

U.N. Charter, and that the Nonproliferation Treaty in any event must not afford a pretext for Soviet use of force in Germany. The invasion of Czechoslovakia brought these issues into public discussion.

The United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued statements last September which made clear our view that articles 53 and 107 of the U.N. Charter gave the Soviet Union no right to intervene by force unilaterally in West Germany. There are also some recent indications that the Federal Republic is now less concerned about this question. And I believe West Germany will come to see its overall interests being served by signing the treaty.

Mr. President, the North Atlantic Alliance has many urgent problems which it must consider and on which it must reach decisions. The Nonproliferation Treaty does not create any new limitations on the scope of the actions that could result from these decisions. If anything, the treaty, through the important contribution it will make as an effective worldwide arms control undertaking, should simplify NATO's task without hampering its effectiveness.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I am very happy to yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, first, I should like to apologize to my distinguished colleague. I did not realize he was behind me. After I had left the room, I understand he paid me a little compliment, which I appreciate very much. Even though I did not hear it, I shall read

it in the RECORD tomorrow. He has always been thoughtful and generous and I appreciate his comments very much.

I hope very much that my colleague does not consider me rude for having left the room. Let me take this occasion to say that he has delivered a cogent and brilliant dissertation on the Nonproliferation Treaty of which he has been an advocate for a long time.

We are very fortunate to have his brand and quality in the Senate.

Mr. PELL. I thank my friend and senior colleague very much, indeed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate following the close of business today, the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives.

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

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, March 11 (legislative day of March 7), 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

James R. Smith, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 11 (legislative day of March 7), 1969:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Gilbert Hahn, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Sterling Tucker, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Jerry A. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 11, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Aharon Shapiro of Congregation Anshe Chesed, Linden, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty G-d, Supreme Ruler of all nations, we invoke Thy blessings upon the honorable Members of the Congress.

We pray Thee, grant them wisdom and guidance in their weighty deliberations; enable them to legislate on behalf of justice, democracy, and brotherhood.

Help them to eradicate intolerance, prejudice, and malice from our midst.

Inspire those who stand at the helm of our Ship of State to continue with their noble efforts to make these United States a powerful leader in the cause of world peace and freedom.

Hasten the day when the words of Thy prophets shall be fulfilled for every country in the world—when the work of righteousness shall be peace, and its effect, tranquillity and security forever; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1969 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 material.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 when I introduced H.R. 7016, the electric power reliability bill of 1969, I promised to supply a detailed analysis of the bill at an early date. Such an analysis has now been completed, and I am herewith placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY BILL OF 1969

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Electric Power Reliability bill of 1969 introduced on February 18, 1969, by Cong. John E. Moss (H.R. 7016), and Cong. Richard L. Ottinger (H.R. 7052), and 38 other Members of Congress incorporates, with substantial revision and new material, the principal features of three bills of the 90th Congress, viz., (1) the bill drafted by the Federal Power Commission which was transmitted to

the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate on June 8, 1967, (2) the bill introduced by Cong. Moss on August 14, 1967, and (3) the Kennedy-Ottinger bill introduced on January 30, 1968.

Legislative history in the 90th Congress

The FPC bill was introduced in the House on June 8, 1967, by Cong. Stagers as H.R. 10727. His statement, with a copy of the letter of transmittal from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and the enclosure thereto entitled "The Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967—A Short Explanation," appears on pages 15229-15230 of volume 113, part 11, of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record. The same bill was introduced on the same day by Cong. Macdonald, as H.R. 10721 (113 Cong. Rec. 15233).

The FPC bill was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Muskie (on behalf of himself, Sen. Magnuson and 9 other Senators) on June 12, 1967, as S. 1934. Their explanatory statement appears at 113 Cong. Rec., Part 12, 15321-15328, together with copies of the text of the bill and the letter of transmittal from the FPC Chairman with its enclosures entitled, "The Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967—A Short Explanation" and "Analysis of Proposed Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967."

Congressman Moss's statement on introducing his bill (H.R. 12322) appears at 113 Cong. Rec., Part 17, 22513-22519, with two insertions entitled, respectively, "Line-by-Line Comparison of H.R. 12322 with FPC bill" and "Explanation of Differences Between the Electric Power Reliability Bill Introduced by Congressman John E. Moss and the Draft Bill which the FPC Transmitted to Congress on June 8, 1967."

Cong. Ottinger's speech, on introducing the Kennedy-Ottinger bill in the House (H.R. 14971), appears on pages H575-582 of the daily issue of the Congressional Record for January 30, 1968, with an insertion in tabular form entitled "Comparison of Proposed Electric Power Reliability Acts—H.R. 10727—H.R. 12322—H.R. 14971."

Senator Edward M. Kennedy's speech introducing the Kennedy-Ottinger bill in the Senate (S. 2889) appears at pages S611-621 of the daily Record for January 30, 1968, accompanied by the text of the bill and a tabular comparison with the earlier versions similar to the one inserted by Cong. Ottinger.

Hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce on S. 1934 and related bills on August 22, December 20 and 21, 1967, and April 26 and 29, 1968, and printed in three parts with the designated Serial 90-30. A hearing was held on H.R. 10721 and related bills before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on December 5, 1967. It has not been printed.

Legislative history in the 91st Congress

Cong. Moss's statement introducing the 1969 bill (H.R. 7016) in the House appears at pages H993-996, and Cong. Ottinger's statement introducing the identical bill H.R. 7052 appears at pages E1110-1111, of the daily Record for February 18, 1969. Sen. Kennedy's speech introducing the same bill (S. 1071) in the Senate appears at pages S1707-1713 of the daily Record of the same date, accompanied by the text of the bill.

ANALYSIS

Sec. 1 states the name of the bill.

Sec. 2 states the purposes of the act. In subsection (a), Congress makes findings that increased reliability in the generation and transmission of electricity is necessary for national defense, commerce, and the general welfare of people of the United States, and that there must be increased coordination in the generation and transmission of electric power within and between regions of the country.

In subsection (b) Congress also finds that the preservation and enhancement of the environment, conservation of natural resources, and strengthening of long-range land-use planning, are vital to the health and welfare of the people of the United States, and that actions taken pursuant to the act should be consistent with such goals.

Thus, Section 2 indicates that Congress, in exercising its constitutional authority, is concerned not only with the transmission of power in interstate commerce (see sec. 201(c) of present Federal Power Act) but also with the effect of power supply upon interstate commerce, the national defense, and the general welfare of the people.

Sec. 3 adds to the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791-825r) a new Part IV, consisting of fifteen new sections, as follows:

Sec. 401 is entitled "Regional Coordination Application and objectives of part; definitions."

Subsection (a) provides that the new Part IV of the Federal Power Act shall apply to all persons who own or operate bulk power supply facilities in the United States. Previous versions stated it applied to "all bulk power supply systems"—a term not defined in the act. The new terms "persons" and "bulk power supply facilities" are expressly defined later in section 401.

Subsection (b) sets out the objectives of Part IV, which in general terms are to further the national policy, declared in existing section 202(a) of the Federal Power Act, of assuring an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and consistent with the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources. The statement of the national electric power policy is modified to make clear that the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources include the preservation and enhancement of the

environment and strengthening of long-range land-use planning and that the term "natural resources" includes scenic, historic, and recreational assets, i.e., esthetic values, as well as the economic values long associated with the term. Furtherance of the national policy would be accomplished—

By enhancing the reliability of bulk power supply;

By strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination in the electric utility industry and establishing new ones;

By encouraging comprehensive development of power resources of each area and region of the United States so as to take advantage of advancing technology while maintaining proper regard for conservation of natural resources;

By providing that all utility systems and their customers have access to the benefits of coordination and advancing technology on fair and reasonable terms;

By assuring as far as feasible that extra-high-voltage facilities include sufficient capacity to meet area, regional and interregional needs for generating and transmission capacity, including the reserve capacity needed for reliability; and

By drawing on the cooperation of all segments (public, private and cooperative) of the electric utility industry.

Subsection (c) defines the term "person" for purposes of Part IV to include not only a "person," "municipality" or a "State" as defined in section 3 of the Federal Power Act, but also any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States. It thus makes clear that the term "person" covers all "persons", whether privately, cooperatively, Federally or otherwise publicly owned.

Subsection (d) defines "bulk power supply facilities" as "facilities for generation or transmission of electric power and energy." The original FPC bill restricted the term to such facilities "which furnish power to points of distribution"—a definition which might exclude auxiliary equipment which energizes starting motors and fuel pumps—facilities of the utmost importance to reliability of bulk power supplies. The change does not extend FPC jurisdiction to local distribution facilities, which will remain exempt under sec. 201(b) of the Federal Power Act. The subsection also gives the FPC authority to exempt from its jurisdiction additional facilities not material to the objectives of the Part, for example, generators owned by an industrial enterprise and used exclusively to supply its own energy requirements.

Subsection (e) defines "extra-high-voltage facilities." In the original FPC bill, the term meant only transmission lines and associated facilities designed to be capable of operation at a nominal voltage higher than 200 kilovolts between phase conductors for alternating current, or between poles in the case of direct current, the construction (this bill adds "extension, or modification") of which is commenced two years or more after enactment of Part IV. The 1969 bill also includes "generating units or plants and associated facilities designed to be or capable of being operated at a capacity of 200 megawatts or more, the construction, extension or modification of which is commenced four or more years after enactment of this part." FPC supervision over the design and siting of large generating plants as well as transmission lines is an obvious necessity for the full implementation of regional coordination, adequacy of bulk power supply, and environmental protection envisaged by the bill.

Sec. 402 is entitled "Relation to Other Parts." Subsection (a) makes clear that the new Part IV supplements, and does not supersede, the existing Parts I, II and III of the Federal Power Act. It specifically states that actions taken pursuant to any part, including the hydroelectric licensing provisions of Part I, shall be consistent with the enhancement and preservation of the environment and the conservation of natural re-

sources, including scenic, historic, and recreation assets, and long-range land-use planning. This codifies the ruling of *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. F.P.C.*, 354 F. 2d 608 (C.A. 2d, 1965), cert. den. *sub. nom. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York v. Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference*, 384 U.S. 941 (1966).

Subsection (b) makes the administrative, procedural, enforcement, rehearing, and court review provisions prescribed by other parts of the Federal Power Act applicable to Part IV, to provide the legal framework into which the specific FPC powers and procedures called into being by the new part are to be fitted.

Sec. 403 entitled "Cooperation of Bulk Power Supply Systems," expresses the policy that the purposes of Part IV should be attained insofar as possible by cooperation among all entities engaged in bulk power supply, their customers, and all those affected by bulk power supply. While the measure of initiative available for the FPC to take actions on its own motion is expanded by the new Part IV, the primary emphasis is on expanded public participation in actions first proposed by the electric power industry itself. The bill recognizes the expertise of individual utilities' engineering departments and managements, while seeking to broaden their views through exchange of technical and economic information among themselves, irrespective of whether they are investor-owned, government-owned, or cooperatively-owned. It seeks to encourage managements' own initiative and make it more responsive to present-day public needs.

Sec. 404, entitled "Regional Power Coordination Organizations," establishes the organizations that would bear the initial responsibility for electrical coordination.

Subsection (a) first provides that, after consultation, under procedures that would be prescribed by the FPC, with persons engaged or interested in bulk power supply, and with appropriate Federal agencies and State commissions, the FPC would secure the establishment of appropriate and effective regional organizations and procedures to carry out regional and interregional coordination with full participation by all segments of the electric utility industry in the region. These organizations, or "regional councils," would be open to membership by each electric system in the region regardless of the nature of its ownership. In appropriate cases, a system could belong to more than one regional council. The Commission would designate representatives from among its staff, who would participate in all aspects of the regional councils' work except the ultimate adoption of plans or any other council actions. State regulatory commissions in the region also would be invited to designate staff representatives for the same purpose.

Administration of the provisions of section 404 might vary with the circumstances of time and place, and with the degree to which regional and interregional coordination had progressed.

The persons within each region that are engaged in bulk power supply or distribution of electric energy would create a regional council, which would be fairly representative of all such persons, and provide the council with sufficient funds to carry out its functions (including the employment of bulk power experts and other permanent staff). Representation on the council might be by individual entities, or by groups of such entities, at the option of each individual entity. Each major bulk power supplier should probably be individually represented. To keep the total number of representatives and expenses down to reasonable and efficient dimensions, groups of distributors and small suppliers might wish to share single representatives. Voting rights and responsibility for sharing regional council expenses should probably be divided by a formula which gives substantial weight to the number of customers or size of load

served by the various members of the regional council.

Subsection (b) directs each regional council to file with the Federal Power Commission a statement of its organization. Such statements would include, among other matters, the following:

- (1) The number of representatives and the persons or groups represented by each;
- (2) How the council would arrive at final decisions, and a fair and reasonable method of hearing and publishing minority views;
- (3) Its rules or by-laws;
- (4) Its methods for notifying and consulting with the Commission and the State commissions of the States wholly or partly within the region, as well as the electric systems within the region;
- (5) Such other information as the Commission requests.

Statements of organization would be filed with the FPC and kept available for public inspection during normal office hours at the Commission's office in Washington and at some convenient place, designated by the Commission within the region affected. In selecting such depository within the region, the Commission would undoubtedly consult with the State commissions in the region, and would consider establishing the depository either at its own regional office or at the office of one of the State commissions in the region. The Commission would publish notices in the Federal Register concerning the filing of such statements of organizations.

On submission of a statement of organization the Commission could call for consultation on any aspect of the statement it considered inconsistent with the objectives of Part IV or the proper functioning of the council, and could propose alternatives or modifications. The Commission might also determine by order, after public notice and opportunity for public hearing, whether the statement was consistent with the objectives of Part IV, and if not, modify it or set it aside.

On approval of its statement of organization, the regional council could be expected to undertake the following duties:

- (1) to prepare and keep current a forecast of the electrical needs of the region in which it functions, covering a reasonable period of years in the future. The forecast would indicate what generation and transmission facilities are needed during such period to achieve the most efficient, economical, and reliable interconnection of the region, as well as appropriate interconnection and coordination between regions.
- (2) to conduct stability studies for its region, contemplating both present loads and the loads forecast under the preceding paragraph.
- (3) to develop appropriate criteria for reliable planning and operation of bulk power facilities for recommendation to the Commission under section 409 of the bill.
- (4) to prepare outline plans for generation, transmission, and interconnection within the region (and to adjacent regions) which are best adapted to the reliability and power needs of the region.
- (5) to develop plans for the coordinated operation of generation and transmission facilities of the region (and of future or presently possible coordination with other regions). These plans would include provisions for automatic load shedding and other emergency procedures, regulation and inspection of system control devices, and provisions for restoration of service after an outage, as well as plans for operation under normal conditions.
- (6) to encourage and strengthen existing coordinating organizations within the region and new organizations where appropriate.
- (7) to provide a forum wherein projects for construction of bulk power facilities can be examined by all persons engaged in bulk power supply or in distribution of electric energy who would be affected by such projects, so that modifications and legitimate

objections thereto could be suggested and discussed at the earliest practicable stage.

(8) to give at least preliminary consideration to land use problems raised by construction proposals, and to consult, where appropriate, with local, State, interstate and Federal agencies having an interest in these problems.

(9) to consult with other regional councils on common problems and possibilities for interregional coordination.

(10) to do all other things necessary and appropriate for the most efficient development, coordination and use of the power resources of the region.

Subsection (c) provides that any regional or interregional coordination plan developed by a regional council must be submitted to the FPC within 30 days of its adoption by such council. The bill anticipates that the FPC would prescribe rules and standards for the form and contents of coordination plans and amendments thereto. The Commission would keep all plans submitted to it available for public inspection at its office and a convenient place in each region affected. In exercising its responsibilities under all parts of the Federal Power Act, including Part IV, the FPC would consider the coordination plans submitted by the regional councils, in the light of the statutory objectives and the comments of the councils developing them, their members, and the public. The FPC might confer with a council on any aspect of its plan which appeared to require modification, in order to secure the council's consent to such modification. After notice and opportunity for hearing, the FPC would be empowered to determine on the record whether any coordination plan submitted to it was consistent with the objectives of Part IV, and if it determined that the plan was not consistent with those objectives or not in the public interest, would be required to modify it or set it aside. Such plans would provide guides to operations and planning for the electric systems of the regions affected immediately upon their submission to the FPC, subject to being suspended if the National Council on the Environment filed an objection within 90 days (see sec. 405(c) and (f)). Thus, in the absence of National Council objection, or FPC objection, a formal order of approval or a hearing, would not be a prerequisite to the effectiveness of a coordination plan.

Subsection (d) directs the Commission to require annual reports from each regional council, and such additional reports as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the objectives of Part IV. Since planning is a nearly continuous process, such reports would facilitate the Commission's knowledge of the current status of the Council's work.

The reports, like statements of organizations and coordination plans, would be public documents, and would be kept available for public inspection both at the Commission's offices in Washington and at a convenient place in each region affected. The Commission would in turn report to Congress annually on the effectiveness of the efforts at regional and interregional coordination made by the regional councils.

Subsection (e) would allow the Commission, if it found, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that any person engaged in generation or transmission of electric energy unreasonably refused to participate in the creation of a regional council, in effective regional or interregional coordination, or in paying its fair share of council expenses, to order such participation as it found necessary to carry out the objective of Part IV. The Commission would expect to utilize such compulsory powers only after failure of reasonable attempts to persuade the person concerned to take part voluntarily in the creation, expenses, or work of a regional council.

Subsection (f) specifies the procedure for amending statements of organization and

coordination plans. Amendments originated by a regional council would be processed exactly as original statements or plans. The FPC, however, on its own motion or pursuant to a complaint received, might initiate an amendment. Amendments initiated by the Commission could become effective only by formal order, following notices and opportunity for hearing.

Sec. 405 is entitled "National Council on the Environment." This section would establish a new agency, independent of the FPC, to review and report upon the probable effect upon the environment of proposed electric utility industry construction and operations.

Subsection (a) establishes the National Council and describes its make-up. It would consist of five experts in such areas as conservation, environmental sciences, esthetics, or land-use planning. The members would be appointed by the President, with Senate confirmation, for 3-year staggered terms. To enhance the independence of the National Council, it would elect its own chairman from among the members, to serve in such office until the expiration of his current term as a member. Not more than three members could be appointed from the same political party, but the President would be encouraged to appoint persons from the scientific and esthetic communities who have no partisan political affiliations. The same provisions against conflict of interest by stock ownership, etc., in electric utilities, provided by section 1 of the Federal Power Act with respect to commissioners of the FPC, would be applicable to members of the National Council on the Environment. The position of member of the National Council would be a full time one, compensated at the same level as FPC commissioners or assistant secretaries of the cabinet departments. The chairman's salary would be at the same level as that of the chairman of the FPC. The National Council would be authorized to delegate executive and administrative functions to the Chairman, and to permit him to redelegate any such functions to employees of the Council. The Council would have authority to adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

Subsection (b) sets out the primary duty of the National Council on the Environment. It would be to review coordination plans submitted under subsection 404(c), and proposals to construct, extend, or modify extra-high-voltage facilities presented under section 410 of the Federal Power Act as amended by this bill, and in addition to review applications for Federal water power licenses governed by Part I of the existing Federal Power Act. The review would be for the purpose of ascertaining whether such plans, proposals, applications (or amendments to any of them) are consistent with the goals of environmental enhancement, conservation, and strengthened long-range land-use planning set out in subsection 2(b) of the bill, discussed above.

Subsection (c) requires the National Council to file a report of its review of any coordination plan or application for a hydropower license with the Federal Power Commission within 90 days of service upon it of the plan or application. The period could be extended, for cause, only by the FPC. If the National Council found the plan or application (or amendment thereto) inconsistent with the objectives of environmental enhancement, conservation, or strengthened long-range land-use planning, it would be authorized to file an "objection" with the FPC. The effect of an objection is covered in subsection (f), described below.

Subsection (d) requires National Council review of extra-high-voltage proposals and modifications thereof, presented under section 410 of the act as amended by this bill. The procedures, scope and objectives of the review, and the effect of a council "objection" to any proposal, would be identical with

those provided under subsection (c), above; but the National Council would have six months rather than 90 days to submit its reports to the FPC on original extra-high-voltage proposals.

Subsection (e) provides that the National Council shall have full access to all information relevant to any matter under its review, which is available to the FPC, and such other information as the National Council deems necessary for its work.

Subsection (f) states an objection filed by the National Council with the FPC would have the effect of a suspense order issued by the FPC under section 410 of the act as amended by this bill—that is, no work could proceed on the sites of the proposed facilities to be constructed under the coordination plan, hydropower application, or extra-high-voltage facilities proposal until and unless the FPC, by formal order after notice and opportunity for hearing, overrules such objection. In the case of extra-high-voltage facilities, National Council objections will also suspend for the same period the proponent's power of eminent domain to take without the landowner's consent sites and right-of-way for the proposed facilities.

Subsection (g) provides that the National Council may be a party in any proceeding before the FPC in which it has filed a report or objection. If aggrieved by the FPC's disposition of the matter involved in the proceeding, the National Council may seek rehearing, and if still dissatisfied, judicial review. Subsection (i) would permit the National Council to appear before the FPC, and in the courts on judicial review, by its own attorneys. See further discussion under (1), below.

Subsection (h) contains four paragraphs setting out the authority of the National Council to hire employees, engage consultants, enter into contracts, and cooperate with government agencies, educational institutions and others. Maximum flexibility is granted to facilitate the Council's carrying out of its functions.

Subsection (l) would further the independence of the National Council by providing the special authorization contemplated in 28 U.S.C. (1964 ed. Supp. III) secs. 516, 519, and 547 for permitting attorneys appointed by the Council, acting at its direction, to represent the Council in any administrative proceedings or in court.

Sec. 406 is entitled "National Electric Studies Committee." This section would require the FPC, after consulting with the regional councils, to establish a national committee representative of all elements of the electric industry, including manufacturers and construction firms as well as utilities. This committee would facilitate interregional exchange of views and experience, and would consolidate the industry's efforts to investigate major present and future problems in the planning and operation of bulk power supply facilities. It would also seek to stimulate interest among scientists and engineers in the challenges of achieving reliable and efficient bulk power supply and protecting and enhancing the environment.

Sec. 407 entitled "Advisory Boards," would allow the Commission to establish one or more advisory coordination review boards and to provide for appointment thereto of experts from the electric utility industry, the equipment manufacturers, and the academic and research communities, and of other persons (not Commission employees) drawn from the general public. These boards would assist the Commission in considering matters coming before it under Part IV. They might, for example, review National Council recommendations from a practical industry viewpoint, as well as aid the Commission's understanding of environmental issues.

Sec. 408 entitled "Coordination agreements," would require, subject to such rules as the Commission might prescribe, that all written agreements and written statements

of all oral agreements for coordinated planning or operation of bulk power supply facilities be lodged with the Commission and kept available for public inspection in its office and in each region affected. The requirement would include, but not be limited to, agreements for joint ownership of such facilities. Since many, but not all, such agreements would be subject to section 205 of the Federal Power Act, the Commission's rules should prevent double filing in such cases.

Sec. 409 entitled "Reliability standards" provides that, on the recommendation of a regional council or on its own motion, and after consultation with the regional councils, and after public notice and opportunity to comment, the Commission must issue rules setting forth reasonable criteria for the planning and operation of bulk power supply facilities in order to increase their reliability. Such rules might apply to a particular region or regions, or be of nationwide scope. As specified in section 402(b), the existing provisions of Part III of the Federal Power Act would be available to enforce compliance with such rules.

Section 410 is entitled "Extra-high-voltage facilities: notice of proposed construction: suspension." This section deals with extra-high-voltage (EHV) facilities, which are defined in section 401(e). By virtue of that definition, section 410 will not apply to EHV transmission lines whose construction, extension or modification starts earlier than two years after the enactment of Part IV, or to generating plants of less than 200 megawatts, or to generating units or plants of 200 megawatts or more whose construction, extension or modification starts earlier than 4 years after enactment of the new Part.

Subsection (a) would require any person proposing EHV construction, extension, or modification to which Part IV applies (the "proponent") to file a detailed proposal with the FPC. The proposal would include a map, for rapid public recognition of the area to be affected by the transmission line or generating plant, and such information as the FPC may require in order to determine whether the proposal is consistent with applicable regional coordination plans and consistent with the objectives of Part IV. The filing would also state whether the proponent intended to seek rights-of-way under section 411, which provides for Federal eminent domain and the securing of easements on Federal lands. Copies of the proposal would be kept available for public inspection at the FPC's Washington office and in each region affected. Notice of the filing and of subsequent changes would appear in the Federal Register, be served on the National Council on the Environment, affected regional coordination councils, other entities and persons as determined by the FPC, and would be distributed to the press and other media of the regions affected. The notice would set forth a summary of the proposal, the places where verbatim copies are available for public inspection, and the latest date, not less than 90 days after publication of the notice in the Federal Register, for any person who deems himself interested to file comments or objections.

Subsection (b) prohibits construction of the proposed facilities (1) until 6 months after publication of notice of the proposal in the Federal Register, (2) as long thereafter as a suspense order remains in effect against them, and (3) permanently thereafter if the FPC disapproves the proposal. A suspense order must be issued within 6 months: by the FPC if the proposal appears inconsistent with an applicable regional coordination plan or if the proponent is seeking right-of-way under section 411; or by the National Council on the Environment, in the form of an objection as a result of its review under section 405. Suspense orders shall recite the reasons for their issuance and shall stay in effect until the FPC issues an order approving or disapproving the proposal.

Where no suspense order is issued within 6 months of publication of notice of the proposal in the Federal Register, the proponent may commence construction at the end of the 6-month period without necessity of formal FPC approval.

Subsection (c) provides for a form of conditional approval by the FPC of proposals against which a suspense order has been issued. Conditional approvals will be given by FPC order stating the specific modifications the FPC deems necessary to make the proposal acceptable. Such orders shall be kept available for public inspection, and notices thereof shall be published, served, and distributed in the same manner required by subsection (a) for original proposals. If within 90 days of publication in the Federal Register of the conditional approval order, the changes recommended by the FPC are accepted by the proponent, and no one objects, the FPC must approve the proposal as modified and terminate the suspense order. The suspense order, however, may not be terminated less than 6 months after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the original proposal. If, within 90 days of publication of notice of the FPC's conditional approval order, the proponent does not accept the recommended changes, or someone objects, or the FPC schedules the matter for formal hearing, the suspense order must remain in effect.

Subsection (d) states that, except as provided in subsection (c), above, the FPC may not approve or disapprove a proposal against which a suspense order has been issued without notice and opportunity for public hearing. This provision insures that no suspense order can be terminated by lapse of time or surreptitiously. This subsection, however, gives the proponent of a suspended proposal the right to demand public hearing within 13 months after issuance of the suspense order, or 30 days following the expiration of any period allowed for the National Council or the public to submit comments, whichever is later. Thus the act contemplates that suspended proposals must be voted up or down by the Commission with reasonable promptness; indefinite suspension is impossible over the proponent's objection.

Subsection (e) amplifies criteria for approval of EHV proposals, and further states that even if a proposal meets these criteria, it is not to be approved if the FPC has knowledge of a reasonable alternative which is clearly preferable from the standpoint of environmental enhancement, conservation, or strengthening long-range land-use planning.

Subsection (f) adapts to a modern setting the ancient principle of public utility law, that the property rights of persons who devote their property to public use must yield, under adequate safeguards against confiscation, to the public interest. In line with other provisions of the bill, it regards the various regulated entities' EHV facilities, not as their particular empires, but as part of a national electric utility system. Thus, the FPC is required to include in its orders approving EHV proposals provisions permitting other persons, upon payment of just compensation, to use the transmission and generating capacity in the proponent's facilities which are in excess of the proponent's needs. The FPC is also empowered, under the procedures of section 410, to authorize other persons, at their own expense, to enlarge EHV facilities constructed, extended or modified by proponents pursuant to such section, and to utilize the enlarged capacity for the generation and transmission of electric energy. These provisions would (a) increase reliability by making it more feasible to build facilities with increased reserve capacity that would be available in an emergency; (b) ultimately give consumers of electricity access to the economies of scale, which result from larger plants and lines, regardless of the size or ownership of the particular electric utility which serves them; and (c) prevent needless desecration of the environment by a prolif-

eration of smaller facilities. The FPC is to have authority to hear and decide all disputes arising under subsection (f), subject to judicial review, as provided by section 402(b).

Subsection (g) empowers the FPC in specified emergencies to authorize construction of EHV facilities in advance of compliance with all provisions of sections 405 (pertaining to review by the National Council) and section 410. Eventual compliance may not be dispensed with; and facilities built under emergency authorization pursuant to this subsection must be removed at the termination of the emergency, at the owner's expense, if they are ultimately disapproved. Under the bill it will be entirely voluntary with the proponent whether he chooses to construct under emergency authorization in advance of full approval of his proposed EHV facilities; and the risk of having to remove the facilities is one he must take if he chooses to construct under emergency authorization.

Sec. 411 is entitled "Right-of-way for extra-high-voltage facilities: eminent domain."

Subsection (a) reaffirms 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 even then would require all possible planning to minimize the harm.

Subsection (b) prohibits the condemnation of State, municipal and private lands and interests in land, and the acquisition of easements on Federal land, for sites and rights-of-way for EHV facilities before the time when construction of such facilities is permitted by section 410. This provision is based on the premise that allowing utilities to condemn land for proposed facilities which they may ultimately be banned from building, because not in the public interest, would make a mockery of National Council and FPC review of EHV proposals. Acquisition of State, municipal, and private lands by negotiated purchase is not prohibited.

Subsection (c) provides that when construction of proposed EHV facilities has been authorized pursuant to section 410, then the proponent may acquire right-of-way over Federal land, and may exercise its power to acquire right-of-way over State, municipal and private land by condemnation under State law if it has such power, or, if the proposal approved under section 410 expressly stated such intention, by exercise of the Federal power of eminent domain. A proviso follows to protect persons who raised objection to the proposed site or routing of the approved EHV facility in the FPC proceedings. When such person is party to the condemnation case, the plaintiff utility must point to the Commission's record and show that it, as proponent before the FPC, proved the part of its proposal to which that party's objection was raised was the best of all feasible and prudent alternatives.

Subsection (d) regulates use of the Federal power of eminent domain by proponents of approved EHV facilities to obtain State, municipal or private land for construction of such facilities. The proponent must first try to secure the desired property by contract. He can resort to Federal eminent domain only if he is unable, after reasonable negotiation, to obtain the property at an agreed price. If a party to the Federal condemnation action is a person who raised timely objection to the routing before the FPC, the proviso of subsection (c), described above, would also apply. The condemnor, whether or not it be a Federal agency, could use the declaration of taking procedures of 40 U.S.C. secs. 258a, 258b, and 258d, to gain

immediate title to the land and, in the discretion of the court, the possession thereof. But such use of a declaration of taking would be at the peril that if the condemnor fails to prove all aspects of its case at trial, it may have to return the property and pay damages to the dispossessed owner.

Subsection (e) governs the granting of rights-of-way over Federal land. It will provide the exclusive authority for such rights-of-way for EHV facilities as defined in subsection 401(e), superseding *pro tanto* all other laws authorizing right-of-way grants over areas included in the definition of "Federal lands" given in subsection (f), below.

Such rights-of-way will be granted by the FPC rather than by the agency administering the Federal land affected. The grants will be either for a limited term of not more than 50 years, or without limit as to duration. If the FPC places no limit on the duration of the grant, however, it will retain jurisdiction, at intervals of not less than 10 years, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to modify or add to the terms and conditions of the grant, as it deems necessary in the public interest.

In the case of Federal lands other than Indian reservations, the subsection requires notice to the department or agency administering the land affected, so that it may effectively and promptly submit its comments or protests to the FPC. In the case of Indian reservations the subsection requires consent of the tribe having jurisdiction before any right-of-way may be granted. In the case of tribes organized under the Indian Reorganization Act, such consent is now required by statute (25 U.S.C. 476). In the case of all other tribes such consent is now required either by regulations of the Department of the Interior (25 CFR 161.3(a)), or by treaty. To abandon this requirement would be contrary to the current national policy of vesting Indians with increased responsibility for management of their own affairs and would approach a breach of faith by Congress.

All rights-of-way would be granted on three mandatory conditions:

(1) Payment of just compensation for the right-of-way grant, to be made to the administering agency of the land affected, or in the case of Indian reservations to the Tribe having jurisdiction.

(2) Prompt payment by the right-of-way holder of special damages (not included in the initial just compensation) to anyone whose land, improvements, timber, or crops are harmed by the holder, his successors in interest, or his contractors, in the course of use of the right-of-way or as a result of the construction, operation or maintenance of the facilities thereon. Such special damages, for example, might include payment to individual Indians for their homes or crops or tribal land which are destroyed when the right-of-way is cleared, or payment to Forest Service permittees for injuries to their summer cabins in National Forests. Special damages might, of course, also become payable to the owner of the land underlying the right-of-way, i.e., the Federal Government or an Indian tribe, when injury occurs of a kind not contemplated when the initial just compensation for the grant was fixed.

(3) Such reasonable land use conditions relating to nonpower matters as the department or agency administering the land affected by the right-of-way (or the Indian tribe having jurisdiction, in case of Indian reservation land) might require. The FPC could by regulation specify a reasonable time prior to issuance of the right-of-way grant for the department, agency, or tribe to file with it such proposed conditions, but if timely filed would be under a mandatory duty to include them in the grant.

The right-of-way grants would also be upon such additional conditions as the FPC might in its discretion prescribe. These conditions

would ordinarily have to do with power matters, but they might concern environmental or other values suggested to the FPC by the National Council, State or local officials or the public, or raised on its own motion.

Just compensation for right-of-way across Federal land would in each case be stated by the FPC in its granting order or in a supplemental order. If the proponent and the agency administering the land underlying the right-of-way, or in the case of an Indian reservation the tribe having jurisdiction, promptly agreed on the amount, the FPC would be bound by the agreement. If the parties, however, did not agree within a reasonable time, the FPC, in the case of non-Indian land would afford the agency and the proponent an opportunity for hearing and proceed to determine the compensation. In the case of Indian reservation land, however, the FPC would not be authorized to use this procedure unless the proponent and the tribe agreed upon it in advance. No right-of-way over tribal land in an Indian reservation could be granted, therefore, unless the tribe having jurisdiction agreed in advance with the proponent either (1) on a definite amount of compensation, or (2) to submit the matter of compensation to FPC hearing, or (3) with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to have the compensation determined by some stipulated form of appraisal or arbitration. Just compensation would be payable, at the option of the agency or tribe, either in a lump sum in advance for the duration of the grant but in no event for more than 50 years, or in the form of annual charges. Lump sum compensation would be redetermined at 50 year intervals, and annual charges at 10 year intervals, in accordance with the same procedures applicable to the initial determination of compensation. Where Indian reservation land was involved, unless the tribe agreed upon the manner of redetermination, either at the time of giving its original consent to the right-of-way grant or at some subsequent time, the right-of-way would terminate on the redetermination date in the absence of a new agreement between the tribe and the holder on future compensation.

Claims for special damages would be adjudicated by the courts in the absence of agreement between the right-of-way holder and the claimant. Failure of the holder promptly to pay agreed or adjudicated special damages, however, would be a breach of condition of the grant, and cause for its cancellation under subsection (h), below.

Subsection (f) defines "Federal lands" as the "public lands" and "reservations" referred to in section 3 of the existing Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796), but somewhat broadens the exemption of National Park Service lands from the FPC's jurisdiction to grant rights-of-way. Section 3 of the existing act defines "public lands" and "reservations" as follows:

(1) "public lands" means such lands and interest in lands owned by the United States as are subject to private appropriation and disposal under public land laws. It shall not include "reservations," as hereinafter defined;

(2) "reservations" means national forests, tribal lands embraced within Indian reservations, military reservations, and other lands and interests in lands owned by the United States, and withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under the public land laws; also lands and interests in lands acquired and held for any public purposes; but shall not include national monuments or national parks;

The Electric Power Reliability bill of 1969 would forbid the FPC to grant EHV rights-of-way not only in National Parks and National Monuments, but also in any other areas administered by the National Park Service except National Parkways, National

Recreation Areas, and recreation areas administered by the National Park Service under cooperative agreements with other agencies. National Parkways are landscaped roadways, which may be hundreds of miles long. While it would be unreasonable to ban EHV lines from crossing these long narrow strips, and the bill would not do so, there is no intention of permitting transmission lines to be built along the length of any National Parkway, National Recreation Areas and recreation areas administered by the National Park Service under cooperative agreements frequently surround large power dams and reservoirs, and preservation of the natural environment is not their primary purpose. Hence the bill imposes no restrictions on EHV rights-of-way in such areas.

Subsection (g) defines "right-of-way" as including sites for generating plants and auxiliary installations as well as easements for transmission lines.

Subsection (h) authorizes the FPC, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to cancel any right-of-way granted under section 411 over Federal land, for failure to correct any default in observance of a condition of the grant within a reasonable time after notice of such default. An implied condition of each grant under section 411 would be that the grantee and his successors in interest use the right-of-way for purposes of constructing, operating, and maintaining EHV facilities and for no unrelated purpose. Hence abandonment of the right-of-way or using it for unrelated purposes would be grounds for cancellation. The FPC will be expected to adopt procedural regulations to implement subsection (h). Such regulations might authorize the Federal agencies or Indian tribes administering lands underlying rights of-way, as well as the FPC on its own motion, to serve notices of default upon right-of-way holders, and might require notice of proposed cancellation hearings to be served upon such agencies and tribes as well as upon the holders. Such regulations might also authorize the agencies and tribes to demand hearings, and to participate in them as parties, upon showing probable cause to the FPC that a previously noticed default has gone uncorrected.

Subsection (i) expressly provides that nothing in the Electric Power Reliability bill shall repeal or modify any provision of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) or any statute implementing it. That act contains various restrictions on man-made structures in wilderness areas as defined therein.

Sec. 412, entitled "Compulsory Interconnections," would permit the Commission, after notice and hearing, to direct any person engaged in generation or transmission of electric energy to establish physical connection of its facilities with those of another person or persons engaged in generation, transmission or sale of electric energy, to sell energy to, exchange with, or transmit energy for, such person. The Commission could do so on its own motion or on complaint, but would have to find that no undue burden would be imposed on the respondent by the interconnection order. It would also have to find that this action was necessary or appropriate to carry out the objectives of Part IV. The Commission could prescribe the terms and conditions of the arrangement to be made between the parties affected by the order, and the compensation to be paid by one to the other. If the order contemplates construction, extension or modification of EHV facilities, all the procedures and requirements of sections 405 and 410 must be followed. Section 412 would not modify or repeal any provision of any Federal power marketing statute. Hence, among other things, it would not authorize the FPC to disregard a clause in any such statute affording publicly-owned or cooperative utilities or consumers preferential rights to purchase Federally-generated electricity.

Sec. 413, entitled "Abandonment," would prohibit the abandonment of any bulk power

supply service, or of any part of a person's bulk power supply facilities, if the effect would be abandonment, curtailment or impairment of bulk power service, without the advance approval of the FPC. Approval could be granted after notice and opportunity for hearing, on a finding that the abandonment or curtailment would be consistent with the objectives of Part IV. This section is similar to section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717f(b).

Sec. 414, entitled "Authority to exempt," would give the Federal Power Commission power to exempt facilities, persons or activities from any requirement of Part IV or from any rule or regulation thereunder, in order to avoid excessive burdens on persons engaged in bulk power supply, regional councils, and the public. It would not, however, authorize the FPC to dispense from any requirement of section 411 or any regulation implementing section 411. Thus it would preserve the safeguards of that section against invasion of parkland, indiscriminate condemnation of private, State, and municipal lands, and granting of rights-of-way over Indian reservations without tribal consent. The FPC could issue exemptions under section 414 by rule, after notice and opportunity for hearing, and on determining that the exemption was necessary and appropriate to carry out the objectives of Part IV. Conditions could be attached to an exemption, and it could be revoked after notice and opportunity for hearing.

Sec. 415, entitled "Hearings, public information," gives specific implementation to one of the overriding purposes of the Electric Power Reliability Bill—that all members of the public shall have maximum opportunity to participate in utility planning and decisions that may affect their safety, prosperity, and the total environment in which they live.

Subsection (a) declares Congressional intent that all persons who may be affected by any action proposed under any part of the Federal Power Act, as amended by this bill, shall have a convenient opportunity both to express their views in writing and to participate in public hearings, and that therefore (1) the public should be given prompt, early and accurate notice of scheduled FPC hearings, and (2) every FPC hearing should be open to the public and held in a place of maximum convenience to members of the public and other persons affected by the subject matter of the hearing.

Subsection (b) requires, insofar as practicable, that every hearing authorized by any part of the Federal Power Act shall be held in or near the area affected, unless the FPC determines that the objective of full participation by all persons who may be affected by the outcome of the hearing can be better achieved by holding the hearing elsewhere.

Subsection (c) requires advance notice of all hearings scheduled under authority of any part of the Federal Power Act to be promptly published in the Federal Register and made available to the press and other media in the areas affected. It requires the FPC to take such other steps as may be necessary to assure that the general public in the area affected as well as the parties particularly interested in a proposed hearing will be promptly and accurately informed of the place, date, and time it is to be held and the substance of the subject matter to be considered. It requires that notice of the hearings be given sufficiently early so as to afford all interested parties an adequate opportunity to prepare for appearing and testifying at the hearing.

Section 415 completes the amendment to the Federal Power Act proposed by the Electric Power Reliability bill of 1969. The following sections are not amendments to the Power Act.

Sec. 4 is entitled "Surveys and research." Subsection (a) would require the FPC to survey existing and planned high voltage heavy current testing and research facilities

in the United States for adequacy and accessibility to all interested persons and to report its findings to Congress within one year, making recommendations for corrective action, if necessary.

In volume I of its report of July 1967 entitled *Prevention of Power Failures*, the FPC pointed out (on page 71) that some power failures have been caused by malfunction of major new high voltage equipment that was inadequately tested under operating conditions. At the present time, the report continues, there are only two laboratories in the United States equipped to provide the extremely high current requirements for such testing, each owned by a large manufacturer and not accessible to other manufacturers or operating companies.

The FPC report stated (p. 71): "Preliminary plans have been developed for a test facility near Grand Coulee Dam in the heart of the major hydroelectric network of the Pacific Northwest." Whether this facility will be open to all manufacturers and operating companies without discrimination, and whether one such facility will be adequate for all Americans needs, should be carefully evaluated.

Obviously the reliability of power facilities and transmission will be increased by technological progress as well as by improved coordination of operating entities. Section 4 is aimed at correcting one of the major bottlenecks to technological progress.

Subsection (b) would require the National Council on the Environment to make a study of the social and economic impact of overhead high-tension lines and towers. It is very important that we have some objective measurement to evaluate the true cost of these lines to communities and to the nation so that we can determine realistically when underground alternatives might be more economical. Now when the cost is compared, one only gets utility installation costs. Lost tax revenue, devalued real estate and such public costs are not considered.

GUARANTEE THAT EVERY CHILD SHALL EAT

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which amends the Social Security Act to provide for the furnishing of three full meals a day, 5 days a week, to all children under age 16 who are eligible for aid to families with dependent children or whose families are below the poverty level.

The best estimate I have at present indicates this program would reach 11 million children at a cost of \$4.5 billion annually. However, nearly \$2 billion of this amount would be obtained by repeal or reduction of Federal expenditures for existing food assistance or welfare programs, thus making the net additional annual expenditure \$2.5 billion.

My program does not guarantee every adult an income because he has a child. It does guarantee every child that he will eat. And it is my hope the administration will consider this suggestion when it makes its own welfare proposals.

Under the bill, meals would be provided at public and private schools, day-care centers, nursery schools, summer camps, and other nonprofit child-care institutions. They would be provided without cost to children receiving AFDC payments or whose families are below the poverty level—including Indian children—but would be available at cost to other children.

The entire cost of the program would be paid by the Federal Government.

The bill would repeal existing school lunch, milk, and breakfast programs and reduce 75 percent of Federal matching funds now paid in cash to AFDC recipients for food purchases. However, no State would be permitted to reduce its contribution under the AFDC program as a result of my proposal unless it meets a family's full need as established by its own standards.

Regulations for the program would insure that no child is stigmatized by receiving meals.

Welfare payments are intended to supply the basic needs of life. But the amount allotted for food under these programs rests on the assumption that every mother is an honor graduate in nutrition of one of our great land-grant colleges. The truth, of course, is that none of them is.

The second fallacy of our welfare programs is that if sufficient money is put into these programs a child will be fed a balanced diet. Surveys show that food is the last item a family buys.

In order to feed a child well, a mother must understand how to select a balanced diet, must live within reasonable distance of an adequate supply of food, and must have the transportation to get there. In addition, she must have available a constant source of fuel for cooking and a constant source of refrigera-

tion. For many of the poor, both urban and rural, none of these conditions exists.

The present welfare system has existed for more than a generation. Obviously, it is a colossal failure. It has failed to feed people.

Let us try a new approach. Let us rear one generation of American children that has been properly fed. Then, let us check the effects.

THE RELEASE OF FUNDS FOR 96 SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, a total of 96 small watershed projects approved by both Houses of the 90th Congress are still awaiting operations funding—funding that should, by law, be theirs today. The reason for the holdup of these funds is a decision made by President Johnson in 1966 that the authority to approve small watershed projects belongs to the President, not to the Congress.

Briefly, since 1954, the Agriculture Committees of both Houses have exercised their right under Public Law 566 to approve watershed projects limited in capacity to less than 4,000 acre-feet.

Projects with structures in excess of that amount must be approved, according to Public Law 566, by the Public Works Committees.

Following committee approval, the Soil Conservation Service allocates construction funds to the projects from previously appropriated funds. This was the method followed by Congress for 12 years until the Johnson administration decided to claim the power to approve these small watershed projects, leaving to the Congress only the right to review.

Naturally enough, Congress rejected this proposal, and so President Johnson ordered that operations funding be withheld until Congress was ready to yield their approval power.

Mr. Speaker, this stalemate has gone on long enough. Ninety-six small watershed projects in 31 States are being needlessly held back.

I call on the new administration to examine this matter immediately. The communities awaiting the benefits of these small watershed projects should not have to suffer any longer while an authority disagreement goes on.

A list of projects, the States and districts in which they are located, the counties they will serve, and the cost of the projects follows.

I urge President Nixon to see that operations funds for these projects are promptly released, and I call on my colleagues to join me in this plea.

PUBLIC LAW 566 WATERSHED PROJECTS—OPERATIONS APPROVAL PENDING MAR. 7, 1969

State	Congressional district	County(s)	Watershed	Public Law 566 cost	Other cost	Total cost
Alabama	4	Cleburne	Cahulga Creek	\$253,000	\$266,000	\$519,000
Do	3	Bullock, Macon	Old Town Creek	3,848,000	2,892,000	6,740,000
Do	2	Lowndes	Upper Big Swamp Creek	4,417,000	2,088,000	6,505,000
Arizona	2,3,4	Maricopa, Yuma	Harquahala Valley	3,014,000	3,830,000	6,844,000
Arkansas	1	Lawrence, Randolph	Big Running Water Ditch	1,215,000	991,000	2,206,000
Do	3	Yell	Cedar Piney Creeks	956,000	508,000	1,464,000
Do	4	Chicot	Chicot	1,509,000	2,781,000	4,290,000
Do	1	Randolph	Fourche Creek	4,981,000	2,107,000	7,088,000
Missouri	10	Ripley	Larkin Creek	630,000	1,067,000	1,697,000
Arkansas	1	Lee, St. Francis	South Fourche	3,829,000	868,000	4,697,000
Do	2,3,4	Perry, Yell, Saline, Garland	Buttontown water management project	4,339,000	5,673,000	10,012,000
California	18	Kern	Lower Llagas Creek	4,656,000	2,381,000	7,037,000
Do	9,10	Santa Clara	Main Street Canyon	1,289,000	680,000	1,969,000
Do	38	Riverside	Mustang Creek	372,000	1,508,000	1,880,000
Do	15	Merced, Stanislaus	New Jerusalem	1,236,000	1,858,000	3,094,000
Do	15	San Joaquin	Upper Llagas Creek	3,325,000	2,504,000	5,829,000
Do	9,10	Santa Clara	Canon	1,373,000	247,000	1,620,000
Colorado	3	Fremont	California Lake	1,027,000	1,047,000	2,074,000
Florida	2	Dixie	Pond Creek	492,000	1,437,000	1,929,000
Do	1	Santa Rosa	Hudson River	3,818,000	1,744,000	5,562,000
Georgia	9	Banks, Franklin, Madison	Suwanee Creek	1,130,000	728,000	1,858,000
Do	9	Gwinnett, Hall	Tesnetee Creek	1,116,000	535,000	1,651,000
Do	9	White, Lumpkin	Yellowjacket Creek	995,000	522,000	1,517,000
Do	6	Troup, Meriwether, Coweta	Georgetown Creek	758,000	1,246,000	2,004,000
Idaho	2	Bear Lake	Bay Creek	4,125,000	3,132,000	7,257,000
Illinois	21	Pope, Johnson, Massac	Mill Creek	2,634,000	1,602,000	4,236,000
Do	22	Clark, Edgar	Big Raccoon Creek	1,836,000	2,766,000	4,602,000
Indiana	5,7	Montgomery, Putnam, Parke, Hendricks, Boone	Delaney Creek	1,171,000	593,000	1,764,000
Do	9	Washington	Little Walnut Creek	1,171,000	850,000	2,021,000
Do	7	Parke, Putnam	North Pigeon	543,000	175,000	718,000
Iowa	7	Pottawattamie	Waubensie Creek	1,199,000	334,000	1,533,000
Do	2	Mills, Fremont	Cross Creek	1,739,000	513,000	2,252,000
Kansas	7	Shawnee, Jackson, Pottawatomie	Lower Elk River	2,474,000	447,000	2,921,000
Do	5	Elk, Wilson, Chautauqua	Lower Salt Creek	619,000	457,000	1,076,000
Do	1	Ottawa, Lincoln, Mitchell	Upper Elk River	3,773,000	589,000	4,362,000
Do	5	Elk, Butler, Greenwood	Upper Salt Creek	3,691,000	1,786,000	5,477,000
Do	1	Lincoln, Mitchell	West Fork Mayfield Creek	2,066,000	1,322,000	3,388,000
Kentucky	1	Carlisle, Graves	Cameron-Creole	1,580,000	602,000	2,182,000
Louisiana	7	Cameron	Central Madison	649,000	1,590,000	2,239,000
Do	5	Madison	Upper Bayou Teche	1,725,000	2,839,000	4,564,000
Do	3,7	Iberia, St. Martin, St. Landry	West Fork Bayou Lacassine	838,000	1,166,000	2,004,000
Do	7	Calcasieu, Jefferson Davis	Nezincot River	1,053,000	883,000	1,936,000
Maine	2	Androscoggin, Oxford	Stevens Brook	333,000	42,000	375,000
Do	1,2	Cumberland, Oxford	Washington Mountain Brook	412,000	389,000	801,000
Massachusetts	1	Berkshire	Big Creek	2,103,000	1,519,000	3,622,000
Mississippi	4,5	Jasper, Smith, Jones	Box Creek	625,000	315,000	940,000
Do	4	Holmes	Browns Creek	2,424,000	1,195,000	3,619,000
Do	2	Prentiss, Tishomingo, Itawamba	Chunky River	4,889,000	3,210,000	8,099,000
Do	4	Neshoba, Newton	Eutacutaches Creek	564,000	245,000	809,000
Do	4	Rankin	Five Creeks	2,068,000	1,384,000	3,452,000
Do	4	Yazoo	Richland Creek	2,531,000	1,114,000	3,645,000
Do	4,5	Lawrence, Simpson, Jefferson Davis	Silver Creek	2,979,000	2,003,000	4,982,000
Do	2	Tallahatchie, Coahoma, Quitman	Tri-County Hopson Bayou	595,000	584,000	1,179,000
Do	5	Jefferson Davis, Lawrence	Whitesand-Greens Creeks	4,310,000	2,187,000	6,497,000

PUBLIC LAW 566 WATERSHED PROJECTS—OPERATIONS APPROVAL PENDING MAR. 7, 1969—Continued

State	Congressional district	County(s)	Watershed	Public Law 566 cost	Other cost	Total cost
Missouri	4	Lafayette	Little Sni-A-Bar	\$804,000	\$518,000	\$1,322,000
Montana	2	Hill	Beaver Creek	698,000	463,000	1,161,000
Nebraska	1	Gage, Lancaster	Clatonia Creek	450,000	246,000	696,000
Do	3	Lincoln, Frontier	Lower Medicine Creek	605,000	830,000	1,435,000
Do	2	Washington, Douglas, Sarpy	Papillon Creek	1,515,000	2,344,000	3,859,000
Do	3	Lincoln, Hayes, Frontier	Upper Medicine Creek	816,000	1,050,000	1,866,000
North Dakota	1	Pembina	Midland-Drayton	523,000	260,000	783,000
Oklahoma	2	Washington, Osage, Nowata	Cotton-Coon-Mission Creek	2,186,000	2,280,000	4,466,000
Kansas	5	Pushmataha, Choctaw	Dumpling-Beaver Creeks	1,000,000	1,475,000	2,475,000
Oklahoma	3	Logan	Fitzgerald and Soldier Creeks	697,000	222,000	919,000
Do	6	Sequoyah	Garrison Creek	696,000	337,000	1,033,000
Do	4	Comanche, Tillman	Jack Creek	1,244,000	738,000	1,982,000
Do	2,6	Pawnee, Noble, Payne	Lower Black Bear Creek	2,668,000	1,299,000	3,967,000
Do	2,6	Noble, Pawnee	Lower Red Rock Creek	2,365,000	1,417,000	3,782,000
Do	1,2	Okfuskee, Creek, Okmulgee	Okfuskee tributaries	3,448,000	2,643,000	6,091,000
Oregon	2	Baker	North Powder River	3,190,000	2,932,000	6,122,000
Do	2	Union	Wolf Creek	2,402,000	2,021,000	4,423,000
South Carolina	4	Laurens	Beaverdam Creek	672,000	683,000	1,355,000
Do	5	Union	Brown's Creek	1,139,000	631,000	1,770,000
Do	5	Lancaster	Cane Creek	2,915,000	2,244,000	5,159,000
North Carolina	8	Union	Jackson-Mill Creek	1,019,000	1,149,000	2,168,000
South Carolina	5	Fairfield	Little Lynchs Creek	2,034,000	1,010,000	3,044,000
Do	5	Kershaw, Lancaster	Hurley Creek	606,000	193,000	799,000
South Dakota	1	Turner	Spring-Bull Creek	635,000	395,000	1,030,000
Do	2	Charles Mix	Aquila-Hackberry Creek	2,681,000	2,747,000	5,428,000
Texas	6	Hill, Johnson	Arroyo Colorado	3,002,000	8,981,000	11,983,000
Do	15	Cameron	Bennett Creek	679,000	239,000	918,000
Do	17	Mills, Lampasas, Hamilton	Darrs Creek	572,000	414,000	986,000
Do	11	Bell	Farmers Creek	1,387,000	577,000	1,964,000
Do	13	Montague	Los Fresnos Resaca	3,310,000	9,814,000	13,124,000
Do	15	Cameron	Mill Creek	2,004,000	1,716,000	3,720,000
Do	4	Van Zandt	Pecan Creek	448,000	190,000	638,000
Do	17	Hamilton	Rancho Viejo	3,232,000	8,399,000	11,631,000
Do	15	Cameron	Pohick Creek	1,004,000	4,199,000	5,203,000
Virginia	8,10	Fairfax	Slate River	1,016,000	412,000	1,428,000
Do	4	Buckingham	Upper Clinch Valley	1,226,000	633,000	1,859,000
Do	9	Tazewell	Elk Twomile Creek	1,164,000	969,000	2,133,000
West Virginia	3	Kanawha	Kanawha Twomile Creek	1,129,000	767,000	1,896,000
Do	3	Kanawha	Blackhawk-Kickapoo	1,136,000	403,000	1,539,000
Wisconsin	3	Crawford, Vernon	Tri-Creek	812,000	334,000	1,146,000
Do	3	Monroe	Willow Creek	718,000	290,000	1,008,000
Do	3	Richland, Sauk	Upper North Laramie	243,000	401,000	644,000
Wyoming	1	Albany				

In addition to the above 96 plans, supplements to 2 previously approved plans listed below also are pending approval

Georgia	9	Rabun	Head of Little Tennessee River	\$1,022,000	\$407,000	\$1,429,000
North Carolina	11	Macon	Mountain Run	466,000	554,000	1,020,000
Virginia	7	Culpeper				

1 At large.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which will increase the authorization for funds to acquire the remaining lands to be included in the Point Reyes National Seashore.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1962 this national seashore was established, to be comprised of 53,000 acres of some of the most beautiful shoreland in the entire world. Its incomparable scenic beauty and recreational features, only a short distance from San Francisco, probably cannot be duplicated anywhere in the country so close to a large metropolitan center.

At the time the seashore was established, \$14 million was authorized for its acquisition, but even as we deliberated the cost of the valuable shorefront property was increasing. In 1966 we authorized additional funds, \$5,135,000, but we still have acquired less than half of the designated park area.

My distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Marin County and San Francisco, Mr. CLAUSEN and Mr. MAILLIARD, have joined in this effort. We have been assured by the National Park Service that the entire park can be acquired within the additional authorization we

seek, \$38,365,000. A companion bill also is being sponsored in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we shall be able to act on this bill in this session and that we can acquire the entire national seashore as envisioned by the Congress when it established the park in 1962.

CHILDREN'S THEATER IN ST. LOUIS—VALUABLE COMMUNITY RESOURCE

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, society's coming of age can be made more simply and quickly through the conscientious efforts of citizens working within their communities to utilize every available resource for learning. Only in this way can we meet the challenge of maturity presented to us today.

St. Louis has given us such an example—by making use of its children's theater program to bring new insights into the classroom.

Seeking makes understanding much easier. St. Louis students have been given the opportunity, through live theater, to look beyond the play acting and experience the reality of integrated human relationships.

For many black students in St. Louis, children's theater has provided a first opportunity for identification with a black hero or with a black actor. For many white students, St. Louis Children's Theater has provided a first opportunity for them to experience the kind of reverse identification black people have known for so long.

Through children's theater—where the active cooperation of community service organization and schools has taken place—St. Louis has made strides toward human understanding so long overdue.

In hopes that my colleagues may benefit from this example, I commend the following account of children's theater in St. Louis to the attention of my colleagues:

CHILDREN'S THEATRE IN ST. LOUIS

In 1959, the Children's Theatre of the Junior League of St. Louis began trouping its production to the city schools of St. Louis. In 1965, the Council of Jewish Women was invited to have members of its Trouping Theatre take part. In this way, it was possible to make two full casts, thereby increasing the total number of productions possible.

For the past five years, the plays have been performed at twelve locations around the city, with two performances a day, and reaching about 22,000 children a year. Generally, it has been the children's only experience with live theatre.

This year, seeking to make the production

even more meaningful to the many children it serves, the Junior League invited the Persona Players of the Page-Park Branch YMCA to join the touring company. The members of the Persona Players, who are almost all teachers in the city schools, were very interested in the educational advantages of a cast which would include both men and women, black actors as well as white, and they agreed to participate. Breaking further with past habits and striking out anew, a Chinese legend was chosen for the first play to replace the western fairytale performed by a cast of white women.

Showing their approval of the aims of the three participating groups, the St. Louis Board of Education gave its full cooperation. It released Mr. Jerome Williams, principal of the Cole School, and Mrs. Emily Brown, kindergarten teacher at the Williams School, for the three-week period of the tour. The Page Park Branch YMCA lent its cultural director, Mr. Ronald O. David. Mr. Williams, Mrs. Brown and Mr. Davis are all members of the Persona Players. Mr. Williams and Mrs. Davis both have strong backgrounds in professional theatre.

The tour was hardly underway before it became clear—the children's response to the inclusion of men and to the integrated cast is one of increased delight. The children in the inner city areas are particularly pleased that the hero is a black actor and the principal character actor is also black. The work of the theatre has seemingly been brought close to all the children. The actors all circulate among the children after the performance to make it clear that actors are real people. The actors answer the children's questions, "Is that a real tall?—Are you a person?—And what is that stuff on your face?"

Performers in St. Louis Children's Theatre believe the children have a real chance for self-identification this year—made possible by the increased numbers and cooperation which has been made part of St. Louis Children's Theatre. Not only the children—but the performers are getting more out of Children's Theatre in St. Louis.

There is an evaluation questionnaire being distributed to all classes who attend the performances. It is hoped that a study of these evaluation replies will enable the groups to make next year's production even more effective.

THE NEW COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE AGAINST SAIGON WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE WITHOUT THE BOMBING HALT

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, according to news reports this morning the Communist offensive in Vietnam has not tapered off. Instead the next few days are expected to be "very critical." Some five or six North Vietnamese divisions are now moving on to Saigon from the Cambodian sanctuary, poised for an all-out attack.

Not even in the surprise Tet offensive last year did the North Vietnamese attempt such an all-out assault on the South Vietnamese Capital.

Let me just observe today, well in advance, that if this expected assault materializes it will have been made possible chiefly by the total bombing halt which this country undertook in complete good faith last November.

I supported that halt. It seemed a reasonable risk to take to find out in Paris whether we and the North Vietnamese

really could move together toward a genuine deescalation of this war.

But it was a very real risk and it involved and continues to involve some grave dangers to our troops in the field. Now in the environs of Saigon we can begin to see the full extent of those risks. I am myself sick and tired of all those pseudomilitary experts, both inside and outside the Pentagon, who have repeatedly claimed that bombing North Vietnam never accomplished anything.

The one key thing the bombing accomplished was to raise a hob with the North Vietnamese production and supply system. It may not have stopped it completely, but it sure kept its effectiveness low. Since November the North Vietnamese have worked around the clock to make up for those serious restrictions. In these past 4 months they have hauled thousands upon thousands of tons of supplies and weapons from Hanoi to the borders of South Vietnam, including the Cambodian border from which this current offensive on Saigon is being launched.

Let there be no mistake; the North Vietnamese could never have committed five or six combat divisions to such an assault were it not for the respite provided by the November bombing halt. As the Nation's leadership now contemplates what should be done to respond to the offensive, I hope this simple fact may finally replace all the myths and wishful thinking we have indulged ourselves with in recent months.

NEW MOREHEAD NEWS BUILDING

(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, I include in the body of the RECORD an editorial taken from the Morehead News, Morehead, Ky., by Mr. W. E. Crutcher, the publisher:

Contracts will be signed this (Thursday) afternoon for the new 14,800 floor foot building to house the Morehead News and affiliates.

The newspaper and modern lithograph-offset with web equipment printing and reproduction plant will be on about an acre of land on First Street in West Morehead, a little west and to the rear of the Morehead (Cowden) Company.

It's costing so dern much that this community-minded and community-active Publisher would probably have night-mares except a doctor friend gave us a prescription for some mild sleeping pills, and even milder tranquilizers which have about as much effect as watered-down beer.

It will be a far cry from the time that we ran job presses until after midnight to meet the paper bill, rent, and a then small payroll . . . and the good wife brought our lunch and supper so the hand-fed presses didn't stop.

The new Morehead News (and affiliates) building will be one of the most modern community plants in the nation. Many cities don't have all this automatic and computerized equipment. It is financially feasible and possible through contracts, all out of Morehead and some in other states, for spot and process color printing and mailing.

The move will be the first week in August, and we impart that there'll be ample parking space; big offices with carpeted floors, full

air-conditioning; and a private office in which the Publisher can transact his business, political meetings and other affairs. We're even figuring on a long and expensive leather couch in the Publisher's private (all enclosed) office so we can lie down when we get tired or doze off our problems and forget this troubled world.

Fronting the building will be a plot of grass 100 feet by 130 feet which we don't intend to mow because there's two ways to get a job done, i.e., do it yourself; or delegate the proper authority. We plan to delegate an official grass mower who will also have the responsibility for trimming the shrubs and keeping the flowers pretty and in bloom.

The Morehead-Rowan County Beautification Committee should love us because this place will look in the front more like the White House lawn or a home for the mentally ill than newspaper and printing premises.

The front lawn will have a sign like that at the Morehead State University Fieldhouse. It cost extra, but we've always believed in traveling first class.

In all the planning for our new building over the past two years, this getting less controversial Publisher has insisted on one thing—that is a large flag pole . . . we've already designated the official American flag putter-upper in the morning and taker-downer in the afternoon at quitting (time clock) time. And, we've told him that if that flag ever touches the ground he might as well hand in his resignation and lose all these ever-increasing fringe benefits.

We want all to see and know that here is one newspaper, and affiliated newspapers, with no communists or communism; has nothing "red" about it except the inks we use; no long hairs, subversives or race discrimination; and its owners, staff and long established editorial policy stand for Americanism, and America, just like our forefathers who fought and died so that we could have such a fine newspaper building and freedom of the press.

We believe that few businesses have had so many employees (percentage-wise) in the armed forces of World War I, the Korean War and the Vietnam conflict than the Morehead News and our two other affiliated Kentucky county-seat newspapers. That's probably because our employees learn so much in this business that they easily pass the army mental or educational entrance exams, and are paid enough so they eat good and are physically fit. We are proud of this, and know they, like everybody else in this plant, will be proud of "our" American flag.

Perhaps they'll fly the flag at half-mast when the hearse bearing the remains of this getting-older Publisher passes toward Lee cemetery, and maybe the tear of an employee will fall in the ink fountain.

That matters not, but the important thing is that so long as we shall live that American flag will proudly fly in front of The Morehead News.

Perhaps others in our community who will erect new buildings, or can adapt their present business structures, will adopt our conviction that the most beautiful thing in this day of beautifying America is the banner of 13 stripes and 50 stars.

SOUND FINANCING FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appro-

priations are joining with me in introducing a bill to provide sound financing for the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Our colleague, Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of the Post Office Committee, announced last week that the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, which he chairs, would hold hearings during the week of March 17 on a bill that he and other distinguished Members of the House have introduced to strengthen financing for the civil service retirement system.

Today the bill we are introducing is in strong support of certain provisions of that bill. However, our bill is confined to providing sound financing for the fund. It does not include certain benefit liberalizations. They certainly are secondary in importance to the paramount issue of assuring that the retirement system be financed on a sound basis, which is not the situation at the present time.

The new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Chairman Robert E. Hampton, appeared before our subcommittee recently in support of the Commission's fiscal year 1970 budget request. He stated that the civil service retirement and disability fund "now has an unfunded liability approaching \$57 billion. Within 5 years the system will be paying out more than it is taking in; within 18 years, its balance will have hit zero and additional appropriations of \$3 to \$4 billion each year will be required."

This is an alarming situation and our subcommittee, which reviews the retirement fund financing managed by the Civil Service Commission, has been greatly concerned about this problem of adequate financing for many years. It is imperative that some action be taken to put the fund on a sound financial basis without further delay.

A sound financing proposal was developed during the last session of the Congress by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office and incorporated in H.R. 10912, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS). That bill passed the House but did not pass the Senate before the 90th Congress ended. As indicated, Mr. DANIELS and other distinguished Members of this body have again introduced a similar bill this session, H.R. 770, that I referred to earlier.

The civil service retirement and disability fund was created to provide annuities for eligible employees of the Federal Government who retire because of age and service or disability and for benefits to eligible survivors of employees who die in service or after retirement. Membership in the civil service retirement system consists of about 2.7 million active Federal employees. Currently about 875,000 retired employees and survivors receive monthly benefits totaling over \$2 billion annually. The financing of this fund is shared by employees and the Government. The employees have paid their share through the years, but the Government has not always done so. Today the employees' contributions are not adequate to pay their share for liberalizations of recent years.

The present method of financing has been in effect since the beginning of fiscal

year 1958. Employing agencies contribute, from their appropriations, amounts equal to the sums withheld from the salaries of their employees at the deduction rate of 6½ percent of basic salary. These agency contributions, however, do not cover the Government's portion of retirement cost on a normal cost plus interest basis.

To illustrate the urgency of the problem we face today—the deficit was \$9.9 billion in 1953 when early measures were initiated to strengthen the fund. By 1958 the deficit had reached \$18.1 billion when a provision was inserted in the annual appropriation act to arrest the mounting deficit, but for several reasons this has only been partially effective. As of June 30, 1965, the deficiency had risen to \$40.4 billion; as of June 30, 1967, the deficit was \$48.1 billion; during fiscal year 1968 the deficit increased to \$52.6 billion; and this year it is estimated the deficit will increase by \$5.1 billion to reach \$57.7 billion by June 30, 1969.

This is why we feel strongly that this fund should be put on a sound basis. I urge enactment of legislation to accomplish this objective. Let me repeat, there are no provisions in this bill to provide for liberalization of benefits. My committee feels that we should address ourselves to sound financing—to putting the retirement fund on a sound operating basis—this we consider of overriding importance.

The Congress has a responsibility to provide financing that will assure future benefit payments to employees who in good faith make contributions through their working careers in anticipation of benefits when they retire. The integrity of the Government is pledged to the payment of such benefits when they become due. This will be assured if the fund is placed on a sound operating basis without further delay. I urge the passage of the legislation which all members of our subcommittee are joining in introducing today.

INCREASE THE SERIES E BOND INTEREST RATE

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the middle-class citizen bears a tremendous share of the burden of supporting the Government, a fact that is being emphasized with increasing frequency in the efforts that are being made to put the Federal income tax system on a more equitable basis.

There is another area that requires more equitable treatment, and that is the interest rate that is paid by the Federal Government on its series E bonds. These currently pay 4¼ percent per year, providing they are held for the entire 7-year period of their issuance. The interest rate is less if the bonds are redeemed before 7 years after purchase. The principal purchasers of series E bonds are the same group of citizens who bear so much of the heavy tax burden—the wage earners, the Government workers, the military and other small investors, many of whom buy the bonds regularly under the payroll deduction plans that the Government so earnestly urges.

Contrasted with the 4¼-percent rate, however, are the highest rates that the Treasury has paid in the past century on its obligations—the 6¼ to 6½ percent that it pays on the notes it has recently issued in trade for other existing obligations. Practically all of these go to banks, pension funds, mutual funds, insurance companies and other large investors.

There are differences in the obligations issued by the Treasury, with one having some advantages over another, or different disadvantages. The basic fact, however, is that the purchasers of all kinds of Treasury obligations are lending their money to the Government, and all should receive interest on their money at a fair, equitable rate.

As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have directed various staff studies concerning the efficiency and economy of the series E bond operation. For example, a study was made into rates of redemptions of series E bonds in some periods, and the consequent possibility that the costs of issuing and redeeming the bonds were so high that the program was uneconomic. However, the Treasury was convinced, and so advised me, that although at times more series E bonds were redeemed before their maturity than were sold, the program nevertheless was justified because the bonds gave the Treasury a means of obtaining wider distribution of the Federal debt, and at the same time provided a vehicle whereby citizens could express their interest—or patriotism—in assisting the Government to carry out its functions.

Three years ago, when President Johnson raised the interest rate on series E bonds from 3¼ to 4.15 percent, I commended him for that action. I also expressed by pleasure at the assurances that had been given to me by the Secretary of the Treasury that the matter of changing the rate of return on savings bonds was kept under constant Treasury scrutiny. The rate was later raised to 4¼ percent.

The Treasury has recently again indicated that it desires to raise the interest rate paid to the small—series E bonds—investors. Under existing law, the 4¼ percent now paid on 7-year series E bonds is the maximum rate allowed. Because a wide discrepancy exists between the interest paid to the small investor, and the rate paid to the large, I strongly urge that the Treasury early decide where, and if, series E bonds fit into the present overall debt obligations picture. If it concludes that some such instrument should be retained, it should also decide whether the obligation can be issued as a note, or in some other form, under existing law; and, if that is not possible, the Treasury should ask the Congress for the kind of legislation that is needed to give the small investor a proportionately fair interest rate on his loans to the Government.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES A. MEYER AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

(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, I was very pleased to learn that President Nixon nominated Charles A. Meyer for the very sensitive and dual position of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Meyer, a distinguished business executive with a considerable knowledge of Latin America, is currently director of eastern operations for Sears, Roebuck & Co. He became an assistant to the chairman of the board of that company for Latin American affairs in 1947. From 1953 to 1955 he was president of a Latin American subsidiary of Sears with headquarters in Bogotá, Colombia. Thereafter he spent 5 years as the company's vice president for Latin American operations. During this period he built up a 10-country department store chain which now does more than \$135 million in annual business. In the process, Sears, Roebuck & Co. appears to have done a remarkable job of building up good will by promoting local personnel and stocking local goods whenever possible.

Mr. Meyer also had previous governmental experience in the Latin American field. He was an adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 1957 Economic Conference of the Organization of American States; a member of the National Advisory Commission on Inter-American Affairs; chairman of the Latin American Committee of the Business Advisory Council; and Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Meyer has shown a sensitivity and understanding for the problems of economic development in Latin America, and an ability to use local talent and initiative in solving them.

I may add that Mr. Meyer comes from a civic-minded and well-known family. Mr. Meyer's paternal grandfather, George von Lengerke Meyer, was a prominent political figure at the turn of the century. He was speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, Ambassador to Italy and to Russia, as well as Postmaster General and Secretary of the Navy.

I want to congratulate the administration on this timely and very suitable nomination. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I look forward to working with Mr. Meyer on tasks relating to the formulation and execution of our policy toward Latin America.

THE SERIOUS DANGER FROM AN INCREASED OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) for bringing to the attention of the House the grave danger now confronting our troops in Vietnam by the current Communist offensive which has been made much easier to mount by the bombing cessation.

The decision authorizing the bombing

cessation was one which I personally considered very ill-advised from the military standpoint at the time it was made because I had observed throughout my years as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services just what the North Vietnamese did every time there was a bombing cessation. The intelligence reports and films which were shown to me revealed that a major supply build-up was begun immediately by the North Vietnamese after each bombing pause was effected. Since March 31, 1968, they have repeated their past actions and today our troops face what appears to be a well-supplied major offensive action.

I would point out to the Members of the House that the purpose of the bombing cessation on March 31, 1968, was to get peace talks started and to avoid the unnecessary killing of civilians. But the bombing cessation which was put in operation extended also to the transportation of supplies, materials, equipment, and troops that have been moved down the coast of North Vietnam to a point north of the DMZ zone by sea-going ships.

Certainly there was no reason at all to have a cessation of bombing in regard to that shipment. The Members of the House should be aware of the fact that tons upon tons of supplies and equipment are moving down the coastline every day. I do not desire to be too harsh in my judgment of those responsible for making the difficult military and political decisions in Vietnam but too many of my fellow Americans have already been killed by decisions which have resulted in America trying to fight a war with one hand tied behind our backs. I would hope that President Nixon does not repeat the mistakes of the past.

SABMIS STUDY ROADBLOCKED

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to imagine a citizen or enterprise in the market for a product who would refuse to take a look at something claimed to be twice as good at one quarter the cost. Strangely, this is precisely the situation with the Department of Defense relative to Sabmis, the sea-based, anti-ballistic-missile concept. I do not know whether Sabmis would be twice as good and four times less expensive or not. It could well be. But I have learned enough about it to be convinced that this country stands to make a very serious mistake if the Department of Defense does not at least thoroughly examine the feasibility and potential advantages of including it in our ABM structure.

Parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, let me add that I have very grave doubts about the ability of either the United States or the Soviet Union to deploy an ABM system with any great degree of effectiveness without incurring prohibitive costs. But let us assume for the moment that the United States is going to move toward a limited ABM capability of some sort.

I would also make it clear that neither

I nor any group of which I have knowledge propose that Sentinel be scrapped and superseded by Sabmis. My suggestion merely is that Sabmis be investigated as an adjunct to the Sentinel-type system.

There is a third point, Mr. Speaker, which should be clarified. Deputy Defense Secretary Packard has apparently been advised that Sabmis can only be produced far, far downstream from the Sentinel. This is simply untrue. Sabmis is based on current technology. No scientific breakthroughs are required. The basic technical ingredients are the Poseidon missile and tracking and acquisition radars of a type already deployed at sea on a more limited basis. With proper support it can be fully operational in the same time span as Sentinel.

Sabmis has been treated as an unwanted child from the start. Department of Defense has released just enough investigation funds to be able to say that it is being looked into. Less than \$1 million have been spent up to this point and a considerable portion of that came out of the Navy's own hide through internal reprogramming action. Rather than encouraging the study of this promising concept, powerfully effective individuals in DOD have done everything within their power to roadblock it. DOD has even withheld funds officially obligated for the study of Sabmis, meanwhile spending \$4 billion on Sentinel.

One can only conclude that the whiz kids are still in charge, giving the same answers they settled upon a half decade ago. I hope that President Nixon and Secretary Laird will hasten to fulfill their promise of decentralizing the Pentagon so that all the services can contribute freely to the development of the strategy of the future. Thus far, the new administration has failed.

Sabmis, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than a mobile sea-based ABM system which would be deployed close to the launch sites of potential enemies. Such a system would afford early interception and destruction of an adversary's offensive missiles before such weapons split into a shower of thermonuclear warheads, decoys and penetration aids. It would function when the chances for effective interception would be highest. It would perform its function without fall-out on our population centers. And it would attract thermonuclear countermeasures into the oceans rather than to American soil and air space. No bomb shelters would have to be built because of its existence.

A further remarkable feature of Sabmis is its ability to help turn aside nuclear blackmail by adversaries who might hold friends and allies "hostage" under the threat of missile borne destruction. With Sabmis, if we should choose, we could offer ABM protection to nations such as Japan, the Philippines, and Australia, for examples.

Sabmis also promises a substantial alleviation of the inherent crucial shortage in decision time before committing our own offensive missiles. An enemy might even tip his hand in advance of an attack by the pattern of his actions to circumvent Sabmis. I include, for the RECORD, a more substantial explanation

of the advantages of Sabmis contained in my letter of February 18, 1969, to the Secretary of Defense.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that Sabmis units are readily mobile, swiftly deployable in response to specific sources and types of threat as events require. They can operate out of the coastal waters of Germany, India, Norway, Japan, Israel, and the United States, as well as anywhere on the high seas.

I have been advised that as few as four Sabmis ships could afford the same protective coverage as provided by the entire Sentinel system as currently visualized. These ships would be men of war, the size of large cruisers, and would have to be especially designed and built. The likely cost would be around \$500,000,000 each. The number of ships that might be utilized is flexible, of course, but the maximum would probably be eight, unless we decide to spend ourselves bankrupt by trying to provide an effective shield against any and all types of full scale attacks from the Soviet Union.

Sabmis affords President Nixon and Secretary Laird with a unique opportunity to inject a much needed fresh breeze into the entire ABM picture. I hope that they will cause an immediate serious investigation of Sabmis and will not merely come forward with cosmetic changes to Sentinel such as cutting out a few bases and moving the rest a few miles away from our cities. I hope they will do this before any final decision for ABM deployment.

Just as important, Mr. Speaker, I hope there will soon evolve in DOD an environment conducive to the study and development of new uses of seapower. As a nation it is time for us to become enlightened about the real estate of the sea. As President Kennedy said, our survival may depend upon it.

The letter mentioned above follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are to be commended for your decision to conduct a review of the proposed Sentinel ABM system before proceeding with production and deployment commitments. I share with you the conviction that the Nation will be well served in taking initial steps toward deployment of a credible ABM capability—whether our profit accrues from a stronger position in arms control bargaining or from possession of an effective, although admittedly incomplete, shield from missile attack.

In either prospectus, the practical effectiveness of the system to be deployed is of obvious importance. Indeed, it is reasonable doubt of Sentinel's ability to cope with the determined M.I.R.V. attack which (a) underlies much domestic opposition to the cost of deployment, and (b) would erode Sentinel's deterrent value as well as its benefits in United States-Soviet arms control negotiations.

With respect to the above considerations, I earnestly urge your consideration of a combination Sentinel-Sabmis system.

Sabmis (sea-based anti-ballistic missile intercept system) is in large measure a marriage of the Polaris-Poseidon technology with the Sprint and Spartan systems. In effect, the deployment of a Sabmis unit would place in the seas close to an adversary's homeland

and across his "launch trajectory window," a mobile screen of anti-missile forces. I commend to your attention the following outstanding features of Sabmis:

First. Early interception of an adversary's offensive missiles promises the destruction of multi-warhead missiles before such weapons split into a virtual shower of decoys, penetration aids, and thermonuclear warheads. The proposed terminal phase anti-missile defenses surrounding our priority targets within the United States will have to deal with each incoming element of the "shower" individually, unless the launch vehicle is thus intercepted before its dispersion is effected.

Second. Along with the Polaris-Poseidon forces, Sabmis would move much of the impact of any future nuclear confrontation out to sea and away from our population centers. One example of this feature is that Sabmis interception and destruction, with its inevitable nuclear collisions and fallout, would take place over the adversary's homeland or over the sea.

Third. A wisely balanced mix of Sabmis and fixed, terminal-phase, Sprint-Spartan-type defenses would give us two interception zones, thus vastly increasing any opponent's difficulties in insuring penetration, and magnifying his doubts of any reasonable prospectus of achieving a disabling first strike. The latter are deterrent factors, but should irrationality prevail and deterrence fail, the utilization of Sabmis would reduce the task of the terminal-phase defenses to manageable proportions and/or force an attacker to divert substantial forces to attempts to find and neutralize and ocean-based barrier. These attempts in themselves, it should be noted, would constitute warnings of the most valuable sort.

Fourth. Sabmis promises a substantial alleviation of that most crucial shortage in crisis decision time before committing our land-based offensive missiles. Where first strikes by a potential enemy against our strategic retaliatory forces can be deflected by Sabmis far from our shores, that terrible counterblow need not be launched immediately to avoid destruction of the launch sites. Such a time buffer reduces the chances of overaction, accident, or error.

Fifth. A remarkable feature of Sabmis is the ability it can provide us in turning aside nuclear blackmail bargaining by adversaries who, in effect, hold our friends and allies "hostage" under the threat of missile-borne destruction. Thus, the deployment of a Sabmis unit in the Sea of Japan or the Bay of Bengal could cover the approach routes of missiles from China directed against Japan or India, respectively. No fixed-base system in the United States offers such an answer to this type of threat to our international interests.

Sixth. Needless to say, the unique shielding capability of Sabmis is of enormous significance to the whole non-proliferation thrust. Sabmis, very simply, can offer a substantial degree of security to poorer friendly nations against crude but terrifying nuclear missiles acquired by ideologically militant neighbors—without requiring such threatened states to develop their own deterrent nuclear forces.

Seventh. We are not speaking here of a defensive system requiring a chain of technological breakthroughs for practical realization. The R. & D. requirement for Sabmis is largely a recombination of state-of-the-art hardware and technology.

Mr. Secretary, I submit that the clear and readily attainable advantages of a Sabmis-Sentinel combination offer, at moderate cost, sufficient enhancement of our ABM capability (for deterrence, defense, alliance policy or negotiation) to warrant most serious consideration before a final commitment to exclusive reliance upon a terminal phase system. Your customary patient attention and

thoughtful assessment will be deeply appreciated.

With kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM R. ANDERSON.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO TAKE ACTION ON THE PROBLEM OF LUMBER

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, Congress is faced with a very serious situation. It is a situation that is real—it is a situation that must be promptly met.

The point is, there has been more than a 100-percent rise in the cost of lumber during the past 12 months. This has resulted in the entire building industry suddenly being involved in an upward pricing spiral never before experienced. It is going to have a very deteriorating effect on the HUD 235 program.

Congress wonders why. The answer is very plain.

According to the following information which I have received from a prominent lumber dealer and building contractor in my district:

The Japanese have been getting an enormous amount of our raw material . . . logs . . . 2¼ billion feet in 1968 alone, with no sign that the "Morse Amendment" limitation for export to 350 million feet a year will at all affect this year's or possibly next year's exports because of existing export contracts.

As I write you, there are 284 million feet of logs in the waters of west coast ports, most assumingly ready for export. This vast drain of logs to Japan has kicked up timber prices drastically. It is commonplace today for timber stands to sell at two to three times their appraised value.

And the little mill operator, who does not own stands of saw timber, and who is totally dependent on buying federally-sold timber, is forced to meet these export-inflated prices to obtain a stumpage for our domestic United States use. As this trend continues, and we see no sign of its abating, then the somber forecast of serious lumber economists may well come true . . . i.e., with further lumber price increases of as much as 25% or more this spring. Right now we lumber dealers find it almost impossible to get firm prices quoted from lumber suppliers who fear that tomorrow's inflation will make today's quotes invalid.

The result? We in turn, leaning on lumber as we do for most construction projects, find it likewise impossible to bid our jobs with reasonable certainty that our estimates will be correct when construction commences. We do know what must be done and when. We ask most respectfully for immediate action by the Congress and the Executive Branches for:

1. An immediate and total ban on exports of timber, from the United States to any place in the world, from any port, of any commonly used building species; such ban to last until this patently apparent crisis has eased in the opinion of the President. Such ban to be imposed by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, under powers now possessed by these two Cabinet officers to so act.

2. The immediate increase of allowable cut—the amount of timber which may be harvested without jeopardizing sustained yield and other sound conservation practices—from Federal Lands of at least 10% by the United States Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

3. Passage by Congress of immediate additional appropriations by the United States Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management which will allow placement of immediate sale of blowdown (storm toppled) timber and/or bug infested timber which is lying on the ground rotting at present.

Taking these three steps will give our suppliers the raw materials they must have, will at least hold the current line on prices, and will restrict primary use of a United States commodity to the United States, rather than exporting it and the jobs it creates to a foreign nation.

We tell you finally that Japan, for one, does not need United States logs at present. Its economic journals have said repeatedly since last November that Japanese ports are glutted with United States logs which they overbought last year as a last minute Japanese attempt to anticipate implementation of the "Morse Amendment" export limitation.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in Japan last fall we saw bay after bay filled with logs. There was no question but that they had come from the Pacific Northwest, Canada, and Alaska. The building industry needs immediate attention before this great industry grinds to a complete halt for want of our basic building component; namely, wood. It is time for Congress to take action on this very serious situation.

THE EXPLOSIVE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, my hometown, Richmond, Ind., is the seat of Earlham College, a small liberal arts college of about 1,100 students, which is affiliated with the religious Society of Friends.

The president of Earlham College is Dr. Landrum Bolling, who, before he became a college president, had a distinguished career as a war correspondent, newsman, world traveler, and student and professor of political science.

One of the areas to which Dr. Bolling has devoted much time and study is the Middle East, and the explosive situation which exists there today between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

Recently, Dr. Bolling gave an interview on this subject to a weekly newspaper, the Richmond, Ind., Graphic, which is one of the most informative and dispassionate discussions of the Israel-Arab problem that I have seen.

Dr. Bolling's discussion is neither pro-Israel nor pro-Arab; he takes a clear look at a most difficult situation and assesses it from the point of view of our own national interest, and as one deeply concerned with the maintenance of world peace.

Dr. Bolling comes to the conclusion that, given the present situation in the Near East, peace in the area can be brought about today only by and through action by the great powers—that the time to act is now—and that failure to act may well lead to renewed warfare in the area; a situation which might hold grave possibilities of another Vietnam or even of a serious confrontation between Soviet Russia and the United States.

The subject is of such vital importance, and Dr. Bolling's discussion seems to me so sane and intelligent, that I am offering a copy of this interview for insertion in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House and to that of persons in the national administration who are charged with responsibility in this area:

PEACE OF WORLD ENDANGERED UNLESS MIDDLE EAST AGREEMENT COMES SOON

(Interview with Dr. Landrum Bolling)

Question. I know that as a historian you never like to start with the present, so perhaps we can back up just a little bit and cite a few facts which led up to our present situation. Maybe starting with 1948? Would that be far enough back, or do we have to go back to Old Testament times?

Dr. BOLLING. I don't think we have to go back to the Old Testament, but I think we have to go farther back than 1948. I think that the fundamental issue that you have to look at is the whole basic concept of the Zionist movement. You see, Zionism was the creation of a Jewish journalist in Vienna named Theodore Herzl, who in the 1880's and 90's began to develop a movement, an ideology for the gathering together of the Jewish population.

He, of course, like many other Jews in central Europe was well aware of the incredible persecutions of the Jewish people over many generations and centuries, particularly in Poland and Hungary. And he had the idea that Jews would never be secure, they would never have any sense of hope in the world until they had their own homeland.

And so he began to try to sell this idea to Jewish communities in various parts of Europe and to preach the idea that Jews should be gathered together. The dispersed Jews, or as they call it, the Jews in Diaspora, should be brought back together.

Now, in the beginning there was not clear agreement that this would be in Palestine. As a matter of fact, the early Zionists negotiated for some time with the British about the possibility of setting up a Jewish homeland in the highlands of Central Africa and they actually negotiated about setting up a Jewish state in what is now Uganda. This idea was talked about seriously for a long while, but eventually was dropped and they came back to the idea of re-establishing a Jewish settlement in Palestine.

SOME HAD BEEN THERE

Of course, there had been some Jews who all through the years had remained in Palestine, though the Jewish population in Palestine at the turn of the century was very small indeed. Those who had lived there in Palestine and in other parts of the Middle East among the Arabs had, on the whole, probably as little difficulties with their neighbors as in any part of the world.

The Arabs are, after all, Semitic people themselves. One of the things, incidentally, that infuriates the Arabs is to be called anti-Semitic. It is a contradiction in terms. "We are semites ourselves," they say. "We are obviously very closely related to Jews in blood, in culture, in language even, and so on."

So the Jews and the Arabs lived quite harmoniously together over the centuries, though, of course, very few Jews actually did remain in Palestine over a period of 1800 years or so.

The Zionist movement began to focus on Palestine about the time of World War I and the Zionist leaders began to negotiate with the Turkish government which, as an imperial power, controlled most of the Arab lands and controlled Palestine.

MADE DEAL WITH TURKS

This is one of the things, in a sense, that got the Jews off to a bad start with the Arabs,

because the Jews made their deal with the hated colonial Turks in the first place to get into Palestine. A lot of the Arabs who thought about these matters were quite bitter that their hated Turkish imperial overlords should bring another people into their midst.

But on the other hand, there were many Arabs who went along in a very friendly way with the idea of bringing Jews into the Middle East. King Hussein's (of Jordan) grandfather, for example, sold considerable tracts of land to Jewish settlers back around 1920, and many of the early Jewish migrants came into Palestine with the full blessing of the Arabs from whom they bought land and with whom they traded, and they settled down to live there."

Question. Did they only come individually?

Dr. BOLLING. They came individually or they came sometimes in small groups or small communities out of some part of Poland or Russia. And they began to develop their cooperative communities, their Kibbutzim.

As they became more noticeable on the landscape, as they became more numerous, tensions began to develop and the first of the Jewish-Arab conflicts developed in the 20's and continued on in the 30's with occasional outbursts of violence by one side toward the other and particularly, of course, on the part of the Arabs.

BAD FEELING GROWS

Certain Arab nationalists were beginning to explode at the thought that the Jews were coming into their midst and were going to be taking over more and more territory.

One of the tragic aspects about the whole business was that Arab nationalism was beginning to come to the fore just as, in a sense, Jewish nationalism was coming to the fore. These two nationalisms came into conflict at a moment in history and in a place where conflict was inevitable. I think that is the heart of the whole thing.

One of the most fascinating books that has been written about the current problems out there is a book by a Jewish member of the Israeli parliament, a member of the Knesset. He is also an editor of a magazine. His name is Yuri Avneri who has written this book called "Israel Without Zionists."

He himself says that he owes his life to the Zionist movement. His father was a German Jew who brought him to Palestine in 1933. He says if it hadn't been for the Zionist movement, he would probably be dead today. He fought first of all as a teenage underground fighter in the secret terrorist organization, the Irgun, against the British before they got out. He fought in the war of '48. He fought in the war of '56. He fought in the war of '67.

In spite of all that, he says a purely Jewish state is a bad idea. And he goes beyond that to say that the one single, simple mistake Herzl and the early Zionists made was that they overlooked the fact that the territory was already occupied by the Arabs.

CONSIDER JEWS INVADERS

Now this is a very central point of the whole argument—that here you have an area in which the Arabs, as they see it, had had undisputed control of this area, except for the colonial powers that were over them at various times, for 1,500 years, and all of a sudden they are confronted with this, as they see it, an invasion of foreigners coming in and pushing them out. So this kind of feeling that you get among the Arabs is something that is very much at the bottom of the whole conflict.

Now during the 20's and the 30's, immigration to various parts of Israel increased. Of course, after Hitler came to power in '33, the tide of immigration increased very rapidly until it was shut off by Hitler's control of most of Europe, though actually there were some Jews who managed to get out. They either escaped or bought their way out; that

is, they were ransomed out by Jews on the outside.

After the war was over there were, of course, several hundred thousand Jewish survivors in the concentration camps and in hiding around Europe who now came out and many of these wanted to get out of Europe as fast as they could. Many of them wanted to come to the U.S. or Australia or Canada or South Africa, but many of them felt the only hope for them was to go to Palestine.

ZIONISTS FIGHT BRITISH

And so between '45 when the war ended and '48 when Israel came into being, there was this constant struggle against the British forces that occupied Palestine and had the League of Nations mandate to administer Palestine. It was a struggle between the Zionists and the British over the rate of immigration into Palestine.

Question. Now, if I may ask, it was from World War I until World War II that the British had a mandate? Is that right?

Dr. BOLLING. Right. The British wound up at the end of World War I with a League of Nations mandate to administer Palestine and to prepare it for self government.

Question. And this was the time the Jews were promised a "homeland"?

Dr. BOLLING. Well, the Jews were promised the homeland in the Balfour declaration of 1916. This was a one page letter written by Lord Balfour, the foreign minister to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who was a very brilliant Jewish scientist, a subject of Great Britain who had been very active in helping with the British war effort.

Weizmann was a leading, enthusiastic Zionist and when the British government asked him what they could do to reward him for his great services in war industry effort, he said, "There is one thing and one thing only that I could ask, and that is that you help us establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine."

And so Lord Balfour wrote a letter in which he said that his majesty's government views with favor the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Now that is essentially all it said and you can judge by these words that they were very vague. It didn't say what kind of homeland. It didn't promise a separate independent political state. It didn't say how many Jews. It just said the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. That letter has been argued over ever since then. The British put one interpretation on it. The Jews put another. The Arabs put another. And yet, of course, the Balfour declaration was, in a sense, the basis of the public commitment to aid this immigration from World War I on.

TEMPO OF DISCORD RISES

Now, between '45 and '48, the tide of migration into Palestine was moving pretty rapidly in spite of difficulties, in spite of the fact the British at one time cut off all immigration into Palestine on the grounds they couldn't keep order because the Arabs were objecting so strenuously to it. And there were riots. There was fighting.

The Jews meantime formed their own para-military organizations to support their cause. One of these was called the Stern gang. One was called the Irgun. These two bodies were, as the British called them, terrorist organizations. They had no official standing, but they were armed bands of men and boys who felt that the survival of the Jews was at stake and that they were out to fight to get freedom and independence for a Jewish community.

There was actually some fighting among themselves, because these people were very passionate about their ideas. There was a good deal of hostility and competition for leadership.

Well, the British finally decided, you recall, in 1947, that they could not continue to ex-

ercise this mandate. They said it was no longer possible to govern this country, that it is really ungovernable as it now stands, and therefore the British said to the United Nations, we transfer this back to the United Nations as the successor to the League of Nations and ask that you decide what's to be done with it.

PARTITION FINALLY VOTED

So inside the United Nations was long, long debate that lasted for many months about what should be done about it. A partition plan was finally put forward and the U.N. voted somewhat cautiously and reluctantly to divide Palestine into a Jewish and Arab state, with Jerusalem to be an international city, open to both sides.

Well, the Arabs refused to accept the partition idea. They said this is impossible—we will not allow our territory to be taken away from us this way. And the Israelis said, well this isn't exactly what we wanted—this isn't as much territory as we would like, but all right we will accept it.

So the U.N. decision in 1947 called for the creation on May 15, 1948, of a new state to be called Israel, with the previously predominantly Arab section of what remained of Palestine to be set up on another basis.

As I say, the Arabs would not accept this decision. And on the day that Israel was born officially, May 15, 1948, the Arab neighbors attacked Israel, intending to destroy this state before it really could get born. The Arabs defended their actions then and they defend them still on the grounds that the creation of the state of Israel was an act of aggression against them. Every time the Israelis denounce the Arabs for attacking Israel, the Arabs reply: the very nature, the very existence of Israel is an offense to us and is an aggression against our people and against our territory. And they will always go back to this particular argument.

CHANGES FOLLOW STATEHOOD

Now I think it has to be said that in the period since '48, a lot of things have happened that obviously alter the situation and determine the course of events today and in the months ahead. In the first place, you have to bear in mind that the Israelis proved to be enormously effective fighters and the Arabs proved to be very poor fighters. The Israelis were, in a sense, fighting for survival. Their backs were to the sea. They had to win. If they didn't they felt they would be exterminated. And so they fought heroically and with great effectiveness in '48 and again in '56 and again in '67.

Furthermore, the Israelis were for the most part western trained and western oriented in their skill, their outlook. They are people of the modern world. The Arab populations, in very large measure, are simple and backward and primitive people with limited education and without a sense of passion for their cause.

So the Arabs did not do terribly well in any of these wars. And the Israelis won. In the war of '48, which was connected with their independence, they won convincingly. And in the end they wound up with more territory—something like 30% more territory—than they would have had if the Arabs had accepted the original U.N. partition plan.

TAKE HALF OF JERUSALEM

They also wound up holding half or more than half of the city of Jerusalem. And they refused to accept the idea of an international city—just as the Arabs as a matter of fact, refused to accept the fact of an international Jerusalem.

From '48 to '56, there was a cease-fire, but no peace. In all these 21 years since Israel was created, there has been no real peace in the Middle East. There has been only a truce. And that truce has been broken again and again, particularly by the Arab guerillas who commit acts of sabotage against the Israelis.

And they have been doing this on and on for many years.

The Israelis, meantime, have built up a powerfully efficient military organization. I suppose they have the most comprehensive military training program in the world.

Israel is an armed camp. Israel is a nation in which everyone is expected to do his military duty, male and female. They have conscription, required military service that lasts from, say age 18 to something like 50 years of age. And on the roads and streets of Israel you see women in uniform right alongside the men in great numbers. They are draftees. The women are drafted just the same as the men.

A NATION OF "SQUARES"

As a people, they are intelligent. They are hard working. They are technically skilled. They are passionately devoted to the defense of their country. And one interesting thing, they are the most "square" people that you will find. No beards, no long hair. Everybody is ship-shape and trim, you know. They give this appearance of a sort of army camp.

Question. As a nation, they are devoted to God and country?

Dr. BOLLING. They are devoted to God and country. At least, they are devoted to country. God is not terribly important in Israel, in the sense that the overwhelming majority of Jewish people in Israel have no interest in their own religion as such. It is largely an agnostic and atheistic population. The religious Jews are a tiny minority of the total. But of course, the religious Jews do have a very powerful voice in the total policy of the country.

Well, back to the events since Israel came into being as a state. Israel was never able to get the Arabs to accept her existence. The Arabs have maintained a boycott against Israel. They refuse to trade with her. They refuse to recognize her and refuse to have diplomatic relations with her. They refuse even to allow people to cross from one side of the border to the other, except under very rare circumstances.

Religious pilgrims might at Easter time or Christmas go through the gate, but normally there was a complete shut-off of communication and transportation between Israel and the Arab countries that completely surround her. Of course, Israel has not liked this. She has wanted to be accepted. She wants to have peace with her neighbors. This is perfectly clear.

ISRAELIS OVERWHELM EGYPT

In 1956, after Nasser had nationalized the Suez canal and after he had begun to make an army deal with the Russians, the British and the French backed the Israelis in an attack on Egypt. The Israelis swept across the Sinai peninsula to the Suez canal and Egypt was overwhelmed almost immediately, but the United Nations went into action almost immediately. And in this case the United States and the Soviet Union stood on the same side.

They denounced the Israelis, the British and the French and they compelled them to withdraw, promptly. The Israelis got only one thing out of that war of '56. They got a promise of free passage of their ships through the Gulf of Aqaba, through the straits of Tiran, which Egypt, of course, could control, provided the United Nations would make Israel withdraw from the Sinai peninsula. This kind of a deal was made and the Israelis did withdraw and the Egyptians did allow the shipping to proceed to Elath.

Nasser precipitated a crisis in the spring of 1967 by saying he was going to close that strait. He was going to shut off the Israeli shipping to Elath. And the Israelis said, of course, we can't tolerate this; this is vital to us and we will fight.

Nasser meantime, trying to re-establish his leadership in the Arab world, trying to rattle the sword and see what it could get

by way of concessions, was pushing his country and the Arab world to the brink of war. Many people will argue with you as to whether he intended to go to war or not. The Jews, of course, say that he was making every gesture as if he were going to war and they were not going to sit there like sitting ducks until the Egyptians and Jordanians and the Syrians attacked them and overwhelmed them.

THE 6-DAY WAR, JUNE 1967

So the Israelis admit they fired the first shot. They made a pre-dawn attack on the Egyptian air force in the early hours of June 5, 1967, and within a very short period of time—a matter of a few hours—they had destroyed them. They caught them on the ground by surprise, and they completely decimated the Egyptian air force which the Soviets had built up by providing MIG planes and training their pilots. But here in a flash, the Israelis had completely destroyed this.

Having destroyed the Egyptian air force, the Egyptians were not able to use their ground forces, their tanks and their troops to good effect, and again the air force. The air power of the Israelis, plus their skill and hard fighting ability, made it possible for them to overwhelm the Egyptians, to overwhelm the Jordanians, and to overwhelm the Syrians in what we now call the Six Day War.

Since that defeat, there has been, I think a greater hope that a peace could be made than at any time in the last 20 years. The reason I say this is for the first time, I think the responsible leadership in Egypt and in Jordan, particularly, have come to see that they have got to accept the existence of the State of Israel. I think this is the big shift that has taken place. They do not believe it possible to drive Israel into the sea, and they have been very careful about what kind of claims or promises they would make about what they could do.

NASSER COOLS SPEECHMAKING

Nasser used to make speeches, day after day condemning the Israelis—that is before 1967, saying, we are going to get revenge—we are going to drive the Israelis into the sea. They don't talk of that any more. They don't believe that any more. They know that they can't do this. At least they couldn't do it unless they got the Russians' help to do it and this would very likely precipitate a nuclear war.

So I think, the big difference since '67 has been the growing realism of the Arab leadership, in Egypt and Jordan particularly, that some time or other they have got to come to terms with Israel.

Now, after a long drawn-out debate in the United Nations, after Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Johnson had the summer summit conference at Glassboro, New Jersey, and so on, you remember, the U.N. went into session that fall and argued and argued and finally came up on the 22 of November, 1967, with a resolution that called for the acceptance of various principles on which a peace would be based.

The U.N. formula contained in that resolution has four main points and, I think is very important to try to keep in mind. The U.N. resolution of the 22nd of November said that peace should be based upon these principles:

THE UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION OF NOVEMBER 22, 1967

One—acceptance of the rights of all the states in the area to exist behind secure boundaries. This means, of course, accepting the right of Israel to exist.

Secondly—the right of the shipping of all nations to use freely the international waters of the area. This again would guarantee to Israel the right to use the Suez canal, the Gulf of Aqaba and so on.

Third, the resolution said that there should be undertaken immediate steps to find a comprehensive solution to the problems

of the Arab refugees. You see, ever since 1948, there have been hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees driven from their homes in what is now Israel, living many of them on U.N. relief allotments and others scattered all across the world. The Arab refugees are today a very, very explosive factor in the whole problem of the Middle East conflict. And so the U.N. resolution called for a comprehensive settlement of that.

And the final point—actually it was point number one in the resolution—called for the Israelis to withdraw from the territory they had taken.

This resolution, as some of the people who have been most involved say, is a typical British compromise. It was an attempt to get each side to give a little in order to reach some common ground on which a peace could be based.

ARAB LEADERS ACCEPT RESOLUTION

After a brief delay, the representatives of both Jordan and Egypt accepted that Nov. 22 resolution. The Israelis have not to this day accepted the resolution.

When they are pressed on this point, such as the other day on "Meet the Press," the Israeli ambassador said, "Well of course, we have accepted this resolution, except that we say that the implementation of the resolution requires the two sides to sit down and negotiate."

The Israelis have not accepted that resolution. This is a kind of playing with words, because the Israelis have made very clear that they do not intend to give back a substantial part of this territory. The resolution from the very outset says Israel must give up all the territory she has taken. But the Israelis do not intend to give up all the territory. In fact, there are some in Israel who argue they shouldn't give up a square foot of the territory they have conquered. They say that this is a just retribution on the Arabs for the war, that they precipitated the war and therefore they should pay the penalty of it.

Well, this is a part of that whole argument. The Israelis keep saying, "Come to the conference table, let us negotiate." The Arabs keep saying, "Tell us first whether you accept the U.N. resolution." The Arab point of view is that until Israel has declared whether she accepts the resolution or not, they do not know on what terms they are going to negotiate.

ARAB LEADERS FEAR ASSASSINATION

What the Arabs say is Israel wants to get us in a closed room without any U.N. presence, sit down at the table with us and dictate terms of peace to us. We are not going into that room. We are not going to enter into negotiations on this basis.

What is more realistic in one sense is to say that the Arab leaders know that if they entered into negotiations at this point they would be assassinated.

The Arabs are passionate, violent, fanatical people, and no one of these Arab leaders could for a moment consider sitting down at the conference table with the Israelis at this point. Certainly not without some real assurance that the Israelis would live up to the U.N. resolution. They are not going to sit down and negotiate with them. The interesting thing is, of course, that the Israelis know this too. They know that the Arabs are not going to negotiate them. That is why they can keep on saying come and negotiate.

The truth of the matter is that the Israelis really do not want peace now, and I have been told almost this in so many words. They will say something like this: we don't really believe that a peace is possible now, not until the Arabs have had a drastic reform in their government, until they have got rid of these leaders, until they have got themselves better educated, till they have reformed their society, until they have a decent social order et cetera and so on.

They are waiting for the great, glorious new age of Arab reform to take place. Then, they say, it will be possible to sit down and negotiate with the Arabs.

CAN SIT TIGHT, DEFEND SELVES

Furthermore, they have, as they see it, defensible boundaries now. They know that they have military superiority over the Arabs. And they say to you—in fact one of the high officials in Israel said to me—we are not too badly off the way things now stand. We can defend ourselves. We have good boundaries and we have a highly efficient and mobile military force. We can deal with any combination of Arab power thrown against us, and protect ourselves for at least the next 5 to 10 years. And who can plan his life more than 5 to 10 years ahead? This is the honest picture of what is going on in the minds of these people.

The big new factor since the June war, of course, has been, the emergence of the commandos. The Fedayeen is the general term that is used by the Arabs, which is a word that means people willing to sacrifice their lives.

The most important of these organizations is called Al Fatah. The leader of Al Fatah is today—no question about it—the most popular man in the Arab world. He is the man who symbolizes Arab resistance and Arab hope.

One of the things that has to be borne in mind about the Arab people is that they are, by and large, completely disillusioned with their governments. Even Nasser, who at one time was a great hero throughout the Arab world, is today a man who is largely discredited. There just isn't a great leader.

Hussein has a certain popularity with some, but he is not popular even with his own people. If there was an election, would Hussein win? Who knows, but a lot of people are opposed to Hussein, and some of these have guns and wouldn't be at all adverse to using them on Hussein, particularly if he should sit down to negotiate with the Israelis.

NO LEADERSHIP IN ARAB WORLD

So there is no real leadership among the Arabs, today. The commandos give a kind of emotional outlet to a frustrated and angry and bitter Arab who wants something to be done.

When you talk to some of the young people in the Arab world—and I have talked to Arab refugees in Cairo and I have talked to Arab refugees in Jordan and in Lebanon and in New York City, for that matter, and even in Washington, D.C., where I talked to an Arab refugee just a few days ago, a taxi driver—they all sound alike. They say exactly the same thing. They hate the State of Israel. They hate their present leadership. They want something to be done. They are prepared to use violence to change things.

In that total situation, I would say that the possibilities of peace between Arabs and Israelis are virtually nil, in so far as you depend upon the Arabs and Israelis to bring it about.

I think the only possible way in which there is any hope for peace in the Middle East is for that peace to be forced upon them by the pressure of the great powers. Now, this seems like, perhaps, a very horrible way to bring about peace, but I am convinced that the only way in which there is any possibility of peace is for the United States and the Soviet Union to agree—at least to agree sufficiently on a basis for peace, to compel both sides to accept peace.

Unless we are able to do this, then I would say you might just as well forget it and prepare for another round of warfare between the Arabs and the Israelis.

Question. You say that the war—the Six Day war—finally convinced the Arab leaders that they had to come to terms with the Israelis, and therefore this provided the first real hope for peace. This isn't the same thing

as saying that the time since then has increased the possibility of peace, is it?

PEACE HOPES HAVE FADED

Dr. BOLLING. No, the reason why it has become less and less likely to bring peace is that the Israelis did not accept the U.N. resolution. They did not accept the requirement that they withdraw from this territory.

If the Israelis had been willing to withdraw and implement the resolution, and if the United States and Soviet Union had been willing to guarantee the provisions would be carried out, peace could have been brought about.

I think there was a very good chance of peace in the fall and early winter of '67, but the longer the delay continues, the more bitterness rises, the more acts of violence are committed, the stronger Arab commandos become, and the more retaliation the Israelis will inflict on the Arabs. This thing just keeps getting more and more out of hand.

Question. President Nixon has stated that the United States has three options. One is four-power talks within the United Nations, secondly, four-power talks outside the United Nations, and thirdly bilateral talks with Russia. Would you see those as the three options? Are they limited to that?

Dr. BOLLING. I am not sure that his options are limited to these. There are certainly three major options. I think the four-power talks inside the United Nations is a good place to begin. You may have to transfer these outside the framework of the U.N. to carry them on. And at some point there is not any doubt at all the United States and Soviet Union have got to sit down and talk face to face about this thing, and probably without any outside help.

The French want to be involved in this. The British want to be involved in it, because both the British and French have long had very considerable interest in the Mid East.

DE GAULLE WANTS IN THE ACT

DeGaulle has taken a major hand in pushing for a four-power conference. You can't very well exclude him, but the real test is to be found I think in regard to the ability of the United States and Soviet Union to sit down and talk this thing through in a wholly realistic way. We have to say to the Russians: Look, we have an interest in peace in this part of the world. You have an interest in peace in this part of the world. We don't want to get involved in a nuclear confrontation here.

I personally have a feeling that of all the danger points in the world, the point where there is greatest possibility of a real nuclear confrontation is the Middle East.

I don't think that this is going to come about. I don't think either the United States or Soviet Union want such a confrontation or will take the steps that will bring a confrontation about. But if one should come, I think the Middle East is the place where it would come. I think the Russians know this. We know it and therefore we both have an interest in trying to cool this thing off.

Question. Where do you think U.S. policy has failed since the Six Day war?

Dr. BOLLING. I think it has failed by our refusal to put pressure on Israel to get the Israelis to accept the U.N. resolution as a basis for a negotiated peace. I think that if President Johnson had been willing to stick his neck out at the end of 1967 and say to the Israelis: We are going to insist on a peace here, you cannot go on in this state that you are in now, and we are not going to continue to supply you with arms and economic aid to enable you to maintain this position; you and your long-term survival depends on making peace with your Arab neighbors; the U.N. resolution gives a basis for bringing about a peace, and we will underwrite that peace.

ISRAELIS DISCOUNT U.N. GUARANTEES

Now the Israelis, of course, have always said that the U.N. resolutions mean nothing. The U.N. does not carry out its resolutions and therefore they are saying if they would agree to a peace, the Arabs would immediately violate it and the U.N. would do nothing.

I think, in a sense, the Israelis have a very good point here—that if there is going to be any peace, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. must underwrite that peace. But Mr. Johnson was not willing to do this. Mr. Johnson was playing politics with this issue, and there is of course an enormous American sympathy for Israel. There is an enormous Jewish block pressure in the United States in support of Israel, and any American politician is obviously, in one sense, taking his life in his hands when he tries to force Israel to do anything. This is one of the plain, blunt facts of life about this situation.

Question. You would, then, consider the U.N. resolution as the logical and acceptable basis for drawing up the peace?

Dr. BOLLING. I think it is a logical framework within which you can create a peace. It would mean nothing unless you had serious negotiations to spell it out and unless you had a real guarantee of its enforcement. The Israelis have said over and over: If we are asked to withdraw, then who is to say the Arabs will carry out their obligations the rest of the way? They say: All right, we might give up our hold on this territory, but then the Arabs would say all right, we have changed our minds; you still can't use the Suez canal, you can't use the Gulf of Aqaba; we are not going to recognize you or your existence. The Israelis say they are not going to give up this territory without knowing what is going to happen.

Inside Israel, of course, is a great division about what kind of peace would be acceptable. A very interesting thing happened just in the last couple of weeks that highlights this division in Israel. The prime minister of the country, the man who is supposed to be the head of the government Mr. Eshkol (who died suddenly last week) gave an interview to Newsweek magazine in which he indicated the kinds of territorial changes Israel would insist on in order to have peace.

PRIME MINISTER STIRS UP STORM

Mr. Eshkol spelled out what the Israeli government wants. He said: We want to absorb the Gaza strip; we will insist on maintaining our control of all of Jerusalem; we will insist on maintaining our control of the Golan heights in Syria, bordering on north-eastern Israel, and we will insist on a control of the point of land that juts out into the Straits of Tirhan way down at the very bottom of the Sinai peninsula. He said these are absolute essentials and Israel will insist on these territorial changes.

That is, in effect, saying, we won't accept the U.N. resolution; we are not going to give back that territory; that is our basic position. Then he goes on to comment on the west bank, where something like 600,000 Arabs live: Well, we perhaps would give back most of this territory, but we would insist on certain security measures along the Jordan valley and we want to have some four or five community bases down there.

Now this was the prime minister of the government speaking, supposedly in full knowledge of what he could deliver. He created a storm of protest in his country. His government almost fell because he gave this interview. Why? Because he was promising to give away more than many Israeli politicians were willing to have the prime minister promise to give back. And this is just a very dramatic proof of the fact the Israelis themselves are not united on what they want or what they would do.

As a matter of fact, in Israel which is

a democratic country which does have a free press, you have competing political parties. You have people ranging all the way from one extreme, who would say not only that Israel should give back all the territory it now has but that it ought to start to negotiate and unite with Jordan in a kind of Arab-Jewish federated state. That is one extreme.

FANATICS OPPOSE CONCESSIONS

At the other end you have the fanatical religious orthodox Jews who insist that Israel should keep every foot of land they have and get more. They say that the destiny of Israel is to control all of the land between the Nile and the Euphrates river, because this is what in the Old Testament the great God Jehovah promised his chosen people.

So you know you have these extremes of opinion in Israel. They are not a united people. They are very sharply divided and they have a kind of open competitive political situation in which everybody can stand up and say his piece. It is very difficult for a government in Israel to really pull the country together on this issue.

Question. How about the refugees, who are generally conceded to be the most violent seedbed of hatred in this area? What is the eventual outcome of this group, if any?

Dr. BOLLING. This is the greatest unknown, I think, in the whole situation—what is to happen to the Palestinian Arabs, what is to happen to the refugees who have for various reasons and at various times left their home. One interesting thing is that something like 60% of the original Arab refugees went out and found new homes for themselves on their own.

I talked to the United Nations relief director for Arab refugees in Beirut, in Lebanon, and I raised with him the question that is often put forward by the Israelis who say these refugees are just sitting in idleness in camps being kept there by the Arab governments that want them to stay there and be a factor that creates hatred and bitterness and so on.

This U.N. director, who was an American, was very irritated and scornful of this idea. He said this was a favorite bit of Israeli propaganda, but that the truth was that more than 60% of the Arab refugees have gone out by their own initiative and found new homes and new jobs in various parts of the world, in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, in Lebanon, in Cairo and even the United States, France, Britain and elsewhere.

LEARNING TO IRRIGATE

Furthermore, a number of them have been settled in areas very close by. I visited the Jordan valley on the Jordanian side and saw some of the irrigated farms which the Jordanian government, with the help of the World Bank and the U.N., have developed over the last 12 years since they began this project.

They are people who came into a new land and with the help of irrigation were able to develop very attractive and successful farms. So some of these people solved their problems, but still there are lots of them in refugee camps, maybe 350,000 to 500,000 of them.

Of course, there are lots more refugees in camps today than there were before June '67, because there has been a great flood of new refugees poured out of the so-called west bank of the Jordan and from the Gaza strip. And many of these are living in tents in the highlands between Amman and the Jordan. Many of these refugees were previously living in the Jordan valley, which is below sea level, you know. It is warm, sort of semitropical and a very comfortable place to spend the winter. But because of the Israeli raids on these towns along the river, the Jordanian government had to evacuate those people up

into the hills, where it is cold and wintery. It is a miserable situation for them.

These people are terribly bitter. You can imagine if you are a refugee in the first place living in reasonable warmth down in a semi-tropical valley and then you are driven out of there and up into the cold, bleak and sometimes snow-covered hillside up in the hills, you can just imagine how bitter those families feel.

NO NEED TO STIR UP

There is no question the refugees are a source of hatred and bitterness. The Israelis keep complaining the Jordanian government stirs up hatred among them. They don't have to stir up any hatred. They don't have to give them any propaganda. These people, out of their own experience, will tell you sometimes with tears and sometimes with screams, how they feel about their experience. The hatred is there. It is unmistakably there. It is not something the Jordan government has to stir up.

Question. If the political situation can be stabilized, perhaps can these refugees be absorbed?

Dr. BOLLING. Politically they would like the right to go back. Most of them would never go back; they wouldn't think of going back into areas that are going to be permanently Israel. This is a very bitter political point—they say: Israel has to admit our right to go back to the homes we had before; then we have to have the choice as to whether we go back or not; if we don't go back—and they will all agree that 99% of them wouldn't go back and live under Israel—then Israel has got to compensate us for the houses, the land, the equipment, the bank accounts which they have taken from us and which they hold.

Of course, the Israelis do still hold these properties. They keep records very carefully. They know whose property was whose, and they say: Ultimately we will either return the property or pay for it. But up to this point—and it is 21 years now—this settlement has not been made. And here again is another reason for this bitterness among Arab refugees.

INDEPENDENT ARAB STATE POSSIBLE?

The big question that a lot of people are speculating about is whether a settlement might provide for the creation of an independent Palestinian Arab state that would not be a part of Jordan. You see, what happened after the war of '48 was that Palestine—what remained of the Arab part of Palestine—was annexed to Jordan; became part of this Hashemite kingdom of Jordan which, incidentally, used to be called Trans-Jordan, you will remember. After this union came about, it dropped the "trans" and became simply the Kingdom of Jordan.

A good many Palestinian Arabs would like to break away from Jordan, partly because they look down on the Jordanians. The people from Amman are a more primitive Bedouin. The Palestinian Arabs look upon themselves as the kind of cultural, economic elite of the Arab world, and they look upon the people on the other side of the Jordan river as being Nomadic tribesmen and, of course, a great many of them are, or recently have been.

So the Palestinian Arabs feel a kind of personal identity among themselves. They feel a certain solidarity. They feel a common bitterness and hatred of the Israelis and of the world. There is nobody who really speaks for them, you see. King Hussein doesn't really speak for these Palestinian Arabs. Nasser certainly doesn't speak for them. The Syrians and the Lebanese can't speak for them. And they are scattered all over the world today. In one sense, this is a kind of Jewish dispersion.

The Palestinian Arabs are now literally all over the world, and most of them want to come home. Most of them would like to come home and find that the homes were theirs

again, and that the Jews had somehow disappeared. They know that isn't going to happen, so what do they do? Do they try to create a small state between Jerusalem and the Jordan valley or do they unite with Jordan permanently?

ISRAELIS FAVOR BUFFER STATE

The Israelis have had a theory about this. One of the things they have pushed very hard has been to try to get the Arabs on the west bank to create a semi-independent state with which Israel would make a treaty, in which Israel would guarantee to trade with and to deal with them in a favorable way and so on.

The Israelis have until fairly recently, kept all of the Arab mayors in office. They have kept the Arab judges in office. They went out of their way to try to say to the Arabs on the west bank area: Look, this is your land; we recognize this; these are your homes; this is your government; we want you to be independent; we want you to be self-reliant; we want to deal honorably with you; now you just tell us what you want and let us live in peace together; you form a government on the west bank and we will deal with you. The Arab leaders up to this point have indignantly rejected this. They say: That is a harlotry; you are trying to treat us exactly the way Hitler treated the Czechs; you want a Quisling state here, and we are not going to be Quislings; you Jews of all people ought to understand that no people is going to accept this kind of subject status.

The Israelis reply: You misunderstand us; you are accusing us of the wrong ideas and intentions; we just want to live in peace and so on.

PROSPECTS FOR PLAN NOT GOOD

Well, this is one of those things that is not getting anywhere. The Israelis keep saying, let the Palestinian Arabs organize their own government. We will deal with them and once we have made peace with the Palestinian Arabs, then the Jordanians and the Egyptians will have to fall in line. That approach, as far as I can see, isn't going to go anywhere, but there are a lot of Israelis who are playing around with this idea.

Question. How about Lebanon? Will its traditional friendship with the West break under the current strains?

Dr. BOLLING. The Lebanese are very resentful of the West and what we have done.

The Lebanese are very canny businessmen, and they are very determined to maintain their own economic position. I don't think they are about to get involved in a war with Israel or break relations with the West so long as it is to their advantage to go the way they are going. They are small; they have little in the way of military power. Emotionally, of course, they are committed to the Arab cause, and to the cause of the Palestinian refugees. They received a pretty heavy blow when the Israelis attacked the Beirut airport, but their involvement so far has been an emotional involvement. I think they will find ways to continue to trade with the West and to be on basically good terms with us.

Question. Out of this tangled skein of cause and effect, if you had to pick one element that you think might be most important in leading to peace, what do you think you might select?

Dr. BOLLING. I think the common fear of the Americans and the Russians is nuclear annihilation. I think that is the most constructive factor in the whole situation—both the Russians and the Americans don't want to get into a nuclear confrontation anywhere. And they certainly don't want to get into a nuclear confrontation in the Middle East.

MUST PRESSURE "CLIENT STATES"

I think because the Americans and the Russians realistically see this danger, they are going to try very hard and seriously to force their client states—and that is what you have to call those people; Israel is a

client state of the United States and the Arabs are client states of the Russians—into some sort of live-and-let-live truce. That won't be easy, but I think that our mutual apprehension about war may be the main factor that will drive us towards peace.

Question. So we know all this about the perilous Mid East situation. Why is there any reason for a resident of Richmond, Indiana, to concern himself about these matters?

Dr. BOLLING. We are all concerned about the peace of the world. We are all concerned about whether the United States is going to get itself involved in another Vietnam.

Because we are interested in our own peace, we have every reason to be interested in the peace of the Middle East.

Question. But what can we do about it?

Dr. BOLLING. I think we have to give support to the president and the state department to go forward with negotiations to try to bring about a peace and to make what we will have to do in the end—make some commitments to enforce whatever peace is agreed on.

In addition to that, we are going to have to make some pretty important financial foreign aid commitments that help both Arabs and Israelis get out of this mess.

This won't be an easy thing, and it won't be an inexpensive thing, but it is so important to the peace of the world we have got to do something.

IS THE SURTAX NECESSARY?

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, last year we were told that passage of the surtax was necessary to keep our dollars from being devalued, and that such a tax would curb inflation.

This tax affects every person drawing a salary—our workers and our great middle class. Inflation continues to soar, however, and spending has not been cut back.

Few of our millionaires, billionaires, and countless foundations pay any tax at all. Some of our extremely wealthy pay a small tax because of a guilt complex or to keep up appearances.

By means of foundations, members of wealthy families have been able to continue their control of their great wealth, whereas without such foundations 77 percent of the moneys placed in foundations would have gone to the Government in the form of taxes.

Unless the loopholes through which these millionaires, billionaires, and economically and politically motivated foundations escape taxation are stopped, we should consider voting against the surtax which is a heavy weight on the backs of our working people.

"PUEBLO" CREW TAX EXCLUSION BILL INTRODUCED

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 6, I brought to the attention of the House what I believe to be a serious injustice in the Federal tax treatment of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. Today I am introducing a bill which, if enacted, will correct that injustice. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8653

A bill to provide for an exclusion from gross income in the case of compensation for members of the crew of the United States Ship *Pueblo*

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the case of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was aboard the United States Ship *Pueblo* at the time of her capture by military forces of North Korea, any compensation received for service performed on or after January 1, 1968, and before February 1, 1969, as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be treated as compensation for active service to which subsection (a) or (b) (as the case may be) of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 applies.

If enacted, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will provide the crewmembers of the *Pueblo*, during the period of their captivity in North Korea, the same Federal income tax benefits that are accorded members of our Armed Forces who serve in officially designated combat zones.

The present inequity insofar as the *Pueblo* crew is concerned is this, Mr. Speaker:

Members of the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam and contiguous waters do not pay income tax. By Presidential directive, Executive Order No. 11216, dated April 24, 1965, Vietnam and contiguous waters are designated as a combat zone so that servicemen, in the case of enlisted personnel, are excluded from income tax liability on their military pay. This includes both regular pay and "hostile fire" pay. In the case of commissioned officers, the tax exclusion is \$500 per month.

Last year, during the period of North Korean captivity of the crewmembers of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, the Congress, by special action, made available to the crew the same "hostile fire" pay available to our Armed Forces serving in combat zones. However, since North Korea is not covered by the provisions of Executive Order No. 11216 and is therefore not designated as a combat zone, the *Pueblo* crewmembers presently face the prospect of having to pay to the Internal Revenue Service income tax on the pay that was held for them during their captivity.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I look on this inequity as an oversight which the Congress should move quickly to correct. Although the Bureau of Naval Personnel did not withhold Federal income tax from the pay of the crew, the Internal Revenue Service states that it has no choice but to collect the tax. It is due and payable 120 days following the crew's release.

I was happy to note, Mr. Speaker, that a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have contacted me since last Thursday to express their support of my effort to correct this inequity, and have asked to be listed as cosponsors of the bill I am introducing today. I am pleased to have their support, and I wish to invite any and all of my colleagues to introduce similar legislation if they so desire. Such action should enhance the chances of obtaining favorable and

timely action on this vitally needed measure.

INTEREST RATES ON U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for the third straight month, more U.S. savings bonds and freedom shares were cashed in by Americans than were bought for the future. This is a clear indication that the present rates of interest being paid on these bonds are unrealistic and unfair. I have introduced legislation (H.R. 7015) which would authorize the President to raise the interest rates to at least compare with bank rates. We cannot expect the small investor to sacrifice his interest earnings in the name of patriotism when big investors in Federal securities are grabbing off interest rates above 6 percent.

When \$13 million more Series E bonds were cashed in than were purchased last month, it should be obvious that more and more Americans are realizing that under present interest rates these bonds are not good investments. I am hopeful that Congress can read the handwriting on the wall, and will take action to bring these bonds up in line with today's money market. Savings bonds have long been an important part of Federal borrowing, as well as providing financial security and a convenient way to save through payroll deductions for millions of Americans. We should not let this program wither for lack of action.

WILBUR MILLS HONORED IN SALT LAKE CITY CEREMONY

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

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) was in Salt Lake City, Utah, where he was presented the second annual Arthur V. Watkins Distinguished Congressional Service Award at the University of Utah Founder's Day celebration. Former Utah U.S. Senator Arthur V. Watkins presented the award to Representative MILLS for "significant contributions toward the solution of vital national problems and deep dedication to the prerogatives of the House of Representatives." The award is sponsored by the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the university and friends of former Senator Watkins.

It is with great pleasure that I include here the full statement explaining the basis for the selection of Congressman MILLS for this Distinguished Service Award:

Now thirteenth in seniority in the entire House of Representatives, Wilbur D. Mills was elected to Congress in 1938, and is now serving, thirty-one years later, in his sixteenth consecutive term. In him, the people of Arkansas' second Congressional district and the citizens of the United States have a

fiscal authority who combines wisdom, gentility, and courage of the highest order. Faced with the demand by a powerful President for a surtax increase, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee insisted that significant reductions in Executive Branch expenditures precede any increase in taxes. The bargain which he forged, against incredible pressures, produced the fiscal miracle of the 1960s—moving the government's accounts from a twenty-five billion dollar deficit to a two billion dollar surplus in twelve months. But beyond a dollars-and-cents victory, what Wilbur Mills really accomplished during the 90th Congress, second session, was the employment of that most ancient parliamentary weapon, the purse string, to reassert parity for the legislative branch in the scheme of our national government. James Madison would be proud of Wilbur Mills!

For his courage in the face of great pressures, for his significant contributions to the solution of a vital national problem, and for his deep dedication to the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, Wilbur Mills is qualified, in an outstanding way, to receive the Arthur V. Watkins Distinguished Congressional Service Award for the 90th Congress, second session.

HEROIC MINER RESCUED IN UTAH

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

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic rescue operation to free a trapped Utah miner ended Sunday night when rescue crews hauled William V. "Buck" Jones, 61, of Midvale, Utah, from a 5-foot cubicle in which he had been entombed for more than 8 days.

Mr. Jones, who is the father of 11 children, was trapped March 1 in a cave-in at the lead-zinc mine in Lark, Utah, west of Salt Lake City. It took rescue crews about 4 days of round-the-clock digging before they could establish contact with Mr. Jones and ascertain that he was still alive.

The first coworker to hear Mr. Jones' voice through the mass of rock and debris quoted him as saying:

When are you going to get me out of here? I'm thirsty.

Rescuers shortly thereafter completed cutting through a small lifeline through which food and water was lowered to the trapped miner. Then Sunday night, crews who had been chipping away at solid rock with handtools to avoid a second cavern, reached the miner via a small passageway.

Mr. Jones was in fairly good condition despite the ordeal, and managed to wave to a crowd of relatives, miners, and newsmen before being placed in an ambulance at the mine entrance.

Coworkers have contributed at least part of the successful rescue to Mr. Jones' experience and knowledge gained in more than 30 years in the mines.

I salute this courageous man. Utahans, and indeed the entire Nation, have been inspired by his rare display of faith and toughness. I also salute the rescue teams for their valiant performance in bringing him out alive.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune on the rescue:

[Editorial from Salt Lake City (Utah)
Tribune, Mar. 11, 1969]

MINER'S FAITH, FINE EXAMPLE

The saga of William V. (Buck) Jones is the story of human endurance. Not just the ability of one man to survive a punishing ordeal, but also the devotion of relatives, friends, fellow workers and mining company in carrying out the agonizingly prolonged rescue.

When falling rock sealed Buck Jones in his trunk-sized underground tomb March 1, the always ominous alert to a mine cave-in was sounded. It signaled 8½ days of hard work, prayer, and grim vigil. Though unharmed and untroubled by fire, flooding waters or lethal gases, the 61 year-old miner was nonetheless trapped, almost encased, forced to endure in isolation a crouching confinement and the constant threat of another earth collapse. The minutes of uncertain peril turned to hours, then days.

In fact, it was four days before rescue crews made voice contact and were able to send food and water through a tube. From Wednesday to Sunday evening, when a weary but smiling Buck Jones was carried from the mine entrance, Lark, Utah, exemplified man's unhesitating dedication to saving a life in jeopardy.

Company crews and officials worked around the clock, often to the point of exhaustion, exercising every device and method available that promised quick, safe entry to Buck's rock-plugged prison. The Jones family, worried but always hopeful, bravely held up under the strain.

Throughout the ordeal, the trapped miner himself, periodically expressing his heroic patience, renewed the hope and energies of those anxiously waiting or carefully digging. He knew his own strength and the commitment of his rescuers.

Heartfelt congratulations go to everyone connected with the successful rescue. Buck Jones deserves a full measure of admiration and respect. He said minutes after regaining his freedom: "I would never have gotten out alive if the good Lord hadn't had His arms around me."

There is in this man's lonely, frightening experience a significant lesson. Faced by known peril, reminded by foreboding walls around him of the possibility of slow death, Buck Jones put unquestioning faith in his God, in his fellow man, and in himself. And now that his ordeal is over, the rescue reminds us all of the power of faith and confidence to accomplish the seemingly impossible.

TAX-LOSS FARMING

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the first day of testimony on tax-loss farming before the House Ways and Means Committee. I submitted written testimony on this very important subject because of my sincere interest in this area and because I had authored bills on this matter both in the previous session and in this session.

Under a provision of the law, purchases of expensive improvements on farms which tend to make the farm more productive or of greater capital value over a period of years, may be amortized. This has become a very necessary tool for many farmers who have tilled their farms, or put in a cement feeding floor for livestock, or put up a modern dairy, poultry or livestock barn or other facilities in order to meet higher

and higher quality standards. This has resulted in a benefit to the American housewife in lowering the cost of her food and fiber, while improving the quality and quantity to such an extent that the American consumer has the world's greatest bargain. However, misuse of this provision has occurred by outside interests or corporate entities whose main source of income is other than agriculture. My bill puts a limit of \$15,000 of off-farm income which may be applied against the cost of production or of making improvements. This will largely prohibit deductions for annual cost of production by those groups who use the most expensive equipment and who sell their produce at less than cost, thus producing a form of subsidized, unfair competition against the bona fide farmer.

I believe that the Ways and Means Committee and the administration should be commended for their early consideration of closing this loophole.

PROPOSED UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the best interests of American consumers were ignored by those who have sought to destroy the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code currently under consideration in numerous State legislative bodies.

The proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code was the product of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, currently comprised of about 180 unpaid lawyers, appointed by the Governors of the various States. These same Commissioners on Uniform State Laws have developed uniform laws affecting many important areas which have been adopted by the various States and have produced beneficial results.

The violent attack by the Consumer Federation of America has virtually sealed the fate of the proposed code in State after State, even in those States where present State law affords practically no consumer credit protection, and legal interest rates run as high as 300 percent. Hearings 2 weeks ago before the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in which the Consumer Federation of America charged "misrepresentation" and "deceit" against those who promulgated the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code showed how little regard this group had for the reputation and character of those who toiled for 5 years—at no personal compensation—in producing the proposed code.

Among other things, the House Consumer Affairs Subcommittee hearings revealed that the Consumer Federation refused to grant the commissioners an opportunity to discuss the code prior to adoption of a position against the code by the consumer group. Also, contrary to press reports, which claimed the code was supported by lenders, a large segment of the banking and small loan industry vigorously have been working

against adoption of the code by State legislatures.

During the hearings I requested the representatives of the Consumer Federation of America to submit proposals for changes in the Uniform Consumer Credit Code which would make the code acceptable to them. Even though these representatives agreed to submit such changes, nothing has been forthcoming from them to date.

Further, the statements of Mr. J. L. Robertson, vice chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made before the House Consumer Affairs Subcommittee made it quite clear that in order for the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act to be fully effective most States must change their laws regarding the regulation of credit. Mr. Robertson further stated that certain provisions of the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act actually subordinate this act to State laws.

The net result of this zeal to destroy on the part of the Consumer Federation is that efforts to reform State law governing consumer credit protection may have been set back perhaps as much as a decade. The damage that was done by the reckless charges of the Consumer Federation against the UCC is best illustrated by the fact that on February 10, 1969, the Washington Post carried a highly critical article concerning the Uniform Consumer Credit Code which was entitled "A Code To Legalize Usury." Yet, on Sunday, March 2, 1969, the same newspaper carried another editorial, entitled "Consumer Code: Another View," in which they retract the statements made in their February 10, 1969, issue. I will include copies of these editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[Editorial from the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1969]

A CODE TO LEGALIZE USURY

Sometime before July, 48 of the 50 state legislatures will consider bills devised to write into law maximum interest rates of as much as 36 per cent for small loans and installment purchases and as high as 24 per cent for revolving charge accounts. The proposals are the object of heavy lobbying by bankers and small loan companies. But they are also beginning to raise eyebrows on Capitol Hill. Most recently Rep. Wright Patman denounced them on the floor of the House as proposals to "legalize usury" and warned that if adopted they will codify "some of the highest interest rates ever imposed on the American consumer."

Mr. Patman is dead right. For what the financiers have done is to move quietly but effectively to subvert not only the intent of the truth-in-lending act passed last year by Congress, but to undermine many of the consumer protection statutes already on the books in most of the states. To do this, they have devised a neat legal gimmick called the Uniform Credit Code, which uses to their own advantage provisions in the truth-in-lending act itself.

Their gimmick is this: the new Federal law allows state law to supersede it in cases where the state law is at least as strong on truth in lending as the Federal act. The Federal law requires, among other things, that lenders and creditors disclose interest rates on credit. It does not, however, set ceilings on those rates. The monied interests have drafted language in their Code, therefore, which carefully meets all the Federal disclosure standards, while at the same time setting outrageously high interest rates, and

worse, removing a host of restrictions and responsibilities now imposed on the finance industry by law. The Code, in the guise of protecting the public from disreputable practices, is couched in language so obtuse, so unreadable, as to tax the skill of the keenest lawyer.

Some of the language in the proposed California Code, and like it the codes in the majority of the states, was unraveled into laymen's terms by Judge George Brunn of Berkeley in an address before the Consumer Assembly here last month:

Under present law, Judge Brunn said, small loan companies are scrupulously regulated and subject to suspension or revocation of their licenses for infractions of the law. The Code, however, says that such action can be taken only after "repeated and willful violations."

"Present law forbids the taking of realty as security," Judge Brunn pointed out, but the Code allows it in loans over \$1000. The meaning of this, of course, is that failure to repay a loan can result in the loss of one's home, an occurrence not uncommon to families in urban ghettos.

A partial list of other "protections" to the consumer reads as follows:

Present law forbids charges in addition to interest other than official fees and insurance. The Code would allow a host of other charges, including delinquency charges, deferral charges, and a vaguely worded loophole allowing "charges for other benefits . . . conferred on the debtor."

The present law provides for bonding; the Code does not.

Unlike present law, the Code does not prohibit the loan company from transacting business under a different name.

Unlike present law, there is no requirement to give the borrower a receipt for each payment.

Unlike present law, there is no prohibition against the use of incomplete instruments (blank contracts filled in after they are signed).

And so on and so forth. The catalogue of horrors is equally as long and as disreputable for credit sales. The worst feature of this sleazy attempt to subvert laws, of course, is that it will be the poor, upon whom the financiers can most easily prey, who will suffer the consequences.

This is an issue, therefore, which goes to the very heart of the cycle of poverty gripping inner city ghettos throughout the Nation, and the reaction of the states and the Congress to it will surely indicate whether those in authority intend to attack the problems of the cities with something other than rhetoric. Consumer protection laws are, if anything, in need of strengthening. If the Code proposed by the financiers is adopted in any of the states, however, the poor, and with them the interests of the public, will have suffered a major defeat.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1969]
CONSUMER CODE: ANOTHER VIEW

In our Feb. 10 editorial, "A Code To Legalize Usury," we asserted (in no uncertain terms, alas) that the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code under consideration in the state legislatures throughout the country was a scheme devised by financiers to subvert the intent of the truth in lending act of 1968. With the benefit of further study, subsequent testimony before a congressional committee, and some constructively critical correspondence, we would like, as they say in Congress, to revise and extend our remarks.

To begin with, a correction is in order. The Code was not, as we said, devised by financial interests. It was proposed, rather, by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, a group of state officials who adopted the highly complex Code after extensive consultation with all consumer-

interested people and organizations, including, of course, financiers.

It must also be conceded that there are compelling arguments in favor of adoption of uniform ceilings on interest rates for small loans (36 per cent) and revolving charge accounts (24 per cent), major provisions in the Code. As pointed out by Harvard Professor Robert Braucher in hearings on the Code this week before the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, about half the states now have maximum small loan rates of 36 per cent or higher, and about half have no maximum rate at all on revolving charge accounts. While the proposed rates may on face value appear high, they are in fact neither unfair to the consumer nor exorbitant for the loan companies.

Former Senator Paul Douglas, in lending his qualified support for the Code earlier this year in Massachusetts, noted that "higher or lower rate ceilings do not raise or lower finance company profits but rather, determine credit availability." It is a harsh fact of life, particularly in the inner city ghettos, that credit is not generally available. The alternative to legal rates, of course, is the black market where, as Professor Braucher points out, rates often soar to "260 per cent or higher."

While the Code is not the embodiment of all earthly evil, neither is it the final answer on consumer protection. There are, in point of fact, inherent dangers in it, the most salient of which is that it may be swallowed wholesale by state legislatures. In states with stronger consumer protection legislation already on the books, the effect would be to weaken existing laws. Responsible critics of the Code have raised serious objections to its coverage of licensing and regulation of small loan companies and have pointed out a number of loopholes. It should be in a spirit of caution, therefore, that the proposed Code be considered in the state legislatures. The Commissioners who drafted it, as Rep. Lenor Sullivan put it bluntly at the hearings, have tried to push the Code down the throats of state legislators "before they have time to know what they're voting on." The consequences of such an exercise may in the long run prove damaging to the Commissioners, to the Code, and to the interests of consumer protection.

The winners of this reckless game will be those who benefit from the present hodgepodge of State consumer credit law, particularly loan sharks. The losers are the consumers, especially low-income Americans who constitute the primary source of revenue to the multi-billion-dollar loan shark segment of organized crime.

The Federal Truth-in-Lending Act barely scratched the surface in affording the consumer the degree of protection he deserves. Without a complete review and reform of the large body of State consumer credit protection laws, many of which provide little or no protection to the consumer, its effect will be sadly undermined. While the falseness of the charges against the proposed State code is beginning to emerge, I fear the truth will never catch up with the initial charge and, unless prompt corrective action is taken, the damage will have been lethal.

A BILL TO STUDY REFORMS IN ANTI-TRUST LAWS

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I in-

troduced legislation today to establish a commission to study reforms needed in the antitrust field. Cosponsoring this legislation are Representatives GERALD R. FORD, CAHILL, MACGREGOR, McCLORY, SMITH of New York, MESKILL, SANDMAN, RAILSBACK, BIESTER, WIGGINS, DENNIS, FISH, COUGHLIN, BETTS, BOW, LATTA, CLANCY, TAFT, WYLIE, and McCLOSKEY.

I am pleased to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that Senator JAVITS is introducing identical legislation in the other body today, and his cosponsors will be Senators DIRKSEN, COOPER, HARTKE, and MATHIAS.

Mr. Speaker, American antitrust policy must constantly resolve the dilemma posed by this Nation's desire for economic efficiency and its belief in the importance of decentralized economic and political processes.

To resolve this dilemma reasonably and with intelligence, we must be constantly vigilant to insure that our antitrust policy is consistent with these goals.

Often today, this is not the case. Economic concentration of our resources threatens to cripple competition in the market sector of the economy.

The merger movement offers the most obvious example. In 1950, section 7 of the Clayton Act was amended at least in part to halt this trend toward concentration. But whatever the intended effects of the Celler-Kefauver amendment were, its passage did not diminish the number of mergers. In fact, after 1950, the number increased rapidly. In the fields of manufacturing and mining, mergers increased annually from 219 in 1950, to 387 in 1954, to 683 in 1955, to between 835 and 1,000 during the period from 1959 to 1965, and probably surpassed 2,300 in 1968. Between 1951 and 1961, the companies listed in Fortune's "500" acquired on the average 6.8 companies.

More significant, however, was the increasing number of multi-industry companies. Between 1954 and 1958, the number of multi-industry firms increased by approximately 59 percent while the number of all firms, including all single-unit firms, increased by only 13 percent. That conglomerate mergers clearly dominated the merger trend during this period is shown by a comparison of conglomerate, horizontal, and vertical mergers during the periods 1948-53 and 1960 and 1964. Of the 811 large mergers effected during these periods, the number of horizontal mergers decreased from 31 to 12 percent, vertical mergers increased from 10 to 17 percent, while conglomerate mergers increased from 57 to 71 percent of the total. In 1968, they accounted for 90.7 percent of the total. Indeed, manufacturing multi-unit firms increased by 40 percent while the number of all manufacturing firms increased by only 3 percent. Moreover the conglomerate tended to account for a large percentage of the factors of production expended. For example, in 1958, conglomerate accounted for only 1.3 percent of the more than 3.1 million companies but employed more than 44.4 percent of the total company labor force.

With concentration, whether horizontal, vertical, or conglomerate, comes standardization and uniformity, albeit

efficiency, which can pose grave dangers to our economic and social institutions, if not effectively regulated.

But mergers only represent one facet of the problem. In addition, the increasing occurrence of vertical price fixing, tying agreements, territorial and customer restrictions which threaten vertical integration and undercut the vitality of the small businessman command a reexamination of the methods of detection and regulation of such activities. Moreover, the ability of American enterprise abroad to compete effectively with foreign cartels, the validity, for antitrust purposes, of patents and patent licensing agreements, the exemptions from antitrust coverage, the deterrence offered by private antitrust enforcement, the ability of the various governmental agencies to effectively enforce the laws and many other issues demand contemporary answers.

Not since 1955, has a comprehensive study of the antitrust laws been undertaken. The Attorney General's National Committee to study the antitrust laws performed most rationally and effectively their most difficult task. But much time has passed. Reexamination is needed now. We must reassess our policy as reflected in the existing antitrust statutes. We must reassess the validity of the economic and social theories currently underpinning the judicial and administrative interpretation of these statutes and procedures to make certain that they maximize the opportunity to achieve the benefits of economic efficiency without endangering the vitality brought to America from small decentralized business units.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Commission, to study needed revisions in the antitrust laws provided for in this legislation, be established at once so that we may soon have solutions to these compelling problems.

ESTATE TAX RELIEF FOR FARMING, RANCHING, AND CLOSELY HELD BUSINESSES

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to spare families of farming, ranching, and small business operations from forced liquidation in order to pay high estate taxes resulting from unrealistic asset valuations.

The devastating impact of Federal estate taxes on the families of ranchers, farmers, and some small businesses has become a problem of grave concern. In recent years, an upward trend in the sales prices of farm and ranch properties, primarily caused by speculators investing in land, has produced higher and higher taxes at the death of the farmer, rancher, and small businessman. Often the heirs have little or no cash with which to pay these death taxes. This has already forced the liquidation of many family operations and could force the sale of countless other ranches, farms, and small businesses on the death of present owners. Moreover, it is usually the smaller

family farms, ranches, and businesses which have to be sold to meet the estate tax levies.

The effect of this trend is to threaten the continuation of the traditional family business, ranch, or farm. For decades, the family operation has given us plentiful production of food available at an ever-decreasing share of take-home pay. Today, the rest of the world looks to the success of the American farmer with admiration. If these families are continually forced from rural America, the present Federal estate tax laws not only hasten the death of the traditional American farm but also speed up the mass migration to the cities where desperate conditions are already screaming for relief. Furthermore, the small, family-owned business has played an equally important role in building America. Such businesses provide the goods and services expected and demanded in neighborhood homes located where big corporations cannot serve efficiently.

Although while alarm is expressed about the disappearance of the farm, ranch, and community business, the Congress unexplainably permits the continuation of a discriminatory tax based on unrealistic, inflated land values and thereby makes it virtually impossible for relatives to carry on the family operations.

In contrast to farms and ranches, the valuation of publicly traded stocks and securities generally reflects their earning power, and such stocks and securities can be sold on death without destroying a family business. Since the earning power of shares of stock in an estate is generally considered the most important factor in determining value, it becomes proper to advocate that earning power should be considered in the valuation of a farm, ranch, or closely held business for estate tax purposes. Thus, decedents whose estates consist of farms or ranches or small businesses are discriminated against in comparison with those whose estates consist of marketable securities.

The principal reason for the estate tax discrimination is the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the tax be imposed on the "fair market value" of the assets at the time of the owner's death. In the case of real estate, the fair market value is usually established by comparing land in the estate with prices recently paid for other land in the area.

More often than not, these prices are vastly inflated and are in no way comparable to the value of the decedent's ranch, farm, or business based on its ability to earn. Today the price for which farm or grazing land might sell to speculators is out of proportion to what it will earn for farm or grazing purposes. Unfortunately, however, many revenue agents refuse to give any consideration whatsoever to the earning capacity of a ranch or farm in determining its value for estate tax purposes. To the contrary, they rely only on inflated sales prices of similar farms and ranches which have been grabbed up by land speculators. Thus, the family which does not have substantial outside assets cannot pay the estate taxes. As a result, the family operation has to be sold or heavily mort-

gaged at the highest interest rates in history and cannot be continued by the next generation.

To illustrate the problem consider the following example: Farmer Jones dies, leaving his 10,000-acre cattle ranch to his son. Assume the ranch is valued at \$30 per acre, is paid for, and the cattle and supplies would sell at an auction for \$150,000. Farmer Jones has no prior debts.

This ranch is now valued for estate tax purposes at \$300,000. The personalty is valued at \$150,000, bringing the total estate to \$450,000. After the \$60,000 exemption, Farmer Jones' taxable estate comes to \$390,000. The estate would have to pay an astounding \$110,500 in Federal estate taxes.

On the other hand, computing Farmer Jones' tax based upon the property's earning power produces a more equitable and realistic evaluation. Jones had an average annual income of \$7,500, a profit that is slightly above the average 1.5-percent value of his total earnings earned by most cattlemen. Taking a capitalization factor of 4½ percent increased value per year, Farmer Jones' capitalized earning value comes to \$165,000. With the \$60,000 exemption, the taxable estate is now \$105,000 and the estate tax would be a much more reasonable \$22,200.

This same problem applies to the small businessman, who finds that high estate taxes make it impossible for the family business to be carried on from one generation to the next. The business is purchased by those who can pay the price, and what used to be a traditional and proud community service becomes a speculative investment for those who can afford it.

Furthermore, it is alarming to view the great migration to the urban areas of over half a million persons a year. A major domestic concern is to reverse this trend and to provide relief to young men and women by encouraging them to remain in the family business and to contribute to the economy of rural America.

The legislation I am introducing will provide a fair alternative to the present estate tax law. It will allow the executor to have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued at either: first, its fair market value—as determined under existing law—or, second, the higher of the decedent's adjusted cost basis or a value based upon the reasonable earning power of the business as measured by taxable income. The earning power of the business would be computed by multiplying the annual average operating return of the business—that is, taxable income of the business—for 10 consecutive taxable years prior to the valuation date by a capitalization factor, which would be ascertained by reference to the price-earnings ratio index of common stock yields for the calendar quarter ending immediately prior to the valuation date as published in the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

If an election by the executor or administrator was not made in a timely manner, the decedent's interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business would be its fair market value. If the fair market value alternative were used, all relevant factors would be considered

in valuing the interest in the ranch, farm, or closely held business, including the earning capacity of the business and the degree of control of the business represented by the decedent's interest.

In order for an interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business to qualify for the election, the decedent would have had to have been in the business for at least 10 years prior to his death. The provisions of this bill, if enacted, would apply only to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

I believe that this proposal represents a fair solution to the problem, and I hope the bill will be carefully and thoughtfully studied by the House Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department, and the Nixon administration so that this taxation injustice can be remedied.

WAITING FOR MR. NIXON

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the prominent daily newspapers serving my district has attempted to evaluate our new President's performance to date. Although the analysis is somewhat critical, I feel it does reflect the feeling of a majority of Virginians and that the administration should be aware of this concern by those who supported the President.

The editorial dated February 24, 1969, from the Richmond News Leader is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

WAITING FOR MR. NIXON

During the past week, we have published several letters from readers and two syndicated columns—one by James J. Kilpatrick, the other by David Lawrence—expressing concern about the thrust of the Nixon presidency so far. Today, more than a month after Richard Nixon took office, we should like to register our tentative agreement with those concerns. Decidedly, it is early: To judge a President by his actions of one month clearly would be unfair. But a month can provide indications, and the indications the Nixon Administration has given conservatives, moderates, and disenfranchised Democrats so far are not encouraging. Those persons get a sense of disillusion—from the appointments made, and from the things left undone.

With the appointments of James Allen, James Farmer, and Nelson Rockefeller, the conservative cannot help feeling that this is where he came in. Jacob Javits, who supported Hubert Humphrey during the campaign, has been recognized by the White House as its agent for clearing appointments to high office in the Department of Labor; of the first six major appointments in the Department, five were Democrats. The UN ambassadorship was offered to Humphrey, Sargent Shriver, and Eugene McCarthy before finally being accepted by Charles Yost: All are Democrats. And Sterling Tucker—who said two months ago, "The Cabinet was [Mr. Nixon's] first test, and he flunked it"—has been named by Mr. Nixon to be vice chairman of the city council of Washington, D.C.

Perhaps this is Mr. Nixon's way of bringing the nation together; perhaps by convincing those persons opposed to his election that they can find a job in his Administration, he is bringing them over to his side. Perhaps. But at the same time, by naming such conspicuous liberals, he runs the risk of alienating the generally conservative constituency that put him in the White House.

The State Department provides a good example of Mr. Nixon's failure thus far to carry out his pledges of last fall. He promised to clean out the State Department and, among other things, to restore Otto Otepka—the former Department evaluations officer who was hounded out of his job by some Great Society heavies. Otepka still is out of a job, while Idar Rimestad—a man dedicated to keeping Otepka unemployed—has been retained as deputy undersecretary for administration. And John Topping, who former Cuban ambassador Earl E. T. Smith has said was "one of the [State Department] officers of influence who was 'pro-Castro and anti-Batista,'" is reported to be slated for a promotion.

Inflation still rages through the land. So does crime: As for Mr. Nixon's war on crime in the capital, it is difficult to understand how he intends to field a police force of 5,000 men when the force is running 1,000 under its present quota of 4,000 men. In the past month, the American casualty rate in Vietnam has increased, and the chit-chat in Paris has not moved off dead center. As far as the public can learn, foreign policy—toward Europe, toward Africa, toward the Middle East—has not changed. And the Johnsonian policy of withholding Federal cash from Southern school districts in which freedom-of-choice plans do not work to Federal satisfaction, continues apace; so does the Federal government's coercive policy of forcing construction contractors—notably road builders—to hire persons for the color of their skin.

We do not know, and cannot, what silent changes the Administration may be preparing to make. Nor are we privy to the intricacies of policy shift. But we will say this: THE NEWS LEADER was enthusiastic in its backing of Richard Nixon. It still is: Nearly all of his Cabinet selections, for example, are particularly commendable. But Mr. Nixon did not win the presidency on the basis of liberal support; he won it with conservative support. He was elected by voters who were tired—tired of protest, tired of Vietnam, tired of excessive Federal spending, tired of nationwide convulsion. They still are tired; they are patient, too. But if Mr. Nixon does not start ministering to those tired voters—most of whom are waiting for him to play the generally conservative cards he showed them last fall—they will lose their patience. And if they do, they will desert Mr. Nixon come 1972. That would mean that Richard Nixon, who is a good man, would meet his political death four years too soon.

LEGISLATION AMENDING ALASKAN STATEHOOD ACT

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

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will amend the Alaskan Statehood Act by repealing the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between a port in the State of Alaska and other ports in the United States.

Today shippers face regulation by two agencies, the Federal Maritime Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In August of 1968 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit declared that transportation of trailers on Alaskan ferries was subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission regulations. Thus, now there exists a duplication of

regulation on goods which are shipped both by sea and land. This bill would greatly simplify procedures for the shippers of Alaska.

With the repeal of section 27(b) the regulation of Alaska's waterborne interstate traffic would become identical to the regulation of such traffic between the 48 contiguous States. Water carriers would be certified under part III of the Interstate Commerce Act and Alaska's interstate commerce would be subject to the regulatory system which has developed from the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887. Thus, as this act applies to traffic between the 48 contiguous States, it would apply to Alaska.

Repeal of this section is needed to avoid a wasteful costly duplication of effort.

SBA POLITICAL "LOANS"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the latest chapter in the intriguing saga of the Small Business Administration's use of the public's money for political favors during the Johnson administration.

It will be remembered that one, L. Donald Pruhs, a member of the Democratic Party heirarchy of Fairbanks, Alaska, received bountiful treatment from the SBA to repair his storm damaged Golden Nugget Motel, while a rival establishment, owned by the then Republican Governor Hickel, had its request for aid cut in half.

Of the \$894,000 low-interest-rate loan to Pruhs, \$107,000 was for repairs.

After I began inquiring into this can of worms, the SBA suddenly discovered—a year ago this month—that Pruhs had made only approximately \$50,000 worth of repairs to his motel and that the remaining \$57,000 had been disbursed without value received.

At my request, the General Accounting Office asked the SBA what was going on.

The GAO was told, on February 20, 1968, that no action would be taken to recover this \$57,000 until the matter had been coordinated with Washington headquarters.

You do not have to be around this town very long, Mr. Speaker, before you know what that means.

Well, they coordinated and coordinated and coordinated all through the spring, all through the summer, all through the fall and on into the dark of winter and, finally, when I figured there had been just about enough coordination—the day after Christmas—I asked what had come of it all.

Let me quote what the General Accounting Office was told by the SBA:

In a letter dated February 3, 1969, the Chief of the Administration's Audits Division stated that an audit of this matter disclosed that the borrower was not able to support, by adequate accounting records, \$50,232.11 of the amount disbursed.

However, he stated that: "Although the borrower's records will not, in fact, support from an acceptable accounting standpoint the borrower's contention that the funds were used properly, a current

appraisal by a permanent, qualified SBA appraiser indicates that the work the borrower claimed was done, has actually been accomplished."

End of quote. Case closed.

This, of course, is what I suspected would happen.

Mr. Speaker, what are we to believe from these SBA giveaway artists?

One year ago they were telling the General Accounting Office that "on four occasions, during the period February 3 through 16, 1968, an Administration appraiser inspected the work" and stated in his written report that nearly \$57,000 had just plain vanished. That only \$50,569.91 worth of repairs had actually been made to this motel.

Now they come along—after this case had become highly embarrassing to the Johnson administration—and, by implication, claim that this appraiser was totally incompetent.

Now they tell us that "a permanent, qualified SBA appraiser" finds that everything is hunky-dory; that the missing money has magically returned.

Mr. Speaker, this situation reeks to high heaven. Obviously, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark was not going to touch it. But now that we have a new head of the Justice Department, I would urge Attorney General Mitchell to initiate a searching look into this whole mess.

A MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE FBI

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the current FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, the very able Director J. Edgar Hoover authored a very timely message which I invite to the attention of all Americans:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

A newspaper columnist noted that today's law enforcement officer has to "speak softly and carry a big law library." Actually, his paraphrase of the well-known quotation from Theodore Roosevelt comes close to being true. There is nothing wrong, of course, with an officer's speaking softly and being well-versed in legal criminal procedure. Ideally, this is as it should be.

Unfortunately, in the criminal realm within which he must work, the law enforcement officer is the only one "playing by the rules." This places him at a definite disadvantage. In complying with all the procedural safeguards established for criminals, an officer must often subordinate his personal safety, his own rights, and the rights of society to insure that he does not commit some error which might later result in the release of the guilty. Criminals are usually well aware of their legal rights and take full advantage of them.

Many critics of law enforcement today substitute paper theories for grim realities. When they advocate more restraint on arresting officers, they do so apparently on the premise that police are dealing with only law-abiding, cooperative citizens who respect the law and those charged with enforcing it. While a big percentage of police contacts are with the responsible members of society, increasing assaults against and killing of law enforcement officers are indicative of the open contempt numerous violators have for police and authority of any kind.

Arguments are made that court opinions and legal restraints are not so broad as to require arresting officers to unduly endanger their lives in order to meet standards established to protect the rights of the suspect or accused. Here again, we encounter the difference between theory and practice. Judicial guidelines which are so vague and questionable that even the highest jurists disagree on their intent place a heavy burden of judgment on the enforcement officer. In crucial moments, this burden of judgment can create indecision. And as we know, moments of indecision can cost an officer his life.

The trend today, even though unintentional, is to negate the enforcement of the laws to insure that the criminal is protected. We are asking our officers to operate under an honor system in dealing with an element of our society which has no honor. Certainly, arresting officers cannot be permitted to resort to illegal tactics themselves, but they must be allowed to perform their duty with confidence and with the assurance that they have the support of the public, the government on all levels, and the courts. The powers of arrest must be as clear and positive as possible.

Vigorous law enforcement is needed to cope with crime and violence in our Nation. It cannot be achieved if arresting officers are required to make an apologetic approach to every killer, rapist, robber, and thug roaming our streets. If the rule of law is to prevail, the law must be enforced.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

(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, today I appeared before the Rules Committee requesting a rule on H.R. 33. My statement contained, among others, the following points:

This legislation, if enacted, would authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Development Association—the Secretary of the Treasury—to agree to contribute to the Association an amount of \$480 million under terms of the resolution which will provide the United States for the first time, as regards any of the various international institutions in which we participate, full protection for the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

IDA, which is the soft-loan affiliate of the World Bank, is without funds. IDA, since its inception, as we all know, has received strong bipartisan support and hopefully it will continue to receive such support by enactment of this legislation.

Under the proposed IDA resolution, this legislation, if enacted, would provide a vehicle whereby other countries will contribute to IDA \$3 for every \$2 contributed by the United States. Significant though this is in that other countries will be bearing a goodly share of the burden of this institution is the fact that our participation in the replenishment of IDA resources will not have any adverse effects on our current balance-of-payments situation. The second replenishment agreement, which elicits this legislation, provides that as long as the United States requires such balance-of-payments protection, the second replenish-

ment can have absolutely no effect on our balance-of-payments position for a minimum of 3 years. In practice during this 3-year period the only call that IDA could make on the U.S. contribution to IDA would be up to the amount of U.S. procurement.

IDA is, in effect, the soft loan window of the World Bank. The terms of IDA's credits provide a 50-year maturity period, including a 10-year grace period in which no principal need be repaid. In lieu of interest charges, the borrower pays an annual service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent. All credits are payable in convertible currency. As of the end of 1968, IDA has committed \$1.8 billion to 139 projects in 43 countries. These loans have been primarily concentrated on such areas as transportation, power, and industry. To date, there have been no defaults on any of these loans.

In order for the proposed IDA replenishment to become effective, two steps are necessary. First, the replenishment resolutions recommended by the IDA directors must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Governors of IDA and, second, at least 12 contributing members whose contributions aggregate not less than \$950 million must indicate notification of their commitment. The first of these steps has been completed. The replenishment resolution was adopted by the required two-thirds vote of the Board in September 1968. The second step, however, has not been completed. A number of countries have agreed to proceed, however, with payment of all or part of their contributions.

As of this time, 91 countries, casting almost 181,000 votes, have voted affirmatively on the resolution. Eleven countries, including the United States, have not yet voted.

The replenishment resolutions provide that the replenishment will not become effective unless at least 12 contributing members whose contributions aggregate not less than \$950 million have deposited notifications of commitment. In fact, therefore, the minimum sum of \$950 million cannot be reached without the U.S. contribution.

As stated in the committee's report on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, IDA has made and will continue to make a major contribution to our lesser developed nations. If IDA were to be allowed to die, it would not only mean a loss of capital available for the countries, but it would also be a severe psychological blow to the people of these countries.

For these reasons it is felt that continued participation in the International Development Association under the negotiated resolution is fully consistent with the desires and objectives of the United States as regards our balance-of-payments situation, our attempts to reduce expenditures, and our foreign aid needs.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is requested that a rule be granted so that this legislation may be acted upon as soon as possible. This legislation was reported out of your Banking and Currency Committee by a strong bipartisan vote of 30 to 3.

Mr. Speaker, I trust all Members will

be present on Wednesday, March 12, when this legislation is scheduled to be debated on the floor, to hear the debate and vote—I hope—favorably.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE LUMBER PRICES

(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, today I have announced an investigation into the serious problem of rising prices for lumber used in the housing industry.

Mr. Speaker, in many cases these prices have risen more than 100 percent and are creating serious problems in the construction of homes throughout the Nation.

The Banking and Currency Committee staff will start immediately to gather facts and the committee will meet as soon as possible on this most serious problem. In addition, we hope to broaden this investigation into a general look at all of the increased prices on housing—including high interest rates and the cost of materials and construction.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a news release which I issued today on this subject:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 11.—Chairman Wright Patman announced today that the House Banking and Currency Committee will launch an immediate investigation into the skyrocketing prices for lumber used in housing construction.

Mr. Patman said the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin gathering facts immediately. He said the Committee would meet on the problem as soon as possible.

"The tremendous increase in lumber costs has created an emergency situation in the homebuilding industry throughout the nation," Mr. Patman said. "This requires quick action by the Congress."

Mr. Patman said the study later will be broadened into a detailed analysis of all factors in the rising price of homes.

"I think it is the general consensus of the Committee that we must do everything possible to prevent housing from being priced out of the range of millions of Americans through rising interest rates and skyrocketing material and construction costs," the Banking and Currency Committee Chairman said. "I believe we will have broad, bipartisan support for a full and thorough investigation of all these rising costs."

GOVERNMENT ACTION CREATES DANGER OF RISING UNEMPLOYMENT

(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, AFL-CIO president, George Meany, has pointed out that some officials of the new administration have stated that a rise in unemployment may be required to achieve greater price stability.

In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Meany labeled such a viewpoint "Neanderthal," an opinion with which I heartily agree. In his statement, Mr. Meany makes it amply

clear that he considers present economic trends extremely dangerous to the welfare of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore include Mr. Meany's statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, MARCH 5, 1969

My name is George Meany and I appear here today on behalf of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

As we in the AFL-CIO see it, the economic outlook for 1969 is clouded. It is difficult to make judgments when one is uncertain about the degree of slow-down during the course of the year and the policies that the new Administration will pursue.

The pace of economic expansion is already slowing down—particularly retail sales—and the government's brake on economic growth may be going too far. Moreover, the recent emphasis of government policy on slowing residential construction, while maintaining special tax subsidies for business investment, is misguided. Interest rates have soared to unprecedented heights. There is danger of rising unemployment.

Some slower economic pace was to be expected this year, after the 5 percent real expansion of 1968, the seventh consecutive year of economic growth. By the beginning of 1969, several dampening developments were already in effect:

The temporary surtax, adopted in 1968, was withdrawing about \$11 billion a year from consumers and business, to pay for part of the increase in military spending. The hold-down on government expenditures, ordered by Congress last year, had placed a lid on the amount of additional funds the government can put into the economy's spending stream. The increase in Social Security taxes, effective January 1, was withdrawing about \$1½ billion a year from employees and a similar amount from business, to pay for improved Social Security benefits. In addition, the buying power of the average worker's weekly take-home pay increased only slightly last year, after accounting for taxes and the 4.2 percent rise in living costs.

On top of these dampening developments, new restrictive government measures were imposed in the early weeks of 1969:

The commercial banks raised the prime interest rate to an unprecedented 7 percent—an effective prime rate of over 8 percent, because of the banks' requirement that such borrowers maintain an interest-free deposit. This boost in the prime rate is raising interest rates all along the line—to medium-sized and small businesses, to home-buyers, farmers, consumers and the government. Some new federal securities have been floated, in recent weeks, at the highest interest rates in over 100 years. These high costs for borrowed money are being built into the price structure, from manufacturer to retailer and consumer—to the profit of the banks and other lenders. In addition, these high interest rates, accompanied by the Federal Reserve's squeeze on bank credit, threaten a sharp slow-down of economic activities.

The government increased the interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages from the high 6½ percent rate of early January to 7½ percent—an effective rate of 8 percent, when insurance is included. This peak rate on government-backed mortgages, on top of the excessive rates for builders' loans, is boosting the cost of homes, which the home-buyer is required to pay for the entire term of the mortgage. These costs are narrowing the home-buying market. A slow-down of residential construction is threatened, instead of the vast home-building expansion that is needed. Past experience teaches that high interest rates and tight money hit home

building fastest and hardest—the tight money-high interest rate policy of 1966 threw residential construction into a deep recession.

The unprecedented interest rates of early 1969 are being built into the prices of almost everything we buy, as businessmen pass on these cost-increases to the consumer. In addition, they are being built into the payments that consumers will make on installment and mortgage loans for years to come.

For example, if you buy a house now and get a 25-year mortgage at the very high rate of 7½ percent, you will have to pay that 7½ percent interest rate, every month for 25 years, even if interest rates decline—unless you are fortunate enough to re-finance the mortgage at some point when interest rates are lower.

These developments and government measures are dampening the rise of economic activities. They present the danger of a sharp economic slow-down and rising unemployment.

Moreover, there have been statements by some officials of the new Administration—as well as by business spokesmen—that a rise of unemployment may be required to achieve greater price stability, although President Nixon has indicated a distinctly different viewpoint.

On February 19, President Nixon, in a letter of greeting to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, made his position clear when he said:

"We must find ways to curb inflation, which robs working men and women and their families of hard-earned gains. And we must do this without asking the wage-earners to pay for the cost of stability with their jobs."

The AFL-CIO welcomes President Nixon's viewpoint on this issue. It is timely and to the point.

The notion that there is an inevitable, mechanical trade-off between inflation and unemployment is economically false and loaded with social dynamite.

Advocates of this Neanderthal view have never explained how a million additional unemployed can possibly reduce such price pressures as physicians' fees, hospital charges, auto and property insurance rates, which have risen sharply in the past decade—or how a million additional unemployed can halt the sharp increases of land costs, with their impact on rents and the price of homes.

Yet a rise in unemployment would hit the most vulnerable workers hardest—the most recently hired, the least skilled, particularly Negroes, other minorities and young workers. Working people generally—and the most vulnerable workers, in particular—would be forced to pay the price in unemployment and substantial losses of family incomes for such a policy.

Furthermore, relative price stability can—and must—be achieved without a growing army of unemployed. Expanded manpower training programs, an effective nation-wide, public employment service and reduction of bottlenecks can help. But most essential to achievement of relative price stability is lower profit margins and reduced profit rates of return on investment.

A study by the staff of the outgoing Cabinet Committee on Price Stability, published last January, reported:

"... if the primary goal is a reduction of the rate of inflation, this can be done by increasing the unemployment rate, decreasing the profit rate, or both. Similarly, a low unemployment rate could be maintained with a smaller rate of inflation if profits were to fall."

A depression or deep recession could probably curb increases in the prices of many consumer goods—at the price of human misery for hundreds of thousands of families. Or a continuing, substantial rise of unemployment and economic stagnation over a period of years could possibly achieve similar results at a similar price.

However, the Cabinet Committee's staff study clearly indicates that there are other alternatives—"a low unemployment rate could be maintained with a smaller rate of inflation if profits were to fall."

Indeed, the inflation of recent years has been largely a profit inflation. Profits skyrocketed between 1960 and 1966, and after a dip in 1967, they moved up again last year. *Business Week* (February 8) reports: "In 1968, U.S. corporations earned more money than they ever did before in a single year—thanks in good part to sharply rising prices."

Business profits moved up sharply after the early months of 1961, as the economy turned up from the recession of 1960-61. Profit margins on sales and profit rates of return on investment continued up sharply in the years that immediately followed. However, the usual pattern of economic recession about every four years—with a drop in profits—did not occur in the 1960s.

Profits continued to shoot up through 1966, as economic activities surged forward. The profit-decline in 1967 was small, and in 1968, profits moved up again.

This sharp rise of profits during almost all of the past eight years of sustained economic expansion has been shifting the nation's income to profits.

Business profits have soared, far out of line with other major types of income. Between 1960 and 1968:

After-tax profits skyrocketed 91 percent.

Dividend payments to stockholders soared 84 percent.

But the total after-tax personal income of all people in the country rose only 68 percent—reflecting increased employment, as well as the income-gains of individuals.

And the weekly, after-tax take-home pay of the average non-supervisory worker (approximately 47 million wage and salary earners in private industry) increased only 31 percent and, in terms of buying power, merely 11 percent.

Thus, during the 1960s, after-tax profits rose one-third faster than the total after-tax personal income of all Americans and almost 200 percent faster than the weekly take-home pay of the average non-supervisory worker. A key cause of the price increases of recent years, therefore, is business profits—surely the record clearly indicates that profits have been the major beneficiary, by far, of these price increases.

For manufacturing corporations, after-tax profits rose from a 9.2 percent rate of return on investment in 1960 to an 11.8 percent rate of return on a much-greater investment in the first three quarters of 1968. At that rate of return—and with the addition of depreciation allowances that are almost as great as after-tax profits—manufacturing corporations can recoup the value of their investments in less than five years. Indeed, at the high rates of return and large depreciation allowances of the past five years, many manufacturing corporations, by 1968, had actually recovered the value of their 1963 investments.

As for the banks, in one year between 1966 and 1967, the after-tax profits of all member banks of the Federal Reserve system rose over 18 percent.

Complete reports for 1968 are not yet available. However, *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle* of January 16 reports that "the past year was a good one with respect to bank earnings." Its 1968 profit report on a group of banks states that "the average increase for the group was 13.5 percent."

These trends are creating economic and social imbalances. An increased share of the nation's income has been shifted to profits. Moreover, with their great profits and large depreciation allowances, most big corporations have created shelters for themselves against the early and full effects of tight money and unprecedented interest rates. In addition, the 7 percent tax credit on investment and new equipment and fast deprecia-

tion of new buildings offset part of the additional cost of high interest rates for these corporations.

Despite tight money and historic interest rates, the profit-laden corporations are continuing substantial increases in their investments in new and improved plants, machines and equipment—after a 100 percent rise between 1960 and 1968—although industry's operating rate is only about 84 percent of existing productive capacity.

This situation, which has been contributing to inflationary demand pressures in recent years, threatens to create a future gap between the economy's rapidly growing capacity to produce and demand for goods and services. It isn't necessary and it can—and should—be avoided.

We in the AFL-CIO have some suggestions along that line—suggestions unanimously adopted late last month by the AFL-CIO Executive Council. We suggest the following policies and measures:

1. Full employment must be the nation's primary economic goal.

The government's tax, expenditure and monetary policies for an adequate rate of economic growth should be supplemented by manpower training measures and a federal program, along the lines of the bill introduced by Rep. James O'Hara of Michigan, to create jobs for the remaining hard-core unemployed and seriously under-employed in providing needed public services.

2. Residential construction must be sheltered from the ravages of the credit-squeeze and unprecedented interest rates.

The 7 percent investment tax credit should be repealed—to curb the flow of available funds into business investment and provide additional funds for home-building.

The provision of double depreciation should be repealed on all new construction, except low- and moderate-rental housing.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development should direct FNMA (Fannie Mae) to assist low- and moderate-income housing, at the lowest possible interest rate.

The development of the new form of government security, authorized by the Housing Act of 1968—government-backed mortgage bonds—should be speeded up, to attract new investment funds into housing.

3. The government's monetary policy should be eased at the first signs of a general economic softening and rising trend of unemployment.

Moreover, a thorough Congressional review of monetary policy and the government's monetary machinery is needed—for the development of a policy that is in the best interest of the nation and the American people, rather than the banks and other lenders.

4. The trend of unemployment in the months ahead and the level of military expenditures should be key factors in deciding whether the temporary surtax should be terminated in mid-year, phased out or continued.

A rising trend of unemployment in the coming months would be a strong reason to terminate this temporary tax or to begin to phase it out.

If the surtax is continued for another six months or a year—or if part of it is maintained—the same rate as the surtax should be applied to income that is now excluded from federal taxation, as a result of the major loopholes for capital gains, oil and mineral depletion allowances and income from state and local bonds.

5. Reform of the tax structure is long overdue: to eliminate loopholes of special tax privileges for wealthy families and business, to establish a minimum tax that will end tax avoidance, and to reduce the relative tax burden on low- and moderate-income families.

6. A substantial rise in the buying power of wages, salaries and fringe benefits is needed to provide wage and salary earners with a fair share of economic progress and to

strengthen the consumer foundation of the national economy.

The lag of real wages and salaries must be ended. Rapidly rising productivity and increased business profits make possible substantial improvements in workers' earnings, within the context of a relatively stable price level.

7. Rising business profits should be based on narrow profit margins on each sales dollar and an expanding sales volume, rather than on swollen profit margins at the expense of consumers and workers—to curb pressures on the price level and to provide an improved economic balance between wages, profits, dividends and other forms of income. This major economic policy issue requires careful and objective examination by the Congress.

8. The trade union movement is disturbed by the accelerated rate of economic concentration in the past few years—including conglomerate mergers and one-bank holding companies—and the impact of this trend on the national economy. The Congress and appropriate government agencies should make the facts fully known to the public and curb the adverse impacts of this trend.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit for the record, with your permission, copies of four statements on major economic and social policy issues, adopted by the Executive Council at the meeting I referred to earlier.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, with an observation that is, indeed, an article of faith with us:

We in the AFL-CIO have faith that the American system will be able to meet the economic challenges that face us.

In our system is the strength and the ability to meet our problems—including economic problems—and come up with solutions that will benefit all of our people.

That, we contend, should be the goal of governmental economic policy—to serve all the people, not just a favored few. That, in truth, is the economic guideline America needs.

A BILL TO GIVE HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD STATUS TO SINGLE PERSONS OVER 35

(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, I have introduced a bill today to extend the benefits of being considered a head of a household to persons over the age of 35 who maintain their own places of residence.

Mr. Speaker, under my bill this tax benefit would be made available to single persons who have never been married, widows and widowers, and persons who have been legally separated or divorced for at least 3 years.

It seems to me that our tax laws should reflect both logic and justice. And to deny a taxpayer the benefit of "head of the household," when he or she is one, is neither logical nor just.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that while the Ways and Means Committee is considering the general cause of tax reform that they will give some consideration to the plight of single persons. Surely, if there is one group in this Nation who are discriminated against it is the single taxpayer in the middle-income tax bracket.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL INCOME TAX REFORMS

(Mr. GALIFIANAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in these early days of the 91st Congress and of President Nixon's administration we are still considering legislative priorities for this session. I rise to speak to an issue which, I believe, should command this Congress, consummate attention and consideration.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the pressing need for basic changes in our Federal income tax laws. The demand for reform, for a more reasonable and equitable distribution of the overall tax burden, is bordering on an outright fiscal revolt by many American taxpayers. The lower- and middle-income groups have borne the major burden of Federal income and social security taxation long enough.

If my mail is any indication, the great majority of these people are becoming acutely aware of this fact, and they are looking to Congress to correct the inequity.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has doubled the salary of the President, will raise the salary of virtually every high Government official, and has permitted a substantial salary increase to be bestowed upon itself. When, the average taxpayer is asking, will we get our pay raise? If Congress does not do something about the plight of these taxpayers, we will have failed to discharge our most important responsibility in the realm of fiscal affairs.

I refer specifically to tax relief in the form of increased personal exemptions, increased ceiling for standard deductions, and possibly, an increase in the standard deduction percentage. This is the only way to provide true relief for the overburdened taxpayer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress, and the President of the United States, to give this matter the highest priority, the most favorable consideration, and the promptest action possible.

WHY NOT "SHALL" INSTEAD OF "MAY"?

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch was quoted as saying he "may exercise" some sanction against those students on our campuses who have been convicted of rioting. It would be much more reassuring and more obedient to the laws passed by Congress if Secretary Finch would change that word "may" to say in the future to those riotous students found guilty of disrupting our institutions of learning, "We shall withhold funds from students guilty of such conduct."

Section 504(a) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 provides that, after affording opportunity for hearing, a student or school employee who has been convicted by a court of record of any crime relating to trespass or seizure of property or other conduct disruptive to normal academic procedures shall be

denied for a period of 2 years the benefits available under that act.

Then there is section 504(b) of the Higher Education Act, which says that if an institution of higher learning, after hearing, determines that a student or employee has willfully disobeyed a lawful regulation or order of that institution, resulting in substantial disruption of normal operations, financial support shall be discontinued.

Finally, section 411 of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act for fiscal 1969 provides that funds for loans, grants, or loan guarantees are to be denied to applicants that immobilize the normal affairs of colleges and universities.

The time is well past, Mr. Speaker, when we can permit such terms as "if" and "may" in considering penalties against those who try to wreck our institutions of higher learning. They are not engaged in harmless schoolboy pranks. Any further delay in fullest enforcement of the laws to protect this investment can only mean surrender of our colleges and universities to the rioters and demonstrators.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, American battle casualties in Vietnam as of the week ending March 1 totaled 32,376 dead since 1961. It is significant that almost one-third of this number, 9,425, died since the start of the preliminary Paris peace talks on May 10, 1968.

These grim statistics make it clear that, contrary to the general public expectations that the advent of peace negotiations would produce a deescalation in hostilities in Vietnam, the fighting has intensified to the point that 2,319 lives have been lost in the 3 months since South Vietnam began to participate in the Paris negotiations on December 7.

According to the New York Post columnist, James Wechsler, Ambassador Averell Harriman, the chief Paris negotiator for the Johnson administration, has said that the present North Vietnamese offensive is "essentially a response to our actions rather than a deliberate reckless attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks."

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, however, stated that the recent wave of enemy attacks against South Vietnam was an "ominous" violation of the understanding between the United States and North Vietnam. He said on March 7:

I want it to state unequivocally, that if these attacks continue unabated, an appropriate response will be made.

Today the New York Times reported Laird as saying that he thought some American forces might be replaced by South Vietnamese forces. He declined to say how many might be replaced or when, but said:

I do not want to see any U.S. military man in South Vietnam a single day longer than is necessary to accomplish our objectives.

With the Nixon administration talking of possible retaliatory action against the North Vietnamese for their current offensive, it is time the Congress embarked on a frank discussion of just what our "objectives," as Secretary Laird termed it, are.

During the presidential primaries of last spring and the campaign of last fall, there seemed to be general agreement among the candidates that the first order of business facing the Nation in January was a speedy termination of the Vietnam war. Indeed, President Nixon said as early as March 14, in the course of the New Hampshire primary:

The next President of the United States must end the war.

The Washington Post noted at that time that he emphasized the word "must." In the same Washington Post article, Mr. Nixon declared that his statement about ending the war "was not a vague campaign promise." He stated:

I do have some specific ideas on how to end the war. They are primarily in the diplomatic area.

The President must now live up to those campaign statements. Our objectives in Vietnam must emphasize the diplomatic area to which he alluded in March of 1968. To lead the United States into a period of increased military confrontation would surely repudiate President Nixon's campaign promises to end the war through diplomatic means. More significantly, however, it would plunge this country still further into the military entanglement in Vietnam which was so clearly repudiated in the presidential primaries of last spring.

I believe it is crucial that the Congress participate in defining the nature of our objectives in Vietnam. The power to commit the United States to prolonged involvement in Vietnam cannot be the sole prerogative of the executive branch of Government.

In order to facilitate that process, I have reserved time for a special order on March 26 for the purpose of discussing our goals and objectives in Vietnam. It is my hope that many Congressmen will join in that discussion. For it must be made unmistakably clear to the administration that this Nation will not tolerate further escalation of the war in Vietnam. The United States must bring this tragic and wasteful war to a speedy conclusion through diplomatic negotiation and a political settlement.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD CONTINUE TO INVESTIGATE MURDER OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Memphis, Tenn., James Earl Ray was convicted of the murder of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and was sentenced to 99 years in prison.

I believe that the questions raised by Ray's statements during his trial and by others as to the possibility that he was a part of a conspiracy to kill Dr. King

and the failure of the trial to resolve that question make it imperative that the Department of Justice continue its investigation into the question of whether or not the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, assassination was the result of a conspiracy.

His widow, Mrs. Coretta King, and his successor as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Rev. Ralph Abernathy, said they believe there was a conspiracy and have called for continuing the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Department of Justice to continue this investigation and make public the results. Public suspicions of a conspiracy will not be resolved by the 1½ hours of testimony nor be relieved by mere expressions of concern by law-enforcement officials.

Full public disclosure of the facts concerning his murder would at least make clear the basis upon which the FBI and the Department of Justice make their determination as to whether or not other individuals were involved.

Dr. King was a towering national figure in whom millions of Americans—black and white—placed their hopes for the resolution of racial tensions and intolerance in this country.

Beyond the question of individual responsibility for this heinous crime, of course, lies the collective responsibility of a society which permitted the evils of discrimination and bigotry to exist and take the life of this noble citizen who only sought to end discrimination, poverty, hunger and war, and to lead us all to the promised land.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

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

MARCH 10, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to submit my resignation from the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library to which I was elected pursuant to H. Res. 263 of the 91st Congress.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

BERTRAM L. POPELL,
Member of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 302, relating to the 50th anniversary of the American Legion.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I commend the committee on the resolution, and its wording; I simply want to make a reservation in order to inquire about two words that are omitted which, in my opinion, would strengthen

it, and which would be most timely in the situation in which our Nation finds itself, both internally or domestically, and certainly externally, so far as freedom around the world is concerned.

I note both the excellent wording of this resolution, for which I would vote under any circumstance, commending the Legion for its 50 years of service to God and to country, and I also note the closing sentence wherein it vouchsafes to have the House pledge its continuing cooperation with the men and women of the Legion in programs of service to community, State, and Nation, and in their determination to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, the principles of freedom, and the principles of democracy upon which our Nation was founded.

The two words that I think may have been inadvertently omitted are the emphasis that the Legion has always, both traditionally and characteristically placed in its resolution, deal with patriotism in youth, and in its Americanism programs. I just wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Colorado who brings this resolution on the floor, would have any suggestions as to whether or not they could be included in this fine resolution.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As the gentleman from Missouri has pointed out, the American Legion has contributed much to our great country, particularly since the end of World War I. The American Legion was first conceived by our men overseas. They had a meeting in Paris in March 1919 where they first conceived of the idea of the American Legion. Thereafter they adopted their constitution and bylaws in your great State, in the city of St. Louis. Since that time they have developed many fine programs. The two that the gentleman has mentioned, patriotism and youth, has contributed much to our country. I anticipate asking that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks, and the items that the gentleman has outlined could be included in such remarks by the gentleman or any other Member.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I certainly appreciate not only the concept of the great organization that we resolve to honor here today, but also its past actions in inculcating patriotism in youth, and the general Americanism program. I hope that we can spread on the RECORD not only commendations but the need at the end of the first 50 years, to continue in the second 50 years with this very thing that may have been lacking in home, State, and school; as well as the community-serving organizations such as the American Legion, in order to offset that which has brought turmoil to some of our campuses and in the minds of our countrymen today; toward the end that at the end of the 100th year, when we again resolve, or those who succeed us resolve, to honor this great organization, we shall be in a much more solid state and condition.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was 50 years ago this month that the veterans of the First World War met to form the organization that was to become the American Legion. During the years since it was chartered by an act of Congress on September 16, 1919, the Legion has grown to be the largest and most effective veterans organization in the world. It is an organization to which we owe a great debt of gratitude and I am proud to join with the millions of my fellow Legionnaires in saluting the American Legion on its 50th anniversary.

In these days of turmoil and crisis, when our Nation is beset by violence and social unrest it is gratifying to witness the millions of American Legionnaires in thousands of posts throughout the country who are engaged in voluntary service to their communities, States, and to our beloved Nation.

Service in time of peril to our country is the common denominator for Legion membership. Nothing so reflects the turbulence of this half century of history into which the Legion was born and through which it has served than the fact that the war veterans of Vietnam represent the fourth group of Americans of the 20th century who have met the highest obligation of citizenship. In Vietnam today there are American young men fighting who are the grandsons of men who knew Chateau Thierry with the combat soldiers' terrible intimacy of sacrifice.

On the shoulders of these young Vietnam era veterans must fall the burden of carrying forth the ideals, goals, and hopes that the American Legion has traditionally cherished and will continue to cherish in its service to God and country.

March 15, 16, and 17, 1919, is marked as the official dates of the Legion's founding. But in a larger sense Legionnaires go beyond that limited period of history for their source of inspiration.

When those American Legion founders—scarred by sacrifices for their country and blessed by a love for her—picked up the torch for continued service in peacetime, they borrowed on the ideals and spirit of men who had gone before them.

Their inspiration were valiant men, who by their blood and sacrifices, had wrested freedom from a despotic and distant monarch in the dark days of the American Revolution.

The Legion founders reaffirmed their belief in the basic American principles of justice, freedom, and democracy for which Valley Forge had proven an early testing ground.

While the American Legion's founders were spurred to action by the ideals and spirit of free men, they were nonetheless practical men. They wanted to guarantee their investment of service in wartime by continued service in peacetime. They wanted to further insure the security and stability of the country for which their sacrifices and those of their departed comrades-in-arms had been made.

As in the beginning, the Legion is

today still fighting the good fight—still fighting to keep these great ideals in the forefront in America. Its resolve is given new strength by a new generation of war veterans.

If one were to attempt to reduce the organization's purpose to the simplest terms, these words might come close:

The American Legion is dedicated to kindling the conscience of America to remember always her great ideals of freedom and the sacrifices that must be made to maintain freedom.

The Legion labors to keep America's backbone stiff and straight—strong—so that these ideals will be carried not only into the next half century but into all time. This so that there always will be one spot where man can turn and see, feel and know the spirit and blessing of freedom.

Legionnaires have worked long and diligently to help educate America to take the long view of history—to see the importance of our stand for freedom and decency in South Vietnam.

So that the same freedom might not be lost through excesses on the home front, the Legion is endeavoring to build a renewed respect for law and order and justice in our society.

The youth-training programs of the American Legion cannot be matched by any other organization in their dimensions. They are a direct Legion contribution to the building of future good citizenship.

More than 15,000,000 boys under 17 years of age have now graduated from American Legion Junior Baseball, the greatest organized teenage boys' sports program in the Nation. It is designed to indoctrinate the junior players with the qualities of good sportsmanship, respect for rules and appreciation of the value of teamwork.

More than 1,600,000 youths have graduated into good citizenship from the 4,000 Boy Scout troops sponsored by American Legion posts. The American Legion is today one of the leading sponsors of the Boy Scout movement.

More than 500,000 high school juniors have learned about the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship and the functions of self-government through the annual American Legion boys state and boys nation programs. In this activity the youths organize and operate a mythical state and a mythical national government to learn by doing what the functions of government are and what the roles of good citizens are in maintaining good government.

The American Legion has made a massive contribution in developing champions and defenders of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. More than 5,500,000 boys and girls have participated in the annual national high school oratorical contests of the American Legion. Some 355,000 students participate annually in this nationwide competition in which they are required to prepare original orations on some phases of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

For the past 50 years, the American Legion has made its influence felt on the American scene as a force for good; a force for the betterment of not only the

veteran population but for every man, woman, and child.

The Legion has a proud heritage and one which is being preserved by continuing and expanding upon the good works on which the reputation of the organization is based.

American Legion posts throughout the Nation are preeminent in the field of community services. There are thousands of hometowns which are better places in which to live today because Legion posts undertook the leadership in needed community improvements.

The men and women who compose the American Legion today have dedicated themselves to a far-reaching program of assistance in the search for real solutions to the problems of our Nation's society.

They are helping to draw the initial blueprint which future generations of American Legionnaires can follow in striving to attain a better society for posterity.

This is a real challenge, and one which is being met by Legionnaires at all levels, who are rolling up their sleeves and getting down to work at the community level by helping initiate projects which are constructive and which will bear fruit.

During its first half-century of existence, the American Legion has maintained a young, vibrant outlook on the major problems with which our Nation has been confronted and has played a major role in helping solve many of these problems.

The American Legion prides itself in never having failed America when the chips were down. I join with other Members of the House on this golden anniversary to add my name to the long list of those who respect and admire the American Legion for the outstanding contribution it has made and is making to America.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in observing the golden anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

As a member for 23 years of Furniture City American Legion Post No. 258, Grand Rapids, Mich., I look proudly back upon the 50-year history of the Legion. I sense the feelings of the World War I fighting men who gathered under the banner of Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., to form the American Legion at caucuses March 17-19, 1919, in Paris, France, and May 8-10, 1919, in St. Louis, Mo.

From its inception, the American Legion has been an organization of men devoted to God and country and imbued with lofty ideals. They came together through feelings of fraternity and comradeship born of war duty and pledged themselves to equitable treatment for all veterans but particularly the disabled, their widows and their orphans. Intensely patriotic, members of the American Legion also have always dedicated themselves to America's best interests and have united in opposing those forces which threaten our national security and besmirch the honor and the dignity of man.

Members of the American Legion can look at the 50-year history of their or-

ganization and proudly recount its accomplishments—promotion of legislation necessary to the care and rehabilitation of disabled veterans, establishment of the American Legion Child Welfare Foundation, the boys state and boys nation programs, the American Legion School Medal Awards presented to encourage good citizenship, sponsorship of some 4,200 Scout units throughout the country, promotion of American Education Week, citizenship schools for aliens, unceasing vigilance aimed at strengthening our national security, support for the United Nations and for such international groupings as NATO and SEATO, and eternal devotion to the advancement of peace.

It is the GI bill of rights that the American Legion claims as its greatest legislative achievement. And this, as we all know, is a measure which has produced incalculable benefits not only for individual veterans but for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I salute the American Legion on the occasion of its 50th birthday—and it is with pride that I personally wear the American Legion emblem. This emblem is symbolic of everything the American Legion standards for as it marks a half century of effort and progress—devotion to the finest ideals of man.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my personal salute and congratulations to the American Legion on the 50th anniversary of its founding. As the son of the author of the Preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion, and as well as a member of Lafayette Post No. 37, in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., I have long been familiar with the outstanding work of the American Legion on behalf of our Nation and its citizens.

Service to communities such as mine has embraced youth work, and leadership in patriotic observance as well as the vital role as the consistent champion-ship of our veterans. Let us hope that all Americans will be inspired by the great achievements of the American Legion's first 50 years and dedicate themselves to the ideals of service to community, State, and Nation which have guided the Legion's first half century. May the American Legion itself enjoy five more decades of success in all its work.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in saluting one of the Nation's great organizations, the American Legion, on its 50th anniversary.

The American Legion is made up of millions of our citizens who have served their country in time of war, and the organization has continued its members' tradition of service to country throughout its 50 years of existence.

In Oklahoma, the Legion has served in many ways to build and promote a sense of responsibility and patriotism among our young people. The Legion has been a friend to the widows and orphans of veterans, and has led the fight for better hospital facilities and more effective programs under the GI Bill. It has consistently been a force for honest, effective law enforcement, for better government, and for a strong national defense.

I am proud to be a member of the

American Legion, and hope it continues to grow in strength and in effective service to our country.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the words "continue to serve" means more to the Legionnaire than the average citizen realizes. These words, based on that portion of the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion reading "To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation," portray the peace-time service of the American Legion.

How many citizens, I wonder, know of the many ways in which posts of the American Legion serve the interests of the community? Far too many people in the community believe that all the American Legion is organized for is to fight for legislation which benefits men who have served during our wars.

It is of the utmost importance that the citizens of every American community know what the Legion is doing for community betterment. It is important that people know that the members of the Legion are continuing to serve in peace as they did in war.

Members of Congress never forget for a moment the power and strength for good, the high ideals, and the practical wisdom of the American Legion.

This year marks the Legion's golden anniversary. Let the citizens of this country know that for half a century Legionnaires have been imbued with a patriotic earnestness that transcends military duty and a determination that the United States shall never again be found unprepared for its defense.

If this were the only mission of the American Legion it would be sufficient to insure its existence. But the boundless energy of Legionnaire service does not end there.

Americanism has been a major interest of the Legion since the inception of the organization. The St. Louis caucus in May 1919, considered as "its major concern—relief work, employment, and Americanism."

At the charter convention at Minneapolis, in the same year, the Americanism Commission was established by convention action. It is the objective of the National Americanism Commission to translate Americanism precepts, principles, and ideals in an understanding manner to Legion posts, and to other interested groups and individuals.

In the field of antisubversive activities, the Legion continues to be an outstanding opponent of communism and other un-American dogmas, and is proud to be known as one of communism's most dangerous and persistent enemies.

The youth programs of the Legion are exemplary. In the 1920's American Legion junior baseball was established. As a by-product of this youth-training program, professional baseball has reaped some excellent talent.

Boy's State is another outstanding educational force developed by the American Legion. First held in Illinois in 1935, it spread rapidly over the Nation.

This program enables thousands upon thousands of boys to reach maturity with practical experience in the application of political practices learned in summer schools of citizenship.

Boy's Nation, started in 1946, annually brings a hundred or more young American leaders from most of our 50 States to Washington, D.C.

These lads are selected from those who have made the best records of achievement in their respective Boys' States.

Every detail of our National Government and political setup which can possibly be emulated by the boys is utilized in the Boys' Nation program.

We cannot overlook the importance of the American Legion's High School Oratorical Contest which enables several thousand students to develop a deeper knowledge and appreciation of the Constitution of the United States. All of the contest's orations are based upon our Constitution.

The present U.S. flag law is the result of a cooperative effort in which the American Legion played a leading role in encouraging proper respect to be shown in displaying our national colors.

Great quantities of literature are mailed from the Legion's Americanism Commission each year to stimulate patriotism and assist in the recognition of patriotic holidays. It is not unusual for the commission to distribute over a million pieces of literature within a year.

The sole purpose of this material is to assist Americans to be good citizens and to teach our youth the American way of life, in order that they may help win the battle for freedom and liberty now being waged in a troubled world.

No one has any higher regard for the Legion's principles, any greater respect for its gifts of heart and mind to our country, or any stronger expectation of the even mightier contributions that it will make in the future, than do I.

Although the American Legion is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year and it is still young and growing. It has the enthusiasm of youth for the causes that it espouses.

So far it has no apologies to make. From its earliest days, it has struggled on behalf of disabled veterans, whom it has sworn to protect, and for the rights of the dependents of veterans. Its service to community, State, and Nation, has been unstinting.

The American Legion inherited the struggles of manhood in its cradle days. When the final history of the Legion is written, the judgment on its efforts will be "well done." When a bugler has blown taps over the grave of an American Legionnaire, this, too, is the appropriate epitaph for a man who has served his country well in war and peace.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join with my colleagues in the House and the Senate in observance and paying tribute today to the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, that great organization which has done so much for this country and continues to have as its hallmark the service to the veterans, their widows, and children. It is indeed appropriate that this House and the Senate have passed appropriate resolutions commending the Legion on this half a century of dedication to the public welfare. It is also appropriate that the Post Office Department has seen fit to issue a special stamp to mark this occasion.

The American Legion was conceived at a caucus March 15-17, 1919, in Paris, France, by members of the AEF. Two months later, at St. Louis, Mo., another caucus adopted a tentative constitution.

Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., son of President Theodore Roosevelt, is credited with being the "Father of The American Legion." A World War II brigadier general, Roosevelt died of a heart attack at the front in Normandy.

The American Legion was chartered by an act of Congress on September 16, 1919, and before the year ended, membership reached 648,000, heralding 50 years of steady growth and public service.

Members come from all walks of life. They include industrialists, publishers, movie stars, leading sports personalities, political leaders, attorneys, doctors, farmers, mechanics, and clerks.

This year the American Legion celebrates the 50th year of its founding. It is a milestone which recalls vivid memories of service and self-sacrifice to the 1,700,000 remaining World War I veterans, and is an observance of some magnitude for all Legionnaires, most of whom will never again be privileged to take part in so historic an event.

From its inception, the American Legion has been known for its spirit; for its sense of fairness to all men; for its ability to accomplish whatever job that needs to be done.

There is perhaps no other institution in America that is so well known locally by name by so many as the American Legion. This public awareness of the American Legion rests largely on its local reputation.

But when it comes to knowing about the sum total of the doings and accomplishments of more than 16,250 such hometown posts, it is an altogether different story.

As a nationwide organization, the American Legion is truly a giant group. It is the largest veteran organization in the world.

You will find, especially in the smaller cities and towns, that the local American Legion post is the community center of patriotic, civic, and in most cases, its social activities.

It is from these deep grassroots in the community life of the Nation, that the American Legion draws its immeasurable strength, vigor, and public support. The people of these communities know of the American Legion's good local works and they stand behind it.

The membership of the American Legion is drawn from all walks of American life with such effectiveness that when it comes to getting a job done in any field of its endeavors, it can command the services, the talents, and the energies of the recognized top leaders in that field.

The American Legion is well represented in high places in Federal and State Government with an impressive list of Legionnaire officeholders headed by President Richard M. Nixon.

Thirty of the 50 Governors are veterans of wartime service with the U.S. Armed Forces and all 30 of those who are eligible for American Legion membership are members.

Vice President SPIRO AGNEW and at

least three members of the Nixon administration Cabinet are members of the Legion.

Heavy majorities of both Houses of the U.S. Congress are also members of the Legion. Nearly completed survey of Members of the first session of the 91st Congress showed that 66 of the 100 Senators and 252 of the 435 Members of the House are Legionnaires.

The American Legion has a women's auxiliary of nearly 1 million members in more than 13,000 community units.

In its committee structure that blankets the United States, the American Legion has 12 basic national commissions. Operating under these commissions are 29 national boards and committees. This structure is paralleled on every State front and carried down through district and county echelons to the community post levels. This provides a chain of command through which the American Legion can—and does—muster all its huge task forces to any given objective.

The American Legion places a high premium on patriotic service in the military forces in time of war. This is a special obligation of American citizenship imposed on the Nation's youth—an obligation that demands special and hazardous service, that calls upon the individual to accept the sacrifices of health, career, education, financial loss, and life itself, if necessary, to protect and preserve our way of life. Nowhere else on the American scene is the individual called upon to make such a sacrifice.

Playing a significant role in the American Legion's planning for the future is the Vietnam war vet, and the number of Viet vets who have joined the ranks of the Legion total more than 150,000.

That the Legion has been and remains both vibrant and stable is attested to by its many accomplishments down through the years: Establishment of a Veterans' Administration; aid to the sick and handicapped—whether veteran-connected or not; programs for the protection and well-being of the Nation's children; and advanced education and training for America's war veterans.

The youth-training programs of the American Legion under the direction of its national Americanism commission cannot be matched by any other organization in their dimensions. They are a direct American Legion contribution to the building of future good citizenship.

More than 15,000,000 boys under 17 years of age have now graduated from American Legion Junior Baseball, the greatest organized teen-age boys' sports program in the Nation. It is designed to indoctrinate the junior players with the qualities of good sportsmanship, respect for rules and appreciation of the value of teamwork.

More than 1,600,000 youths have graduated into good citizenship from the 4,000 Boy Scout troops sponsored by American Legion posts. The American Legion is today one of the leading sponsors of the Boy Scout movement.

More than 500,000 high school juniors have learned about the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship and the functions of self-government through the annual American Legion boys state and

boys nation programs. In this activity the youths organize and operate a mythical state and a mythical national government to learn by doing what the functions of Government are and what the roles of good citizens are in maintaining good Government.

The men who compose the American Legion today have dedicated themselves to a far-reaching program of assistance in the search for real solutions to the problems of our Nation's society.

These men are helping to draw the initial blueprint which future generations of American Legionnaires can follow in striving to attain a better society for posterity.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and that of the entire membership of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for the leadership which the Legion has in its Washington office.

The American Legion prides itself in never having failed America when the chips were down and is taking the occasion of its golden anniversary observance to pledge anew that as long as the need for the Legion's service exists, the American Legion stands ready to serve.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support fully House Resolution 302.

This is a proud time for a great organization—the American Legion.

It was just 50 years ago next Saturday, March 15, that a group of men gathered in the American Club, 4 Rue Gabriel, Paris, France, which turned out to be the first meeting of the American Legion.

That original roll is incomplete, but 463 signed the register and it is known that quite a few others also were present. Today, Legion membership numbers more than 2.6 million, including my own in one of the Legion's biggest posts, Adam Plewacki Post 799, in Buffalo, N.Y.

Four wars and a half century after it was founded, the Legion's continuing major concern is aiding veterans as they return to civilian life. This is a great service and one for which the Legion is well organized.

Besides its fundamental concern with the returning veteran, the Legion also gives great attention to programs for our young people. It is this work for which, it seems to me, the Legion warrants the accolade: "50 years young."

Each year, about 750,000 young men from the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico participate in Legion-sponsored programs. These include: Boys State and Boys Nation, American Legion baseball, the national oratorical contest, Boy Scouting and boys clubs.

The cornerstone of all of these programs, directed by the Legion's National Americanism Commission, is the recognition given to the ideal of human values and the dignity and worth of the individual.

In these programs a young man can find fulfillment in the comradeship fostered by participating in worthwhile projects with others of his own age, and the opportunity and encouragement to develop to his fullest capacity the intellectual, moral, physical and economic qualifications necessary for happy, useful living in a free society.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives salutes the American Legion on its 50th anniversary. The tribute has been made official by the adoption of House Resolution 302 which I enthusiastically support.

As we recognize the achievements of the Legion and the high purposes for which the organization has stood over these past 50 years, we should also look to the future and recognize the important role which the Legion can play in lifting the moral spirit of America.

Since the historic organizational meetings and act of Congress which chartered the Legion in 1919, we have seen the results of the work of this effective organization in many areas.

The Legion has represented the veterans of America in stimulating many legislative accomplishments—most outstanding of which is the GI bill of rights.

In our communities, the Legion has focused on encouraging our Nation's youth to assume the burdens and responsibility of leadership, the national high school oratorical contest, the organization of Boy Scout troops, Legion junior baseball, the Boys Nation program and many other youth activities have enlisted the civic participation of millions of young Americans.

The purposes of these varied programs go far beyond the simple definition of patriotism, for improvement of our society through broad participation is the overall goal of the Legion agenda.

In these times when many young people are rebelling, there is no better way to unite America than through a program which will encourage young people to participate.

The Legion has placed the emphasis on a better understanding of our democratic process—the burdens of leadership, the expense of participating in the decisionmaking procedures of Government, and the meaning of becoming involved in one's own community affairs.

These are the basis for a strong society as well as a healthy society and I am proud to join my colleagues in saluting the American Legion on this 50th anniversary.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal pride that I join my colleagues in congratulating the American Legion on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

As a member of Post 193 of Van Nuys, Calif., and as a veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict, the words of the resolution adopted by the House, clearly identifying the high purpose of the American Legion and its achievements of the past 50 years, have special meaning for me.

In my own post, I have through the years been close to men who, upon returning from World War I, became the Nation's first Legionnaires. They were among those who began the Legion's voluntary service programs in their communities. They laid the foundation for the growth of the Legion into the largest and most effective veterans organization in the world. They paved the way for those of us who became the veterans of other wars, so that we learned and understood the meaning of service to

our country in times of peace as well as in times of war.

We have learned to honor those valiant and brave men who died on the battlefields, and to insure that the sacrifice they made has not been given in vain. Through Legion membership we constantly reaffirm our belief in the principles we fought for—justice, freedom, and democracy.

Of greatest importance are the efforts made by the Legion to lead America's youth to the highest pinnacle of good citizenship. The Legion has made a massive contribution in developing youth participation in hypothetical state and national governments—in learning by doing what the functions of government are and what the role of a citizen should be in maintaining good government. These youngsters will soon take our place in every facet of American life. They will be well equipped to do so as a result of participation in the Legion's many and varied youth programs.

Patriotism, love of country, devotion to community, belief in freedom and justice—these are not merely ideals that the American Legion has set for its membership and for the Nation. They are the legacy that the Legion is passing on to our young people—the legacy that will preserve this great Nation.

For this, and for much more in 50 years of outstanding accomplishments, I proudly salute the American Legion and as proudly claim membership in Post 193.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I lend my wholehearted support to House Resolution 302 honoring a proud time in history for a worthy organization—the American Legion.

I am happy to join my colleagues in honoring this group as they celebrate their 50th year of service to this great Nation. They continue today to serve the veterans who have so ably defended us on many battlefields. It is appropriate that the House and Senate have passed resolutions commending the Legion on this half century of public service. I was especially pleased that the U.S. Post Office issued a commemorative stamp on this occasion.

This mighty organization grew from rather tenuous seeds back in 1919 at a meeting in Paris. Within months after this initial meeting of 463 men, a second meeting was held in St. Louis to adopt a tentative constitution.

Although many men helped the fledgling organization, Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., son of President Theodore Roosevelt, is credited with being the "father of the American Legion."

By an act of Congress, the Legion was chartered on September 16, 1919, and before the year ended membership jumped to 648,000.

From its very birth, the American Legion has been known for its spirit, for its sense of fairness to all men and for its ability to accomplish whatever job that needs to be done.

Although the Legion's image is that of a veterans' group, they have contributed over the years to the youth-oriented programs. In the 1920's American Legion

junior baseball was established. Professional baseball today picks many a player who began by swinging an American Legion bat.

Boy's State is another outstanding educational force developed by the American Legion. It spread across the Nation from its inception in Illinois in 1935. This program guides thousands upon thousands of boys toward maturity and adulthood with practical experience in the application of political practices learned in schools of citizenship.

In 1946, the Legion initiated Boy's Nation, which brings a hundred or so boys from most of our States to Washington every year. Boys are selected from those who have made the best records of achievement in their respective Boy's State meeting.

The American Legion's High School Oratorical Contest enables several thousand students develop a deeper knowledge and understanding of the Constitution.

From boyhood to manhood the American Legion builds Americans. Especially in the small towns of this country, you will find the local Legion post is the community center of patriotic, civic and in most cases, social activity. There are 16,250 such posts across the Nation.

Membership is drawn from the full range of American Life—clerks and industrialists, attorneys and mechanics, the common man and national heroes. The American Legion is well represented in high places in Federal and State Governments, beginning with President Nixon. Thirty of the 50 Governors are veterans of wartime service and all 30 of those who are eligible are members in the American Legion.

Vice President SPIRO AGNEW and at least three members of the Cabinet are members of the Legion.

A survey of Members of the first session of the 91st Congress shows 66 Senators and 252 Members of the House are Legionnaires.

Nearly 1 million members in 13,000 community units belong to the American Legion women's auxiliary.

As a nation, we are indebted to the American Legion for placing a high premium on patriotic service in the military forces in time of war. This is a special obligation of American citizenship borne largely by the Nation's youth. And proudly done. It is right that the American Legion exist to serve those who have honored this country with their bravery and their lives. If the American Legion did not exist—it would have to be created.

We can thank the Legion for its efforts in creating the Veterans' Administration; aid to the sick and the handicapped, whether service connected or not; programs for the protection and well-being of our children; and advanced education and training for America's war veterans.

For the men returning from Vietnam, the American Legion will be waiting in line with their families to welcome them home.

The American Legion has never failed America. And with this golden anniversary, it renews its pledge to stand ready to serve.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in praise of the ideals and aspirations of the American Legion.

This fine organization works diligently to protect the interests of all of America's veterans. Their numerous activities go far in smoothing the road for returning veterans. No single effort better exemplifies the good that the American Legion can do than their efforts on behalf of the GI bill after World War II. Their efforts assured its passage. The result was a boon to the Nation in general—and to veterans in particular.

We are in times when the dedication of men of good will is desperately needed to reconcile and reunite our Nation in equality and justice. An organization sworn to service and to the highest ideals of our Nation can provide a rallying point for such men. Such an observation is particularly apt on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the American Legion. This is an organization whose codes of service can stand as a pattern for public spirited community action across the Nation.

The American Legion, with the rest of the Nation, faces great challenges in the next 50 years. But great difficulties can mean great victories. I look forward, therefore, to the future of the American Legion—for the next 50 years to follow and broaden the patterns of the last 50.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on its 50th anniversary, I wish to congratulate the American Legion and to commend its national commander, William C. Doyle, of Vineland, N.J.

For half a century the Legion has been promoting the kind of 100-percent Americanism which Commander Doyle has described as "a calm, reasoned approach to and concern with the major problems that confront our beloved America, and an earnest effort to seek sane and sound solutions within the framework of law."

The American Legion's Americanism is love of country and respect for its institutions. It requires respect for the rights of our fellow man. It means a concern for the freedom of men, accompanied by a recognition that every right carries with it an accompanying responsibility.

The American Legion has stood these 50 years as a diligent sentinel alert to protect this Nation's welfare and future. The Legion has labored at the big as well as at the small tasks necessary to this mission, a mission willingly undertaken by former servicemen anxious to perform further service to their country as civilians.

But the American Legion is not resting on its laurels. Its work has only begun. Tremendous problems remain to be solved—and the greatest of these is the attainment of world peace.

Who are better fitted to work for this ideal than those who have given most to win it in the past?

The American Legion's primary objective is peace, but beyond that are the objectives of community improvement, individual betterment, and the promotion of every vital American principle and ideal.

The Legion fights on for these in war

and peace, in good times or bad. In a day when the minds of men have been subjected to worldwide tragedy and doubt, when suffering is on every side, the American Legion stands solidly for our country and democracy.

It is my sincere wish that all Legionnaires everywhere know that the American people are proud of them and hope for their continued success.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 302

Resolved, That the House of Representatives salutes the American Legion on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary on March 15 through 17, 1969, and urges the American people to commend this great organization upon its achievements during fifty years of service to God and country; that it acknowledges the need for a service organization such as the American Legion in our American society, and expresses the hope that the outstanding work of the American Legion will continue during the next half century; and that the House pledges its continuing cooperation with the men and women of the American Legion in programs of service to community, State, and Nation and in their determination to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy upon which our Nation is founded.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTING DEALERS AND CONSUMERS OF GOLD AND SILVER PRODUCTS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to protect those who deal in gold and silver products, including housewives, jewelry manufacturers, and their trade associations from fraudulent misstatements of the rare metal content of merchandise.

This bill has been introduced in the Senate by my distinguished Rhode Island colleague, Senator PASTORE, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY.

The bill would amend the 1906 law regulating quality marking of gold and silver to allow interested parties, consumers and manufacturers alike, to institute civil action in Federal district court to obtain an injunction against violators of the act.

Under this bill consumers and members of the trade may recover their actual damages from a violator of the Marking Act, together with costs of the suit and attorney's fees. This would prove to be an effective solution against the false marking situations that have plagued the industry, unbeknownst to the consumer, for years. The cost of false markings, both to the jewelry industry and the American consumer, has been high.

Almost one-third of the jewelry-silverware manufacturing industry is located in the State of Rhode Island. Over 20,000 Rhode Island citizens are employed in this industry and it is the largest single employer in the city of Providence and the second largest in the State.

It is essential that we act to protect both the consumer and the industry against false markings. I urge that my colleagues join in supporting this much needed measure.

THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS

(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 February 5 I introduced a bill that would create a Cabinet-level Department of Youth Affairs. Today it is my pleasure to add the names of 14 of my distinguished colleagues as cosponsors of that bill.

They are Congressmen EDWARD BOLAND, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, SAM FRIEDEL, KENNETH GRAY, JAMES HOWARD, ANDREW JACOBS, JR., CHARLES JOELSON, JAMES KEE, RAY MADDEN, ABNER MIKVA, ARNOLD OLSEN, CARL PERKINS, BERTRAM PODELL, and BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

We believe that more than anything else, today's young people are concerned about the world they live in and they are committed to making it a better place than it now is.

These young people want an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the political life of their country. The overwhelming response of youth to the presidential campaigns testifies to their eagerness to act constructively and obtain results within our political system.

Our task as legislators is not to spurn youth's enthusiastic energy, but to welcome it, encourage it to flourish, to provide a place where young people can be officially, influentially, and constructively involved in the workings of government. The bill which my colleagues and I have introduced would provide such a place.

We propose the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Youth Affairs which would contain the Peace Corps, Volun-

teers in Service to America—VISTA—and the Teacher Corps. Each of these programs is in large measure staffed and carried out by young people, each is almost universally regarded as a solid success, and each is thus a forceful proof of what the youth of this Nation can do once it has the chance.

Other existing programs deemed suitable to be in the new Department of Youth Affairs could be transferred there at the President's discretion.

We also propose that an Office of Youth Participation be created in the Department of Youth Affairs. In this Office at least half of the employees would be between 16 and 24 years old. This Office would administer a program of grants-in-aid to local agencies for the establishment of similar youth participation offices under State supervision. The local offices would then develop and administer social and economic programs in which youths as paid and unpaid volunteers would work for the benefit of their local communities. In addition, we propose that the Secretary of the Youth Affairs Department be instructed to appoint an Advisory Commission on Youth Participation, a majority of whose members would be young people from youth organizations in schools, colleges, and universities and from other youth organizations. The Advisory Commission would speak directly for young people by giving advice on policy matters to Federal agencies whose programs deal with youth.

Mr. Speaker, no group of Americans has more of a stake in the future of the Nation and its government than our young people. Let us give them an immediate stake in its present activities; let us authorize the creation of a Department of Youth Affairs.

The bill follows:

H.R. 6259

A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT

SECTION 1. There is hereby established an executive department which shall be known as the Department of Youth Affairs (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Department").

OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be the head of the Department a Secretary of Youth Affairs (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Youth Affairs and such Assistant Secretaries as shall be determined by the President to be necessary, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for under secretaries and assistant secretaries, respectively, of executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary

determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 3. The functions of—

(1) the Secretary of State under the Peace Corps Act,

(2) the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (relating to VISTA), and

(3) the Commissioner of Education under subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to the Teacher Corps), are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Youth Affairs.

TRANSFER OF RECORDS, PERSONNEL, ETC.

Sec. 4. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments of, and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to—

(1) the Secretary of State under the Peace Corps Act,

(2) the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and

(3) the Commissioner of Education under subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

REFERENCES

Sec. 5. Any reference to—

(1) the Secretary of State under the Peace Corps Act,

(2) the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and

(3) the Commissioner of Education under subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, or other official paper in force on, or which will become effective after, the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Secretary of Youth Affairs.

EFFECT ON EXISTING OFFICIAL ACTIONS

Sec. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this Act, all delegations of authority, orders, regulations, certificates, directives, issuances, and other official actions of—

(1) the Secretary of State under the Peace Corps Act,

(2) the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and

(3) the Commissioner of Education under subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

which are in force on the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue in full force and effect until modified, amended, superseded, or revoked by the Secretary.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this Act, all boards, councils, committees, and similar organizations and groups established by—

(1) the Secretary of State under the Peace Corps Act,

(2) the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and

(3) the Commissioner of Education under subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

pursuant to law may be abolished or continued by action of the Secretary.

OFFICE OF YOUTH PARTICIPATION

Sec. 7. (a) There is additionally established in the Department of Youth Affairs a United States Office of Youth Participation (hereinafter referred to as the "Office").

(b) The Director of the Office shall be appointed by the Secretary and shall be com-

pensated at the rate prescribed for level 5 under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. There shall be a Deputy Director of the Office who shall be compensated at a rate not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5.

(c) At least half of the employees of the Office, classified in grade GS-7 and above, pursuant to section 5104 of title 5, United States Code, shall be persons between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four at the time of their appointments to their positions, and the Office shall establish a personnel policy which encourages the maintenance of this proportion. The Director shall establish a policy which assures that employees of the Office are representatives of a broad range of experience, background, and personal characteristics, with respect to sex, educational attainment, residence, occupation, ethnic origin, and age within the age limits prescribed in the preceding sentence.

(d) The Office of Youth Participation shall—

(1) establish and administer a program of grants-in-aid to public agencies and nonprofit private organizations which shall be made available on application and under terms prescribed by the Office for—

(A) the establishment of similar Offices of Youth Participation and Commissions on Youth Participation under the supervision of governments of the States and the District of Columbia, which will perform at the State level those functions specified in this section;

(B) the development and administration, by such public agencies and nonprofit private organizations, of programs designed to recruit, select, train, and employ youth up to age twenty-four as paid and nonpaid volunteers in social and economic programs of benefit to local communities, especially programs which concern youth generally and programs aimed at reducing poverty and physical blight, improving health, education, and welfare, ending racial discrimination, and achieving equal justice under law for all citizens;

(C) the development of coherent plans and programs, by such public agencies and private nonprofit organizations, which ensure the meaningful participation of youth up to age twenty-four in policymaking bodies of governmental and private organizations which administer social and economic programs, especially programs which concern youth generally and programs aimed at reducing poverty and physical blight, improving health, education, and welfare, ending racial discrimination, and achieving equal justice under law for all citizens;

(2) establish jointly with other Federal agencies administering programs which concern youth generally and programs aimed at reducing poverty and physical blight, improving health, education, and welfare, ending racial discrimination, and achieving equal justice under law for all citizens, a national program under which youth up to age twenty-four shall be recruited, selected, trained, and employed as volunteers in paid and nonpaid positions in such programs.

(e) The Director of the Office shall establish with the heads of Volunteers in Service to America, the Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the President's Council on Youth Opportunity and other Federal agencies concerned with youth participation, cooperative administrative arrangements which insure that such agencies assist in furthering the objectives of this section, including the establishment of means for the exchange of information about volunteer opportunities and applicants for volunteer positions.

(f) In volunteer programs assisted under this section, the Office shall insure, to the greatest extent possible, that such programs—

(1) are planned and administered by public agencies and nonprofit organizations which are composed of youth up to age twenty-four, or which show evidence of substantial participation of such youth;

(2) engage volunteers in ways that permit and encourage them to assist in the planning, administration, and evaluation of policies and programs;

(3) where appropriate, assign volunteers to work directly with clients and beneficiaries of programs;

(4) provide experience which leads to careers for volunteers in the fields in which they work; and

(5) where appropriate, make use of expert technical assistance in planning and administering such programs.

(g) Volunteers in any program assisted pursuant to this section—

(1) shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, except as provided by the Secretary of Youth Affairs, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission; and

(2) shall be compensated, including necessary expenses, as determined by the Secretary of Youth Affairs, except that in the case of Federal volunteer programs the Secretary shall consult with the head of the Federal agency concerned before establishing rates of compensation and expenses.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON YOUTH PARTICIPATION

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary of Youth Affairs shall appoint an Advisory Commission on Youth Participation (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of nine members, at least five of whom shall be persons between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four at the time of their appointments. The Director of the Office shall be an ex officio member of the Commission.

(b) The Secretary of Youth Affairs shall seek recommendations as to the membership of the Commission from youth organizations in schools, colleges, and universities, and from other youth organizations, and shall appoint members of the Commission for two-year terms, except that the terms of the members first appointed may be for a greater or lesser period in order to assure that the terms of not more than three members shall expire at the same time. In appointing members of the Commission, the Secretary shall seek to insure that they are representative of a broad range of experience, background, and personal characteristics, with respect to sex, educational attainment, residence, occupation, ethnic origin, and between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four at the time of their appointments.

(c) Members of the Commission shall select from their number a Chairman and Cochairman, who shall serve in those positions for one year.

(d) Members of the Commission shall be compensated, including necessary expenses, as determined by the Secretary of Youth Affairs. The Secretary shall provide the Commission with necessary staff support.

(e) The Commission shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of Youth Affairs with respect to policy matters concerning the administration of this section and with respect to ways of increasing the involvement of youth;

(2) consult with and advise the heads of Federal agencies administering programs which directly affect the lives of young people, including, but not limited to, the Selective Service System, the Justice Department, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, as to ways of improving such programs and making them more responsive to the needs and concerns of young people; and

(3) hold and publish hearings, and conduct and publish studies, on problems and issues of concern to youth in American society, and make recommendations from time to time for additional means of incorporating young people more fully in meaningful and

responsible roles in the American society and economy.

ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS

SEC. 9. The President is authorized to transfer to the Secretary any other functions relating primarily to youth in the areas of health, education, military service, employment, and related areas not otherwise transferred by this Act, together with such personal property, records, obligations, commitments, appropriations, allocations, and other funds as he determines necessary to carry out any function so transferred under authority of this section.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 10. The Secretary may authorize the performance of any of the functions vested in him by this Act by any other officer or employee of the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 11. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This Act, and the amendments made by it, shall take effect when specified by Executive order of the President, but in no case later than one year after the date of its enactment.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PUFFERY

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Post Office Department delivered to my office, and presumably, to every other congressional office, an example of professional postal puffery that has yet to be topped.

In their publication, "Postal Patronage: A Sampling of Editorial Reaction," the Post Office Department—that paragon Government agency of efficiency and economy—spent \$320.70 to print a 138-page "sampling" of editorial opinion on the patronage problem.

That booklet told us that "a random sampling of editorial reaction" on the subject of postal patronage showed that of the 125 editorials printed, 114 favor the removal of political patronage from the appointment process; two oppose the policy, and nine give tentative approval. Taken at face value, that would seem a pretty substantial "image" for the Post Office Department.

However, I think it is only proper to ask: Are 125 editorials out of approximately 20,400 newspapers and periodicals throughout the Nation sufficient to make a judgment on?

Now if Pennsylvania is any example of the cross section of opinion that the Post Office depended upon to make judgment on its new policy, I wish to advise there are about 482 periodicals in my State, 118 of which are dailies. This current postal puffery took a sample from only 12 papers—an infinitesimal number on which to base an assumption.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE ROSS RIZLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Okla-

homa (Mr. BELCHER) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sense of personal sadness and profound regret that I have taken this time so that other Members may join me in paying tribute to our former colleague, Congressman Ross Rizley, who died early in the morning of March 4, 1969, in Oklahoma City at the age of 74 years.

The Nation has lost a true statesman and I have lost a dear, dear friend in the passing of Ross Rizley. He and I were as close as any brothers, from the time we worked as young men together in Oklahoma organizing Young Republican Clubs around the State, at a time when Republicans in Oklahoma were about as scarce as the proverbial hen's teeth.

Ross Rizley was born on a farm near the Panhandle town of Beaver, Okla., on July 5, 1892. I have often wondered if being so nearly a "Fourth of July child" did not have something to do with the great patriotism and devotion to this country which always characterized Ross' life and public service. He was schooled in the public school system of Beaver County and then taught in the rural schools of that system in 1909 and 1910, while yet a teenager himself. For 2 years following that, he served as a deputy register of deeds for Beaver County, and then he went off to law school in Kansas City. He was graduated from the Law Department of the University of Kansas at Kansas City, Mo., in 1915 and was admitted to the bar the same year.

He returned to his native Beaver to commence practice, and there he married Miss Ruby Seal on June 18, 1916. The couple had seven children, four sons and three daughters. In 1918 Ross was elected county attorney for Beaver County and served in that position until he resigned in 1920 to move to Guymon in Texas County, Okla., where he resumed the practice of law.

There his political career began in earnest. He served as a member of the Guymon Board of Education from 1924 to 1932 and as city attorney from 1928 to 1938. While thus engaged, he successfully sought election to the Oklahoma State Senate in 1930 and served in that body from 1931 through 1934.

In 1938 Ross successfully sought the Republican nomination for Governor of Oklahoma against two opponents, but was defeated in the general election—a fate which came to every Republican nominee for that office from the first post-statehood election in 1907 until 1962.

I had the great privilege of serving as Ross' campaign manager when he sought election to Congress in 1940 from Oklahoma's Eight Congressional District. My memories of the excitement and the fellowship of campaigning up and down the dusty roads of western Oklahoma with Ross that summer and fall are among the fondest of my life. He had a genuine love of people and a deep dedication to the American tradition of freedom and good government—of the people, by the people, and for the people.

That campaign was successful, and in

1941 I came to Washington with the new Congressman to serve as his administrative assistant. There are those here who served with Ross in that 77th Congress and the three succeeding Congresses in which he served. And I know everyone of them will remember him with the same esteem and affection that I feel for him, for he was an eminently likable man, a true friend in the highest sense of that word, and a dedicated public servant who took his work as a representative of the people with a seriousness that I doubt could be eclipsed by the record of any statesman who ever walked these halls.

Ross served on the House Committee on Agriculture during the 77th, 78th, and 79th Congresses and was reelected to each of those Congresses with a greater plurality of the vote than before. Evidence of his dedication and ability is the fact that in the 80th Congress, he was appointed by his colleagues to the powerful and prestigious House Committee on Rules. In that Congress he also served on the special committee established to review expenditures in the executive department and, during the second session, was appointed to a Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures.

No more honest and forthright man ever represented the people of America than Ross Rizley.

In 1948, Ross sought the Republican nomination for the U.S. Senate and more than doubled the combined vote of his five competitors in winning that designation. In that year, also, he served—as he had in 1932 and 1936—as a delegate to the Republican National Convention; but he was unsuccessful in the November general election for the Senate seat and returned to law practice in Oklahoma.

It was my great honor and privilege to be elected in 1950 to the Eighth Congressional District seat which my beloved friend, boss, and mentor had filled with such conspicuous ability for 8 years. His example and the experience of working closely with him during those years was a source of great encouragement and wisdom for me in my freshman years, and his life has been a noble pattern for me and many other men throughout the years.

With the advent of the Eisenhower administration in Washington, Ross was appointed Solicitor for the Post Office Department and served in that capacity from March to December of 1953, when he was appointed Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He served in that capacity until December of 1954 and in February of 1955 took up the seat to which he had been appointed on the Civil Aeronautics Board where he served until April of the next year.

His resignation from the CAB was occasioned by his appointment as judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. His judicial years were ones of distinction and serve as a fitting capstone of this outstanding public career.

Teacher, attorney, legislator, executive, judge—a notably varied public career, but as remarkable for its honesty and dedication as for its variety of services. And these few words speak nothing of the really important contributions of his

life—of his devotion as a husband and father, of his service to his church and community, of all the small, unsung goodnesses that are the mark of a great man. How inadequate are words to express the flood of feeling one has at such a time as this. How pitifully inadequate are a few remarks to pay tribute to the accomplishments of a lifetime. But buried deep in the hearts of his many friends and loved ones is a part of Ross Rizley that will never die.

To his wife, Ruby, and his family, I take the liberty of expressing, not only my own deep sympathy and sense of loss, but that of every Member of the House of Representatives and especially of those who knew and loved him when he served with them here—may God bless you and may His peace, which passes all understanding, strengthen you and uphold you in this time of sorrow.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I am happy to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although I never had the privilege of serving in this body with Ross Rizley, I knew him quite well, because subsequent to his decision to run for the U.S. Senate and with the advent of the Eisenhower administration, Ross Rizley was in Washington, D.C., for a number of years prior to being appointed to the Federal judiciary.

All of my colleagues who served with Ross Rizley have always pointed out that he was a man of the highest integrity, of the greatest diligence, and with the finest views on what was good and in the best interest of our Nation.

As I sat and listened to the recitation of Ross Rizley's long history of public service as recounted by the gentleman from Oklahoma, I know of few records that would match it. He served his local community, in the State government, in the Federal Government, and in the legislative as well as the executive and judicial branches. This is a history of accomplishment that will go down in the annals of Oklahoma's political history.

May I join the gentleman from Oklahoma in extending to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BELCHER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Oklahoma in his tribute to a great Oklahoman, a great American, and a great man. I knew Ross Rizley before he was elected to Congress and served with him during my first term. I worked with him on many matters affecting our State. He came here from the great Panhandle of Oklahoma, an area once known as "No Man's Land."

His family were among the first settlers of that part of the State of Oklahoma. Ross had all of the rugged qualities of a pioneer Oklahoman. He was a man of strong character, integrity, patriotism, loyalty to duty and to his country. He held many important offices both State and Federal, elective and appointive. I believe he was the first State

senator ever elected on the Republican ticket from that part of the State of Oklahoma from which he came. Of course, the gentleman who is in the well of the House was probably as closely associated with Ross Rizley personally, politically, and professionally as anybody that ever knew him.

Ross was a great Congressman and a knowledgeable Congressman. He was a strong member of the executive branch of the Government where he served in at least three important positions. He was an outstanding U.S. district court judge.

I last saw Ross not long ago in Houston, Tex. It was obvious that he was not physically as well as he was when he served here with us, but he still displayed the keen wit and intellect that characterized him throughout his life. He was frank, open, sincere, and he loved his friends. I am so happy that I could always count him as a friend. Though we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, there was never at any time a single iota of difference between us of a personal character.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to Mrs. Rizley, to his children and grandchildren, and to all of his family and loved ones my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma has lost an outstanding citizen in the passing of Judge Ross Rizley. I was proud to call him my warm personal friend.

He not only served our State with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1941 to 1949, but he was one of the relatively few men to achieve prominence in all three branches of the Federal Government.

After leaving Congress, during the administration of President Eisenhower, he was Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. While holding the latter position, Mr. Rizley was appointed a U.S. district judge and returned to Oklahoma. It was during his service with the Post Office Department that I had my last close contact with him.

In all these posts he was known as conscientious and fair. His record is a part of our State history. Our sympathy goes out to his family at his passing.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP) who represents quite a portion of the district that Ross Rizley first represented when I came to Congress.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER), in paying tribute to former Congressman Ross Rizley.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Rizley for many years. In fact, I helped in his campaign when he was elected to Congress in 1940. Through the years, Mr. Rizley has been one of the

outstanding leaders, not only in the State of Oklahoma, but in our United States. This has been shown by the responsibility that has been given to him, first, by former President Eisenhower when he was appointed to serve as Solicitor of the Post Office Department, and later as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The President then saw fit to appoint him to the Civil Aeronautics Board, of which he later became Chairman. In 1956 he was named to the Federal bench in Oklahoma, a position which he has served in ever since.

In the death of Judge Rizley, the people of Oklahoma have lost one of their best friends and leaders, and I, a personal friend.

I would also like to express my condolences to his very fine wife, who has also been a close friend throughout the years, and a wonderful wife and mother.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), who served with Mr. Rizley on the committee when he was here in Congress.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Ross Rizley came to Congress not a great many years after I entered the House and we served together on the Agriculture Committee for 6 years.

I came to know him not only as a good friend, but as an able colleague, a great man, a man of keen wit and sound judgment. We were together on committee trips, and inasmuch as we both came from the Southwest, we enjoyed many interests in common. He was a typical son of the frontier. He was frank, outspoken, modest, but sound and able in his qualifications. He was a true friend.

When Ross Rizley left the House he was missed, but he continued to render great public service in both the executive and judicial branches of Government.

We were saddened to learn of his death, Mr. Speaker, and I want to join others in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and to his fine children and other members of his family.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my long time colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, PAGE BELCHER, in paying tribute to the late, great Ross Rizley. Ross was a Member of Congress when I came to the 80th Congress, in 1947.

It was my pleasure and satisfaction to serve and be associated with Ross Rizley on some of the important matters of that time. He was an able lawyer, a courageous and effective Member of Congress, in the best tradition of his beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, it has been noted that Ross Rizley served in the three important branches of the Government of our country. He was known well and favorably by many men. He will be missed by those men with whom he worked, and by them for whom he did so much.

I too wish to extend to Mrs. Rizley and

to his family the sympathy of the McCulloch family.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

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

Like many Members of this body, who will be expressing themselves today, I also entertained the highest respect and admiration for the late and lamented Ross Rizley of Oklahoma. That high regard was shared by all who served with him, regardless of party, regardless of position, and regardless of the area from whence they may have come.

He was one of the most able, dedicated, and most sincere of the men I have served with during nearly three decades as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Ross Rizley was a man of courage. He was a statesman in the true sense of that word. He always put our country ahead of partisan affairs. He was a leader. He was a dedicated man. He was in the real literal meaning of the term a truly great American. I regarded Ross Rizley as a personal friend, and I join with my colleagues who knew him in expressing sympathy to the surviving widow and members of his family.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) who had the privilege of serving in Congress with Ross Rizley.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and neighbor for yielding to me.

Ross Rizley was elected and started serving in 1941 and 1942. I was elected in the fall of 1942, and started serving in 1943 and 1944.

Shortly after that, in 1946, the House Committee on Government Operations was established. Ross Rizley and I served on that committee. The years 1947 and 1948 were of the 80th Congress. Ross Rizley was the chairman of one of the subcommittees during that session in the House. I served as the ranking Democratic member of that subcommittee.

We investigated the almost unbelievable and unconscionable waste that occurred in the United States after World War II had ended, and when billions of dollars' worth of surplus property were being disposed of in an indiscriminate fashion, and in an unorganized fashion by the agencies who had that property, particularly the three defense agencies.

During the term of 2 years that I served under his chairmanship I can attest to the fact that this Member of the House, Ross Rizley, was a man of great ability and of great personal kindness and understanding. He did a fine job as chairman of that committee.

As a result of the exposures that we made in the waste and in the confusion in the disposal of Government property, in 1949 that same subcommittee, under my own chairmanship at that time, brought out the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949, commonly known as the General Services Administration Act. It was strictly due to the pioneer work that was done by the Rizley subcommittee that we were able to put

that legislation together, and to get it passed in the House.

I believe that the work of the General Services Administration from that time on in doing the housekeeping chores of the Government, and in particular that section which had to do with the disposal of both personal and real property, has saved the people of the United States many, many billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise at this time to pay my tribute to this fine man under whom I had the privilege to serve and to attest to the valuable work that he did in that regard as well as in other regards on other committees on which he served.

I learned with sorrow of his passing and I extend to Mrs. Rizley and to the family my deep sympathy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed to learn of the passing of my good friend and former colleague, Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma.

No finer gentleman, more dedicated to public service, has served in this Congress. It could be said his entire life has been devoted to public service, first at the county level, later in the State senate, and then with the Federal Government. He served with distinction on our Committee on Agriculture and on the Rules Committee. He was always seeking new challenges and greater opportunity for service. He retired from the House in the hope of representing the State of Oklahoma in the Senate. A political career being what it is, he was not successful in that effort, but that did not deter him in his public career. In 1953 he was Solicitor for the Post Office Department, later served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and subsequently Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. All this indicates that he was a man of real ability in whom those who knew him had confidence.

His ability, objectivity and temperament were recognized when he was made a U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Ross Rizley's life stands as a lasting monument of his dedication to the service of his fellow men. While he is no longer with us he continues with us in fond recollection. He will be missed by me. He was a friend and colleague that I shall never forget.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I have learned of the death of a friend and former colleague, Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma.

I was majority leader when he was first sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives on January 3, 1941. Even though we were members of opposite political parties, we became very close personal friends.

His warmth, honesty, and pleasing personality were only a few of his many outstanding characteristics. Whenever he became convinced that one side of an issue was the correct one, he was very sincere and persuasive in his attempt to convince other people to follow his leadership.

This sincerity led to many political arguments on the floor of the House between Ross and myself. However, after the heat of political battle had subsided, we remained the closest of friends.

Mrs. McCormack joins me in extending our sympathy to his loved ones in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, with a sad, heavy heart I am proud to associate myself with my able, distinguished friend, Mr. BELCHER, in the tributes which he has so well expressed concerning our late, esteemed colleague and beloved friend, Hon. Ross Rizley.

I knew Ross very well when he served in this body, and he was outstanding in every respect. He was a man of great ability, strong views and convictions and real patriotic devotion to our American way of life.

Ross was an outstanding Congressman and a great American, and his service in this body was distinguished by demonstrated capacity, fidelity to duty, deep concern for the people, and noteworthy contributions to his constituents, his constituency and the Nation.

Ross Rizley enjoyed a very brilliant, long career in the public service. He served in the House for three terms, was well liked and highly respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In addition to being a nationally recognized Member of Congress, he was a very able Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under Secretary Benson, and most distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, where he did splendid work for American aviation.

In all the very high official posts in which he served, Ross did memorable work. He was admired and cherished by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Subsequently, he was appointed Federal judge for the western district of Oklahoma. He was a well-trained, capable man of broad experience and understanding of the problems of business, labor, and agriculture and other facets of our great system. His contributions to the Federal courts, as lawyer and judge, were meaningful, significant, in our best tradition, and will long be gratefully recalled by his many friends, constituents and the American people, whom he served so faithfully and well.

I extend to his bereaved family my most heartfelt sympathy for the great, irreparable loss they have sustained, which is indeed also the loss of the Nation.

Our hearts go out to them with prayers and compassion, and we ask divine providence to bless and comfort them in their deep sorrow and bring them reconciliation, happiness, and peace.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sadness that I noted the passing away on March 4 of a distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma. Congressman Rizley was 76 years of age.

Ross Rizley was originally elected to the 77th Congress, and his distinguished service in this House extended through the 80th Congress. He retired from the House in 1949.

Subsequent to his service in the House of Representatives, Congressman Rizley held a number of very important positions in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government. He was successively solicitor for the U.S.

Post Office Department, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. He resigned the last-named position on April 15, 1956, to become judge of the U.S. District Court for the western district of Oklahoma.

It was my privilege to know and respect Ross Rizley during his four terms here in the House and his subsequent distinguished work in the executive branch and as a Federal judge. He will be remembered for his many contributions and dedicated and effective service to his district, to Oklahoma and to the Nation.

We all mourn the passing of Ross Rizley, and I am honored to join with his many friends in the House in expressions of tribute and farewell to this valued friend and respected former member from Oklahoma.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death last week of our former colleague, Judge Ross Rizley.

During his tenure here during the 1940's we became very good friends and I learned to respect his good judgment and his dedication in representing the people of Oklahoma. He was a man of character and humanity. As I look back over the years of my service here in Congress, certain individuals come to mind who were a special privilege and honor to know. Ross Rizley was such a man and I mourn his passing.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Rizley and the other members of his family my most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to our esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, the late Ross Rizley, who passed away on March 4. He was a warm and genuine human being who spent much of his life in the service of his fellowman and his country.

As we pause to honor the memory of the gentleman who so well represented the Eighth Congressional District of Oklahoma for 8 years in this Chamber, we recall also the accomplishments of this very able legislator.

Representative Rizley served as a member of the House Agriculture Committee for 6 years and the Rules Committee for 2 years. He was outstanding in his service in the Congress and in the recognition of his fellow Members. I can attest to this because I served with Ross Rizley and shared his friendship. After retiring from Congress, he became Solicitor of the Post Office Department in 1953 and later served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Following these posts, he became Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and later was appointed Federal judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

It is highly appropriate that we now honor his memory, and I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Congressman Rizley's family and in assuring them he will long remain in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma has lost one of her finest citizens in the passing of the Honorable Ross Rizley.

This distinguished former colleague

was one of our State's ablest public servants during his illustrious career.

As a legislator, as an executive, and as a jurist, he made a significant contribution to both his State and the Nation.

A devoted husband and father, Ross Rizley is mourned by one of the finest families in the country, whose hospitality and helpfulness to others were almost legendary.

I will miss Ross Rizley, as a friend and as a fellow public servant.

Oklahoma and the Nation will also miss this splendid man, who helped to build for future generations in many, many ways.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from Oklahoma and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague and friend, Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma.

Certainly Ross Rizley served with distinction his district, his beloved State of Oklahoma and his Nation.

Following his career in the Congress he served in the Post Office Department and later was appointed Federal judge to the western district of Oklahoma, a crowning achievement.

It was my privilege to serve in the 80th Congress with Ross Rizley, and I appreciated his warm personality and friendship.

I extend to the members of his family an expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join those today who salute the distinguished career of Ross Rizley, who served in the Congress from 1941 to 1949, as a representative from Oklahoma.

Over a period of 4 years, I came to know Ross well. Upon entering the House as a freshman Congressman, I had the good fortune of making his acquaintance, and from this vantage point, I had the further opportunity of witnessing his career at close range.

Either in Congress or out, Ross Rizley was frequently on service in Washington in some capacity, and I took great satisfaction in our long and warm friendship.

When in Congress, Ross served 6 years on the Agriculture Committee and 2 years on Rules. Under the Eisenhower administration he received an appointment as Solicitor for the Post Office Department but shortly afterward was offered and accepted another appointment as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He was widely admired for his vast knowledge of agricultural matters and his faculty for figuring out successful solutions to farm problems in general.

In 1955, he was appointed to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the following year was appointed judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, in which capacity he performed with great ability.

As a leading Republican in Oklahoma, Ross Rizley was once honored with his party's gubernatorial nomination, in 1938, and once was nominated for Senator, in 1948, but on both occasions failed of election. He was an outstanding lawyer in his home State, a civic-minded

citizen with a special concern for educational matters, and on several occasions attended the Republican National Convention as a delegate.

I was proud to know this man of great ability and regarded him as a true friend. The State of Oklahoma has lost one of its leading citizens, but the memory of his deeds shall surely prevail.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing a week ago today of the Honorable Ross Rizley who for 8 years represented the people of Oklahoma here in the House of Representatives and who spent a lifetime in dedicated public service. I came to know Ross well when we both served on the Select Committee To Investigate the Disposition of Surplus Property at the end of World War II.

Following his service in the House of Representatives Ross went on to be Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board before being appointed a Federal judge in Oklahoma's Western District. No matter what capacity he filled, Ross Rizley, through hard work and integrity, filled it with distinction. His passing is a great loss to the people of Oklahoma and the country. To his widow and his family and many friends I offer my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their expressions of sorrow at the untimely passing of the late Ross Rizley, former Member of Congress. During the years I have been here I have served with many fine Americans and, certainly, Ross was one of the finest. Able, courageous, and at all times courteous, his influence with his colleagues contributed to his success.

We join, too, in expressing our deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress as a young man, I met Ross Rizley. This was in the old 80th Congress, where I met so many famous Americans—John F. Kennedy, President Richard M. Nixon, Lyndon B. Johnson, and many others served in that Congress. Among the men who stood out in that Congress, a leader among leaders, was Ross Rizley, of the great State of Oklahoma. Being a farmer, I particularly appreciated his keen interests in agriculture. Soil conservation, forestry, and watershed projects were close to his heart and constantly on his mind.

Ross Rizley was a great Congressman, an outstanding administrator, and one who honored the bench as Federal judge for the western district of his great State.

As a result of his keen interests in agriculture, the American farmer today, and the consumer today enjoy a better standard of living. Ross Rizley was concerned about safety in the airplanes of the Nation and devoted much of his time as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to improving the cause of aviation.

He was a great American from this very heartland of our country, who was devoted and dedicated to the entire Nation. He was a warm personal friend of mine, who helped me personally as a young fledgling Congressman. I shall always remember him as a friend and a

statesman who loved his people in Oklahoma and who stood up for God and country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable Ross Rizley.

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a letter from Mr. Rizley's former secretary, Miss Lydia Vacin:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1969.

HON. PAGE BELCHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELCHER: Thank you sincerely for affording me this opportunity of here expressing a personal tribute to a former distinguished Member, the Honorable Ross Rizley, late of the Federal District Court in Oklahoma City.

In January 1941, before Pearl Harbor, Ross Rizley was sworn in as a Member of the 77th Congress. Throughout the following eight years that he was in Congress, I had the good fortune to serve as his Secretary. Those were turbulent years and strenuous days in Congress, as all who were then serving will readily attest. It took men of strong courage and stature to endure, and Judge Rizley was definitely one of those. He was hard-working, hard-hitting, fearless and uncompromising, yet was a gentle and kindly man who seemed never too busy to see a friend, acquaintance, or even a total stranger in difficulty and needing a helping word.

He was an ideal family man, a devoted husband and father, who justly took great pride in his fine family. His three sons, and two sons-in-law enlisted at the outset of World War II, and all served Overseas.

His geniality and wit was always at hand when most needed, and carried us through many dark War days. One evening he inadvertently picked up my reading glasses from my desk as he was leaving the office. Later I called his house and asked his daughter whether he had carried them home. She replied yes, and that he was reading and wearing them. The next morning when he returned the glasses, I asked him how they fitted. He facetiously replied, "All right, but I believe they are a little old for me!"

Judge Rizley had all those qualities which endeared him to people and consequently he had a wealth of friends. As one reporter stated, "They Don't Make Many Men Like Ross Rizley".

He was truly "One of a Kind"—"With malice toward none, and justice for all!"

My deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rizley and her wonderful family, who will miss him greatly.

LYDIA VACIN,

Staff Assistant, House Committee on
Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I received from the Honorable Clifford G. McIntire, who is a former Member of the House of Representatives:

PARK RIDGE, ILL.,
February 6, 1969.

HON. PAGE BELCHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAGE: Word has reached me of the passing of Judge Ross Rizley in Oklahoma. I am saddened by this word because I count myself among the great number who knew him well enough to treasure his personal friendship.

Ross had already served in Congress before I became a Member in 1961. Our acquaintance began in that period when he was an

official in the United States Department of Agriculture. It continued through his years of service on the Civil Aeronautics Board and after he returned to Oklahoma and the Federal bench. He put his outstanding ability into the service of his country with great dedication. His warm personality brought him a host of friends. Those privileged to work with him learned to have great respect for his soundness of judgment and integrity of character.

I know that you and the Judge have had many years of close personal friendship. As one who also treasured his friendship, may I share with you and others a mutual sympathy in the passing of a distinguished American.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE.

MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
THE RUMSFELD LEGISLATIVE
REORGANIZATION BILL—H.R. 6278,
91ST CONGRESS—AND S. 355 AS
PASSED BY THE SENATE, 90TH
CONGRESS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a number of our colleagues in both Houses, and others interested in congressional reform legislation, have suggested that we insert in the RECORD a brief summary of the most important specific differences between the Rumsfeld bill and the bill passed by the Senate on March 7, 1967.

Accordingly, I am today including as a part of my remarks the report prepared by our resident expert on congressional reform bills, Walter Kravitz, specialist in American National Government for the Legislative Reference Service:

MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RUMSFELD
LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION BILL—H.R.
6278, 91ST CONGRESS—AND S. 355 AS PASSED
BY THE SENATE, 90TH CONGRESS

(By Walter Kravitz, specialist in American National Government and General Research Division, Library of Congress)

TITLE I

1. The Rumsfeld bill tightens the provision for open committee business meetings by eliminating Senate-added exceptions for bill mark-up and voting sessions. (Sec. 102(b).)

2. S. 355 limits general proxies but permits proxy voting unless committees decide otherwise; the Rumsfeld bill flatly prohibits proxy voting in committees. (Sec. 102(d).)

3. In S. 355, the proposed 3-day rule may be waived by the Speaker and the minority leader under certain conditions; the Rumsfeld bill deletes such waiver power. S. 355 forbids a floor vote on any measure until 3 days after a report becomes available; the Rumsfeld bill forbids consideration of a measure before those 3 days. Finally, the Rumsfeld bill exempts from the proposed 3-day rule privileged reports under Rule XI, clause 21 (new clause 22), and legislative veto procedures. (Sec. 102(e) "(f).")

4. The Rumsfeld bill restores the Senate-deleted provision for annual printing of each standing committee's rules. And it adds a provision recommended by the Joint Committee but never embodied in the bill, to the effect that the proceedings of subcommittees shall conform to the rules of their parent full committee. (Sec. 102(e) "(h).")

5. The Rumsfeld bill revises the provision permitting the broadcasting of hearings, by declaring most importantly that (1) hearings may be broadcast only as a public service without commercial sponsorship, (2) a

witness may decline to have his testimony broadcast. (Sec. 103(a) "Sec. 133A(b).")

6. The Rumsfeld bill forbids House committees to hold hearings while the House is reading a bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule. (Sec. 104.)

7. S. 355 permits separate explanatory reports by each House on the results of a conference; the Rumsfeld bill calls for a single jointly prepared report. S. 355 provides equal time in debate on a conference report for those who favor and those who oppose; the Rumsfeld bill requires the time to be divided between the majority and minority parties. (Sec. 106.)

8. The Rumsfeld bill deletes all sections dealing with the jurisdictions of Senate and House committees, and committee assignment procedures in the Senate. (Secs. 121-131.)

TITLE II

1. The Rumsfeld bill directs the Comptroller General to cooperate rather than act jointly with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in developing data processing systems for fiscal data and a budget standard classification system. (Secs. 202-204.)

2. The Rumsfeld bill applies to the Appropriations Committees the same rules of procedure re open hearings, broadcasting of hearings, proxy voting, and publication of votes as are contained in Title I.

TITLE III

1. The Rumsfeld bill deletes obsolete provisions: (a) legislative assistants for Senators; (b) travel allowances for Members; (c) provision for a congressional telephone system; (d) revision of Senate telephone and telegram allowances; (e) conversion to gross salary system for Senate employees; (f) Senate public address system.

TITLE IV

1. The Rumsfeld bill increases the size of the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations from 10 to 12, the additional two members to come from the minority party (one in each House) so as to make the Joint Committee bipartisan. (Sec. 401.)

2. The Rumsfeld bill requires that the vice chairman of the Joint Committee shall not be of the same party as the chairman. (Sec. 401.)

3. The Rumsfeld bill adds to the Joint Committee's duties the responsibility for studies on eight specific subjects to be completed from within one to three years. These include: (1) contempt procedure, (2) Capitol facilities for the public, (3) the Congressional role in situations in which U.S. armed forces are sent to combat abroad without a declaration of war, (4) the jurisdictions and staff resources of committees, (5) lobbying with appropriated funds, (6) resources of individual Members to perform their legislative and representative functions, (7) advantages of incumbent Members, and (8) contested elections procedures. (Sec. 402.)

4. The Rumsfeld bill, like S. 355, removes postmasters from congressional patronage, but it also permits Members to answer requests for work aptitude evaluations and security clearance information provided such information and evaluations relate to periods when the applicant was in the employ of the Member. (Sec. 401.)

5. The Rumsfeld bill removes Members of Congress from the process of appointment to service academies. (Secs. 451-455.)

6. The Rumsfeld bill provides a method whereby Members may hire temporary staff to replace an employee suffering from an extended illness without jeopardizing the pay of the sick employee. (Sec. 481.)

H.R. 8289—A BILL TO AMEND THE
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1969, Representative MELVIN PRICE and I introduced H.R. 8289, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The bill is substantially similar to proposed legislation—H.R. 18667—which we introduced in the House last session and a companion measure—S. 3851—which Senators ANDERSON and AIKEN introduced in the other body at about the same time. Among other things, the legislation would require the AEC to review applications for nuclear powerplant licenses to determine whether the issuance of any such license would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Due to the delay of the various interested executive agencies in submitting their comments on this legislation, no final action was taken on the measure by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy prior to adjournment of the 90th Congress.

One change of some significance from H.R. 18667 has been made in H.R. 8289, and I would like to explain why it was made. H.R. 18667 contained a section 8 which would have amended the Atomic Energy Act to add a new section entitled "Control of Thermal Effects." The effect of the amendment would have been to confer on the Atomic Energy Commission authority to regulate the thermal effects of heated liquid effluents discharged from licensed nuclear powerplants. The AEC presently does not have this authority, as was confirmed last month by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

I believe the AEC's foremost concern is, and should continue to be, the regulation of the nuclear power industry from the standpoint of radiological health and safety. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE), shares that view.

However, we believe the AEC should also review each license application from the standpoint of antitrust considerations. We further believe the Commission has a responsibility to help assure that nuclear power plants licensed by the AEC will not reduce the quality of adjoining waterways below applicable water quality standards promulgated by the States and approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the Water Quality Act of 1965. It was for this reason that we proposed in the legislation introduced last session to enlarge the AEC's legislative authority in this regard.

The provision relative to controlling thermal effects has been deleted from H.R. 8289. Eliminating this section from the bill in no way signifies a belief on our part that AEC should not concern itself with this matter. Rather, such action is merely an expression of our belief that the approach to preventing thermal pollution reflected in a bill—S. 7—recently introduced by Senator MUSKIE is to be preferred over a number of other legislative proposals that have been advanced in this regard and are now pending before various interested committees. Senator MUSKIE's bill would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and be applicable to all Fed-

eral departments and agencies. Of course, if S. 7 or a bill substantially like it falls of passage then we would wish to reconsider our own proposal to amend the Atomic Energy Act.

A more detailed explanation of why we are deferring to Senator MUSKIE's proposed legislation is set forth in a letter which I recently sent him. I include the letter at this point in the RECORD, to be followed by the text of H.R. 8289:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC
ENERGY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1969.

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Air and Water
Pollution, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: As you know, Representative Melvin Price and I in the House and Senators Anderson and Alken in the Senate introduced legislation (H.R. 18667, S. 3851) during the last session which, among other things, would have given the AEC regulatory authority over the responsibility for controlling the thermal effects of heated liquid effluents discharged from licensed nuclear power plants. Due to the delay of the various interested executive agencies in providing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with their comments on these bills, no final action was taken by the committee on the proposed legislation in the 90th Congress. However, I fully expected to reintroduce substantially similar legislation in the near future and have every expectation that action thereon will be taken by the committee during this session of Congress.

My purpose in writing is to inform you that I propose to delete from my bill the section (Section 8 of H.R. 18667) on "Control of Thermal Effects." I do so not because of any feeling that the prevention of thermal pollution is of no concern to the AEC; I firmly believe that it is, and know my view is shared by others on the Joint Committee. Rather, I do so in deference to Section 3 ("Cooperation by all Federal Agencies in the Control of Pollution") of your own bill, S. 7, which I have examined quite closely and find much to be preferred over the various alternate approaches reflected in proposed legislation presently pending before various interested committees. There seems little reason for the Joint Committee to devote time to a measure addressed solely to the Atomic Energy Commission if a more comprehensive bill, applicable to all Federal departments and agencies, is to be enacted. Moreover, as presently drawn S. 7 more nearly comports with the congressional policy expressed in the various air and water pollution control measures enacted in recent years, namely that it is the states which should have the primary role in preventing and controlling pollution. Finally, as presently drafted S. 7 should avoid the bureaucratic infighting which characterized earlier legislative proposals—including my own—over which Federal agency should have the final word insofar as the issue of thermal effects is concerned. I would hope that your committee could give consideration to the suggested technical changes set forth below, and that the bill can be reported to the House without damaging amendments.

One other matter deserves comment. As you know, the potential problem of thermal effects is not peculiar to nuclear power plants; it is a problem which to one degree or another is shared by all thermal electrical generating facilities no matter what their fuel source—coal, oil, gas or uranium. However, not all such facilities are subject to Federal licensing or other form of regulatory approval. I understand that in some cases certain of these facilities might be required to obtain Corps of Engineers' approval and would thereby become subject to S. 7's requirements, but I am not at all certain

whether this would bring within the bill's purview most or even many such facilities. Thus a significant fraction of all new electrical generating capacity to be added in future years generally will be immune from your preventive measure since it is addressed only to facilities for which a Federal license or permit is required. Quite apart from the exceedingly large loophole in pollution prevention which this exemption will permit, I believe that singling out particular energy sources in this way for special treatment could lead to choices between various energy fuels based on considerations extraneous to those normally considered in deciding the type of electrical plant to be built, namely, economic and other inherent advantages.

Therefore, I would urge your subcommittee to give consideration to legislation requiring that an electrical utility, prior to the start of construction of any facility for the generation of electrical power that (a) will discharge heated liquid effluents into any waters subject to Federal jurisdiction or affecting waters subject to such jurisdiction and (b) is not otherwise required to obtain a Federal license or permit, to submit to an appropriate Federal agency (for example, the Federal Power Commission) certification from appropriate State or regional water pollution control authorities that such activity will be conducted in compliance with applicable water quality standards. I believe an amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act along these lines would be non-discriminatory as between competing fuel sources, and would maintain the delicate Federal-State balance presently reflected in that Act.

There are some technical considerations relative to S. 7 which I would like to call to your attention. These are set forth in the attachment, and I hope that you will give them serious consideration. If you have any questions about these technical comments, or if I or the Joint Committee staff can be of any assistance to you in your consideration of these matters, please call me.

Very truly yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS ON S. 7

1. Pursuant to the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 nuclear power reactors are licensed in two stages: first, a construction permit must be obtained from the AEC to build the facility, and then an operating license must be obtained to operate the finished facility. Proposed new Section 14(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to be added by S. 7 would appear to require an applicant for an AEC license to submit the requisite certification at both stages in the licensing process. To avoid duplication and unnecessary delays the proposed section ought to be amended to make it clear that satisfaction of the section's requirements at the construction permit stage would suffice unless subsequent thereto the applicant proposes a material change in the facility.

2. As noted above, S. 7 as presently drawn would appear to apply to applications for AEC operating licenses as well as to applications for construction permits. With respect to facilities now under construction and yet to be granted operating licenses, it would appear quite impractical to require changes in the design of the facility at this late stage if such were deemed necessary by the appropriate State water pollution control agency to enable it to make the determination, and to issue the certification, required by S. 7. Therefore, if S. 7 is not revised as suggested in (1) above, provision should be made for exempting from the bill's coverage those facilities for which construction permits have been issued at the time of S. 7's enactment.

3. Proposed Section 14(b) would appear to

require the automatic suspension of any affected license or permit if a court of competent jurisdiction finds that such licensee or permittee is not in compliance with applicable water quality standards. In view of the possible adverse effect upon the reliability of a region's electric power supply which the forced shutdown of a large generating facility could have, it would seem considerably more advisable to accord the court discretionary power to permit continuation of the activity pending necessary modification of the facility or its appurtenances, if that is feasible, or of the operating practices followed there.

4. Proposed new Section 14(b) would require certification from an appropriate State or interstate water pollution control agency that the proposed activity will be conducted in a manner which shall "insure" compliance with applicable water quality standards. This seems an unnecessarily exacting standard to impose on the agencies involved, amounting virtually to an absolute guarantee by them that under no conceivable circumstances could the facility's discharges violate any of the applicable water quality standards. Few if any of the many other regulatory statutes now in effect require this high a degree of certainty on the part of the regulatory authorities, and there appears little reason to impose a different and higher standard in the field of water pollution. Certification by the State or interstate agency that there is "reasonable assurance" that the activity will be conducted in compliance with applicable water quality standards would appear to be more in keeping with the tests laid down in other legislative grants of regulatory authority.

5. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 vests in the AEC responsibility and authority for regulating the possession, use, etc., of source, byproduct and special nuclear materials. Pursuant to this authority the AEC has established comprehensive standards and controls over the radiological health and safety aspects of these materials. A potential conflict with this authority and responsibility would appear to exist under S. 7 in the fact that if a State were to adopt standards for the control of radiation from these sources as part of the State's water quality standards, a State or interstate water pollution control authority might withhold the certification required under S. 7 because the activity proposed to be conducted by the applicant for an AEC license, although in complete compliance with AEC standards and controls, might not be in compliance with the water quality standards promulgated by the State concerned. Therefore, at a minimum the Committee report on this legislation, and preferably the bill itself, should make clear that the certification process contemplated by S. 7 in no way comprehends radiological health and safety standards.

H.R. 8289

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (4) of subsection 31(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) utilization of special nuclear material, atomic energy, and radioactive material and processes entailed in the utilization or production of atomic energy or such material for all other purposes, including commercial or industrial uses, the generation of usable energy, and the demonstration of advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy; and"

SEC. 2. Section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Any license for a utilization facility to produce electric energy for

ultimate sale to the public or for a production facility shall be issued pursuant to section 103 unless the license applicant demonstrates, and the Commission determines in writing, that the principal purpose of the facility is the performance of substantial research and development activities for the demonstration of significant advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy, in which case such license shall be issued pursuant to section 104."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of subsection 103(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Commission is authorized to issue licenses to persons applying therefor to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, use, import, or export under the terms of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to section 123, utilization or production facilities."

SEC. 4. Subsection 104(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subsequent to a determination by the Commission as authorized in section 102, the Commission may issue to any person applying therefor a license for a utilization facility to produce electric energy for ultimate sale to the public of a production facility the principal purpose of which is the performance of substantial research and development activities for the demonstration of significant advances in the commercial or industrial application of atomic energy. In issuing licenses under this subsection, the Commission shall impose the minimum amount of such regulations and terms of license as will permit the Commission to fulfill its obligations under this Act to promote the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public."

SEC. 5. Subsection 105(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission, promptly after receiving any application for a license under section 103, shall transmit a copy thereof to the Attorney General who, in the case of an application to construct a utilization or production facility shall, or in the case of an application to operate such a facility may, within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed 180 days after receiving a copy of the application, advise the Commission whether, insofar as he can determine, the issuance of such license or the activities for which the license is sought would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, and such advice shall be published in the Federal Register. The Commission shall give due consideration to the advice received from the Attorney General and, where the Commission finds that activities under any license would tend to create a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, is authorized and directed to refuse to issue such license or establish such conditions to prevent such result as the Commission may determine necessary and appropriate. Upon the request of the Attorney General, the Commission shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information, including, but not limited to, contracts between the applicant and other parties relating to activities for which the license is sought, as the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this subsection. Where the advice furnished by the Attorney General states in substance that he does not favor issuance of such license or requests the Commission to impose thereon conditions requiring such applicant to alter or enter into any contracts or other arrangements with other parties relating to activities for which the license is sought, the Attorney General or his designee shall participate as a party in any proceedings that may thereafter be held on such license application. The Commission, with the approval of

the Attorney General, may except from the requirements of this subsection such classes or types of licenses as the Commission may determine would not significantly affect the applicant's activities under the antitrust laws as specified in subsection 105(a)."

SEC. 6. Subsection 161(n) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "finding of practical value" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "determination of substantial research activities."

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLFELD) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLFELD. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the 91st Congress I reintroduced the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. Joining with me were Representatives BLATNIK, REUSS, ROSENTHAL, ERLBORN, EDWARDS of Alabama, and HORTON. In the 90th Congress these Members joined me in sponsoring H.R. 12510, the predecessor bill reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations. Originally I introduced the bill at the commencement of the 90th Congress as H.R. 157, and identical bills were introduced separately by several Members. When H.R. 12510 was introduced as a clean bill and reported by the committee, the above-named Members joined with me in putting their names to it. In the 91st Congress the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement is numbered H.R. 474.

The Members will note from the sponsorship of H.R. 474 that it is bipartisan. The objectives of the bill are nonpartisan. Briefly we propose a temporary Commission to study the whole field of Government procurement and to make recommendations for greater economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The potential for savings is apparent when we consider that the Government now spends in the neighborhood of \$50 billion a year for the procurement of goods, services, and facilities. The Commission would be composed of 15 members, including four appointed by the Speaker of the House, four appointed by the President of the Senate, and six appointed by the President of the United States, with the Comptroller General or his designated representative serving as an additional ex officio member of the Commission.

According to the terms of the bill the Commission would study and investigate, first, the present statutes affecting Government procurement; second, procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the Federal departments and agencies; and, third, the procurement organizations which can most effectively accomplish the declared congressional policy for improved procurement set forth in section 1 of the bill. In an address to the Government Contract Conference of the Federal Bar Association held in Philadelphia, Pa., on March 2, 1967, I summed up the objectives of the bill in this way:

We want to improve Government procurement and contracting procedures and practices. We are interested in economy and ef-

iciency. We want Government to get its money's worth and contractors to be treated fairly. We want to examine the accretion of laws, iron out inconsistencies, close gaps in coverage, throw out what is obsolete, and recognize what is new and necessary. We want to reconcile the regulations within and among agencies which may have needless differences in phrasing or intent, to disseminate useful information more widely, to make the knowledge and experience of some agencies available to all.

When the Committee on Government Operations held hearings in April 1967 on H.R. 157, the original version of this bill, favorable testimony was received by the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, representatives of the Government's major procuring agencies, and professional and business spokesmen. As the committee stated in House Report No. 890 of the 90th Congress, first session, at page 7:

It is clear to the committee that not only Members of Congress receiving complaints from their business constituents, but those who do business for the Government, those who do business with the Government, and those in the legal and engineering professions who do business on both sides, all have an interest in this legislation. And certainly the taxpayers, who ultimately must foot the bills for these massive yearly procurements, will be interested in the Commission's recommendations for economy, efficiency, and improved management in Government procurement and contracting.

Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats endorsed the bill, I may note, before he knew that the committee would accept an amendment making him an ex officio member of the proposed Commission. The Comptroller General not only endorsed the bill, but outlined to the committee 15 subject areas in Government procurement which he considered particularly appropriate for study by the Commission.

Although H.R. 12510 was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations, it was not granted a rule by the Committee on Rules and therefore never got to the floor of the House. I hope that we will not be confronted with a similar situation in the 91st Congress. Before we report the bill again, however, we plan to hold extensive hearings on this bill during the present session, commencing later this month. The hearings will serve to reaffirm support for the bill in the Government, professional, and business sectors, give an up-to-date reading on the major procurement problems, and lay a solid fact base for committee and floor consideration. The Military Operations Subcommittee, under my direction, will conduct the hearings.

We will hold 7 days of hearings in March—March 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, and 27. Then, after the Easter recess, the hearings will resume in mid-April. Later hearings will be announced when scheduled.

That we have many procurement problems, the Members can plainly see. Committees have been active in exploring several facets of Government procurement and in developing remedial legislation. Indeed the 90th Congress has been very active in procurement investigations. However, if Members have the time

to read the hearings and reports of the several committees they will note that many important procurement areas are bypassed, others are overemphasized for their publicity value, and in-depth studies generally are lacking. The end results of these hearings and investigations in some cases are bits and pieces of legislation, hastily contrived in reaction to an immediate problem, and inserted into a yearly authorization or appropriation bill or some other legislative measure. There is no assessment of their significance or effect in the whole context of procurement laws and regulations.

During the 90th Congress, bits and pieces of legislation affecting Government procurement and contracting have been handled by the House Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance in extending the Renegotiation Act; by the House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency in extending the Defense Production Act; by the Armed Services Committees in the yearly authorization bills; and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in the yearly appropriation bills. Committees without legislative jurisdiction which have been actively investigating selected areas of Government procurement are the House and Senate Committees on Small Business and the Joint Economic Committee through its Subcommittee on Economy in Government. The House and Senate Committees on Government Operations, which have legislative jurisdiction over the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and across-the-board jurisdiction for determining the economy and efficiency of Government activities, also have examined into the Government procurement. All of these committees are doing good work and in no sense would I want to discourage them. However, none of these committees has the time, the staff, the resources, or the jurisdiction for the sustained, comprehensive review of Government procurement contemplated in H.R. 474.

Rightfully viewed, the findings and recommendations of an expert commission would give context and perspective to the work of the several congressional committees and help them in carrying out their legislative and investigative responsibilities. As one who served on the second Hoover Commission, I am well aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the commission form as an instrument for study and investigation of important public problems. Sometimes a commission serves merely for window dressing or to endorse a preconceived plan or program in the Government. Sometimes a commission is a device for postponing needed action. We all know that problems can be studied to death. I want to point out that the Commission on Government Procurement would serve no other purpose than to study, evaluate, and recommend, in a completely objective and nonpartisan fashion, ways and means to improve the public business in procuring needed goods, services, and facilities. It would endorse no preconceived plan or program, and certainly it would not postpone needed action, because it is obvious that the committees of Congress

are continually at work. What we need is more depth of study, broader perspective, systematic inquiry in Government procurement areas, including those which have been neglected as well as those which have received much attention without satisfactory solution.

Many commissions have been authorized by the Congress in recent years, and others have been appointed independently by the President. None could do a more worthwhile job than a Commission on Government Procurement. It would bring balance and breadth of understanding and reasoned judgment to solving a wide range of problems in Government procurement, which accounts for so large a segment of the yearly Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a recent letter by the Comptroller General endorsing H.R. 474. The letter is addressed to the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 26, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of January 15, 1969, requesting our comments on H.R. 474, 91st Congress, which would establish a Commission on Government Procurement.

Section 4(a) of the bill would empower the Commission to study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and the organizations by which procurement is accomplished to determine to what extent these facilitate the policy as set forth in section 1 of the bill to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the procurement of goods, services, and facilities by and for the executive branch of the Government.

The General Accounting Office is vitally concerned and active in promoting economy and efficiency in Government procurement. A substantial portion of our effort has been devoted to procurement and contract audits and the rendering of legal decisions on procurement matters. Our work in these areas lends support to the need for an inquiry to develop the means to achieve the specific objectives set forth in section 1.(1) to 1.(12) of the bill. In our report to you dated March 16, 1967, on the similar legislation proposing to establish a Commission on Government Procurement we included an appendix setting forth some of the problem areas recommended for consideration by the Commission. A copy of this appendix is enclosed. In our testimony before your Committee we expect to cover additional areas of inquiry which are now being developed.

The evolution of Federal procurement law can best be described as a gradual development of piecemeal legislation designed to solve or alleviate specific and, in some instances, relatively narrow problems as they have arisen from time to time. While it is true that two basic and fairly broad procurement statutes were enacted in the late 1940's (Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, 1949) these statutes deal primarily with procurement authority and procedures and do not expressly encompass the various ancillary laws and Government policies and

programs which have an impact on procurement. Moreover, these two basic statutes are under separate administration and each has its own implementing regulations.

H.R. 474 would authorize the Commission to make a broad and searching inquiry into every aspect of Government procurement. We believe that such an inquiry would be timely and should result in improved Government procurement procedures which, in turn, would be of great benefit to both the Government and the business community. We, therefore, endorse H.R. 474 and recommend its favorable consideration.

In the event the bill is enacted into law you may be assured that we will give the Commission our full cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,

Comptroller General of the United States.

APPENDIX

The 10 items set forth in section 1 of the bill are broad and significant areas for study in Government procurement. Within the framework of these 10 items, we suggest that the following specific subject would be worthy of consideration by the Commission:

1. Government policies in regard to the use of formal advertising and negotiation procedures. Are these policies being uniformly and correctly applied by the procurement agencies and do they result in the procurement of supplies and services at the lowest reasonable cost to the Government?

2. Methods used by procurement agencies in formulating, reviewing and approving procurement regulations.

3. Government programs and policies in regard to (1) labor surplus area set asides, (2) small business act asides, (3) Buy American Act, (4) labor standards and minimum wage provisions, and (5) furnishing Government-owned facilities. What effect do these programs have upon the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of procurement?

4. Sources of supplies and services.

A. Government policy concerning procurement of supplies and services (personal and nonpersonal) from Government as against private commercial sources.

B. Policy with respect to the use by Government contractors of Federal supply sources.

5. Consideration of ways and means of facilitating the procedures surrounding contract negotiation with a view towards making them less burdensome and more timely.

6. Consideration of ways by which paperwork associated with procurement could be reduced and simplified. In this connection a study could be undertaken to determine whether bid and offer solicitation documents could be simplified and more clearly drafted in order to give Government suppliers better notice of any unusual contract conditions and requirements.

7. Inquire into the need to define more fully (1) the extent to which contractors are permitted to use Government-owned tooling and equipment on commercial production, and (2) the basis for the establishment of equipment rental rates.

8. Should there be an overall Government policy as to the extent the Government should share in contractor's independent research and development costs?

9. Patents and proprietary data.

A. What should be the respective rights of the Government and the contractor in items developed under Government contracts where a substantial portion of the development costs have been borne either directly or indirectly by the Government?

B. Should the Government's procurement of patented or proprietary components or items be made on a competitive basis or restricted to the firm to which the item is proprietary or which holds the patent?

C. Inquire into the procedure under which

the Government acquires rights to proprietary data and the use by the Government of contractor's proprietary data in procurements from other sources.

10. Access to records.

A. Is the legal authority for access to contractor's records by Government representatives adequate to discharge the duties placed upon them by the Congress?

B. Are the laws relating to access to records sufficiently clear to insure recognition by all parties as to the types of records that may be examined?

11. Public Law 87-653 ("Truth in negotiations" statute).

A. Examine the experience under the act to determine whether such experience indicates a need to change the act or its implementing regulations.

B. Should the statute be made expressly applicable to civilian agencies?

C. Is there consistency in implementation of the act by procurement agencies?

12. Undertake a study of minimum wage requirements as they relate to Government contracting.

13. Undertake a study of Government debarment procedures, both under statutory and administrative authority, to determine whether these procedures are fair and afford adequate safeguards to contractors against unwarranted debarment.

14. Administrative settlement of claims under the standard Disputes clause.

A. Is there a need for greater uniformity in procedures and decisions of contract appeal boards?

1. If there is such a need, would the establishment of one or two Governmentwide appeal boards satisfy such need?

B. Should a procedure be established under which the Government would have an adequate right of review of adverse decisions by contract appeal boards similar to that presently enjoyed by contractors?

C. Examine the need and feasibility of developing suitable contract clauses to provide an administrative remedy for all contract disputes and, thus, avoid fractionalization of remedies.

15. Subcontracts.

A. Undertake a study to determine whether the no-privity rule should be relaxed in order to afford subcontractors direct access to the Government in the presentation of claims.

D. Undertake a study to determine whether it would be desirable or feasible for the Government to take an active role in assisting subcontractors and protecting them from possible abuses by prime-contractors.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee and a proponent of this bill.

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

As one of the cosponsors of H.R. 474 and also as one of the cosponsors of the bill introduced in the 90th Congress, I applaud the gentleman's efforts in the 90th Congress and his announcement today of the hearings which are being undertaken by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

I have the privilege of serving as ranking minority member on that subcommittee. I assure the Members of the House these hearings are going to be in-depth hearings with the purpose of indicating to the Membership the need for such a commission. I believe we have in many instances in this House had doubt cast upon resolutions and proposals for establishment of committees or commis-

sions, but in this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a very important function we are proposing, namely the establishment of this Commission on Procurement.

Procurement is one of the most widespread problems in the Federal Government. It accounts for a large part of the Defense budget. As the gentleman from California has indicated, our hearings will go in depth into the problems of procurement, reaching across the board into all areas.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an important point. This is an across-the-board hearing, just as the Commission itself would be empowered to make a procurement study on a Government-wide basis. It would transcend the jurisdictional areas of the separate committees of the House. The Committee on Agriculture can review certain problems of procurement by Government agencies and by the Department of Agriculture. Other departments can study the areas in which they have legislative jurisdiction. But this commission would be very much like the first Hoover Commission. It would conduct an across-the-board study, not of all the functions of Government, but of the specific function of procurement as practiced by the different agencies of the Government. This would include the rules and regulations which are applied to the procedures of bidding and to the evaluation of bids and all the other methods of procurement which the different agencies of Government practice within their own empires of procurement.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is emphasizing, if he will yield further, the point I was making, that only in the Government Operations Committee can this type of study be made, it seems to me. So, therefore, I think it is well that we take this time today to explain to the membership exactly what we will be doing in these hearings.

As the gentleman has explained, we are going to start hearings next week. We will have seven hearings before the Easter recess, and I understand from the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) we will have probably 25 to 30 hearings before we finish.

I hope as a result of the hearings we will be able to lay a sound basis for later judgment by the House of Representatives about the need for this type of commission.

It seems to me what has happened in the field of procurement has been that these different practices have grown up, and without any criticism of the executive or the legislative bodies, it seems to me the time has come today when the American people are demanding that there be economy and efficiency in these procedures. I believe we will be able as a result of these hearings to point up the need for the House to consider the proposal that is contained in H.R. 474.

I do want again to indicate to the chairman my willingness to do everything I can to be of assistance in these hearings. I wish to indicate to the House that the members of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee have met and

have given the chairman a commitment to be present as often as possible so that we can have a complete and full hearing, in order to justify the need for the Commission as set forth in H.R. 474.

It was the committee's thought at the time of the earlier hearings that we should not attempt to do what a commission itself should do; namely, to examine in depth and detail all the many important problems in all their ramifications. However, the growing concern in the Congress, generated by reports of overcharges, waste and mismanagement, makes it necessary to examine more closely the dimensions of these problems. We will hear from Government agencies, professional organizations, representatives from big and small industries, and others who have useful information to convey or important problems to bring to our attention.

I am sure that most Members of Congress have the same experience as I do. They receive many personal visits, telephone calls, telegrams and letters from businessmen who have problems in doing business with the Government. Many of these inquiries and complaints come from small businessmen, and as a member of the Committee on Small Business, I am conversant with their needs and their problems.

I hope that Members of the House will follow our hearings and support H.R. 474, which will bring expert review and beneficial recommendations for better management in the Government procurement area.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Illinois I should like to say that I brought up the problem, one might say, of committee jurisdiction.

The various committees of the House have separate jurisdictions in their particular legislative fields as to procurement legislation. Most of the committees become involved with legislation in one way or another in this field.

The Committee on Government Operations has an across-the-board jurisdiction on matters pertaining to the economical and efficient operation of the Government.

I have been chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee for the past 15 years. I would not even begin to try to tell of the many, many subjects, contracts, complaints of Members and so forth which this subcommittee has tried to solve. To the benefit of the taxpayers, to the benefit of business, and to the benefit of Members who had these problems, we have helped to solve many of them.

I would be the first to admit that no committee of the Congress, including the Subcommittee on Military Operations, has the resources or the time of its members to look into this matter as it should be looked into. I have come to that conclusion after years of effort and hard work trying to do so.

I believe my subcommittee, with its broad jurisdiction, could probably do as good a job as any. I am not apologizing for the job we have done. I am frankly and honestly recognizing the fact that, considering all our duties in our other committees and on the floor of the House

and to constituents from our districts when they visit us here in Washington, we cannot possibly give the concentration of time and attention to this overall problem of procurement which is needed.

Having served on the second Hoover Commission, I have come to the conclusion that a commission approach to this would be proper, with the Commission adequately staffed by experts drawn not only from business and professional quarters but also from the agencies of Government.

As Members know, the bill does provide for six Presidential appointees, and it also provides for the Comptroller General, who is probably as experienced as any man in the United States in dealing with procurement and contracting problems, to act as an ex officio member of this 15-man Commission.

I believe this is the way to approach the problem. This is where the money is being spent, in procurement. Over \$50 billion a year is spent in procurement by the agencies of Government. In this field efficient methods of procurement, standardization of bid procedures as nearly as possible, and elimination of duplication and waste can be accomplished.

This can be accomplished, in my opinion, by having a blue-ribbon commission appointed by the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the President of the United States, with the Commission given enough expert staff to do as the Hoover Commission did, to set up task forces in the different fields or different areas of procurement.

There are a number of different fields, as I will show when I put into the RECORD the material on the announcement of the hearings. I will show the scope of procurement problems. It is absolutely amazing.

It is so great that it causes you to pause and wonder if the problem can really be solved. However, I am personally convinced that no subcommittee or committee of the Congress can go into the tremendous complications and the details of the rules and regulations which alone fill up 25 to 30 volumes. That is why I am saying if we are going to solve the problem, we have to approach it by this method and not by the methods that we have been trying to follow in the past in the Congress.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my complete support of the statement that the gentleman has made with regard to the need for such a Commission. I want to emphasize, also, that when we went before the Committee on Rules in the 90th Congress some of the questioning seemed to indicate the scope of the Commission's proposed jurisdiction, and it was felt by the Committee on Rules members that the job could be done by existing committees of the House. I recall the gentleman from California at that point saying what he said here in the well essentially today; namely, that there is not any committee in the House today that can give the time, assuming that it had the broadest

jurisdiction, for an in-depth and systematic study of the procurement practices of the Federal Government. This is one phase of what we are getting ready to undertake here.

The other phase, which I think is also very important, is that even though we are going to have 25 or 30 days of hearings, which will involve many hours of hearings, all we will be able to do is scratch the surface. Is that not right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think in 25 or 30 days of hearings we can cover the areas which need to be studied and set forth the reasons for studying those areas. I do not believe that we can reach the solutions of the problems that are in these areas. We can have some of the problems stated by the different people who are in procurement in the different agencies of the Government and other experts in this field, but I am sure that we can more or less outline a very fine program for study. Then I think it will be up to the commission and its task forces thoroughly to examine the different areas of procurement and to come up with recommendations for the improvement of procedures in those areas. That is what I think.

Mr. HORTON. One further question, if the gentleman will yield further. If in the course of our hearings we find that there is legislation needed, then it would be our procedure to recommend that legislation to the appropriate committee which would have jurisdiction of the matter. I wanted to clarify that. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad that the gentleman from New York brought up that problem. This is not an attempt to impose anything on the jurisdiction of any of the committees of Congress. All the recommendations would have to go to the committee having jurisdiction. For instance, if there was a recommendation in the handling of foodstuffs or in relation to Public Law 480, any recommendation in that field would go to the Committee on Agriculture. Any recommendation which would be in the field of improving the defense procurement procedures would go to the Committee on Armed Services. Likewise matters dealing with interstate and foreign commerce would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and matters dealing with small business to the Small Business Committee or the Banking and Currency Committee. In other words, these matters would go to the committee of jurisdiction and not necessarily to the Committee on Government Operations. This would be the plan which would take into consideration and preserve the legislative jurisdiction of every committee of the House.

Mr. HORTON. I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that there was some apprehension in the 90th Congress that this proposal had to do only with procurement in the area of the Department of Defense. That is not what we are talking about exclusively; we are talking about procurement in the entire jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Federal Government. In other words, all procurement matters as they relate to the Federal Government. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. A great part of the procurement is being done in the Department of Defense, but it is not by any means inclusive of the procurement which is being done by other agencies of the Government under the laws of the Congress that have been passed and which come under other committees.

And, so, it is necessary to study the whole field in order to come up with uniform procedures and the elimination of faulty procedures.

Now, I might say that in certain areas the Department of Defense takes the lead in better procurement practices. But there are other areas of the Department of Defense that could stand improvement. There are many areas in the other departments of Government which are not up to date as much as is the Department of Defense.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

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

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

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding to me at this time. I wish to join with the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from New York in this discourse about H.R. 474.

As has been stated, this bill, or a similar bill, was introduced in the last session of Congress and was reported to the Committee on Rules. I was a cosponsor at that time and I was sorry that we were not able to bring the bill out onto the floor of the House for its debate.

I am certain that the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from New York have well covered the purposes of this bill as well as the questions of jurisdiction that are so important.

I hope that at the conclusion of the many days of hearings on the bill that the chairman of our subcommittee has scheduled we will have made the legislative record that will prove the necessity for the kind of study which is called for in H.R. 474.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 474, the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. As the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) has said, the sponsorship of the bill is bipartisan and the objectives are non-partisan. We are not interested in attacking any individuals or undermining any particular Government programs. Our purpose is to bring more economy and efficiency into the biggest business in the world—the \$50 billion annual business of the U.S. Government in procuring goods, services, and facilities.

As I participated in or observed the various activities of the 89th and 90th Congresses, both in committee and on the floor, I was all the more impressed with the need for an expert Commission on Government Procurement. A number of committees, in discharging their legislative tasks were confronted with problems relevant to Government procurement and contracting. They needed a better base of information in this field, and lacking it, did the best they could.

The relation of excess profits to procurement methods, the feasibility of uniform accounting for defense contractors, ceilings on indirect costs for grants and contracts, price considerations in urgent procurements—these were some of the problems which were considered by separate committees and were the subject of legislative action of one kind or another.

All committees of the Congress would benefit by the work of the Commission on Government Procurement. The basic procurement laws are now two decades old. A mountain of procurement regulations has grown on top of them. It is time to survey the field and see what changes and improvements are needed in the interest of more economy and efficiency in Government, fair dealing with contractors and good performance on their part, and better service to the public. So far as I know, there has never been a statutory commission exclusively devoted to this field. It is time we created one and put it to work.

I thank the gentleman and I want to compliment the gentleman in the well for taking the leadership that he has in this very important field of study of governmental procurement and I am happy to join with him in his efforts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks. I believe the gentleman would agree with me that this is a matter of concern to the present administration as well as to the previous administration. I am looking forward hopefully to the support of the executive branch of the Government in this field because I believe it will rest upon its merits and that they will recognize that this is a nonpartisan effort on our part. Therefore, I do wish to thank the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle who are members of our committee for their valiant support in the past and beseech it for the future.

Would the distinguished gentleman from Illinois agree with me that he believes that this will also be in the interest of the new administration in the executive branch of Government?

Mr. ERLBORN. If the gentleman will yield I certainly believe that it will be, and it should be. As the gentleman from California well knows, in the hearings which were held on the prior bill there was no opposition from the executive branch or from the agencies that the bill is designed to cover and to study with reference to procurement practices. I am certain that will be true again and I hope we will have substantial support for H.R. 474.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous-consent request I wish to place at the conclusion of my prepared remarks a copy of a letter under date of February 26, 1969, from the Comptroller General of the United States in which he also endorses this study. I might also add that I have had conversations with some of the members of the Bureau of the Budget and they have also expressed a great interest in this matter. Therefore, I am expecting when we call their representatives before us that we shall have their support for this very badly needed study.

TAX BREAK FOR THE AMERICAN COMMUTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we gave a tax break to John Q. Straphanger, the American commuter.

Our present system imposes an unfair burden of taxation on those persons who incur expenses traveling to and from work. It permits a businessman to deduct traveling expenses under the theory that they are "ordinary and necessary" to the conduct of his business, but it does not permit the working man and woman a similar deduction.

Surely the expense of commuting to and from work is "ordinary and necessary" to the taxpayer's source of income, whether he is the employer or the employee. He is certainly not traveling back and forth every day for the fun of it. He is doing it to earn the income on which he pays heavy enough taxes.

The taxpayer must spend a substantial portion of his salary just to be physically present at his place of work, certainly the most fundamental of all the expenses of holding a job. If ever there was a legitimate expense, this is it.

And the plight of the commuter has been further exacerbated by the shortage of suitable inner-city housing, rapid suburbanization and the general failure to provide suitable and inexpensive mass transit facilities. As a result, the working man must not only pay exorbitant commuter fares, but the current system forces him to pay a tax on that money, as well.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to permit taxpayers to deduct up to \$250 a year from income taxation for expenses incurred in traveling to and from work.

The bill would allow deductions for the cost of subway, railway, and bus fares, as well as expenses for autos used to commute to work.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would do more than just provide tax relief for commuters. It might well encourage people who now drive to work to use transit facilities instead. This could result in increased revenues to mass facilities and could prove to be a tremendous relief to our ever-growing traffic problems.

I have always believed, Mr. Speaker, that meaningful and justified tax relief is an integral part of tax reform. It is not enough for us to merely end existing favoritisms in our tax system. We must see to it that those who have thus far borne a disproportionately heavy share of the tax load now receive a measure of relief.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

POLICY, PLAN TO BUILD "FLOOR OF PROSPERITY" AVAILABLE NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1205, the Pay-As-You-Go Social Security Prosperity Insurance Act,

to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monetary benefits to those 60 and over, based on minimum wage standards. It would also provide for the disabled, for children and families deprived of parental support, for persons unemployed because of automation, and students 18 to 25.

This is the up-to-date application of the principles of the original Townsend plan to today's problems of social security and poverty. Its purpose is to "reflate" the "deflated" human life in our country—deflated by loss of income—command in old age, disability, families' loss of parental support, the elimination of jobs by technological advances and financial inability to command education sufficient to qualify people for existing and available employment. It would be accomplished by means of a national pension upon retirement, or on encountering disability, or the other just mentioned income-denying misfortunes.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend and the dedicated associates who have carried forward the plan he originally envisioned have greatly contributed to concentrating public opinion on these great needs. For development of present legislation and its constructive advances, I believe great credit belongs to them and to their plan for prosperous instead of impoverished retirement for all Americans as a matter of right.

The bitter fears which old age and disabling misfortunes held for people only a generation ago have been blunted. "Over the hill to the poorhouse" is a long-dead phrase. While we constantly learn more of its shortcomings, present legislation is a far cry from the total dependence and complete pauperism of most aged and disabled before Dr. Townsend's crusade and the enactment of social security.

While we take satisfaction from such progress, we must recognize that, despite our legislative labors for justice, the social tensions so violently obvious in recent months sternly warn our achievements are minimum and leave great gaps of problems unsolved. In fact, ever since World War II, virtually every Congress has adopted ever broader social security amendments; but each set of amendments has only revealed the need for still greater ones. The last, 1967 amendments, have emphatically lived up to that pattern. The scope of proposed changes has simply tidal-waved. Obviously, our works have been of great, humane value so far as they have gone; but, obviously, too, we need a policy and plan which will substantially solve—not just temporarily ameliorate—the problems.

H.R. 1205 contains such principles and programs. I believe Mr. John Doyle Elliott, secretary of the Townsend Foundation, in testimony to the Democratic Party Platform Committee, closely defined the real difference between present legislation and H.R. 1205 in the following passage:

Before turning to the "financial technology" through which such benefits are to be implemented, beneficially to all honest interests, let us note certain truths about these benefits. First, the benefits of this Act will stand the permanently and temporarily unemployable (as distinguished from unemployed who are employable) solidly on a

"floor of prosperity" below which they need never live. Present programs' inadequate benefits literally hand people under a "ceiling of poverty"—right in the midst of its misery.

"Nobody need more than look at the millions—especially our ever growing legion of elderly—who are unemployable, to realize that until we establish this "floor of prosperity" below which all persons encountering unemployability need not live, we won't conquer poverty and its unjust evils, no matter what other successes and glory we achieve. In fact, the greater our other successes and glories, the less justified becomes our continued allowance of poverty in any form.

Second, the benefits herein proposed must be viewed in the light of creating what other proposals and existing programs do not—that prosperity (as defined above) which must replace the poverty which constitutes our problem—and our danger, too, beyond anything any foreign foe may venture.

In this respect, we have so-called "poverty-lines" (as promulgated by the Social Security Administration) and "eligibility criteria" (per war-on-poverty officialdom for calibrating individuals' needs for aid). These standards are not only "ceilings of poverty" under which people are suspended, right in poverty's midst; they're not better than halfway up out of it to start with! Not, at least, as far as freedom from want is concerned, even though superior to public assistance standards, now, in most States.

Most impressive are the suggestions recently coming forth for amendments to present legislation. They honor H.R. 1205 in the sincerest way possible—by imitation. It leads me to observe now as I did 2 years ago:

The sense of history repeating itself persists. In the Townsend plan, where in the past we found the guiding ideas for improving social security, I believe we will find the guidelines for its perfection, in the future.

I believe this assembly of circumstances requires in the public interest that Congress take a closer-than-ever look at this pay-as-you-go Social Security and Prosperity Insurance Act whenever we face the mounting problems of social security and poverty.

Technological progress, in multiplying our ability to produce wealth, has benefited most of our people beyond any dreams of our fathers—and of most of mankind, even now. We must also honestly recognize, however, that in applying such new tools to industry and business tens of millions have suffered tremendous injury and loss. Even more millions have been left far behind, reaping only pittance instead of the great, prospering gains acquired by most.

The most important group in this respect are the aged because they are the category to whose membership all are inevitably destined. Sadly, the economic heritage of most American elderly is severe, constantly deepening, unjust financial impoverishment.

That is the truth—despite all our social security policies and programs—public and private combined with all other income sources people themselves can acquire—as authenticated by Census Bureau's annual report—series P-60—on income distribution by age and sex. The facts are:

First. In 1947, persons 65 and over had 34.5 percent the median income of those 25 through 64. By 1967, with all our programs and legislation, it had shriv-

elled to 29.2 percent—a drop of 15.4 percent.

Second. In recent years, decline by the aged has not only continued—it has accelerated.

In 1964, men over 65 had a median income of \$2,037—\$2,904 less than men 55 through 64. Women had \$952—\$958 less than women 55 through 65.

In 1965, men over 65 had \$2,116—\$3,134 less than men 55 through 64. Women had \$984—\$1,035 less than those 55 through 64.

In 1966, men over 65 had \$2,162—\$3,588 less than men 55 through 64. Women had \$1,087—\$1,129 less than those 55 through 64.

In 1967, men over 65 had \$2,304—\$3,818 less than men 55 through 64. Women had \$1,123—\$1,229 less than those 55 through 64.

Third. In 1947, there were 10,641,000 persons over 65; in 1967, 18,245,000, up 71.5 percent. In 1947, there were 72,497,000, 25 through 64, in 1967, 86,513,000, up only 19.3 percent.

Thus, the elderly are increasing nearly four times faster than younger adults. We are accumulating steadily greater economic depression for this ever greater part of our adult population, the aged, to whose membership virtually all of us are destined.

Mr. Speaker, those are the facts.

Can anybody need more compelling reasons to look with ever greater attention at the up-to-date embodiment of the original Townsend plan, as poverty perpetuates under prevailing policy—not actually holding the line as the problems consistently outrun the remedies?

Mr. Speaker, in all good sense and justice, automation and other such advances should benefit all and hurt none. They should make it possible to avoid impoverishments and not, in mismanagement under the stingy, obsolete rules of scarcity, occasion injury to countless millions and tremendous and irretrievable loss to our country.

In the future, I hope to present the financial methodology by which H.R. 1205 provides for equitably and, for all honest interests, profitably financing the genuine solution of the problems of social security and unjust poverty. For now, I wish only to background introduction of this bill with the established facts dictating that the public interest increasingly calls for its ever closer consideration as its alternatives fail to accomplish the results justice requires.

Mr. Speaker, history certainly teaches that the test of wisdom and prophecy is fulfillment. I believe history offers few clearer examples of wisdom and prophecy being honored by fulfillment than has been and increasingly is the case with this plan. Here is a swift summary of the evidence.

From the very start, about three and one-half decades ago, enacted as the alternative to the original Townsend plan, social security legislation has steadily moved in the directions of various facets of the Townsend plan. From its original partial coverage of the people, it has moved to virtually universal coverage. From providing only old-age insurance, it has embraced survivors insurance, disability insurance, and health insurance, plus the opening phase of educational in-

insurance. From the hard line of age 65 for retirement, maintained adamantly for nearly three decades, it has moved far toward age 60. From almost no allowed earnings without loss of benefits, it has almost wholly adopted the Townsend bill's principle of \$1 loss of benefits for each \$2 earned—and this year, wide support for public assistance recipients to be allowed to keep half of any earnings has unfolded.

Under medicare, even the relation between benefits and past earnings was dropped in favor of equal benefits for all aged alike.

For fully three decades the benefits of present legislation and of the financial structure which could provide no better were adamantly defended and Townsend plan benefit concept rejected as impracticable. In the last 2 years particularly rising demands for greatly increased minimum benefits—up to \$150 monthly—have appeared. In January 1968, the President appointed the Commission on Income Maintenance programs "to examine" all plans which might help solve the "income needs of all the American people," clearly recognizing prevailing programs and policies have not and can not do the job which should be done.

On March 1, the "Riots Commission" advised public guarantee of poverty-barring income through "more adequate levels of assistance on the basis of uniform national standards instead of States setting assistance amounts." April 29, the Special Senate Committee on Aging, in Senate Report 1098, pinpointed inadequate income as "now more than ever the major problem of Americans living in retirement"; and pictured a "steadily worsening situation unless a genuinely comprehensive Federal plan for action is fashioned." It urged adjustment of benefits to both rising living costs and standards. The minority substantially agreed on these points.

In June HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen said:

We must assure a basic income which permits them to participate fully in community and family life.

These are words right out of the statement of purpose of H.R. 1205.

The Democratic Platform called for drastic benefit increases, especially minimum benefits; for abandonment of the "hodge podge" of States, inadequate assistance plans and for uniform national standards of assistance, Federally financed. Both party platforms agreed on benefits advancing to meet rising living costs. On these points at the recent conference of Republican Governors, Nelson Rockefeller substantially agreed.

I recommend study of H.R. 1205 by all as embodying the ideas and principles and programs needed to perfect social security and end poverty, including the financial ways and means to make these achievements into an efficiently working mechanism of prosperity insurance.

NO MATTER HOW MUCH THE CONGRESS AUTHORIZES OR APPROPRIATES FOR GOVERNMENT HEALTH PROGRAMS, IT NEVER SEEMS TO BE ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentle-

man from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the Congress authorizes or appropriates for Government health programs, it never seems to be enough. Those who believe that all problems can be solved if we just keep throwing money at them continue to picture us as an aggregation of cheapskates, who are absolutely oblivious to the cries of the sick.

I have taken this special order for the purpose of demonstrating that we have been more than generous in providing for the health needs of the Nation. A careful perusal of President Johnson's last budget shows that \$12,270,899,000 was obligated for health programs during fiscal 1968. Estimated obligations for fiscal 1969 and fiscal 1970 will be \$13,585,101,000 and \$15,392,232,000, respectively.

Except for comparative pittances allotted to the Federal Radiation Council, all of the programs that require such huge outlays of taxpayers' funds are administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. None of the programs that the Veterans' Administration operates for the benefit of former servicemen have been included.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that considerable duplication and overlapping can be found among the myriad of health programs that are run by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such duplications and overlapping must be eliminated if we are going to trim the budget for fiscal 1970 and bring it into balance.

The tabulation which follows includes descriptions of the various programs:

	[In thousands of dollars]		
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE			
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service			
Air pollution control:			
Abatement and control:			
Grants	17,021	22,755	25,300
Direct operations	4,370	8,861	10,077
Research, development, and demonstration:			
Grants and contracts	7,641	24,701	31,300
Direct operations	14,327	20,943	22,033
Manpower training:			
Grants	2,706	3,159	3,500
Direct operations	1,251	1,900	1,990
Program direction and management services	2,280	2,500	2,600
Total program costs, funded	49,596	84,819	96,800
Change in selected resources	12,071		
Total obligations	61,667	84,819	96,800

Abatement and control. Grants are made to regional, State, and local air pollution control agencies on a matching basis for the purpose of establishing, developing, improving, and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Grants are also available for planning programs under the Air Quality Act of 1967. Direction operations: This includes direct Federal abatement in interstate and intrastate areas, enforcement of Federal automotive vehicle emission standards, technical assistance to States and local governments, the Federal facilities pollution control program, and implementation of the emergency episode provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Research, development, and demonstration. Grants and contracts: Grants are made to public agencies and communities for surveys to assess their air pollution problems and to demonstrate control techniques. Grants are also made to universities and other nonprofit institutions to conduct research into air pollution problems. Contracts relating to fuels and vehicles are used to accelerate research and development into new and improved methods, having industrywide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels. Direct operations: This includes research into the nature and extent of air pollution; its transport and atmospheric behavior; the effects on humans, other biologic systems, property, and the atmosphere itself; and improvement in means for controlling pollution. The 1970 program will continue and expand the ongoing research in automotive vehicle emissions, sulfur oxides pollution, and development of air quality criteria, and will place primary emphasis on research areas designated for special attention by the Air Quality Act of 1967. These include accelerated research into new and improved methods, having industrywide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution from the combustion of fuels; development of air quality criteria and emission control techniques as preliminary to subsequent application and regulatory enforcement measures; a comprehensive economic cost study; and a program of registration by manufacturers and processors of all additives placed in fuels used for combustion.

Manpower training. Grants: Fellowship awards support individual postgraduate training in air pollution research and control activities; training grants are awarded to universities to support the development and improvement of, primarily, graduate-level air pollution curricula and to provide student stipends. Direct operations: Training of technical personnel for Federal, State, and local government research and control operations is carried out.

Program direction and management services. Overall executive direction and supervision of Federal air pollution activities and formulation of program and administrative policies are carried out. Direction, supervision, and coordination of administrative services, including financial and personnel management, general services, contracting and facilities planning are also provided. During 1970, emphasis will be directed at coordinating and assisting Federal, State, and local efforts at establishing effective control programs in cooperation with the designation of Air Quality Control Regions. The increase requested will provide for additional executive direction to support the expanded programs.

	[In thousands of dollars]		
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Buildings and facilities:			
Total program costs, funded	950	22,075	10,309
Change in selected resources	-45		
Total obligations	905	22,075	10,309

The 1970 request provides for continuation of a program of major alterations, repairs, and improvements of existing buildings and facilities.

	[In thousands of dollars]		
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and Expenses, Office of the Administrator: Management and central services (costs, funded obligations)			
	5,504	5,830	6,203

The Office of the Administrator directs, administers, and coordinates consumer protection and environmental health activities of the Department. This consists of: establishment of basic Service policies, goals, and objectives; provision of legislative, public and intergovernmental affairs, and policy compliance functions for the Service; provision of leadership in evaluating and formulating plans related to Service research and development activities; provision and coordination of overall Service program planning, development, implementation, and assessment; and provision of Service administrative management planning, direction, coordination, evaluation, and assistance and management consultation to operating programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FOOD AND DRUG CONTROL			
Medical evaluation:			
Grants.....	891	821	821
Direct operations.....	18,643	17,953	18,853
Scientific research and evaluation:			
Grants.....	870	870	870
Direct operations.....	15,320	15,508	15,969
Education and voluntary compliance.....	1,363	1,275	1,296
Regulatory compliance:			
Grants.....	919	690	690
Direct operations.....	28,154	28,515	29,338
Program direction and management services.....	4,939	4,812	4,861
Total program costs, funded.....	71,099	70,444	72,698
Change in selected resources.....	-3,828		
Total obligations.....	67,271	70,444	72,698

Medical evaluation. Grants: Research grants are awarded to universities and other eligible institutions to support studies of accidental poisonings, burns, and other product-related injuries. Direct operations: Medical policy pertaining to the efficacy and safety of drugs is developed and promulgated. New drug applications proposing the sale of human and veterinary drugs, as well as claims for investigational drugs, are evaluated. An adverse drug-reaction program and an epidemiological program, as well as clinical studies of drugs, are conducted. The medical aspects of the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory programs and court cases are developed. Studies of the detrimental effects of long-term exposure to pesticides are performed intramurally and through contracts. Labels of pesticides are evaluated before the Department of Agriculture registers them. Data on poisonous substances are collected and disseminated; and programs to reduce injuries resulting from hazardous products are conducted. The 1970 increase will provide for additional effort in the review of drug submissions from industry, and for an expansion of research on contraceptives and drug equivalency.

Scientific research and evaluation. Grants: Research grants are awarded to State agencies and other qualified investigators to promote the study of pesticide-caused hazards. Direct operations: Biological and chemical research is conducted intramurally and through contracts to support the agency's regulatory mission. Regulations are developed and promulgated for pesticide residue tolerances and exemptions, food additives, color additives, and food standards; scientific evaluations are made of the submission required by those regulations and of the labeling of hazard products. Methods and bases for the evaluation of petitions and the establishment of tolerances are developed. Scientific activities of the agency are coordinated, and a scientific information system is

maintained. A facility has been established in the field to support regulatory activities through expeditious analysis of drug samples.

Education and voluntary compliance. Programs are conducted to enlist industry's voluntary compliance with the law and to educate and inform consumers. Programs aimed at industry include seminars on good manufacturing practices, the self-certification program for food manufacturers, and other advisory or training services to help improve the quality of its products.

Regulatory compliance. Grants: Research grants are made available to State agencies, universities, and other eligible institutions to support research in shellfish sanitation. Direct operations: Nationwide inspectional, investigational, and analytical programs are carried out to administer the laws that are the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration. Methodology research is performed intramurally to develop methods used in the analysis of product samples; inspectional and other field actions are reviewed to evaluate the degree of compliance with the law; and evidence is developed to support court cases where necessary.

Program direction and management services. The executive functions include the establishment of policy; the formulation and promulgation of agencywide plans, budgets, and directives; the allocation of resources; the day-to-day direction of the agency; the evaluation of performance and accomplishments; the maintenance of liaison with Congress and other Government agencies; and the coordination of the agency's activities in the area of international affairs. Management services are provided in the areas of financial management, mail and records, printing and distribution, facilities management, supply management, management services, personnel, and training.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1969 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL			
Solid wastes:			
Grants.....	7,831	10,084	9,584
Direct operations.....	3,517	5,191	5,588
Occupational safety and health:			
Grants.....	2,430	3,443	3,443
Direct operations.....	2,949	4,020	4,590
Radiological health:			
Grants.....	4,294	4,296	4,296
Direct operations.....	12,887	11,887	13,057
Community environmental management:			
Grants.....	4,735	5,750	4,369
Direct operations.....	20,289	11,627	6,848
Water hygiene:			
Grants.....	420	358	358
Direct operations.....	1,735	1,824	2,435
Program direction and management services.....	2,862	3,080	3,130
Total program costs, funded.....	63,949	61,560	57,698
Change in selected resources.....	4,702		
Total obligations.....	68,651	61,560	57,698

Solid wastes. Grants: Research, training, demonstration, and planning grants support this activity. Direct operations: The solid wastes program is designed to ensure proper health protection and improved solid wastes disposal practices and technology through research, training, technical assistance, demonstration development, and systems planning. The 1970 increase will provide field demonstrations, studies in reuse and disposal of wastes, and initiation of computer analysis to solid wastes management.

Occupational safety and health. Grants: Research and training grants support this activity. Direct operations: Research is conducted and assistance provided to Federal,

State, and local agencies and to industry for prevention and control of occupational hazards and diseases. The 1970 increase will provide for expansion of studies on the health problems of uranium workers.

Radiological health. Grants: Research and training grants support this activity. Direct operations: This program has the responsibility for conducting a national program for the control and prevention of radiological hazards to public health, involving both basic and applied research on the sources, levels, and effects of radiation as well as means of protecting the public. A training program is utilized to provide the competencies needed in the expanding area of radiation protection and control. Technical assistance is provided to State and local agencies to aid in the development of their own radiation programs. The 1970 increase will be used for further expansion of research and development related to radiological health hazards associated with electronic products.

Community environmental management. Grants: Research and training grants and fellowships support this activity. Direct operations: This program directs its efforts to managing environmental conditions associated with man's home, neighborhood, metropolitan area, and regional complexities. Assistance is provided to communities through technical consultation, training, demonstrations, and establishment of criteria for planning healthful environments for urban areas and the development and application of standards to improve the quality of healthful housing. Effective programs for the control and prevention of foodborne illnesses are developed in conjunction with other Federal agencies, States, communities, and the food industry. Investigations are conducted on health and sanitary hazards associated with interstate travel including implementation of the Interstate Quarantine Regulations. The program is also engaged in research and developmental efforts aimed at control of the threat posed by the Aedes aegypti mosquito. The Arctic Health Center emphasizes an environmental health program which will enhance human adaptation to and health in cold weather climates.

Water hygiene. Grants: Research and training grants and fellowships support this activity. Direct operations: The responsibility of this program is to assure that the quality of the nation's waters intended for drinking, recreation, and other human contact is maintained at safe levels. Through research, training and technological assistance, standards development, and interstate regulatory and certification activities, guidance and leadership are provided to States and local communities for safeguarding the sanitary quality of water supplies. The 1970 increase will be used to conduct a program of epidemiological surveillance of selected communities related to their water supplies and on the status of community water supplies, and to permit more effective Department of Health, Education, and Welfare participation in the nationwide interdepartmental water resources planning activities.

Program direction and management services. The Office of the Commissioner of the Environmental Control Administration directs and coordinates the programs of the Administration and furnishes management services for the Administration's performance. This is accomplished by (1) formulation of administrative and program policies, coordination of research and development activities and dissemination of information, and (2) providing of management activities with regard to program planning, legislative matters, financial and personnel management, procurement, office services, and organizational and staffing problems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
REVOLVING FUND FOR CERTIFICATION AND OTHER SERVICES			
Certification services:			
Antibiotics.....	2,457	2,480	2,495
Color additives.....	463	560	560
Insulin.....	58	73	73
Establishment of tolerances:			
Pesticides.....	222	250	250
Total operating costs.....	3,200	3,363	3,378
Capital outlay funded: Purchase of equipment.....			
	424	160	145
Total program costs, funded.....	3,624	3,523	3,523
Changes in selected resources.....	-153		
Total obligations.....	3,471	3,523	3,523

The Food and Drug Administration certifies batches of antibiotics, insulin, and color additives for use in food, drugs, or cosmetics; it also establishes tolerances for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural products and for color additives in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. These services are financed wholly by fees paid by the industries affected.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS			
Food and drug control.....	175	112	112
Air pollution control.....		40	40
Environmental control.....	3,566	4,206	4,206
Total obligations.....	3,741	4,358	4,358
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMIN- ISTRATION			
Mental Health			
Support and conduct of research:			
Grants:			
Research.....	72,306	81,159	82,273
Hospital improvement.....	10,491	10,601	8,000
Early child care demon- strations.....			1,000
Direct operations:			
Intramural research.....	14,625	17,339	18,259
Planning, development, and administration.....	3,262	5,070	5,775
Manpower development:			
Grants:			
Training.....	96,518	109,046	112,500
Fellowships.....	10,155	10,641	10,866
Direct operations.....	2,532	3,094	4,583
Support of State and com- munity programs:			
Grants:			
Construction of com- munity mental health centers.....	41,937	50,000	40,500
Staffing of community mental health centers.....	43,359	46,032	51,300
Narcotic addiction and alcoholism community assistance.....	4,000	8,000	12,000
Direct operations.....	2,158	2,364	2,379
Service activities:			
Narcotic addict treatment program.....	12,567	14,663	17,526
Regional and field activi- ties.....	2,230	2,346	2,346
Scientific communication and public education.....	1,494	2,588	2,771
Program direction and management services.....	4,419	4,971	5,221
Total program costs, funded.....	322,053	367,923	377,299
Change in selected re- sources.....	5,151		
Total obligations.....	327,204	367,923	377,299

Support and conduct of research. Grants: Research: Grants are awarded on a project basis for behavioral, clinical, psychological,

and applied research in the area of mental health. Clinical research centers and general research support grants are also supported. Hospital improvement: These project grants to State institutions for the mentally ill are designed to improve the quality of care, treatment, and rehabilitation in these institutions. Early child care demonstrations: These grants are designed to demonstrate and evaluate various methods of contributing to early, healthy child development and preventing emotional disturbances and mental illness among young children from poor and culturally deprived families. Direct operations: Intramural research: Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in the behavioral and biological sciences; e.g., psychiatry, socioeconomic studies, neurobiology, and neurochemistry. Additionally there is laboratory and clinical research in special mental health problems of neuropharmacology, clinical psychopharmacology, narcotic addiction, and alcoholism. Planning, development, and administration: This supports the planning, development, and administration of grant and contract programs in behavioral sciences research, applied research, clinical research, and psychopharmacological research. It also includes those multidisciplinary programs which focus and coordinate the Institute's efforts in special areas of concern, such as alcoholism, suicide prevention, crime and delinquency, schizophrenia, and the mental health of children and families.

Manpower development. Grants: Training: Grants are made to training institutions for training in psychiatry, behavioral sciences, psychiatric nursing, psychiatric social work, and other mental health disciplines. Experimental and special programs and continuing education in the mental health field are included as well as special training in such areas as alcoholism, drug abuse, and suicide prevention. Fellowships: Awards are made on the basis of excellence to individuals involved in mental health research. Direct operations: Analytic studies of manpower are undertaken and the national mental health training program is coordinated and supported. Emphasis is given to the full range of manpower requirements in the field of mental health including the disciplines of psychiatry, behavioral sciences, psychiatric nursing, and social work. Also funded in this subactivity are the training activities of the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research and a program for training psychiatrists for careers in the Public Health Service.

Support of state and community programs. Grants: Construction of community mental health centers: Grants are awarded for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers. Staffing of community mental health centers: Grants are awarded on a project basis to eligible community mental health centers for partial support of the staffing costs of these centers. Narcotic addiction and alcoholism community assistance: These grants provide partial support for the construction and staffing of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics. This activity also provides for grants to nonprofit agencies to cover the cost of developing specialized training programs for prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and conducting surveys and field trials for evaluating narcotic addiction prevention and treatment programs with a view to their improvement. Direct operations: The administration and stimulation of the community mental health centers program is undertaken in this subactivity as well as technical program assistance such as the mental hospital improvement program and its corollary, the mental hospital inservice training program. The nucleus for ex-

perimental, model community mental health centers, is also funded from this subactivity.

Service activities. Narcotic addict treatment program: This provides for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts under control arrangements with community agencies; the multidisciplinary programs of the Center for Studies of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, and the activities of the narcotics hospitals at Lexington, Kentucky, and Fort Worth, Texas. Regional and field activities: The professional activities related to mental health programs in the Department's regional offices are funded in this subactivity. It also covers the central office coordination of regional programs and the Institute's relationships with other Federal agencies, professional societies, and State and community organizations. Scientific communication and management services: The National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information which collects and disseminates scientific and technical information in the mental health field and the Institute's public education program are funded here.

Program direction and management services. Central Institute program planning and evaluation, biometric and legislative services, and administrative management are funded in this subactivity.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION			
Construction:			
Hospitals and public health centers.....			
	95,041	109,220	107,316
Long-term care facilities.....	61,053	55,816	54,836
Diagnostic or treatment centers.....	15,111	16,856	15,884
Rehabilitation facilities.....	10,767	9,653	10,504
Modernization.....	51,054	76,120	76,120
Operations and technical services.....	3,762	3,881	4,015
Total program costs, funded.....	236,788	271,546	268,675
Change in selected resources.....	41,695		
Total obligations.....	278,483	271,546	268,675

Construction. Federal funds are provided for the construction and modernization of hospitals, long-term care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, diagnostic or diagnostic and treatment centers, public health centers, and related health facilities. The modernization program provides funds for the renovation and replacement of hospitals and other health facilities which are functionally or structurally obsolete and inefficient or unsafe to operate.

Operations and technical services. State agencies are provided technical assistance in making inventories of their hospitals, public health centers, and other health facilities and in determining the type, size, and locations of additional facilities required, and developing programs to meet the indicated needs. Technical assistance is also provided to States and to communities regarding the planning, programming, and design of hospital and other medical facilities, including facilities for the care of the mentally retarded. Proposed hospital and other health facility projects are reviewed to determine eligibility and compliance with the law and regulations. State plans and their annual revisions are reviewed for conformance with planning criteria and guidelines. Project applications, plans and specifications, wage rates, and contracts are reviewed for compliance with standards, and surveillance is maintained over projects under construction.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES			
Partnership for health grants:			
Planning.....	8,052	20,861	20,000
Formula grants.....	57,270	66,032	72,000
Project grants.....	43,463	86,600	98,000
Migrant health program:			
Grants.....	7,200	7,200	12,000
Direct operations.....	787	900	910
Standard setting and resources development.....	9,315	10,318	11,256
Program direction and management services.....	2,804	2,129	2,184
Total program costs, funded.....	128,891	194,040	216,350
Change in selected resources.....	14,358		
Total obligations.....	143,249	194,040	216,350

Partnership for health grants. Planning: (1) Formula grants for comprehensive State health planning provide support for basic staff and advisory council costs for the State agency designated for comprehensive health planning. Under contractual arrangements, specialized studies are underway in such areas as: Impact on the provision of health services and costs of Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and specific recommendations on its implementation in the States, manpower problems, delivery of services to rural areas, ambulance services, alcoholism, drugs, water resources, and special problems of high risk groups. (2) Project grants for areawide comprehensive health planning provide support for planning personnel and for the collection and analysis of data, and aid in establishing the agency as a focus for coordination and cooperation among local institutions in the planning of health facilities and services. (3) Project grants for training, studies, and demonstrations for comprehensive health planning provide support for both long-term and short-term training of health planners in such areas as basic concepts of health, planning theories and techniques, urban sociology, and social problems in society today. They also support demonstration projects for the development of citizen representatives to serve effectively on health planning bodies. Formula grants: These grants to State health and mental health authorities assist the States in attacking those health problems they consider of most immediate importance. Project grants: These grants provide support for activities to meet special regionally or nationally determined needs. Funds requested will provide continued support for cancer, mental retardation, tuberculosis, neurological and sensory, and venereal disease treatment and control projects. Support will also be provided for comprehensive health services in ghetto areas, rat control projects, and health components in model cities programs. A proposed transfer of funds in 1969 will initiate an intensive immunization program against rubella.

Migrant health program. Grants: Grants are made to finance part of the costs of establishing family health services clinics, to provide short-term hospitalization, and for other projects to improve the health services and health condition of agricultural migrant workers and their families. Funds requested will provide for patient visits for medical care, dental visits, and hospital care. Direct operations: The program provides technical assistance to migrant health projects and conducts studies vital to the effectiveness of the program.

Standard-setting and resources development. This provides for development of specialized programs in comprehensive health and medical care administration, including the professional health aspects of Title XVIII

of the Social Security Act. Assistance is provided to Federal, State, and local health agencies, voluntary organizations, and other interested groups through consultation, studies, demonstrations, and assignment of specialized personnel. This also provides for program evaluation of the grant programs and the review of approval of such grants. The increase in 1970 will provide for expanded consultation services and technical assistance to cities in improving the health care for the poor, the expansion of health planning, and review and approval of grants activities.

Program direction and management services. Provides for overall executive direction and planning and for administrative management.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS			
Operational and planning grants.....	43,635	92,365	96,000
Development, assistance, and chronic disease control.....	20,755	24,865	22,762
Program direction and management services.....	1,355	1,851	1,879
Total program costs, funded.....	65,745	119,081	120,641
Change in selected resources.....	1,994		
Total obligations.....	67,739	119,081	120,641

Operational and planning grants. Regional medical program grants support the establishment of cooperative arrangements among medical schools, hospitals, research centers, physicians, and other health groups and institutions on a regional basis for the purpose of planning and conducting research, training, demonstrations of patient care, and other related projects which increase the availability and utilization of advanced diagnosis and care for these diseases.

Development, assistance, and chronic disease control. These programs provide extramural and intramural research, training in chronic disease control, and program consultation and assistance to State and local health agencies, voluntary organizations, and educational institutions on the conduct of their programs of regionalization and chronic disease control through contracts, cooperative agreements, assignments of personnel, and loan of equipment.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES			
Patient care.....	63,941	70,703	73,241
Field health services.....	19,269	22,943	25,661
Special assistance to the Menominee Indians Administration.....	341	350	350
Adjustment of prior years' costs.....	1,643	1,884	1,927
	-235		
Total program costs.....	84,959	95,880	101,179
Change in selected resources.....	321		
Total obligations.....	85,280	95,880	101,179

Patient care. This consists of the operation of general hospitals and their outpatient clinics and tuberculosis sanatoria and medical care under contract with non-Federal hospitals, clinics, private physicians, and dentists.

Field health services. These include programs in sanitation, health education, nutrition, maternal and child health, school health, tuberculosis and other communicable disease control, medical social services, public

health nursing, oral health, and family planning. The services are provided through health centers, clinics, and other field units operated directly by the Service, as well as through contractual arrangements with State and local health organizations. A program initiated in 1969 trains Indians as community health representatives providing educational, sanitation, and referral services to the beneficiary population.

Special assistance to the Menominee Indians. This covers joint school district costs and public welfare benefits as well as health and sanitation services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
PATIENT CARE AND SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES			
Operation of hospitals and clinics.....	65,178	74,804	75,428
Medical care for special groups:			
Coast Guard.....	2,371	2,515	2,655
Federal employees.....	2,204	3,077	3,707
Special health services:			
Rehabilitation services.....	137	168	168
Payments to Hawaii.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
Personnel detailed to other agencies.....	902	1,805	1,805
Program direction and management services.....	1,934	2,430	2,459
Total program costs, funded.....	73,926	85,279	86,702
Change in selected resources.....	396		
Total obligations.....	74,322	85,279	86,702

Special health services. Payments to Hawaii: Grants are made to defray the cost of care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

Program direction and management services. Staff program advice, guidance, and direction, along with management services are provided operational personnel and facilities with regard to the efficient and effective conduct of program activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
Studies, training, and systems development:			
Grants and contracts.....	25,641	37,362	40,672
Direct operations.....	2,755	2,703	3,312
Program direction and management services.....	369	857	991
Total program costs, funded.....	28,765	40,922	44,975
Change in selected resources.....	1,905		
Total obligations.....	30,670	40,922	44,975

Studies, training, and systems development. Grants and contracts: Research grants and contracts are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals for carrying out research investigations dealing with the organization, financing, utilization, quality, availability, and delivery of health services. Training and fellowship grants are awarded to institutions and to qualified scholars for supporting research training programs in the health services field. Direct operations: This provides staff with the operational capability for both extramural and intramural research programs. It permits utilization of Federal direct health services and federally funded programs for the disadvantaged for the development, testing, and demonstration of improved health services techniques, and also the strengthening of research and development in such areas as economic analysis, the improvement of health service institutions, and manpower utilization. The 1970 increase will provide for consultative services

associated with the center's program and to develop research training programs in universities and other appropriate settings.

Program direction and management services. This includes top management and staff services for the national center, including central management services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL			
Operating costs:			
Clinical and community services.....	33,563	37,129	38,091
Training and education.....	1,041	1,420	-----
Research.....	469	585	-----
Unfunded adjustment:			
Property or services transferred in without charge.....	-151	-75	-75
Capital outlay:			
Clinical and community services.....	701	855	880
Training and education.....	4	16	-----
Research.....	25	35	-----
Unfunded adjustment:			
Above capital assets transferred in without charge, net.....	-20	-20	-20
Total program costs, funded.....	35,632	39,945	38,876
Change in selected resources.....	256	-113	-----
Total obligations.....	35,888	39,832	38,876

Clinical and community services. This provides all of the therapeutic and rehabilitative programs of the National Center, maintenance of buildings, procurement of supplies and materials, and provision of necessary administrative services. The hospital is cooperating with the District of Columbia in the establishment and operation of a community mental health center on its campus, in order to serve the residents of the major southeast portion of the District.

Training and education. This supports the Division of Intramural Training, and provides multidisciplinary clinical training for professional and ancillary personnel engaged in or interested in mental health activities.

Research. This supports the Division of Clinical Research of the National Center which carries out coordinated research programs for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of the causes of mental disorders, and of the factors bearing upon their development, treatment, and possible prevention.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
COMMUNICABLE DISEASES			
Laboratory improvement.....	4,521	6,027	6,346
Prevention and control.....	-----	-----	-----
Grants.....	9,730	6,777	2,921
Direct operations.....	25,534	27,695	27,570
Program direction and management services.....	1,793	1,894	1,894
Total program costs, funded.....	41,578	42,393	38,731
Change in selected resources.....	1,844	-996	-----
Total obligations.....	43,422	41,397	38,731

Laboratory improvement. A comprehensive national laboratory improvement program is administered through research for improving and standardizing laboratory methodology and through evaluation of techniques, materials, and reagents used in public health laboratories. States are provided experimental vaccines and special immune globulin is distributed to prevent and control laboratory infections. They are also provided consultation, training, and informa-

tional services in laboratory techniques. The program provides for upgrading the performance of the nation's clinical laboratories and for the licensure and evaluation of clinical laboratories engaged in interstate commerce.

Prevention and control. Grants: Research grants are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals for research concerned with epidemiology, prevention, laboratory diagnosis, and treatment of communicable diseases at the community level. Direction operations: Communicable diseases: Scientific technical skills in the fields of epidemiological medicine and microbiology are provided to State and local health departments through investigations, consultations, and demonstrations. Important disease investigation and control programs include hepatitis, aseptic meningitis, poliomyelitis, rubella, viral encephalitis, the enteric diseases, staphylococcal and other institutionally acquired infections, the acute fungal diseases, diseases of animals transmissible to man, and the vector borne diseases. Professional competence in the investigation of epidemic outbreaks is afforded to the States through the staff of the Epidemic Intelligence Service which is constantly alert to the epidemic situation in the country. Epidemic Intelligence Service officers provide a wide range of service, including epidemic aid, epidemiological field investigations, consultations in communicable disease control, surveillance of infectious diseases, and collaborative field and laboratory research. Tuberculosis: Studies are conducted in epidemiology, prevention, detection, diagnosis, and therapy of tuberculosis. This research is conducted in cooperation with State and local health departments, tuberculosis hospitals, private investigators, and others. The results of the applied research are made available to the States and integrated into tuberculosis control programs by means of demonstrations, consultative services, operational studies, and training activities. Venereal diseases: Research evaluation activities are directed toward maintenance of uniformly satisfactory nationwide serologic services; development and introduction of new syphilis diagnostic tests; development of an immunizing agent for syphilis; improvement of diagnostic techniques for gonorrhea; evaluation of more effective methods of therapy; and the improvement of control procedures. Scientific and general information about venereal disease for both professional and lay groups is disseminated through State agencies. Foreign quarantine: Certain visa applicants are examined in order to determine those who are excludable for physical or mental reasons. Other inspections (persons and importations) are made to prevent the introduction into the United States of quarantinable and other communicable diseases.

Program direction and management services. This includes top management and staff services for the National Center.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES			
Hospitals:			
New and replacement.....	1,689	4,556	2,175
Modernization and repair.....	341	2,320	554
Outpatient care facilities.....	832	1,801	2,130
Grants to community facilities.....	250	864	-----
Sanitation facilities.....	8,173	14,420	19,113
Personnel quarters.....	3,341	1,379	806
Total program costs, funded.....	14,626	25,340	24,778
Change in selected resources.....	4,162	531	-5,076
Total obligations.....	18,788	25,871	19,702

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL HEALTH STATISTICS			
National vital and health statistics.....			
Program direction and management services.....	462	460	460
Total program costs, funded.....	9,982	8,028	9,773
Change in selected resources.....	-2,111	-----	-----
Total obligations.....	7,871	8,028	9,773

National vital and health statistics. The program of the National Center for Health Statistics comprises the major activities of the Public Health Service in the measurement of the health status of the nation and in developing and applying optimum technical methods for the collection, processing, and analysis of health statistics. It includes: The collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics on births, deaths, fetal deaths, marriages and divorces, and other health data related to these basic vital events; continuing surveys and special health statistics studies on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions; studies of health survey methods with a view toward their continued improvement; and technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods in the health and medical fields.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
District of Columbia medical facilities: Construction grants or loans (costs—obligations).....			
			15,000

Federal funds would be provided to make grants or loans to assist in meeting the cost of projects for the construction and modernization of public or nonprofit hospitals in meeting the cost of projects for the construction or modernization of public health centers, long-term care facilities, including extended care facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, facilities for the mentally retarded, and community mental health centers.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
EMERGENCY HEALTH			
Medical stockpile:			
Acquisition of stocks.....	3,232	1,397	457
Inventory management.....	3,583	3,607	3,683
Stockpile management.....	579	637	684
Training and community preparedness.....	2,518	2,698	2,813
Hospital and ambulance services.....	489	561	561
Total program costs, funded.....	10,401	8,900	8,198
Changes in selected resources.....	-160	-610	-377
Total obligations.....	10,241	8,290	7,821

Medical stockpile. The goal is to provide medical material for civilian needs in time of disaster. Medical supplies and equipment have been assembled into emergency packaged disaster hospitals which are located throughout the United States. The estimate for 1970 provides for a continuing program of rehabilitation and refurbishment of the existing packaged disaster hospitals; relocating the packaged disaster hospital to achieve di-

rect affiliation with the community hospital; procurement of new materials to increase the emergency medical supply inventories of community hospitals; and maintaining, inspecting, and servicing the national medical stockpile.

Training and community preparedness. This supports the preparation of national emergency health and medical plans, and the development of preparedness programs to achieve a continuity of health services necessary to meet all conditions of a national emergency. The estimate for 1970 provides for a continuing program of the development of plans and operational capability of civilian health manpower as well as utilization and distribution of other health resources including: the placement of federally furnished medical supplies and equipment in community hospitals; development and initiation of disaster management services; training at the State and local level; and providing assistance to States and communities in disaster situations.

Hospital and ambulance services. This provides for assistance to States and communities for the planning of organized programs of emergency health services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
SERVICE AND SUPPLY FUND			
Fiscal services: Cost of services.....	863	1,708	1,939
Supply distribution:			
Cost of goods sold.....	2,272	2,454	2,437
Other.....	591	560	579
Publications distribution: Cost of services.....		49	78
Total operating costs.....	3,726	4,771	5,033
Total capital outlay.....	8	13	13
Change in selected resources.....	-263	-6	19
Adjustment in selected resources (donated working capital).....	-1		
Total obligations.....	3,470	4,778	5,065

This fund finances medical supply and service operations of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
Retired pay of commissioned officers:			
Retirement payments.....	5,849	7,086	9,967
Survivors' benefits.....	100	112	130
Dependents' medical care.....	5,341	5,843	6,603
Total obligations.....	11,290	13,041	16,700
Advances and reimbursements:			
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator.....	1,062	13	
Health services research and de- velopment.....	28		
Comprehensive health planning and services.....		50	50
Regional medical programs.....	10	2,000	2,029
Hospital construction.....	1	2	2
Communicable diseases.....	19,556	8,031	8,723
National health statistics.....	430	432	449
Emergency health.....	19	65	65
Chronic diseases.....	440		
Consolidated working fund.....	5,910	2,980	1,848
Research grants.....	1,250	1,275	1,337
Total program costs, funded.....	28,705	14,848	14,503
Change in selected resources.....	57	-590	-208
Total obligations.....	28,762	14,258	14,295
Buildings and facilities:			
Total program costs, funded.....	2,150	7,355	9,092
Change in selected resources.....	454	2,971	-1,164
Total obligations.....	2,604	10,326	7,928

This includes all proposed direct construction items of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, except construction

of Indian health facilities, and all continuing projects except the mental health-neurology research facility.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 estimate
HEALTH SERVICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION TRUST FUNDS			
Patients' benefits.....	47	49	49
Unconditional gifts.....	7	50	5
Conditional gifts.....	44	93	59
Special statistical work.....		15	15
Construction and maintenance of Indian sanitation facilities.....	138	177	158
Total program costs, funded.....	236	385	286
Change in selected resources.....	-2	-6	-14
Total obligations.....	234	379	272
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
Management and central services— Total program costs, funded.....	6,706	8,601	9,978
Change in selected resources.....		878	
Total obligations.....	7,584	8,601	9,978

Management and central services. This supports the Office of the Administrator, and includes staff advice to the Administrator and guidance, leadership, and direction to the programs and activities of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration regarding administrative and financial management, personnel, property and records management, office services, and organization and staffing problems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE MANAGEMENT FUND			
Disease prevention and en- vironmental control.....	\$2,335		
Health services.....	1,717		
Total program costs, funded.....	4,052		
Change in selected resources.....	-105		
Total obligations.....	3,947		

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH			
Health manpower:			
Institutional support:			
Medical, dental, and re- lated.....	32,588	66,000	96,400
Nursing.....	5,657	7,000	7,000
Public health.....	6,558	9,471	9,471
Allied health professions.....	8,123	10,975	10,988
Student assistance:			
Traineeships.....	17,135	30,958	25,620
Scholarships and op- portunity grants.....	16,636	24,636	48,800
Loans.....	38,680	41,979	30,500
Manpower requirements and utilization:			
Grants.....	2,992	4,195	4,425
Direct operations.....	5,995	10,107	10,870
Program direction and management services.....	1,261	1,339	1,390
Total program costs, funded.....	135,586	206,659	245,464
Change in selected re- sources.....	25,059		
Total obligations.....	160,645	206,659	245,464

Institutional support. The principal agents of this activity are grant programs directed toward enhancing the educational experience of students entering the health and allied health professions resulting ultimately in better health service to the nation. Schools use these funds to support and enlarge fac-

ulty staffs, expand library holdings, modify existing and add new curricula, modernize teaching laboratories, and purchase educational aids and equipment. Support for nursing schools in 1970 is for project grants. Schools of pharmacy and veterinary medicine will be eligible for support for the first time in 1970. Improving the utilization of limited resources of health professionals requires appraisal of how various types of personnel are being utilized and the identification of new categories of allied health professionals and technicians for more effective team practice. In 1970, allied health new methods grants will support projects to develop curricula to produce personnel requiring newly identified skills.

Student assistance. This is of two kinds: graduate and specialized, comprising traineeships and research fellowships; and undergraduate, comprising scholarships and student loans. Research fellowship support candidates at the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels for research training in special fields related to studies for improving nursing care. Traineeships support the graduate and specialized preparation of teachers needed to expand and improve curriculum offerings, and the advanced training needed by supervisors, administrators, and other specialists in nursing, public health, and the allied health professions. Nursing and health professions scholarships enable deserving students from low-income families to pursue their education. Students of veterinary medicine will become eligible for scholarships for the first time in 1970. Schools make scholarship awards to students who, in the judgment of the school, have an exceptional financial need. The student loan programs for the health professions, including nurses, are also designed to help provide an adequate supply of health manpower and to assure that the needed supply of health professions and nursing manpower is drawn from the most capable individuals, but particularly to assure that students from low-income families can enroll for health professions training. The 1970 program concentrates these loans to students from families with annual incomes under \$10,000.

Manpower requirements and utilization. Grants: Research grants support studies in the areas of physician methods and techniques, continuing physician education, effective use of health manpower, nursing care, and methods to deliver nursing care to patients. Research training grants enable institutions to establish training programs in fields where there is unusual demand for researchers having skills in nursing specialties and in the field of educational research. Direct operations: Funds are provided for programs to assess requirements, availability, and quality of health discipline education; provide professional guidance and leadership to meet the goals of nursing care by means of research, consultation, application of research findings and administration of grants; develop, administer, and support grant and operational programs to increase the supply and improve the education, utilization, and effectiveness of manpower in the health occupations; for servicing training and construction grants, student loans, scholarships, and operational programs for training of personnel. The increase in 1970 will be used primarily for services and technical assistance related to the new and expanded grant programs of the Health Manpower Act of 1968.

Program direction and management services. The Bureau of Health Manpower guides and supports health manpower programs, designs proposals to meet needs for new or revised health manpower programs, coordinates research and program reporting activities, and provides technical guidance and coordination to Bureau activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research.....	79,163	80,052	80,488
Fellowships.....	4,019	4,374	4,201
Training.....	11,050	11,641	11,186
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	15,082	16,114	17,178
Collaborative research and development.....	66,719	64,380	66,102
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.....	1,285	1,380	1,565
Review and approval of grants.....	2,427	2,459	2,598
Program direction.....	1,079	1,019	1,084
Total program costs, funded.....	180,804	181,419	184,042
Change in selected resources.....	-4,897		
Total obligations.....	175,907	181,419	184,402

Grants. Research: Funds are provided for research grants, general research support grants, and specialized research centers. Fellowships: Postdoctoral and special fellowships and career award and career development fellowships will be supported. Training: Grants are awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction in the curriculum; clinical training grants are awarded for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: This includes laboratory research in the fields of biochemistry, biology, pathology, and physiology and clinical research in the fields of dermatology, endocrinology, immunology, metabolism, and surgery. Collaborative research and development: Research is conducted in the areas of etiology and cancer therapy. This activity includes several task forces including breast cancer and lung cancer and the special virus-leukemia program. Research efforts include field studies, investigations and contracts with public and private organizations and universities for the acquisition, development, and application of new knowledge pertinent to the prevention, control, and treatment of cancer. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: This program is designed to analyze defined populations having unusual risks to specific cancers or known exposure to high risk environments, in order to reveal statistically significant cause-and-effect associations and disassociations leading to the discovery of etiologic factors and agents.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research.....	104,825	99,666	101,307
Fellowships.....	6,769	7,604	7,309
Training.....	17,267	18,150	17,442
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	12,017	13,168	13,641
Collaborative research and development.....	10,500	17,354	18,148
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.....	1,199	1,692	1,724
Training activities.....	142	225	204
Review and approval of grants.....	2,253	2,561	2,723
Program direction.....	652	590	643
Total program costs, funded.....	155,624	161,010	163,1
Change in selected resources.....	5,698		
Total obligations.....	161,322	161,100	163,141

Grants. Research: Funds are provided for research grants, general research support grants, categorical and specialized research centers, and the heart cooperative drug study. Training: For undergraduate training, funds will provide assistance to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and public health. Funds will also provide grants for graduate research and clinical training.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: Research is conducted to aid in the understanding of the cardiovascular system and its diseases, with emphasis in therapeutic agents, diagnostic instrumentation, surgery, and clinical medicine. Collaborative research and development: Funds will support the artificial heart-myocardial infarction program, heart cooperative drug study, and a national blood program. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: This activity conducts and supports epidemiological, biometrics research, and clinical trial studies to seek knowledge of the causes and prevention of cardiovascular disease. Causal factors are sought both by intensive study of "natural experiments" in population groups and by experimental modification of suspected factors. Training activities: Inservice training is provided for positions requiring unique combinations of cardiovascular training and experience.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES			
Grants:			
Research.....	83,217	83,717	84,263
Fellowships.....	20,207	21,373	20,040
Training.....	44,729	46,901	45,568
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development.....	3,924	3,295	3,288
Training activities.....	381	449	337
Review and approval of grants.....	2,741	3,125	3,251
Program direction.....	829	1,095	1,056
Total program costs, funded.....	156,028	159,955	157,803
Change in selected resources.....	-278		
Total obligations.....	155,750	159,955	157,803

Grants. Research: Grants will be supported. In addition, funds will be provided for general research support grants, research and training resources, and research centers in diagnostic radiology and anesthesiology. Fellowships: Awards will be made. Training: Grants will be awarded.

Direct operations. Collaborative research and development: Studies in the biomedical sciences and supportive areas are conducted by contract with institutions. Training activities: This activity supports a program for training pharmacologists and toxicologists.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH EDUCATIONAL, RESEARCH, AND LIBRARY FACILITIES			
Teaching facilities:			
Medical, dental, and other health personnel.....	150,799	130,196	141,000
Nurses.....	19,382	18,781	8,000
Allied health professions personnel.....	1,792	3,008	
Health research facilities.....	38,368	20,640	
Medical libraries.....	10,000	1,250	
Total program costs, funded—obligations.....	220,341	173,875	49,000

Teaching facilities. Federal grants are provided on an individual project basis to assist in the construction of medical, dental, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary, osteopathy, and public health teaching facilities, schools of nursing, and for training centers for allied health personnel. Allied health professions personnel: Matching grants are made to public and other nonprofit schools for construction, expansion, and rehabilitation of teaching facilities as training centers for technical and other allied health personnel.

Health research facilities. Matching grants are made to public and other nonprofit institutions to assist in the construction of new facilities, and replacement of outmoded facilities, for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health.

Medical libraries. Matching grants are made to public and other nonprofit agencies or institutions for construction of new, and the renovation, expansion, or rehabilitation of medical library facilities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES			
Grants:			
Research.....	94,203	91,691	92,289
Fellowships.....	6,574	6,737	6,475
Training.....	15,383	16,109	15,480
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	13,774	15,891	15,664
Collaborative research and development.....	4,439	6,498	6,670
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.....	554	706	712
Review and approval of grants.....	2,101	2,279	2,373
Program direction.....	253	321	305
Total program costs, funded.....	137,281	140,232	139,968
Change in selected resources.....	1,617		
Total obligations.....	138,898	140,232	139,968

Grants. Research: Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research centers. Training: Grants will be awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: Research is conducted in the field of arthritis, rheumatism, diabetes, and other metabolic disorders, as well as studies in the major disciplines including pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry, nutrition, chemistry, pathology, endocrinology, physical biology, molecular biology, chemical biology, gastroenterology, hematology, and biomathematics. Collaborative research and development: These projects are conducted cooperatively and under contract with individuals and institutions, including comprehensive programs in scientific communications, such as the preparation of abstracts on specific areas of research interests; research and development conducted cooperatively and under contract leading to improved methods of hemodialysis and the development of a simpler, more economical, and less cumbersome artificial kidney; and projects directed toward the preparation and distribution of hormonal substances. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: Research and epidemiological studies are conducted on arthritis, diabetes, cholecystitis, iodine metabolism, and hyperuremia in special population groups, including long range studies in the southwestern United States.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES			
Grants:			
Research	58,520	60,185	60,582
Fellowships	3,911	4,362	4,191
Training	8,856	9,488	9,118
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	13,530	14,581	15,182
Collaborative research and development	9,677	12,630	12,855
Training activities	154	165	155
Review and approval of grants	1,394	1,438	1,531
Program direction	269	324	308
Total program costs, funded	96,311	103,173	103,922
Change in selected resources	1,919		
Total obligations	98,230	103,173	103,922

Grants Research: Among the grants are those for the United States-Japan cooperative medical science program. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and International Centers for Medical Research and Training. Fellowships: Awards will be made for postdoctoral, special, and research career fellowships. Training: Funds will provide grants to train individuals in allergy and immunology, tropical medicine, infectious diseases, parasitology, mycology, and rickettsiology.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: This is conducted in the broad fields of allergic infections and parasitic diseases. The increase in 1970 provides for expanded research in clinical allergy and immunology, chronic and degenerative, and viral diseases. Collaborative research and development: Contracts are programmed in the areas of vaccine development and testing, research reagents development, production and distribution, tissue transplantation immunology, and for the geographic medical science program. Training activities: This activity provides two-year training of promising young scientists to work abroad as members of the United States biomedical research groups in medical research related to problems of an international nature which cannot ordinarily be undertaken in the United States.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE			
Grants:			
Research	50,524	59,134	59,506
Fellowships	2,694	3,213	3,085
Training	11,130	15,659	15,047
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	8,488	9,879	10,100
Collaborative research and development	9,651	9,742	10,092
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	2,790	3,016	3,028
Training activities	66	74	72
Review and approval of grants	1,894	2,058	2,114
Program direction	579	490	441
Total program costs, funded	87,816	103,265	103,485
Change in selected resources	12,365		
Total obligations	100,181	103,265	103,485

Grants. Research: Grants will be supported. Funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research cen-

ter grants, and specialized research center grants. Training: Graduate training grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology, ophthalmology, and otology.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: Research is being conducted on disorders of the brain, and spinal cord and peripheral nerves, such as epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, and apoplexy, and Parkinson's disease; on neuromuscular disorders, such as muscular dystrophy; hearing impairments; and the perinatal physiology studies using primates. Collaborative research and development: These studies include the coordination and central service activities for the collaborative project on cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of childhood. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: These studies include epidemiological, biometric, and international studies relating to cerebrovascular disease, speech and hearing disorders, and research on viruses and their effect on the central nervous system. Training activities: Support is given for inservice training of qualified staff members in subjects related to neurological and other sensory disorders.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT			
Grants:			
Research	36,474	41,679	46,564
Fellowships	2,953	4,193	4,027
Training	7,272	10,012	9,621
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	5,754	6,065	6,373
Collaborative research and development	1,299	3,975	6,721
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	481	2,022	2,176
Training activities	89	89	85
Review and approval of grants	1,829	1,956	2,037
Program and direction	676	809	807
Total program costs funded	56,827	70,800	78,411
Change in selected resources	9,552		
Total obligations	66,379	70,800	78,411

Grants. Research: Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and mental retardation research centers. Fellowships: Postdoctoral and special fellowships will be supported. Also, career awards and career development fellowships will be supported. Training: Training grants will be supported.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: This is conducted in five major program areas of child health and human development: (1) Reproduction and population research—reproductive biology, endocrinology, and ecology. (2) Perinatal biology and infant mortality—maternal-child interactions; maturation of motor and behavioral systems; nutrition and development. (3) Growth and development—neurophysiology, neurochemistry, and nutrition. (4) Adult development and aging—cellular biology, biochemistry, physiology, and psychology. (5) Mental retardation—biochemistry, neurophysiology, and behavioral research. Collaborative research and development: This activity supplements and complements the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's intramural research programs. It is one of the most effective ways for coordinating program development in family planning, perinatal biology, growth and development, aging, and mental retardation. The main thrust of the Institute's popula-

tion research program is accomplished by contract efforts within this activity. Program liaison is maintained and advanced through support of interdisciplinary research conferences and symposia and through scientific information centers. Biometry, epidemiology and field studies: Through contracted research, this activity supports the Institute's scientific staff in planning and conducting studies dealing with the incidence, distribution, and control of health problems in certain populations. Efforts are also being made to develop more effective and reliable means for measuring health problems, to collect and analyze health data, and to make statistical studies for use in initiating and evaluating scientific programs. Training activities: This activity represents the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's career development program designed to help overcome the shortages of professional manpower in pediatrics and obstetrics and the lack of the necessary cross-disciplinary training required in the basic research programs of the Institute.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
GENERAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES			
Division of Research Facilities and Resources:			
Grants:			
Research	56,797	60,871	64,831
Fellowships	148	154	146
Training	368	376	364
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development	1,193	1,488	1,483
Review and approval of grants	1,123	1,533	1,615
Program direction	471	643	641
Division of Computer Research and Technology: Direct operations	3,395	4,611	4,753
Engineering development:			
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development		750	750
Program direction	101	259	226
Total program costs, funded	63,596	70,685	74,809
Change in selected resources	1,640		
Total obligations	65,236	70,685	74,809

Division of Research Facilities and Resources. Grants: Research: Funds provide General Clinical Research Centers, Special Research Resources, Animal Resources (including primate centers). Direct operations: Collaborative research and development: Research is conducted in collaboration with Federal and non-Federal institutions through contracts. Included are chemical/biological information handling program, special research resources, surveys of animal resources, development of standards for laboratory animal facilities, and the applying of engineering and technological innovations to biomedical problems in such areas as the development of artificial organs, synthetic materials, and the automation of clinical and laboratory measurements.

Division of Computer Research and Technology: Direct operations. This activity conducts research in mathematics and the computer sciences as they relate to biomedical problems, provides professional advice to other areas of the National Institutes of Health, serves as a focus for training activities in computation and data processing, and operates a central computing facility for the National Institutes of Health.

General Research Support Grants—obligations: \$59,674, \$60,700, \$61,500.

This provides for grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions for the general support of research and research training in sciences related to health.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH			
Grants:			
Research.....	15,521	15,055	15,559
Fellowships.....	1,724	1,765	1,694
Training.....	5,280	5,609	5,390
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	4,394	4,687	4,947
Collaborative research and development.....	662	845	942
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.....	375	431	436
Review and approval of grants.....	608	689	763
Program direction.....	294	338	331
Total program costs, funded.....	28,858	29,419	30,062
Change in selected resources.....	169		
Total obligations.....	29,027	29,419	30,062

Grants. Research: Project grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and dental research institutes. Training: Grants will be awarded to schools for training individuals for academic teaching and research careers in the various fields of dental sciences.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: Research is conducted in the fields of dental caries, periodontal diseases, growth and development, oral surgery, microbiology, histology, pathology, and biochemistry. Collaborative research and development: The programs are concerned with investigations and contracts with public and private organizations for the accumulation, development, and application of new information related to oral health. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: The programs are concerned with epidemiologic activities or field studies related to oral diseases and conditions.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research.....	14,086	16,206	19,660
Fellowships.....	354	676	650
Training.....	2,703	3,603	3,462
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	610	737	754
Collaborative research and development.....	168	349	349
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.....	267	303	317
Review and approval of grants.....	366	366	466
Program direction.....			120
Total program costs, funded.....	18,554	22,240	25,778
Change in selected resources.....	2,612		
Total obligations.....	21,166	22,240	25,778

Grants. Research: Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research center grants. Training: Graduate training grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in ophthalmology. Traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research: Research is being conducted in the causes of blindness and disorders of the eye including glaucoma, disorders of the cornea, infections of the eye, disturbances of eye movements, and refractive errors of vision. Collaborative research and development:

Grants. Training: Training grants are awarded. Special scientific projects: Awards are made to health scholars. Library resources: Libraries will receive grants.

Direct operations. Library operations: The increase in 1970 will provide funds for continued installation and conversion to a second generation Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System to improve the quality and speed of response to meet increased service demands, and expansion of bibliographic, reference, and loan services. Toxicology information: Increases in 1970 will maintain continued identification of user needs, fact gathering and file building activities, and staff planning and project management. National Medical Audiovisual Center: The increase in 1970 will support the initial implementation of a videotape distribution center; expansion of existing collections of motion picture films, audiotapes, and other audiovisuals with primary emphasis for use by medical and health-related professions; and the increased demand for loans of audiovisuals to health professionals, agencies, institutions, and organizations interested in health. Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications: The increase in 1970 will fund systems engineering in information and communications science and design and activation of a national biomedical communications network.

These studies include contractual programs for collaborative research on blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies: Special studies in the fields of epidemiology and biometry will be developed to determine causes of blindness and eye disorders.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE			
Grants:			
Training.....	612	1,137	1,021
Special scientific projects.....	41	89	100
Research.....	980	1,285	1,442
Library resources.....	2,670	2,994	2,458
Regional medical libraries.....	517	1,750	2,211
Publications support.....	372	228	376
Direct operations:			
Library operations.....	2,929	7,465	6,493
Toxicology information.....	586	1,153	1,549
National Medical Audiovisual Center.....	1,438	1,451	2,175
Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications.....	187	526	2,058
Research and support contracts.....	1,032	248	
Review and approval of grants and contracts.....	545	480	621
Program direction.....	1,337	917	1,469
Total program costs, funded.....	13,246	19,723	21,973
Change in selected resources.....	3,869	452	909
Total obligations.....	17,115	20,175	22,882

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
Grants:			
Research.....	8,496	8,406	8,967
Fellowships.....	42	200	194
Training.....	3,763	3,892	3,740
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research.....	4,357	4,432	5,322
Review and approval of grants.....	396	440	443
Program direction.....	266	312	338
Total program costs, funded.....	17,320	17,682	19,004
Change in selected resources.....	-764		
Total obligations.....	16,556	17,682	19,004

Grants. Research: Regular research grants will be supported. Environmental Health Institutes will be supported. This activity supports research on the phenomena associated with the source, distribution, mode of entry, and effect of environmental agents on biological systems through grants to universities, research institutes, and other public or private nonprofit institutions. Fellowships: Predoctoral, postdoctoral, and special grant awards will be made to graduate students and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences. Training: Grants will be supported. The graduate research training program supports the availability of high-quality training opportunities

in environmental health. It was a threefold goal: to increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health; to enable training institutions to strengthen and to enrich their research training capabilities; and to expand opportunities for environmental health research training in a greater number of graduate institutions throughout the United States.

Direct operations, laboratory and clinical research: This supports the in-house research programs in environmental health sciences at the National Environmental Health Sciences Center in the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Included are research efforts in cell biology, pharmacology and toxicology, analytical and synthetic chemistry, biophysics and biomedical instrumentation, animal science and technology, pathologic physiology, epidemiology, biometry, epidemiologic pathology, and scientific information as well as the supporting services for these laboratories and branches. Review and approval of grants: This supports the scientific and administrative staff responsible for the review, negotiation, processing, and awarding of all grants. Program direction: This supports the Office of the Director of the Division and scientific administrative staff who assist in the planning, supervision, and technical direction of the program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)			
Foreign health research—Total program costs, funded.....	7,830	17,460	15,322
Change in selected resources.....	5,560		
Total obligations.....	13,390	17,460	15,322

The research efforts supported with foreign currencies, derived through the sale abroad of surplus agricultural commodities, are directed toward the solution of disease and health problems which hold promise of contributing knowledge of value and significance to the advancement of medical research in the United States and other countries. Research projects in the field of human reproduction and family planning will be supported. The collection and analysis of morbidity and mortality data as well as other scientific activities overseas such as research training, international conferences, and translation of research publications will also be supported.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
DENTAL HEALTH			
Grants:			
Research.....	1,121	1,259	1,339
Fellowships.....	79	150	150
Training.....	2,598	3,850	5,276
Direct operations.....	4,200	4,926	5,123
Total program costs, funded.....	7,998	10,185	11,888
Change in selected resources.....	1,418		
Total obligations.....	9,416	10,185	11,888

Grants. Research: Research grants support studies in the prevention and control of oral diseases, more efficient methods for delivering dental services, and the effective use of dental manpower. Fellowships: Research fellowships support candidates for advanced degrees to prepare them to conduct research to help improve dental health by obtaining information about preventive dentistry, dental diseases, dental education, and more effective methods of delivering dental services. Training: In 1970, three new dental schools

will initiate developmental programs to train students to use dental auxiliaries. The increased funds will permit existing programs to lengthen the training and to include other types of auxiliaries such as dental hygienists. Research training grants enable institutions to establish training programs in fields urgently in need of researchers in dental science. A dental continuing education grant program provides for upgrading the skills of dentists and auxiliaries through a national network of dental school programs.

Direct operations. Funds are provided for programs to study the supply, utilization, and distribution of dental manpower, to increase the productivity of dental practitioners, and to assist dentists to keep abreast of the latest concepts and techniques in dentistry. Funds also provide for disease prevention control programs, for studies related to the organization, delivery, and financing of dental health care service, and for research and development in dental technology.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
BIOLOGICS STANDARDS			
Program costs, funded.....	7,373	8,305	8,338
Change in selected resources.....	138		
Total obligations.....	7,511	8,305	8,338

Activities include administration of the Biologics Control Act, establishment of standards for preparation of biologics, testing of vaccines and their preparation, and research related to development, manufacture, testing, and use of vaccines and analogous products.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
Operations:			
Grants:			
Research.....	229	150	150
Fellowships.....	1,378	1,636	1,570
International center.....	1,106	1,588	1,740
Facility planning and construction.....		500	
Total program costs, funded.....	2,713	3,874	3,460
Change in selected resources.....	11		
Total obligations.....	2,724	3,874	3,460

Operations. Grants: Research: Funds are provided for grants and for scientific evaluation. International center: This provides for the executive direction, planning, and coordination of all international activities of the National Institutes of Health, including operation of overseas offices and international seminars and conferences.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT FUND			
Research services.....	12,640	14,897	15,181
Clinical services.....	16,374	18,872	19,483
Administrative management.....	6,293	7,218	7,475
Grant review and approval.....	7,678	8,347	8,394
Cafeteria.....	145		
Total program costs, funded.....	43,130	49,334	50,533
Change in selected resources.....	2,198		
Total obligations.....	45,328	49,334	50,533

Research services. These provide the central administration and operation of services for the conduct of research activities such as

the planning and supervising of design, construction, and development of new research activities; providing laboratory animals, culture media, and glassware; design and fabrication of laboratory instrumentation; operating the National Institutes of Health medical reference library including the translation of medical literature; scientific photography and medical arts; maintenance and alteration of all physical facilities including utility services; and environmental engineering services.

Clinical services. This consists of the operation of the clinical center together with the laboratory space required for the treatment of research patients.

Administrative management. This provides for such office services as housekeeping, transportation, space management and communications, supply management, and protection and safety.

Grant review and approval. This initiates and develops recommendations and provides staff support services for the National Institutes of Health in formulating Public Health Service grants and awards policies and procedures relating to research, center, and training grants and fellowship programs; assigns grant and award applications to the appropriate bureau of the Public Health Service; assigns applications within the National Institutes of Health to institutes and divisions and to initial review groups, and provides for the scientific review of applications by the National Institutes of Health study sections and review committees; conducts negotiations with grantee institutions, makes studies, and provides advisory and consultative services to National Institutes of Health institutes and divisions relative to Public Health Service grant policy and National Institutes of Health-wide management matters; collects, stores, retrieves, and analyzes management and program data needed by the National Institutes of Health in the management of its intramural programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
SERVICE AND SUPPLY FUND			
Administrative services:			
Cost of goods sold.....	4,408	4,958	5,482
Other.....	1,708	2,310	2,315
Computation and data processing:			
Cost of service.....	3,835	4,398	5,114
Instrumentation:			
Cost of goods sold.....	277	272	278
Other.....	1,056	1,050	1,179
Research animals:			
Cost of goods sold.....	182	156	160
Other.....	1,275	1,208	1,418
Total operating costs, funded.....	12,741	14,352	15,946
Capital outlay, funded: Sales program:			
Purchase of equipment.....		40	
Total program costs, funded.....	12,741	14,392	15,946
Change in selected resources.....	229	37	12
Adjustment in selected resources:			
Donated working capital.....	-48		
Total obligations.....	12,922	14,429	15,958

Administrative services. These include the sale of commodities, printing and reproduction services, and other services. The National Institutes of Health maintain a supply of scientific and general-use materials and supplies, alteration and construction material, linens, and special equipment. The Printing and Reproduction Section provides printing, distribution, and related services.

Computation and data processing: Cost of service. This central facility is expected to provide data systems design and consultation, key punching, EAM processing, computer programming, and computer processing services to Institutes/Divisions of National Institutes of Health.

Instrumentation. The Biomedical Instrumentation and Engineering Branch maintains, repairs, and fabricates scientific laboratory apparatus and equipment for use in the research laboratories at National Institutes of Health. There is also a specialized inventory of materials used in the development of the scientific equipment which is part of the services provided by the shops.

Research animals. The National Institutes of Health animal facilities provide small and large research animals to the research laboratories. They include breeding, holding, and conditioning facilities for mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, hamsters, dogs, cats, primates, and ungulate animals.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 estimate
NURSE TRAINING FUND			
Loans to schools of nursing.....	6,581	7,300	2,671
Federal National Mortgage Association fees for sale of notes.....	8		
Interest accrued on participation certificates.....	51	222	222
Interest to schools of nursing (differential).....			184
Interest to Treasury.....	64	249	627
Total program costs, funded—obligations.....	6,704	7,771	3,704

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATION FUND			
Loans to health professions schools.....	11,540	12,209	1,113
Federal National Mortgage Association fees from sale of notes.....	26		
Interest accrued on participation certificates.....	169	734	735
Interest to Treasury.....	234	473	661
Interest to health professions schools (differential).....			604
Total program costs, funded—obligations.....	11,969	13,416	3,113

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS			
Health manpower education and utilization.....	1,810	1,979	2,110
National Cancer Institute.....	2	10	10
National Heart Institute.....	9	10	10
National Institute of Dental Research.....	2	6	6
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.....	9	2	2
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke.....	50	86	86
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....	693	746	733
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....	1	1	1
National Library of Medicine.....	578	625	625
Total obligations.....	3,154	3,465	3,583

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR			
Management and central services (total program costs, funded).....	5,812	6,993	7,193
Change in selected resources.....	326		
Total obligations.....	6,138	6,993	7,193

Management and central services. This provides the overall executive direction, policies, information, and planning of intramural and extramural research programs. This activity also includes financial management, personnel management, and management surveys, analyses, reviews, and evaluations.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti- mate	1970 esti- mate
BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES			
Total program costs, funded.....	13,199	13,861	11,828
Change in selected resources.....	-8,893	934	-5,154
Total obligations.....	4,306	14,795	6,674

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			
Grants to States for medical assistance:			
Payments for medically indigent receiving maintenance payments:			
Old-age assistance.....	300,928	411,600	470,700
Aid to the blind.....	12,318	16,900	17,600
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	190,055	279,200	319,900
Aid to families with dependent children.....	346,676	488,400	593,800
Payment for medically indigent not receiving maintenance payments:			
Aged.....	566,647	674,122	895,600
Blind.....	3,520	4,600	5,625
Permanently and totally disabled.....	98,547	129,700	219,700
Families with dependent children.....	180,782	230,500	284,400
Other—children under 21.....	60,300	76,200	132,700
State and local administration.....	76,918	98,100	130,000
Total, all activities.....	1,836,691	2,409,322	3,070,025
Collections and adjustments during year.....	-4,472	-13,000	-13,000
Total program costs, funded.....	1,832,219	2,118,300	3,057,025
Change in selected resources.....	341,566	72,737	
Adjustment between State requirements and Federal grants to States for fiscal year.....	-28,881		
Total obligations.....	2,144,904	2,191,037	3,057,025
Maternal and child health:			
Maternal and child health services.....	49,567	50,000	50,000
Crippled children's services.....	49,787	57,000	58,000
Maternity and infant care.....	29,645	48,000	62,850
Health of school and preschool children.....	36,779	39,000	40,950
Training.....	7,000	9,000	11,200
Research.....	5,580	6,200	7,700
Total obligations.....	178,358	209,200	230,700

Maternal and child health services. Formula grants are made to States for the extension and improvement of health services for mothers and children.

Crippled children's services. Grants are made to States on a formula basis.

Maternity and infant care. Matching grants are made to State or local health agencies, or to other public or nonprofit private organizations for maternity and infant care projects to help reduce infant and maternal mortality and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions associated with childbearing. The existing projects also improve the quality and quantity of maternity services to women in low-income areas.

Health of school and preschool children. Matching grants are made to State or local agencies, medical schools, and teaching hospitals for comprehensive health care projects for children and youth, particularly in areas where low-income families are concentrated.

Training. Grants are made to public or nonprofit institutions of higher learning including university-affiliated mental retardation centers for training personnel for health care and related services for mothers and children.

Research. The main focus of this program is to improve delivery of health services to needy mothers and children through research grants, contracts, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
MENTAL RETARDATION			
Research.....	126	126	126
Hospital improvement.....	8,610	8,972	8,972
Rehabilitation services projects.....			4,500
Community service facilities:			
Construction.....	15,998	18,013	13,531
Initial staffing.....		8,358	12,000
Construction of university-affiliated facilities.....	682	9,100	
Mental retardation implementation.....	1,394		
Total obligations.....	26,810	44,569	39,129

Research. Grants are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals to provide new knowledge and data relative to mental retardation. They support appropriate research activities to explore the health and care needs of the mentally retarded.

Hospital improvement. Grants are awarded to institutions for the mentally retarded to improve the quality of care provided for the mentally retarded through projects for care improvement and inservice training.

Rehabilitation services projects. Grants are awarded to public, nonprofit organizations, and to individuals, for service, training, and research activities. Professional and nonprofessional personnel will be trained, as will students in the Student Work Experience and Training program.

Community service facilities. Construction: Grants are awarded to public and other nonprofit organizations to support construction of community service facilities to house services for the mentally retarded. Initial staffing: Grants are awarded to assist in initial staffing of new community mental retardation facilities and new programs in existing facilities which will provide specialized services to mental retardates not now being served.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Health services.....	1,700	2,261	2,885

Health services. These are provided to new arrivals and to needy refugees in Miami and include medical screening, outpatient clinic services, and care of patients with tuberculosis and mental illness.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
Medical assistance.....	1,193	1,438	1,791
Mental retardation.....	706	750	741
Total obligations.....	1,899	2,188	2,532

Medical assistance. This administers programs of medical assistance to the needy, particularly the medical assistance program authorized by Title XIX of the Social Security Act. These programs provide comprehensive medical care including nursing homes and intermediate care facilities to the needy, through State medical assistance programs. Also included is evaluation of the programs, assistance in recruiting and training State staff, and the development of policies and guides related to the comprehensiveness of State medical assistance programs.

Mental retardation. This develops and co-

ordinates programs to support health and rehabilitation services for the mentally retarded. Consultative services are provided to State, local, and voluntary health agencies, educational and other institutions, that are initiating, improving, or expanding retardation services and activities. It provides grants to improve or provide care, to train personnel in State residential institutions, to support construction and initial staffing of community service facilities, and for planning and construction of university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advancements and reimbursements:			
Smoking and health.....	61	50	50
Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals: Mentally ill—Total obligations.....	347	379	384

This provides for hospitalization and services to repatriated mentally ill United States nationals until arrangements can be made for assumption of responsibility by States of residence or the repatriate's family.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged:			
Reimbursement for hospital insurance expenditures for the uninsured.....	556,372	465,227	617,262
Contributions to supplementary medical insurance trust fund.....	723,287	895,000	928,151
Total obligations.....	1,279,659	1,360,227	1,545,413

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged:			
Reimbursement for hospital insurance expenditures for the uninsured.....	556,372	465,227	617,262
Contributions to supplementary medical insurance trust fund.....	723,287	895,000	928,151
Total obligations.....	1,279,659	1,360,227	1,545,413

Reimbursement for hospital insurance expenditures for the uninsured. This covers the costs of hospital and related care for individuals aged 65 and over who are not insured under the social security or railroad retirement systems.

Contributions to supplementary medical insurance trust fund. These finance the Government's contribution to the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund. For each monthly premium paid by enrollees in the voluntary medical insurance program, which primarily covers doctor bills, the Federal Government matches a like amount.

[In thousands of dollars]			
	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND			
Benefit payments.....	3,736,322	4,367,000	4,940,000
Construction.....	459	2,044	701
Administration:			
Authorized program.....	96,671	97,997	105,839
Proposed increase in limitation.....		1,232	
Total obligations.....	3,833,452	4,468,273	5,046,540

Benefit payments. The hospital insurance program provides protection to persons aged 65 and over against the costs of inpatient hospital services, post-hospital home health services, and post-hospital extended care services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND			
Benefit payments.....	1,389,622	1,567,000	1,598,000
Construction.....	593	2,636	903
Administration:			
Authorized program.....	158,467	180,533	214,981
Proposed increase in limitation.....		1,588	
Total obligations..	1,548,682	1,751,757	1,813,884

Benefit payments. Almost all persons aged 65 and over are eligible to enroll in the voluntary supplementary medical insurance program provided by the Social Security Act. Participants in the program are covered for the costs of physicians' services, home health services not covered under the hospital insurance program, outpatient services, and certain other medical costs within specified deductible and coinsurance amounts.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
Health insurance program:			
Hospital insurance plan.....	86,536	88,493	92,500
Supplementary medical insurance plan.....	154,731	178,785	205,312
Total program costs, funded.....	241,267	267,278	297,812

Health insurance program. Hospital insurance plan: This affords protection to persons aged 65 and over against the costs of inpatient hospital services, posthospital home health services, and posthospital extended care services. Bills for services rendered under the hospital insurance program are generally submitted by hospitals, extended care facilities, home health agencies, and in some instances by individuals who have received emergency care in nonparticipating hospitals. **Supplementary medical insurance plan:** Almost all persons aged 65 and over are eligible to enroll in the supplementary insurance program, which covers the cost of physician services and other medical costs within certain deductible and coinsurance requirements. Enrollees in the program pay a monthly premium and the aggregate of these premiums is matched by the Federal Government. (The administrative costs budgeted under the health insurance program cover the bill and claim payment functions performed by the intermediaries; services performed by State agencies in certifying and consulting with providers of services; all work performed by the Social Security Administration in directing the program, providing services to beneficiaries, maintaining records by individual beneficiary of utilization of hospital and medical services and processing claims to establish entitlement to hospital insurance for persons not insured for cash benefits under either the social security or railroad retirement program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimated	1970 estimated
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS			
Freedmen's Hospital:			
Operation and maintenance.....	9,103	11,239	11,232
Education and training.....	1,357	1,391	1,477
Total obligations.....	10,460	12,630	12,709

This is incorporated into Howard University as its teaching hospital. In carrying out this function, the Freedmen's Hospital furnishes inpatient and outpatient care and furnishes a facility for training of physicians and nurses and other professional and technical health personnel.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Office of the General Counsel, Salaries and Expenses:			
Departmental program services:			
Public health grants and services.....	279	214	226
Food, drug, and environmental health.....	339	459	520
Health insurance.....	158	221	221
Total obligations.....	776	894	967

The Office of the General Counsel acts as legal adviser and provides legal services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS			
Task force on prescription drugs.....	108	63	
Advisory Committee on Alcoholism.....	31	25	
Environmental health task force.....	13		
International health activities.....		749	1,130
Total program costs—obligations.....	152	837	1,130

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Executive direction and administrative costs (program costs, funded).....	92	163	124
Change in selected resources.....	33	-40	
Total obligations.....	125	124	124

The Council advises the President with respect to radiation matters directly or indirectly affecting health, including the formulation of radiation standards and the establishment and execution of programs of cooperation with the States.

Grand total..... \$12,270,899 \$13,585,101 \$15,392,23

IN DEFENSE OF THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the President of the United States will announce his decision as to whether or not we are going to proceed with the deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system. This is a most awesome responsibility which rests on the shoulders of our President, and I am sure the entire country prays with Mr. Nixon in making this difficult decision. Indeed, this is one of the most far-reaching decisions to confront the President of the United States. It is one that has been widely debated on both sides and one that offers no simple solution.

I am confident the President will do what in his judgment he believes is the best thing for the security of the United

States and for the defense of our country. In the final analysis, while we can all advise, the decision must be the President's and his alone. It is moments like these that make one realize how lonely the Presidency can be when only he—and he alone—must make the final judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to assure the President that there are at least some of us here in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, and in the other Chamber, who strongly believe that we ought to move forward with deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system.

I am mindful of the shortcomings of the Sentinel but I am also mindful that a great deal of research will continue in this field while the initial phases of construction are underway.

I do not challenge the honesty and integrity of those who have strongly opposed the Sentinel system. I am sure that most of them are well-meaning Americans who see this controversy in their own light. But, I am reminded that in the middle 1930's there were similar voices who opposed all efforts by this country to build an adequate defense establishment. I have always felt that if America had had a better defense establishment, World War II could have been avoided. If the United States had had 10 percent of the defenses we have today, I believe that Hitler would have never gotten off the ground. All the agony that occurred in World War II could have been avoided.

So while I respect the right of those who wish to oppose the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system, I believe that we ought to place this entire matter in proper perspective.

In my judgment we ought to move forward with the construction of an anti-ballistic-missile system as quickly as possible. If we were to break ground tomorrow, we could not finish this system much before 1972.

It is now a matter of public knowledge that Red China will be fully capable of hitting the United States and our vital targets with nuclear missiles within the next 48 months.

There is no longer any question about Red China's capability.

Three of the 10 nuclear devices that Red China has detonated have been detonated in devices propelled by missiles.

We are in a race against time with Red China and those who try to downgrade the threat of the Red Chinese, or ridicule it, in my judgment are doing a disastrous disservice to the future security of this country.

I listened with a heavy heart last week when a Member of the other body ridiculed a witness before his committee who tried to point out that the anti-ballistic-missile system is designed to deal primarily with the threat coming from Red China. I do not believe we serve the security of America when we engage in that kind of tactic.

I believe that anyone who has taken the trouble to look at what has happened in Red China today must certainly realize the fact that Red China constitutes a meaningful threat to the United States.

Nor is there any reason to believe that

the Soviet Union has embarked on any policy of coexistence with the rest of the world.

The Soviet Union has made concessions only when they served the best interest of the Soviet Union, but when a small nation like Czechoslovakia, while pledging to remain within the Communist orbit, tried to restore some human dignity to her country; some freedom of choice, some freedom of speech, and when the Soviet leaders realized that this kind of an attitude could become infectious and adversely affect the Communist monolith behind the Iron Curtain, with cold and calculated brutality they struck down the seeds of freedom in Czechoslovakia while the whole world looked on helplessly.

Nor can we ignore the fact that the Soviet Union has methodically rearmed every one of the Arab States. The aggression being waged against Israel today is being waged with weapons and guns and tanks and ammunition supplied to the Arabs by the Soviet Union.

There is not a single piece of evidence anywhere that the Soviet Union has abandoned its policy of seeing Israel destroyed as a citadel of freedom in the Middle East.

Then there was the Berlin crisis last week when West Berliners tried to hold an election against intense Soviet provocation—are these the signs of a nation that seeks to live in peace with the free world?

Finally, all we have to do is to look at the mounting rate of American casualties in Vietnam.

Is there anyone naive enough to believe that the stepped-up war in Vietnam has not been stepped up on instructions from the Soviet Union?

Mr. Speaker, I submit there is nothing in the record at this point in time to indicate that the Soviet Union wants to live in peace with the rest of the world.

It is, therefore, extremely important that the United States move forward with the building of an appropriate antiballistic-missile system as a deterrent to any designs which either the Soviets or Red Chinese may have to disturb the peace of the world.

There are those who try to ridicule it and say it will not work. There are those who try to put all sorts of preposterous price tags on it. Some very distinguished Americans have spoken out against the system.

I respect their right to speak out against this system, but I would submit that their conclusions are drawn on erroneous information.

Last week a group of nuclear physicists issued an open letter attacking my position in support of the ABM system.

They are all employed at the Argon Nuclear Energy Laboratory at Argon, Ill. They would have you believe that because they work for the Atomic Energy Commission, that somehow or other they are experts in the field of missiles. I have made inquiry at the Atomic Energy Commission and I find that none of these people have been fully briefed on the Sentinel system and therefore many of their conclusions are based on erroneous information.

It occurs to me that those who want to oppose the system have a right to do

so. But I think it would be wise if they first got the information and the facts straight.

There is nothing to indicate that the Soviets have in any way deferred the deployment of an ABM system around Moscow. As a matter of fact, Time magazine properly points out that there are now 75 missiles ringing Moscow. They have shown photographs of the Galosh system which the Soviets have perfected. There are those who say that the Soviet system does not work but those are only speculations and very dangerous speculations which tend only to mislead the American people into a sense of false security.

I do not see that the Soviets are in any way deterred in moving forward. They are not saying that by building a system around Moscow that somehow or other they will impede any discussion for a Nonproliferation Treaty.

It seems to me that we Americans ought to let our President know that we support his doctrine of speaking softly, as he has proposed to do, but to carry a big stick.

I believe President Nixon is trying sincerely to find some means of communication with the Soviets. But until we can look forward to the day of an open-skies policy, which has been proposed by Mr. Nixon and three previous Presidents, and until the Soviet Union shows some indication that it is willing to have foolproof mutual inspection, I think it would be national suicide for America not to build an anti-ballistic-missile system for our own protection.

The ABM proposed for our country is a deterrent.

Since World War II, we Americans have spent in excess of \$1 trillion on national defense to try to preserve peace. It has not always worked. But I think it has helped deter major war. Our entire defense effort during these 20 years has been to deter war.

I remember being at an installation in Arizona where we had these huge ICBM's. You looked down into the ground 240 feet and you did not see the end of this huge intercontinental ballistic rocket capable of traveling 6,000 to 8,000 miles across oceans and continents and dropping a nuclear warhead on an enemy target.

It was rather significant to me that the soldiers there had written across the gate, as you drove into this installation, what I think spells out our foreign policy better than anything I could say or than anyone else here could say.

They had written the simple phrase across the gate to their ICBM installation:

If we ever have to use it, we have failed.

Ponder the message of those few words and the wisdom of those soldiers. They know the ICBM is there not as an aggressive weapon to wage war against another country. It is there as a deterrent to war, to demonstrate to our adversaries the futility of mass attacks upon the United States, to demonstrate to them that should they ever be foolish enough to disturb the peace of the world on a major scale with an exchange of nuclear devices, they will suffer the full consequences of our ICBM arsenal.

The antiballistic missile being proposed in the Sentinel system is just one more instrument in this arsenal of deterrent to war.

It is no secret that the range of the Spartan is no more than 400 miles. This is a matter of public knowledge, published in the press. The whole Sentinel system is defensive. It could not hurt a fly on another continent. It is designed only to make sure that enemy rockets do not hit the United States if someone is foolish enough to launch them against this country.

So I say that those who oppose this system are, in my judgment, subjecting this Nation to nuclear blackmail. We know that the Soviet Union is moving forward in the development of ICBM's. The Soviet Union now has 950 ICBM's according to published reports, and capable of producing them at the rate of 300 more a year. You cannot close your eyes to these capabilities and expect peace to endure in this world unless you have an effective defense to serve as a deterrent.

When there is a shift in the balance of power, which could occur if the Soviet Union develops a space platform capable of launching nuclear rockets at any target in the world, or as they develop other offensive weapons they are now working on, the United States will again have to look at its capabilities.

It has been a never-ending struggle to maintain a balance of power, and we believe we have maintained such balance of power vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. This has been our most effective deterrent to major war.

This is why at this point in time the ABM is not designed against the Soviet Union. We feel we have a sufficient capability in offensive weaponry to checkmate the Soviet Union.

There is also a cultural background involved. We have reason to believe that the Soviet Union does not want to destroy its country with nuclear devices, any more than we want to destroy ours.

But that is not the story with China.

Red Chinese officials at the highest level have publicly stated they have no regard for a nuclear retaliation threat from the United States. They have publicly stated they could well afford to lose 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 of their people through atomic attacks and look upon that as one way of solving their massive problem of overpopulation.

We are dealing with two different countries. One has respected our retaliatory power, and at this point in time, continues to respect it, namely the Soviet Union. The other has no regard for our retaliatory power, namely Red China.

It is within this framework that our Defense Department has properly said we must start building an ABM system. Nobody contends that it is the pluperfect system.

The story of defense is a tragic story of obsolescence.

Almost every dollar that we spend in this Chamber on defense finds us buying obsolete equipment, obsolete by the time it is delivered, because man keeps surging forward in his technological progress. But no one has ever suggested that we ought to stop buying hardware altogether because it is going to be obsolete. We deal

with the best equipment we have, and according to the best brains in this country, the Sentinel system is the best system that we have at this point in time.

Of course, it is going to be improved and developed. For all we know, in a couple of years there may be a better system. Only a few short years ago we praised the Nike system as the best, and we spent millions of dollars on it, only to find Nike-Zeus came along and was a better system. Then the Sentinel system came along and is still a better system.

It is entirely possible that this Nation may develop a space platform capable of launching nuclear rockets at any target in the world, and then that will become the most effective deterrent at that point in time.

But I submit that for this country to bury its head in the sand, and say we are not going to do anything because it is going to be obsolete, is to follow the road to disaster.

We followed that road once before, and we saw how the tragic consequences developed into World War II.

So I say to those who stubbornly oppose this system, give it a chance. Let us try to improve it.

It is going to take money. Of course, it will take money. I, too, would like to see this money spent on schools, and hospitals, and housing, and health, and all the other things—or, better yet, I would like to see a tax break for the taxpayer, to give him back some of the money he is paying in taxes.

However, I think the American people are realists. There is nothing at this time to indicate we have reached that glorious plateau when man will war no more. So we have to be ready.

It is said this will take \$400 billion. I think that statement is the most irresponsible statement. There is no substance to it. The one who made that statement says that the Brookings Institution recently showed the cost of military hardware has increased by 700 percent, and therefore he says the ABM system will cost \$400 billion before it is completed, and that he is right.

The logic of that speaker totally escapes me, but more important, he does a disservice to his country by misleading the American people with figures he knows are indefensible and cannot ever be proven.

The best figures we have are that this system is going to cost us \$12 billion, of which \$4 billion have already been spent on research. I think we ought to underscore the fact that \$4 billion have already gone into the cost of research.

There are those who would have us believe the ABM Sentinel system was devised by some cigar-smoking general in some basement room of the Pentagon.

The fact is that some of the finest nuclear physicists in the world have worked on this system for more than 14 years, and they have now come to a period where they believe they have a system that can do the job. We cannot ignore the fact that all this research has gone into the project, and I think we have to rely on their recommendations.

Furthermore, we very seldom hear anyone mention the fact that the nuclear warhead for both the Spartan and

the Sprint was devised and developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. It is rather interesting to me that some of the finest nuclear physicists in the world have worked on this project.

I am glad to see the distinguished Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy here. It is also interesting to note that the Federal law, the Atomic Energy Act, specifically forbids the licensing of atomic devices which do not meet certain minimum safety standards. The recommendation for use of the nuclear warhead in the Sentinel system was made by the AEC fully mindful of the instruments and the ingredients with which they are working. The AEC would not and could not have recommended this system before it was satisfied the system is safe.

Are we to say that all these people are wrong, and nobody knows what he is doing except the opponents of this system?

For that reason it occurs to me that those who have not taken the trouble to familiarize themselves with the system and who have just gone ahead and tried to impress upon us how bad it is just do not know what they are talking about. I am sure that most of those who oppose the Sentinel system are well-meaning people, motivated by the highest ideals, but I am also sure they do not have the facts.

This is why I believe President Nixon was correct in calling for his own evaluation. Certainly we can all join in hopeful prayer that a reevaluation of this proposal will show that it can be built further away from the big cities. This is something which has disturbed many of the people.

The President was wise, as a new President of the United States, to get his own facts and his own figures, to make his own decision on this case.

I hope also that we can, if possible, find we can hold the cost down. Again I think the President was wise in seeking his own information.

But I hope now that he has this information we will move forward with the system. Only by moving ahead with the ABM can we demonstrate to the enemy the futility of trying to wage aggression against this country. There is no question in my mind that we can make it clear to our adversaries that any attack on the United States is going to fail.

When I hear distinguished scientists like Edward Teller defend this system and speak of its capability, then certainly I cannot in good judgment say he does not know what he is talking about. He has been joined by many other distinguished scientists and military people whose dedication to the preservation of this country is beyond question.

There are those who would have us believe that somehow or other a new un-American monster has been born in this country called the military-industrial complex. They would have us believe that somehow or other this is a conspiracy of men who have only the dollar sign in front of them and are not motivated by any other factors.

This kind of thinking is dangerous to America. Nobody wants peace more than all of us here in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle. But I hope that we are

not going to make the mistake we made in the middle 1930's. We could have at that time preserved peace.

I remember a great President who stood at the dedication of a bridge in Chicago in 1937 and made an eloquent plea to the free world to stop the first of the aggressors when Abyssinia was invaded. At that time the President recommended a quarantine against the aggressor. But the forces of isolation in this country shouted the President down, and Congress passed a neutrality act, an open invitation to aggression.

I am not saying that the Sentinel system is the most perfect system ever devised by man, and I am sure that between now and the time it becomes operational, many changes will be made.

But I believe it would be a tragic mistake if we failed to move forward at this point in time. I feel it is just as important to let Red China know as it is to let the Soviet Union know that any attack on this country will prove to be a failure. There are those who say "You are not building this system against the Soviet Union." As we said time and again, this system can be converted to meet the Soviet threat any time we feel the balance of power has shifted and we need a defense against the Soviet Union.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, looking 48 months down range, we know what is going to be the capability of Red China. We know the evil designs of Red China. I am sure every one of us here will say a thankful prayer if indeed all of these countries all of a sudden came to a realization that there is enough room for all of us in this world and that we do not have to war with each other.

I will tell you this, though: As one Member of this Congress elected to represent the interests of my people, I do not intend to shirk my responsibilities. I was too young in the middle thirties and I was away at war in the forties when the seeds were laid for the problems which we are faced with today, but this Member of this House, speaking for himself, intends to speak out as long as he can in defense of his country and its people.

The road to peace in this world, in my judgment, is to impress on our adversaries the futility of trying to disrupt this peace. I think the American people are willing to stand behind that plan and support it financially.

It is for this reason that I hope President Nixon will give the go sign for deployment of the ABM.

AMERICAN FISHING SOCIETY

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill whose purpose is to honor the founding of America's oldest natural resources conservation organization by providing for the striking of medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fishing Society. I am pleased to be joined in this bill by my distinguished colleague, Mr. JOHN SAYLOR.

This society, whose primary objectives

were to promote the cause of fish culture, and to gather and disseminate information in the area of fishery science and practice, was founded in New York City on December 20, 1870, and was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1910. The American Fisheries Society has long played a leading role in the field of fisheries, and was the first to urge the Congress to establish the first Federal fish hatcheries, one for salmon on the west coast and one for shad on the east coast.

The society has now expanded into an international association of more than 5,000 memberships in the United States and Canada and some 60 other countries throughout the world. Its present-day objectives include the promotion and advancement of all branches of fishery science; to exchange teaching of all phases of fishery sciences in colleges and universities; and most important, to promote conservation and wise utilization of fisheries.

The society will celebrate its centennial September 13-16, 1970, at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City. This bill will provide for the striking of medals commemorating this centennial. I urge that it be given favorable consideration.

AMENDMENT TO UNITED STATES-UNITED KINGDOM MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENT ON USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that President Johnson in the waning hours of the 90th Congress submitted to the Congress a proposed amendment to the 1958 Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes. In accordance with section 123d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. No resolutions respecting the proposed amendment have been introduced since its submission, and therefore no formal report thereon is required of the committee. However, in the interest of keeping the Congress informed with respect to matters of this kind, I thought it appropriate as chairman of the committee that I provide an informal report on the unclassified terms and conditions of the proposed amendment as well as on certain understandings that have been reached with the executive branch as to implementation of the agreement.

Subsection 123d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, provides that no cooperation in the military field with any nation or regional defense organization for the transfer of classified atomic energy information or material may be undertaken unless a proposed agreement for cooperation has been submitted to the Congress and referred to the Joint Committee, to lie before the committee for a period of 60 days while Congress is in session. In addition to the submission of the proposed agreement, there must also be transmitted to the Congress

the approval of the President of the United States and his determination that "the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security." The proposed agreement for cooperation or any amendments thereto shall not become effective if during the 60-day period the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed agreement.

The proposed amendment will extend for a period of 10 years, under the authority of section 91c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, those provisions of the 1958 United States-United Kingdom agreement, as amended, which expire December 30, 1969, and provide for the transfer of special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications. The proposed amendment also provides that the transfer of specific other materials will be authorized for such applications. The maximum quantities of these specific materials to be transferred, or authorized for transfer, by the United States during the effective period of this amendment—that is, prior to December 31, 1979—are set forth in supplementary classified documents which were submitted to the Congress together with the proposed amendment. According to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense, these materials can be made available for transfer during the period involved without adverse effect on our national defense programs.

As is required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the United Kingdom is participating with the United States in an international arrangement pursuant to which the United Kingdom is making substantial and material contribution to the mutual defense and security. Indeed, as noted in the President's message to Congress which I shall include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, this material, which will be used as fuel in the United Kingdom's nuclear submarine program, would substantially enhance the ability of the United Kingdom to contribute to our mutual defense, particularly in the North Atlantic area.

The Joint Committee's review of this matter actually antedates formal submission of the amendment by the President in October 1968. On October 25, 1967, officials of the Atomic Energy Commission consulted with the committee in executive session concerning a proposal to extend those provisions of the existing agreement authorizing the transfer of atomic materials for naval nuclear propulsion purposes. On March 10, 1969, the full committee convened to review the final details of the proposed amendment. Due to the necessary reference to classified information, the hearing was held in executive session. Principal witnesses in attendance were Commissioner Gerald F. Tape of the AEC; the Honorable Carl Walske, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Atomic Energy; and the Honorable Philip J. Farley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Politico-Military Affairs. All three agencies of Government expressed support of the proposed amendment.

During the hearing the executive

branch assured the committee that no transfer of naval nuclear propulsion technology or equipment, or of materials and equipment for nuclear weapons, could be made under the proposed amendment. The committee also was assured that the preferred method of transfer of special nuclear materials to the United Kingdom for use in its submarine program would be through toll enrichment—that is, through the enrichment in the AEC's gaseous diffusion plants, at published prices, of natural uranium supplied by the British—as opposed to outright sale of U.S.-enriched uranium, although the United States would, of course, have the unilateral option of selling enriched uranium if in a particular case that was deemed in the U.S. interest.

Finally, and most importantly in the view of the Joint Committee, the executive branch provided certain assurances concerning the use to be made of the nuclear fuels, equipment and technology transferred under the agreement. Specifically, the committee was assured that the enriched uranium to be provided under the amendment would be for fueling of United Kingdom nuclear-powered submarines, and for no other purpose. Moreover, the committee was assured that all assistance furnished to the United Kingdom submarine program pursuant to the agreement, whether in the form of materials, equipment, or technology, including that heretofore furnished, is subject to the provisions in article VII of the existing agreement which preclude its retransfer by the United Kingdom without U.S. consent. The executive branch today submitted a letter to the committee confirming these assurances in writing. Further, in view of the expiration at midnight on March 12, 1969, of the 60-day period during which the amendment must lie before Congress, the executive branch agreed that it would obtain confirmation from the British Government that it shares these understandings, before exchanging with the United Kingdom the diplomatic notes necessary to bring the amendment into force.

As I noted earlier, no formal Joint Committee vote or report on this matter is required. However, on the basis of its review of the proposed amendment and supporting data, and in consideration of the explicit assurances given to the committee by the executive branch respecting the amendment's implementation, I believe it was the sense of the committee that there was no substantial ground on which to interpose any objection to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message to the Congress dated October 11, 1968, and supporting documents and correspondence be included at this point in the RECORD, together with a copy of the AEC letter to the committee dated March 11, 1969, referred to above.

To the Congress of the United States:
Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended, I am submitting herewith to each House of the Congress for appropriate action an authoritative copy of an amendment to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for

Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958, as amended. The Amendment was signed at Washington on September 27, 1968.

The Agreement of July 3, 1958 as amended included a provision under which the Government of the United States agreed to transfer to the Government of the United Kingdom prior to December 31, 1969 special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications.

Under the Amendment submitted herewith, the Government of the United States shall transfer to the Government of the United Kingdom special nuclear material and authorize the transfer of specific other materials to the Government of the United Kingdom prior to December 31, 1979. The transfer of this material to be used as fuel in the United Kingdom's submarine program would substantially enhance the ability of the United Kingdom to contribute to our mutual defense, particularly in the North Atlantic area.

I am also transmitting a copy of the Acting Secretary of State's letter to me accompanying authoritative copies of the signed Amendment, a copy of a joint letter from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Secretary of Defense recommending approval of this Amendment, and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto, setting forth my approval.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 11, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 4, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

The PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit with a view to its submission to the Congress for appropriate action pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, an Amendment to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes, as amended. The Amendment transmitted herewith was signed at Washington on September 27, 1968 on behalf of the United States pursuant to the authorization granted in your memorandum of September 26, 1968 to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a copy of which was received by me. The Amendment provides for the transfer of nuclear fuel for the United Kingdom's submarine program.

Respectfully submitted,

NICHOLAS KATZENBACH,
Acting Secretary of State.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 26, 1968.

Memorandum for Secretary of Defense;
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

In your joint letters to me of September 18, 1968, you recommended that I approve a proposed Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

I note from your joint recommendations, the United Kingdom is participating with the United States in international arrangements pursuant to which it is making substantial and material contributions to our mutual defense and security. The proposed Amendment will permit cooperation which will further improve our mutual defense posture.

Having considered your joint recommendations and the cooperation provided for in the Amendment, I hereby:

a. Approve the program for the transfer of materials, in the types and quantities and under the terms and conditions provided in

the joint letters of September 18, 1968, to me from the Chairman, USAEC, and the Secretary of Defense and the proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement;

b. Approve the proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement;

c. Determine that the performance of the proposed Amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

d. Authorize the execution of the proposed Amendment for the Government of the United States in a manner specified by the Secretary of State.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is hereby submitted for your consideration and approval a proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

The proposed Amendment will extend, under the authority of Section 91c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the provisions of the 1958 Agreement, as amended, which provide for the transfer of special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications. The proposed Amendment also provides that the transfer of specific other materials will be authorized for such applications. The maximum quantities of these specific materials to be transferred, or authorized for transfer, by the United States during the effective period of this Amendment (i.e., prior to December 31, 1979), are covered in a supplementary classified letter. These quantities can be made available for transfer during this period without adverse effect on our defense programs.

As is required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the United Kingdom is participating with the United States in an international arrangement pursuant to which the United Kingdom is making substantial and material contribution to the mutual defense and security.

This Amendment does not provide for an extension of the exchange of naval nuclear propulsion technology or equipment or for any transfer of materials and equipment for nuclear weapons. On the other hand, it does not affect any of the provisions of the Agreement which are not being amended and, accordingly, does not affect our ability to continue to cooperate in the weapons or intelligence areas under the existing provisions.

The cooperation authorized by the provisions of the Amendment would cover the period January 1, 1970 to December 30, 1979, inclusive.

It is recommended that you:

a. Approve the program for the transfer of material as set forth herein and in the proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement;

b. Approve the proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement;

c. Determine that the proposed Amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

d. Authorize the execution of the proposed Amendment for the Government of the United States in a manner specified by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State concurs in the foregoing recommendation.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,

Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

PAUL H. NITZE,

Secretary of Defense.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority;

Desiring to amend in certain respects the Agreement for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes signed at Washington on the third day of July, 1958, as amended;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Subparagraph A.3 of Article III bis of the Agreement for Cooperation shall be deleted and subparagraph A.4 of Article III bis shall be renumbered as subparagraph A.3 thereof.

ARTICLE 2

Paragraphs B and C of Article III bis of the Agreement for Cooperation shall be renumbered as paragraphs C and D thereof, respectively, and a new paragraph B shall be inserted to read as follows:

"B. The Government of the United States shall transfer to the Government of the United Kingdom special nuclear material, and authorize the transfer of other material, for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications, in such quantities, at such times prior to December 31, 1979, and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed."

ARTICLE 3

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation shall be amended as follows: The words "paragraph A or paragraph B of Article III bis" shall be deleted from subparagraph 1 of paragraph B and the words "paragraph A, paragraph B, or paragraph C of Article III bis" shall be substituted therefor.

ARTICLE 4

This Amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the Agreement for Cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this Amendment.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this twenty-seventh day of September, 1968.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN M. LEDDY,
GERALD F. TAPE.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

PATRICK DEAN.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1969.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: During the Joint Committee's consideration yesterday of the proposed Amendment, signed September 27, 1968, to the Agreement for Cooperation with the United Kingdom on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes, two points were raised about which the Committee desired clarification.

This will confirm my testimony on those points, namely:

1. That the U-235 which would be provided under this Amendment to the Agreement would be supplied for the fueling of United Kingdom nuclear powered submarines; and for no other purpose.

2. That all of the assistance furnished to

the United Kingdom submarine program pursuant to the Agreement whether in the form of materials, equipment or technology, including that heretofore furnished, is subject to the provision in Article VII of the basic agreement, which precludes its transfer by the United Kingdom without U.S. consent.

Moreover, we would not proceed with any implementation of the Amendment until after the United Kingdom confirms that it agrees with these points. We shall, of course, provide the Committee with copies of the confirming documentation.

Sincerely,

GERALD F. TAPE,
Commissioner.

THE LOBBY FOR A GOLD PRICE INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, March 17 will mark the first anniversary of the accord that terminated intervention by the gold pool nations in the London gold market and established the two-tier price system. The accord successfully brought an end to speculation against the dollar that had threatened to drain the United States of its gold reserves and precipitate the most serious international monetary crisis since World War II. With the end of official intervention in the London market, purchases of gold from producers to increase official reserves were also terminated. The prospective distribution of Special Drawing Rights, sometimes referred to as "paper gold," led the financial leaders who formulated the accord to conclude that "the existing stock of monetary gold is sufficient."

Shortly after the accord was announced, I and several other Members of Congress applauded it as a constructive step in the postwar evolution of the international monetary system. In addition to alleviating the immediate pressures on the dollar, this agreement signaled the end of dependence upon gold as a critical factor in the successful operation of the system. The March 17, 1968, accord should be retained as a permanent component of the international monetary structure.

In the year since conclusion of the Washington accord, we have witnessed two severe international monetary crises, and the possibility of a third is now imminent. Disturbances in France last May and June led to the speculation against the franc that was eventually defeated through loans from the International Monetary Fund and other countries to the French Government. Speculation against the franc and in favor of the deutsche mark, believed to be a prime prospect for upward revaluation, renewed last fall and produced massive French reserve losses and similar German gains.

Although expectations at the time pointed toward a realignment of exchange rates, officials of the two nations resolved to deal with the problem through temporary changes in border tax adjustments and a variety of domestic restraints. Previously scheduled wage negotiations between French unions and the government deadlocked last week without agreement. The prospect of

labor unrest on another round of substantial wage increases, beyond the gains won last summer, has renewed pressure against the franc and recently pushed up the free market price of gold.

Before the accord was reached last March, the view was commonly expressed throughout Europe that international monetary difficulties would not abate until the price of gold was doubled or perhaps even tripled. A number of Wall Street investment advisers expressed similar views.

In the months following the accord, the international monetary system has been buffeted by financial storms as severe as any since 1950. No official intervention retarded increases in the free market price of gold. Moreover, South Africa, the world's largest gold producer, withheld its supply from the free market. Still—under these extreme conditions—the free market gold price failed to reach a level even beginning to approximate the dire forecasts.

The same sources continue to forecast a major increase in the official price of gold. Scarifying advertisements alluding to explosions and collapses still appear frequently in the financial section of the Sunday New York Times. The performance of the free market in the past year indicates the unreliability of these forecasts and the fallaciousness of advice stating that the problems of the international monetary system would be solved if only the official price for gold were increased by a multiple of the current level. A March 5, 1969, article in the Wall Street Journal by Alfred L. Malabre observed:

Some investment advisers, who have been talking about an imminent increase in the official gold price for many years, must by now find the non-event absolutely mortifying.

Even those who argue for a substantial increase in the official gold price admit that their solution would not be permanent. Given the net tendency throughout the industrialized world for prices to rise rather than fall, we—the gold boosters concede—would face precisely the same situation again in one, two, or three decades.

The March 17, 1968, accord constituted a historic step forward. At the appropriate time, it broke the dependence of the international monetary system on gold. Now that this dependence has been broken, we can move to base the international monetary system on a supply of reserve assets that will not be a source of periodic speculation.

Mr. Malabre's article follows:

VESTED INTERESTS IN A GOLD-PRICE RISE (By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Few matters are so forbiddingly complicated and yet so vitally important to so many Americans as the relationship between the dollar and gold under the international monetary system. Uncle Sam, of course, has been insisting for years that the official U.S. gold price won't be increased—period. But any enterprising soul who, believing this claim has become a broken record, looks outside of Washington for expert opinion bumps into this unfortunate fact:

Discussion of the dollar-gold question all too often reflects only one point of view—that the wisest course for Uncle Sam would be to sharply increase the gold price.

The primary obstacle to a more balanced debate, to put it bluntly, seems to be the large and highly vocal contingent of influential business persons who, for one reason or another, stand to benefit if the U.S. boosts the gold price. At the same time, there is no comparable group on the other side that would gain if the gold price did not go up.

THEORETICAL PRICE-FIXING

The dollar and its relationship with gold, of course, constitute the foundation underlying the monetary arrangements by which non-Communist nations carry on international trade and capital transactions. Uncle Sam has pledged to buy and sell gold for dollars in dealings with other governments at an approximate rate of \$35 per ounce. In so doing, the U.S., in theory at least, has fixed the international value of the dollar at one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold.

Other non-Communist nations, in turn, set the international values of their own currencies in terms of the dollar. The British pound is currently fixed at \$2.40; the West German mark is set at 25 cents.

In such a manner, non-Communist countries attempt to maintain fixed currency exchange rates for international dealings. In a transaction between businessmen in West Germany and Britain, for example, marks and pounds can be exchanged, barring unusual obstacles, at the rate of about 9.6 marks per pound, a ratio that derives from each currency's fixed relationship with the dollar.

The trouble with all this, as most Americans are by now well aware, is that the U.S. has run perilously low on gold; the U.S. supply stands at less than \$11 billion today, about 50% below the level a decade ago. The current supply, moreover, amounts to barely more than a quarter of the value of foreign-held dollars; these dollars, of course, represent potential claims on the U.S. gold stock.

Foreign governments recently have refrained, for the most part, from cashing in dollars for U.S. gold. Much as they may admire the yellow metal more than the eroding dollar, they realize that if the U.S. runs out of gold or stops selling it altogether, the international monetary system would be in jeopardy. It is doubtful, however, that foreign governments will indefinitely resist the temptation to cash in dollars for gold at the \$35 rate (considerably below the free-market rate in London and elsewhere, which reached record levels yesterday). Nor do many analysts expect America to be able in the long-term to halt the net flow of U.S. dollars abroad; last year's slim balance-of-payments surplus is widely regarded as a fluke, not likely to be repeated in the years ahead.

Optimistic observers are quick to point out that the creation of Special Drawing Rights, possibly later this year, should ease the pressure on the U.S. gold stock; the new SDRs, according to plan at least, will serve as a sort of "paper gold," theoretically as good as gold in international monetary dealings. Pessimists doubt, however, that ultimately SDRs will prove a solution to the gold-shortage problem; some analysts even doubt that the new form of monetary reserve will be available in time to help prevent a monetary crisis later this year.

In the present situation, then, the debate over what should be done about the dollar-gold predicament becomes an urgent, enormously important matter. Unfortunately, however, discussions of what should be done all too often wind up strongly favoring preservation of the fixed-rate system at all costs, including if necessary a very large increase in the official U.S. gold price, perhaps to triple the present level.

Those who urge that the fixed-rate system be maintained at all costs stress the familiar argument that only through such an arrangement can intolerable uncertainty be avoided in international business. This could, of course, turn out to be the case; so long

as the present system remains intact, the answer cannot be known.

A corollary to this argument, it should be added, is that the fixed-rate system is currently jeopardized by the reduced U.S. gold supply and that the U.S. must move rapidly to "increase" this supply by raising the official gold price to \$70 or even \$105 per ounce. Only then, the argument runs, would the gold-dollar foundation of the fixed-rate system be secure, hopefully for many years.

Whatever validity there may be to this line of reasoning, it seems regrettable indeed that so much is being heard about the alleged virtues of the fixed-rate system and the "need" for a gold price boost while so little is being heard about the problems of the system and the highly undesirable aspects of an increase in the official gold price; these range from rewarding such lands as South Africa and the Soviet Union, the big gold producers, to harming anyone who has taken Uncle Sam at his word that the official gold price won't be changed.

It must be emphasized that there does not appear to be any actual conspiracy among those who lobby loudly for a gold price increase. Rather, like those who make up the influential military-industrial complex, the gold lobbyists seem to represent a diverse assortment of individuals involved in a variety of businesses. In some instances, no doubt their desire to see gold go up reflects a perfectly unselfish analysis of what would be best for the general economic welfare.

This notwithstanding anyone attempting to appraise today's gold-dollar debate would be well-advised to take a close look at some of the people who campaign for a higher U.S. gold price.

One particularly vocal group is made up of persons who make a business of providing investment advice. A recent advertisement under the black headline: "Granville Asks, Is Gold Fever on the Rise Again?" The ad goes on to talk about the "excellent opportunity" that gold-mining stocks may currently afford.

PREDICTIONS ON PRICES

An even larger ad predicts a 1969 gold price rise. In part, the ad states that "we do not see how a forthcoming overhaul of the international monetary system can fail to attack what, by our analysis, is the root problem—namely, to incorporate a sharp increase in the official price of gold. This, we predict, will take place in early 1969."

It is axiomatic, of course, that if the U.S. does not increase the official gold price, this could prove highly embarrassing to such advisors as the Holt service. Some investment advisors, who have been talking about an imminent increase in the official gold price for many years, must by now find the non-event absolutely mortifying. Investors who for many years have been putting large sums into gold stocks or, worse still, illegally into gold itself, which is often costly to store and pays no interest, have sadly missed far greater investment opportunities in dozens of businesses that have blossomed and boomed in the post-World War II era.

A still more biased source of support for higher gold prices are individuals who have a direct financial interest in costlier gold, such as persons who own it or mine it. Fritz Machlup, a Princeton University economics professor, recently described the activities of those who mine gold as follows:

"In 1967, after years of rapid increase, the consumption of gold was still only about one-half of the output of the Free World. The excess gold supply has always had a secure outlet into monetary gold reserves, but the mining interests were not satisfied with the official support price. Thus, by means of stories continuously fed to the press and to investment analysts, they developed a huge demand for gold for private stockpiling. Private purchases for stockpiling increased . . . taking eventually not only the excess of gold output over gold consumption but several billion

dollars worth of gold from monetary reserves."

One way in which gold-mining interests propagandize for a higher gold price is through arranging well-publicized conferences of eminent economists and other businessmen. Such conferences, typically, are sponsored by institutions that appear to have no direct tie with gold-mining. The meetings often wind up with resolutions calling for a big increase in the U.S. gold price.

One such conference was held last year at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, a private organization based in Geneva, after lengthy discussions, the conference produced a "final resolution" stating in part that "the price of gold should be approximately doubled." One American who attended the Geneva meeting recalls that Homestake Mining Co. of San Francisco approached him beforehand with an offer to pay the cost of the European trip for him. The American, who did not agree with the resolution, refused the offer and paid his own way, an expense of about \$750. (A Homestake official concedes such an offer was made but claims that the money would have been provided by "other sources" than Homestake itself.)

SOUTH AFRICA'S INTERESTS

South African gold-mining interests appear especially active in setting up monetary conferences. The Transvaal and Orange Free State Chamber of Mines, for instance, financed a long weekend meeting of monetary analysts at a plush Tarrytown, N.Y., estate in October 1965. Guests included a considerable number of analysts known to favor a higher gold price, as well as members of the U.S. financial press.

Unlike the affair at Geneva, no resolution was issued and other views were presented. The official sponsor of the meeting was the prestigious National Industrial Conference Board, the nonprofit research organization, based in New York. More than 3,500 U.S. corporations, including most of the biggest, rely on Conference Board reports in the conduct of their business.

It may or may not be true that we would all be better off if the U.S. does decide to raise the official gold price. But we would all be better off if somebody as affluent as, say, the gold-mining people were available to finance a balanced discussion.

HOBLING TRADE WITH TARIFF AND NONTARIFF CURBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress are especially sensitive to the complexities of international trade and to the important role which trade plays in our commercial and diplomatic relations with other nations, as well as in our domestic industrial development.

The long, technical negotiations during the Kennedy round of world trade talks, completed in 1966 and signed by 76 nations, resulted in significant tariff reductions that are beneficial to all signers. It was hoped, too, that the reductions would assure steady progress toward a freer world trade.

That the agreed-upon tariff cuts would cause unfortunate dislocations in specific industries was to be expected, and we in the Congress were prepared to give sympathetic attention to serious dislocations, not only because of the short-term damage to some industries but also because national security interests are sometimes involved.

But it is distressing now to note, even as nations concur in the long-term goals

of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, that additional handicaps, in the form of increasing numbers of "nontariff barriers" are appearing, in the United States and in other countries throughout the world. One of the major obstacles to the elimination of these barriers has been the failure of the Congress to repeal the "American selling price" system as agreed during the Kennedy round. I hope that we shall do so in this session.

An informative review of the hazards which this and other "nontariff barriers" present to international trade was written by Mr. J. Russell Boner in the March 3, 1969, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I insert it at this point in the RECORD, and I urge its careful consideration by my colleagues in the Congress:

HOBLING TRADE: NONTARIFF CURBS SPREAD DESPITE FREE TRADERS' FIGHT TO REMOVE THEM—COMMON MARKET SET TO TAX SOYBEAN OIL; UNITED STATES WANTS "VOLUNTARY" TEXTILE QUOTAS—SOME TARIFF CUTS ARE OFFSET

(By J. Russell Boner)

GENEVA.—The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade recently finished a catalog that was intended to list every nontariff barrier impeding trade among Free World nations. The 276-page tome contains such obscure items as an Italian "sanitary tax" on foreign snake poison.

But the catalog already is out of date. It doesn't include the "import deposit" plan by which Britain limits sales in the United Kingdom of all sorts of foreign goods, nor the "voluntary" limits on shipments of steel to the U.S. that European and Japanese mills accepted under American pressure. They came too late to make the list.

And by the end of 1969 the catalog may be ancient history. A complete listing of nontariff barriers by then might have to include "voluntary"—or even mandatory—quotas on foreign textile shipments to the U.S. Plus an Austrian "variable" tax on foreign chickens that might be manipulated to keep their price always above the price of Austrian-grown birds. Plus a \$60-a-ton tax on soybean oil sold in the European Common Market that American farmers think will crimp their exports of that commodity. Plus, free traders fear, many other schemes now intriguing protectionists around the world.

For, as the catalog's speedy obsolescence shows, an international effort to tear down nontariff barriers has accomplished less than nothing. Not only have few barriers come down; new ones are going up at an accelerating pace.

THE REASONS WHY

Why? "Nature abhors a vacuum, and manufacturers abhor free trade," a GATT official answers caustically. But however accurate he may be in identifying the underlying reason, there are some more immediate reasons. One, ironically, seems to be what looked like a great free-trade victory: The agreement signed in 1966 by 76 nations participating in the Kennedy Round of world trade talks to cut tariffs on industrial goods an average of 35% in five years.

While carrying out the first stages of these cuts, some nations have imposed new nontariff restrictions. By no coincidence, free traders suspect, some of these restrictions seem likely to soften or even negate the impact of the tariff reductions.

In the Kennedy Round, for example, the U.S. won a promise that the Common Market would impose neither tariffs nor quotas on soybean products. Now, officials fear the Market's proposed sales tax on soybean oil will make this victory meaningless.

The \$60-a-ton tax would apply to domestic oil, as well as to imports, but the Common Market produces little soybean oil. So Americans suspect the tax is designed to prompt

Common Market customers to buy European-produced substitutes in place of the \$500 million worth of U.S. soybean oil they had been expected to buy this year.

"TVA" TAXES

Many European lands also are collecting sales taxes by the "TVA" (for "tax on value added" by manufacturing) system, which generally makes taxes higher on imports than on domestic goods. "Since the Kennedy Round, Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden have switched to TVA, and Norway is planning to," says an expert of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris.

Monetary crises have led to erection of new trade barriers, too. Import restrictions are expedient measures to strengthen a currency, says a Common Market expert, because "they help the balance of payments and cater to internal protectionist groups at the same time."

(The restrictions may be unpopular with other citizens. Some 1,500 Japanese dog lovers demonstrated outside the ministry of international trade and industry building in Tokyo last November to protest severe restrictions on pet-food imports. The ministry, however, stuck to its position that if the yen is to hold its value, Japan can't send too much money abroad to pay for such unessential products as dog food.)

Altogether, the OECD reports receiving twice as many notifications of changes in trade regulations—mostly restrictive changes—from its 21 members in the past two years as in the prior two years.

SOME INTERNATIONAL FIGHTS

This spread of nontariff barriers hasn't gone unopposed. GATT is complaining to the International Monetary Fund that the British import-deposit system violates trade treaties whose operation GATT supervises. The system requires many British importers to deposit with the British treasury for six months, at no interest, a sum equal to half the value of the goods they import. Britain imposed the system under IMF rules if claims allow such steps to protect a currency, such as the pound, facing a devaluation threat.

The Common Market similarly is demanding that Italy, a member nation, remove a 0.5% "administrative tax" on imports. It also has hauled France, another member nation, before a court maintained by European-unity organizations, charging that France failed to remove on schedule a system of subsidies to French manufacturers designed to enable them to compete more effectively against foreign rivals. The Market had allowed these subsidies as temporary measures to strengthen the franc against devaluation threats.

It's possible, however, that these fights may end by speeding the construction of nontariff barriers. International organizations usually punish a country that restricts trade in violation of the organizations' rules by allowing countries that are hurt to retaliate. Thus, if GATT can't get Britain to end the import-deposit system, it might have to allow its other members to erect barriers against British goods. Whether or not that would be just punishment, it would hardly further the cause of free trade.

The tendency to fight trade barriers with retaliatory trade barriers already is strong, and it alarms free-trade advocates.

There is "a very strong incentive for countries to emulate other nations' nontariff barriers, and with tariffs coming down there is even more incentive to do this," says Harald B. Malmgren, a U.S. Government trade official. He fears the result may be "a real wave of protectionism"—particularly if the U.S. acts to restrict imports further.

And the U.S. may do just that. Some American officials threaten that if the Common Market goes ahead with its proposed sales tax on soybean oil, the U.S. may retaliate against such major imports from the Common Market as autos, steel, office machines, cheese, ham and wines—though perhaps by

raising tariffs on them, rather than by erecting nontariff barriers.

Efforts to stop the spread of nontariff barriers by diplomacy usually have been hamstrung because most nations are in a poor position to protest against other nations' barriers. The potential protesters usually have or are building nontariff barriers of their own that can be pointed out with embarrassing effect.

TRACTOR REGULATIONS

France, for instance, has irritated exporters of other nations by imposing "highway safety" regulations on farm tractors. The rules require tractors to have headlights. Headlights weren't required before the Kennedy Round, and would-be exporters to France say the expense of installing them just about cancels the effect of a 2% Kennedy Round tariff cut on tractors.

Both the U.S. and Germany have been annoyed—but they haven't protested. Possible reason: Germany requires two sets of brakes on a tractor and two seats—requirements that some trade experts consider as restrictive as the French headlight rules—while the U.S. enforces safety regulations on autos that European car makers consider costly to meet.

The U.S. has expressed concern to the Common Market about the group's proposed sales tax on soybean oil. The Common Market has countered by expressing equal concern about U.S. pressure on foreign textile mills to "voluntarily" limit cloth sales to the U.S. President Nixon, at a press conference in early February, spoke of possibly "having to go to legislation which would impose import quotas" on textiles if a "voluntary" agreement couldn't be reached.

A SMALL AGREEMENT

In this climate of "you're another" arguments, more formal efforts by international organizations to get nontariff barriers torn down have made only minuscule progress. The European Free Trade Association, a customs union of Britain and seven other nations, has been concentrating its efforts on nontariff barriers since its members abolished tariffs on each other's industrial goods at the end of 1966. Only last month, however, did it announce its first nontariff agreement, and that was a minor one: The eight partners agreed that they could use each other's test reports on electrical consumer goods, rather than having each nation run time-consuming separate tests on the other nations' products.

A much more important agreement to lower nontariff barriers has never gone into effect. During the Kennedy Round trade talks, some European nations agreed to eliminate discriminatory sales taxes against large American-made cars, in return for a U.S. agreement to scrap the "American selling price" system of valuing certain imported chemicals and dyes. Under the American selling price system, tariffs levied against the imports are calculated, not as a percentage of their actual price, but as a percentage of the price of competing American-made products. The system is considered a "nontariff" barrier because it affects the way the tariffs are calculated rather than the actual tariff rates.

Only Congress can repeal the "American selling price" system, however, and Congress hasn't seen fit to do that. So the Europeans haven't revised their auto sales taxes either—and their disappointment over the experience threatens to gum up pending negotiations about other nontariff barriers.

The negotiations, to be conducted under GATT auspices, will cover the whole range of nontariff barriers listed in GATT's 276-page catalog. Preliminary discussions opened last month. So far, they have established only that the Common Market delegation is reluctant to talk seriously about any concessions unless it can get some assurance that Congress will put into effect re-

ciprocal concessions that might be agreed to by the U.S. delegation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Tuesday, March 11, 1969, through Thursday, March 27, 1969, on account of illness.

Mr. PODELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. McMILLAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, March 10, and the balance of the week, 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. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of California, for 1 hour, on March 26.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELCHER and to include several letters.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER in three instances.

Mr. LUJAN in three instances.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. CONTE in five instances.

Mr. McEWEN in 10 instances.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BROCK in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. POFF.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. DENT.
 Mr. EILBERG.
 Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. RONAN.
 Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
 Mr. OTTINGER.
 Mr. SIKES in 10 instances.
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.
 Mr. ST GERMAIN.
 Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
 Mr. ASHLEY in three instances.
 Mr. MIKVA in three instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in five instances.
 Mr. FALLON in two instances.
 Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.
 Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
 Mr. MARSH in two instances.
 Mr. KYROS in two instances.
 Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
 Mr. DULSKI in three instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
 Mr. STEPHENS.
 Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 497. An act to amend section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Aircraft piracy, preliminary report (Rept. No. 91-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4297. A bill to amend the act of November 8, 1966 (Rept. No. 91-34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 213. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct studies and investigations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and

for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-35). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 282. Resolution to create a select committee to regulate parking on the House side of the Capitol (Rept. No. 91-36). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 268. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 91-37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 313. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 33, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 306. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of prices of lumber and plywood (Rept. No. 91-39). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 8584. 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 Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 8585. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide, under the program of aid to families with dependent children, for the furnishing of three meals a day to all children under age 16 who are eligible for such aid or whose families are below the poverty level, at appropriate day-care centers and at public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8586. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 8587. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 8588. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation development, and utilization of natural resources, and maintenance of the quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 8589. 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.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 8590. 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. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8591. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce," approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CABELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr.

HATHAWAY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 8592. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 8593. A bill to change the definition of annuities for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8594. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which tickets to professional, semiprofessional, and amateur baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer games will be furnished at no cost by local police officers and firemen to individuals under the age of 19, particularly such individuals who are economically underprivileged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8595. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8596. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8597. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8598. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8599. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8600. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8601. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 8602. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote in presidential and vice presidential elections of certain persons who change their legal residence prior to such election; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 8603. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8604. A bill to improve law enforcement in cities by making available funds to be used to increase police salaries and to add more police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 8605. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 8606. A bill to amend section 312 of

the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 8607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. JONAS, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 8608. 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 Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 8609. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 8610. A bill to amend section 4063(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption of specified articles from the tax on motor vehicles); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8611. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 8612. 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. HALPERN:

H.R. 8613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 8614. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Informative Science; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 8615. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 8616. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 8617. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. SCHWENDEL, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 8618. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8619. A bill to amend the Federal

Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8620. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of certain cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8621. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 8622. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 8623. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8624. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent across-the-board benefit increase (with a minimum retirement annuity of \$80 a month) and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8625. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to extend to certain veterans who served in the Mexican border conflict the benefits enjoyed by veterans who served during periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8626. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 8627. 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. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 8628. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the valuation of a decedent's interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 8630. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8631. 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. RONAN:

H.R. 8632. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8633. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services

of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 8634. 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.

H.R. 8635. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 8636. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 8637. 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 exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 8638. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to modify the reporting requirement relating to pensions for veterans and to liberalize the oath requirement for hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8639. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 8640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 8641. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 8642. A bill to abolish the preferential tax treatment of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 8643. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8644. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8645. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall construct and operate a monorail system connecting Dulles International Airport with Washington National Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8646. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8647. A bill to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to establish a national wildlife refuge in the south San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 8648. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8649. A bill to establish the Fort Point National Historic Site in San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8650. A bill to equalize the promotion opportunity of officers of the Air Force Reserve involuntarily ordered to active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired policemen or firemen or their dependents, or to the widows or other survivors of deceased policemen or firemen, shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RALLSBACK, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BOW, Mr. LATTI, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.R. 8652. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY (for herself, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 8653. A bill to provide for an exclusion from gross income in the case of compensation for members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8654. A bill to provide that for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for returns regarding receipts of interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 8656. A bill to authorize the use of certain real property in the District of Columbia for chancery purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 8657. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 8658. A bill to amend the Alaskan Statehood Act, Public Law 85-508, July 7, 1958, 72 Stat. 339, by repealing the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Alaska and other ports in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8659. A bill to improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8660. A bill to provide for special programs for children with learning disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 8661. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 8662. A bill to authorize command of the U.S.S. *Constitution* (IX-21) by retired officers of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8663. A bill to amend the act of September 20, 1968 (Public Law 90-502), to provide relief to certain former officers of the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8664. A bill to authorize an increase in the number of flag officers who may serve on certain selection boards in the Navy, and in the number of officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve who are eligible to serve on selection boards considering reserves for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8665. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8666. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8667. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8668. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8669. A bill to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to make certain air carriers ineligible for subsidy payments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 8670. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 8671. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize educational assistance loans to veterans to supplement educational assistance allowances paid to such veterans under such chapter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8672. A bill to amend section 717 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize lump-sum settlements of national service life insurance maturing in the future unless the insured elects a different mode of settlement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 8673. A bill to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8674. A bill to authorize the reduction or elimination of the hazards of public rail-highway grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washing-

ton, D.C., and Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8675. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by State policemen for meals which they are required to eat while on duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by State, regional, city, county, and town policemen for meals which they are required to eat while on duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 8677. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 8678. A bill to provide for the remission or mitigation of the forfeiture of a vehicle involved in a narcotics violation if the legal owner of such vehicle shows no actual knowledge that the vehicle would be used in such violation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 8679. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, subject to the existing actuarial reduction, and that women with 30 years' coverage may retire at age 62 with full benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 532. Joint resolution designating January 15 of each year as "Martin Luther King Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 533. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a national preferential primary election to select candidates for the office of the President and Vice President and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by the popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 534. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the book, "Our American Government," as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to provide Congress with a plan for legislation to deal with the crisis of the cities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 307. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 308. Resolution providing for the payment out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for a limited period of the salaries of certain House committee personnel newly appointed in the 91st Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Res. 309. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H. Res. 310. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to con-

duct an investigation and study of prices of lumber and plywood; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 311. Resolution, U.S. aid for Iraqi Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Res. 312. Resolution establishing a Code of Ethics and Standards for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. OLSEN: Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives to the Montana congressional delegation and to the Secretary of Agriculture, asking that appropriate changes be made in Federal statutes so that Montana meats, inspected under State inspection which has been approved as equal to Federal inspection standards, may be shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

45. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, asking that the President and Congress expand the aid now given by the Federal Government, specifically to the Navajo and Hopi Indians, under Public Law 474, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 47, 25 U.S.C. 639), to all recognized Indian tribes and nations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

46. Also joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, requesting that the fight site of Meriwether Lewis and his men with Blackfeet Indians on the south bank of the Two Medicine River on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of the State of Montana and the surrounding area evidencing ancient marine and animal life and Indian cultures be designated as both a historical landmark and national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

47. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, that the superintendent of Yellowstone National Park and various Montana veteran wildlife and sportsmen organizations reach an agreement whereby members will be available to a call of the superintendent to be deputized as park rangers to assist regular park rangers in reducing the elk population in the park to safe and sustainable numbers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

48. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, asking that the Montana congressional delegation take action necessary to insure that the Federal Government will continue to make payments for certain persons in State institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

49. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of Montana to the Montana congressional delegation, asking that the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to forward to the State of Montana all unclaimed and unpaid deposits in the discontinued U.S. postal savings system, plus interest, in which the State of Montana is interested; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

50. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives to the Montana congressional delegation, stating that Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming are now doing active planning for the development of water and related resources in order to achieve full resource potential, that additional time is needed to complete this planning and, therefore, until planning is completed in the four States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, there should be no interstate-interbasin transfer of water from these four States; to the Committee on Public Works.

51. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and

House of Representatives, asking that Highway 16 from Glendive via Sidney, Culbertson, Plentywood, and Port of Raymond be designated as the interstate connection with the Province of Saskatchewan; to the Committee on Public Works.

52. Also, joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, urging the Congress to provide immediate funds for the construction of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary to be located at the Fort Harrison, Mont., Reservation adjacent to the existing Veterans' Administration hospital facility; to the Committee on Veterans' 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. 8680. A bill for the relief of Adelina Marilyn Soto Aristy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8681. A bill for the relief of Shiela Joy Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8682. A bill for the relief of Eraldo Cinganeli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8683. A bill for the relief of Antonio Costante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8684. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe and Francesco Siragusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 8685. A bill for the relief of Yehuda, Eva, and Rony Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8686. A bill for the relief of Dr. Iqbal Ahmed Ansari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8687. A bill for the relief of Francesco Canale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8688. A bill for the relief of Carlos Orueta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8689. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Ricotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8690. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Rosamilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8691. A bill for the relief of Maria de Rosario Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 8692. A bill for the relief of Angiolino Agriesti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 8693. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maruf Aziz Razzuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 8694. A bill for the relief of Capt. John T. Lawlor (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8695. A bill to authorize the negotiated sale of vessels from the reserve fleet to Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 8696. A bill for the relief of Alice Elisa Encinas Baca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8697. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joshua A. Perper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8698. A bill for the relief of Sebastian Silvio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8699. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade of certain officers in the U.S. Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 8700. A bill for the relief of Polyxeni Pantazatou and Alexandra Pantazatou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 8701. A bill for the relief of Laura Colubig and her daughter, Barbara Colubig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8702. A bill for the relief of Guy Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8703. A bill for the relief of Anna Leonetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8704. A bill for the relief of Mollie King Williams and Clarence Fitzroy Williams (husband and wife); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 8705. A bill for the relief of Felipe Perez Bazan and Carmen O. Bazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8706. A bill for the relief of Clarence Cisin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8707. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Giuliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8708. A bill for the relief of Mani Hashem, his wife, Maline Hashem, and their minor daughter, Ariela Hashem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8709. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Solomon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8710. A bill for the relief of William Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 8711. A bill for the relief of Dr. Waheedul Haque and his wife, Dr. Abida K. Haque; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 8712. A bill for the relief of Ena Gaymes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8713. A bill for the relief of Livia Villano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8714. A bill for the relief of John Dallas Cosgrove; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 8715. A bill for the relief of Dr. Desiderio Hebron and his wife, Dr. Martha Hebron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8716. A bill for the relief of Emidio Ascenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8717. A bill for the relief of Italo Rosati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 8718. A bill for the relief of Angela Ielo Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8719. A bill for the relief of Lide Babayan Sae Gharajeloo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 8720. A bill for the relief of Howard C. Ramey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 8721. A bill for the relief of Luisa Celis de Reyes, Carlos Crispin Reyes, and Luisa Marie Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8722. A bill for the relief of Delfin S. A. Goleco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8723. A bill for the relief of Lodovic Ancillotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8724. A bill for the relief of Vida A. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8725. A bill for the relief of Salvador Borras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8726. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Csatar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8727. A bill for the relief of John Kaung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8728. A bill for the relief of Eel Fong Koo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8729. A bill for the relief of John Sellars Lyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8730. A bill for the relief of Youssef Faraj Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8731. A bill for the relief of Esmeralda Antonia Ramirez y Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Luigi Viekoslav Pirjavec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8733. A bill for the relief of John Alexander Staine and his wife, Georgiana Melba Staine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:
H.R. 8734. A bill for the relief of Herman F. LeDoyt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:
H.R. 8735. A bill for the relief of Umberto Maccarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8736. A bill for the relief of Doris Isabelle Robotham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:
H.R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Carmela Toschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:
H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Mateo M. Arce; 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:

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Art Brown, Flint, Mich., relative to religion in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. Also, petition of Mr. James K. Kelly, Lansing, Kans., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. Also, petition of Eugene Lynch, Oakland, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXPLOSIVE GROWTH OF THE AIRLINES

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps no other major industry in our country has the problems of explosive growth as those faced by the airlines. Consider, for example, that over the past 10 years—since the first U.S. jet flight—air travel has grown more than 16 times faster than the population and more than twice as fast as the gross national product. This exceptional growth has not been without serious problems, particularly airport-airways congestion which resulted in some massive air traffic jams last summer at several of our major airports.

I do not believe that any airline official is more concerned about this crisis in air transportation than Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., the distinguished president of TWA. Through his initial efforts, the airlines and the Government are moving toward a solution to this complex problem which involves varied interests.

Mr. Tillinghast talked about the overall problem on a recent evening in Chicago before members of the Economic Club of Chicago. I believe that Senators will find his analysis of the problem most informative and thought provoking. More important he has suggested steps for immediate action to relieve air congestion.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tillinghast's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRWAYS OF THE FUTURE

(Address by Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr.)

For the invitation to address you this evening I am complimented and grateful. It is a pleasant experience to be here though it is an appearance not to be taken lightly. The distinguished traditions of the Chicago Economic Club and your position in our nation as a listening post and valuable source of opinions command the respect of any speaker. Also, no city has been more deeply involved in transportation, or benefited so much from it, as yours.

In the middle of the last century when your ancestors decided to make railroads available to Chicago, they didn't quibble. Ten thousand miles of track were laid in

nine short years. The benefits that accrued to Chicago from its fabulous railroad network are with you yet. Similarly from the beginnings of commercial aviation, Chicagoans have been air-minded. With the opening of Midway Airport in 1931, Chicago swiftly built a reputation in the air to match her reputation for primacy on the ground. You led with airport development in anticipation of the jet era, and with the advent of O'Hare in 1955 continued to perpetuate your distinction of having the world's busiest airport. Your municipal officials have developed a reputation for progressiveness and foresight in this area.

No city stands to gain more from its airways to the rest of the world in the Seventies and Eighties than does Chicago. And no city has greater reason to be concerned about the problems facing air transport today. So if I address myself to some of the current problems and opportunities of air transportation, we should, at least, find ourselves on a ground of common interest.

That the airline industry has a few problems should come as no surprise to you. The explosive growth that has seen U.S. air travel grow 16 and a half times faster than the population and two and a half times faster than the gross national product in the decade since the introduction of jets, has given us our share of problems—economic, financial and political. We have been alternately the hope and despair of the investment community, the sinew of commerce and industry and the frustrator of carefully laid plans, the symbol of romantic travel to exotic places, and the disturber of the peace.

One could talk at length to any of these subjects and occupy an evening—or at least so much thereof as would be meaningful after so bountiful a repast. But I propose this evening to focus on just two matters which are currently the subject of governmental consideration in Washington and with respect to which major policy decisions must be made in the coming months. These issues are first, the improvement of our airways and airports system, and second, the maintenance of the United States' position as a purveyor of advanced technology to the world, with special reference to supersonic transport.

Many of us fly between New York and Chicago where there are flights with ample capacity every half-hour from morn till night. Some of you undoubtedly fly on the hour, but, personally, I prefer to fly on the half-hour and therefore fly TWA. In any event, those who experience this abundant service under good conditions may wonder whether there are any very basic problems that a little better management could not solve. But those who have looked deeply into the situation know that things aren't that simple.

At the moment, 38 airlines are involved in the process of attempting to ration by agreement a maximum of 115 movements per hour at O'Hare. The agonies of this exercise

speaking eloquently of the seriousness of the problem and the diversity of viewpoints. If there were any doubts as to this seriousness and diversity, they should be quickly dispelled by the loud cries of complaint from general aviation interests at the mere idea of controls on the use of airports.

The whole problem is confused somewhat by the multiplicity of voices in and about our industry. A great many interests are involved and most are aware that the stakes in 1969 are very high. Few of these voices are bashful. Most solutions that make sense involve disappointment to somebody, somewhere. It is an era when we understand the significance of the poet's words: "What you are shouts so loud I can't hear what you say." As President Nixon said in his inaugural address, "America has suffered from a fever of words." He couldn't have phrased it better for the aviation industry.

One who speaks for commercial aviation today, for example, has a hard time being heard by one who speaks for general aviation, or so-called private flying. One who speaks for a new airport site has a hard time being heard by the nearby landowner.

But let us move back a step or two this evening and see if we cannot look at the subject with some degree of objectivity:

Last summer we saw at Chicago, New York and Washington, and at times at other cities, a series of massive air traffic snarls that shook many people out of their complacency. Congestion drove home, as no one previously had been able to do, the realization that we have a major problem. The fact that the problem of 1968 was due in large measure to the culmination of what is basically a labor problem between the flight controllers and FAA is of relatively little moment, for had there not been a controller's slowdown the other factors bearing on this problem would have presented us with this gigantic traffic jam in 1969 or 1970 or 1971. And indeed, the failure of our federal government to provide a complement of controllers adequate to the demands of the system is quite symptomatic of the basic problem.

The basic problem is not one that has developed out of thin air. It has been quite apparent in the distance to any of us—commercial airlines, general aviation, federal government and local government—to any one who cared to stop and really listen. During the 10 years of the jet age, concerned elements in industry and government have been shouting warnings and appeals to each other, but few of the elements have really listened. And so we have found ourselves making extensive and expensive studies and calling out the results to the other fellow like characters in a dream, whispering for help in voices that no one hears.

I hardly need to labor the point that paralysis of our air transport system is economically and socially undesirable. From our standpoint, it has contributed to a sharp