of the House Judiciary Committee. HUAC is, therefore, a useless as well as a harmful appendage to the body politic.

No name change or public relations work will alter the harmful effects that now befall a citizen who has the misfortune to be called before HUAC, or change what my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN, labeled as the "vagueness and arbitrariness under which HUAC's activities are carried out."

The name change suggested today still fails to come to grips with the overriding questions of interference with civil liberties that has been the hallmark of HUAC.

Since no one has seriously challenged the ability of the Judiciary Committee to protect the internal security of the United States, there can be no quarrel with a resolution that would confirm the committee's jurisdiction.

Such a move would not only be correct within the framework of the Constitution and in the eyes of the citizens of this country, it would also be an act of economy. HUAC has already spent $6 million in public funds since 1945 with little or nothing to show for it.

Transferring HUAC's responsibilities to Judiciary might also improve the actual protection of internal security. HUAC's record of nine successful contempt citations in 25 years is not a record that would be difficult to improve upon.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the question of the desirability of voting against the previous question on House Resolution 89.

It is my understanding that the defeat of the previous question is the only available method of permitting possible amendment of the resolution and securing the necessary extended discussion of the mandate, jurisdiction, and organization of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or some successor committee or subcommittee to be charged with the duty of investigating problems of internal security including the activities of persons or organizations seeking to overthrow our institutions of government by unlawful means or who seek to otherwise give aid and comfort to foreign enemies.

Certainly any fairminded person would concede that the limit of 1 hour of debate permitted prior to the vote on the previous question is an inadequate time to consider a question of the importance presented by House Resolution 89. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question not only to permit the fullest consideration of House Resolution 89 in its present form but also to permit possible alternatives to its proposed organization and mandate.

The author of House Resolution 89, the present chairman of HUAC, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. ICHORD) quite reasonably seeks to alter the present charter of HUAC which he described as "extremely vague and ambiguous" when he introduced a resolution similar to House Resolution 89 in 1967. If this quotation expresses his present attitude he is echoing the lead of the U.S. Supreme Court in two landmark cases.

In Watkins against United States, decided in 1957 the court was considering the validity of House rule XI, authorizing the House Un-American Activities Committee and defining its purposes and authority. The majority opinion stated:

> It would be difficult to imagine a less explicit authorizing resolution. . . . An excessively broad charter, like that of the HUAC, places the courts in an untenable position if they are to strike a balance between the public need for a particular interrogation and the right of citizens to carry on their affairs free from unnecessary governmental interference.

On this ground the court set aside a contempt of Congress citation.

In the succeeding case of Barenblatt against United States, decided in 1959, the Court upheld a similar contempt citation in a partial retreat from the Watkins case on the basis that the long history of rule XI flushed out the vagueness of the rule itself. At the same time the majority opinion again restated its objection to the vagueness of the chartering rule.

Whatever the conflict of results in the Watkins and Barenblatt cases it must be conceded that the Supreme Court in both cases described the present charter of HUAC as vague, nonexplicit, and excessively broad and this conclusion is apparently concurred in by the author of House Resolution 89.

It is apparent that we are confronted with a major issue which goes far beyond the insubstantial issue of mere change of a committee name. Certainly we need more than 1 hour of discussion under rules which limit the recognition privilege to the chairman of a committee which is seeking to reform itself.

The author of the resolution should welcome extended debate and the assistance of members of the Judiciary Committee and other qualified lawyers on the floor in securing the best possible language of reform and the best possible organization for reform.

I support the right of Congress to oversee the problem of internal security and challenges to that security from abroad. My earnest desire is to create a vehicle in the House which will accomplish that function in the best possible manner.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the House is called upon to vote on House Resolution 89 which would do more than just change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It would also broaden its jurisdiction.

In the face of growing opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee, I believe this resolution is merely an attempt to quell criticism of the committee by giving the impression that Congress has given it a different authorization to carry on its investigations. Rather than proposing effective and genuine reform in the work of this committee, in reality, this resolution attempts to improve the committee's public relations image.

However, the objections leveled at the House Un-American Activities Committee cannot be erased by changing the committee's name to that of the Committee on Internal Security. And, surely, the vague broadening of the committee's authority will only serve to increase the growing number of voices in opposition.

It is this new description of the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee which causes me most concern. We should certainly do our utmost to protect the internal security of our country. However, care must also be taken so that, in our efforts to insure our internal security, we legislate no more broadly than required, and also insure against unnecessary threatening of our basic freedoms. The reconciling of these freedoms with internal security is a very exacting task. I do not believe that House Resolution 89 accomplishes this reconciliation. Rather, it broadens the mandate of a committee whose jurisdiction is already questionable, both with regard to constitutionality and usurping of another committee's responsibilities.

House Resolution 89 authorizes investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee with respect to activ-

ities involving "violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means." The committee's authority is additionally extended to investigate groups and organizations as well as propoganda. Once an organization falls within the classification of those organizations to be investigated, all activities, both innocent and threatening may be investigated. Speech, assembly, and thought are undoubtedly those innocent acts which would be vulnerable to such investigation. I believe this to be an unnecessary threatening of basic freedoms.

The criticisms of this committee were not leveled primarily at its name, nor did they call for an increase in the scope of its powers. This resolution, with its vague language and dangerous infringement on civil liberties, can only serve to increase the already warranted criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee and to further confuse its jurisdiction with that of the Judiciary Committee.

I will vote against House Resolution 89. This resolution compounds rather than solves the problems of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have felt for some time that the responsibilities now held by this committee would more appropriately belong under the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee, and no name can change or alter that fact. I will support the amendment by the Honorable JOHN C. CULVER, if it reaches a vote, to consolidate all internal security functions within the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the new name and differently written mandate for the House Committee on Un-American Activities proposed in House Resolution 89 remove none of the reasons why I and many other Members oppose continuation of an investigating committee of this kind. We urge that this resolution be decisively rejected.

What are the reasons which make us oppose continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee or of the Internal Security Committee? The two most compelling reasons are the first and fifth amendments to our Constitution. This committee has most flagrantly violated the first and fifth amendments. And this committee, with whatever name, would surely continue to do so because of the very nature of its investigations.

Let none of us be deceived by the differently worded mandate in House Resolution 89.

Under its present mandate, the committee is authorized to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States." Propaganda means dissemination of ideas and the expression of thought. And so the committee was authorized to investigate the dissemination of ideas and the expression of thought.

The first amendment says that:

> Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

In *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 178 (1957)), in which the Supreme Court reversed a contempt conviction arising from one of the committee's investigations, Chief Justice Warren, speaking for the Court, defined the investigative power of Congress. He said:

> No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of the Congress.

This means that Congress can investigate in all the areas in which it can legislate—the areas of the powers enumerated in article I, section 8. And this means that Congress cannot investigate in areas in which it is forbidden to legislate—and it is forbidden by the first amendment to make any law abridging the rights of speech and peaceful assembly. Hence, there is absolutely no way to avoid the conclusion that the present mandate of the committee, which authorizes it to investigate the dissemination of ideas and the expression of thought, violates the first amendment.

We have been told by supporters of House Resolution 89 that a primary purpose of the new mandate is to make it clear that the committee has no power "to investigate and suppress ideas and thoughts," and that it is limited to investigate "activities" aimed at subversion.

I should like to ask how it is possible to investigate activities without investigating thoughts and ideas. Every human activity is formed by the purpose it serves. Hence, the proposed mandate of the committee authorizes it to investigate the "objectives" of organizations and groups. But objectives and purposes are expressed by ideas. And so we are immediately invading the sacred area of first amendment rights.

The new mandate, moreover, gives the committee power to investigate the "character" of organizations and groups. But how else does any group acquire a character except by the objectives or purposes which its members have in mind? And so the proposed mandate confers as much power as the present mandate to do violence to freedom of thought and speech and assembly.

Let us not be so naive as to accept the distinction which has been proposed between activities on the one hand and the propagation of ideas on the other. Any group which seeks to change the present political or social order must necessarily undertake to do so by enlisting as widespread support as possible. It is impossible to bring about political or social change without widespread support. And how else can any group enlist widespread support except by seeking to change people's minds—except by bringing people to see things in a new perspective? So the Un-American Activities Committee or the Internal Security Committee must inevitably focus its investigations on the expression of thought and the dissemination of ideas if it undertakes to investigate the activities of groups and organizations to discover the purposes or objectives of those activities.

The committee's investigations violate the fifth amendment as well as the first. The fifth amendment guarantees that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

People who have suffered community rejection and ostracism and loss of jobs because they were compelled to appear before the committee have surely been deprived of liberty and property without due process of law. And by inflicting such penalties on individuals, the committee has usurped the duties of prosecutor—an executive function—and of judge and jury—judicial functions.

The Supreme Court said in the Watkins case:

> Abuses of the investigative process may imperceptibly lead to abridgement of protected freedoms. The mere summoning of a witness and compelling him to testify, against his will, about his beliefs, expressions or associations is a measure of governmental interference. And when those forced revelations concern matters that are unorthodox, unpopular, or even hateful to the general public, the reaction in the life of the witness may be disastrous.

We all know the circus atmosphere that too often surrounds the hearings held by this committee. In my own city of Chicago, for instance, hearings were held a few years ago by this committee which were referred to by many of our outstanding citizens as "star-chamber proceedings."

Msgr. George C. Higgins, Director of the Social Action Department of the U.S. Catholic Conference, in the Chicago archdiocesan newspaper New World, referred to the committee as useless and one which despotically denied the rights of American citizens. Its procedure, he wrote, is one "by which friendly witnesses are allowed to defame others without being subjected to cross-examination and by which those defamed are then subpenaed and required to answer committee questions but are not allowed to testify in their own behalf or to have others testify for them." We know, too, that witnesses are sometimes paid to come before the committee, and I think it highly irregular that they be paid a sum of money for making an appearance.

I am as interested as any of my colleagues in routing the Reds, and in fact, led the cleanup in 1947 on the Illinois State Industrial Union Council in Chicago when five of six places on the executive board of the central CIO body, representing 275,000 Illinois workers, went to avowed anti-Communists.

I cannot, however, agree in good conscience with the unfair tactics employed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is highly questionable whether the committee serves any serious purpose other than exposure.

Therefore, when the first session of the 90th Congress convened in January of 1967, and again when the first session of the 91st Congress convened last month, I introduced legislation, along with many of my colleagues, calling for the discontinuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the transfer of its duties and responsibilities to the House Judiciary Committee. I believe this is the most advisable course of action to follow and look forward to the day when a majority in the House will agree with me.

It is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that the committee, acting under its new name and new mandate, would continue to bring about the punishment of individ-

uals without due process of law, thus violating the fifth amendment, and would continue to curtail our first amendment freedoms of speech and press.

Congress must certainly establish the legal basis for protecting our form of government from violent overthrow by means of espionage, sabotage, and other overt acts. All such legislation is properly within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and my resolution, House Resolution 20, would amend House rule XI, clause 12, by adding explicitly to the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction "sabotage and other overt acts affecting internal security."

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the House abolish this committee which outrages the Bill of Rights and violates the separation of powers. A new name and a differently worded mandate will not change the character of this committee. They may change the name, but the game is the same.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution being considered today is to rename the House Committee on Un-American Activities and reword its mandate. This resolution was reported by the House Rules Committee and now comes before us for consideration. This resolution not alone seeks a change of name but also authorizes the committee to make investigations, which broadens its mandate. Though a difficult task, the Congress must protect the internal security of the United States on one hand while assuring the rights and liberties of the individual on the other. I fear the House Un-American Activities Committee has accomplished very little, if indeed anything at all, in protecting the internal security of the Nation. However, in pursuing its investigations in the past, the committee has been lacking demonstrably in assuring the individual his rights. This contradicts not only the word and spirit of the Constitution, but the very tenets upon which this Nation was founded.

The Supreme Court has stated that the "right of government to maintain its existence and self-preservation is the most pervasive aspect of sovereignty." I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one in this Chamber who would dispute this contention. It is a direct result of the Nation's security, both internal and external, that we are in fact able to enjoy our constitutional rights.

Yet, when the security of our Nation is not directly threatened, an individual's rights should not be violated. When they are violated, we are confronted with nothing but a mockery of everything this House truly stands for.

When the mere service of a subpena brands an individual guilty of certain un-American activities, whether he is innocent or guilty, it is time for a change. A subpena from the House Committee on Un-American Activities—or if changed, the newly named Internal Security Committee—automatically surrounds the individual with a stigma of guilt, especially when it is accompanied by a notice in the press stating that the individual is to be investigated for alleged subversion or various forms of treachery. These, Mr. Speaker, are my basic objections to the continuance of the committee.

I respectfully submit that this proposal would accomplish nothing new except that it would establish a new facade, changing the outward appearance of the committee and extending its powers, as aforesaid. I further submit that the mandate and function of the committee be first realistically and clearly defined, and then transferred to the Judiciary Committee. If this is done, the internal security of the country would still be protected while the constitutional rights of the individual would not be infringed upon.

A subpena issued by the Judiciary Committee would not carry with it the same dark shadow of guilt that is associated with a subpena and subsequent appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Internal Security Committee. This pillorization in the press compounds what already is a gross travesty of our great legal heritage.

The Congress should never forget that this great country was founded to protect the dignity and integrity of the individual citizen; and when his rights and liberties are violated, then the very foundation of this Nation is undermined. It is this consideration, above all else, that causes me to advocate the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the transfer of its functions to the Judiciary Committee whose capability, experience, and dedication, not only to the preservation of the security of this Nation, but also to the preservation of our constitutional rights and liberties, is beyond question.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has, for many years, performed a valuable and useful function. Since its creation, our Nation has been faced with many internal enemies. These have included the pro-Nazi German American Bund, the Communist Party, and other organizations which have advocated the overthrow of our Government and the destruction of our freedom.

The investigations conducted by this committee have resulted in legislation designed to protect our society from those who would destroy it. Beyond this, the many valuable studies published under the auspices of this committee have helped to inform the American people of the true nature of the enemies we have faced.

From its inception, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been the butt of stubborn opposition. This opposition has, of course, come primarily from those who were engaged in the kinds of subversive activities which were the responsibility of the committee to investigate.

The resolution being considered by the House today is to clarify the mandate of the committee, and to give it a new name. House Resolution 89 spells out in precise legal language what constitutes "subversive activities," and gives the committee the usual jurisdiction and investigatory powers that have been exercised by the Committee on Un-American Activities. The new name would be the "House Committee on Internal Security."

This resolution has been proposed in the interest of strengthening a committee which is vital to the maintenance of our democratic form of government. The radical left has been violently opposed to this change. The Communist Daily World, in its September 18, 1968, issue, stated:

> The proposed new wording of HUAC's mandate is specifically designed by the sponsors of the resolution to "preserve the full jurisdiction and powers" of the investigatory body.

It is because they want to see the committee abolished or, at the very least, weakened, that the Communists have opposed this change.

There is increasing violence in our country. Our cities have been victimized by riots, and our campuses are in a virtual state of siege. Examples of such violence have been numerous. In recent days, the president of Swarthmore College died of a heart attack after being locked in his office by militant black students. New York Times editor James Reston was forced off the stage at New York University. Brandeis University was closed down, and campus buildings have been bombed at Berkeley and at Stanford. There is much material worthy of congressional investigation in these events, particularly the question of who is financing these radical student movements.

Rarely before has the need for an effective House committee to investigate such violence been so great. The changes included in this bill would strengthen the committee, and for this reason I support them.

The changes will also make certain that the rights of all witnesses are safeguarded and that due process will always be observed. In a society such as ours, means are ends in themselves. All committees must be clearly controlled and must operate by the rules. But Congress must also have the information it needs to legislate, and this is particularly true in the area of internal security. The proposed changes involved in this bill would make certain that both of these elements are preserved and protected.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 89 does clarify the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe that the establishment of a new committee and name, the Committee on Internal Security, is a sound step. An objective review of House Resolution 89 clearly demonstrates that the new committee in more precise legal language will be vested with proper legislative jurisdiction and related investigatory powers.

May I state, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the House Judiciary Committee, whose members are bearing a far heavier than normal workload, can give this matter the attention and persistence which is required. In view of the fact that a number of the members on the majority side of the House Judiciary Committee are critical of the former House Committee on Un-American Activities they would hardly be expected to facilitate the

operations of a new subcommittee under their full committee jurisdiction.

Therefore, I feel that the resolution is a practical one and that the new Committee on Internal Security will make a sound, constructive contribution to the internal security of our country, which continues to be beset by activities financed and stimulated by various Communist sources.

However, as a matter of legislative procedure, I did not vote for the previous question since I feel the critics of the committee ought to be given an opportunity to more thoroughly express their views and offer substitute motions. The outcome of this battle is clear. Only the extreme liberal faction of the House, a small group indeed, is seeking to wipe out this essential committee. But, I do feel despite my strong support of the committee that its critics should have an opportunity to more thoroughly express their dissent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Representative RICHARD ICHORD of my neighboring district, the Eighth District of Missouri, having been named chairman of the committee under consideration has stated his desire to redefine its jurisdiction and conduct its operations to achieve a fairer, less sensational, and more businesslike performance. With this in mind he offered House Resolution 89. There are those who argue that this resolution would not or could not accomplish the desired result. If they are correct the House will have the opportunity to so judge and render such judgment when the committee's future is again considered as it periodically is. In the meantime it is my view that the new chairman's initiative deserves the benefit of the doubt, and the chance to chart a new, a better understood, and a more generally acceptable course for the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think it essential that the House vote on the proposal sponsored by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) to place the activities of the present Committee on Un-American Activities under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is not a new idea; it has been advocated several times in the past. Without intending any disrespect for the present chairman of the committee, I do feel that this proposal has greater merit than the resolution of the chairman to change the name of the committee. That does not go far enough, in my estimation; nor do his proposed reforms go far enough. I am encouraged that the committee will no longer be investigating "propaganda," that is, speech in all its manifestations. Its past record in this area stands as a shabby testament to abuse of the investigation prerogative. But the stigma attached to this committee makes it imperative that the House be done with it and that its functions be transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Clearly, Congress has the right of investigation. This was forthrightly acknowledged in *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. at 187 (1957), when the Supreme Court stated:

> We start with several basic premises on which there is general agreement. The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad. It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling the Congress to remedy them. It comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency or waste.

The Court continued:

> But broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress. No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress. Investigations conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to "punish" those investigated are indefensible.

Everyone is well aware that this opinion was delivered in reversing the conviction of Mr. Watkins for contempt of Congress because of his refusal to answer questions directed to him by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. These questions had to do with the alleged membership of certain persons in organizations considered subversive. Watkins declined to affirm or deny membership of any person whom he did not know as a member at the time of the inquiry. He declined, in other words, to identify persons as past members on the grounds that:

> I do not believe that such questions are relevant to the work of this committee nor do I believe that this committee has the right to undertake the public exposure of persons because of their past activities.

The Court agreed with Mr. Watkins.

It was not until after World War II that the kind of inquiry for which the Committee on Un-American Activities gained its notoriety became commonplace. As the Court noted in Watkins—at 195:

> This new phase of legislative inquiry involved a broad-scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens. It brought before the courts novel questions of the appropriate limits of congressional inquiry.

In effect, it raised the serious question of the legitimate scope of inquiry without trespassing on the rights and privileges of individuals as guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Regrettably, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been guilty innumerable times of overstepping the legitimate boundaries of congressional inquiry. It has exposed for exposure's sake. It has invaded the rights of free speech. It has laid itself open to disruptive, chaotic, and embarrassing hearings by calling witnesses and attempting to compel from them testimony which the committee knew full well would precipitate recalcitrance, anger, and demonstration. Too often its policy has been one of deliberate provocation for the purposes of gaining publicity. Too seldom has its policy been designed to further the legitimate ends of congressional inquiry. No better proof of these observations exists than in a comparison of its legislative record with its record for issuance of contempt resolutions. Only six pieces of legislation reported by the committee other hand, it has handed out more than 160 contempt citations since 1945.

The history of the committee does not merit its continuance. Moreover, the charter establishing the committee is loosely worded and permits the widest latitude for abuse. In Watkins—at 197— the Court stated:

> An investigation is subject to the command that the Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech or press or assembly.

Under its charter, the committee has violated that injunction.

The Court announced in Watkins—at 201–202:

> It is the responsibility of the Congress, in the first instance, to insure that compulsory process is used only in furtherance of a legislative purpose. That requires that the instructions to an investigating committee spell out that group's jurisdictions and purpose with sufficient particularity.

And, in commenting on the charter of the committee, the Court said:

> It would be difficult to imagine a less explicit authorizing resolution.

In the face of all this, it seems clear to me that the House would be well advised to adopt the proposal of the gentlemen from Iowa (Mr. CULVER). As he pointed out himself on February 6 of this year, his resolution responds to the criticism of the Court and guarantees that abuse of the investigating prerogative of Congress will not occur in the future during investigations of purported subversive activity.

It does this by clearly defining what the new subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may probe in its investigations; that is:

> The Committee is authorized to investigate for legislative purpose those activities of groups or organizations which involve espionage, sabotage, insurrection, force or other coercive acts when such activities attempt to alter or overthrow the lawful authority of the Government of the United States.

It could be stated no more clearly than that.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the past record of the Committee on Un-American Activities does not justify its further existence as an independent body. The jurisdiction of a committee of this House investigating subversive activity must be narrowly drawn and must strike a sensible balance between the necessity of security and the precious rights of our citizens. The Culver resolution does this and we ought to have the opportunity to vote upon it. Accordingly, I urge defeat of the previous question and adoption of an amendment embodying the proposal of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER). If the previous question succeeds, I will vote against the resolution seeking a change in the committee's name and extension of its mandate.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89, a resolution to change the name and amend the mandate of the present Committee on Un-American Activities.

There has been a general recognition that the present mandate and procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities require reform. In fact, the

present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), has forthrightly expressed this view.

Thus the need for reform is clear. The question is whether the new mandate contained in this resolution is that needed reform. It is my view that this resolution does not provide that reform. Accordingly, I will oppose it.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), and legal experts, including the staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, have given their opinion that there is nothing that the old committee could have done under the old mandate that the new committee will not be able to do under the new mandate. The language of the new mandate is far from clear. The specific enumeration of subjects to be investigated overlaps the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, as the chairman of that committee has so ably indicated.

For these reasons I have concluded that the new mandate is not the needed reform measure.

Moreover, I have for several years introduced legislation to abolish the present Committee on Un-American Activities and transfer its legitimate functions to the Judiciary Committee. It is my understanding that if this resolution is defeated an effort will be made to accomplish this abolition and transfer. For this additional reason I will oppose the resolution.

At this point, however, I want to make it clear that I strongly support the right of Congress and the House of Representatives to investigate matters pertaining to the internal security of the United States. I see this not only as a matter of right but of obligation.

I am equally concerned and convinced that the constitutional rights of all witnesses appearing before committees of the Congress must be scrupulously protected. It is clear that they have not always been so protected in the past.

In my judgment both obligations could be better met if the Committee on Un-American Activities were to be dissolved and the function of investigating in the area of internal security be assumed by the Committee on the Judiciary, as it is in the Senate.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I am for reform, and this resolution does not provide reform.

This resolution will change the name and the face of the Committee on Un-American Activities, but the body would remain the same. My objections are to the body, to the substance, to the unconscionable ways in which the committee has conducted certain of its past proceedings. In the past, the committee has conducted inquisitorial proceedings, needlessly pilloried witnesses, and has contributed nothing to the legislative process which could not have been supplied by orderly, objective, and civilized proceedings before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the previous question so that amendments can be offered to House Resolution 89 to change the name of the Un-American Activities to the Committee on Internal Security. First, let me say that I do not believe a change in the name of the committee will change its activities or improve committee procedures.

I will support the amendment to remove jurisdiction of the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Judiciary Committee. I am one of the sponsors of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the belief that the Un-American Activities Committee serves no useful legislative purpose. The committee's past record of performance is evidence of this. Any investigation of "un-American propaganda" should focus on activities protected by the Bill of Rights—those of speech, assembly, and thought. The committee has been consistently criticized for the manner in which it has conducted hearings.

The Judiciary Committee is composed of attorneys and the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction extends to the protection of constitutional rights of the individual. It is my earnest and sincere belief the Judiciary Committee can meet the responsibilities of maintaining a proper balance between the protection of individual rights and the conduct of congressional hearings on legislation relating to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the passage of this measure. Let me make it quite clear from the beginning that I do feel there are some valid areas of operation for a committee such as the House Un-American Activities Committee. And, indeed, some areas of the committee's work in the past may have had some value. However, on balance, the value of the committee certainly is questionable. There has been far too much of the "big brother" flavor about the committee's operations. In this era of ever-decreasing personal freedom, too often activities of the committee have been costly in terms of personal freedom, and have adversely affected the lives and reputations of the people being investigated by it.

It is my position that any legitimate functions of this committee can be more adequately and properly carried out by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. By transferring the legitimate functions to such a subcommittee, we would be placing this important but delicate assignment with a committee which is noted for handling its affairs with full regard for due process of law. Further, the transfer would give added prestige to legislation arising in this area. All too often, the present committee has been inclined to give short shrift to the basic rights of those persons under investigation.

Let us put this whole matter back in proper perspective, and under proper supervision, by transferring such of the functions as may be valid to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities should be abolished. It should not be replaced. I firmly support the transfer of whatever valid and relevant legislative functions are now held by that committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In the 31 years since the first Special Committee on Un-American Activities was established, no other congressional committee has contributed so little of substantive value, yet created as much controversy. Of course, had the committee stayed only within its initial mandate—that of investigating "Un-American propaganda"—I believe it would have faded away long ago. But, over the years, that mandate mysteriously has expanded into today's current monolith which more resembled a quasi-judicial operation than it does a constituted legislative body.

My argument is not with the concept of dealing with subversion. I quarrel with the means of dealing with that danger, not the end. And, in doing so, I believe that the objectives outlined under the mandate of the proposed Internal Security Committee already exist well within the traditional mandate of the Judiciary Committee.

We must not be deceived. The motion before the House today is not merely one of changing the name of a committee. Passage of House Resolution 89 creates an entirely new committee—a committee with overly broad and quite vague powers, powers which would seriously endanger our given rights of speech and association. Indeed, were House Resolution 89 approved, such action would be interpreted as a justification of all the previous infringements upon civil liberties perpetrated by the Un-American Activities Committee.

My own position is also strongly based on strict procedural grounds. Formation of an Internal Security Committee would cause major conflicts and jurisdictional disputes between that committee and the Judiciary Committee. I support the opinion of the respected chairman of the Judiciary Committee that "aggrandizement of jurisdiction customarily exercised by the Committee on the Judiciary is a matter of critical concern."

Yet, despite this deep concern by the senior Member of the House, the process which brings House Resolution 89 before this Chamber today has ignored other meaningful and significant proposals relating to other possible changes in the Un-American Activities Committee.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 134, which calls for abolishing the Un-American Activities Committee and transferring its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee, I am disturbed that no major attention at all was given by the Rules Committee to that proposal—or any other than House Resolution 89. Nor am I pleased with the rule which permits no amendment to House Resolution 89 unless the previous question can be defeated.

I view today's debate over the future of the Un-American Activities Committee as a crucial point in the direction of the 91st Congress. Adoption of House Resolution 89, and creation of an Internal Security Committee, will forever serve as a stigma attached to the reputation of this Congress.

There can be no argument that subversion of the United States should be quickly halted. But I question whether gross trespassing on basic civil liberties of American citizens, in the name of routing subversion, is not an equal dan-

ger to our most dear principles of democracy and justice.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89. I intend to vote against the motion which would cut off debate and prevent the offering of amendments. I intend to vote in favor of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) to consolidate all internal security functions within the Committee on the Judiciary.

I must oppose the attempt to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the House Internal Security Committee.

If I could be sure that with the switch in names Congress would also get a new committee in the sense that the questionable behavior of HUAC would give way to a more intelligent, less zealous and damaging investigation of internal security threats, I would support a name change.

But I am familiar enough with the dubious achievements of this committee to harbor little hope of an about face. And a turnabout is sorely needed, in light of the many past indiscretions committed by this group in their investigations—the overriding function of which serves more to garner publicity than to realize any substantive good for the country.

HUAC has abused its investigative mandate, totally rejecting any legislative role, and carried on forays against any number of citizens and groups involved in the legitimate pursuit of their civil liberties. Intelligent, rational inquiry is one thing, harrassment for publicity sake is quite another. And it is the latter that has become HUAC's forte.

Certainly it is important for any democracy—including the United States—to guard against internal subversion which resorts to unlawful techniques intended to circumvent and destroy the will of the majority.

In the executive branch of our government this function is carried on primarily by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In the legislative branch—in the other body—this function is carried on by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Neither of these institutions has caused the abridgment to freedom that the Committee on Un-American Activities have dealt the many subjects of their investigations.

Why is this?

I submit that it is because both institutions are subdivisions—important subdivisions—but nevertheless subdivisions of a larger institution whose primary objective is justice.

This means justice equally for the minority who want to exercise their constitutional rights of free speech and assembly, and justice for the majority who do not want to have their rights taken away.

The FBI is a subdivision of the Justice Department.

The Senate Internal Security Committee is a subdivision of the Judiciary Committee.

As subdivisions, their zeal for protecting the majority is tempered by the interest of their parent organization in *protecting the* minority.

In our House Committee on Un-American Activities we have no such tempering influence.

The mandate of HUAC from the House is to protect the majority from the minority and there is no built-in balance which to protect the rights of minorities.

Making HUAC a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee would create such a balance wheel.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question motion so that we all may vote on the Culver amendment to transfer the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, during today's debate on House Resolution 148, it was announced that had the parliamentary situation permitted, I would have joined the gentleman from New York, Congressman PODELL, in moving to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

My position stems from belief in the principal that the protection of first amendment freedoms is basic to our Constitution. Beyond the questionable constitutionality of investing Congress with powers of investigation into speech, association and ideas, there is the additional danger inherent in the vagueness of the committee's mandate. As the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman CULVER, a former member of HUAC, remarked:

> Innocent activities are most often those of speech, association and belief . . . /the HUAC mandate/leaves too much room for subjective and highly political judgments in an area purposefully left free by the first amendment for seemingly unrespectable ideas.

The activities of the committee since its inception have further underscored the wisdom of adhering to this principle. The courts have upheld only 9 of the 133 contempt citations issued by the committee. Furthermore, the committee has often seemed not to understand—or at least not to accept—the constitutional distinction between advocacy and action, possibly because the jurisdiction over activities legitimately subject to congressional investigation resided in another standing committee of the House. The dean of the House, the gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, whose constitutional expertise has earned him great distinction as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, put this point very clearly:

> Traditional practice and custom also indicates that the Committee on the Judiciary, established in 1813, historically has exercised legislative jurisdiction over bills dealing with crime, espionage, sedition and penalties.

Not only is the existence of such a committee questionable under the Constitution, and legislatively unproductive, but the cost of maintaining it has added to the already excessive burdens of the taxpayers. The committee has maintained an average staff of 46, at a cost of more than $6 million, and has produced only five pieces of legislation since 1945. Contrast this record with the Ways and Means Committee which, operating with half as large a staff, has consistently considered a full 20 percent of the legislative output in each session of Congress.

It seems reasonable to conclude that a committee whose legitimate functions are encompassed by the mandate of another committee, whose activities have not brought credit to Congress, whose inquiries have resulted in damage to a substantial number of citizens and whose cost to the taxpayer has been excessive, should, after 20 years of such unsuccessful experimentation, be discontinued.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, once again we are asked to perpetuate the cardinal sin that is the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Ever since this controversial committee was established as a special entity in 1938, its record has been a potpourri of the oratorical and the inquisitorial, full of sound and fury, and accomplishing nothing. Its continued existence is an affront to all the constitutional principles we hold dear and sacred in this country.

Instead of terminating this travesty, we are now called upon, through the provisions of House Resolution 89, to bestow a new name on the cancer and to expand its mandate to pillory the unorthodox. I totally oppose this proposal. To change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities would not rid us of the basic deficiencies that afflict this committee. Its staff has given no indication that it will discontinue its disturbing propensity for characterizing as "subversive" a wide variety of dissent and nonconformity.

Further, the mandate to broaden the committee's powers seriously encroaches on the activities and jurisdictional responsibilities of the House Committee on the Judiciary. We do not need this—given the consistent, unhealthy record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. An expansion of its authority serves only to discredit the protections guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution. I congratulate my colleague (Mr. CULVER) for his wisdom, courage, and leadership in calling for an end to the continuation of the gross perversion of American values and traditions spanning three decades.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the inquisitory powers of Congress are vital in order to assume maximum corrective and remedial action in areas of our national life that require it.

These important functions, like the functions of each and every branch of the Government, must always be exercised with due regard for the Constitution, the laws and the rights of all persons coming before our committees or involved in any way with their hearings, proceedings and deliberations.

In every instance, committee hearings must be conducted in a fair, impartial manner, and must be conducted in a climate where a judicial atmosphere is maintained, orderly procedures followed, and full respect and consideration given under the rule of law for the rights of all persons appearing before the committees, or whose matters may be discussed, considered or acted upon by the committee.

At the same time, the free inquiry that is required to enable Congress to get the facts it needs to legislate intelligently and adequately must be unimpeded by obstructive, vociferous, insulting conduct on the part of witnesses, or

those in attendance, as well as on the part of those participating in the hearings.

In a word, the maintenance of order, fair procedure, recognition of the constitutional and legal protections and safeguards of those called before committee hearings must be at all times rigorously upheld and preserved.

In this context, the controversy over the House Un-American Activities Committee must be discussed, debated, and settled by the Members.

There are some people who do not believe in any investigative powers in this area, and would exempt all persons suspected of subversive activities from congressional inquiry of any sort.

I think this view is most unrealistic. It fails to recognize present dangers of many kinds that exist in this Nation and the world and that spring from the activities of individuals and groups advocating, urging, and defending communism, its objectives and actions, and who are engaged advancing communism, other subversive isms, and similar systems, in the Nation and the world.

One would have to be politically, legally, economically, socially, and spiritually blind, not to realize the existence of dangerous, threatening subversive movements in this day and age, not only in other parts of the world, but in this Nation.

One look at current conditions in this country should be relevant on this point. A most superficial observation of the many disturbing conditions existing in this country bearing on public stability, law and order, and the activities of individuals and groups who do not believe in our free, American institutions, indicate that many of these groups are unceasing, vigorous advocates of revolutionary Marxism and other subversive doctrines and activities which are part of the monolithic structure of world communism and its activist role in this country and the world.

Let us continue to strive with all our hearts for equality, justice, freedom, and peace in the Nation and the world.

Undoubtedly, there have been some abuses practiced by the Un-American Activities Committee in the past, and that is true also of some other committees. Human nature, and the tides of sharp public controversy being what they are, it is not always easy to prevent some abuses from creeping into the deliberations of our committees, any more than they can be totally excluded from our judiciary system, or similar bodies.

It is up to the Congress to put a stop to them, and that is what we have tried to do throughout the years, with respect to the activities of every one of our committees, where necessary, including the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

I am not impressed at the claim that changing the name of this committee, or altering some of its habiliments is an adequate substitute for specific action that the House can take in any given situation to apply a strict, corrective rule.

Obviously, we must have some satisfactory, efficient, effective forum in this Congress for investigating and bringing to light the actions of enemies of the Nation who are working in our midst to undermine our freedoms and destroy our democratic system.

Since such people are always among us, and always active, sometimes like the iceberg; that is only 20 percent above the surface and 80 percent below the surface, it is not always easy to do this kind of job.

But that is no reason for neglecting our responsibilities for protecting internal security, nor is it any reason or excuse for failing to carry out our official oath to uphold the Constitution and individual rights in every way we can.

I yield to no man in my advocacy and defense of individual rights, human rights, and the legal rights of our fellow citizens and all those who live in this Nation, or who, in any way, are involved in congressional hearings or proceedings. But I am of the opinion that this can be done without abandoning the mission we certainly have, as Members of Congress, to perceive current dangers and threats to our way of life, and act to expose, check and, where necessary, take appropriate action through legislative means and the exercise of our advisory functions to protect the Nation, our freedoms, and the other great institutions we prize.

As we move toward these tasks, we should not minimize the dangers, nor should we have any reason to fail to protect the rights of our fellow citizens, and all others coming before us, as our Constitution and our laws provide, and as the spirit of American personal liberty so strongly exhorts us to do.

I believe that we must have an effective, fair, judicial-minded instrument in the House to cope with the problems posed by active communism in the Nation, and make as sure as we can that the rules of law and justice shall prevail above all that this great Nation shall survive against all the storms raging against it.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 89. It makes sense. After all, the real problem for Congress and the Nation is the internal security of the country and we have already witnessed altogether too much uncertainty in the courts as to what "Un-American Activities" means. See Watkins against United States, for example.

When serving as president of the National Association of Attorneys General in 1957 it was my privilege to recommend to that distinguished association that it constitute a committee on internal security. This was done in that year and I had the honor to serve as its chairman for several years. The committee still exists and performs a valuable function within an association of national law enforcement officials. Options were present then to call it a Committee on Un-American Activities and these were rejected after considerable discussion. The same reasons apply here today.

The pattern of violence and anarchy developing on and off campuses of America at this hour becomes of increasing concern as subversion appears to be a common denominator. That the discord, hatreds, interruptions of academic training, and destruction of property takes place by design on the part of a few deliberate activists is a fit subject for investigation, report and probable legislative recommendations from a House Standing Committee on Internal Security. This resolution (H. Res. 89) helps strengthen the charter of the former Un-American Activities Committee in the courts. Anything that strengthens our capacity to keep watch over such things in the proper manner with just rules of procedure is desirable at this time. It is likewise understandable that those who opposed the original Committee will oppose strengthening its judicial weaknesses.

The need for an effective committee such as this in the Congress of the United States is great. Let us help it along its difficult path toward protecting the internal security of the United States by voting for the previous question and passing House Resolution 89.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 123, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—262

Abbitt	Cowger	Hutchinson
Abernethy	Cramer	Ichord
Adair	Cunningham	Jarman
Albert	Daniel, Va.	Johnson, Pa.
Alexander	Daniels, N.J.	Jonas
Anderson, Tenn.	Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.
Andrews, Ala.	de la Garza	Kazen
Andrews, N. Dak.	Denney	Kee
Arends	Dennis	Keith
Ashbrook	Devine	King
Aspinall	Donohue	Kleppe
Ayres	Dorn	Kyl
Baring	Dowdy	Kyros
Bates	Downing	Landrum
Battin	Dulski	Langen
Beall, Md.	Duncan	Latta
Belcher	Edmondson	Lennon
Bennett	Edwards, Ala.	Lipscomb
Berry	Edwards, La.	Lloyd
Betts	Erlenborn	McClory
Bevill	Eshleman	McClure
Biester	Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch
Blackburn	Fallon	McDade
Blanton	Fascell	McDonald, Mich.
Boggs	Findley	McEwen
Bow	Fish	McKneally
Bray	Fisher	McMillan
Brinkley	Flood	MacGregor
Brock	Flowers	Mahon
Broomfield	Ford, Gerald R.	Mann
Brotzman	Foreman	Marsh
Brown, Mich.	Fountain	Martin
Brown, Ohio	Frey	Mathias
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton, Pa.	May
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Tenn.	Mayne
Buchanan	Fuqua	Meskill
Burke, Fla.	Galifianakis	Michel
Burleson, Tex.	Garmatz	Miller, Ohio
Burlison, Mo.	Gibbons	Mills
Bush	Goodling	Minshall
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffin	Mize
Cabell	Griffiths	Mizell
Caffery	Gross	Mollohan
Camp	Grover	Monagan
Carter	Gubser	Montgomery
Cederberg	Haley	Morton
Chamberlain	Hall	Natcher
Chappell	Hamilton	Nelsen
Clancy	Hammer-schmidt	O'Konski
Clark	Hanley	Olsen
Clausen, Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	Passman
Clawson, Del	Harsha	Patman
Cleveland	Harvey	Pelly
Collier	Hastings	Pepper
Collins	Hébert	Perkins
Colmer	Henderson	Pettis
Conable	Hogan	Philbin
Corbett	Hosmer	Pickle
Coughlin	Hull	Pirnie
	Hungate	Poage
	Hunt	Poff

Pollock	Scott	Vander Jagt
Preyer, N.C.	Sebelius	Vigorito
Price, Tex.	Shipley	Waggonner
Pryor, Ark.	Sikes	Wampler
Purcell	Sisk	Watkins
Quie	Skubitz	Watson
Quillen	Slack	Watts
Railsback	Smith, N.Y.	Weicker
Randall	Snyder	Whalley
Rarick	Springer	White
Reid, Ill.	Stanton	Whitehurst
Reifel	Steed	Whitten
Rhodes	Steiger, Ariz.	Widnall
Rivers	Steiger, Wis.	Wiggins
Roberts	Stephens	Williams
Robison	Stratton	Wilson, Bob
Rogers, Colo.	Stuckey	Winn
Rogers, Fla.	Symington	Wold
Rooney, Pa.	Taft	Wright
Roth	Talcott	Wyatt
Ruppe	Taylor	Wylie
Ruth	Teague, Calif.	Wyman
Satterfield	Teague, Tex.	Yatron
Saylor	Thompson, Ga.	Young
Schadeberg	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki
Scherle	Ullman	Zion
Schneebeli	Utt	Zwach

NAYS—123

Adams	Foley	Mink
Addabbo	Ford, William D.	Moorhead
Anderson, Calif.	Fraser	Morgan
Annunzio	Frelinghuysen	Morse
Ashley	Friedel	Mosher
Biaggi	Gallagher	Moss
Bingham	Gaydos	Murphy, Ill.
Blatnik	Giaimo	Nedzi
Boland	Gilbert	Nix
Bolling	Gonzalez	O'Neill, Mass.
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Ottinger
Brasco	Gude	Patten
Brooks	Halpern	Pike
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Podell
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Pucinski
Button	Hawkins	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Reid, N.Y.
Cahill	Hechler, W. Va.	Reuss
Carey	Helstoski	Rodino
Celler	Hicks	Ronan
Chisholm	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	Howard	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Jacobs	Roybal
Conte	Joelson	Ryan
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Corman	Karth	St. Onge
Culver	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Daddario	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Kluczynski	Stafford
Dellenback	Koch	Stokes
Dent	Leggett	Thompson, N.J.
Derwinski	Lowenstein	Tiernan
Dingell	McCarthy	Tunney
Dwyer	McCloskey	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	McFall	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Whalen
Ellberg	Meeds	Wilson, Charles H.
Esch	Mikva	Wolff
Evans, Colo.	Miller, Calif.	Wydler
Farbstein	Minish	Yates

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson, Ill.	Holifield	O'Neal, Ga.
Barrett	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Bell, Calif.	Kuykendall	Riegle
Burton, Utah	Landgrebe	Rosenthal
Casey	Long, La.	Roudebush
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Rumsfeld
Delaney	Lujan	Sandman
Dickinson	Lukens	Scheuer
Diggs	Macdonald, Mass.	Shriver
Feighan	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Flynt	Matsunaga	Staggers
Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Gray	Myers	Sullivan
Green, Oreg.	Nichols	Udall
Hagan	O'Hara	Waldie
Heckler, Mass.		

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Mr. Hagan for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Long of Maryland for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Waldie against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Casey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Delaney with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Mailliard.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Smith of California with Mr. Myers.

Mr. Roudebush with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Kuykendall with Mr. Lukens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 306, nays 80, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—306

Abbitt	Conable	Hamilton
Abernethy	Conte	Hammer-schmidt
Adair	Corbett	Hanley
Albert	Coughlin	Hanna
Alexander	Cowger	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson, Tenn.	Cramer	Hansen, Wash.
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Harsha
Andrews, N. Dak.	Daniel, Va.	Harvey
Arends	Daniels, N.J.	Hastings
Ashbrook	Davis, Wis.	Hays
Aspinall	de la Garza	Hébert
Ayres	Dellenback	Henderson
Baring	Denney	Hicks
Bates	Dennis	Hogan
Battin	Dent	Horton
Beall, Md.	Derwinski	Hosmer
Belcher	Devine	Hull
Bennett	Dickinson	Hungate
Betts	Donohue	Hunt
Bevill	Dorn	Hutchinson
Biaggi	Dowdy	Ichord
Biester	Downing	Jacobs
Blackburn	Dulski	Jarman
Blanton	Duncan	Joelson
Boggs	Dwyer	Johnson, Calif.
Bow	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Bray	Edmondson	Jonas
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Brock	Edwards, La.	Kazen
Brooks	Erlenborn	Kee
Broomfield	Esch	Keith
Brotzman	Eshleman	King
Brown, Mich.	Evans, Colo.	Kirwan
Brown, Ohio	Evins, Tenn.	Kleppe
Broyhill, N.C.	Fallon	Kluczynski
Broyhill, Va.	Fascell	Kyl
Buchanan	Findley	Kyros
Burke, Fla.	Fish	Landrum
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Langen
Burleson, Tex.	Flood	Latta
Burlison, Mo.	Flowers	Lennon
Bush	Ford, Gerald R.	Lipscomb
Byrnes, Wis.	Foreman	Lloyd
Cabell	Fountain	McClory
Caffery	Frelinghuysen	McClure
Cahill	Frey	McCulloch
Camp	Friedel	McDade
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	McDonald, Mich.
Cederberg	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen
Chamberlain	Fuqua	McFall
Chappell	Galifianakis	McKneally
Clancy	Garmatz	McMillan
Clark	Giaimo	MacGregor
Clausen, Don H.	Gibbons	Madden
Clawson, Del	Goodling	Mahon
Cleveland	Griffin	Mann
Collier	Griffiths	Marsh
Collins	Gross	Martin
Colmer	Grover	Mathias
	Gubser	May
	Haley	
	Hall	

Mayne	Quillen	Symington
Meeds	Railsback	Taft
Meskill	Randall	Talcott
Michel	Rarick	Taylor
Miller, Ohio	Reid, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Mills	Reifel	Teague, Tex.
Minish	Rhodes	Thompson, Ga.
Minshall	Rivers	Thomson, Wis.
Mize	Roberts	Tiernan
Mizell	Robison	Ullman
Mollohan	Rodino	Utt
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Van Deerlin
Montgomery	Rogers, Fla.	Vander Jagt
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Vigorito
Morton	Rostenkowski	Waggonner
Murphy, Ill.	Roth	Wampler
Natcher	Ruppe	Watkins
Nelsen	Ruth	Watson
O'Konski	Satterfield	Watts
Olsen	Saylor	Weicker
O'Neill, Mass.	Schadeberg	Whalley
Passman	Scherle	White
Patman	Schneebeli	Whitehurst
Patten	Scott	Whitten
Pelly	Sebelius	Widnall
Pepper	Shipley	Wiggins
Perkins	Sikes	Williams
Pettis	Sisk	Wilson, Bob
Philbin	Skubitz	Winn
Pickle	Slack	Wold
Pike	Smith, Iowa	Wolff
Pirnie	Smith, N.Y.	Wright
Poage	Snyder	Wyatt
Poff	Springer	Wydler
Pollock	Stafford	Wylie
Preyer, N.C.	Staggers	Wyman
Price, Ill.	Stanton	Yatron
Price, Tex.	Steed	Young
Pryor, Ark.	Steiger, Ariz.	Zablocki
Pucinski	Stephens	Zion
Purcell	Stratton	Zwach
Quie	Stuckey	

NAYS—80

Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Mink
Addabbo	Ellberg	Moorhead
Anderson, Calif.	Farbstein	Morse
Annunzio	Foley	Mosher
Ashley	Ford, William D.	Moss
Berry	Fraser	Nedzi
Bingham	Gallagher	Nix
Blatnik	Gaydos	Ottinger
Boland	Gilbert	Podell
Bolling	Gonzalez	Rees
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Brasco	Gude	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Ronan
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Rooney, N.Y.
Button	Hawkins	Roybal
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Ryan
Carey	Helstoski	St Germain
Celler	Howard	St. Onge
Chisholm	Karth	Schwengel
Clay	Kastenmeier	Stokes
Cohelan	Koch	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Leggett	Tunney
Corman	Lowenstein	Vanik
Culver	McCarthy	Whalen
Daddario	McCloskey	Wilson, Charles H.
Dawson	Mikva	Yates
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—45

Anderson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Barrett	Kuykendall	Riegle
Bell, Calif.	Landgrebe	Rosenthal
Burton, Utah	Long, La.	Roudebush
Casey	Long, Md.	Rumsfeld
Davis, Ga.	Lujan	Sandman
Delaney	Lukens	Scheuer
Diggs	Macdonald, Mass.	Shriver
Feighan	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Flynt	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Gray	Myers	Sullivan
Green, Oreg.	Nichols	Udall
Hagan	O'Hara	Waldie
Heckler, Mass.	O'Neal, Ga.	
Holifield		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Casey for; with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Delany with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Shriver.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Powell.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 251) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 251

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Internal Security: Richard H. Ichord (chairman), Missouri; Claude Pepper, Florida; Edwin W. Edwards, Louisiana; Richardson Preyer, North Carolina; Louis Stokes, Ohio; John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina; William J. Scherle, Iowa.

Resolved, That all bills, resolutions, executive communications, petitions and memorials heretofore referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities in the 91st Congress are hereby referred to the Committee on Internal Security.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, due to the press of other official business I missed the vote on House Resolution 89. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement that had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COURT OPINION REFLECTS FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have often stated that perhaps the most important feature of the Freedom of Information Act is the proviso that any person administratively denied access to a Government record has the right to ask a Federal district court to rule on the propriety of such a refusal.

My faith in the effectiveness of the judicial review section of the act is again borne out by a ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals as reported in the Washington Post this morning. Judge Edward A. Tamm's reported opinion in this case clearly reflects the letter and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act as intended by Congress and I wish to commend him for his insight. The news story follows:

APPEALS COURT RULES AGENCY'S SECRECY ILLEGAL

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

A Federal agency that takes action against a private enterprise on the basis of confidential staff memoranda is required by the Freedom of Information Act to make the documents public, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled yesterday.

In an opinion that flayed the administrative practices of the Commerce Department's Maritime Subsidy Board, Judge Edward A. Tamm said the 1966 Act forbade "indiscriminate administrative secrecy."

Government employes may find it difficult to "operate in a fish bowl," he said, but those affected by the actions of those employes cannot "operate in a darkroom."

If an agency refuses to disclose the background for a ruling, he said, "this court is unaware of how a party can meaningfully prepare a request for reconsideration."

The issue arose in a steamship company's appeal of a Subsidy Board order demanding the return of $3.3 million in Federal subsidies that the company received while allegedly carrying more crew members than necessary on nine ships.

American Mail Line Ltd. sought reconsideration of the order, and asked to be informed of the reasoning that led up to it.

The Board responded that "a memorandum dated Nov. 26, 1965, revised Dec. 20, 1967," was the basis for the ruling and refused to give the memorandum to the company.

The company went to court to seek access to the information, lost in U.S. District court and appealed. While the appeal was pending, Judge Tamm said, the Board released a fully detailed summary of its position and sought to have the appeal dismissed as "moot."

"The backwardness of appellee's administrative procedure is appalling," Judge Tamm said of this maneuver. "The issuance of the Board's decision does not render this cause of action moot for the simple reason that appellants' lack of need for the memorandum is irrelevant to their right to obtain it under the Act. . . . In short, we feel that the issuance of this decision compounds the Board's lamentable administrative practices and procedures."

The Subsidy Board found that 50 men, rather than 58, could have operated the ships. The ships were subsidized under the Merchant Marine Act because they had American crews instead of cheaper foreign crews. The merits of the dispute between the Board and the company were not before the court.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to create an urban mass transportation trust fund and to provide a new program to meet the vital transportation needs of the residents of our cities.

My bill has been designed to be realistic in terms of the expenditures it contemplates and the financing it requires. It is critical that the projects it contemplates be begun now. I believe there is no more important bill before the Congress, and intend to exert every effort to have it promptly enacted into law during this session.

The transportation problems of our Nation are enormous. We are plagued by traffic congestion on our city streets, overcrowding of aircraft in the skies, inadequate rail service into our cities, and a general lack of coordinated, convenient travel facilities. A society which prides itself on its mobility is increasingly in an air-land-and-sea traffic jam that brings it to a standstill.

Chief among our problems is the lack of fast, convenient, efficient, and attractive mass transportation within our cities. Urban mass transportation of high quality is a necessity if our cities are to remain, indeed become, viable and habitable. Yet, since World War II, mass transportation has been in a cycle of increasing costs, decreasing quality, and decreasing numbers of passengers. It behooves us to understand why we have reached this sorry state and to do something about it.

The root of the problem is the private automobile. It has created traffic jams and pollution as to cause people to desert the center cities for the suburbs. It has led to disproportionate expenditures for highways in urban areas. These highways have in many cases wrecked neighborhoods, gobbled up parks and recreational areas, and generally poisoned the environment. If America does not end this infatuation with the private automobile, the bulk of the country may ultimately be paved over.

A major factor in creating the problem is the relatively large amounts of Federal funds that have been available for highway construction—almost $5 billion in the current fiscal year—and the relatively small amounts available for urban mass transportation—less than $200 million in the current fiscal year. Large capital investments for mass transit are vital if we are to have sound development of our cities. These investments can lead to high quality service that will attract riders and reduce dependence on automobiles and the need for building new highways. The destruction of our cities by excessive highway building can be ended.

In 1956, Congress created the highway trust fund to insure availability of suf-

ficient Federal financial assistance to local communities for carrying out a long range program of public investment in mass transit.

In 1969, the Congress must create an urban mass transportation trust fund to insure availability of sufficient Federal financial assistance to local communities for carrying out a long range program of public investment in mass transit. State and local governments lack the resources to fund these activities. Only the Federal Government has the capacity to meet the critical transportation needs of our cities.

The urban mass transportation trust fund I propose would initially be limited to a term of 4 years. This would make its life coterminous with that of the Highway Trust Fund. It would be funded to provide $1 billion in fiscal year 1971, $2 billion in fiscal year 1972, $3 billion in fiscal year 1973, and $4 billion in fiscal year 1974.

These amounts are modest by comparison with the highway trust fund. But we must be realistic with respect to what can be prudently spent in the near term and the availability of financing in the present tight budget situation. I believe the amounts in my bill are sound in these practical respects and yet will get mass transit going. If greater amounts seem prudent at a later date, I will call for them; and in the period after 1974—when I hope the highway trust fund can be terminated—I expect that even greater amounts will be available for urban mass transit.

The urban mass transportation fund will permit active research and development programs, planning in those cities that are just beginning to develop plans, and construction for those cities that have already done sound planning. New facilities will be built and existing facilities improved and expanded. Besides making needed funds immediately available, cities will have the assurance that Federal funds will be available in future years as their planning efforts come to fruition.

The Federal share of the projects will be 90 percent as under the highway trust fund. Broad authorities to make the most productive use of funds would be given the Federal and local administrators of the program. Projects will be fully responsive to the needs of individual cities whatever their circumstances.

In addition to the trust fund, my bill contains two other innovative features. First, it permits advance acquisition of urban land, an increasingly scarce resource, to both reduce costs of projects and permit comprehensive planning. This provision will also allow the program to reap the profit from the increase in value in adjacent land that stems from the sound development of mass transportation. Second, my bill provides for relocation assistance to residents and businessmen affected by construction. This insures a humane program, not one that builds without regard for those who must be displaced for the good of the larger community.

With respect to funding, my bill looks primarily to the automobile excise tax. That tax, now at 7 percent, is scheduled to drop to 5 percent during calendar 1970, 3 percent during 1971, 1 percent during 1972, and to go out of existence on December 31, 1972. The bill would maintain that tax at 7 percent and extend it through June 30, 1974, to coincide with the trust fund. The automobile excise tax produces well over $1 billion per year and should be adequate in itself to fund the trust fund during the first 2 years. To the extent additional revenues are needed to fund the trust fund in later years. I would look to the gasoline excise tax and elsewhere—including general revenues if the budget situation so permitted. I would also consider raising the automobile excise tax, say up to 10 percent.

The automobile excise tax is a particularly appropriate source of revenue for the urban mass transportation trust fund. The overindulgence of the automobile is at the root of the urban transportation problems. Further, this excise tax has never been regarded as a user charge, as its scheduled expiration clearly shows. It is not like the gasoline tax which is generally regarded as a user charge. Using the automobile excise tax, therefore, avoids arguments over proper appropriation of user charges. Even strong advocates of the highway trust fund should be able to agree as to the appropriateness of this source of financing for the urban mass transportation trust fund.

I hope everyone will consider my bill from the standpoint of the public interest. The transportation area is notorious for each industry group seeking only its own interest. The hour is too late for that to go on.

The people whom the urban mass transportation trust fund will help most are the poor, the elderly, the infirm, the young, the disadvantaged—all those for whom the automobile is no alternative. But it will also help us all to live better in our cities. Nothing should have a higher priority in this Congress.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would establish an urban mass transportation trust fund to finance the mass transportation facilities our country needs. The program would commence in fiscal year 1971 when $1 billion would be provided and the program would continue for 4 years with an annual budget increase of $1 billion. This money would be acquired for the program's first 2 years through the continuation of the automobile tax at 7 percent; an additional appropriation would be needed to reach the $3 billion and $4 billion level in fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Federal participation in urban mass transportation construction would be increased from the current urban mass transportation program's two-thirds to 90 percent as provided in the highway trust fund. Thus, we would eliminate the present inducement for a metropolitan area to choose a highway over mass transportation on the basis of greater Federal participation for the former.

As in the Federal highway program, my bill provides for relocation assistance to those displaced by construction of the mass transportation facilities. And it enables the locality to engage in advance acquisition of lands adjacent to the proposed facility. This will allow the local transit program to reap the profit from escalating land values resulting from the construction of a transportation facility instead of letting those private individuals "in the know" obtain a windfall. This provision also would allow for advanced city planning for commercial and housing development in the area surrounding the transit construction.

Finally, under my bill, the current unfair 12½-percent limitation on grants and loans to any one State would be removed. This would enable the money to go where it is most needed: to the metropolitan areas.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will act in establishing this trust fund. Our Nation must greatly increase its urban transportation program to meet the transportation needs of our mushrooming metropolitan areas which will contain at least 70 percent of our Nation's population in 1970. We have established a trust fund for the highways which are destroying the cities. Let us commence to rebuild by providing the cities with the mass transit facilities they so desperately need.

The text of H.R. 7006 follows:

H.R. 7006

A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that the rapid urbanization and the continued dispersal of population and activities within urban areas has made the ability of all citizens to move quickly and cheaply an urgent national goal; that new directions in the Federal assistance programs for urban mass transportation are imperative if efficient, safe and convenient transportation compatible with soundly planned urban areas is to be achieved; and that success will require substantially greater and assured Federal financial participation to permit confident and continuing local planning, and greater flexibility in program administration to conserve scarce resources and to take account of widely varying local conditions. It is the purpose of this Act to create a partnership which permits the local community, through Federal financial assistance, to exercise the initiative necessary to satisfy its mass transportation requirements.

TITLE I—UBRAN MASS TRANSPORTATION REVENUE ACT OF 1969

Creation of trust fund

SEC. 101. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the urban mass transportation trust fund (hereinafter in this Act called the "trust fund"). The trust fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the trust fund as provided by this Act.

Transfer to trust fund

SEC. 102. (a) EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES.—There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to the tax received in the Treasury before July 1, 1974, and which are attributable to liability for tax incurred before July 1, 1974, under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (tax on automobiles, etc.).

The amounts appropriated by this section shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts, referred to in the preceding sentence, received in the

Treasury. Proper adjustment shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(b) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund such additional sums as may be required to make the expenditures referred to in section 104. These sums are to be repayable advances unless otherwise provided.

Management of trust fund

SEC. 103. (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the trust fund, and (after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation) to report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during the current and next ensuing fiscal year, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made.

(b) INVESTMENT.—It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the trust fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. For such purpose such obligations may be acquired (1) on original issue at issue price, or (2) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price. The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of special obligations exclusively to the trust fund. Such special obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yield during the month preceding the date of such issue, on marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt rounded to the nearest one-eighth of one percent. Such special obligations shall be issued only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest. Advances to the trust fund pursuant to section 102(b) shall not be invested.

(c) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the trust fund (except special obligations issued exclusively to the trust fund) may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price, and such special obligations may be redeemed at par plus accrued interest.

(d) INTEREST AND CERTAIN PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the trust fund shall be credited to and form a part of the trust fund.

Expenditures from the trust fund

SEC. 104. (a) URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS.—Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures to meet obligations of the United States which are incurred after June 30, 1970, for fiscal years 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974 under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended (including general administrative expenses).

(b) REPAYMENT OF ADVANCES FROM GENERAL FUND.—Advances made pursuant to section 102(b) shall be repaid with interest to the general fund of the Treasury when the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available in the trust fund for such purposes. Interest shall be at rates computed in the same manner as provided in section 103(b) for special obligations and compounded semiannually.

Limitation on expenditures

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, estimate the amounts which will be available in the trust fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures required to be made from the fund. The Secretary of the Treasury shall advise the Secretary of Transportation whenever, after all other expenditures required to be made from the trust fund have been defrayed, the amounts available in the trust fund (excluding repayable advances) will be insufficient to defray expenditures required to meet obligations incurred under section 104(a). Whenever he is advised of any insufficiency, the Secretary of Transportation shall, for the fiscal year affected, determine the percentage which the amount remaining available is of the amount authorized to be obligated for that fiscal year under section 104(a) and shall, by prorating using that percentage, determine the amount which can be obligated in lieu of the amount which would be obligated but for the provisions of this subsection. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, there will be available in the trust fund (excluding repayable advances) amounts sufficient to defray the obligations previously withheld under section 104(a) for any fiscal year, he shall so advise the Secretary of Transportation who may then obligate such amounts.

Internal revenue amendments

SEC. 106. (a) Subparagraph (A) of section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on passenger automobiles, etc.) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Articles enumerated in subparagraph (B) are taxable at 7 percent. The tax imposed by this subsection shall not apply with respect to articles enumerated in subparagraph (B) which are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer after June 30, 1974."

(b) Section 6412(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to floor stocks refunds on passenger automobiles, etc.) is amended by striking out "January 1, 1972, or January 1, 1973," and inserting in lieu thereof "or July 1, 1974,".

Effective date

SEC. 107. This title shall take effect on the date of enactment.

TITLE II—URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this Act and on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make grants or loans (directly, through the purchase of securities or equipment trust certificates, or otherwise) to assist States and local public bodies and agencies thereof in financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such service with highway and other transportation in such areas. Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and other real and personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Secretary determines that the applicant has or will have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control, through operation or lease or otherwise, over the use of the facilities and equipment. The Secretary may make loans for real property acquisition pursuant to subsection (d) upon a determination, which shall be in lieu of the preceding determinations, that the real property is reasonably required in connection with a mass transportation system and that it will be used for that purpose within a reasonable period. No grant or loan funds shall be used for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses.

"(b) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section. However, loans may be made for projects as to which grants are made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7, and project grants may be made notwithstanding the fact that the real property involved in the project has been or will be acquired as a result of a loan under subsection (d). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 102(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, except that the Secretary may provide for the waiver or forgiveness of the payment of interest on up to 100 percent of any loan made for real property acquisition under subsection (d) when, in his judgment, waiver or forgiveness will further the objectives of this Act and is in the public interest. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, loans may be made under this section only out of the urban mass transportation trust fund established in title I of this Act.

"(c) No financial assistance shall be provided under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of, a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired (after the date of enactment of this Act) from any such company, or for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company, unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (2) the Secretary finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, (3) just and adequate compensation will be paid to such companies for acquisition of their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws, and (4) the Secretary of Labor certifies that such assistance complies with section 13(c) of this Act.

"(d)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make loans under this section to States or local public bodies and agencies thereof to pay the entire cost of acquisition of real property for use as rights-of-way, station sites, and related purposes, on urban mass transportation systems, including the net cost of property management and relocation payments made pursuant to section 7. Repayment of amounts loaned shall be credited to the urban mass transportation trust fund. If a grant is made under subsection (a) for a project involving real property acquired through a loan under this subsection, the grant proceeds may be applied against the loan. Each loan agreement under this subsection shall provide for actual construction of urban mass transportation facilities on

acquired rights-of-way within a period not exceeding ten years following the fiscal year in which the agreement is made. Each agreement shall provide that in the event acquired real property is not to be used for right-of-way purposes, an appraisal of current value will be made at the time of that determination, which shall not be later than ten years following the fiscal year in which the agreement is made. 90 percent of the increase in value, if any, over the original cost of the real property will be paid to the Secretary for credit to the urban mass transportation trust fund.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make loans under this section to States or local public bodies and agencies thereof to pay the entire cost of acquisition of property adjacent to and in reasonable proximity to existing or proposed rights-of-way, station sites, or other facilities, on urban mass transportation systems, including the net cost of property management and relocation payments made pursuant to section 7, where the use of the property for development or redevelopment to a higher use is anticipated, and its acquisition will enhance the ability of the urban mass transportation system to serve the planned development of the urban area. Repayments of amounts loaned shall be credited to the urban mass transportation trust fund. If a grant is made under subsection (a) for a project related to any real property which has been acquired through a loan under this subsection, the grant proceeds may be applied against the loan. However, the cost of real property which has been acquired through a loan under this subsection may not be included as an item in a project for which a grant is made.

"(A) When real property acquired pursuant to this subsection is leased or sold, the lessee or purchaser shall be obliged to operate or develop the property to the uses and in the manner specified in the loan agreement, as originally executed or subsequently modified; and the State or local public body or agency thereof shall pay to the Secretary, under terms and conditions prescribed by him, 90 percent of the increase in value of the real property. The increase in value shall be computed as follows:

"(i) where the real property is sold before the date of institution of new mass transportation service on the right-of-way adjacent to the property, the difference between that sale price, which must be approved by the Secretary after appraisal, and the cost of the property when acquired by the State or local public body or agency thereof; or

"(ii) where the real property has not been sold before the date of institution of new mass transportation service on the right-of-way adjacent to the property, the difference between the appraised value of the property at a time not later than three years after institution of new mass transportation service and the cost of the property when acquired by the State or local public body or agency thereof.

The appraisal shall take into account the effect on the value of the real property of the anticipated mass transportation service and of the land use and zoning specified in the loan agreement, and such other factors as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(B) Amounts repaid shall be credited to the urban mass transportation trust fund, and shall be used by the Secretary to reduce the Federal share of the net project cost of any grant under this Act which is made, or may be made, for a project on the urban mass transportation system for which the loan under this subsection has been made. The State or local share of the increase in value of the real property shall be applied first to reduce the State or local share of the net project cost of any grant under this Act which is made, or may be made, for a project on the urban mass transportation system for which the loan under this subsection has been made. Any part of the State or local share of the increase in value of the real property remaining after application to the net project costs shall be held in reserve by the State or local public body or agency thereof until such time as the Secretary determines that such public body or agency will not in the foreseeable future be the recipient of a capital grant under this Act. In the absence of this determination, and in the event a capital grant under this Act is made, the amount held in reserve will be applied to reduce the local share of the net project cost.

"(3) Loans for the purposes described in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2) may be made independently, or concurrently, or concurrently with a loan or grant made under subsection (a)."

SEC. 202. (a) Subsection 4(a) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, is amended by inserting the following immediately before the word "no" in the first sentence thereof: "and except for loans pursuant to subsection 3(d),"; and substituting in the second to last sentence thereof for the words "two-thirds" and "one-third" the following: "90 percent" and "10 percent".

(b) Section 4 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(c) To finance grants and loans and administrative costs under this Act there is hereby authorized to be obligated not to exceed $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $3 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $4 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. Amounts authorized to be obligated under this subsection shall be available for obligation during the fiscal year for which they were first authorized and shall remain available until obligated. There shall also be available for obligation during any fiscal year such net additions to the urban mass transportation trust fund as have been paid to the Secretary as the proceeds of increased property value pursuant to loans made under subsection (d)(2) of section 3.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the urban mass transportation trust fund, such amounts as may be necessary to liquidate obligations incurred as authorized by subsection (c)".

SEC. 203. Section 7 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1954 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall not make any grant or loan under section 3 of this Act for any project which will cause the displacement of any person, business, or farm operation unless he receives satisfactory assurances from the State or local public body or agency that—

"(1) fair and reasonable relocation and other payments shall be afforded to displaced persons in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f);

"(2) relocation assistance programs offering the services described in subsection (g) shall be afforded to displaced persons; and

"(3) within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement there will be available, to the extent that can reasonably be accomplished, in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families and individuals displaced, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings, as defined by the Secretary, equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and individuals and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

"(b) In order to prevent unnecessary expenses and duplication of functions, a State or local public body or agency thereof may make relocation payments or provide relocation assistance or otherwise carry out the functions required under this chapter by utilizing the facilities, personnel, and services of any other Federal, State, or local government agency having an established organization for conducting relocation assistance programs.

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall approve, and include in any agreement for a grant or loan made under section 3, the cost of providing the payments and services described in subsection (a), except that notwithstanding any other law, the Federal share of the first $25,000 of such payments to any person, on account of any real property acquisition or displacement occurring prior to July 1, 1972, shall be increased to 100 per centum of such cost.

"(2) Any agreement for a grant or loan made for a project under section 3 before the date of enactment of this chapter with respect to property which has not been acquired as of the date of enactment of this chapter under any such program shall be amended to include the cost of providing the payments and services described in subsection (a) with respect to such porperty.

"(d)(1) PAYMENTS FOR ACTUAL EXPENSES.—Upon application approved by the State or local public body or agency thereof, a person displaced by any project for which a grant or loan under section 3 has been made may elect to receive actual reasonable expenses in moving himself, his family, his business, or his farm operation, including personal property.

"(2) OPTIONAL PAYMENTS—DWELLINGS.—Any displaced person who moves from a dwelling who elects to accept the payments authorized by this subsection in lieu of the payments authorized by subsection (d)(1) may receive—

"(i) a moving expense allowance, determined according to a schedule established by the Secretary, not to exceed $200; and

"(ii) a dislocation allowance of $100.

"(3) OPTIONAL PAYMENTS—BUSINESSES AND FARM OPERATIONS.—Any displaced person who moves or discontinues his business or farm operation who elects to accept the payment authorized by this section in lieu of the payment authorized by subsection (d)(1), may receive a fixed relocation payment in an amount equal to the average annual net earnings of the business or farm operation, or $5,000 whichever is the lesser. In the case of a business, no payment shall be made under this subsection unless the State or local public body or agency thereof is satisfied that the business (1) cannot be relocated without a substantial loss of its existing patronage, and (2) is not part of a commercial enterprise having at least one other establishment, not being acquired by the State or by the United States, which is engaged in the same or similar business. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'average annual net earnings' means one-half of any net earnings of the business or farm operation, before Federal, State, and local income taxes, during the two taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which such business or farm operation moves from the real property acquired for such project, and includes any compensation paid by the business or farm operation to the owner, his spouse, or his dependents during such two-year period.

"(e)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, the State or local public body or agency thereof shall make a payment to the owner of real property acquired for a project which is improved by a single-, two-, or three-family dwelling actually owned and occupied by the owner for not less than one year prior to the initiation of negotiations for the acquisition of such property. Such payment, not to exceed $5,000, shall be the amount, if any, which, when added to the acquisition payment, equals the average price required for a comparable dwelling determined, in accordance with standards established by the Secretary, to be a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling adequate to accommodate the displaced owner,

reasonably accessible to public services and places of employment and available on the private market. Such payment shall be made only to a displaced owner who purchases and occupies a dwelling within one year subsequent to the date on which he is required to move from the dwelling acquired for the project. No such payment shall be required or included as a project cost if the owner-occupant receives a payment required by the State law of eminent domain which is determined by the Secretary to have substantially the same purpose and effect as this section and to be part of the cost of the project for which Federal financial assistance is available.

"(2) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, the State or local public body or agency thereof shall make a payment to any individual or family displaced from any dwelling not eligible to receive a payment under subsection (e)(1) which dwelling was actually and lawfully occupied by such individual or family for not less than 90 days prior to the initiation of negotiations for acquisition of such property. Such payment, not to exceed $1,500, shall be the amount which is necessary to enable such person to lease or rent for a period not to exceed two years, or to make the down payment on the purchase of, a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling of standards adequate to accommodate such individual or family in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities.

"(f)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, the State or local body or agency thereof shall reimburse the owner of real property acquired for a project for reasonable and necessary expenses incurred for (i) recording fees, transfer taxes, and similar expenses incidental to conveying such property; (ii) penalty costs for prepayment of any mortgage entered into in good faith encumbering such real property if such mortgage is on record or has been filed for record under applicable State law on the date of final approval of the location of such project; and (iii) the pro rata portion of real property taxes paid which are allocable to a period subsequent to the date of vesting of title in the State or local public body or agency, or the effective date of the possession of such real property by the State or local public body or agency thereof, which is earlier.

"(2) No payment received under this section shall be considered as income for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or for the purpose of determining the eligibility or the extent of eligibility of any person for assistance under the Social Security Act or any other Federal law.

"(g)(1) Each State or local public body or agency thereof shall provide a relocation advisory assistance program which shall include such measures, facilities, or services as may be necessary or appropriate in order—

"(i) to determine the needs, if any, of displaced families, individuals, business concerns, and farm operators for relocation assistance;

"(ii) to assure that, within a reasonable period of time, prior to displacement there will be available, to the extent that can reasonably be accomplished, in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families and individuals displaced, housing meeting the standards established by the Secretary for decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings, equal in number to the number of, and available to, such displaced families and individuals and reasonably accessible to their places of employment;

"(iii) to assist owners of displaced businesses and displaced farm operators in obtaining and becoming established in suitable locations; and

"(iv) to supply information concerning the Federal Housing Administration home acquisition program under section 221(d)(2) of the National Housing Act, the small business disaster loan program under section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act, and other State or Federal programs offering assistance to displaced persons.

"(2) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit any person from exercising any right or remedy available to him under State law with respect to any action of a State or local public body or agency thereof in carrying out this chapter.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the effective date of this section, any Federal agency which acquires real property for use in connection with a project for which a grant or loan under section 3 has been made shall, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, provide the payments and services described in subsections (a), (d), (e), (f), and (g). When real property is acquired by a State or local public body or agency for such a Federal project for purposes of this Act, the acquisition shall be deemed an acquisition by the Federal agency having authority over such project.

"(i)(1) To carry into effect the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may determine to be necessary to assure—

"(i) that the payments authorized by this section shall be fair and reasonable and as uniform as practicable;

"(ii) that a displaced person who makes proper application for a payment authorized for such person by this section shall be paid promptly after a move or, in hardship cases, be paid in advance; and

"(iii) that any person aggrieved by a determination as to eligibility for a payment authorized by this section, or the amount of a payment, may have his application reviewed by the head of the State or local public body or agency thereof making such determination.

"(2) The Secretary may make such other rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this section as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out this section.

"(j) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'person' means—

"(A) any individual, partnership, corporation or association which is the owner of a business;

"(B) any owner, part owner, tenant, or sharecropper who operates a farm;

"(C) an individual who is the head of a family; or

"(D) an individual not a member of a family.

"(2) The term 'family' means two or more individuals living together in the same dwelling unit who are related to each other by blood, marriage, adoption, or legal guardianship.

"(3) The term 'displaced person' means any person who moves from real property on or after the effective date of this chapter as a result of the acquisition or reasonable expectation of acquisition of such real property, which is subsequently acquired, in whole or in part, for a project for which a loan or grant under section 3 is made, or as the result of the acquisition for such a project of other real property on which such person conducts a business or farm operation.

"(4) The term 'business' means any lawful activity conducted primarily—

"(A) for the purchase and resale, manufacture, processing, or marketing of products, commodities, or any other personal property;

"(B) for the sale of services to the public; or

"(C) by a nonprofit organization.

"(5) The term 'farm operation' means any activity conducted solely or primarily for the production of one or more agricultural products or commodities for sale and home use, and customarily producing such products or commodities in sufficient quantity to be capable of contributing materially to the operator's support.

"(6) The term 'Federal agency' means any department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government and any corporation wholly owned by the Government."

SEC. 204. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Except for grants for relocation payments in accordance with section 7, grants made before July 1, 1970, under section 3 for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the aggregate amount of grant funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection 4(b), and grants and loans made on or after July 1, 1970, under section 3 for projects in any one State shall not be limited."

SEC. 205. Nothing herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants, under the authority of sections 6(a), 9, and 11 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, for projects or activities primarily concerned with the relationship of urban transportation systems to the comprehensively planned development of urban areas, or the role of transportation planning in overall urban planning, out of funds appropriated to him for that purpose.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would extend and expand the Hill-Burton hospital construction program for public and private nonprofit hospitals. The authorization would be for 3 years begining July 1, 1970.

Joining with me in sponsoring this legislation are the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ).

First, this legislation would extend the existing authorization of appropriations for grants for modernization and new construction of public or other nonprofit hospitals and public health centers, public or other nonprofit facilities for long-term care, and public or other nonprofit rehabilitation facilities. The Federal share of these grants would total $285 million for 1971, $290 million for 1972, and $295 million for 1973.

Second, this legislation would establish a new program of guaranteed loans to nonprofit private agencies for the modernization of nonprofit hospitals, facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers.

Under this new loan guarantee program, the amount guaranteed, when added to any grant or loan under the program, may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, the Federal Government would pay one-half of the interest on the guaranteed loan, up to a maximum of 3 percent.

The maximum principal of loans with respect to which guarantees may be issued would be $400 million for fiscal year 1971, $800 million for fiscal year 1972, and $1.2 billion for fiscal year 1973.

Under this legislation, allotments to the various States would be made on the basis of population, extent of the need for the type of facility involved, and financial need of the respective States.

This allotment formula would be the same for the loan guarantee program and the grant program for new construction and modernization.

In addition, a State would retain the right, after receipt of the allotment, to determine priorities in the distribution of the allotment within the State.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a new approach to solving the needs of our Nation with respect to hospital beds and related health-care facilities.

The statistics from the Public Health Service indicate the need for this new approach to meeting our hospital needs. As of 1968, in our general hospitals alone, there was a need for 85,007 new beds and for a modernization increase of 240,624 others. In my own State of Florida, where there are a large number of senior citizens, there is a need for 10,805 new beds in general hospitals and for a modernization increase of 5,238 others.

The national average for the cost of construction of new beds is approximately $35,000 per bed; for modernization, the average is $30,000 per bed.

For long term care, such as nursing homes and the like, the bed need is even greater. There is an estimated need of some 164,430 new long term care beds and 214,506 through modernization. This need could be met at an average cost of $10,000 per bed.

These figures indicate a national need of more than $14 billion for general hospital new beds, modernization, and long-term care facilities. This legislation that I am introducing has a projected cost over 3 years of approximately $972 million. This is the Federal share, which of course will be matched by the States and private nonprofit agencies.

I realize that we are not going to meet our hospital and long-term care needs this year, or next, or even in the next 5 years, but this legislation puts new impetus into the construction and modernization programs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should do everything we can to reduce the cost of hospital care. For that reason, I have included specific language in this bill which would require that the extended-care facilities of a hospital be structurally part of or physically connected with, and under the supervision of the professional staff of, such hospital before any project for construction or modernization of any general hospital is approved by a State agency.

The purpose of the extended-care facilities is to give the patient the necessary care as he recovers from his illness, but yet move him out of the acute-bed area, and thus reduce the daily cost of the hospital room to the patient without reducing the quality of care.

A further new provision in this legislation provides for grants for the modernization of emergency rooms in general hospitals for the improved treatment of accident victims and the handling of other medical emergencies. Ten million dollars would be authorized for each of the 3 fiscal years.

I am hopeful that early hearings can be held on this legislation, and that we can move ahead to continue the commitment to the citizens of this Nation in their health-care needs.

INSURED LOANS FOR REA BORROWERS

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide future financing for REA borrowers through a program of insured loans.

Two years ago I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 7390, to assist REA electric borrowers to move from a position of complete dependence upon the Federal Government toward the commercial money market. The bill I am introducing today contains the same provisions for REA electric borrowers, and in addition would create an insured loan program for REA telephone borrowers.

In essence, this bill would amend the Rural Electrification Act in three respects:

First, to establish two loan accounts, one for the electric program, and the other for the telephone program, to provide a source of funds for continued direct loans for some borrowers;

Second, to establish a program whereby the Administrator could provide a Government guarantee or insurance to assist both electric and telephone borrowers to move toward the private money market; and

Third, to make certain amendments to the original act which would be appropriate in connection with the establishment of loan accounts and insured loan programs.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that REA telephone borrowers, including several in my district, have an acute financial need for new capital. Most of them recognize that there is much criticism of the 2-percent-loan program, and that the REA is finding it increasingly difficult to get appropriations from Congress for this program when other citizens are paying rates of interest of 7 percent or more. The problem is to find new sources of capital for the REA borrowers. In my opinion, the approach of my bill is the solution to their problem, because they can move immediately to the commercial money market, assisted by a Government guarantee. I believe it is better than the "bank" approach, which many REA borrowers do not like.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am privileged to be vice chairman, is scheduled to hold hearings on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week to consider H.R. 7, a bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, to establish a telephone "bank." I recognize that there is not enough time for witnesses to testify this week on my bill. However, I hope that the committee will be able to hold hearings on my bill at some future date, and that it will be given serious consideration before a decision is reached upon the future direction of REA financing. I believe that the new administration and the new Congress should carefully study all the alternatives before amending the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF THE CAPTURE OF THE U.S.S. "PUEBLO"

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has now become apparent that more is at issue in the case of the circumstances surrounding the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by the North Koreans than merely the behavior of Commander Bucher and his men. Grave questions about the action of high Navy officials and the adequacy of the Navy command have been raised. As a result, the Navy now appears to be in a position of passing judgment on the facts of its own case in the current inquiry being conducted in California.

For that reason, I called upon Secretary of Defense Laird and Secretary of the Navy Chafee last week in duplicate letters—which appear on pages 3327–3329 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to end the naval inquiry immediately and turn it over to a more impartial body.

It is my feeling that the Congress is the appropriate body to conduct a fair and thorough investigation of this matter, and to assess the facts and their implications for national policy. I also proposed, therefore, that the Congress should resume and complete the current naval inquiry if and when it is terminated.

Several committees of the Congress have indicated an interest in investigating various aspects of the *Pueblo* case, raising the possibility that the officers and men of the *Pueblo* might have to be subjected to multiple, redundant appearances before a series of inquiring congressional committees. I feel strongly, however, that the men of the *Pueblo* should not be made to endure any more strain and hardship, beyond what they have already suffered at the hands of their North Korean captors, than is necessary to obtain a complete and unbiased record of the facts of the *Pueblo* case.

To avoid the unfair and unjustifiable hardships that would be imposed on the officers and men of the *Pueblo* by multiple congressional hearings, I indicated to the chairmen of the major standing committees of the House and Senate currently considering investigations of the *Pueblo* incident that I would offer a resolution to provide for a consolidation of congressional investigative efforts.

I am today introducing such a concurrent resolution. It calls for immediate suspension of the current naval inquiry, and formation of a special joint committee to be known as the Joint Investigating Committee on the *Pueblo* Capture, to be composed of nine members of the

House—appointed by the Speaker—and nine members of the Senate—appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. The committee is instructed to study and survey all facts and issues relating directly to the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, to make all such information available to standing committees of the Congress, and to make as much information available to the public as is consistent with the national interest and security. It is also instructed to make whatever recommendations it deems appropriate based on this information, but it is given no power to receive or report legislation.

I have received a reply from Secretary of the Navy Chafee, on behalf of himself and Secretary of Defense Laird, indicating their disagreement with my position that the current inquiry by the Navy should be terminated and resumed by a less biased body, preferably a committee of the Congress. The Navy inquiry, however, as Secretary Chafee has noted in his reply to me, "will not preclude a later congressional investigation, if that is deemed appropriate."

It is crucial that the Congress indicate its sense as my resolution states, that the current naval inquiry be halted, to be resumed and completed in the Congress, where a fairer hearing and assessment of the facts can be achieved. In addition, congressional action must be consolidated to avoid subjecting the officers and men of the *Pueblo* to undue hardship.

I hope, therefore, that the distinguished chairmen of the standing committees of the House and Senate most concerned with this matter, and the rest of my colleagues in the House and Senate, will join me in support of this concurrent resolution.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SYSTEM TO DETERMINE FAIR FARM PRICES

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the National Agricultural Bargaining Act. This legislation, which proposes to establish a national collective bargaining system for determining fair farm prices, has been introduced in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator of Minnesota, WALTER MONDALE.

As you may recall, this legislation was introduced in the House and Senate last year, and hearings were conducted on the Senate side. I think those hearings effectively demonstrated the need for this legislation and I am hopeful our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in its support.

The Agricultural Bargaining Act would have the following provisions:

First. To let producers decide when a commodity price is too low and when bargaining action is needed.

Second. To let producers decide with a commoditywide referendum if they want a bargaining committee.

Third. To let producers decide who will represent them on a bargaining committee.

Fourth. To provide expanded authority for producers to strengthen prices under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937.

Fifth. To provide penalties to be imposed upon those who conspire to intimidate, discriminate against, or otherwise coerce producers in their efforts to increase prices and to strengthen market power.

All those familiar with the situation in rural America today know that farm families do not have the power to bargain effectively for a fair return for their production. I believe it is imperative that the Congress act now to give our farmers the bargaining muscle they must have. The current cost-price squeeze should prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that our farmers cannot rely on the generosity of processors and consumers.

Some are calling for an end to our important farm programs, but I read the mail in my office each morning and I do not believe they are speaking for our farmers. I intend to do all I can to fight for passage of the Bargaining Act and other equally important farm bills and I hope the Members of this body—on both sides of the aisle—will join in this fight to help our farm population.

FEDERAL AID FOR CAMPUS RIOTERS AND REVOLUTIONARIES? CONGRESS AND AMERICAN PEOPLE SAY "NO"

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States that says the American Republic has to be put in a position of financing its own destruction. However, Federal educational aid to campus rioters and revolutionaries adds up to just exactly that. Congress passed two laws last year aimed specifically at cutting off such financial aid, but it has now been revealed that not only have these laws not been enforced, but they were both ignored and downgraded by officials in the Johnson administration who, when asked by universities for clarification and interpretation, sent out a memo full of reasons why the laws should be repealed.

Figures show that one out of every six undergraduate students in the United States receives a scholarship, loan, or grant from the U.S. Government, or has a bank loan secured with Government backing. It is also clear that a good many of the students most actively engaged in disrupting classes and administration and tying up major universities around the country are on the receiving end of taxpayers' money. Five hundred and forty-nine students were arrested so far this school year at San Francisco State University, for example, and 122 of these were getting Federal help.

The laws we passed last year were to act in different ways. One provided that the Office of Education in HEW was to withhold Federal scholarships and loans from any student convicted of trespassing or some other disorder that meant disrupting the school. The other law provided that the university had to initiate proceedings. If the university determined a federally aided pupil had caused "serious" disruption of the campus, then his Federal support was to be stopped.

It is said now that the laws are "unenforceable" and the following reasons are given:

First, the claim is made that the Federal Office of Education cannot do anything because it has no record of which students receive Federal money and therefore cannot determine who should lose Federal support. About $500 million is given annually to colleges in scholarships and loan money to be distributed at the discretion of the school itself. Under present policies, the Government does not know who eventually gets it.

To correct this, I would suggest a master list from each university, giving the names of who has received the money, then another list of students suspended or convicted for campus disorders. Both lists would be made available to the Office of Education, which could then rule the student ineligible for more money.

The second law passed by Congress puts the burden on the university, telling it, in effect, to police itself, and cut off Federal aid to a student who has disrupted campus life. This has been ignored for several reasons:

First. Some university officials oppose the law, saying it would penalize a poor student, making him leave school for lack of funds, while the student with money could stay. To this I would respond that it makes no difference—rich student, poor student—no one has any business getting Federal money for his education who then turns around and disrupts the normal life of his university and, most important of all, of his classmates, who are there to further their education and not cause trouble for others. Besides, the university officials who oppose the law to the point of ignoring it are missing a vital factor: if they do not like the law, then they should work to have it changed. Their actions are part of that malicious doctrine of "selective obedience" to the laws, and obeying only those the individual chooses to observe, that has caused this country so much grief and anguish over the past few years.

Second. Universities say an act serious enough to cut off Federal funds is also serious enough for outright expulsion of the student. Fine, if the university expels the rioter, but this has not been done. The campus communications building at Brandeis University was occupied for 10 days last month. So far not one student involved has been suspended, and one-fourth of the Brandeis students are getting Federal aid.

Third. Universities have received no guidance from Washington on how to enforce the law. As mentioned earlier, former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen's "guidelines" to universities consisted mainly of why the law should be repealed. Former Secretary Cohen's time to make these points was while the legislation was being considered by Congress. Once the law is passed, it was his job to enforce it, and not try to undercut it. I am confident that the new administration takes a different view of the laws of the land as drafted, acted upon, and passed by the U.S. Congress.

Fourth. Enforcement of the law would only stir up more trouble. This is no excuse at all and should not even be offered as one. We either have laws or we do not have. If their enforcement is shied away from by spineless officials, then it is time for our universities to place in positions of authority men like Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, at San Francisco State University, who will not meekly submit to outright anarchy.

Fifth. About half of the Federal aid programs go to students in the form of loans from banks, which have been guaranteed by the Federal Government, and the Government cannot break its contract with the banks. This, admittedly, is a difficult problem and would take extremely careful legislation to handle. How do you discipline the student, yet protect the university, the bank, and the Government?

The U.S. Office of Education has already suggested to universities that applicants for Federal aid sign a statement that they have not had their aid cut off under the law at another university. At present, an act at one college leading to suspension still allows the student to switch schools and receive Federal aid. But a student's actions, serious enough to mean a cutoff of funds but not serious enough for suspension, means he cannot get Federal aid at another college. These contradictions should be resolved.

The most disruptive students generally are those who complain the loudest that they are being treated like "children" as if they were not capable of "responsibility." There is some truth in this, but I myself have yet to see very many really responsible, carefully thought-out and constructive suggestions come out of all the picketing and shrieking of obscenities. Most of it is, quite flatly, revolution for revolution's sake, often instigated and ramrodded by outside agitators who know they can find a bunch of simple, willing stooges ready and waiting to follow blindly wherever some demagog leads.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) who is chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, recently went right to the heart of this matter. She said:

> We are faced with the fact that we have romantic revolutionaries and anarchists who are simply out to destroy the colleges and universities in which they are enrolled . . . If a person on a college campus is not there to get a college education, he does not have the right to an education paid for by taxpayers.

And that is in a few well-chosen words the sentiment which I am sure is heartily endorsed by the overwhelming majority of Americans, many of whom did not have any sort of Federal benefits for their own college education but worked their way through alone. Her subcommittee will be holding hearings later this year on withdrawing Federal loans and scholarships to students who disrupt campuses. I intend to request permission to testify at these hearings, and at that time present specific legislation to help deal with the problems outlined above.

Dr. Sidney Hook of New York University is an outstanding writer and civil libertarian whose credentials cannot be challenged. In a recent Atlantic Monthly article, entitled "The War Against the Democratic Process," Dr. Hook delivered a masterful rebuttal to those who defend student violence. He ended with these words:

> One sign of responsibility is the making of an intelligent response not only to events that have occurred but to the possibilities of what might occur. The faculties and student bodies of this country can measure up to their responsibilities only by addressing themselves now, separately and cooperatively, not so much to the conquest of power in the academy or general community but primarily to the problems of achieving the best liberal education possible under the imperfect conditions of American society.

The title for Dr. Hook's article was remarkably apt, for this is nothing less than a "war against the democratic process." And the time has come to completely cut off Federal Government support from those who are so ardently working to destroy everything that same Federal Government stands for.

MOST FOREIGN DAIRY STANDARDS INADEQUATE FOR AMERICAN CONSUMER

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a proposal which would require all imported dairy products to meet American sanitary standards. At this time only Canada and New Zealand have been certified as having sanitary standards comparable to ours.

The Food and Drug Administration has provided me with the following report of the seizures of foreign dairy products it has made in the past 3 years:

Item No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date
65	Casein, hydrochloric, 67,200 lbs	Australia		Bacteriological contamination, held under insanitary conditions during shipment.	Philadelphia, Pa	Jan. 25, 1966
66	Casein, lactic, 54,115 lbs	Argentina		do	do	Jan. 6, 1966
67	Colby cheese, 2,720 cartons	Australia	David Lavery & Son Proprietary, Ltd., Melbourne.	Contains poisonous substances, DDT, DDE, and TDE.	do	Jan. 10, 1966
68	Sap Sago cheese, 1,199 lbs	Switzerland	Geska, Glarus	Contains poisonous substances, DDT, lindane, and TDE.	New York, N.Y	Feb. 1, 1966
69	Sap Sago cheese, 3,395 lbs	do	do	do	do	Mar. 10, 1966
71	Sardo cheese, 75 cartons	Argentina	Capai, S.R.L., Buenos Aires	Mandatory labeling omitted		Mar. 15, 1966
72	Swiss cheese, green, 10,822 lbs	Switzerland	Gesellschaft Schweizerischer, Glarus	Contains poisonous substances, DDT, lindane, and TDE.	do	Feb. 11, 1966
73	Swiss cheese, green, 4,268 lbs	do	Geska, Glarus	do	do	Feb. 23, 1966
1863	Cheese, 50 cartons	Argentina	Casento Sociedad Responsabilidat Ltda., Buenos Aires.	Contains benzene hexachloride	do	Apr. 14, 1966
1864	Cheese, 20,576 lbs	do	Marre y cia, Buenos Aires	do	do	Apr. 11, 1966
1865	Cheese 100 cases	do	Coffee Hnos. Com Ind. S.R.L, LaPlata, Buenos Aires.	do	do	Mar. 4, 1966
1866	Cheese 118 cases	Australia	David Lavery & Son, Ltd., Melbourne	Contains DDT, DDE, and TDE	Newark, N.J	Mar. 25, 1966
1867	Cheese, 92 lbs	Canada	Canada Packers, Ltd., Toronto, Ontario	Mite infested	Buffalo, N.Y	Apr. 19, 1966
1868	Cheese, 300 lbs	Denmark	J. Hansen Co., Aarhus	Contains dieldrin	Minneapolis, Minn	Mar. 28, 1966
1869	Cheese, 200 cartons	Italy	Eili Mannoni fu Paolo, Thiesi	Contains fly eggs and maggots	Boston, Mass	Do.
1870	Cheese, 100 crates	West Germany	Edelweiss Mich. K. Hoefelmayr, Gmbl Kempten, Netherlands.	Decomposed	New York, N.Y	May 11, 1966
3317	Sardo cheese, 14,339 lbs	Argentina	River Plate Dairy Co., S.A., Buenos Aires	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	May 16, 1966
3318	Sardo cheese, 6,931 lbs	do	River Plate Dairy Co., Buenos Aires	do	do	May 20, 1966
3319	Sardo cheese, 14,048 lbs	do	do	do	do	June 1, 1966
3320	Sardo cheese, 20,781 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
3321	Sardo cheese, grated, 50 cartons	do	Casanto, S.R.L., Buenos Aires	do	do	June 2, 1966
3322	Sardo and Reggianito cheese, 6,056 lbs	do	River Plate Dairy Co., Buenos Aires	do	do	May 16, 1966
4111	Buttermix 1,018 cartons	Belgium	Ets St. Gery, S.A., Brussels	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride, DDT, and dieldrin.	Port Everglades, Fla.	July 8, 1966
4112	Buttermix, 1,019 cartons	do	do	do	do	Do.
4113	Buttermix, 1,018 cartons	do	do	do	do	Do.
4114	Buttermix, 1,019 cartons	do	do	do	do	Do.
4115	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
4116	Buttermix, 708 cartons	do	do	Contains a pesticide chemical, benzene hexachloride.	Houston, Tex	July 19, 1966
4117	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
4118	Buttermix, 985 cartons	do	do	do	do	Aug. 1, 1966
4119	Buttermix, 900 cartons	do	Utex, S.A., Geneva, Switzerland	do	do	Do.
4120	Buttermix, 1,580 cartons	do	do	do	do	Do.
4121	Buttermix, 1,400 cartons	do	do	do	do	Do.
4122	Buttermix, 11,200 lbs	do	do	Contains an unsafe food additive, BHC	New York, N.Y	Aug. 10, 1966
4123	Edam cheese, 5,861 cartons	Netherlands	Bernard Schulisch, Hamburg, West Germany	Insect infested	do	June 23, 1966
4124	Grapex, 330,680 lbs	Belgium	Ecoral, Dilbeek	Contains an unsafe food additive, pesticide residues.	Chicago, Ill	July 5, 1966
4125	Grapex, 122,806 lbs	do	do	do	do	July 21, 1966

Item No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date
4127	Junex, 14,980 cartons	Belgium	Nicolas Falise, Antwerp	Contains unsafe food additives; benzene hexachloride, DDT, DDE, dieldrin, and TDE; contains nondescript dirt and was held under insanitary conditions during shipment.	Atlanta, Ga	July 14, 1966
4128	Junex, 9,500 cartons	do	Nicolas Falise Co., Brussels	Contains unsafe food additives; benzene hexachloride, DDT, DDE, dieldrin, and TDE.	Savannah, Ga	July 22, 1966
4129	Pecorino cheese, 2,302 lbs	Italy	Ropconi, Naples	Filthy, unfit for food	Chicago, Ill	Aug. 8, 1966
5760	Cheese, 600 packages	Switzerland	Cholet Cheese Co., Ltd., Burgdorf	Decomposed	San Francisco, Calif.	Aug. 19, 1966
5761	Cremex, 228,346 lbs	Belgium	Ecoval, Antwerp	Contains unsafe food additives	Los Angeles, Calif	Aug. 16, 1966
5762	Cremex, 84,202 lbs	do	Interexport Friedberg & Co., Brussels	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y	Aug. 22, 1966
6142	Gorgonzola cheese, 1,320 lbs	Italy	Garancini, S.P.A., Carnate	Decomposed	San Francisco, Calif	Sept. 12, 1966
4502	Butsug, 2 cartons	Netherlands	Kasehandel-Erzaugungs-gesellschaft, Austria. Linz,	Contains unsafe food additives	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 10, 1966
4503	Butter-sugar mixture, 36 cases	France	Union Export Co., Paris	Contains a deleterious substance, benzene hexachloride.	San Francisco, Calif	Sept. 21, 1966
4507	Kasseri cheese, 22,004 lbs	Bulgaria	Rodopa, Associated State Enterprise, Sofia	Contains an unsafe food additive and animal dung.	New York, N.Y	Sept. 26, 1966
7161	Cheese spread, with smoked herring (pasteurized), 2 cases.	Norway	O. Kavli, A.S., Bergen	Contains a poisonous suostance, pesticide chemicals.	Minneapolis, Minn	Oct. 20, 1966
7163	Edam cheese, baby, 180 packages	Netherlands	De Producent, Gouda	Insect infested		Oct. 21, 1966
7164	Koshkoval cheese, 11,583 lbs	Yugoslavia	Agrd Export-Import, Beograd, Mitita	Moldy	New York, N.Y	Oct. 27, 1966
7848	Colby cheese, 220,460 lbs	Bulgaria	Rodops Associated State Enterprise, Sofia	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Nov. 3, 1966
8188	Cheddar cheese, 3,749 lbs	Canada	Pet Milk of Canada, Ltd., Scarborough, Ontario.	Mite infested	Buffalo, N.Y	Dec. 2, 1966
8189	Colby cheese, 56,199 lbs	Australia	David Lavery & Son Proprietary, Ltd., Melbourne.	Contains DDT and related compounds over tolerance levels.	Philadelphia, Pa	Nov. 30, 1966
8190	Colby cheese, 55,972 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8191	Colby cheese, 57,461 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8192	Colby cheese, 5,610 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8193	Colby cheese, 56,145 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8194	Colby cheese, 56,160 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8195	Colby cheese, 56,043 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8196	Colby cheese, 56,689 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8197	Colby cheese, 55,656 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8198	Colby cheese, 56,137 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8199	Colby cheese, 32,870 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
8200	Colby cheese, 8,333 cartons	New Zealand	New Zealand Dairy Board, Wellington	Contains pesticide residue	Houston, Tex	Dec. 21, 1966
8201	Colby cheese, 741,360 lbs	do	do	Contains pesticide chemicals, DDT, DDE, and TDE.	Galveston, Tex	Dec. 29, 1966
33	——— ———, 4,256 cartons		do		Tacoma, Wash	Jan. 4, 1967
34	Reggianito cheese, 150 loaves	Argentina	Estableimento Mecanico, Kremnitzer, SRL, Buenos Aires.	Contains an unsafe pesticide chemical, benzene hexachloride.	Boston, Mass	Jan. 30, 1967
503	Colby cheese, 170,240 lbs	New Zealand	New Zealand Dairy Board, Wellington	Contains an unsafe pesticide chemical	Tacoma, Wash	Feb. 16, 1967
505	Swiss cheese and Gruyer processed cheese, 6,490 lbs.	Switzerland	Weitifurrer International, Zurich	Unfit for food, dimethyl anilene present in product and containers.	New York, N.Y	Feb. 17, 1967
2041	Colby cheese and Flanders cheese, 982 cartons.	Belgium	ETS, Freddy Baines, S.A., Antwerp	False labeling: identity of product misrepresented; contains unsafe food additives, DDT, HE, DDE, and TDE.	do	Apr. 13, 1967
2042	Dari-Sweet, 164,340 lbs	do	J. Brand, A.S. Kalvsund, Ribs, Denmark	Contains unsafe food additives, BHC, DDT, DDE, dieldrin, and TDE.	Atlanta, Ga	Mar. 31, 1967
2044	Feta cheese, 12,714 lbs	Bulgaria	Rodopa, Proforma, Sofia	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT and DDE.		Mar. 29, 1967
2049	Monterey Jack cheese, 5,000 lbs	United States	Koffman Food Importers, Vancouver, British Columbia.	Contains E. Coli and a high bacterial count	Blaine, Wash	Apr. 3, 1967
4058	——— ———, 600 cartons	France	Fromageries Bel, Paris	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Milwaukee, Wis	June 13, 1967
4062	Reggianito cheese, 275 cartons	Argentina	C.A.P.A.I., S.R.L., Buenos Aires	Decomposed	San Francisco, Calif	July 17, 1967
5236	Cream cheese, 17 cartons	Denmark	H. Tholstrup, Copenhagen	do	New York, N.Y	Aug. 17, 1967
5237	Fantina cheese, 4,262 lbs	Italy	Nicolao Fuchs, Novara	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Aug. 10, 1967
5239	Parmesan cheese, grated, 5,000 lbs	Argentina	Herbert Ahbehsesra, S.R.L., Buenos Aires	Contains a pesticide chemical, benzene hexachloride.	San Francisco, Calif	July 21, 1967
6153	Cheese, 360 lbs	France	Establissements Avenal, Le Havre	Contains mold, and inaccurate contents statement.	do	Aug. 28, 1967
6156	Parmesan cheese, grated, 600 lbs	Canada	Thomas J. Lipton, Ltd., Bramalea, Ontario	Contains insect filth	Buffalo, N.Y	Sept. 14, 1967
6811	Feta cheese, 20,202 lbs	Bulgaria	Union Economic D'Etat, Sofia	Contains an unsafe food additive, BHC	New York, N.Y	Oct. 6, 1967
6812	Kasseri cheese, 11,006 lbs	do	Agro Export, Rijeka, Yugoslavia	do	do	Do.
6813	Sap Sago cheese, 3,086 lbs	Switzerland	Gesellchaft Schweizeilscher, Geska	Contains poisonous substance, DDT and lindane.	do	Oct. 3, 1967
	Feta cheese, 53,109 pounds	Bulgaria	Associated State Enterprise, Sofia	Unsafe food additive	do	Oct. 6, 1967
	Reggianito Parmesan cheese, granted, 6,600 pounds.	Argentina	Casanto, S.R.L., Buenos Aires	Contains lindane	San Francisco, Calif	Oct. 16, 1967
	Parmesan cheese, grated, 6,600 pounds	do	do	do	do	Nov. 14, 1967
	Sao Sago cheese, 300 pounds	West Germany	Richter & Co., Hamburg	do	New York, N.Y	Nov. 21, 1967
	Alps cheese, 492 cases	Rumania	Prodexport Foreign Trade State Co., 5-9, Bucharest.	Contains benzene hexachloride	Philadelphia, Pa	Dec. 21, 1967
	Sap Sago cheese, 6,173 lbs	Switzerland	Geska, Schaffhausen	Contains DDT	New York, N.Y	Jan. 31, 1968
	Riddar cheese, 29,846 lbs	Sweden	Svenska Mejeriernas Riksforeining, Stockholm	Contains mold	do	Feb. 21, 1968
	Cheese, 252 lbs	West Germany	Harder & de Voss, Hamburg	Decomposed	San Francisco, Calif	Apr. 8, 1968
	Cheese, 819 lbs	Switzerland	Probst & Co	Quantity of sodium misrepresented	New York, N.Y	Mar. 21, 1968
	Cheese, Samaoe, 5,392 lbs	France	Uk Cheese Export, Ltd., Braedstrup, Denmark	Contains donzone hexachloride	Philadelphia, Pa	May 29, 1968
	Cheese, gouda (process cheese), 16,038 lbs.	Israel	Kfir, Ltd., Haifa	Contains a food additive, donzone hexachloride.	New York, N.Y	Do.
	Milk, sweetened, condensed; and milk, skimmed, sweetened, condensed, 4,629 lbs.	Netherlands	Holland Canned Milk, Ltd., Amsterdam	No valid import milk permit	do	May 22, 1968
	Cheese, Gruyere, 66 cases	Switzerland	Chalet Cheese Co., Burgdorf	Contains poisonous substances, BHG	Milwaukee, Wis	June 14, 1968
	Cheese spread, pasteurized process, 7,200 packages.	France	Fromageries Bel La Vache Rit, Paris	Contains an unsafe food additive, BHC	San Francisco, Calif	June 21, 1968
	Cheese spread, pasteurized process, 960 packages.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Gruyere, 334 cases	Switzerland	Chalet Cheese Co., Burgdorf	Contains a deleterious substance, BHC	Milwaukee, Wis	July 2, 1968
	Cheese, Samsee, 44,092 lbs	Italy	Uk Cheese Export, Ltd., Braedstrup	do	Philadelphia Pa	Do.
	do	do	UK Cheese Export, Ltd., Braedstrup, Denmark	Contains BHC	do	Do.
	Cheese, 70 bdls	West Germany	Zitsch & Nascher, Bodanfelde	Contains insect larva, soiled and is decomposed.	Chicago, Ill	Sept. 11, 1968
	Cheese, Emmental, 1,200 wheels	Switzerland	Swiss Cheese Union, Bern	Contains poisonous substance, BHC and dieldrin.	Milwaukee, Wis	Sept. 26, 1968
	Cheese, cream (processed) 10,600 lbs	Denmark	Birkum Ostefabrik, Copenhagen	Contains mold and leaking cartons	Chicago, Ill	Aug. 6, 1968
	Cheese, Gouda base, 222 lbs	Belgium	Franco Suisse, Bruxelles	Contains excess pesticides	New York, N.Y	Aug. 15, 1968
	Milk, enzyme treated, 200 lbs	Japan	Takasago Perfumery Co., Ltd., Tokyo	Contains benzene hexachloride	do	Aug. 7, 1968
	Cheese, 240 lbs	France	Cumembert des Prelots, St. Paulin	Contains an unsafe food additive, BHC	San Francisco, Calif	Oct. 16, 1968
	Cheese, 750 lbs	do	Fernand Plegnier, Annecy	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 15 lbs	do	Union de Producteurs En Produits Laiters & Avicoles, Paris.	do	do	Oct. 11, 1968

Item No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date
	Cheese, Auricchio, 17,316 lbs	Italy	Gennaro Auricchio, Naples	Contains unsafe food additives	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 26, 1968
	Cheese, Grinder, 170,297 lbs	Switzerland	Geiser & Schmuts, Aarwangen	Contains mold	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 4, 1968
	Cheese, Vice, 4,432 lbs	Greece	Dodoni Dairy Cooperative, Jannina	Contains an unsafe food additive, BHC	New York, N.Y.	Oct. 3, 1968
	Cheese, 320 lbs	France	Etablissements Avonel, Le Havre	Contains benzene hexachloride	San Francisco, Calif.	Oct. 25, 1968
	Cheese, 2,400 packages	do	Fromageries Bel, Paris	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 3,600 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 720 lbs	do	Fromagerie dn Chateau de Flamboin a Gouaix, Seine Et-Marne.	do	do	Nov. 6, 1968
	Cheese, 120 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Edam, 8,377 lbs	Argentina	S.A. Luis Magnasco Cia., Lda., Modelo	do	do	Nov. 12, 1968
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 26,556 lbs	Italy	Rodolfa Ranconi, Milano	Maggot infested	Philadelphia, Pa.	Nov. 7, 1968
	Cheese, Sardo, 17,912 lbs	Argentina	Ratto Delfino Y Cia., Buenos Aires	Contains benzene hexachloride	New York, N.Y.	Nov. 12, 1968
	Dry skim milk powder, 40,000 lbs	Canada	Cooperative Agricole De Granby, Montreal, Quebec.	Contains salmonella	Champlain, N.Y.	Nov. 1, 1968
	Cheese, 1,400 lbs	France	A. Gouaix, Seine-et-Marne	Contains benzene hexachloride	San Francisco, Calif.	Dec. 19, 1968
	Cheese, 480 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 525 lbs	do	Entremont, S.A., Annecy	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 2,400 lbs	do	Fromageries Bel Paris, Paris	do	do	Dec. 17, 1968
	Cheese, 675 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 2,025 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Big Marc, 292.50 lbs	do	Entremont, S.A., Annecy	do	do	Dec. 19, 1968
	Cheese, Parmesan (grated), 22,000 lbs	Italy	D. M. Vonk & Co,. Rotterdam, Netherlands	do	do	Dec. 17, 1968
	Cheese, Sardo, 38,683 lbs	Argentina	Herbert A. H. Behrines, S.R.L., Buenos Aires	do	New York, N.Y.	Dec. 16, 1968
	Cheese, Sardo (hard grating), 7,820 lbs	do	Compania Argentina Productos Agropecuarios, Buenos Aires.	do	do	Dec. 18, 1968
	Cheese, Extra Balkan Kashkaval, 11,327 lbs.	Yugoslavia	Stokopromet Export-Import, Skoplje	Contains lindane and benzene hexachloride	do	Do.
	Cheese (dock accumulation), 9,230 lbs	West Germany		Decomposed	do	Do.
	Cheese, Edam (hard), 12,016 lbs	Argentina	P.P.S.A. Luis Magnasco y Cia., Lda., San Jose	Contains benzene hexachloride	do	Dec. 31, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I have deleted the labeling or import-permit violations, and have included just the products found to be in an unsanitary or adulterated condition.

At this time, our ports are being flooded with great amounts of dairy products in the form of cheap cheeses, various butterfat mixtures, and processed dairy food items that European nations are trying to dump in the rich American market. While in many areas of the EEC nations standards are high, no nation has been certified by the Food and Drug Administration as having standards on a par with ours.

The list, of course, includes only those items that the FDA was fortunate enough to discover.

In fiscal 1968, 12,300 shipments of various dairy products came into our country. Of these, only 451 were inspected less than 4 percent of the total number of shipments. Of those shipments inspected, 58—over 12 percent—were detained.

Although a great deal of the foreign dairy products consumed in America come from Canada and New Zealand, in 1968 there was only one instance of a seizure of an unsanitary dairy product from either of these countries.

It is my contention that we would go a long way toward eliminating unsanitary imported dairy products sold in the United States of America, if those products were manufactured, stored, and shipped under conditions comparable to those found here.

FIGHTING SALE OF PORNOGRAPHY TO CHILDREN

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for reference to the appropriate committee a bill to fight the sale of pornography to children. This bill is similar to H.R. 2522, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL). I commend him for the efforts that he has put forth in fighting pornography, and direct my colleagues to his remarks on page 374 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, 1969.

As drafted, my bill would do two things that would put some teeth into the fight against pornography. It would prohibit mail-order sales of pornographic materials to school-age children, and, secondly, it would make the unsolicited mailing of hard-core pornography to a family with children under 16, a Federal offense punishable by fine and imprisonment.

I have received a number of complaints from people in my district who have received pornography through the mails. Last year the Post Office Department received over 165,000 formal complaints from people who had received obscene materials through the mails, and it is my guess that the number of those receiving such material is much larger than the list of formal complaints would suggest. The fact that such obscene mailings are being received by those who do not want such smut—particularly parents with children—indicates that our laws dealing with the control of pornography are not doing the job.

Mr. Speaker, the record is full of statements about pornography and our attempts to combat it. We are all against it; there are laws on the books against it; and there have been many court cases dealing with it. But I frankly think that these efforts have been somewhat thwarted by the decisions of the Supreme Court in this area. I grant the difficulty of defining obscenity. It is not my intention here to get into an argument or discussion on the nuances and interstices of constitutional law—the case books are full of that. However, it is clear that the Supreme Court has been consistent in ruling that hard-core pornography is not protected by the Constitution, and, secondly, that parents have the right to protect their children from such pornography. I think the legislation I introduce today satisfies the test of constitutionality.

My interest is in finding an effective curb against the dissemination of pornography to children, and I believe this legislation would accomplish that purpose. I therefore urge that early consideration be given this bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 89-239 TO PROVIDE FOR DEMONSTRATION OF HEART-SAVER SQUADS

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to zero in on one of our Nation's major killers—heart attacks.

Proper medical care within the first 60 minutes following a heart attack can mean the difference between life and death. Yet those 60 minutes are generally wasted in the process of getting a heart attack victim to adequate medical facilities.

This legislation is designed to expedite the application of knowledge which could save a large portion of those precious "first 60 minutes."

It has already been found in Belfast, Ireland, and in an area of New York City serviced by St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center, that those precious minutes can be saved. Instead of transporting the patient to a medical facility before proper emergency treatment and care can be rendered, adequate medical facilities, in the form of a "heart-saver squad" are now taken to the patient.

By dispatching to the patient a cardiologist, nurse, technician, and driver-attendant in an ambulance specially equipped with a portable electrocardiograph and defibrillator, the patient's condition may be assessed and treated in a fraction of the time it now takes. The damage to the heart can be determined immediately by the electrocardiograph and, if necessary, the heart reactivated with the defibrillator.

Out of the first 77 heart attack victims thus treated on the spot by St. Vincent's Hospital's heart-saver squad, 74 were saved. Under former circumstances it is likely that half would have died.

The original intent of title IX of the

Public Health Service Act, establishing the regional medical programs, was to encourage local initiative in the application of new knowledge and techniques. By amending title IX, my proposed bill would provide Federal assistance and encourage local initiative to demonstrate the effectiveness of such emergency care for heart attack victims by dispatching to the patient specially trained persons in specially equipped ambulances.

Not only would it encourage the application of this modified health care measure, through demonstrations of its effectiveness, but my bill would also help provide funds needed to equip ambulances with adequate portable instruments required in cardiac emergencies.

Further, since the success of any new program is directly dependent upon the availability of trained manpower, my bill would help provide funds to supplement appropriately the training of specialized personnel in the use of the pertinent portable equipment and emergency care techniques.

Equally important, this legislation specifically provides for the dissemination of information about the new service to potential users, including police, physicians, and the general public, so that full advantage may be taken of the demonstration project.

One or more of three mechanisms may be operating during a heart attack which could result in death. More often death occurs from an abnormal, chaotic rhythm of the heart or an actual arrest of heart contractions. The National Heart Institute reports that cardiac defibrillators, external electric pacemaking and driving devices which return the heart rhythm to normal have already proven lifesaving instruments.

In other instances, death in heart attacks is caused by abnormal nerve reflexes which become deranged and bring about circulatory collapse, or "shock." This mechanism can sometimes be controlled by drug therapy.

But whether prescribed therapy employs mechanical devices or drugs, success is often dependent upon the immediacy of accurate diagnosis and treatment following a heart attack.

Let me elaborate by drawing from recent testimony of the Director of the National Heart Institute. According to him, each year over 140,000 Americans under 65—to say nothing of those over 65—die from acute heart attacks. Physicians call it "myocardial infarction." Yet great strides are being made today in research toward saving heart attack victims through the use of anticoagulant drugs which minimize the heart damage from blood clots or occlusions of the blood vessels. In most clinical research studies, reports the National Heart Institute, these drugs, used during the acute phase of heart attacks, have increased survival anywhere from 30 percent up to more than 50 percent.

Research on fibrinolytic agents, which might help dissolve blood clots also show promise for reducing mortality among heart attack victims.

One of the dreaded complications of heart attacks—because they are often the immediate cause of deaths—are the so-called arrhythmias. This is the technical name applied when the normally smooth contractions of the heart become erratic, often leading to cardiac arrest. Fortunately, says the National Heart Institute, if promptly detected and treated, many arrhythmias stemming from heart attacks can be corrected or controlled by anti-arrhythmic drugs, such as digitalis.

Serious arrhythmias which do not respond to drug therapy, moreover, can often be corrected by precisely timed shocks delivered to the heart by electrical defibrillation equipment.

Research on other drugs designed to relieve cardiogenic shock are also showing promise by correcting blood vessel tone, blood vessel constrictions and ineffective heart pumping from damaged heart muscle. At one time cardiogenic shock complicating heart attacks carried mortality rates as high as 80 to 95 percent. Although we still have a long way to go, medical advances have now reduced these motality rates from 35 to 60 percent.

In recent years, especially in 1968, scientists and physicians have made significant—and sometimes much publicized—advancements in heart transplants and other surgical techniques, as well as the development of artificial devices to provide temporary or permanent circulatory assistance to damaged or failing hearts. These are among the many medical promises held out to the heart attack victim if he can but survive the acute stage of his attack.

Such promising help for heart attack victims form the cores of the National Heart Institute research program and the regional medical programs, in both of which the Congress can take extreme pride. These promises have a greater chance of becoming realities through the demonstration projects provided by this legislation. I believe the amendments provided in the bill would directly contribute to the "advancement of knowledge or method that makes some worthwhile difference in the lives of people." That difference is likely to be "life," itself.

Should we delay 1 hour, unnecessarily, in assuring heart attack victims the best possible chance to survive the acute attack and obtain the most promising therapy? To deny our responsibility here could deny life to as many as half, or more, individuals suffering heart attacks.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are all aware of the enormous task this Nation faces in the next few years in trying to provide enough adequate housing for low-income families, there is no consensus as yet on how this is going to be accomplished.

During the past presidential campaign we heard much talk about inducing private enterprise to solve the problems of our cities. Private enterprise, however, has no magic wand either, and as a recent editorial of the Evening Bulletin from Providence, R.I., makes clear, will have problems going it alone without Federal assistance. The editorial proceeds to mention what I and many others think is a necessary element in the solution. Accordingly, I want to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

FUELING THE ENGINE

During the presidential campaign last fall, Richard Nixon argued that the federal government had to cut its spending on programs to help the poor. What had to be done, he said, was to enlist the great engine of private enterprise in what would otherwise be a hopeless task.

Despite the partisan rhetoric that shrouded this issue, there was actually widespread agreement on the thesis that the help of private enterprise is necessary. The underlying question, however, was how the great engine was to be fueled. It is this question that is now facing the President and George Romney, his new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The question was posed most recently by Edgar F. Kaiser, the industrialist who heads the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships. Mr. Kaiser said the group, which includes among its board of directors top figures in American industry, was eager to start work on plans to build a large volume of low-rent housing.

The problem, Mr. Kaiser said, is that more money is needed for the rent supplement program to ensure a supply of tenants for the housing that would be built. Howard R. Moskof, vice president of the businessmen's group, said, "If you don't have subsidies of one kind or another for the tenants, then you don't have the market. And business can't produce low-income housing for low-income tenants without subsidies."

Thus far, neither Mr. Romney whose department manages the rent subsidies program, nor Mr. Nixon, who must live with the overall budget expenditures, has committed himself on the question of more money for the program. But they can scarcely ignore what is becoming more and more obvious every day: that the engine of private enterprise needs a generous helping of federal funds to operate efficiently in this area of need.

The request by Mr. Kaiser's group that the Nixon administration seek 50 million dollars more for the program in the present fiscal year and an overall appropriation of 100 million in the fiscal year starting July 1 seems eminently reasonable in the light of the housing situation in the country now.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION INDIFFERENT TO PLIGHT OF LOWEST PAID WORKERS

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has been in power less than 30 days and I noted with great interest the other day that the first step to be taken in behalf of the Nation's working men and women was to be a giant step backward.

Mr. Schultz, the new Secretary of Labor, and spokesman for the Nixon administration in this vital area, stung the Nation's working poor as if they had been slapped in the face by stating in effect he opposes any further congressional increases in the minimum wage at this time.

As one of the reasons cited for his opposition, he indicated that the effect of the 1966 amendments to the minimum

wage law needed to be evaluated. For the benefit of the Secretary, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of his own Department of Labor, in a report to this 91st Congress just a little over a month ago, concluded:

> Employment in the areas affected by the extensions of coverage has increased, and there is no evidence of any restraining effect of the broader coverage on employment opportunity. The increased minimum wage levels set in 1966 have not contributed to the current inflationary spiral to an extent which permits reasonable questioning of their net value in strengthening both the position of low-paid workers in particular and the economy in general.

It would be callous disregard of the facts of economic life if we ignored that recent cost-of-living increases and this same inflationary spiral have wiped out much of the benefit of recent minimum wage increases.

Rather than step back, we must press forward to adopt a universal minimum wage of $2 per hour and eliminate the current exemptions for overtime after 40 hours per week.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Secretary Schultz' statement was an unstudied, off-the-cuff remark which after reflection he will not feel bound to pursue. This statement by Secretary Schultz seems to be out of character with what many of his supporters had led us to believe were his views and concerns.

I would submit, if this is any real indication of callous indifference on the part of the Nixon administration to the plight of the lowest paid working men and women of this country, then we have yet some very sorry days ahead of us.

ELIMINATION OF WASTE IN LAKE MICHIGAN

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize elimination of pollutional waste into Lake Michigan in the area served by the North Shore Sanitary District of Illinois.

This measure is intended to supplement through a Federal grant the local and State contributions designed to improve the quality of water in Lake Michigan.

In proposing this legislative measure I am mindful of the $35 million bond issue approved overwhelmingly by the voters of Lake County—whom I represent in the Congress—as evidence of their sense of local responsibility to eliminate polluted materials from Lake Michigan.

It is apparent also that the State of Illinois will also share in these improvements through both technical and financial assistance in a total amount which is not yet determined.

The authority for emptying treated wastes of the North Shore Sanitary District into Lake Michigan was established many years ago by State legislation at a time when the district had a relatively small population. The district's program of improvements has been commendable and consistent with modern technology and health standards. Notwithstanding this record, the need for eliminating all treated wastes from the waters of Lake Michigan is quite apparent and a modern program looking to the diversion of the treated effluents to waterways lying along the western border of the district has been developed. The total cost of completing this program is in the neighborhood of $60 million for which the taxpayers of the district have obligated themselves to the extent of $35 million.

At the initiative of State Representative John Henry Kleine, of Lake Forest, a member of the Northern Illinois Water Resources Commission, I had occasion to convene a meeting recently in Lake Forest, Ill. This meeting was attended by Clarence W. Klassen, technical secretary of the Illinois Sanitary Water Board and James McDonald, representing H. W. Poston, regional director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency; State Senators Robert Coulson and Karl Berning; State Representatives George W. Lindberg and John S. Matijevich, as well as Mr. August P. Cepon, president of the North Shore Sanitary District; Robert P. Will, Donald W. Wylie, trustees of the North Shore Sanitary District; Raymond Anderson, general manager, and Mark Beaubien, secretary-attorney for the North Shore Sanitary District, M. D R. Riddell, project engineer for the North Shore Sanitary District's contemplated improvements, as well as representatives of the various organizations and of the public.

At this meeting it was emphasized that this program to eliminate pollutional wastes from Lake Michigan can benefit all of the area bordering on Lake Michigan. Accordingly, this measure, if favorably acted upon by the Congress, is expected to improve the quality of Lake Michigan waters along the shore of Lake Michigan in Cook County, as well as the waters along the shorelines bordering the States of Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this measure which I am introducing today has broad national interest and offers opportunities for substantial benefits to residents of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin, as well as all who have occasion to enjoy and utilize the waters of Lake Michigan.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that this measure is consistent with an overall national policy to reduce water pollution in order that the waters of Lake Michigan and similar bodies of water may serve the broad needs of this and future generations.

ADVANCE PAYMENT IN FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, no attribute of a government is more valuable than a deserved reputation for integrity. No defect is more damaging to a government than the knowledge that integrity may be lacking.

I want to commend President Nixon and Secretary of Agriculture Hardin on the way they have met the test of integrity with regard to obligations to U.S. grain producers.

Here are the facts involved in this test. For several years, farmers participating in some of the commodity programs have been eligible to draw advance payments of up to 50 percent of the amounts owing to them for acreage diversion. They could receive a partial payment in advance early in the year rather than having to wait until later to receive the full amount. This was of considerable advantage to them in arranging for their year's credit needs and in meeting current expenses.

When the 1969 feed grain program was announced last December 26, there was no mention of any change in the amount of the advance payment. Farmers, accordingly, made their plans on the same basis as in earlier years.

Then in mid-January came word from the outgoing administration that instead of a maximum of 50 percent, the advance payment this year would be no more than 25 percent. This would mean a reduction of some $168 million in funds flowing into the agricultural economy during the next several weeks.

A few days ago the President and Secretary of Agriculture rescinded this unfair action. The President said:

> I feel the Government has a moral obligation to honor this implied commitment.

And I feel that the President is quite right in his assessment of the situation.

These payments were originated because the agricultural economy was sagging. The agricultural economy is still sagging, and farmers on the average have only three-fourths as much income per capita as nonfarmers. The advance payments are still needed.

I commend the President and the Secretary on this action. Integrity has no price tag.

Mr. Speaker, I took this time today so that some of my colleagues might also have the opportunity to say a few words about this action of the new administration.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I am happy to associate myself with the statement just made by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington, who is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain, on which I am also privileged to serve.

Mr. Speaker, farmers throughout the Nation are welcoming President Nixon's prompt announcement that advance payments to feed-grain producers will be at the rate of 50 percent rather than only 25 percent as recommended by the Johnson-Freeman administration. This forthright action will prevent great injustice which at the least would have caused great inconvenience and at the worst incalculable harm to many farmers participating in the 1969 program. This demonstration of the President's ability to cut through redtape promptly thereby eliminating unfair discrimination against feed-grain farmers is most

encouraging to all who are concerned about the farm problem as it affects both producers and consumers.

If the President had not taken this prompt and affirmative action, more than a million and a half feed-grain producers would have been forced to abruptly change their hard-pressed financial planning to accommodate a $168 million cut in advance payments this year.

Under the budget submitted by the Johnson-Freeman administration these advance payments would have been arbitrarily slashed from the customary level of 50 percent down to 25 percent. No advance warning had been made to farmers already signing up for participation in the 1969 program that a reduction was contemplated. The budget came to the Hill on January 15, and the feed-grain program signup began February 3. I certainly concur with the President's strong statement that the Government had a moral obligation to honor the implied commitment established by long usage that advance payments would be continued without change in rate.

The majority of farmers in feed-grain-producing areas voted for Richard Nixon in November and the President's most recent action regarding program participation is a vindication of their confidence in him. It is most encourging to have this very tangible evidence that the "bring us together" spirit of the new administration truly includes farmers. I am confident that the President is very much aware of the urgent necessity to strengthen farm income and is and will be doing everything that he properly can to that end.

I thank the distinguished gentlewoman again for yielding.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SEBELIUS. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone connected with agriculture is aware of the harsh cost-price squeeze facing the American farmer today. In fact, the cost-price squeeze has actually become a virtual bear hug where everything the farmer must buy keeps going up in price and the price of everything he sells keeps going down.

One of the major cost items in modern agriculture that directly aggravates this situation is the cost of money. Interest rates are at new highs but nevertheless, farmers must invest heavily in such items as seed, fertilizer, and herbicides—the basic essentials necessary to produce a crop. Much of these items must be financed with borrowed capital.

President Nixon's recent decision to advance acreage diversion payments to those producers who are taking part in the various farm commodity programs, has a direct bearing on the present cost-price squeeze. What the President's decision means is that many farmers will not have to borrow to finance their springtime planting expenses.

To put it simply, many farmers will not have to go further in debt and that alone is a tremendous savings as well as good news to those producers who have cooperated over the years in a mutual effort with the Government to hold down production and avoid costly surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend President Nixon and his Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Clifford Hardin, for their action on behalf of the farmers in my western Kansas district and across the entire Nation.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was especially pleased with President Nixon's announcement of instructing Secretary Hardin to make available advance payments to farmers up to 50 percent of entitlement when they participate in the feed grains program. This certainly indicated a keen awareness of the financial problems faced by some of these farmers as they go into the spring planting season. This is the time of year when the farmer has to buy much of his material and in a sense makes the greatest investment of the crop season. If he does not have the cash at hand to meet these expenses then he must borrow and we all know that the farmer today can ill afford to pay the current high interest rates on top of all his other high costs of operation.

This particular aspect of the feed grains program is the result of an amendment which I offered to the so-called emergency feed grain bill back in March 1961. I have here in my hand a copy of the proceedings of the House reporting the debate on H.R. 4510 and here on page 3663 is recorded the adoption of my amendment. I should comment at this point that my offering that amendment resulted from a suggestion that was made to me in a letter I received from a farmer-constituent of mine. Since that time these advance payments have been made available to the farmers participating in the program and they have become accustomed to this money being made available to them at the time of their greatest need. The action recently announced by the present administration making 50-percent advance payments available to cooperators was certainly welcome news to the family farmer in my Congressional District.

President Nixon is to be commended for taking such forthright action in the face of a most difficult budgetary situation.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I would like to say that I do well remember how hard he worked to make his point on the need as well as the wisdom for this program at the time.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my distinguished colleague from Washington (Mrs. MAY) in commending President Nixon and Secretary of Agriculture Hardin for their keen appreciation of the current money needs of farmers.

This was reflected in their decision to continue making available to farmers one-half of their feed grain and wheat program diversion payments at the time they sign up to participate this spring. This is an important decision for farmers because they face one of the tightest credit situations ever seen. With no advance payments or greatly reduced ones, many farmers would have been badly handicapped in financing their spring plantings.

This was not an easy decision for the President in view of the serious budget problem. The outgoing administration had provided for reducing the advance payments under the diversion program from 50 percent down to 25 percent, apparently to reduce expenditures for this current fiscal year. However, little had been said about this so that few farmers were aware of the contemplated cut. Farmers this year expected the customary advance payments at the 50-percent level as had been authorized for the past 8 years. The action taken by the President makes it possible to continue the practice for this year and demonstrates the President's interest in the welfare of farmers.

Advance payments to feed grain, wheat and some cotton producers are expected to total about $386 million.

I am hopeful that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture will also consider advance payments against wheat certificates this year. The House approved legislation permitting such payments late in 1967 but the Senate took no action. I have reintroduced legislation (H.R. 4820) to authorize this.

Advance payments up to 50 percent against 1969 crop wheat certificates could bring approximately $50 million into the hands of North Dakota growers early this year. This would make it unnecessary for many of them to seek commercial loans to meet operating expenses during the first half of the year. Interest rates are the highest in a century. Moreover, available Farmers Home Administration emergency loan funds are fully committed now.

The Bureau of the Budget recently released $15 million in emergency FHA funds which had been "frozen" by the preceding administration. I understand that there is still some $15 million which has not been released.

Because of the unusually severe winter which has gripped North Dakota and neighboring States this year, livestock feeding has been extremely heavy. Many farmers and ranchers will have to purchase additional feed this spring. Heavy snows also pose a spring flood threat in some areas. Even if remaining FHA funds are released, they will fall far short of meeting the probable needs.

For this reason, I believe there is special urgency in moving additional funds into farmers' hands through advance payments against wheat certificates.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear that participants in the 1969 feed grain and wheat program will again have available the maximum 50-percent advance payment made on diversion contracts.

When the 1969 feed grain program was announced last December, there was no indication that any changes would be

made from the previous year's program. However, on the 15th of January, when the budget for fiscal year 1970 was released, it became evident that the advance payment program was being cut to 25 percent with no advance payments to be made for the 1970 program. Suddenly, farmers who began signup for the 1969 program on Monday, February 3, were faced with a massive change in ground rules that threatens their operations for this year. It was obvious that this budget chicanery was at the expense of rural areas and those that work so hard to provide this country with our food and fiber. With the parity ratio at depression year levels of 72, the removal of $186 million from the economy of our farming sector would have had disastrous effects.

I agree with President Nixon and Secretary Hardin that this sudden change by the previous administration was unfair. I strongly endorse the restoration of the full advance payment for our wheat and feed grain program participants.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in one of their first important decisions on farm policy, President Nixon and Secretary Hardin have taken a bold and imaginative step in announcing that they want continued the practice followed in recent years of making available a 50-percent advance payment to participants in the feed grain program under the present law.

As the President said, the Government has a moral obligation to honor this commitment. It is obvious that the President is appreciative and is aware of the great contributions American farmers have made to the well-being of our Nation. America's farmers, despite their contributions to agriculture, still fall short of receiving their fair share of the national prosperity, and it is only right that the President should continue the advance payments and hopefully they will consider such advance payments for wheat also under a bill I have introduced recently to bring equitable treatment to the wheat farmer. This act shows that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are interested in our farmers and I feel sure that it is only the first of a series of decisions aimed at recognizing the immense contributions of modern American agriculture to the health and strength of our country.

I hope consideration will be given to better and more beneficial trade agreements with other friendly nations to have imports of all agriculture products be brought into a more equitable and competitive position so our own producer and taxpayer is not driven out of business because of a flood of cheaper produced inferior products.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of my special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. MOSS ON INTRODUCING AN IMPROVED ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY BILL

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, today I, together with a number of colleagues in both Houses of Congress, introduce a new bill to increase the reliability of electric power supply for the United States.

The present bill springs from three bills introduced in the 90th Congress. A bill drafted by the Federal Power Commission was introduced in the House on June 8, 1967, as H.R. 10721. I introduced a revised version on August 14, 1967, as H.R. 12322. An explanation of my revisions appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 17, page 22513. The gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER), on behalf of himself and 20 colleagues, made further revisions in the bill and introduced it on January 30, 1968, as H.R. 14971, and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY introduced an identical bill in the Senate as S. 1934. An explanation of their revisions appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 2, page 1500.

The purpose of this legislation is not merely to prevent more cascading power failures—like the Northeast blackout of 1965—but to further the national policy "of assuring an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and with due regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources." This policy was established by the Public Utility Act of 1935.

Conditions have changed tremendously since 1935. Our population has grown 59 percent from 127,250,000 to 202,000,000. Our gross national product has grown 317 percent—from $169.5 billion to $706.9 billion in constant 1958 dollars. Consumption of electric energy, however, has soared 1,170 percent—from 95,287,390 megawatt-hours to 1,214,365,187 megawatt-hours in 1967, the latest year for which complete figures are available. The present trend is for electric consumption to double every 10 years.

Electric utilities now constitute the largest industry in the country.

The phenomenal increase in electric power supply has been made possible by technological advances scarcely dreamed of 34 years ago. In 1935 the biggest generating unit in use had a capacity of only about 200 megawatts. The highest voltage transmission line then under construction was the 287-kilovolt line from Boulder to Los Angeles. Nowadays 1,300-megawatt generating units are going into operation; a 750-kilovolt direct current transmission line is in service; a 765-kilovolt alternating current line is under construction. Generating plants with 10,000-megawatt capacity will probably be feasible within 20 years.

It is obvious from these figures and facts alone that a review of the 34-year-old pattern of Federal electric utility regulation is now in order. Additional facts demonstrate that amendment of the Federal Power Act along the lines proposed in this bill of today is overdue.

Reliability of electric power service has not kept pace with load growth. Since the great Northeast blackout of November 9, 1965, there have been 37 more major power failures—that is, interruptions of service to at least 40,000 customers for 15 minutes or longer. Twenty-four of these were cascading. That term means two or more generating plants went off the line successively. Seventeen of the major power failures, seven of them cascading, have occurred since I stood here on August 14, 1967, to introduce my previous version of the power reliability bill. The most recent blackout took place in Florida on January 28, 1969. I think it is significant that Florida systems practice much less voluntary coordination with other systems and are subject to less State regulation than the great majority of the utilities in this country. Some of the Florida systems are still contesting FPC jurisdiction.

In attempting to keep up with the soaring demand for power, in many areas of the country utilities have let their reserve capacity fall dangerously low. This is true right here in Washington. To bring in additional power they have sometimes used inadequate connecting links—weak transmission lines that will go out under a slight additional load. And they have planned and even built new generating plants and transmission lines in the wrong places.

The 1935 act stated our national policy was to assure more abundant electric energy, et cetera, "with due regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources." What constitutes proper utilization has changed greatly since those words were enacted. For one thing, nuclear fuel was unknown then. Now its advantages and disadvantages must be weighed against those of various hydrocarbons and falling water to determine the proper utilization of natural resources in particular circumstances.

The very concept of natural resources has broadened, at least in public awareness, since 1935. We speak now of the natural beauty of the countryside and historic sites as natural resources. We have less tolerance for air and water pollution, and more effective means of preventing it.

New mechanisms are urgently needed to achieve continued abundance and increased reliability of bulk power supply under today's and tomorrow's conditions, and to preserve and rehabilitate the environment. Such mechanisms must include increased coordination between utility systems and a greatly expanded role for the public in utility planning. When I say public I mean the affected and concerned citizens as well as the Federal Power Commission or any regulatory agency.

The bill we introduce today will take the planning of our future electric utility system out of the closed boardrooms of individual companies into voluntary regional councils, open to all systems in a region and thereafter into open public hearings. It will insure that the headlong expansion of the utility industry is directed to the greatest good for the greatest number, with the greatest re-

spect for the irreplaceable values of mother earth.

Today's bill, like the original FPC bill, but to a greater extent, regards the electric power industry as one nationwide public service. It combines and improves the best features of the previous FPC, Moss, and Ottinger-Kennedy bills.

The major provisions of the original FPC reliability bill are retained in substance in today's bill. Those provisions, which I shall only sketchily outline here, are as follows:

First. Regional councils of electric utilities would be established. In each region of the country utility management would meet to plan together for coordinated operation to achieve more reliable service. All utility systems, whether privately owned, Government owned, or cooperative, would be eligible for membership. Several regional councils are already in existence on a voluntary basis. Some of them, however, deliberately exclude certain systems in the region. In one area I am aware of, there are two coordinating councils, one consisting principally of the investor-owned utilities, and the other principally of the Government-owned and cooperative systems. The public interest suffers from such cutthroat rivalry. The FPC proposal would end it. Coordination between all systems in a region would become compulsory.

Second. The FPC bill would establish a National Electric Studies Committee. This committee would facilitate development and exchange of technical information nationwide to improve power reliability. This committee would not only contain representatives of the private and the public electric utility systems, but of manufacturers as well.

Third. The FPC bill would empower the Commission to promulgate reliability criteria. Such criteria would establish compulsory technical standards to govern the reliability aspects of the planning and operation of bulk power supples.

Fourth. The FPC bill would regulate the construction and operation of extra-high-voltage transmission lines. Such regulation would require prior Federal review of lines designed to be operated at voltages of 200,000 or higher, which are constructed 2 or more years after enactment of the bill. Such lines would have to comply with regional and interregional coordination plans developed by the regional councils and to embody the technical standards of applicable FPC reliability criteria. Hopefully, this provision would put an end to haphazard proliferation of inadequate lines in the wrong places. The FPC bill would confer upon utilities proposing to construct proper extra-high-voltage facilities, rights-of-way over Federal lands, and the Federal power of eminent domain to secure rights-of-way over other lands.

Fifth. The FPC bill would require extra-high-voltage lines to be located and designed so as to protect the environment. It would establish, as a principle, that not only technical electric factors but also matters concerning rational land use planning and esthetics must be considered before permission is granted to construct extra-high-voltage transmission lines.

Sixth. The FPC bill would expand the Commission's authority to require interconnection of electric systems. It would authorize the Commission, upon its own motion if necessary, to order rival electric systems to interconnect and sell or exchange electricity with each other in order to serve the consuming public better and more reliably.

All the objectives of the FPC bill which I have just described are preserved, in improved form, in the bill we introduce today. They are vital objectives, well nigh indispensable to reliable nationwide electric utility service adequate for late 20th-century needs.

As with many excellent and much-needed initial proposals, however, the FPC bill had its deficiencies.

The public information provisions of the FPC bill were inadequate. The consumers must have a large voice in regional and interregional utility planning. The local residents must have a larger voice before their environment is damaged by huge generating plants and their homes taken for transmission line rights-of-way. Our new bill requires maximum publicity, not only in the Federal Register but also in popular media, for coordination plans and proposals to construct extra-high-voltage facilities. It guarantees the public a right to participate in hearings on what, and where, giant electric utility facilities are to be constructed. It requires copies of all relevant plans and proposals to be kept available for public inspection not only in Washington, but in the regions to be affected.

The objective of protecting and enhancing the environment was little more than a pious hope in the FPC bill. Our bill of today provides mechanisms to effectuate that objective. We would establish a National Council on the Environment, independent of the Federal Power Commission, to consist of five distinguished experts on environmental science, land use planning, esthetics, or related subjects, to hold office under Presidential appointment for fixed terms. This Council would review regional and interregional coordination plans, proposals to construct extra-high-voltage facilities and applications for hydropower licenses. By such review, the National Council would seek to protect the public's need for an improved total living environment.

The FPC bill lacked curbs on indiscriminate exercise of the power of eminent domain by utility companies. While the FPC bill would prohibit construction of large transmission lines in advance of FPC review, and hold up granting of rights-of-way on Federal land while such review was underway, it would do nothing to prevent utilities from using their regular powers of eminent domain in the meantime to take and destroy homes and farms or even non-Federal parkland. In such circumstances the FPC review of the proposed facilities might well be reduced to an examination of their technical sufficiency. The question of their environmental and social impact could be rendered moot and the harm already done by the proposing utility's indiscriminate use of the taking power before the FPC had any chance to rule on these aspects of its proposal.

Our bill would suspend use of the power of eminent domain to acquire rights-of-way for constructing large generating plants and transmission lines until the new National Council on the Environment has had an opportunity to present its views to the FPC. If the FPC disapproves the proposal, the utility would not be authorized to construct any of the proposed facilities or condemn lands for them.

In addition, our bill would incorporate the national policy declared by section 18 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. It would prohibit the use of park, recreation, wildlife refuge, and historic site land for extra-high-voltage facilities unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to such use, and unless all possible planning has been done to minimize the harm.

The FPC bill lacked adequate controls on the design and siting of generating plants. Although the FPC bill would require Federal review for extra-high-voltage transmission lines, it contained practically no effective controls, except by means of reliability criteria, which would be purely technological, upon generating plants. This is a large gap in a bill intended to assure more reliable power supplies throughout whole regions of the country, and to protect the environment from adverse effects which may result from the construction of huge electric bulk power facilities in the future. Hence our bill would also require FPC review of plans for generating plants of 200 megawatts or higher capacity proposed for construction 4 or more years after its date of enactment.

Under our bill, when someone proposes to construct, extend, or modify such a plant, he must file a proposal with the FPC at least 6 months in advance. The proposal must receive widespread publicity in the region to be affected. It must be reviewed by the National Council on the Environment. Not only the technological matter of reliability of the proposed plant must be reviewed, but its siting and its entire effect on the environment. Is it, for example, in the best place to provide service to the maximum number of people in the region and interconnected regions? Is the fuel chosen proper for use at the site? Will it cause fog or smog, destroy the scenery, or pollute rivers? All these matters, and more, ought to be subject to the most careful review in the public interest before ground is broken for a great generating plant; and our bill provides for that review.

The need for such provision is persuasively documented in the report by the Office of Science and Technology, which President Johnson recently released. That report, entitled "Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection," states:

> Our projections suggest that in the next two decades we will triple the present electric power generating capacity but we can do so with far fewer new sites than the

number the industry presently occupies. The reason is that most of the new capacity in the next 20 years will come from some 250 huge power plants of 2 to 3 million kilowatts each. By contrast there are some 3,000 power plants in existence today. While there will certainly be small plants in addition to the 250 or so large plants, the siting problem in the future will not be one of finding room for a proliferation of power plants, but rather being sure that the relatively small number of mammoth-sized plants are adequately planned and located to meet the twin goals of low-cost, reliable power and preserving the quality of our environment.

It is estimated that these 250 huge plants will serve more than 95 percent of the increased power demand projected for 1990. Their total cost will exceed $80 billion. Each plant may represent an investment of almost a third of a billion dollars. The report emphasizes that since the location of generating plants is inseparably related to the location and arrangement of transmission lines, both must be jointly considered in order to attain reliable and economic system expansion plans. Equally important is the need to avoid the adverse or even disastrous impact which each of the giant generating plants could have on scenic and historic areas, fish and wildlife resources, recreation areas, parks, land uses, and the quality of our water and air.

The regulatory scheme of 34 years ago contained in the present Federal Power Act, and existing State regulatory laws, are largely irrelevant to the problems of location, design, and operation of the huge generating facilities of the future. It is unthinkable that individual managements, without public participation, should choose the sites and priorities for 250 plants supplying 95 percent of the Nation's increased power demand. Today's bill will provide for such participation.

The FPC bill failed to provide adequately for common use or ownership of extra-high-voltage facilities. The bigger a generating plant, the lower its cost of producing a kilowatt hour of electricity. The higher the voltage at which a transmission line is operated, the more power it can carry—doubling the voltage roughly multiplies the power by four. From the standpoint of economy and efficiency, larger facilities are obviously desirable. From the standpoint of enhancing the environment they are essential. Three 161-kilovolt lines cut three swathes through a forest each 125 feet wide; one 345-kilovolt line carries as much power as all three of them, but cuts only one swathe of the same width.

To encourage abundant and reliable electric supply and to preserve the environment from gross unnecessary desecration, therefore, the size of plants and lines must not be limited by the needs of the company proposing to build them and its customers. Such plants and lines should be large enough to serve entire areas, regardless of the patchwork of individual company franchises within the area.

Our bill, unlike the FPC bill, faces up to this problem. We would provide that if company A proposes to build a smaller plant for its own customers, which if increased in size could serve also the nearby customers of company B, and more economically than either group could be served by separate plants, the FPC can authorize company B to enlarge the plant at its own expense, and can require the two companies to operate the enlarged plant for the common benefit of both groups of consumers.

Our bill includes similar provisions applicable to transmission lines, and in addition would enlarge the jurisdiction of the FPC to require a utility having excess capacity in its existing lines to transmit energy of another person for a reasonable fee.

Electric transmission lines are part of this country's transportation system. Everyone would recognize the absurdity of the situation if our railroads were reserved for the sole purpose of transporting their owner's own commodities. It would approach madness if the only way a coal company could get its goods to market would be to build its own railroad parallel to an existing underused railroad owned by another coal company.

We have something approaching that lunatic situation in our electric energy transmission system. The bill introduced today will restore reason.

The FPC bill would have weakened the antitrust laws. Electric power reliability and environmental protection do not have to be bought by acquiescing in conspiracies in restraint of trade. Our bill does not have the provision contained in the FPC bill which would confer upon members of regional councils immunity from treble damage and injunction suits brought by an injured person under the Clayton Act. We just do not believe that the antitrust law impedes electric power reliability.

The purpose of grouping into regional councils is to plan for increased electric power reliability and environmental protection; not to conspire to raise prices or limit markets. No antitrust protection is needed for the legitimate objectives of regional council work. To confer unnecessary immunity would invite perversion of Council work into illegitimate channels.

The FPC bill lacked adequate protection for National Park Service lands. Language in the FPC bill could be construed to permit the Commission to grant transmission line rights-of-way through national parks and monuments. Present law bars such facilities from those areas. The National Park Service also administers other areas, such as national battlefields, national memorials, national seashores, and a national scenic riverway. All these national treasures ought to be protected from intrusion. Hence our bill would keep extra-high-voltage facilities out of all lands administered by the National Park Service except certain recreation areas whose primary purpose is not environmental preservation, and national parkways, which are narrow strips sometimes hundreds of miles long, and which it would be unreasonable to ban transmission lines from ever crossing.

The FPC bill failed to adequately recognize Indian rights in tribal lands. Tribal land on Indian reservations is the property of the Indians not of the Government. The FPC bill overlooked this fact and contemplated authorizing the Commission to issue rights-of-way across tribal land without Indian consent. This oversight was corrected in my reliability bill of 1967 and in today's bill. In addition, as a result of comments I received from Indian tribes and organizations on the previous bill, today's bill also provides that compensation for the right-of-way grants may be paid either in a lump sum or in annual charges, as agreed by the tribe.

Mr. Speaker, this summary of the FPC proposal and of the bill now being introduced is an outline of their major points only. To get a wholly accurate view, it is of course necessary to read the bills themselves. I shall, moreover, at an early date request permission to insert in the RECORD a detailed analysis of the new bill.

Meanwhile I recommend careful study and favorable consideration of this important bill by all Members of this House and by the public.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS SURVEY—PART III

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of reports on the Committee on Education and Labor's survey of school superintendents. As I mentioned in the two previous reports, the committee undertook this survey so that we might have the benefit of the experiences of as many of our local school administrators as possible during our consideration of legislation affecting elementary and secondary education.

The previous reports of the tabulations and analyses of the committee survey were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 30, page 2258, and February 6, page 2992. These reports contained information on the superintendents' responses to those questions which asked:

(1) Do you feel the Federal Government is doing its share in providing funds for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education? If not, what suggestions do you have?

(3) To what extent is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act underfunded in your particular school district?

(5) In general, have the recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education been of great, substantial, moderate, or little value?

The tabulation and analyses of the responses to the above questions show that the great majority of local school administrators feel that the Federal Government is not doing its share in providing funds for the improvement of the quality of elementary and secondary education. Approximately 70 percent of the responding superintendents said that the Elementary and Secondary Eduction Act was underfunded in their school districts. A high percentage of school officials responding to the questionnaire indicated that recent Federal enactments have been of substantial benefit to the students in their school systems. A significant percentage were so enthusiastic

about the ESEA programs that they indicated they had been of great value in their districts. Those who felt that the programs were of moderate or little value largely had this opinion because of funding problems—that is, sufficient appropriations, reductions in allotments, and lack of adequate time and information with respect to funding.

Today I am inserting in the RECORD part III of the series on the school superintendents' survey. This segment will show some of the results of the analyses and tabulations of the responses on the question:

What are your greatest needs at the elementary and secondary level?

Many of the school administrators listed as many as 10 or 12 specific problem areas. The task of placing these needs into some kind of categorical listing so that they could be collated and checked was a difficult one, and it was complicated further when, after a random sampling, a work sheet had to be developed which listed over 70 different types of needs, covering every aspect of problems which a local school district might face from curriculum development to additional facilities, from kindergarten needs to adult education.

It is interesting to note that certain problems which administrators face are unique to their particular area, and others reflected an almost universal need. Still others showed patterns of similarity for metropolitan areas, as compared with some which indicated specifically rural-type needs. Certainly one of the areas where there was a pronounced need was with respect to financial support—the need for increased funds, or the need for advance funding to allow for proper planning and implementation of programs. The following are illustrative of this kind of response. The number in parentheses following the school district indicates the school enrollment:

San Jose, Calif. (12,800): "East Side is a secondary district. Our greatest needs are:

"a. Greater numbers of teachers from disadvantaged and minority groups.

"b. Monies to afford more counselors and teachers to lower ratios.

"c. Psychological and medical assistance for many students.

"d. Greater cooperation between various agencies to help overcome student problems that quite often extend beyond the school."

Woodsboro, Texas (862): "Our greatest needs at the elementary and secondary level are: (1) return to the original allotment; (2) provide the money in advance."

Gary, Indiana (49,000): Our greatest needs in Gary are financial. State aid is inadequate and Federal aid insufficient to maintain a quality program. Particularly striking to me in our present methods of financing education is the inequity it creates in support of urban as contrasted to suburban schools."

San Antonio, Texas (78,000): "The greatest needs at the elementary and secondary school level in this school district are for increased funds to supplement the limited tax potential of this central city school district. These schools are being forced to provide services in addition to those of the more affluent school districts because of the relatively high percentage of pupils from low income families with additional needs for special education, health, food services, and counseling and sociological services. Because of the higher percentage of children from sub-standard environments in the central cities, there is a greater need for preschool education than is found in more affluent school districts."

Georgetown, Mass. (1,424): "Our greatest needs are adequate funds with which to run a good educational program."

A very definite need occurred in the area of programs for the disadvantaged, the type of program supported by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. More advance appropriations would do much to alleviate these pressing needs, such as those indicated in the following responses:

Chicago Heights, Ill. (5,100): "Money—In order to provide true quality educational exposure to all—minority or deprived need greater concentration of effort hence greater expenditure per capita."

Salt Lake City, Utah (35,000): "For more resources to deal with problems of poverty and depravity which are increasing in our inner city school areas."

Hawkins, Tex. (505): "Our greatest needs at the elementary and secondary level is to improve the socio-economic level of the poor families so they come to school with adequate clothes, food, status of health, level of aspiration and ambition. We have little difficulty with educating children from homes which provide these basic needs. We do have a need to overcome the results of low levels of adult education and the socio-economic, cultural deprivations that characterize large segments of our school population. The problem seems so vast and expensive that simply providing money on a per capita basis may never result in completely satisfying results."

Manitou Springs, Colo. (1,175): "In response to question 6, it is very difficult to define the greatest needs of education at the elementary and secondary school levels. This is true because of the wide differences in areas, the character of the communities, and the money available for local education purposes. Although we are making a better than average educational effort in our district, I do feel that we fall short in a vocational program. I am sure most smaller districts to not have adequate special education programs. We have been able to improve this service by a Board of Cooperative Services. I do feel that most school districts need to place more emphasis on the economically, culturally and socially deprived, and certainly our Title I programs have made improvements in these areas. Maintaining adequate facilities for educational programs is most difficult."

Chittenango, N.Y. (3,150): Basic reading teachers and services for individual students who are economically, culturally, or mentally and physically disadvantaged."

Mountain View School District, Calif. (5,648): "Our greatest need at the elementary level is sufficient funds to provide instruction to small groups, and, also, to make available adequate funds for inservice training. We have many Mexican-American children in our district and many disadvantaged children. It is important that the teachers have some specialized training with these particular groups."

Superintendent Webb, of Valentine, Tex., stated that "funds for special programs such as remedial reading under title I" was his greatest need. This comment was repeated many times by other school officials not only in this area, but in related areas of special education as well.

Many school administrators are faced with a problem similar to that expressed by the superintendent of schools for Hammonton, N.J., having a student enrollment of 147, when he stated:

The greatest need in the elementary and secondary level is insufficient textbooks.

Provision was made in the original ESEA Act passed in 1965, under title II, for additional textbooks, library resources, and other instructional materials. It is most unfortunate, but nevertheless true, that this is one area where the reduction in funds has been deeply felt.

Additional programs and services for handicapped children was requested time and time again. Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed to provide increased support for such programs and services. Successes under this program have been gratifying, but there is much yet to be done, and many problems still requiring attention by our local school officials, as exemplified in the following responses:

Oregon, Ohio (5,250): "Our greatest needs at the moment are (a) for the provision of occupational training for our students (b) for providing a program for those students who are handicapped (physically, mentally, emotionally) and (c) for those students who are above the special class category and yet not average pupils (I.Q. 75–90) and for preparing our rural students to live in an urban society."

Belmont, Mass. (4,473): "Our greatest needs, and I would guess this is true of most districts, is to develop programs for children who are not average or normal. This category would include the deaf, blind, emotionally disturbed, crippled, and mentally retarded. At the secondary level greater effort should be made to provide adequate vocational education."

White Bear Lake, Minn. (10,500): "Funds to provide programs for the slow learner, for students with learning disabilities and for the exceptionally bright student."

"Additional funds are also needed to experiment with innovative and exemplary programs.

"More funds should be made available under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, especially in the Title I and Title III areas. These funds should be appropriated for two fiscal years so that schoolmen will know well in advance how much aid they can expect from the Federal Government."

Hueneme, Calif. (Port Hueneme) (6,954): "The greatest needs are two: (1) Counseling and guidance, with emphasis on early detection of learning problems at the elementary level, and (2) Diagnostic centers and special schools for the multi-handicapped. Waiting lists for existing facilities are much too long and we do not yet have the peak load in the school age bracket."

Not the least of the problems which confront our local school administrators is that of adequate and qualified staffing. This would not only include teachers in the classroom, but also teacher aides, trained personnel in our libraries and guidance and counseling personnel. A few of the more pertinent responses along this line follow:

Meridian, Idaho (3,543): "Our greatest needs are improved libraries, inauguration of vocational and technical programs, auxiliary personnel to really help boys and girls, qualified personnel at all levels, and modern instructional materials."

Roseville, Calif. (740): "Some of our needs are: library with the people to staff it; specialist in subject mattter areas to help our slow and gifted."

Nyack, N.Y. (3,650): "Our greatest needs at the elementary and secondary level are:

"a. Additional supportive services—such as psychological, psychiatric, social work and attendance.

"b. Expanded library facilities.

"c. Multi-ethnic teaching materials."

Ocala, Fla. (15,644): "The greatest needs at the elementary and secondary level at this time in Marion county are:

"Additional staff to alleviate the problems of the educationally disadvantaged.

"Trained staff to take care of remedial problems in reading and mathematics.

"Housing and equipment for these special programs."

McComb, Miss. (4,400):

"a. Additional well trained professional staff and additional paraprofessional staff for the disadvantaged.

"b. Additional supplements for vocational education programs in such areas as special needs for the educationally disadvantaged."

Madison Township, Ohio (5,730): "Services such as Counselors, Psychologist, Social Worker, Teacher Aids. A wealth of teaching aids that can be placed in library or resource centers for general use. Services for physically handicapped are needed.

"Secondary—An increase in Vocational Education which must begin in six or seventh grade. The child must become acquainted with the World of Work. New innovative courses must be developed that will hold children in school. School building equipped to hold year around school and designed to use various innovative teaching techniques such as: team teaching, nongraded individual instruction, modular schedules, open-ended laboratory, co-op programs, etc."

Wakefield, Mass. (5,667):

"a. Because of the nature of our society and the problems of the home, it is felt that Federally supported residential establishments are of great importance so that young people can be taken out of the negative home environments. These could be set up on a regional basis. Present psychiatric and adjustment counseling techniques and staffing are not adequate to cope with this tremendous problem.

"b. Support for elementary library (resource center) personnel. Wakefield has one elementary librarian. It needs at least six others.

"c. Support for continuous funding for elementary guidance personnel. Wakefield has one elementary guidance person. It needs at least six others.

"d. More relevant programs for the general and potential drop-out students. These can be best accommodated with more extensive work-experience programs.

"e. School construction. Increased pupil population, as well as state mandated kindergartens is placing a tremendous burden on local communities for expansion of their housing facilities.

"f. Expansion of the handicapped program. Personnel as well as housing needs."

Mr. Speaker, many superintendents responded to the questionnaire in the form of a letter. These were frequently very thorough commentaries on successes and problems in their local districts and the relationship of Federal programs to these issues. The following are illustrative:

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Thank you for the opportunity to react to some of your concerns about Federal participation in education.

The questions posed in your letter are all-encompassing, and we find it difficult to react to all of them in the detail which might be helpful to you. However, the following constitutes our reaction to selected problems.

1. Addition of Federal support in a massive way is new to public school systems and, in our estimation, long past due. The urban areas are especially hard pressed in that it seems that the concentration of all of the problems of society occurs in the city. The school system is the one agency that seems to be equipped to best handle a majority of the problems.

We were delighted with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provided us with funds to engage in activities which were designed to provide meaningful educational experiences for deprived children. Educators are prone to forget that extreme differences exist in students, and those students coming from deprived backgrounds are especially ill equipped to cope with traditional educational concepts.

As we gained experience, we identified new areas which we felt should be incorporated into our total ESEA project. However, we experienced extreme frustration in that as we identified necessary expansions of our programs, our budgets were cut rather than expanded to accommodate these new and identified needs.

The obvious solution, of course, is to provide massive additional financial resources. However, if this is an impossibility, we would hope that certain procedures could be built into the funding which would insure a larger share going to the urban areas where the unrest and need is the greatest.

3. Our budget allocation for the school year 1966–67 was $3,323,117.91.

The budget allocation for 1967–68 was $3,262,959.82. We could have utilized funds in the amount of $5,000,000.00 for 1968–69; however, our apparent allocation was cut to $3,102,364.66.

4. We are generally committed to the concept that Federal assistance in education should be categorical in nature. It is our fear that money designated to supplement teachers' salaries is too broad a category and would be, in effect, generalized Federal aid which would jeopardize the rationale that Federal money should be furnished to those districts who most need it. At this point in our history, we are not quite comfortable with the concept of Federal monies designated to supplement teachers' salaries.

5. In general, we feel that the recent enactments of Congress in furnishing support for elementary and secondary education have been of great value. As we gain experience we can identify more programs which could be implemented if additional funds were made available.

6. The greatest needs in urban education are in the area of compensatory education, especially at the primary level. We must be assured that the basic skills are being learned by students coming from the deprived areas. Education should provide the vehicle for these masses of people to escape the vicious cycle of poverty, and the learning of the basic skills will be the key to this problem.

Equally important is the problem of bringing meaningful guidance oriented experiences to children which will be designed to help them plan their own future and to present them with a series of meaningful alternatives in their life plan.

Your questions centered on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, there has been other Federal legislation which has been very important in combating poverty through preparing persons from deprived communities. We have reference to the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Act which we think have allowed the school districts to make a meaningful contribution to the community. Recently, we have found guidelines being changed and new emphasis coming on the scene which have diverted funds which we think have been effectively utilized by our school system in providing educational experiences designed to allow people to assume a productive role in society. We wish that some of these programs could be expanded, or even maintained at their productive levels, so that this good work could be continued. Enclosed is a piece of literature relating to these programs, which may be of interest to you.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the need of Federal aid for school building construction in the large cities. I recall with much pleasure the privilege I had of testifying before a Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, which you chaired, at which time I argued strongly for the need of Federal funds to replace the old unattractive buildings one finds in the inner city of our large metropolitan areas. I recall someone saying that we were well advised to match the grant provided the cities for ESEA programs with funds for new construction. I urge you to give consideration again to this matter of Federal subsidy for construction. Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., whose deputy I was until last August also felt strongly on this matter. He had had many conversations with John Gardner, Frank Keppel, Harold Howe II, and indeed with Vice President Hubert Humphrey, at which times he always received substantial encouragement from all of them on the validity of his argument for Federal support for school buildings.

My one short visit with you in your office is recalled many times by me as an important moment in my life. The fact that you had seen fit to attend your legislative duties, even though you were recovering from a painful accident to your arm, impressed me no end.

If I can be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely yours,

B. J. MCCORMICK,
Superintendent,
Pittsburgh Public Schools.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Thank you for your request for my reaction to legislation affecting education.

My reactions and comments to your questions are as follows:

1. No, not enough of present funds now going to education are specifically for elementary and secondary education and not enough funds have been allocated to education.

2. I would prefer E.S.E.A. going to the district. I am fearful of rigid rules and regulations and lack of imagination at the state level.

3. In our case, a district with 1500 students, we received a one-third cut in funds this year over last year. This has caused us to cut drastically our program and to dismiss personnel.

4. I have not given serious thought to this. I would think a percentage limit should be placed on the amount of money that could go to salaries, also no reduction in local effort.

I would strongly favor some provision so we could hire additional personnel to decrease class load and hire specialty people, etc.

5. Title III, E.S.E.A., was of great help in providing special services for our rural county. Unfortunately, this was only for three years.

The other programs have been of great value.

6. Our greatest needs are for:

(a) Special services such as: guidance, speech therapy, extra administrative assistance especially in the area of research, evaluation, and interpretation of our school program.

(b) If rural areas are to retain people and keep them from piling up in the cities, then we must have available many of the extra educational services and help now only available in larger centers.

(c) Kindergarten and pre-school education.

7. None.

In general, as much as we need educational research, I can't see that the regional labs are doing much.

Any plan to return a portion of Federal Tax to the states should earmark the amount to go to elementary and secondary education. If it is put in a lump sum I am fearful that education in Oklahoma will fare poorly.

Sincerely,

OREN TERRILL,
Superintendent, Pawhuska, Okla., School District I–2.

Still further examples of the thorough nature in which many superintendents responded to the questionnaire may be seen by reviewing the answers to some of the questions. A greater understanding can be gained of the scope and magnitude of problems confronting school administrators, and appreciation for the effectiveness of legislation which assists our elementary and secondary schools through a review of the responses to questions 1, 3, 5, and 6, which asked:

1. Do you feel the Federal Government is doing its share in providing funds for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education? If not, what suggestions do you have?

3. To what extent is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act under-funded in your particular school district?

5. In general, have the recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education been of great, substantial, moderate or little value?

6. What are your greatest needs at the elementary and at the secondary level?

Brooksville, Fla. (3,144):

"1. The Federal Government is just beginning to do its share to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. Although much has been done, hopefully more assistance should be given school districts that are attempting to change the way teachers are working with students. In other words, emphasis should be placed off the teacher because without changes in the teaching personnel no amount of improvement will take place.

"3. We could easily use twice the money we receive which was approximately $76,000.-00 until this year when it was reduced by $11,000.00.

"5. In our county, we honestly feel that it has been of little or moderate help but only because our needs are so great. To lose federal funds now would be to set us back years and years.

"6. As stated under number one and number four, the greatest need today is more and varied instructional personnel, not just any person that has a college degree, but people with special talents that can work with groups, develop curriculum materials, that do not have to depend on textbooks to the extent they presently do, that have positive attitudes toward accepting the best ideas of the new ones, that can allow more student involvement and participation in the classroom, that can allow more new ways of working with students. In addition to more classroom teachers, there is a need for personnel that provide related services, such as testing specialist, psychologist, guidance people, therapists, nurses, audio-visual specialists, and others. While some districts may have all of these, there are some that have none."

Ardmore, Pa. (37,000):

"1. Yes, our original allocations were more than adequate. But, as programs were being developed and expanded in the light of experience and deeper appreciation of needs, the yearly appropriations have decreased. This has necessitated curtailment or elimination of some tested innovations, affecting the morale of the staff and depriving children of some of the benefits.

"3. In the beginning, the allocation was ample, but with our Title I grant cut from $182,000.00 to $117,000.00, drastic curtailments in services have been necessary: i.e., in in-service training of pre-school aides, psychological testing of pre-school children, pre-school summer session, hours of work per week for speech counselors, hours for Junior High recreation-counseling program, hours of work for counselors of drop-outs, elimination of summer adapted Physical Education programs, staff of program for neglected children, and in instructional materials for all programs.

"5. In the particular districts served by Main Line Project Learning we feel that the programs have been of great value. The money expended went for programs that had a very direct affect on children. In general the program nation-wide is entirely defensible. Some pruning, as would be expected, is required.

"6. Elementary: More funds to provide more individualized and psychologically oriented programs for children who are mentally, emotionally or physically impaired. More funds should be spent on early diagnosis of these disabilities.

"Secondary: intensive guidance and counseling of socially alienated young people resulting in case work, cooperative work programs, sheltered work shops, family counseling and coordination with the legal agencies that handle the behavior of young people."

Plainville, Mass. (1,280):

"1. Can do more. Money and information on successful projects.

"3. 1965 $7,424. We hired a teacher and two aides to work with third and fourth children with ability but low achievement. Test results show a tremendous improvement in most children's achievement. 1969 $2,900. We need $10,000 at least.

"5. Substantial. The poor local district can really appreciate the gains from additional funds. Our libraries and audio-visual are much improved.

"6. Kindergarten, social services, audio-visuals, teachers of un-average pupils. (Dyslexia, emotionally disturbed, gifted, etc.)"

Glenburn, N. Dak. (364):

"1. The local school districts have about reached the maximum as to the amount we can provide for education and the state and Federal government will have to help a lot more in the future to maintain only our present standards and program.

"3. We have had three teachers hired under Title I and because of the cuts we have received the district is paying the entire salary of $5,600.00.

"5. To us it has been of great value. We have hired three additional teachers and we have been able to take the slow learners out of the regular classroom for at least a one-half day. Our groups have been about ten or less and the test scores and other results have shown great gains for many students.

"6. Additional money for the additional teachers and supplies for these slower children. We could also use additional adequate classrooms for these students."

St. Jacob, Ill. (1,896):

"1. The Federal Government, in my opinion, is not doing its share in providing funds for education—why?

"A. Largest portion of our taxes go to federal government, with small return to local taxing bodies.

"B. After tax bite of federal government, resistance to all local taxes are indeed strong, which hinders local effort.

"Suggestion—

"1. More categorical aid to qualifying districts.

"2. More money to state agency for distribution to local agencies, based on local needs.

"3A. Title I, ESEA is underfunded by at least 50% or more in our district, as we cannot reach children older than 9 years of age. We think our program should be made available to boys and girls who need help as long as they are enrolled in our schools.

"B. Title II is good, if kept equal to 1967–68 quotas.

"C. Title III should be allowed to remain as a program for innovations and should not be confined to state guidelines, also, this program should be allowed to continue more than 3 years—if it is doing what it was intended to do, otherwise, if it is successful. Title III monies are not now adequate, but should be increased drastically.

"5. Federal help to education has been of great help to our educational program. It has enabled us to better our methods of teaching, provided us with much needed materials and equipment, and has provided us with professional corrective help for those children needing it.

"6A. More professional help for corrective and remedial classes.

"B. More professional help for innovative programs in corrective physical education programs.

"C. More funds for hardware and educational materials to be used within our classrooms.

"D. More help in providing adequate housing facilities.

"E. Federal aid should be forthcoming in helping cope with our special education problems."

Sheridan, Colo. (2,250):

"(1) The Federal Government share is inadequate. It should—

"1. Continue 815 and 874 without federal conflict each year.

"2. Increase categorical aid (for guidance, emotionally disturbed, and social and culturally deprived).

"3. Adequately fund existing programs.

"4. Build programs that take into consideration cost of living and appropriate enough money to meet increased needs.

"5. Assist with capital construction when needed.

"6. Provide general aid.

"7. Reduce excessive paper work.

"(3) Our surveys would indicate that we are receiving funds for less than ⅓ of the students eligible. The first year we received $238.95 per eligible student, this year $134.88.

"(5) The value of federal support over all has been moderate. In certain areas or in some schools when maximum funds have been expended the support has been substantial.

"(6) Elementary level. These needs I see are expanded programs, special education, especially emotionally disturbed. A complete new approach to the socially-economically-culturally deprived educational programs. Improved libraries, capital construction, equipment and supplies, money for school districts, follow through of Head Start and reduced pupil-teacher ratio.

"Secondary needs. Technical and vocational programs. Gear employment needs of society to student programs. Expanded guidance and counseling programs to help students on an individual basis, expanded programs for students with below average ability, expanded special education, expanded programs for dropouts and expanded programs for social-cultural deprived."

Belmont, Mass. (644):

"1. Certainly the present level of support should not be diminished. It would seem that further expansion would be needed in the future. Concerning the output by the federal government in other areas, it would seem education has as yet to receive attention in proper perspective.

"3. It would seem that Title II library money should not be diminished or cut in half as is evidently being proposed. Also Title III 'Innovative' money seems to be at a premium. Title VI money having to do with special education for pupils with varying difficulties probably should be the title receiving the greatest extended interest. I believe it is Title V which has to do with innovative programs for subsidiary personnel or for so-called para-profession and needs innovative support as well as continued subsidy.

"5. Great.

"6. Monies for pioneering innovative programs, for vocational-technical, and for spe-

cial programs for children with mental, emotional, and learning difficulties."

Rochelle Park, N.J. (656):

"1. No. Recent reductions in allowances for ESEA and NDEA have brought the programs to a point where the Federal funds are barely worth the time and effort involved in applying.

"3. Present funds under ESEA are insufficient to allow for supplementary teachers.

"5. The benefit of Federal legislation has been the various attempts at new programs and the ability to purchase new materials (library books, projectors, filmstrips). Our district initiated a remedial reading program which hopefully will be continued without Federal funds.

"6. Additional assistance needed (through NDEA at the elementary level for: foreign language, science equipment, audio-visual equipment; (through ESEA) library materials. We have received no NDEA funds. We have had ESEA, Title II funds cut by ⅔. ESEA, Title I has been cut by 40% or more.

Mr. Speaker, the following tables show the total number of responses indicating greatest needs in four main categories: First, personnel; second, programs and services for disadvantaged and handicapped children curriculum development and research; third, facilities; and fourth, supplies—by State, region, and size of school district. Because there was frequently more than one "need" listed by superintendents, main categories and subcategories were established for recording purposes. Each of the following tables is for a main category and may contain more than one response from each superintendent.

Question. What are your greatest needs at the elementary and at the secondary level?

Number of responses by State and region indicating further assistance is needed in the areas of research, curriculum development, and special programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped

	Number
New England	120
Connecticut	26
Maine	21
Massachusetts	39
New Hampshire	8
Rhode Island	14
Vermont	12
Mideast	313
Delaware	8
Maryland	3
New Jersey	77
New York	126
Pennsylvania	99
Great Lakes	390
Illinois	80
Indiana	73
Michigan	50
Ohio	91
Wisconsin	96
Plains	320
Iowa	55
Kansas	49
Minnesota	99
Missouri	44
Nebraska	44
North Dakota	15
South Dakota	14

Number of responses by State and region indicating further assistance is needed in the areas of research, curriculum development, and special programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped—Continued

	Number
Southeast	186
Alabama	18
Arkansas	51
Florida	8
Georgia	8
Kentucky	9
Louisiana	8
Mississippi	13
North Carolina	14
South Carolina	5
Tennessee	19
Virginia	30
West Virginia	3
Southwest	216
Arizona	15
New Mexico	15
Oklahoma	69
Texas	117

Number of responses by State and region indicating further assistance is needed in the areas of research, curriculum development, and special programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped—Continued

	Number
Rocky Mountain	96
Colorado	29
Idaho	17
Montana	37
Utah	6
Wyoming	7
Far West	288
Alaska	4
California	209
Nevada	7
Oregon	29
Washington	39
Total, United States	1,929

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY REGION AND SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT INDICATING FURTHER ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED IN THE AREAS OF RESEARCH, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED

Region	Total	School enrollment: Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England	120	15	61	42	2	0
Mideast	313	43	151	107	9	3
Great Lakes	390	97	217	72	3	1
Plains	320	179	111	21	9	0
Southeast	186	26	89	60	9	2
Southwest	216	93	103	14	5	1
Rocky Mountain	96	59	25	11	1	0
Far West	288	67	116	92	13	0
United States	1,929	579	873	419	51	7

Number of responses by State and region indicating problems associated with funding

	Number
New England	110
Connecticut	12
Maine	15
Massachusetts	40
New Hampshire	21
Rhode Island	10
Vermont	12
Mideast	262
Delaware	4
Maryland	2
New Jersey	59
New York	93
Pennsylvania	104
Great Lakes	448
Illinois	134
Indiana	53
Michigan	106
Ohio	79
Wisconsin	76
Plains	406
Iowa	69
Kansas	53
Minnesota	113
Missouri	68
Nebraska	34
North Dakota	37
South Dakota	32

Number of responses by State and region indicating problems associated with funding—Continued

	Number
Southeast	196
Alabama	11
Arkansas	37
Florida	3
Georgia	42
Kentucky	26
Louisiana	4
Mississippi	14
North Carolina	14
South Carolina	9
Tennessee	7
Virginia	23
West Virginia	3
Southwest	150
Arizona	8
New Mexico	12
Oklahoma	37
Texas	95
Rocky Mountain	88
Colorado	24
Idaho	11
Montana	36
Utah	10
Wyoming	7
Far West	240
Alaska	3
California	142
Nevada	6
Oregon	43
Washington	46
Total, United States	1,897

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY REGION AND SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT INDICATING PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH FUNDING

	Total	Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000
New England	110	23	65	21	1	
Mideast	262	39	160	62	1	0
Great Lakes	448	118	282	46	2	0
Plains	406	240	124	38	3	1
Southeast	196	30	111	45	7	0
Southwest	150	78	62	9	1	0
Rocky Mountain	88	53	26	8	1	
Far West	240	86	86	61	6	1
United States	1,897	667	916	290	22	2

Number of responses by State and region indicating "personnel"

	Number
New England	111
Connecticut	22
Maine	21
Massachusetts	33
New Hampshire	16
Rhode Island	10
Vermont	9
Mideast	275
Delaware	15
Maryland	12
New Jersey	60
New York	74
Pennsylvania	114
Great Lakes	454
Illinois	137
Indiana	36
Michigan	90
Ohio	122
Wisconsin	69
Plains	577
Iowa	85
Kansas	105
Minnesota	112
Missouri	149
Nebraska	34
North Dakota	42
South Dakota	50

Number of responses by State and region indicating "personnel"—Continued

	Number
Southeast	477
Alabama	54
Arkansas	79
Florida	26
Georgia	54
Kentucky	52
Louisiana	11
Mississippi	34
North Carolina	48
South Carolina	25
Tennessee	47
Virginia	31
West Virginia	16
Southwest	304
Arizona	30
New Mexico	26
Oklahoma	63
Texas	185
Rocky Mountain	148
Colorado	35
Idaho	27
Montana	46
Utah	14
Wyoming	26
Far West	311
Alaska	6
California	216
Nevada	7
Oregon	33
Washington	49
Total, United States	2,657

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY REGION AND SIZE OF ENROLLMENT INDICATING "PERSONNEL"

	Total	Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000
New England	111	14	70	27	0	
Mideast	275	51	114	108	2	0
Great Lakes	454	148	229	71	1	5
Plains	577	338	200	31	7	1
Southeast	477	51	236	155	24	2
Southwest	304	152	118	29	5	0
Rocky Mountain	148	81	48	19	0	
Far West	311	94	118	82	16	1
United States	2,657	929	1,133	531	55	9

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY REGION AND SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT INDICATING "FACILITIES"

	Total	Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000
New England	71	8	44	18	1	
Mideast	116	37	87	42	0	0
Great Lakes	267	71	163	29	0	4
Plains	257	145	41	17	3	1
Southeast	276	31	135	97	11	2
Southwest	124	48	60	14	1	1
Rocky Mountain	66	39	21	5	1	
Far West	117	30	46	35	5	1
Total, United States	1,344	409	647	257	22	9

Number of responses by State and region indicating "facilities"

	Number
New England	71
Connecticut	11
Maine	12
Massachusetts	27
New Hampshire	9
Rhode Island	6
Vermont	6
Mideast	166
Delaware	2
Maryland	3
New Jersey	48
New York	48
Pennsylvania	65
Great Lakes	267
Illinois	76
Indiana	37
Michigan	42
Ohio	58
Wisconsin	54
Plains	257
Iowa	49
Kansas	40
Minnesota	57
Missouri	52
Nebraska	20
North Dakota	13
South Dakota	26
Southeast	276
Alabama	34
Arkansas	52
Florida	13
Georgia	20
Kentucky	46
Louisiana	6
Mississippi	17
North Carolina	18
South Carolina	10
Tennessee	24
Virginia	20
West Virginia	14
Southwest	124
Arizona	19
New Mexico	16
Oklahoma	33
Texas	56
Rocky Mountain	66
Colorado	23
Idaho	10
Montana	17
Utah	9
Wyoming	7
Far West	117
Alaska	3
California	83
Nevada	1
Oregon	14
Washington	16
Total United States	1,344

Number of responses by State and region indicating "supplies"

	Number
New England	49
Connecticut	7
Maine	8
Massachusetts	17
New Hampshire	3
Rhode Island	9
Vermont	5

Number of responses by State and region indicating "supplies"—Continued

	Number
Mideast	133
Delaware	2
Maryland	0
New Jersey	23
New York	62
Pennsylvania	46
Great Lakes	212
Illinois	52
Indiana	21
Michigan	37
Ohio	56
Wisconsin	46
Plains	194
Iowa	41
Kansas	39
Minnesota	38
Missouri	23
Nebraska	31
North Dakota	7
South Dakota	15
Southeast	297
Alabama	20
Arkansas	39
Florida	11
Georgia	14
Kentucky	14
Louisiana	4

Number of responses by State and region indicating "supplies"—Continued

	Number
Southeast—Continued	
Mississippi	24
North Carolina	9
South Carolina	5
Tennessee	19
Virginia	13
West Virginia	125
Southwest	189
Arizona	8
New Mexico	39
Oklahoma	70
Texas	72
Rocky Mountain	61
Colorado	13
Idaho	13
Montana	20
Utah	7
Wyoming	8
Far West	103
Alaska	3
California	66
Nevada	3
Oregon	14
Washington	17
Total, United States	1,238

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY REGION AND SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING "SUPPLIES"

	Total	Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000
New England	49	10	29	10	0	
Mideast	133	27	70	34	1	1
Great Lakes	212	57	124	28	0	3
Plains	194	131	50	12	1	0
Southeast	175	26	85	51	13	0
Southwest	8	4	42	2	0	0
Rocky Mountain	24	43	25	1	1	0
Far West	103	30	43	25	3	2
United States	1,063	393	468	175	20	7

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the responses to question 6 of the committee questionnaire demonstrates emphatically the scope and diversity of needs at the elementary and secondary school level. The tabulations indicate the broad reach of the many pressing demands. Most importantly, the responses to the question and to the other questions which have been discussed in previous reports underscore the necessity for continued and increased Federal aid to education and the programs carried on under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Much has been accomplished—but clearly much more is needed. To meet the challenge will require not only continued, but increased attention and support from all levels—local, State, and Federal.

Very shortly, I will share additional results of the questionnaire with my colleagues.

ADDRESS OF DR. M. MACEO NANCE, JR., AT COMMISSIONING OF POLARIS SUBMARINE U.S.S. "SEA DEVIL"

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. M. Maceo Nance, Jr., president of South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, delivered an outstanding address when the U.S.S. *Sea Devil* was commissioned at Newport News, Va., on January 30, 1969. In South Carolina, we are proud of Dr. Nance as a dynamic educator and as a great American.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of South Carolina State College, whose graduates have been a positive force in uplifting our State and Nation. We are proud that our distinguished, able, and honored colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ROBERT N. C. NIX, is a graduate of South Carolina State College.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and to the citizens of our country, the superb and timely address of Dr. Nance, which follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. NANCE

Commander Currier, Officers and Men of *Sea Devil II*, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are proud and pleased to be here today to participate in these commissioning ceremonies. First we are proud because we come from a State very active in our national defense—particularly from a naval point of view in that the naval operations of the Charleston Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, and its Supply Depot have long played a key role in our national defense and Charleston itself a key role since the Revolutionary War. We are very proud of and pleased with our role as home base for the fleet of Polaris Submarines, and the support which the Naval Supply Depot lends to our fleet all over the world. Second, please let me hasten to add that I am pleased to be here as a son of the Navy. As a veteran of the Navy, we welcome the opportunity to state before our mates and before the public that we cherish our association with what we consider to be the finest of our military organizations.

The commissioning of this submarine today adds another important link to our country's arsenal for freedom, for in all the debates which have taken place over the centuries there has never been disagreement, or at least disagreement that history and facts did not substantiate the Navy's long standing position that control of the seas was important to the defense of this nation and in fact to any nation. In order to maintain this position of strength for the present and long-term interest, this country must remain alert to the changing requirements. *Sea Devil* (SSN664) is evidence of this kind of alertness. The world changes fast these days, and the state of our naval arts perhaps one of the fastest. We should all be forever mindful for we can be quite sure that among the important factors in our naval defenses at the end of the next decade will be some which few people are seriously concerned with today. Yet our ability to safeguard the peace and the defense of our country is going to depend in large measure on our ability to keep peace NOW with the realities of defense as they change over the years. *Sea Devil II* and its counterparts represent the "now" in our national defense and I submit to you they are a very strong deterrent.

It was most gratifying and encouraging to read earlier this month that the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honoroable L. Mendel Rivers, of Charleston, South Carolina, had introduced legislation to start a program for a new U.S. Navy. His plan, as you certainly read, calls for authorization of approximately $3.8 billion for construction of Navy ships in fiscal 1970. This is roughly three times as much as was allocated for 1969!

"Only with a new program can we begin to have a Navy with adequate modern equipment," Congressman Rivers stated.

"Since the Navy must have ships able to go into any part of any ocean on a moment's notice, the necessity of having nuclear propulsion in our Navy is greater than ever before," he emphasized.

I was pleased to see that three nuclear powered attack submarines similar to the *Sea Devil* are among the 19 new war ships proposed.

To those in our country who express deep concern for the amount of funds necessary for the defense of our country, it is the duty of all of us to keep them mindful of this: We must have the type of military power or such a preparedness so that the President of our great country can apply the measure and the kind of force appropriate to any provocation. This is vitally necessary in order that he may use force, when justified, with some confidence that history will judge his actions as serving the best interest of the nation and of the world, and not merely as a weapon for massive mutual destruction. Thus one fundamental prerequisite will be that our naval power must always provide a vast variety of capabilities suitable for dealing with a broad range of constituencies. Our naval power must not only serve to deter those who would misuse the seas and misjudge our motives, but also, if deterrents fail, serve to defend.

The bonus we get from such fine war vessels, like the one we are commissioning today, is that as they patrol the high seas

which belong to all of us, we do not risk the political confrontations inherent in the stationing of ground troops and air units on foreign soil. A second bonus would be that they allow us to maintain our own state of readiness and balance without interference by outsiders. This nuclear type submarine *Sea Devil* (SSN664) represents this kind of balance in our naval power. God forbid that we should ever have naval personnel without the modern equipment and technology to do the job which needs to be done.

As we speak of "technology" one's mind has to turn to the builders of this most modern of our attack submarines, for without the knowledge and ability of this very fine old shipbuilding and drydock company such would not have been possible.

For more than three quarters of a century Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company has had an outstanding reputation of building fine ships for the Navy. I understand that this yard has built about one third of our nuclear submarines. The performance of these submarines is truly a testimony to this very fine organization's workmanship.

The Contract for *Sea Devil* (SSN664) was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilders on May 28, 1964 as part of a three-ship order amounting to $83,850,000. *Sea Devil* is the last of the three. This, we think, is further evidence of the Navy's confidence in the workmanship and abilities of this yard, for it is through the cooperation and dedication of industry working with government which have made this nation strong and will keep it strong.

As one who is working with our youth, we would only hope and pray that we are doing our part to continue to supply companies such as this with the personnel and know-how needed to carry on this fine work.

In our opinion, one of the finest traditions that the Navy has is to continue to keep alive the names of its fighting ships for all of them have a glorious past which should forever be a part of our continuing naval history. As families and industry strive to preserve their names for posterity, so does the Navy strive to preserve the names of her ships. The U.S.S. *Sea Devil* (SSN664) is the second ship of the fleet to bear the name of a giant ray fish noted for tremendous swimming power and great endurance.

She is named in commemoration of Submarine *Sea Devil* (SS400). It has been said that the past is only important in that it points up the needs of the future. In this instance we think it appropriate to mention the past as it relates to *Sea Devil* (SS400), in that it was a glorious past and certainly will serve as a motivating force for the pride that we share today in *Sea Devil II*.

Our first *Sea Devil* was built at the Portsmouth Navy Yard in Portsmouth, New Hampshire and her keel was laid November 1943. She was launched 28 February 1944, and was commissioned in the Portsmouth Yard 24 May 1944 with Commander Ralph E. Styles in command. During World War II she served with distinction, having made five war patrols and being responsible for the sinking of a total 29,519 tons of Japanese ships. During her glorious career she won five battle stars as well as the Navy Unit Commendation.

After the war, *Sea Devil* (SS400) was decommissioned and recommissioned from 1951 to 1954 and from 1957 to 1964, during which periods she engaged in training in the Far East and off our west coast. To round out a most noteworthy career, in 1963 she participated in exercises in conjunction with naval units of the Republic of South Korea, Nationalist China and the Republic of the Philippines. She was decommissioned for the last time 17 February 1964 when she was sunk as a target.

The keel of *Sea Devil II* was laid on April 12, 1966 and launched October 5, 1967. She is one of twenty-four vessels authorized by the Navy in the sturgeon class of nuclear attack submarines. These ships are 290 feet long and have a surface displacement of 4,140 tons. The new *Sea Devil* is equipped with the latest navigation and electronic systems, a computer-controlled weapons system which enables her to detect and attack targets at various distances. The characteristics combined with her ability to operate at high speeds for long periods of time and the environmental independence provided of nuclear propulsion, make a powerful weapon against surface ships and submarines alike.

Sea Devil II joins a group of attack type submarines making a total of thirty-eight. In addition to this, we also have forty-one Polaris Submarines, making a total of seventy-nine nuclear submarines in operation. Thus *Sea Devil II* becomes a part of a very potent submarine attack force which numbers approximately one-half of what Congress has presently authorized. I think it is worthy to note that *Sea Devil II's* trial runs were under the direction of Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, who is considered to be the father of our nuclear submarines. Suffice it to say, *Sea Devil II* well represents its namesake—the powerful giant ray fish commonly known as "sea devil" and which is also known as the king of its species.

Needless to say, the US Navy has made tremendous strides since its first submarine, The U.S.S. *Holland*. From 1900 to January 1969 I think we can truthfully say we have made the Herculean step. It is highly possible that the type of attack submarine that we commission today was not dreamed of when the *Holland* was commissioned. It is of remarkable credit to this country and particularly to the Navy, to have had the kind of confidence that the Navy has had in the development of this so-called "new craft" or "new vessel" as was the case of the *Holland*. This is just another example of industry and government working cooperatively to meet common needs.

It is also interesting to note that in the first development of the submarine in the 1800s, it was thought by England that it would do more harm than good if it were adopted in that her enemies would copy it. But such is the challenge today—to keep not only abreast of the enemy but ahead. Again *Sea Devil II* represents this "ahead" in her class.

In a world which is beset with problems, and indeed in a country which is confronted with dealing with problems of a magnitude never witnessed before in the history of this country, as we prepare ourselves here today to defend this country from the outside, we must be forever cognizant of the presence of those who would attempt to destroy us from within. And, as you men of the Navy, indeed of *Sea Devil II* prepare to do your part, please be assured that we shall do everything in our power to do our part. Again I refer to those of us in rolls of leadership related directly to the preparing and educating of our youth and the responsibilities which we have to restore in the minds of our youth faith in our nation. We must have them believe, as you and I were taught and as I still believe, that our great nation was forged in a furnace of faith—a faith that free men will prevail no matter what the struggle. We must dispel the idea that we are a nation robbed of reason and rationality by riots and rage sweeping through every American city or some sort of uncontrollable civic insanity. We must convince our young people that breaking down of law and order does not establish that our entire nation has lost its way in a tangled jungle of emotion and extremism. We must have them believe that the foment and difficulties over these issues in our country today are not the sign of failure. They are not a sign that our national fabric is being ripped apart. They are a sign that irrational inequalities can not be suppressed. They are a sign that we must face the challenges and eliminate injustices that condemn some citizens to an environment that breeds despair and violence. These are some of our challenges as you do your part we wish to assure you that we shall be forever striving to do ours. We must carefully explain to our youth and indeed to some people in this country, that many of the problems which we see today are not really new; in fact, they are not the problems of America alone, they are problems which exist throughout the world. "When dead they have seen the end of war." I didn't say that first; Aristotle did.

So, what is our responsibility? As I see it, it is developing strong-hearted, resourceful men who, like yourselves, are willing to uphold and strengthen our Republic and a responsibility to show all concerned that this is a Republic which works and a kind of Republic which we all can look forward to in the future with confidence, courage, hope and spiritual strength so that you officers and men of this ship will know what you are working for and what you believe in is not lost.

The Atomic Age in itself is truly a challenge to the men of our Armed Forces today and certainly a great challenge to our Navy men whose branch of service has long been one of the most technical of all the Armed Forces.

The officers and enlisted men chosen to serve on this mighty vessel I am certain are among the finest that the country, and indeed the Navy, have to offer. One has only to read the background of your commander, Commander Currier, to erase any doubt that the responsibility of leadership of *Sea Devil II* is in good hands, for his training and experience will serve him well in this command. And, we would say, without reservation, not having had the opportunity to read the biographical sketches of the other men who will serve on this vessel, they too are as equally prepared to serve her well.

So, as *Sea Devil II* is commissioned today, I am confident with all of us working together—you providing another link for the defense of our country and freedom from without and we providing a link of strength and faith from within—the dedication which we pledge will always prevail and, with all your preparedness for combat, your very presence will guarantee smooth seas in a troubled world.

THE UNITED STATES AND HUMAN RIGHTS: A TIME FOR ACTION

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last year was designated by the United Nations General Assembly as "International Human Rights Year." During 1968 I urged Congress to ratify the U.N. Conventions on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights for Women, and Freedom of Association, all of which are now still pending before the Senate.

Unfortunately and inexplicably, no congressional action was taken. I say inexplicably because the United States has nothing to lose and everything to gain by ratifying these conventions. Indeed, these conventions seek nothing for the whole of the people of the world not already a birthright of every U.S. citizen.

Ratification would not require imple-

menting legislation but simply represents affirmation of a genuine desire to universalize those rights which now exist in our Nation. On that basis, the United States should have been the very first to ratify these conventions.

Consider how we must appear in the eyes of the world. Even before we became a nation, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed existence of "certain unalienable rights" as the heritage of "all men." The first official action upon becoming a nation was passage of a Bill of Rights assuring all Americans these rights. Yet, for over 20 years the United States has refused to assert that these rights are due all men. Have we then rewritten the Declaration of Independence to read "some men"?

The Convention on Genocide was passed by the United Nations with strong U.S. support. The Convention on Freedom of Association—a right protected in the United States by the first amendment—was approved by the U.N. as a result of American initiative, as also was the Convention on Forced Labor. The Convention on Political Rights of Women covers rights already embodied in the 19th amendment—an amendment ratified almost 50 years ago. Yet, despite all this, Congress has not ratified even one of the four U.N. conventions.

The moral strength of this Nation as a world leader largely is bound up in our support for the rights and freedom of other people. And, what could more sap this moral strength than application of a dual standard of justice and freedom; one standard for Americans, and another—less rigorous—standard for the rest of the world. Such a practice is a repudiation of all that the United States stands for and believes in.

Our charred and terrified cities stand in mute testimony to the result of maintaining two classes of civil rights within our own borders. Will the entire world someday give like testimony to the results of maintaining two standards of human rights?

As a nation we say no longer can we tolerate existence of two classes of citizenship for Americans. How then can we implicitly support the concept of two classes of human citizenship by our refusal to ratify these conventions?

Do not mistake it: To admit to two classes of human rights is to admit to two classes of human beings. Refusal to ratify these conventions makes a hypocrisy of our supposed domestic commitment to equality—a fact undoubtedly noticed by interested parties, both foreign and domestic. America's position of influence in the world community stems, in large part, from a championing of human rights. Thus, it is in our interest to protect our moral reputation—or what remains of it after Vietnam—by swift ratification of the four conventions.

American interest is bound up in another way with the ratification of these conventions. In the words of President John F. Kennedy:

> The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

President Kennedy devoutly believed human rights and peace to be intimately related and historically interdependent. He stated this relationship very well in his magnificent American University speech when he asked, "and is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?"

Ratification of human rights conventions would be a significant step in demonstrating U.S. support for the United Nations, thereby strengthening the U.N. in its endeavors to foster international peace. A stronger U.N. has been a key objective of American foreign policy since the organization's founding in 1945. Every President since Harry S. Truman has actively committed himself to this goal.

The latest such commitment came from President Nixon on December 17, 1968, when he said, on the occasion of his visit to the United Nations as President-elect:

> I am honored to be here and I particularly wanted to come here with Secretary of State designate, Mr. Rogers, so that by this visit we could indicate our continuing support of the United Nations and our intention in the years ahead to do everything that we can to strengthen this organization as it works in the cause of peace throughout the world.

The importance of the United Nations as an alternative to unilateral action should be obvious to all in light of the tragic Vietnam debacle.

In terms of national commitment let us not forget that the United States is a signatory to the U.N. Charter—chapter IX, articles 56 and 55 of which read:

> All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of . . . universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

We should remember that it was largely through American efforts that the human rights conventions were passed by the U.N. General Assembly. Thus the American Government both through treaty and subsequent action has committed itself to the support of these conventions. Failure to ratify them, therefore, must be seen not merely as a passive refusal to act but as an active repudiation of previous policy, and with it, a repudiation of the content of the conventions.

In short, the United States seems to be coming out against freedom of association, equal rights for women, abolition of forced labor, and prevention of genocide.

Yet, we here know that this is not the true indication of the American people. Consider the diverse groups who testified in support of the Genocide Convention—the American Legion, the AFL–CIO, the Salvation Army, the General Federation of Women's Clubs. That is only a partial list.

There is no question but that, if asked, the people of this Nation would rapidly and overwhelmingly ratify these conventions. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have both published the strongest possible endorsements of the human rights conventions. In addition, human rights conventions which have reached the Senate floor have all been passed by unanimous votes.

So, once again, I say that our Nation's failure to ratify the United Nations human rights conventions is both inexplicable and inexcusable. Conscience and good sense urge us to act. Our people and our leaders are everywhere on record in support of these ideals. We have repeatedly failed to fulfill our obligations and to measure up to our pronouncements.

We must remove this 20-year-old blot by the speedy and enthusiastic ratification of all of the human rights conventions.

This is, of course, a matter for the Senate to act upon, but I feel that House support of these conventions is a necessary, if not sufficient, step to the formulation of a more positive American position of these conventions. It is because of this that I am introducing today a resolution in order to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the importance of U.S. ratification of the four human rights conventions.

PRESIDENT BALAGUER'S SPEECH TO THE SEVENTH INTER-AMERICAN SAVINGS AND LOAN CONFERENCE

(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, on January 27 my wife and I were privileged to be among those attending the opening of the seventh Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference in the Dominican Republic in the beautiful capital of Santo Domingo. Some 750 delegates from all over the Americas had come to participate in this meaningful conference to promote the great savings and loan industry which has already exhibited such phenomenal growth and is magnificently expanding. Upon this occasion all of us, including our distinguished U.S. Ambassador, the Honorable John Hugh Crimmins, were thrilled to hear the eloquent and inspiring address of the distinguished President of the Dominican Republic, the Honorable Joaquin Balaguer. President Balaguer, in words of moving beauty, challenged all of us in the Americas to meet our responsibilities in providing homes and a higher level of life for our people who are denied these blessings. He touched the hearts of all those who heard him by his deep sincerity and his devotion not only to making things better for the people of his great republic but for all of the people of all of the Americas and he called upon those who represented the savings and loan industry in the United States and in Latin America to take the lead in new programs which would produce greater happiness for the underprivileged of all of our countries.

It was particularly fitting, we all agreed, that the eminent President of the old land where Columbus first landed and opened up the vista of a new world

should call upon us all to pioneer new institutions and open up vistas of a new life to the needy people of the Americas which Columbus discovered.

Mr. Speaker, I include the splendid address of this outstanding statesman of the Americas in full following my remarks, and I commend them to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Honorable Members of the Diplomatic Corps, Mr. Chairman, Honorable Delegates, the Dominican people receive, with keen interest and the warmest sympathy these representatives of friendly countries who will participate in the VII Interamerican Savings and Loan Conference which is inaugurated today in this, the oldest of the cities established in the hemisphere.

The joy with which we receive you here in our land is understandable because of the problem of housing. The principal focus of the agenda of this Conference is indeed one of the most urgent and important ones for a country such as the Dominican Republic which has one of the highest rates of population growth in the entire hemisphere and one of the most impressive deficits in the area of housing in the entire world of our time.

For many economists, no relation whatsoever exists between housing and the process of economic development. The housing deficit, according to this criterion, will improve as prosperity extends to all the economy and as the national income is distributed up to the point of covering, each time more extensive areas of the economically abandoned classes. Our opinion profoundly differs from this point of view. We believe that progress, in the housing field, is as influential and decisive in the general development of a country as is the upgrading of technical and educational levels. It would be difficult otherwise to conceive development in a country in which the majority of the population lives in almost primitive conditions up to the point of ignoring comfort and hygiene in their most elementary expression. A man, deeply involved in promiscuity, surrounded by a vicious moral and economical atmosphere in which only misery and abjection are breathed, is a lost dollar to the economy of a country and a negative factor to the ascending process of the community towards the goals of human excellence.

A good house, equipped with the minimum comfort required in modern living, constitutes a powerful educational instrument and forms one of the essential incentives for economic development and progress of the social institutions in any country. Thus, the importance that, in accordance with this criterion, the government ruling the destiny of this country, has given and will continue to give to a policy, vigorously aimed at providing hygienic homes for the Dominican population who has traditionally lived on the threshold of civilization, and deprived of their fundamental satisfactions. Only the limitation of our internal resources has prevented us from carrying out even further this policy that has however to its credit, worthwhile achievements not only in the urban zones but also in the rural areas. In a farm called "La Estrella", located a few kilometers from the capital city of the Republic, we have constructed a pilot project for the farmers established by the Dominican Agrarian Institute in that section. Our purpose is to spread this plan to all the areas in the Republic where the importance of these agrarian placements become feasible.

Many are of the opinion that the construction of good housing in the big cities, especially in the capital city of the Republic, helps stimulate the farmer's migration to the urban centers. This theory seems to be the opposite of our experience and of that of other Latin American countries, where it is easy to observe that farmers' migration to to the cities is due to a number of factors, the majority of which escape the control of authorities, those of the government, as well as those under municipal organizations. The truth is that the demographical explosion in some of our countries, like in the Dominican Republic, is greater in the farms than in the urban zones simply because the population of the rural zones almost duplicates that of the urban areas. The farmer migrates towards the city because farming, still almost in its primitive phase of development, is incapable of absorbing extra help on the farms which lack lands, even for small farming purposes. The rural migration, in short, is due not to the construction of homes in the city for low-income families but to the fact that on the farm there is a lack of land fit for the agrarian reform.

One of the present government's most debated activities is the preoccupation shown to this date, not only with the betterment of our housing deficits but also with the embellishment of or principal dominican cities. There are those who believe that before constructing a park or planning an avenue in any city, the official achievements in the agricultural and livestock sector should be extended, and technicians should be trained so that they can take charge, with strictly scientific criteria, of the national development process.

This is another point of view which we believe should not be accepted in the absolute terms in which it is presented by the government's opponents. We believe that the embellishment and grooming of the urban area form an integral part of our development and there is no possible progress in cities which remain dirty, park lawns full of weeds and their main streets badly paved. What we say about the man who inhabits a run-down hut, belittled by poverty and promiscuity can be also said about the man who inhabits in an urban area that depresses his spirit and project before his eyes a deplorable and discouraging hourly image. Art and Beauty, supreme manifestations of the spirit also constitute impelling development forces, since a beautiful statue, a magnificent avenue and a well-groomed garden arouse a man's imagination and create within him the urge to excel resulting everywhere in constructive and powerful achievements. The divine phrase: "Not only by bread liveth man" are renewed throughout the centuries in the mind of His Holiness Paul VI when he said: "Peace is the New Name for Development".

Another factor worth considering, not only for the Dominican Republic but also for its application in other latitudes, be they in or out of our hemisphere, is that of the almost imperious necessity to use housing construction planning to absorb a considerable part of the laborers who remain idle in the great urban zones. Here in our country, for example, we have applied the policy of using thousands of unemployed laborers for the cleaning and mowing of grass in the near outskirts of the capital city.

For similar reasons it is understandable that this same policy can be used to diminish unemployment by the production of housing projects for low-income people in the overpopulated areas. The construction industry, above other activities, has the advantage that it can give more numerous possibilities to the unemployed class. Therefore, housing projects not only resolve the living problem in a country for the many families of scarce resources who live almost unsheltered and who squeeze together like beasts in improvised huts, but these projects also constitute a powerful factor of political stability which can and should be used by governments to solve volcanic situations created by the private sector's incapability to offer remunerative employment to a mass that grows greatly every day, attracted by the mirage of finding productive occupations in the industry. One of the characteristic phenomena in Latin American countries where institutions of representative democracy have real effect, is the existence in all the great urban centers of political agitators who exploit the natural dissatisfaction of the unemployed classes in order to provoke disorders and create the appropriate social climate for their subversive activities. Therefore, the necessity to use housing as one of the most important aspects of the performance of every government that aims towards the development of his country without detriment to political liberty and with that minimum of comfort to which every man of all creeds and race is entitled in the human civilization of our days.

The countries in Latin America, united, not only geographically, but by the knowledge that each of them have of its community of destinies and ideals, have gathered together for the achievement of important matters in the field of the cultural and political integration and since some time past, also in the economic integration. The countries of the Southern Cone principally, have started to take decisive steps to bring to the economic field the profound solidarity established amongst them by the history and the geography. But there are still some problems which have a great social gravity in all the continent and which could be solved more rapidly if we could give economic solidarity an effectiveness as sound as that which is beginning to result from the cultural and political solidarity between all members of the great interamerican family.

Therefore, the greatest difficulty encountered by the housing projects intended to solve housing deficits in Latin America, is that of the financing, necessary not only for the housing destined for the sectors of low income but also to those groups in the average income classification who feel the necessity of owning their houses, with as much or more urgency than those in the marginal zones. Even in those prosperous countries of the continent and in those which have reached a greater scale of economic development the local savings are not sufficient to satisfy in that field, the growing requirements of Latin American people. If we could manage to create an interamerican cooperation system which would permit the usage, in the housing field, of the private capital lying idly in the banking institutions of many countries of the Hemisphere, surely this problem could be confronted everywhere under considerably more satisfactory conditions than the present. Within this system would fall certain provisions which should facilitate the attraction of local savings and the expansion of the mortgage portfolios of the entities dedicated to this type of activity in Latin America.

Since housing is after all an attractive business for private enterprise, it should be relatively easy to channel towards this field a great part of Latin American savings, as long as a guaranty system is applied by the public institutions for the benefit of those willing to invest in countries where the housing deficit is more alarming. In countries who, like the Dominican Republic, are still in the primary phase of development, the limitation of capital and the demand for money for other types of investment, necessarily reduce the possibility of directing the entire policy to providing homes for those unfortunate classes.

This fact not only holds in the combined

state and private sectors as in the case of the Savings and Loan Systems, but also in those sectors operating exclusively with State funds.

There is one aspect of housing policy which cannot be underestimated by the authorities of any country. We refer to the progressive transformation into slums of many Latin American cities, including their capital cities, because of the indiscriminate construction of unattractive houses built in central areas which belong to the State, or are privately owned, or pertain to the municipalities or State Institutions. The formation of these slums not only detracts from the beauty of the city but also threatens the health and security of those people who build them against the law.

In order to confront this problem, which in our country has reached alarming proportions, during the last few years, the present government has had to use part of the funds which should be applied to other urgent necessities in order to save the city from becoming a sordid conglomeration of run-down shacks. The blame for this situation is not only on the municipal authorities and the government, but it falls also on the political misfortunes which during the last years have strongly punished the Dominican family. But, whatever be the causes of this condition, it is obvious that a stop must be made to the invasion of this deplorable housing in our capital city and to that anarchy in the construction of improvised housing. If the Dominican Government does not act energetically to provide hygienic living quarters to low-income families in these slums zones, and does not complete that programme with the construction of those great avenues, which are shown in the regulating plans for the capital city, as vital arteries for the embellishment of the city and its future expansion, it can be assured that within a few years we will have lost, together with the colonial enchantment that sprouts from our centenarian stones, the possibility of using the natural resources of our country which could convert this city into one of the most attractive in the Hemisphere. Our ideal should not be that tourists visit Santo Domingo as they would to a part of Africa, attracted to this corner of the continent because of its primitive ways or its ridiculously picturesque appearance and the anarchy of its constructions, but because of its cleanliness, the order and symetry of its residential suburbs and the absence, in the areas covered by the regulating plan, of the insulting spectacle of poor housing in which our worst social vices are nakedly displayed.

The magic word for every Latin American country is therefore: "Construct." Build hydroelectrical dams, open irrigation channels, multiply transportation means to make possible the exit of agricultural products towards the consumption centers, make drinking water available to all rural sectors, conquer every piece of suitable soil for the agrarian reform and place a decisive hand on housing, the most acute problem confronted today in all the continents subject to political and social destruction by the demographic explosion.

Another point, apparently insignificant, but worthwhile mentioning to this conclave regarding construction of houses with funds provided in part by international credit institutions, is the strict conditions established for the construction of standardized houses destined to low-income families and especially for laborers. Due to the poor flexibility of these loans, the institutions using them under the guaranty of the government, are sometimes forced to build houses which do not have the required sanitary conditions, if we take into consideration the composition of the family group to which they are assigned. Poor people in our country, as well as in other Latin American countries, have the largest families. The price to which the construction of these houses is subjected does not permit building them with sufficiently ample rooms to accommodate a family of a man, his wife and at least ten or twelve children. Hence the lack of interest shown by these laborers for whom the houses constructed with foreign funds, are built. There have been cases inclusively, where laborers and farmers reject this type of housing, refusing to habitate them because they consider them less comfortable than the huts in which they live almost unsheltered. Therefore, it is urgent that the institutions dedicated in each country to the construction of such housing, come up with a model house suitable to the atmosphere, living standards and the amount of persons per family to be favoured by these social plans.

Many of the most qualified experts in the housing field are participating in this VII Interamerican Savings and Loan Conference. The presence in our country of such capable and experienced technical personnel lead us all to believe that the decisions taken by this conclave will be of great significance to the technical improvement not only of the Savings and Loan Systems but also for the future successful construction and betterment of housing in Latin America.

The success of this Conference and its debates, which will be followed with great interest and profound sympathy by all Dominicans, will give us enormous satisfaction.

The interchange of experiences and the conscientious analysis of the different mechanisms put into practice in Latin American countries, above all, those for the promotion of Savings and the development of the so-called Secondary Market, will serve basically to all official organisms for the establishment of technical roots required in order to avail ourselves properly in the future of the results obtained from our mutual efforts in the search of adequate solutions to the housing problem in this part of the world. We are dealing with a technical problem, but of great incidence in the social, economic and political stability of Latin America. If there is anything explosive in our atmosphere, from Rio Grande to the Antarctic deserts, it is the uneasiness caused not only by our hungry masses but also by our unsheltered multitudes. Your work consequently, is of utmost importance for all our countries and on it we base our hopes of a better future for the dispossessed in our hemisphere and for an unshaky Latin America, political and socialwise. May God permit that your decisions meet our hopes and that the day is not far away when there will not be one sole family without a home and a piece of land where the national symbol will shine, synthesizing each country's history and destiny in its immortal colours.

RHODESIA: A NIXON OPPORTUNITY

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, while the Nixon administration goes about the rather formidable task it faces in cleaning up the rubbish, failures, and broken-down contraptions left by the Johnson administration, I hope that, when it comes across the file folder marked, "Rhodesia," a searching reexamination of our disastrous policy will be undertaken. It is a shameful chapter in this Nation's history and one that needs expunging in the worst way.

Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, says just about the same thing in a recent column which I would like to urge every Member to read.

A GOOD WAY TO BEGIN IS RHODESIA

In cleaning up the mess made by the last administration, President Richard M. Nixon will have his hands full. The catalog of errors made on the domestic and international fronts in the last eight years is enormously long. *A good way to begin, however, would be to rescind the Executive orders issued by former President Johnson authorizing economic sanctions against Rhodesia.*

The Johnson administration went into a tailspin in its handling of relations with independent Rhodesia. Though Rhodesia isn't the biggest problem on the international scene, the former administration's mistaken policy-making regarding that country is symptomatic of what's wrong with U.S. foreign policy in many parts of the world.

The last administration, like the Kennedy administration before it, alienated friends while it appeased foes. This was the case with respect to Rhodesia. The Rhodesians offered to send a contingent of soldiers to fight alongside the Americans in the struggle against communism in Vietnam. No black African country has ever come close to making such an offer. On the contrary, the nations of black Africa have been part of the chorus that shouted condemnation at the United States.

So what did the Johnson administration do? On July 29 of last year, Lyndon Johnson issued Executive Order No. 11419, prohibiting U.S. nationals from engaging in commercial and financial activities that would support the Rhodesian economy. What a way to treat a nation that extended the hand of friendship! The Executive Order backed up a resolution for sanctions that was pushed through the U.N. by the radical Afro-Asian bloc.

As a result of the order, American industry was refused permission to import chrome ore from Rhodesia, a highly strategic metal. Where did American purchasers have to turn ? The answer is "Russia."

But that was all right with the Johnson administration. While the Johnson administration was quick to punish Rhodesia, a Western-oriented nation with a free enterprise economy, it was all for "building bridges" to the Soviet Union and its communist satellites.

Though the former administration was all for applying thumb screws to the Rhodesians, it rejected economic sanctions or pressures against the Soviet Union after the Kremlin sent 600,000 men into Czechoslovakia in a shocking act of ruthlessness and terror.

It is time for the United States to discard the double standard that has been employed in the last eight years. If economic sanctions are to be employed, let's use them against enemies of the United States—the communist and socialist states that hate freedom. Let's not join any more U.N. lynch mobs that want to destroy friendly, progressive governments such as that of Rhodesia.

The Rhodesians have as much right as any people to enjoy independence on their own terms, as much right, for example, as the American colonists of 1776. They not only have the right to self-rule but they have the capacity for it. This is not the case with the majority of African countries, for their economies are in a state of chaos and their politics often are the politics of terror.

The extremists in and out of the U.N. try to present independent Rhodesia as a threat to the peace, when that country isn't menacing anyone and is in a state of internal peace. But the U.N. won't even consider the civil war in Nigeria which has resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands of Biafran

secessionists and which also has led to the use of Soviet weapons on the African continent. The government of Kenya, another black African state, expels thousands of longtime Asian residents, but the U.N. doesn't do anything about that. The Johnson administration didn't issue any Executive Orders to reprimand Kenya or Nigeria.

President Nixon has a great opportunity to make a new start in foreign policy by ending the shame and hypocrisy of Executive Order No. 11419 issued by his predecessor. With a stroke of the pen, he can allow resumption of normal U.S. trade relations with Rhodesia. *This step logically should be a prelude to U.S. recognition of the government of independent Rhodesia and an exchange of ambassadors.*

From this action, the world would know that there's a "new broom" in Washington and that the mistakes of the past will be swept away. The world would know that henceforth the U.S. will reserve its hostility for foes of freedom and will give the anti-communist nations the support and solidarity they deserve.

THE CONSUMER, THE COMPUTER, AND THE BANK

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the chutzpah of the banks, the imperviousness of the computer, and the threat of a bad credit rating have combined to create a nightmare for the consumer.

I have previously deplored the practice of some credit card outfits in sending out credit cards unsolicited, tempting the unwary recipient by telling him or her that he has a shiny new line of credit up to $300.

I have now discovered that the situation is even worse than I had thought: once one receives one of these credit cards, he is stuck. He cannot get rid of the darned thing. Protesting letters go unanswered and notifications tumble in showing unidentifiable entries issued by a Frankenstein-like computer who will not listen to reason.

Here is my sad tale: some weeks ago I received a credit card, known as the "Bankamericard" from the State Street Bank & Trust Co. of Boston, issued to me—name slightly misspelled—at my home address. I promptly returned the card with an angry note saying I did not want it. Next I received a computer-issued statement showing a balance due under the credit card account in the amount of $10.79 for a purchase my wife had made by mail from S. S. Pierce & Co. of Boston. O woe, that such a fine old firm should lend itself to these monstrous practices. This was annoying enough. What made it worse was that my wife had already paid by check for the item ordered. I returned the statement with another angry note. I made sure to write the note on congressional stationery. "That ought to make them sit up and take notice," I thought. What naivete. The computer was wholly unimpressed.

Since then, I have received a second statement, showing $10 of the $10.79 as past due, with a 16-cent interest charge added to the balance, and two increasingly sharp "reminders" that my account is overdue.

I feel like a character in a Kafka novel. In desperation, I am making this public complaint on the floor of the House of Representatives. But what if I were not a Congressman? Would I simply have to submit to this outrage or find myself blacklisted by the credit reporting agencies?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a halt. I am today introducing legislation, similar to that already introduced by Senator PROXMIRE in the Senate, to prohibit the issuance of credit cards except upon request.

TO STRENGTHEN THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, lack of true equal employment opportunity can produce nothing but frustration and despair for those who have the doors to factories and offices closed in their faces. Job discrimination has no place in American life.

The Congress affirmed this principle in 1964 by passing the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act. That act, has, in the 4 years since it became law, done a great deal to eliminate job discrimination in this country. But those 4 years have demonstrated that the instrument that Congress created is not strong enough. Former Attorney General Clark pointed out that the unemployment rate for Negroes is still twice that for whites, and that the problem is most acute for Negro teenagers entering the job market for the first time.

I am today introducing a bill to strengthen the act; it was originally introduced by my distinguished colleagues from California and New York, Mr. HAWKINS and Mr. REID. As they pointed out, the proposal would permit the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue cease and desist orders enforceable by the courts and would extend coverage to employers and labor organizations with eight or more employees or members.

RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill to encourage the development of new job-creating industries in rural areas, thus serving to expand the economic base and more fully and effectively utilize the human and natural resources of our rural communities.

Although several improvements have been made, the bill I introduced today is essentially the same as the Rural Job Development Act of 1967. This bill attempts to provide a judicious blend of private initiative and public responsibility to stimulate the economies of our rural society.

In the other body, this bill was introduced by a number of Democrats and Republicans alike. And I concur in their endorsement of the tax incentives for purpose of bringing new industry and business to the rural areas.

The overall theme of rural development has been referred to as rural revitalization, rural urban balance, and balanced urbanization. Whatever the label, we are all talking about the urgent necessity of expanding economic and social opportunities in our rural communities. I think it is clear to all that new jobs lie at the heart of the rural development effort. For unless we can create upward of 500,000 new and better jobs each year in our rural communities, nothing else we do will have any meaningful or lasting effect.

I include the full text of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969 at this point in the RECORD:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Rural Job Development Act of 1969".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to increase the effective use of the human and natural resources of rural America; to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity; and to reduce population pressures in urban centers resulting from such forced migration.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "rural job development area" means any area which the Secretary of Agriculture determines is—

(A) a county—

(i) no part of which is within an area designated as a standard metropolitan statistical area by the Bureau of the Budget.

(ii) does not contain a city whose population exceeds fifty thousand, and

(iii) in which more than 15 per centum of the families residing therein have incomes under $3,000 per annum; or

(B) a county defined in paragraph (A) (i) and (ii) in which for the most recent five years employment has declined at an annual rate of more than 5 per centum; or

(C) an Indian reservation or a native community designated by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior; or

(D) a county defined in paragraph (A) (i) and (ii) and is undergoing or is likely to undergo a substantial emigration of persons residing therein (other than military personnel and their dependents) as a consequence of the closing, or curtailing of operations, of an installation of the Department of Defense.

The Secretary's findings under this subsection shall be made on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(3) The term "person" means an individual a trust, estate, partnership, association, company, or corporation.

(4) The term "industrial or commercial enterprise" means any of the following types of business engaged in, by any person, through an industrial or commercial facility,

(A) the manufacture, production, processing, or assembling of personal property—

(i) for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business excluding any part of the activities of such business consisting of retail sales and leases or

(ii) for use in such person's business,

(B) the distribution of personal property as principal or agent, including, but not

limited to, the sale, leasing storage, handling, and transportation on thereof but excluding any part of the activities of such business consisting of retail sales and leases, or

(C) the construction of any building in a rural job development area as contractor for, or for sale to, any customer, but only in the case of a person engaged in the business of constructing such buildings as a contractor for, or for sale to, customers.

The term "industrial or commercial enterprise" does not include the activities of selling, leasing, or renting out of real property including the selling or leasing or renting out of a factory, workshop, office, warehouse, sales outlet, apartment house, hotel, motel, or other residence, or the lending of money or extending of credit.

(5) The term "industrial or commercial facility" means a fixed place of business, in which an industrial or commercial enterprise is wholly or partly carried on, including but not limited to:

(A) a place of management or office,

(B) a factory, processing facility, plant, or other workshop,

(C) a warehouse or sales outlet,

(D) a center for the transportation, shipping, or handling of property.

(E) a recreation facility, including guest accommodations constructed as part of such a facility, providing recreation to the public for a charge or fee which is (i) not inconsistent with State recreation plans, approved by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, (ii) other recreation facilities consistent with local economic development plans, but no benefit shall be granted for recreation facilities where the tax credit would result in an undue local competitive advantage.

The term "industrial or commercial facility" does not include any store, or other premises, or portion of premises used as a retail facility.

(6) The term "retail sale or lease" means a sale or lease made to a party whose payments therefor do not constitute the expenses or costs of a business.

(7) The term "retail facility" means a store, premises, or portion of premises in which a substantial percentage of the sales or leases are retail sales or leases.

TITLE I—ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE CERTIFICATION

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary shall issue a certificate of eligibility for benefits under this Act to any person, who is engaged in an industrial or commercial enterprise, through a new industrial or commercial facility (or a new portion of such a facility) located in a rural job development area, if—

(1) such facility has been approved by local authority as consistent with local zoning ordinances and economic and physical planning;

(2) such facility (or new portion thereof) was placed in service by the person to whom the certificate is to be issued in a rural job development area in the first taxable year of the certification period;

(3) placing such facility (or new portion thereof) in service has resulted in regular, full-time employment by such person of at least ten additional persons;

(4) at least 50 per centum of the persons employed at such facility (including the existing portion of an expanded facility) in such first taxable year are (A) persons who reside within such rural job development area or any other rural job development area within reasonable commuting distance of such facility; or (B) persons who within the three years preceding the commencement of their employment (i) have served at least one year on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States or (ii) have been enrolled for at least one year in the Job Corps;

(5) the Secretary determines that the industrial or commercial enterprise was not relocated from one area to another except that he may waive this requirement if (A) the establishment of such industrial or commercial facility will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location (or in any other area where such enterprise conducts business operations), or (B) such industrial or commercial facility is not being established with any intention of closing down the operations of such enterprise in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations;

(6) the person to whom the certificate is to be issued agrees, in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe, to maintain records listing the names and residences of all full-time employees at the industrial or commercial facility for which the certificate is being issued, the date on which they were hired, their employment, their residences and economic situation at the time of hiring, and any other information reasonably required by the Secretary for the purposes of this title; and

(7) the Secretary determines that the expected benefits to employment and to other aspects of the economic and social welfare of such rural job development area warrant the granting of the income tax incentives under title II of this Act as to the capital investment in such industrial or commercial facility.

(b) The Secretary shall issue a separate certificate of eligibility with regard to each industrial or commercial facility (or new portion thereof) which meets the requirements of subsection (a) regardless of whether such facility is operated by any person as part of a single industrial or commercial enterprise.

(c) The Secretary shall issue a certificate of eligibility for benefits under this Act to any person who is a successor in interest to any person operating an industrial or commercial enterprise which has established an industrial or commercial facility in a rural job development area and with respect to which facility a certificate of eligibility was issued under subsection (a), if—

(1) such person agrees to continue to use the facility as an industrial or commercial facility, and to conform to the requirements of subsection (a); and

(2) the issuance of such certificate is in accordance, as determined by the Secretary, with the policy set forth in subsection (a) (5) respecting the relocation of industry.

(d) The Secretary shall terminate a certificate of eligibility issued to any person under this section to operate an industrial or commercial facility whenever he determines, after an appropriate hearing, that the person to whom such certificate was issued has failed, after due notice and a reasonable opportunity to correct the failure at such facility, to carry out its agreement under subsection (a) (4). In making a determination under this subsection, the Secretary shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following criteria:

(1) a reduction in the number of qualified jobs provided by any such enterprise below the minimums specified in subsection (a) (4), shall not be grounds for termination of a certificate of eligibility issued to such enterprise, if the Secretary determines that (i) such reduction results from business or economic factors beyond the control of such enterprise, and (ii) not less than two-thirds of all the persons employed full-time in such jobs by such enterprise to meet the requirements of subsection (a) (4), continue to meet those requirements.

(2) a change in the residence of any person employed by such enterprise, after his employment has commenced, shall not affect his status for purposes of applying section (a) (4).

(e) The Secretary may waive all or part of the requirements specified in subsection (a) (4) if he finds that the operation of a facility requires skills that are not available within the rural job development area and that the expected benefits to other aspects of the economic and social welfare of the rural job development area warrant the granting of tax incentives under title II of this Act.

(f) Each certificate of eligibility issued under this section shall describe the industrial or commercial enterprise and the industrial or commercial facility (or the portion thereof) with respect to which it is issued in such detail as may be necessary for purposes of administering the income tax incentives under title II of this Act.

(g) The Secretary shall keep interested and participating Federal, State, and local agencies fully apprised of any action taken by him under this section.

(h) No certificate of eligibility shall be issued under this section to any person, unless application therefor is received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of ten years after the date of enactment of this Act.

REPORTS

SEC. 102. (a) the Secretary may by regulation require any person to whom a certificate of eligibility is issued under section 101 to file such reports from time to time as he may deem necessary in order to carry out his functions under this title.

(b) Whoever, in any report required to be filed under this section, knowingly makes a false statement of a material fact, shall be fined not more than $——— or imprisoned for not more than ——— years, or both.

TITLE II—TAX INCENTIVES

INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY IN RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 201. (a) Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Investment in certain depreciable property in rural job development areas.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter, the amount determined under subpart C of this part.

"(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart C."

(b) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"Subpart C—Rules for computing credit for investment in certain depreciable property in rural job development areas

"Sec. 51. Amount of credit.

"Sec. 52. Certain dispositions, etc., of section 40 property.

"Sec. 53. Definitions; special rules.

"Sec. 51. Amount of credit.

"(a) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The amount of the credit allowed by section 40 for the taxable year shall be equal to:

"(A) 7 percent of the qualified expenditures (as defined in section 53(b)) made during taxable year in regard to section 40 real property (as defined in section 53(a) (3), and

"(B) 14 percent of the qualified expenditures made during the taxable year in regard to section 40 personal property (as defined in section 53(a) (4)).

In the case of qualified expenditures made with respect to a section 40 facility (as defined in section 53(a)(5)) which is located in a rural development area (as defined in section 3(2) of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969) which has a population density of less than 25 persons per square mile, the percentages specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be 10 percent and 17 percent, respectively.

"(2) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the credit allowed by section 40 for the taxable year shall not exceed the taxpayer's liability for tax for such year.

"(3) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—For purposes of this section, the liability for tax for the taxable year shall be the tax imposed by this chapter for such year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under—

"(A) section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit),

"(B) section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interests),

"(C) section 37 (relating to retirement income), and

"(D) section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

For purposes of this paragraph, any tax imposed for the taxable year by section 531 (relating to accumulated earnings tax), section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax), or section 1378 (relating to tax on certain capital gains of subchapter S corporations), and any additional tax imposed for the taxable year by section 1351(d)(1) (relating to recoveries of foreign expropriation losses), shall not be considered tax imposed by this chapter for such year.

"(b) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDITS.—

"(1) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—If the amount of the credit determined under subsection (a)(1) for any taxable year exceeds the taxpayer's liability for tax for such taxable year (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'unused credit year'), such excess shall be—

"(A) a section 40 credit carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the unused credit year, and

"(B) a section 40 credit carryover to each of the 10 taxable years following the unused credit year,

and shall be added to the amount allowable as a credit by section 40 for such years, except that such excess may be a carryback only to a taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969. The entire amount of the unused credit for an unused credit year shall be carried to the earliest of the 13 taxable years to which (by reason of subparagraphs (A) and (B), such credit may be carried and then to each of the other 12 taxable years to the extent that, because of the limitation contained in paragraph (2), such unused credit may not be added for a prior taxable year to which such unused credit may be carried.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of the unused credit which may be added under paragraph (1) for any preceding or succeeding taxable year shall not exceed the amount by which the taxpayer's liability for tax for such taxable year exceeds the sum of—

"(A) the credit allowable under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year, and

"(B) the amounts which, by reason of this subsection, are added to the amount allowable for such taxable year and attributable to taxable years preceding the unused credit year.

"Sec. 52. Certain Dispositions, Etc., of Section 40 Property.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate—

"(1) EARLY DISPOSITIONS.—If section 40 property (as defined in section 53(a)(2)) is disposed of, or otherwise ceases to qualify as section 40 property with respect to the taxpayer, the tax under this chapter for the taxable year in which the disposition occurs shall be increased by an amount equal to the credits allowed under section 40 for prior taxable years for qualified expenditures (as defined in section 53(b)) which were made—

"(A) in the case of section 40 real property (as defined in section 53(a)(3)) within 10 years before the date of the disposition, or

"(B) in the case of section 40 personal property (as defined in section 53(a)(4)) within 4 years before the date of the disposition.

This paragraph shall not apply to any qualified expenditures with respect to which there has been an increase of tax under paragraph (2).

"(2) TERMINATION OF CERTIFICATES.—If the section 40 certificate (as defined in section 53(a)(1)) is terminated under section 101(d) of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969, with respect to a section 40 facility of the taxpayer—

"(A) the taxpayer's tax under this chapter for the taxable year in which the termination occurs shall be increased by an amount equal to the credits allowed under section 40 for prior taxable years for qualified expenditures which were made in accordance with section 53(b)(3) within 3 years before the date of the termination with respect to all section 40 property used at, or in connection with, such facility; and

"(B) the taxpayer's gross income for the taxable year in which the termination occurs shall be increased by an amount equal to the deductions allowed to the taxpayer under section 183 in such taxable year and the 2 preceding taxable years with respect to employees employed at such facility.

"(3) CARRYBACKS AND CARRYOVERS ADJUSTED.—In the case of any disposition described in paragraph (1) or any termination described in paragraph (2), the carrybacks and carryovers under section 51(b) shall be adjusted.

"(b) SECTION NOT TO APPLY IN CERTAIN CASES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) a disposition by reason of death,

"(2) a disposition to which section 381(a) applies,

"(3) a disposition necessitated by the cessation of the operation of a section 40 facility where the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that such cessation results from economic factors beyond the control of the section 40 business (as defined in section 53(a)(6)), or

"(4) a disposition on account of the destruction or damage of section 40 property by fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or by reason of its theft.

For purposes of subsection (a), property shall not be treated as ceasing to be section 40 property with respect to the taxpayer by reason of a mere change in the form of conducting the section 40 business so long as the property is retained in such business as section 40 property and the taxpayer retains a substantial interest in such business.

"Sec. 53. Definitions; Special Rules.

"(a) SECTION 40 CERTIFICATE, ETC.—For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) SECTION 40 CERTIFICATE.—The term 'section 40 certificate' means a certificate of eligibility issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 101 of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969.

"(2) SECTION 40 PROPERTY.—The term 'section 40 property' means property which, in regard to a taxpayer conducting a section 40 business—

"(A) is of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 and which is not property of a kind which would properly be includible in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year or which is not property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business,

"(B) will be used by such taxpayer (i) as a section 40 facility, (ii) as an integral part of, or in the operation of, any such facility, (iii) in furnishing transportation, communications, electrical energy, gas, water, or sewerage disposal primarily to any such facility, and

"(C) has at the time it is first used by such taxpayer after such taxpayer has been issued a section 40 certificate in regard to the section 40 facility at, or in connection with which, such property is used, a useful life of at least (i) 4 years in the case of section 40 personal property, (ii) 10 years in the case of section 40 real property.

Property shall not be treated as section 40 property if, after its acquisition by the taxpayer, it is used by a person who used such property before such acquisition (or by a person who bears a relationship described in section 179(d)(2)(A) or (B) to a person who used such property before such acquisition).

"(3) SECTION 40 REAL PROPERTY.—The term 'section 40 real property' means section 40 property which is section 1250 property (within the meaning of section 1250(c)).

"(4) SECTION 40 PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The term 'section 40 personal property' means section 40 property which is section 1245 property (within the meaning of section 1245(b)).

"(5) SECTION 40 FACILITY.—The term 'section 40 facility' means an industrial or commercial facility (as defined in section 3(5) of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969) which is specified by the Secretary of Agriculture in a section 40 certificate.

"(6) SECTION 40 BUSINESS.—The term 'section 40 business' means an industrial or commercial enterprise (as defined in section 3(4), of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969) with respect to which a section 40 certificate has been issued which has not been terminated under section 101(d) of such Act.

"(b) QUALIFIED EXPERIENCES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified expenditures' means, with respect to each taxable year, expenditures by the taxpayer—

"(A) properly chargeable to capital account,

"(B) paid or accrued for—

"(i) the manufacture, production, construction, or erection of section 40 property,

"(ii) the acquisition of section 40 property by a purchase (as defined in section 179(d)(2) and subsection (d) of this section), or

"(iii) the reconstruction, permanent improvement, or betterment of section 40 property, and

"(C) made before the close of the 10-year period beginning with the date on which a section 40 certificate is first issued to any person with respect to the section 40 facility, at, or in connection with which, such property is used.

"(2) LIMITATION.—Expenditures in regard to section 40 real property shall be treated as qualified expenditures only if the construction, erection, acquisition, or reconstruction, permanent improvement, or betterment for which such expenditures are made, conforms to the standards prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(3) YEAR OF QUALIFIED EXPENDITURES.—All qualified expenditures shall be deemed made in the taxable year in which—

"(A) in the case of qualified expenditures for the manufacture, production, construction, erection, or acquisition by purchase of section 40 property, the year in which the section 40 property is placed in service, and

"(B) in the case of qualified expenditures for the reconstruction, permanent improve-

ment, or betterment of section 40 property, the year in which the section 40 property as reconstructed, improved, or bettered as a result of the qualified expenditure is placed in service.

For purposes of this paragraph, any manufactured, produced, constructed, erected, or acquired section 40 property, or any reconstructed, improved, or bettered section 40 property, shall be deemed placed in service in the taxable year in which such manufactured, produced, constructed, erected, or acquired section 40 property, or such section 40 property as reconstructed, improved, or bettered, first becomes subject to depreciation by a taxpayer computing depreciation on a daily basis.

"(4) REPLACEMENT PROPERTY.—If section 40 property is manufactured, produced, constructed, erected, reconstructed, or acquired to replace property which was destroyed or damaged by fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or was stolen, the qualified expenditures with respect to such section 40 property which would (but for this paragraph) be taken into account for purposes of section 51(a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount received by the taxpayer as compensation, by insurance or otherwise, for the property so destroyed, damaged, or stolen, or to the adjusted basis of such property, whichever is the lesser.

"(c) CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY.—A person who is a lessor of property, which in the hands of the lessee constitutes section 40 property, may (at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions as are provided by regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) elect with respect to any section 40 property, as to which no prior credit under section 40 has previously been taken, to treat the lessee as having purchased such property for an amount equal to—

"(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), the fair market value of such property, or

"(2) if such property is leased by a corporation which is a member of an affiliated group (within the meaning of section 46(a)(5)) to another corporation which is a member of the same affiliated group, the basis of such property to the lessor. If a lessor makes the election provided by this subsection with respect to any property, the lessee shall be treated for all purposes of this subpart as having acquired such property. For purposes of this subpart, the useful life of property in the hands of the lessee is the useful life of such property in the hands of the lessor.

"(d) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATION.—In the case of an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371)—

"(1) the qualified expenditures for each taxable year shall be apportioned pro rata among the persons who are shareholders for such corporation on the last day of such taxable year, and

"(2) any person to whom any expenditures have been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expenditures, and such expenditures shall not (by reason of such apportionment) lose their character as qualified expenditures.

"(e) ESTATE AND TRUSTS.—In the case of an estate or trust—

"(1) the qualified expenditures for any taxable year shall be apportioned between the estate or trust and the beneficiaries on the basis of the income of the estate or trust allocable to each, and

"(2) any beneficiary to whom any expenditures have been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expenditures, and such expenditures shall not (by reason of such apportionment) lose their character as qualified expenditures.

"(f) CROSS REFERENCE.—'For application of this subpart to certain acquiring corporations, see section 381(c)(24)'."

(c) Section 48(a) of such Code (relating to definition of section 38 property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) SECTION 40 PROPERTY.—Any property which is section 40 property (as defined in section 53(a)(2)) shall not be treated as section 38 property to the extent that expenditures for the manufacture, production, construction, erection, reconstruction, permanent improvement, betterment, or acquisition of such property constitute qualified expenditures (as defined in section 53(b))."

(d) Section 381(c) of such Code (relating to carryovers in certain corporate acquisitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) Credit under section 40 for investment in certain depreciable property in rural job development areas. The acquiring corporation shall take into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and section 40, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the items required to be taken into account for purposes of section 40 in respect to the distributor or transferor corporation."

(e)(1) The table of subparts for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Subpart C—Rules for computing credit for investment in certain depreciable property in rural job development areas."

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Investment in certain depreciable property in rural job development areas.

"Sec. 41. Overpayment of tax."

(3) Part V of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to tax surcharge) is amended—

(A) by renumbering section 51 as 56, and

(B) by striking out "51" in the table of sections and inserting in lieu thereof "56."

DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION

SEC. 202. Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to depreciation) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(i) SECTION 40 PROPERTY.—

"(1) Useful life.—At the election of the taxpayer—

"(A) the useful life of any property which is section 40 property (as defined in section 53(a)(2)) shall, for purposes of this section, be 66⅔ percent of the useful life of such property determined without regard to this paragraph; and

"(B) the guideline class lives prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate which are applicable to any property which is section 40 property shall, for purposes of this section, be 66⅔ percent of the guideline class lives applicable to such property determined without regard to this paragraph.

An election under this paragraph shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations.

"(2) NEAREST FULL YEAR.—If the useful life or guideline class life of any property as determined under subsection (i) includes a fraction of a year, such useful life shall be deemed the nearest full year.

"(3) RESERVE RATIO TESTS.—In justifying class lives used for purposes of the deduction allowed by this section under the reserve ratio tests prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a taxpayer who makes an election under paragraph (1)(B) shall, for all purposes, be deemed to have utilized class lives equal to 150 percent of those applicable determined without regard to this subsection.

"(4) SALVAGE VALUE.—In determining the salvage value of section 40 property subject to an election under paragraph (1), the useful life of the property shall be deemed that life which would be applicable without regard to paragraph (1).

"(5) EXCEPTION.—No election may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to any section 40 property which is placed in service after the expiration of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which a section 40 certificate (as defined in section 53(a)(1)) is first issued to any person for the section 40 facility (as defined in section 53(a)(5)) at, or in connection with which, such section 40 property is used."

NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYOVERS

SEC. 203. Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to net operating loss deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(D), and (E)" in subsection (b)(1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "(D), (E), and (F)";

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b)(1) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) The portion of a net operating loss for any taxable year to which (under subsection (1)) this subparagraph applies which is allocable to the operation of a section 40 business (as defined in section 53(a)(6)) through a section 40 facility (as defined in section 53(a)(5)) shall be a net operating loss carryover to each of the 10 taxable years following the taxable year of such loss."

(3) by redesignating subsection (1) as (m), and by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

(1) CARRYOVER OF NET OPERATING LOSSES OF SECTION 40 BUSINESSES.—Subsection (b)(1)(F) shall apply, with respect to the operation of a section 40 business through a section 40 facility, only to a net operating loss for (A) the taxable year in which the operation of such facility is begun by any section 40 business under a section 40 certificate (as defined in section 53(a)(1)), or (B) any of the 9 succeeding taxable years."

SPECIAL DEDUCTION FOR COMPENSATION PAID DURING TRAINING OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 204. (a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 183. Special deduction for certain businesses operating in rural job development areas.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any person engaged in a section 40 business (as defined in section 53(a)(6)), there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year (in addition to any deduction under section 162) an amount equal to 50 percent of the compensation paid or incurred in money during the taxable year to each employee who—

"(1) satisfies the requirements of section 101(a)(4)(A) or (B) of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969,

"(2) performs substantially all of his services as an employee at a section 40 facility (as defined in section 53(a)(5)) through which such section 40 business is conducted, and

"(3) is receiving training to acquire the skills necessary to perform (A) the position or job in which he is employed or (B) another position or job as an employee at such section 40 facility.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The deduction under subsection (a) shall be allowed with respect to the compensation of an employee only—

"(A) if the Secretary of Labor certifies that such employee requires training to acquire the skills in order to perform satisfactorily the position or job in which he is employed or for which he is being trained, and

"(B) for the period that the Secretary of Labor certifies that such training is so required.

"(2) DELEGATION OF DUTIES.—The Secretary of Labor may perform his duties under paragraph (1) through the United States Employment Service or through such State agencies as he may prescribe."

(b) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 183. Special deduction for certain businesses operating in rural job development areas."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 205. The amendments made by this title shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS DATA

SEC. 301. The Secretary may collect, analyze, and publish data pertaining to investments in various types of enterprises in relation to employment, inventories of resources, unemployment and underemployment, suitability of potential locations for various types of enterprises, qualifications, and skills and training needs of the labor force in various areas, market information, and other economic subjects, for use in carrying out the purposes of this Act and for the information and guidance of businessmen who may seek to establish job-creating enterprises in rural job development areas. In the connection of such data, existing sources and facilities shall be utilized to the maximum extent feasible.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 302. The Secretary may appoint a National Advisory Committee on Rural Industrialization which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of business, industry, labor, agriculture, State, and local governments, and the general public. The Secretary shall designate a Chairman from the members appointed to such Committee. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending after the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED FOR INFORMATION PROGRAM

SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary is authorized to collect and disseminate relevant economic data and to serve as an information clearinghouse for local communities and businesses considering establishing job-creating enterprises in job development areas. Information programs under this section shall include—

(1) telling businessmen of the advantages of locating plants in rural America;

(2) providing a site location and analysis service; and

(3) assisting in the coordination of community, State, and Federal programs for industrial and community development.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for each fiscal year to carry out the provisions of this section.

A BILL DESIGNED TO SAVE LIVES

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today designed to save lives. It is an idea that has been favorably considered and recommended by many civic minded groups and individuals.

The bill simply directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to promulgate a regulation requiring railroad cars to be equipped with some luminous reflector materials.

We are not talking about some astronomical sum of money, nothing like the costs of seat belts and other passenger safety equipment for automobiles. We are not talking about a program that will take 2 years of study—reports and recommendations. The purpose of this bill can be accomplished in a very short time and it can save many lives.

Today, when more young people are using the highways at night, and when it is fashionable for more young people to travel to nighttime school activities, the need is ever greater for this simple warning program.

I urge your consideration and support for this bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, our Nation of over 200 million population has been conditioned to respond nearly automatically to various signals or words. One of these action-producing words is, and has been, the word "Fire." Another phrase is the question, "Is there a doctor in the house?"

Today, I want to use both of these words in order to get the remedial action needed to quench the worst fire that we may ever experience. The fire I am referring to is the inflationary one. It is galloping, it is uncontrolled, it is ravaging, it is completely destructive, and it may—unless counteraction is taken very soon—may be completely uncontrollable.

Already we have definite signs of the impoverishment and crippling effects of this long, well-fed fire among our elderly, and those who are retired. It also has caused many hopes and dreams of parents to crumble into ashes for a chance for education for their children.

Inflation can be stopped by an orderly withdrawal of our destructive governmental habit of engaging in spending beyond our income and thus mortgaging future earnings of all citizens. However, in addition some palliatives are needed for those who have been so horribly burned from unwise promises. I am offering two bills today to provide that palliative.

One will amend the Social Security Act to provide an automatic cost-of-living increase to social security recipients. These people are locked into a dollar limitation by law, regardless of the quality of that dollar. I believe this bill has a great deal of merit and should be passed by this Congress.

The second bill also amends the Social Security Act and will be of major assistance to not only the individuals involved, but also to our Nation. The bill simply allows social security pensioners to earn $250 per month instead of the present $140 per month. This increased allowance is still below the so-called poverty level and is, I believe, a reasonable request. The passage of this amendment could have a very beneficial effect on the present-day costs and usage of the medicare program.

I urge consideration of these amendments.

NEEDED HELP PROVIDED FOR TEACHERS

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, educators report that the present rate of knowledge tends to double itself in 7 to 10 years. This tremendous avalanche cannot be assimilated by daily perusal of our newspapers or periodicals. It is necessary, at times, to engage in intensified educational programs to do this.

The need to provide the basic knowledge to young, inquisitive minds was never greater—thus throwing a greater responsibility on our teachers.

However, as conscientious as our teachers are and as willing to take the special courses, it too often becomes an impossibility because of the lack of individual finances or inability to deduct this cost from his gross income. Therefore, I have introduced a bill today which will amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow teachers to deduct from their gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing those courses for academic credit.

The bill also authorizes some deductions for the expenses incurred in traveling to and from such institutions where the academic courses are offered.

STOP "DE FACTO" GUN REGISTRATION

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the results and effects of the 1968 gun registration are finally being felt. In that legislation the Treasury Department was delegated authority to issue rules and regulations pertaining to the sale of ammunition. And issue regulations they did.

These regulations, drafted in the waning days of the Johnson administration, call for the businessman to obtain the following information from the purchaser: first, date; second, manufacturer; third, caliber, gage, or type of component; fourth, quantity; fifth, name; sixth, address; seventh, date of birth;

eighth, mode of identification—driver's licenses—other—specify.

The Treasury has grossly misinterpreted the will and intent of Congress. They have created a bureaucratic monster that creates "backdoor" or "de facto" gun registration. The Congress specifically and decisively defeated an amendment last year that would provide for gun licensing and registration. I, along with an overwhelming majority, voted against such a proposal.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the "de facto" registration feature to the Treasury regulations, a clerical and "redtape" burden has again been placed upon our businessmen. It would be difficult to estimate how many Government forms they must already fill, complete, and file. Now, we are adding one more.

To correct this inequity, clerical burden and runaway interpretation, I am introducing a bill that would change the definition of "ammunition" in the Gun Control Act of 1968 so that shotgun shells, metallic ammunition suitable for use only in rifles, or any .22 caliber "rimfire" ammunition would be exempted from the Treasury regulation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to hear of any apprehension of criminals due to the implementation of these regulations. I seriously doubt if this will ever occur. But beyond this, it defies all rules of logic to regulate the ammunition used by sportsmen and hunters. The average criminal will not be seeking this ammunition, nor will he obtain it through normal channels. I can foresee no detrimental effects upon law-enforcement activities. What can be foreseen by the passage of this proposed legislation in the restoration to the law-abiding citizen the freedom they have enjoyed and rightfully possessed and exercised. Truly, we should register, legislate against—and insist on prosecution of—criminals, not the sportsman's guns and ammunition.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN FROM OBSCENE MAIL

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress passed legislation which I joined in sponsoring, designed to stop unscrupulous publishers and dealers who use the mail as a pipeline for the unconscionable flow of smut and obscenity to minors.

I felt that Congress had helped to slam the door on filth peddlers when the anti-smut amendment to the omnibus postal revenue bill passed into public law in 1967.

However, Mr. Speaker, recent investigations reveal that in 1968 alone postal authorities received over 168,000 formal complaints from recipients of obscene mailings. Most of these complaints were from parents of children who are of school age.

Not enough has been done to keep this vile and unwelcome literature out of the homes of decent citizens and the hands of children.

Today I am once again joining in the attack against filth merchants by introducing a much stronger bill which would specifically prohibit mail order sales of obscene materials to children under 16 years of age.

This bill would make the unsolicited mailing of hard-core pornography to any family with children under 16 a Federal crime punishable by heavy fine and a jail sentence.

The Supreme Court has continually held that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press" where the interests of children are concerned.

In a landmark decision—*Ginsberg* v. *New York* (390 U.S. 629)—the Supreme Court held a New York State statute constitutional, which prohibited the sale to persons under 17 years of age of materials defined as obscene to minors, even though the same material might not fulfill, in reference to adults, the Court's definition of "obscenity."

The Court recognized that "exploitation" of otherwise noncensorable material "entirely on the basis of its appeal to prurient interests" can so taint the distribution of such matter as to take it out of the realm of constitutional protection.

The right of parents to direct their children's education and upbringing, including the ability to protect them from offensive and obscene material, is established in Ginsberg against New York. The Court said it had only to "be able to say that it was not irrational for the legislature to find that exposure to material condemned by the State is harmful to minors."

Patterned on this approach, the legislation I am introducing today makes it a violation of Federal law to use the mails to sell, offer for sale, deliver, distribute or provide to a minor any picture, photograph, drawing, sculpture, motion picture film, or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body which depicts nudity, sexual conduct, sado-masochistic abuse in a manner designed primarily to appeal to the viewer's prurient interests.

Prohibiting the mail-order distribution of pornography to minors or to families with minors puts the burden of responsibility for protecting our youth from access to filth on the smut peddler, where it belongs—and not on victimized families.

If a dealer in hard-core pornography is convicted under the provisions of this legislation for sending offensive material to minors, he can be fined up to $5,000 and imprisoned 5 years for the first offense and $10,000 and 10 years for subsequent offenses.

It is time that we protected our youth from access to this filth with hard-hitting and responsible laws.

Parents, churches, and schools spend years educating our young people in the moral values of our society. Now the Congress has an opportunity to aid parents and put a crimp in the activities of smut merchants by making it a Federal crime to sell or mail obscene materials to minors.

Pornographic material can lead to antisocial behavior and contribute to juvenile violence and delinquency. This bill offers an effective way to stop the alarming flow of pornographic literature and material that reaches the hands of minors through the mail. I hope that every Member of Congress will support its prompt enactment into law.

PITTSFORD CENTRAL SCHOOL HONORS GRADUATES KILLED IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsford Central School in my 36th Congressional District of New York State is honoring three young men who died in combat in Vietnam.

I would like to share with you and my other colleagues a letter I received from the school. This letter tells the deep feeling of school officials and students far better than I could.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 24, 1969.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
Representative of 36th Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. HORTON: Too many times the youth of our country are accused of not caring, not knowing, and not appreciating the toil and blood-shed our forefathers gave to allow us to live in freedom today. They are accused of not knowing right from wrong and of being only too willing to take for granted the privileges and rights that they have.

Fortunately, for today's youth who will be tomorrow's leaders, not all of us feel this way, because we know that most of these accusations are false for the majority of our young people. There are so many unheralded youth who accept a full measure of responsibility.

We at Pittsford Central High School are expressing our feelings of patriotism and thankfulness for freedom through music on Wednesday evening, February 26, 1969. Our band and chorus will be performing an entire repertoire of patriotic music. We strongly feel that this is one small way in which we can show our gratitude for the heritage which those before us have left.

Over the past year, our student body has been deeply touched and saddened by the news of the lives lost of three of our recent graduates in the combat zones of Vietnam. At the concert the student body will dedicate in memoriam a plaque listing all those graduates of Pittsford High School who gave their last full measure of devotion in Vietnam.

It would so enhance the program of dedication if you could find the time to send a short memorial letter or telegram that could be read during the ceremony at the concert. We would be most appreciative of your favorable consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD F. MCAULLIFFE,
Director of Vocal Music.
VALENTINE C. ANZALONE,
Director of Instrumental Music.
ARNOLD T. CARLSON,
High School Principal.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved by the letter as I am sure many of you are. Too often these sentiments are lost in the hustle and bustle of our modern lives.

John Gresens, 21, was a lifelong resident of the Rochester area. He entered Pittsford schools in the fourth grade. As a student he showed himself to be a determined boy who set goals for himself and worked to achieve them.

Although employed at part-time jobs throughout his high school career he was able to achieve graduation in 3 years.

His teachers remember John as having overcome a natural shyness and a slight physical handicap and becoming an assertive, self-directed youth.

He was endowed with a questioning nature which led him to display a better than average interest in the social studies.

A purposeful boy and a responsible citizen was lost to both Pittsford and the Nation when he gave his life on January 9, 1967.

Michael Lawton, 19, entered Pittsford High School following his ninth-grade year at Churchville-Chili.

Comments from a counselor and a former teacher show his potential as a future citizen of the community and the Nation:

I think he will work to make a success of his pursuits.

And—

Mike has a strong desire.

Mike's infectious grin hid a strong will. He is remembered as a boy who regarded any setback as a challenge.

Regularly employed throughout his school years, he found time to take an interest in normal boyhood pursuits.

He was killed in action last November.

Melvin D. Mogan, 22, attended Pittsford schools for his entire school career, graduating in June of 1965. As a student Mel showed a definite interest and aptitude for mechanics—an interest which he pursued as a helicopter crew chief in the U.S. Army.

Mel will be remembered by those who knew him as a fun-loving boy who showed definite potential and growth as he matured. A staff member reminisced that—

He was always polite to me whatever the situation.

Mel's progress in becoming a contributing member of society was evident as he followed his responsibility to his death, January 2, 1969, on his second combat tour in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, these young men, as are the tens of thousands who have died in Vietnam, are being taken at the prime of their lives. We will never know what they could have accomplished. It is only fair that we take a few moments to give them honor.

I sincerely regret that the business of this House will prevent my attending the memorial concert on Wednesday, February 26. But I will be sending my commendation, and that of all our colleagues, to the students and school officials who are honoring these men.

PORNOGRAPHY TO MINORS MUST BE HALTED

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4849, to prohibit the mailing of smut to school-age children and to make the unsolicited mailing of hard-core pornography to any family with children under 16 a Federal crime.

Obviously, H.R. 4849 is only a small start in the crusade against indecency, and I am hopeful that the 91st Congress will enact whatever legislation is necessary to reverse a tending toward national debauchery by protecting the public from the growing avalanche of obscenity that is flooding the mails, infesting newsstands, and invading the airways. We are going to have to take bold action to blacken the bold airwaves of obscenity from television.

While peddlers of lascivious materials continue to use the mails and newsstands in defiance of family, community, and national standards and desires, television stations are transmitting filth and bawdiness directly into American living rooms.

The fact that films are marked "adults only" does not justify the transgression. It should not be necessary for parents to audit every broadcast to make certain that their children are not exposed to the corruptive practices of ravenous iconoclasts.

Inasmuch as the Federal Communications Commission has been reluctant to place a limit on program impropriety, the new menace to respectability and morality will have to be met with new laws and/or mass rejection of the products of those who advertise on guilty stations.

We must enact H.R. 4849 and whatever other legislation is necessary to curb the crime of pornography. I am confident of new and demanding cooperation on the part of parents, churches, and civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations in this vital effort.

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE—FROM RED SKELTON HOUR, JANUARY 14, 1969

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, Richard "Red" Skelton is without question one of the finest showmen in America. He is a great comedian whose talents and imagination have entertained us for years. But, Mr. Speaker, Red Skelton is more than a star in show business. He is also a dedicated American, a sensitive, warm human being, whose qualities come through the pancake makeup and the slapstick routines.

Last month, on January 14, 1969, Red passed some thoughts on to his audience on the "Red Skelton Hour." I found them very meaningful and would like to share them with my colleagues today, as follows:

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I remember this one teacher. To me, he was the greatest teacher, a real sage of my time. He had such wisdom. We were all reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he walked over. Mr. Lasswell was his name . . . He said:

"I've been listening to you boys and girls recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester and it seems as though it is becoming monotonous to you. If I may, may I recite it and try to explain to you the meaning of each word:

"*I*—me, an individual, a committee of one.

"*Pledge*—dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

"*Allegiance*—my love and my devotion.

"*To the Flag*—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

"*Of the United*—that means that we have all come together.

"*States*—individual communities that have united into 48 great states. 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, and that's love for country.

"*Of America.*

"*And to the Republic*—a state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

"*For which it stands.*

"*One nation*—meaning, so blessed by God.

"*Indivisible*—incapable of being divided.

"*With liberty*—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats or fear or some sort of retaliation.

"*And justice*—The principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

"*For all*—which means it's as much your country as it is mine."

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance—"under God." Wouldn't it be a pity if someone said, "That's a prayer" and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

RED SKELTON.

COLLEGE THESIS NO BASIS TO INDICT AMERICAN DEFENSE POSTURE

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a sense of justice and accuracy compels me to speak about a series of recent newspaper articles concerning the Nation's aerospace and electronics industries. The first one by Mr. Bernard Nossiter on January 26 in the Washington Post casts considerable doubt on the effectiveness of these industries. The article summarized a report written supposedly by a military expert. I naturally assumed the expert must be from the Department of Defense and that the report would have some official validity. So I wrote to Secretary Laird about it, asking for a copy of the report. Mr. Laird sent me a copy—pointing out that the author was indeed not a Department of Defense employee at all and that the report was not a DOD document. Further investigation discloses the author, Mr. Richard Stubbing, was on sabbatical leave from his post at the Bureau of the Budget and that his "study" was his college thesis written last spring and freely available at the Princeton library since that time.

Two other newspaper articles have also recently appeared which bear on this so-called study. On January 29 the au-

thoritative Aerospace Daily seriously questioned the validity of the study. The second in the Washington Star on January 30 cast even greater doubt. In it the author admits that several key assumptions in his paper reflected his personal judgment and were not concurred with by his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to become an apologist for the aerospace industry or for any other single segment of our Nation's activities, but I do believe that in this case some incorrect statements have been made. Certainly the aerospace industry is not without fault, but I am sure fault can be found anywhere if we look for it. But just as certainly the same industry which is castigated in Mr. Nossiter's article is that segment of our Nation's resources whose efforts have not only given us the means to defend our country, but also have resulted in the magnificent success of the Apollo 8. The aerospace and electronics industries further have pioneered many of the technologies and management methods which continue to afford us the greatest standard of living in the world. It works at the edge of the frontier of knowledge where mistakes must be expected. In most cases, it works remarkably well.

I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point the two articles which I mentioned earlier, so that we may consider them and judge for ourselves:

[From Aerospace Daily, Jan. 29, 1969]

WEAPONS EXPOSE WAS AUTHORIZED BY BOB STAFFER AS MASTERS THESIS

The sensational "expose" of U.S. military weapons development published in last Sunday's Washington Post under the headline "Weapons Systems: A Story of Failure," turns out to have been authored by a staff member of the Bureau of the Budget as a thesis for his masters degree at Princeton University.

The author is Richard Stubbing, described by Post reporter Bernard D. Nossiter, who wrote the story, "a key Government official with access to secret data and responsibility for examining the costs of the Pentagon's complex ventures." Nossiter noted that "He and his agency cannot be identified here."

The Daily, at presstime yesterday, was still trying to get an official answer from the Budget Bureau as to Stubbing's job classification, beyond the title of "budget examiner." It was understood from other sources that he is "an Indian, not a chief," and that he is concerned with review of the DOD budget with regard to aircraft procurement.

All efforts to contact Stubbing by telephone yesterday got the stock reply that "He's in a meeting."

Efforts to determine who leaked the thesis to The Post were equally frustrating. There was strong speculation that it was shown to Nossiter by a member of Congress, while other sources said it may have come from someone in Systems Analysis at the Pentagon.

An interesting sidelight to the affair is that the thesis had been classified "confidential" by Pentagon officials even though it was and is on file and readily available at the Princeton University library. It was submitted by Stubbing last May 3 to a Professor Bradford.

Aerospace circles in Washington expressed surprise at the Post story in that it seemed to be a rehash of old problems that have been well aired in both the public and trade press, and that some of its conclusions, some reading like they should have been on the editorial page, were misleading, to say the least.

But the real shock came in learning that what seemed to be represented, by inference, at least, as an official document, turns out to be a student's masters thesis.

Meanwhile, the Stubbing report came in for some criticism yesterday by a long-time Congressional staff member. The source said he had been provided with a copy of the thesis and had found it "superficial." He added, "It sounds like something a half-informed person would write for a graduate degree."

In particular, the source criticized Stubbing's treatment of the Skybolt and B-70 programs as examples of failures. Skybolt was cancelled after it was found to be successful the source said, and the report overlooked the factor of foreign policy. "We decided we didn't want the English to have it," he said. "That may not have been the overriding consideration, but it was a factor." And the B-70 was designed before the U.S. found that low-flying bombers were needed to fly under radar screens, he added. "When the B-70 was ready, it flew; but it no longer was in the world of reality."

The Senate Armed Services' Committee chairman, Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.), was asked if the Stubbing report might be taken up by the committee, as recommended by a member, Stuart Symington (D-Mo.). Stennis replied that he had no such plans to do so at present.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 30, 1969]

WEAPONS SYSTEMS STUDY HITS COST, PERFORMANCE

The Budget Bureau made public today a report of weapons systems costs and performance originally written by one of its budget examiners as a class paper last spring when he was a student at Princeton University.

The study was released following a news story earlier this week reporting on the contents of the study and identifying its author, Richard A. Stubbing, only as "a key government official."

Stubbing, who spent the 1967-68 academic year at Princeton as part of a Budget Bureau training program, wrote the study for a class in systems analysis and, when he returned to Washington, produced a classified version which was made available to officials in the Pentagon and other government agencies.

He found that the electronic equipment that forms the heart of most modern weapons systems frequently falls far short of proposed standards, that costs are frequently much higher than original estimates, and that the companies that produce them often are awarded with unusually high profits.

Stubbing acknowledged, however, in a note attached to the copies of the study made public today, that "several key assumptions in this paper reflect my personal judgment as to their importance which is not concurred with by my colleagues at Princeton and elsewhere."

Although they took exception to some elements they considered limiting, some high-ranking Pentagon officials said they were impressed by Stubbing's conclusions. He recommended the use of equipment known to be reliable in new systems that have to be developed in a hurry; a more leisurely approach when the main objective is an advance in technical ability, and more competition, both in the early development and during the production of military equipment.

One of Stubbing's chief assumptions is that the performance of a piece of electronic equipment can be measured best by the time it runs before breakdown.

He used this standard to measure the performance of several families of weapons systems against the specifications set when they were contracted for—and found that those built in the 1960s did not measure up even to the relatively poor performance of those built in the 1950s.

Pentagon officials who have seen the study, however, said the time a piece of equipment performs reliably is only one measure of its performance and that this standard provides no comparison with the system it replaced.

For example, a device that was designed to run for 100 hours without breakdown and actually ran for 90 hours, would appear much better than one designed to run 1,000 hours which only ran for 500, they said.

Other officials objected to Stubbing's use of the return on net worth as a measure of a company's profitability—a measure that shows the aerospace industry running well ahead of other industries. Some other standards show defense industries generally lagging in profits.

TAXATION OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS—FOUNDATIONS SHOULD CARRY A FAIR SHARE OF THE TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to present a statement to the Committee on Ways and Means which outlines the urgent need for reforms of tax-exempt privately controlled foundations. I want to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the text of my remarks for the consideration of the Members. My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, DEMOCRAT OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOUNDATIONS, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON TAX REFORM, FEBRUARY 18, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your invitation to testify before this committee on the important subject of privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundations.

Today, I shall introduce a bill to end a gross inequity which this country and its citizens can no longer afford: The tax-exempt status of the so-called privately-controlled, charitable foundations, and their propensity for domination of business and accumulation of wealth.

Put most bluntly, philanthropy—one of mankind's more noble instincts—has been perverted into a vehicle for institutionalized deliberate evasion of fiscal and moral responsibility to the Nation.

This has been accomplished by tax immunities granted by the United States Congress. The use of the tax-free status, as I shall amply document, reveals the continuing devotion of some of our millionaires to greed, rather than conversion to graciousness.

Mr. Chairman, when a privilege is abused, it should be withdrawn. And the onerous burdens on 65 million taxpayers demand that Congress curb the tax-exempt foundations which, in unwitting good faith, it helped to create.

Did the Congress intend that foundations use their tax-exempt status to finance the recruiting of college football players? To pay the bills for several years of gay living and partying by twin sisters who befriended an aging millionaire? The foundations fiddle while the small businessman, the farmer, the individual citizen, pay the tax bills—and burn. If the rich care to fritter away their

dollars in senseless frivolity, that is certainly their privilege—but Congress has no obligation to give them tax-free dollars at the expense of the rest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, my bill is by no means a vindictive measure; indeed, by encouraging the foundations to return to the original purpose for their existence—that is, philanthropy—they should emerge stronger, not weaker. This new vigor I do not fear, so long as it is exercised in the proper area. Their pained outcries of persecution notwithstanding, I do not seek to destroy the foundations, but to reform them. And I do not single out the foundations for harsh regulation—I simply propose that they be subject to the same economic rules as the rest of America. Equal treatment under the law is perhaps a painful contemplation for some of them, but equal treatment under the law is really what America is all about.

My bill has three features, each of which is directed at a shortcoming discovered during the continuing study which the Subcommittee on Foundations of the House Small Business Committee has conducted since 1962:

(1) Every privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would pay a tax in the amount of 20 percent of its gross income, including capital gains. Gross income would be comprised of the following: gross profit from business activities; interest; dividends; gross rents; gross royalties; gain or loss from sale of assets, excluding inventory items; and other income, *excluding* contributions, gifts, grants, etc., received.

(2) A privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would not be permitted to own more than three percent of the outstanding shares of any class of stock of a corporation or to own more than a three percent interest in the capital or profits of a partnership.

(3) The net income of every privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would have to be disbursed annually for the purposes for which it was organized.

According to the Internal Revenue Service, there are 30,262 private, tax-exempt foundations in the nation. The Internal Revenue Service is responsible for regulating the foundations, but it has been a singularly ineffectual watchdog. For instance, despite the multitude of computers and data-retrieval systems with which it watches the individual taxpayer, the Internal Revenue Service cannot tell the Congress the assets and income of all the foundations it is supposed to supervise. But an indication of the foundations' economic girth comes from the study of 596 foundations by our Subcommittee on Foundations. In 1966 these foundations had a gross income of $1,079,627,732, including capital gains. A 20 percent tax on this income alone would yield the U.S. Treasury some $200 million. Income from the other 29,666 foundations known to the IRS would add to this figure; but, lacking firm data, the exact amount cannot be computed.

Yet, the amount of the tax revenue, significant though it may be, resolves only part of the problem. Another issue before the Congress is the astounding amount of wealth which foundations have managed to spirit away behind the protective walls of tax exemption. And the figure is increasing rapidly, both in terms of income and assets.

The value of the assets of the 596 foundations covered by our Subcommittee's study was 50 percent greater at the close of 1966 than it had been six years earlier, at the end of 1960—$15.1 billion, compared to $10.2 billion. The $15.1 billion valuation is 41 percent greater than the $10.7 billion capital funds (capital, surplus, and undivided profits) of the 50 largest banks in the United States. This massive, systematic diversion of assets into tax-exempt status erodes our nation's tax base, and forces millions of individual citizens and small businessmen to carry a still heavier tax burden.

The statistics on foundation receipts are even more sobering.

The 596 foundations reported total receipts of $559.7 million during the first accounting period for which they submitted data to the Subcommittee (usually 1951). By 1966 the total receipts had increased to $1.3 billion.

The foundations will suffer no injustice from my proposed reforms. Instead, they will finally share with all of us the burden of maintaining our society. If foundations pay their share of taxes, the burden on 65 million taxpayers can be somewhat lessened—the most welcome charity of all.

One of the questions that turns up frequently in the mail I receive is, "What are the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, the two biggest foundations in the country, really up to?" This question usually stems from the following type of expenditures and is reason for mounting concern over foundation operations:

In fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the Ford Foundation paid out $360,351.26 to four outside law firms. Of this amount, $159,644.73, or 44 percent, was paid to Ginsburg & Feldman, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

The Ford Foundation paid out $446,262.46 for public relations in fiscal year 1967.

The Rockefeller Foundation paid $31,546.53 to Earl Newsom & Company, Inc., New York City public relations counsel, in 1967.

The Ford Foundation spent $210,037.38 for outside printing in fiscal year 1967.

As of September 30, 1967, the Ford Foundation had 357 employees in the United States and 920 in foreign countries.

As of December 31, 1967, the Rockefeller Foundation had 211 employees in the United States and 112 in foreign countries excluding nationals hired locally. The Rockefeller Foundation sent 75 percent more money out of the country in 1966 than it spent here. It spent $17.8 million for the benefit of foreign institutions or persons, while individuals and institutions in this country received only $10.9 million.

The Rockefeller Foundation spent half as much just running its New York office—$5.4 million—as it spent throughout the entire nation in 1966. It spent more just running its New York offices—in salaries and the like—than it spent on "benevolence" in New York State and California combined. The Foundation spent $1,693,762 in India, but not a penny in Arkansas. It spent half a million dollars in Uganda, but not a cent in Idaho. It spent more than $1 million in Nigeria, but it could bring itself to spend only $1,000 in Kentucky.

It spent nearly $2 million in Colombia, but it spent nothing at all in South Carolina, or Wyoming, or Maine, or Delaware.

More than $5 million went into the upkeep of its elegant offices in New York, but only $2,374 of its money went into West Virginia.

In fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the Ford Foundation lost $92,496.92 and $100,119.58 respectively in the operation of its cafeteria and dining room, and, of course, the taxpaying restaurant owners in New York City lost over 300 potential customers.

In 1966 and 1967, the Rockefeller Foundation lost $44,456 and $47,176 respectively in the operation of its lunchrooms, and the taxpaying restaurant owners in New York City lost over 200 potential customers here.

I am hopeful that this committee will agree that there is an urgent need to redefine the role of the privately-controlled charitable foundation. Are the giant foundations on the road to becoming political machines? An article in the New York Times of December 23, 1968 says "Ford grants have gone lately for widening voter registration in Cleveland's slums" and are said "to have aided the election of Carl B. Stokes in November 1967."

The Ford Foundation had gross income of $252 million in 1967, 385 million in 1966, and has assets valued at $3–3½ billion. The Rockefeller Foundation had gross income of $53 million in 1967, $42 million in 1966, and has assets valued at $736 million. I need not tell you gentlemen what can happen in a local, state or national election where this kind of money is turned loose, directly or indirectly, in behalf of their favorite candidates.

This committee would do well to scrutinize closely the ventures of the foundations in politics. The Honorable John J. Rooney of Brooklyn, New York can tell you quite a good deal about that. It is alleged that the Ford Foundation's grants for experimental school decentralization in New York helped ignite New York City's longest teacher's strike. Have the giant foundations made or do they plan to make grants that will aid certain candidates to run for National, state and local office? Does the Ford Foundation have a grandiose design to bring vast political, economic and social changes to the nation in the 1970's? Is this what Congress had in mind when it granted tax exemption to privately-controlled foundations?

It has been reported that the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and others have made grants to public servants. This committee should consider the effect on public servants when they are subjected to foundation grants. Will the grantees be critical of their benefactors? Do you want the foundations to make grants to public servants in police departments, health, or sanitation departments? Do you want city employee unions to receive foundation grants?

On July 10, 1968, a story in the Washington Post said:

"The Ford Foundation has offered generous travel grants to various members of Kennedy's Senate staff, including three of the young writers and intellectuals who were important influences on the Senator's philosophical development—Peter Edelman, Adam Walinsky and Tom Johnston.

"The grants are provided under a Foundation program of long standing that seeks to ease the transition from public to private life. They provide up to a year of leisure and freedom from immediate financial concerns."

Subsequently, the Ford Foundation advised us that the following aides of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy received travel and study awards from the Ford Foundation aggregating $131,069.50:

Jerry Bruno	$19,450.00
Joseph Dolan	18,556.00
Peter Edelman	19,091.00
Dall Forsythe	6,390.00
Earl Graves	19,500.00
Thomas Johnston	10,190.00
Adam Walinsky	22,200.00
Frank Mankiewicz	15,692.50
Total	131,069.50

I have the most heartfelt sympathy for the late Senator Kennedy's associates, but again I ask this Committee, is this what the Congress had in mind when it granted tax exemption to charitable foundations? Were aides of Vice President Humphrey, Senator McCarthy, and Governor Wallace offered similar awards by the Ford Foundation.

As you know, a foundation is exempt from taxation today under section 501(c) (3) of the Code, provided it is organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or education purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or other-

wise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office."

In coming weeks, the foundation lobbyists will be emitting predictable cries that they can't "afford" taxation because it would divert funds from their "vital activities" in public welfare, educational and other fields. Let us dispense with this nonsense in a hurry, for the bloated foundations would benefit greatly from forced attendance at a financial weight-watchers' class. If their managements have trouble deciding which "vital" programs should be abandoned because of the 20 percent tax, I direct their collective attentions to several gross examples of foundation foolishness discovered during our Subcommittee's study.

While our cities decay, and while those of us not fortunate enough to merit the tax-exempt status of the foundations pay a 10 percent surtax to keep the nation more or less solvent, the Bollingen Foundation of New York City, a creation of the Mellon banking family of Pittsburgh, spends tax-free dollars on such esoteric research subjects as: "The works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal," "The phenomenology of the Iranian religious consciousness," "The origin and significance of the decorative types of medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina."

While the Congress and the Administration searched feverishly for funds to finance essential urban rebuilding programs, the Richard King Mellon Foundation sent $50,000 to Ireland for the "preservation of historical buildings."

While thousands of Puerto Rican youngsters drop out of New York Schools because they can't master English, the Agricultural Development Council, Inc., of New York, one of the 13 Rockefeller-controlled foundations in our study, sends $311,280 to Japan to "improve English language teaching in Japanese schools." The list is seemingly endless—one could call the examples ironic, but I think "tragic" is the better adjective. The shortage of physicians in America is critical, so the Commonwealth Fund of New York sends $208,141 to Canada for medical education.

The fore-mentioned Bollingen Foundation, an organization that seems to specialize in sending thousands of dollars abroad for the development of trivia into nonsense, disbursed $212,113 in foreign grants during the period January 1, 1965–November 15, 1967, including grants for the following:

Archaeological research and preparation for publication of a study relating to the remains of rural chthonic traditions which existed in Europe during the Middle Ages—$4,500.

Completion of study of a Roman mystery cult of the second and third century, A.D.—$5,000.

Acquisition of data on important proto-historic entrepots and on maritime activities of peoples of Southeast Asia in proto-historic times—$3,000.

Congress certainly cannot complain if the entire Mellon banking family assembles in one of their Pittsburgh mansions each evening for a round-table discussion on the origin and significance of the decorative types of medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina. If the Mellons are more interested in medieval tombstones than in Pittsburgh poverty, and care to spend their money studying 12th and 13th Century church construction, that is the Mellons' affair. However, there is no obligation upon either the Congress or the American citizenry to give the Mellons tax-free dollars to finance their exotic interests.

In sum: The foundation programs contain ample fat that could and should be trimmed, and the Federal government can find better uses for the money than studies of medieval tombstones.

Grants to governments by U.S. foundations are not without precedent. The Ford Foundation, for example, made direct grants (in U.S. dollars) to at least 25 foreign governments during the period January 1, 1965-September 30, 1967: United Arab Republic, Government of Jordan, Government of Lebanon, Republic of Zambia, Government of Northern Nigeria, Federal Republic of Nigeria, Government of Midwestern Nigeria, Government of Eastern Nigeria, Government of Pakistan, Government of West Pakistan, Government of East Pakistan, Government of India, Republic of the Ivory Coast, Syrian Arab Republic, Republic of Iraq, United Republic of Tanzania, United Mexican States, Government of Kenya, Republic of Tunisia, Government of Antigua, Federal Republic of Cameroun, Government of West Bengal, Republic of Chile, United States of Brazil, Government of Nepal.

Thus far, the relationship between the tax exempt foundations and the United States Government has been a one-way street—with the foundations doing all the "gittin." For example, three of the Rockefeller-controlled foundations have received Federal funds totalling at least $16 million during the past 13 years, in part from the Agency for International Development.

Our review of the records of 25 of the 596 foundations under study shows that 22 of those 25 foundations disbursed grants abroad in dollars, totalling $70.4 million, purchased foreign securities costing $91 million, and sent $15.2 million to foreign branch offices during the period January 1, 1965-November 20, 1967. Translating this into hardships imposed on our tourists, the aggregate outlay of $176.6 million is equal to the amount of duty-free goods that 1,766,000 Americans would be permitted to bring into this country at $100 a person.

The second part of my reform bill is directed at the use of foundations to dominate businesses and to escape estate taxes. Through their domination of numerous corporations, the foundations wield a significant—and unchecked—weight in the American economy.

The progressive development of thousands of foundations through gifts of corporate stock illustrates the increasing flow of formerly taxable income into these cozy tax shelters. In the hands of the foundations, the dividends, of course, go untaxed, and our tax base is further eroded.

The tax-exempt foundation has long been used by many of our millionaires as a loophole which enables them to avoid Federal estate taxes and thus keep their businesses and large fortunes intact. The late Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon used a charitable foundation to avoid estate taxes on his multimillion dollar estate. The Ford Foundation was created to reduce the taxable estates of Henry and Edsel Ford, and to enable their heirs to avoid having to sell Ford Motor Co. stock to meet estate taxes. Thus the Ford Foundation was given more than 90 percent of the equity in Ford Motor Co.

Substantial portions of the great fortunes of men who profited by the enormous expansion of American business continue to find their way into tax-exempt foundations. These foundations have already passed and will continue to pass—by right of inheritance—to the control of heirs or their trustees. This enables a few individuals to control ever increasing tax-exempt wealth.

Here are a few conspicuous examples of prominent Americans who have died in recent years and whose personal foundations will receive at least $293.4 million, which will, of course, escape estate taxes.

[In millions of dollars]

Donor	Donee	Approximate amount that will pass to the Foundation valued as of date of death
Archibald G. Bush, St. Paul, Minn.	The Bush Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.	$118
Henry R. Luce, New York, N.Y.	Henry Luce Foundation, Inc., New York, N.Y.	68
Arthur Vining Davis, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Arthur Vining Davis Foundation No. 2, Pittsburgh, Pa.	15
Do.	Arthur Vining Davis Foundation No. 3, Miami, Fla.	30
George Gund, Cleveland, Ohio	The George Gund Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio	20
Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Currier, New York, N.Y.	Taconic Foundation, New York, N.Y.	20
Billy Rose, New York, N.Y.	Billy Rose Foundation, Inc., New York, N.Y.	20
Walt Disney, Los Angeles, Calif.	The Disney Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif.	2.4
Total		293.4

The trend to shift the wealth of America's richest families into tax-exempt foundations and trusts represents a gigantic loophole in our tax laws. This is an area urgently needing reform.

Stanley S. Surrey, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, is reported to have said in a speech on February 23, 1967: "The present resort of tax and business planners to the creation of a private foundation to hold the stock of a business enterprise so as to perpetuate the family control of that enterprise is a complete distortion of the policies and philanthropic motivations that underlie the tax benefits granted charitable contributions and charitable institutions." I agree emphatically with Mr. Surrey's statement, and urge that Congress put an end to this distortion.

Increasing numbers of foundations hold substantial interests in commercial enterprises. Of the 596 foundations under study by our Subcommittee, 136 held stock in 288 corporations at the close of 1966, in amounts ranging from five to 100 percent of the outstanding shares of at least one class of stock. The carrying value of those shares was $2.5 billion, the estimated market value $4.9 billion. Even the latter figure is most likely an understatement, however, because in many instances the securities were in closely-held companies that are not traded. A prime example is the James Irvine Foundation, of San Francisco, which owns 53 percent of the Irvine Co., which in turn owns 88,000 acres in suburban Los Angeles, almost one-fifth the land area of Orange County. The land is reportedly valued at $1 billion—but the Foundation carries the Irvine Company stock at $2.

Here is a sampling of some nationally-known companies that had substantial links with tax-free foundations at the end of 1966:

B. Altman & Co. (New York)—95 percent of the capital voting stock owned by Altman Foundation, New York City.

American Chain & Cable Co., Inc.—17 percent of the capital voting stock owned by Wm. T. Morris Foundation, New York City.

American National Insurance Co.—35 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Moody Foundation, Galveston, Tex.

Cannon Mills Co.—16 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Cannon Foundation, Inc., Concord, N.C.

Coca-Cola International—16 percent of the common voting stock owned by Emily & Ernest Woodruff Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.

Dana Corp.—17 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Charles A. Dana Foundation, Greenwich, Conn.

Duke Power Co.—57 percent of the common voting stock owned by Duke Endowment, New York City.

Federal Cartridge Corp.—100 percent of the common voting stock and 100 percent of the preferred nonvoting stock owned by Olin Foundation, Inc., New York City.

Ford Motor Co.—100 percent of the class A nonvoting stock owned by the Ford Foundation, New York City.

W. T. Grant Co.—10 percent of the common voting stock and 8 percent of the preferred nonvoting stock owned by the Grant Foundation, Inc., New York City.

Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc.—34 percent of the common voting stock owned by John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc., New York City.

H. J. Heinz Co.—17 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Howard Heinz Endowment, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Hughes Aircraft Co.—100 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Miami Beach, Fla.

Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc.—8 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Norton Simon Foundation, Fullerton, Calif.

Irvine Co.—53 percent of the common voting stock owned by the James Irvine Foundation, San Francisco, Calif.

Kaiser Industries Corp.—15 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Oakland, Calif.

Kellogg Co.—Approximately 51 percent of the common voting stock owned by W. K. Kellogg Foundation Trust, Battle Creek, Mich.

S. S. Kresge Co.—22 percent of the capital voting stock owned by Kresge Foundation, Detroit, Mich.

Eli Lilly & Co.—24 percent of the common stock owned by Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

McDonnell Aircraft Corp.—7 percent of the common voting stock owned by the McDonnell Foundation, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.—17 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Charles E. Merrill Trust, New York City.

Miller Brewing Co.—47 percent of the common voting stock owned by De Rance, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.

Ralston Purina Co.—20 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Mo.

Rohm and Haas Co.—19 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Phoebe Waterman Foundation, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sahara Coal Co., Inc.—36 percent of the preferred nonvoting stock and 24 percent of the common voting stock owned by Woods Charitable Fund, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Sun Oil Co.—22 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Pew Memorial Trust, Philadelphia, Pa.

Timken Roller Bearing Co.—10 percent of the common voting stock owned by the Timken Foundation of Canton, Ohio.

United States Sugar Corp.—48 percent of the common stock owned by Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Flint, Mich.

Wieboldt Stores, Inc.—91 percent of the 6 percent cumulative preferred voting stock owned by Wieboldt Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

My bill, by limiting foundation holdings to more than three percent of any class of shares, would make it more difficult for our millionaires to bypass the tax collector by handing their intact estates over to tax-free captive foundations. The estate tax—was a Congressional declaration of public policy—the use of tax-exempt foundations to avoid estate taxes is a violation of that public policy, and should be halted.

My constituents in East Texas have a bitter truism: "Them that has, gits." When speaking of the foundations, one can add two more words: "Them that has, gits, and keeps." And it is to the proclivity of some foundations for hoarding money, rather than distributing it, as they are supposed to do, that the third section of my reform bill is directed. The tax returns of the 596 foundations under study by our Subcommittee indicate they had accumulated (meaning unspent) income of $1.9 billion at the end of 1966. At the end of the first accounting period for which they submitted data to our Subcommittee (usually 1951), their unspent income totalled only $364 million.

My solution is straightforward, and simple: The foundations were created to spend, not to hoard and grow—thus Congress should require them to spend, annually, their net income, and for the purposes for which they were organized.

The foundation problems are far more numerous and serious than Treasury officials have been willing to admit publicly. During our Subcommittee's 1964 hearings, I made the following statement, in part:

"The Secretary of the Treasury has testified that it is the Treasury's duty to be alert to all possible violations of law. The Secretary also says (1) he does not consider it proper for a foundation to engage in insider's stock deals, stock price manipulations, short sales, margin trading, speculation in commodity futures, or to act as an unregulated source of stock market credit, and (2) the SEC should be alerted to the possibility of a foundation's involvement in insider deals and stock price manipulations.

"Yet, testimony before this Subcommittee indicates the following:

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether they are violating any Federal securities laws—including those relating to insider's stock deals, stock price manipulations, and unregulated sources of stock market credit.

"The IRS has not collected any information, as to the extent that foundations are involved in speculation and trading on margin.

"The IRS has not collected any data on the involvement of foundations in corporate proxy fights.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether their foreign operations may be in conflict with Government policies.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether the foundations are channeling income and corpus in a direction that may hurt competitors and investors.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether they are being used as a device for engaging in various trade practices which might be in violation of certain statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission or the Antitrust Division.

"Few of the persons in the IRS who examine foundation tax returns would be sufficiently familiar with the antitrust law to know whether the practices as cited may violate Section 5 of the FTC Act or the Sherman Act.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether there is a conflict of interest between the duties of a foundation's directors or trustees and their interests as officers, stockholders and employees of business corporations whose stock is controlled by the foundation.

"The Acting Commissioner does not know of any cases where compensation of officers, directors or trustees among the large foundations has been unreasonable or unjustified. Yet, Mr. Benson Ford received $15,000 for attending three meetings of the Ford Foundation.

"The IRS does not review a foundation's individual charitable donations.

"The IRS has no rule of thumb regarding the percentage of income that a foundation must spend for the purpose for which it was granted tax exemption.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether contributions are being made to the foundations by persons or organizations that supply goods or services to companies interlocked with the foundations.

"The IRS does not know how much money was spent overseas by U.S. foundations in 1963.

"The IRS does not examine foundations to determine whether they are making loans overseas that may be contributing to our balance of payments problem.

"This is the most impressive record of do-nothing that I have seen in my 36 years in Congress."

I regret to say that those observations are just as pertinent today as they were in 1964.

The fact that foundations are exempt from taxation does not mean that they are exempt from other Federal laws. Hence, antitrust law, FTC law, SEC law, etc. are applicable to foundations.

It is, of course, possible for a foundation to be used as a device for engaging in various trade practices which may be a violation of certain statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission or the Antitrust Division. For example, contributions may be made to a foundation by (1) persons or organizations that supply goods or services to companies interlocked with the foundations, or (2) from persons or organizations that buy goods or services from companies interlocked with the foundation. The point is that, if the company that is interlocked with a foundation is doing business and by a contribution to the parent foundation they get the business because of that interlock, they are obviously getting an advantage. This is one of the things that the Ways and Means Committee should consider in drafting a self-dealing law.

In other words, a contribution can be made to a foundation for a business purpose rather than an eleemosynary purpose. For example, under the Robinson-Patman Act, business concerns are prohibited from making disproportionate discriminatory discounts to particular buyers if the effect might be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. Hence, contributions to a foundation can be a method of getting around this provision of law.

Also, there is the business practice known as reciprocity, which may violate the antitrust laws. It involves tacit or actual agreement to do business with a firm if it reciprocates and gives business in return. Foundations may be parties to reciprocity arrangements. For example, a business affiliated with a foundation may say to one of its suppliers, "I will buy from you if you will contribute to such and such a foundation" or, "if you buy from me, such and such foundation will make you a business loan at favorable terms".

Our study indicates that many business suppliers and buyers have made sizable contributions to foundations controlled by customers. For example, we know that a number of suppliers of the Hilton Hotel chain are contributors to the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, of Los Angeles. Mr. C. N. Hilton, Jr.,

Secretary of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, has acknowledged that, during the fiscal years ending February 28, 1952 through February 28, 1963, 29 donors—who were suppliers of goods or services to Hilton Hotels Corporation or its subsidiaries—made contributions to the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation in the amount of $61,695.18.

Does not this kind of situation appear to raise the specter of business reciprocity—We will buy from you if you contribute to our foundation?

If so, does it not raise a number of serious antitrust problems? Specifically, may it not involve a possible violation of the Robinson-Patman Act because it involves the inducement of discriminatory prices?

Or may it not involve a violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act as have other instances of business reciprocity because they involve "unfair methods of competition"?

Here is another case that we discussed in our hearings. The Rogosin Foundation, of New York City, is controlled by the Rogosin family. The Rogosin family has also dominated Beaunit Corporation (formerly Beaunit Mills, Inc.), Rogosin Industries, Limited, and Skenandoa Rayon Corporation.

At December 31, 1952, the Foundation held 33⅓ percent of the nonvoting preferred stock of Beaunit Mills, Inc. (carrying value $2.7 million) as well as 5 percent of the common voting stock of the same corporation (carrying value $1.9 million).

Beaunit Mills, Inc., manufactures synthetic yarn, knits and weaves fabrics, and manufactures intimate apparel. The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Akron, Ohio, has been a buyer of tire-cord yarn from Beaunit Corporation.

In March 1952, Goodyear made a cash donation of $150,000 to the Rogosin Foundation. Additionally, on March 10, 1952, Goodyear loaned $2.5 million to the Rogosin Foundation at 4 percent interest. The loan was to be paid off in installments due January 3–August 15, 1953, January 3–August 15, 1954, and January 3–August 15, 1955. According to the Foundation, payments on the loan were made on August 15, 1953, August 15, 1954, and August 15, 1955.

The Foundation states that it used the $2.5 million loan to purchase from Beaunit Mills, Inc., 30,000 shares of the latter's preferred stock. An identical number of shares of Beaunit Mills, Inc., preferred stock was pledged by the Foundation as collateral for the loan.

So, here we have the question as to whether this arrangement involves a price discount from Rogosin to Goodyear, for which Goodyear, the buyer, compensated Rogosin by making a contribution to the Rogosin Foundation. If this were the case, would it not seem to raise both tax and antitrust problems. First, it is a method whereby the buyer compensates the seller by making a tax deductible contribution to the Rogosin Foundation? Second, would not this practice, at best, be a distortion of the pricing and exchange process in a free enterprise economy? Third, might not this practice actually involve, (a) a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act because it involved discriminatory pricing, or (b) a violation of section 3 of the Federal Trade Commission Act because it is an unfair method of competition? Additionally, of course, Goodyear was acting as a source of unregulated credit.

Then there are the possible antitrust problems—actual or potential conflict of interest situations—that may stem from situations where board members of foundations also sit on the boards of business firms that compete with each other. As we all know, Section 8 of the Clayton Act provides that no person shall be a director of two or more competing corporations. Now, that Act does not apply to indirect interlocks, such as when a foundation has two board members, one of whom is also a board member of corporation A and the other member is on the board of corporation B (a competitor of A). While there is nothing illegal about such an arrangement under Section 8, there could be a special public interest problem when a foundation established for eleemosynary purposes becomes a vehicle for such indirect interlocks which might affect competition.

Here is another area that this panel should explore. Does a businessman in government pose a greater potential conflict of interest than the officials of foundations in government—such as, for example, McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation, whose overlords, the Ford family, have immense commercial interests throughout the world, including the Middle East? It seems to me a bit inconsistent for the Congress to require a businessman to completely eliminate potential conflict of interest when, at the same time, it permits Mr. Bundy to wander in and out of the Government while retaining his $65,000 annual salary from the Ford Foundation. This was the case in June 1967 when Mr. Bundy became Executive Secretary to the National Security Council Committee on the Middle East.

Now, to turn to the stock market—there is ample evidence that many foundations are actively trading in the market with substantial portions of their funds. Judging from the content of their portfolios and the frequency of turnover, many foundations are concerned less with equity yields and inflationary trends than they are with the lure of capital gains to swell their principal funds. I might add that former Secretary Dillon testified that he shares my view that speculative gains for charity are not worth the risk of speculative losses, and that he knew of no case where directors or trustees of a foundation have reimbursed the foundation for losses incurred in speculation.

One of the operations that should be subjected to the close scrutiny of this committee is that of the private pooling of investments by some foundations—in other words, the pooling of capital to trade in the stock market. For example, some of the Rockefeller foundations have informed us that they have a joint investment staff of 16 persons, not including secretarial, headed by Mr. J. Richardson Dilworth, which provides investment services with the cost shared by the various Rockefeller participants.

Does this not raise some potential problems—the possibility of speculative tactics, the possibility of a conflict of interest, the possibility of huge buying power that will have a strong impact on the prices of stock they deal in?

Secretary Dillon also testified that a foundation can be a source of unfair competition arising from active use of foundation assets by donors or trustees for private business ends, and that there are an infinite number of ways in which foundation assets or income can be used for the preferment of one set of private persons over another. The Secretary agreed that (1) foundations' moneylending activities put them into unfair competition with private lenders and also give the foundations an element of influence over a wide range of business ventures, and (2) such activities may present problems, such as preferential rates of interest. All this is made possible by the fact that, at present, the only restraint on a foundation's moneylending appears to be that loans must carry a "reasonable" rate of interest and adequate security, and that nothing prevents the foundation from making loans to its founder or his family, the businesses under his control, or a donor.

I conclude with this thought: There is something fundamentally wrong in conditions which make such acquisition of economic power possible, and which tolerate its continuation. And it is the responsibility of Congress to correct those conditions.

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to appear before this distinguished panel. Thank you very much. You may be assured that our Subcommittee will do everything possible to cooperate with the Committee on Ways and Means. I have informed Chairman Mills that we will be delighted to loan our records and our staff to the Committee on Ways and Means whenever it wishes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to insert here for the record breakdowns of certain Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation payments and other data which I mentioned earlier.

ANOTHER BANKER JOINS THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT CLUB

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, banker No. 4 has been added to the list of notables at the U.S. Treasury Department.

The latest is Mr. James E. Smith, who has been appointed Special Assistant to the Secretary for Congressional Relations. The title is, of course, a polite name for Treasury Department lobbyist.

Mr. Smith's most recent place of employment has been the Washington office of the American Bankers Association. The last quarterly list of lobbyists as compiled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and published in the January 13, 1969, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 472 to 500, lists Mr. Smith as a lobbyist for the American Bankers Association.

So, obviously, Mr. Smith will find no great change in his duties. He has been lobbying for the banks for the American Bankers Association. He will now be lobbying for the Treasury Department.

As a lobbyist for the American Bankers Association, Mr. Smith has, of course, worked with Mr. Charles Walker, who was executive vice president of the American Bankers Association before he became Under Secretary of the Treasury last month. Mr. Smith and Mr. Walker are now rejoined at the Treasury.

And I am sure that Mr. Smith will be no stranger to the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, who was chairman of the Continental-Illinois National Bank, one of the largest members of the American Bankers Association, and Mr. Paul Volcker, the other Under Secretary of the Treasury, who was a vice president of the Chase Manhattan National Bank, also a heavy contributor and a leading member of the American Bankers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a Treasury Department release announcing the arrival of Mr. Smith:

SECRETARY KENNEDY NAMES JAMES E. SMITH AS ASSISTANT FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy today announced appointment of James E. Smith of Aberdeen, South Dakota, as Spe-

cial Assistant to the Secretary. His responsibilities will include Congressional Relations and associated duties.

Before joining the Treasury, Mr. Smith was on the Washington staff of the American Bankers Association from 1963 to 1969. His positions included Deputy Manager and Associate Federal Legislative Counsel.

From 1962 to 1963, Mr. Smith was minority counsel to the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. He served as legislative aide to Senator Karl E. Mundt from 1957 to 1962, and from 1955 to 1957 was an investigator in the Office of Security, Department of State.

Born in Aberdeen, September 28, 1930, he received a bachelor of science degree in 1952 from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City. In 1959 he received a bachelor of laws degree from The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Smith is married to the former Sarah Spear of Ashley, Illinois, at one time an assistant to Senator Paul H. Douglas. The Smiths and their daughter, Susan Elizabeth, 8, live at 3604 Barcroft View Terrace, Bailey's Cross Roads, Virginia. Mr. Smith has a son James E. Smith II, 14, by a former marriage.

WASHINGTON POST WARNS ABOUT DANGERS OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the concern over the trend toward conglomerates centered around big banks is growing throughout the Nation.

The American public is waking up to the realization that the banks, through the loopholes in the Bank Holding Company Act, are threatening to place the entire American economy under the control of a handful of people.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington Post of February 18:

WHAT IS BANKING?

The one-bank holding company is something we are likely to hear a great deal about in the next few months. Such strange bedfellows as McChesney Martin, Wright Patman and Ralph Nader are coming together in opposition to these things and seem to be squaring off with the bankers and probably the Treasury Department for a battle royal over them. Both sides admit that the outcome of this battle will have a lot to do with the shape of the American economy.

In ordinary phraseology, a one-bank holding company is simply a company that owns exactly one bank. Its significance is that such a company is exempt from regulation under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 which applies to companies owing two or more banks. That Act was passed to prevent undue concentration of the control of banking and to keep the business of banking somewhat separate from the rest of American business. Until the last two or three years, this exemption was used primarily in small towns. There, one small company might own the local bank as well as the insurance agency, a warehouse or two, and so on. But the latest fad among bankers is to create these one-bank holding companies. In the last four months of 1968, plans were consummated or announced for the creation of 99 new ones involving banks with deposits of $90 billion. The suddenness of their spurt is clear when those figures are compared to the statistics gathered by the staff of the House Banking Committee showing that on last Sept. 1 there were 684 one-bank holding companies involving banks with deposits of $18 billion.

The rush to create these new companies seems to have arisen from the discovery by the bankers that this is a method of broadening their activities. Such a holding company may own all sorts of other enterprises, thus increasing the scope and earnings potential of the aggressive banks. For example, the Jim Walter Corporation, which is widely known as a builder of low cost housing, owns the First National Bank of St. Petersburg, Fla., among other things. Montgomery Ward & Co., R. H. Macy & Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. and many other major corporations own one bank. Now, Bank of America, Chase Manhattan Bank, First National City Bank, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company and many others are turning themselves into companies which will be the legal equivalent of these.

The danger, according to the critics, is that these one-bank holding companies will become the keystone of large industrial empires thus turning control of the American economy over to the bankers. They point out that the six largest banks in the country have turned or have announced plans to turn themselves into one-bank holding companies. This raises the possibility that the nonbanking subsidiaries of such companies will have first call on money in its cheapest form—demand deposits—and a distinct advantage over competitors in the struggle for credit.

The problem, of course, is what the business of banking ought to entail. In recent years, banks have branched out into mutual funds, insurance companies, travel agencies, credit card arrangements and so on. In some instances, competitors have blocked the banks from entering these fields because of the National Bank Act which authorizes banks to engage only in the "business of banking," whatever that is. But the one-bank holding company gets around that barrier totally.

The public policy question—and the one Congress will have to deal with this spring—is what the business of banking ought to include. It is not an easy question in an era when the traditional functions of banks such as lending money and providing savings accounts have been eaten into by, for example, the development of mutual funds and the expansion of the activities of insurance companies. But it is a fundamental question, particularly when some believe there are similarities between the piling up of holding companies in the 1920s and the potential of the new banking conglomerates.

NOW WE KNOW

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Bill Moyers, one of ex-President Lyndon Johnson's several press secretaries, has given us an insight into why the so-called Great Society was such a monumental flop.

Now we know at least one of the reasons we are all in the fix we are in. It is a pity Mr. Moyers did not see fit to speak out long, long ago.

I include for insertion in the RECORD an article from today's Wall Street Journal quoting Mr. Moyers:

NOTABLE AND QUOTABLE

I think one of the significant problems in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations was that the men who handled national security affairs became too close, too personally fond of each other. They tended to conduct the affairs of state almost as if they were a gentlemen's club, and the great decisions were often made in that warm camaraderie of a small board of directors deciding what the club's dues are going to be for the members next year. The reason this is a handicap is simply that when you're debating fundamental policies, you should press your debating opponents to the very limit of their reasoning faculties. If you are close to them, if you are good friends with them, you are less inclined, in a debating sense, to drive your opponent to the wall and you very often permit a viewpoint to be expressed and to go unchallenged except in a peripheral way. If the Secretary of Defense is "Bob" to you, and the Secretary of State is "Dean," you are less willing to risk the personal affront that comes in destroying his case. So you often dance around the final hard decision which would set you against three men who are very close to you, and you tend to reach a consensus. The reliance upon persons who are close to you can be very dangerous.

THE INTERNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IOWA

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my privilege to associate with the humanities and to support their programs in the Congress. Without disparaging our vast and wonderful scientific achievements, I would respectfully suggest to you that the balance between science and humanities is far out of perspective. We are now faced with the anomalous situation where we have the marvelous technical capability of transferring organs from one human being to another, but are really rather ill equipped to make some of the moral judgments, which of necessity accompany these operations. I feel that we have too long ignored the humanities in favor of science, and that we must now greatly accellerate our efforts in the humanities. One effort in this direction is the National Endowment for the Humanities. Mr. Barnaby Keeney and his staff have been very effective in getting this organization off to a good start. However, they will need greatly increased support if they are to make really significant progress on a broad basis.

One shining example brought about as a result of this program is the international writing program at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. This program, is in part, funded by the National Endowment, and is under the very capable direction of Mr. Paul Engle. I would be remiss if I left any implication that the success of this fine program is the result of anything other than Mr. Engle's very capable leadership, but it is a wonderful example of the type of program the National Endowment is involved in, and should be even more involved in. Mr. Engle has prepared a brief report on the program and two newspapers have written on the program. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD Mr. Engle's report, a column from

the Saturday Review by Mr. James F. Fixx, and an article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette dated December 13, 1968:

BRIEF REPORT TO FRIENDS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM, DECEMBER 1968

The attached story from the Saturday Review indicates that this Program, in its first full year of operation, has already attracted the approval of the American literary scene. We have been asked by a publisher in New York to assemble an anthology of writing in translation from our foreign participants, so that in 1970 there will be a permanent record of the first two years.

Recently an anthology of contemporary Chinese poetry, and an anthology of contemporary Korean poetry, both translated into English by students from Taiwan and from Korea whom I brought here, have been accepted for hard-cover publication in a series of translations to be undertaken by the new University of Iowa Press. A brochure of poems in English translation from the Chinese of Wang Ching-lin, one of last year's participants from Taiwan, has been published by the University's Windhover Press. A brochure of translations from the Persian verse of Miss Tehereh Saffarzadeh (Iran) is now on the press, and a third pamphlet, translated from the Polish of two current members of the Program, Zbigniew Bienkowski and Malgorzata Hillar (they are husband and wife), will appear in the spring of 1969. This series will continue with three a year until it reaches fifteen, when a hard-cover collection of all will be published. Thus, in only one year, three solid books and several brochures will make a permanent proof of the practicality of bringing writers from all parts of the world into one literary community and letting them be productive.

Much of the work in translation was done with help from The National Endowment for the Humanities in Washington, D.C., evidence that the federal government actually can aid the arts and scholarship without in any way interfering.

An anthology of recent American poetry is now being translated into Spanish by Fernando Arbelaez, distinguished poet and translator from modern Greek as well as English, from Bogota, Colombia.

During the 1850's a Polish poet, Cyprian Norwid, lived obscurely in New York City, writing several poems on American themes, such as John Brown, and many letters about his experiences. These are totally unknown in English. A substantial collection of his poems and letters is being translated into English for publication as a "Selected Works of Norwid" by Zbigniew Bienkowski with the help of Sydney Smith, an Irish poet from Dublin now in this Program, and Bruce Carruthers, a young writer from Long Island, New York.

Refik Erduran, leading Turkish playwright is working with Asa Baber, a young American writer, on putting his plays into English.

We have nine writers from Latin America and six from East Europe, as well as our first Israeli. Thanks to The Field Foundation, American minorities are represented by Simon Ortiz from the Indian Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico, and Emmery Evans Jr. of the black Watts Workshop, Los Angeles.

Fourteen writers brought wives, a lovely and lyrical addition, and seven brought children, a lovely and loud addition. Funds for 1969–1970?

PAUL ENGLE,
Director.

[From the Saturday Review, Nov. 30, 1968]

TRADE WINDS

(By James F. Fixx)

One of the most remarkable international gatherings I know of is currently taking place not in New York or Paris or any such cosmopolitan spot, but in, of all places, Iowa City, Iowa. It's called the International Writing Program, and it has brought together thirty-eight young poets, novelists, and playwrights from all over the world—Argentina, Yugoslavia, Ceylon, China, France, Iran, Poland, and Sweden, to name only a few of the countries represented. The key to its attraction is a wonderfully freewheeling atmosphere in which discussion, debate, and hard work all go on in a spirit of real tolerance. (A good thing, too, since the writers' countries aren't always on entirely cordial terms.) Participants meet formally once a week during the school year, and in between times they get together at dinners, in homes, and occasionally over a beer or two. Sometimes the conversation is poignant and revealing. At one of these sessions, for example, a Chinese writer was asked why she suspected the Communist Chinese of harshness when the writings of Mao often seemed to express such gentleness and sensitivity. Her reply: "They killed my father."

The program, now in its second year at the University of Iowa, sounds daringly experimental, and in one sense it is. In another sense, though, it was almost an assured success from the moment it was thought of. The reason lies in its director, Paul Engle, who founded the university's renowned creative writing program, ran it for twenty-five years, and is an old and respected hand at the nurturing of writers. (Among his recent protégés: Richard Kim, author of *The Innocent*, reviewed in *SR*, Nov. 23.)

I'm inclined to suspect that one of the secrets of Mr. Engle's success is his extraordinary enthusiasm. A few weeks ago, while chatting with him on the phone, I mentioned that I was thinking of saying a few words about his program in this column. A day or two later the mail began to arrive from Iowa City—long and lively letters, catalogues, lists of students and their published writings—and as a result I now sit in the midst of an impressive mountain of Iowan artifacts and memorabilia. Mr. Engle's description of his fund-raising problems (only 10 per cent of the money needed for fellowships is contributed by the university) gives a good idea of the kind of energetic fellow he is: "I began raising money for American writers years ago; counting this year's total, the sum is now around three-quarters of a million dollars, which I suppose is more than any other person has found for the cause of poets, novelists, and an occasional playwright. . . . It's a dog's life, fund-raising, and sometimes I get tired of barking, especially when I fail."

Mr. Engle's barking obviously pays off. Still, I have a feeling he may be up against a bit of a problem this year when he tries to come up with a field trip to equal the one last year's group took. They all headed for Chicago, where they spent a few convivial hours in that citadel of authentic American culture, the Playboy Club.

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Dec. 13, 1968]

WRITING PROGRAM, POETRY MARK GOOD YEAR FOR IOWA'S ENGLE

IOWA CITY.—It's been a very good year for Professor Paul Engle of the University of Iowa.

He believes his new project, the International Writing Program, is reaching maturity. He is finding that his former project, the U. of I. Writers Workshop, is still bearing fruit from seeds planted years ago. And he has found time to prepare a new book of poetry for the press and to publish in national magazines a two-part poem inspired by a photograph taken of Mrs. Martin Luther King at her husband's funeral.

Engle said that he wrote the poem about Mrs. King during a meeting of the National Arts Council, of which he is a member, in Tarrytown, N.Y., in April. "I was talking to Sidney Poitier at breakfast before the meeting," he recalls. Poitier, an actor who is also a member of the council, had been to the funeral, and his account of it mixed in Engle's mind with the photograph of the grieving Mrs. King wearing a veil.

FRAGMENTS

"Phrases kept coming into my mind, and I wrote them down, which is how poetry usually comes—in scraps and fragments," Engle said. He wrote throughout the meeting, continued in his room that night, and finished the final lines while visiting a college in St. Louis shortly afterward.

One section of the poem was published in Life magazine in May, and the other section is in the December issue of Harper's Bazaar. It ends:

"The black transparent veil protects—the brown veil of your face, and that protects—the red veil of your heart, and that protects—these people and this country as nothing else protects.

A volume of Engle's poems about love, some new and some from previous books, will be published by Random House in February, he said.

Although Engle left the directorship of the Writers Workshop two years ago to establish the International Writing Program, he still delights in seeing the success of former students. Three of them won what could be called the Triple Crown of American Poetry this year: Anthony Hecht won the Pulitzer Prize with his book, "Hard Hours"; Robert Bly won the National Book Award for poetry with "Silence in the Snowy Fields"; and Jane Cooper won the Lamont Poetry Prize with "The Weather of Six Mornings."

Engle said, "Neither I nor anyone else is responsible for their talent." But at the same time it gives him satisfaction to know that he invited them to the writing community of the Iowa workshop when they were unpublished and unknown and at a time when "nobody else was taking a chance on them."

Engle's present preoccupation is directing the International Writing Program, which this year brought 37 writers to the U. of I. from such countries as Chile, Ceylon, Taiwan and Romania. Some are candidates for master of fine arts degrees, and others have the status of "visiting artists."

As was true in 1967–68, when IWP began, Engle has arranged for each student to receive an unabridged dictionary and a library of 150 paperback classics in fiction, poetry, literary criticism and other fields—all donated by 10 major publishers.

The program calls for the IWP participants, in addition to attending classes, to gather weekly while one of their number lectures on the contemporary literature of his homeland.

It also calls for occasional weekend visits to nearby cities. Last year the students went to Minneapolis to the Tyrone Guthrie Theater and to Chicago to visit the Art Institute and Playboy Club. Last weekend the group went to Des Moines to tour the American Republic Insurance Co.'s computer room and art collection, to see a selection of art films, and to visit friends of the program.

Engle is also kept busy with what he calls "immense correspondence" involving students to take part in the program next year. A former student in Germany may send him three books by a writer he considers a likely candidate, or Engle may exchange letters with the state department about bringing to Iowa a novelist and his journalist wife.

But the largest part of Engle's time is consumed in fund-raising, since, as he says, a state university cannot be expected to finance completely a program as unusual as IWP. This year IWP received $48,000 from the Ford Foundation, the first grant he had obtained from that source, and a long-time

supporter, Miss Emma Reppert of Santa Barbara, Calif., gave the program a house at 124 Grove St., Iowa City, to make two apartments available for visiting writers.

TIRED OF BARKING

In a recent interview with Saturday Review, Engle said, "I began raising money for American writers years ago; counting this year's total, the sum is now around three-quarters of a million dollars, which I suppose is more than any other one person has found for the cause of poets, novelists, and an occasional playwright . . . It's a dog's life, fund-raising, and sometimes I get tired of barking, especially when I fail."

Engle, now 60, calls his perpetual fund-raising campaign "extremely arduous." He said, "It is no way to spend the declining years of your life. I've got a lot of books I want to write." He is looking forward to the day when a successor will assume the directorship.

He has derived satisfaction from his career as patron of the unknown writer, and says it gratifies him to remember how he invited poet James Tate to the workshop when he was on the verge of military enlistment. Tate soon afterward won the 1966 award in the Yale Series of Younger Poets.

Vicarious satisfaction is valuable to Engle. "But everybody wants to publish his own books," he said.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, February 18, and Wednesday, February 19, on account of death of mother.

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. STUCKEY), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATTEN, for 30 minutes, on February 20, 1969, to commemorate the 125th anniversary of the birth of Michael Munkacsy; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MESKILL (at the request of Mr. CAMP), for 1 hour, on March 5; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI and to include an editorial.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts to insert his remarks in the RECORD following those of Mr. CULVER on House Resolution 89.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in five instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PODELL and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.
Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. MIZE in two instances.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. CONTE in three instances.
Mr. RUMSFELD.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. BROCK in two instances.
Mr. POLLOCK.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. HUNT in two instances.
Mr. SCHNEEBELI.
Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.
Mr. MORTON.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. MIZELL in three instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.
Mr. NELSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California in five instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.
Mr. DENT in six instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
Mr. GARMATZ.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. RYAN in two instances.
Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. MARSH in two instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.
Mr. LEGGETT.
Mr. HELSTOSKI.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana.
Mr. OLSEN in two instances.
Mr. GILBERT in two instances.
Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN.
Mr. FRASER in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

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. 76. An act for the relief of Soon-Hie Cho Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 85. An act for the relief of Dr. Jagir Singh Randhawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 109. An act for the relief of Dr. Benito V. Odulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 112. An act for the relief of Dr. Kenneth Siu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 113. An act for the relief of Dr. Mete V. Altug; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 127. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Suarez-Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 129. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge P. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos M. Perez-Abreu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 131. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Fernan Dominguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 132. An act for the relief of Dr. José Remón Fernández-González; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 147. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel A. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 148. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Alfredo Milera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 149. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Garcia Plasencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 151. An act for the relief of Dr. Fermin Ferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 153. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Jesus Aguilar Lima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 154. An act for the relief of Dr. Joaquin Francisco Palmerola Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 155. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ramon Portela y Margolles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 156. An act for the relief of Dr. Aurelio Julian Andres Jimenez Cortana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 157. An act for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 256. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 319. An act for the relief of Liliana Grasseschi Baroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 378. An act for the relief of Peter Rudolf Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 490. An act for the relief of Gyorgy Sebok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 495. An act for the relief of Marie-Louise (Mary Louise) Pierce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 510. An act for the relief of Stella Drabensky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 572. An act for the relief of Dr. Cesar Baro Esteva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Guerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 584. An act for the relief of Domingo Lamadriz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 678. An act for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 682. An act for the relief of Rene E. Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 686. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan

Antonio Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Jack Edwards.
2. Wm. L. (Bill) Dickinson.
3. George Andrews.
4. Bill Nichols.
5. Walter Flowers.
6. John H. Buchanan, Jr.
7. Tom Bevill.
8. Bob Jones.

ALASKA

At Large

Howard W. Pollock.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. Sam Steiger.

ARKANSAS

1. William V. Alexander.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. John Paul Hammerschmidt.
4. David Pryor.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. Phillip Burton.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. Paul N. (Pete) McCloskey, Jr.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Jerome R. Waldie.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Glenn M. Anderson.
18. Robert B. (Bob) Mathias.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. (Gus) Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Del Clawson.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Charles E. Wiggins.
26. Thomas M. Rees.
27. Ed Reinecke.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Jerry L. Pettis.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. John V. Tunney.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. Frank E. Evans.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr.
5. John S. Monagan.
6. Thomas J. Meskill.

DELAWARE

At large

William V. Roth, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. Bob Sikes.
2. Don Fuqua.
3. Charles E. Bennett.
4. William V. Chappell, Jr.
5. Louis Frey, Jr.
6. Sam M. Gibbons.
7. James A. Haley.
8. William C. (Bill) Cramer.
9. Paul G. Rogers.
10. J. Herbert Burke.
11. Claude Pepper.
12. Dante B. Fascell.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. Maston O'Neal.
3. Jack Brinkley.
4. Ben B. Blackburn.
5. Fletcher Thompson.
6. John J. Flynt, Jr.
7. John W. Davis.
8. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Spark M. Matsunaga.
Patsy Takemoto Mink.

IDAHO

1. James A. McClure.
2. Orval Hansen.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Abner J. Mikva.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Daniel J. Ronan.
7. Frank Annunzio.
8. Daniel D. Rostenkowski.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. John N. Erlenborn.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Tom Railsback.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Earl F. Landgrebe.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. Richard L. Roudebush.
6. William G. Bray.
7. John T. Myers.
8. Roger H. Zion.
9. Lee H. Hamilton.
10. David W. Dennis.
11. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. John C. Culver.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Wiley Mayne.
7. William J. Scherle.

KANSAS

1. Keith G. Sebelius.
2. Chester L. Mize.
3. Larry Winn, Jr.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. William O. Cowger.
4. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
5. Tim Lee Carter.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Patrick T. Caffery.
4. J. D. (Joe) Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. John R. Rarick.
7. Edwin W. Edwards.
8. Speedy O. Long.

MAINE

1. Peter N. Kyros.
2. William D. Hathaway.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Lawrence J. Hogan.
6. J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.
8. Gilbert Gude.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Margaret M. Heckler.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. John Conyers, Jr.
2. Marvin L. Esch.
3. Garry Brown.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. Donald W. Riegle, Jr.
8. James Harvey.
9. Guy Vander Jagt.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Philip E. Ruppe.
12. James G. O'Hara.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Lucien N. Nedzi.
15. William D. Ford.
16. John D. Dingell.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.
19. Jack McDonald.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. John M. Zwach.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Charles H. Griffin.
4. Gillespie V. Montgomery.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. William (Bill) Clay.
2. James W. Symington.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. (Bill) Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. (Bill) Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard (Dick) Ichord.
9. William (Bill) Hungate.
10. Bill D. Burlison.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Robert V. Denney.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. John E. Hunt.
2. Charles W. Sandman, Jr.
3. James J. Howard.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen.
6. William T. Cahill.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Henry Helstoski.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. Florence P. Dwyer.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

1. Manuel Lujan, Jr.
2. Ed Foreman.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Lester L. Wolff.
4. John W. Wydler.
5. Allard K. Lowenstein.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Frank J. Brasco.
12. Shirley Chisholm.
13. Bertram L. Podell.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. Edward I. Koch.
18. Adam C. Powell.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William F. Ryan.
21. James H. Scheuer.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Jonathan B. Bingham.
24. Mario Biaggi.
25. Richard L. Ottinger.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. Martin B. McKneally.
28. Hamilton Fish, Jr.
29. Daniel E. Button.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Robert C. McEwen.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. James M. Hanley.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Barber B. Conable, Jr.
38. James F. Hastings.
39. Richard D. McCarthy.
40. Henry P. Smith III.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Walter B. Jones.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Nick Galifianakis.
5. Wilmer Mizell.
6. Richardson Preyer.
7. Alton A. Lennon.
8. Earl B. Ruth.
9. Charles R. Jonas.
10. James T. Broyhill.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Mark Andrews.
2. Thomas S. Kleppe.

OHIO

1. Robert Taft, Jr.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas Ludlow Ashley.
10. Clarence E. Miller.
11. J. William Stanton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Chalmers P. Wylie.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Louis Stokes.
22. Charles A. Vanik.
23. William E. Minshall.
24. Donald E. Lukens.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. John N. Happy Camp.

OREGON

1. Wendell Wyatt.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. John R. Dellenback.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Joshua Eilberg.
5. William J. Green.
6. Gus Yatron.
7. Lawrence G. Williams.
8. Edward G. Biester, Jr.
9. G. Robert Watkins.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. R. Lawrence Coughlin.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Fred B. Rooney.
16. Edwin D. Eshleman.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Joseph M. Gaydos.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Albert W. Johnson.
24. Joseph P. Vigorito.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. Robert O. Tiernan.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. William J. Bryan Dorn.
4. James R. Mann.
5. Tom S. Gettys.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. Quillen.
2. John J. Duncan.
3. William E. Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. William R. Anderson.
7. Ray Blanton.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Dan Kuykendall.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. John Dowdy.
3. Jim Collins.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Earle Cabell.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. George Bush.
8. Bob Eckhardt.
9. Jack Brooks.
10. J.J. (Jake) Pickle.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. E. (Kika) de la Garza.
16. Richard C. (Dick) White.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Robert Price.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.
23. Abraham (Chick) Kazen, Jr.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. G. William Whitehurst.
3. David E. Satterfield III.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. W. C. Daniel.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. William Lloyd Scott.
9. William C. Wampler.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Lloyd Meeds.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Thomas S. Foley.
6. Floyd V. Hicks.
7. Brock Adams.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert H. Mollohan.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John Slack.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. James Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Schadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William A. Steiger.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Glenn R. Davis.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

John Wold.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Jorge L. Córdova.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

514. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 91–8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

515. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 86th quarterly report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1968, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

516. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on personal property donated to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k), pursuant to the provisions of section 203(o) of that act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

517. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the survey of the cost to design, construct, and equip selected general hospitals in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

518. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on policies, procedures, and practices for determining requirements for military family housing and bachelor officer and enlisted quarters, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

519. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. Resolution to authorize investigations by the Committee on Agriculture, with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 131. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations (Rept. No. 91–18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 143. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy (Rept. No. 91–19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 152. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States (Rept. No. 91–20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 189. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee, with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space (Rept. No. 91–22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations (Rept. No. 91–23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4214. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 6943. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6944. A bill to amend section 5042(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals who are not heads of families to produce wine for personal consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6945. A bill to safeguard the consumer by requiring greater standards of care in the issuance of unsolicited credit cards and by limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6946. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities of American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6947. A bill to amend the act of October 13, 1964, to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 6948. A bill to name the bridge being constructed across the Mississippi River linking the States of Tennessee and Missouri in honor of a former Member of the House Robert A. Everett and Mr. S. P. Reynolds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. WYATT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6949. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6950. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6951. A bill to enact the Interstate Agreement on Detainers into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 6952. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that such chapter shall not apply with respect to the sale or delivery of certain ammunition for rifles or shotguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 6953. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6954. A bill to establish the birthplace of Susan B. Anthony in Adams, Mass., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6955. A bill to create in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Ecological Advisers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 6956. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 6957. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6958. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 6959. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointment of postmasters, to provide for the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General on a merit basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6960. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict or of service in the Armed Forces are or may be buried, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6961. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 6962. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6963. A bill to extend the executive reorganization provisions of title 5, United States Code, for an additional 2 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself and Mr. ASPINALL):

H.R. 6964. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 6965. A bill to establish the Capitol Guide Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6966. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6967. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6968. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 6969. A bill to permit tacking of citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6970. A bill to deduct from gross tonnage in determining net tonnage spaces used for slop oil on board vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6971. A bill to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6972. A bill to amend section 212(B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6973. A bill to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H.R. 6974. A bill to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6975. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 6976. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, with the assistance and advice of a Long Island Sound Advisory Commission, to study and formulate a comprehensive plan for the development and preservation of Long Island Sound and related shoreline areas in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for the public use and benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6977. A bill to establish the Sandy Hook National Seashore in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 6978. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 6979. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6980. A bill to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the dollar limitation on direct loans under the veterans home loan program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6981. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased dependency and indemnity compensation to widows in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6982. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to improve the education and training programs for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6983. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that amounts inherited from bank accounts jointly or separately owned shall not count as income for death or disability pension or for dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6984. A bill to enlarge the classes of persons eligible for servicemen's group life insurance, and to improve the administration of the program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6985. A bill to authorize the use by policyholders of the cash surrender value or the proceeds of a matured endowment policy of U.S. Government or national service life insurance to purchase annuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6986. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide cost-of-living increases in monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payments to widows of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6987. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide outpatient care for certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6988. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6989. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide medical and hospital care to the widows and children of persons who died of service-connected disabilities and to wives and children of persons who have service-connected disabilities rated as total; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6990. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into contracts for the provision of health services for certain veterans and certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 6991. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6992. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6993. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6997. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire and ambulance companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 6998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6999. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 7000. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7001. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded or who has cerebral palsy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7002. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 7003. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 7004. A bill to establish producer owned and controlled emergency reserves of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7005. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7006. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7007. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, to enlarge the service area of the Sacramento canals unit of the Central Valley project to include Yolo and Solano Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7008. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Paskenta-Newville unit, Sacramento River division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7009. A bill to encourage the States to extend coverage under their State unemployment compensation laws to agricultural labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 7011. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize additional grants for the construction of facilities to remove pollution wastes from the Lake Michigan watershed; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mr. McCLORY):

H.R. 7012. A bill to establish a Legislative Data Processing Center and to coordinate the development of automatic data processing facilities and services in the legislative branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7013. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish rural electrification and telephone loan accounts, to provide for insured loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 7014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 7015. A bill to permit the President to authorize the sale of savings bonds yielding not more than 5 percent per annum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 7016. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination; to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities; to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources; to establish the National Council on the Environment; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7017. A bill to extend the life of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7018. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 7019. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 7020. A bill to extend the life of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 7021. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress, and to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7022. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of certain nonimmigrants into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 7023. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the immediate retirement without reduction in annuity of employees and Members of Congress upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 7024. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7025. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a code system for the identification of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 7026. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 7027. A bill relating to the commission of a crime of violence in the District of Columbia when armed with any firearm or other dangerous or deadly weapon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7028. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 7029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit sharing plans as those presently provided for employeees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7030. A bill to encourage worldwide interest in U.S. developments and accomplishments in military and related aviation and equipment by authorizing Federal sponsorship of an International Aeronautical Exposition in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7031. A bill relating to taxation by

States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7032. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7033. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct inequities in the prohibition of nepotism in Government employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7034. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7035. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7036. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 7037. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER (for himself and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 7038. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 7039. A bill to amend section 118 of title 28, United States Code, to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania shall be held at Easton, Philadelphia, and Reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 7040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7042. A bill to broaden participation in the observance of Inauguration Day as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7043. A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7044. A bill to broaden participation in the observance of Inauguration Day as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 7046. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7048. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 7049. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to accord to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the same tariff treatment as is provided for insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7050. A bill to assure the purity and quality of all imported dairy products for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry and protecting the public health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 7051. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age–62 cutoff (the same as is presently done in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination; to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities; to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources; to establish the National Council on the Environment; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7053. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose additional limitations on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7054. A bill to expand and improve Federal law enforcement facilities and programs, to assist State and local units of government in expanding and improving their law enforcement programs, to provide for study and research in areas of crime control and crime prevention, to encourage the development of certain experimental rehabilitation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7055. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 7056. A bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) to provide that exclusive territorial franchises, under limited circumstances, shall not be deemed a restraint of trade or commerce or a monopoly or attempt to monopolize, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7057. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 7058. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 7059. A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7060. A bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay comparable wages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7061. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7062. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7063. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7064. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7065. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL (for himself and Mr. CLANCY):

H.R. 7066. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 7067. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7068. A bill providing for federal railroad safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7069. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of the U.S. Highway No. 50 in the State of West Virginia as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 7070. A bill to authorize realistic, eco-

nomic, and modern building heights and bulk in the District of Columbia, to provide new business and employment opportunities for all, to expand the tax base, to stimulate and assist efforts to break the poverty cycle and strengthen the economy, to provide parking, to rebuild and renew blighted, slum, burned-out, and underdeveloped areas, to conserve and make the best, and maximum, use of land, to achieve the best design, to save tax funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7071. A bill to provide for the construction and improvement of a certain road on the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 7072. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds sufficient to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property for addition to the Fort Frederica National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish rural electrification and telephone loan accounts, to provide for insured loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7074. A bill to prohibit the leasing of submerged lands under the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif., for exploration, development, and removal of minerals, and to rescind all such existing mineral leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 7076. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 7077. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 7078. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 450. 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. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 451. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring voluntary blood donors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.J. Res. 452. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution to provide for a study and evaluation of scientific research in medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 454. 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. MESKILL (for himself and Mr. WEICKER):

H.J. Res. 455. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 456. 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. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period March 2 through March 8, 1969, as "Circle K Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 458. 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. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 460. 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. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 461. Joint resolution designating the 14th of February, St. Valentine's Day each year, to be known also as National Postman's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 462. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the participation in nondenominational prayers in any building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution to consolidate projected congressional investigations of the *Pueblo* capture and minimize further hardships on the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by establishing a Joint Investigating Committee on the *Pueblo* Capture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to foreign producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution relating to freedom for Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution expressing the profound concern of the Congress to the proposed consumption taxes of the European Economic Community on oilseed products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution to authorize study of rail passenger service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 252. Resolution, U.N. Conventions on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 253. Resolution for the peace and stability of the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 254. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the consideration by the House of resolutions disapproving the recommendations of the President of the United States on Federal executive, legislative, and judicial salaries under section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 255. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit the presentation and recognition in the Hall of the House of holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 256. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 192; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

18. By Mr. OLSEN: Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana urging the preservation of natural and esthetic value of clearcut timber sales as viewed from our highway; to the Committee on Agriculture.

19. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana urging that the Federal Government establish a multistate vocational education center at the Glasgow Air Force Base; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

20. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana urging immediate funds be allocated for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Harrison, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

21. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to obtaining release of Lt. Joseph P. Dunn from Red China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Diega Arnone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Carrieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Long Kam Soi, also known as Guiloermo Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Antonio Augusto Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of June Vernon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Virgil Vernon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Ricardo P. Villero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Maria De La Cruz Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Maria T. Szostak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Ines Perez and Gonzalo Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of Evan Juan Fornilda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7091. A bill for the relief of Therese Jean Juste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Antonio Laezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. CHISHOLM:
H.R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Simonia D. Kirton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. COHELAN:
H.R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Bichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ferrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7096. A bill for the relief of David Long and his wife, Angela Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 7097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac P. Dionaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GILBERT:
H.R. 7098. A bill for the relief of Miss Sun Duck Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CELLER:
H.R. 7099. A bill for the relief of Olivia Violet Tennyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DELANEY (by request):
H.R. 7100. A bill for the relief of Jose Cajigal-Garaban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DELLENBACK:
H.R. 7101. A bill for the relief of Miss Chung Ja Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FALLON:
H.R. 7102. A bill for the relief of Elvira G. Matucan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FRIEDEL:
H.R. 7103. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Hersz Lapides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GUDE:
H.R. 7104. A bill for the relief of Mahmoodullah Baig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7105. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Nery Bueno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:
H.R. 7106. A bill for the relief of Chong Suk Stroisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HORTON:
H.R. 7107. A bill for the relief of Francesco Bernabei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7108. A bill for the relief of Mario DiBattisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7109. A bill for the relief of Paul Andrew Farrer, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7110. A bill for the relief of Giuseppi Fiorica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7111. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Laszlo Fulop and daughters, Eva and Alice Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7112. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Kaddusi Gazioglu and sons, Orhon and Mehmet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7113. A bill for the relief of Miss Milagros M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7114. A bill for the relief of Maria and Anna Gueli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7115. A bill for the relief of Pietro Severino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7116. A bill for the relief of Domenico Stalteri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7117. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gongren Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOELSON:
H.R. 7118. A bill for the relief of Anna D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7119. A bill for the relief of Orazia Dierna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7120. A bill for the relief of Delia Petracca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KOCH:
H.R. 7121. A bill for the relief of Dr. Petra Elena P. Banogon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7122. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miriam Ehrenkranz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7123. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eriberto Lozada and his wife, Dr. Divinia Ilano Lozada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7124. A bill for the relief of David Shefer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7125. A bill for the relief of Miss Ngyen Thoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCLURE:
H.R. 7126. A bill for the relief of Antonio Orbe Ugalde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McDADE:
H.R. 7127. A bill for the relief of John Fletcher Hurst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McEWEN:
H.R. 7128. A bill for the relief of Vivat Raksasat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Domenico Rocco Tropepi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MATHIAS:
H.R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Mr. Wing Young and Swee San Soo (Mr. Young's wife); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MINISH:
H.R. 7131. A bill for the relief of Joseph Miano and his wife Maria Miano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. MINK:
H.R. 7132. A bill for the relief of Shao-er Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORSE:
H.R. 7133. A bill for the relief of Arni Natesan Mohan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 7134. A bill for the relief of Adelta da Luz Bettencourt (Ortins) and Joao dos Santos Ortins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PHILBIN:
H.R. 7135. A bill for the relief of Antonio Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. POWELL:
H.R. 7136. A bill for the relief of Lucius Edward Arnold and his wife, Ann Marie Arnold, and their children, Steven Watkins Lucius Arnold and Patricia Diana Marie Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Elena Foldes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7139. A bill for the relief of Joseph Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Gladys Maud Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Alfredo I. Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Enrique Hernando Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Leticia M. Solema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Jose Jesus Villalobos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Ruby Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 7146. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Leontaritis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Mavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7148. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pollina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7149. A bill for the relief of Mr. Milton Stamatakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RHODES:
H.R. 7150. A bill relating to cancellation of an agreement issued to Jack Gray, Henry Gray, and Robert Louis Gray for grazing cattle within the confines of Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. ROONEY of New York:
H.R. 7151. A bill for the relief of Mr. Nicolo Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROYBAL:
H.R. 7152. A bill for the relief of Hung-Ju Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7153. A bill for the relief of Irineo M. Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 7154. A bill for the relief of Silvia Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7155. A bill for the relief of Lilieth W. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7156. A bill for the relief of Manuel Silvestre Lara Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7157. A bill for the relief of Claudio Silvestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7158. A bill for the relief of Caridad Suarez-Amparo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7159. A bill for the relief Elma Eiola Tobitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. STAGGERS:
H.R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Charles Richard Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:
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; to the Committee on Agriculture.
H.R. 7162. A bill relating to cancellation of an agreement issued to Jack Gray, Henry Gray, and Robert Louis Gray for grazing cattle within the confines of Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; to the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:
H.R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Andromachi S. Pamfilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WHITE:
H.R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Douglass Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:
H.R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Ching Chio Fang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WOLFF:
H.R. 7166. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROYBAL:
H. Res. 257. Resolution honoring the late Rossell G. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. R. Sherwood, Jr., Grass Valley, Calif., and others, relative to aiding our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

60. Also, petition of Association for Grand Jury Action, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to opposition to the proposed organized crime control bill of 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.