

been delayed, the number of passengers using National has increased by 2,275,000 or 17 percent over the preceding 20-month period. And the problem will continue to grow until positive steps are taken to limit the number of flights at National.

In the beginning, it was hoped the airlines would do this voluntarily and they were granted a delay to work out an agreement. Nothing happened. And, judging from the testimony of former FAA Administrator E. R. Quesada, himself an airline director, nothing will happen. Competitive pressures in the industry are simply too strong for there to be any realistic hope of a voluntary solution, according to General Quesada. That leaves the problem squarely in the hands of the FAA and the CAB.

In requesting the most recent delay in this proceeding, the Department of Transportation expresses hope that new regulations concerning the use of high-density traffic airports, of which National is one, might resolve the congestion problem. Frankly, I see little chance of that happening.

The new regulations make no change in the number of commercial flights now using National nor do they remove the exemption for extra sections of commuter flights. In its testimony Wednesday, the FAA make it clear that under these flight limitations, and without introducing larger aircraft into National, the number of passengers will increase by 6 million in 1980.

The high-density traffic airport regulations are scheduled to become effective on June 1, 1969, and to expire 6 months

later or December 31, 1969. If the Department of Transportation waits to evaluate the results, it could be another year before CAB hearings are held.

Mr. President, I am disappointed by the failure to move ahead with this investigation. Any further lengthy delays would be unconscionable. I hope the hearings now being held by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia will impress the Department of Transportation and the CAB with the urgency of the situation. We know the problem and we know the solution. What we need now is to act.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1969, under authority of the order of March 24, 1969:

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Harold B. Finger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Kenneth E. Frick, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles H. Rogovin, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Jerome M. Rosow, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 26, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Finally, brethren, be of one mind, live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you.—2 Corinthians 13: 11.

Eternal Spirit, who art ever speaking to man and always seeking to lead Thy children into the ways of peace, we pray for our country.

Strengthen our leaders that they may walk with Thee as they carry their responsibilities. Sustain our people that in true service and with humble hearts they may usher in a new day of peace by doing Thy will.

So unite us in our love for Thee and by our confidence in one another that together we may hasten the day when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

With this creative faith and this courageous spirit may we march forward together toward a greater nation and a better world.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 25, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 4:40 p.m., on Tuesday, March 25, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President transmitting the report for fiscal year 1968 on the interna-

tional educational and cultural exchange program.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968 ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the report for fiscal year 1968 on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256). During fiscal year 1968, 6,777 teachers, scholars, and distinguished leaders were involved in this program in the United States and in 126

other nations and territories. This was a reduction of 10 percent from the preceding year. Since 1949, a total of 125,777 persons have participated in the exchanges.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 1969.

**EXTENDING FOR ANOTHER YEAR
INCOME TAX SURCHARGE—MES-
SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 91-92)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Clearly this nation must come to grips with the problem of an inflation that has been allowed to run into its fourth year. This is far too long, and it has already caused substantial distortions in our economy.

Inflation is a form of economic aggression against the very young and the very old, the poor and the thrifty. It is these Americans who are largely defenseless against the kind of price increases for food, clothing, medicine, housing and education that have swept over the Nation in the last few years.

Government has two major instruments for dealing with this problem. One is monetary policy, which should continue its program of restraint. The other is fiscal policy—the management of the Federal budget—which must turn away from budgets which have propelled the inflation, and turn instead to one with a strong surplus that will help to curb it.

The prospect of a thin budget surplus or a return to deficits would again nudge monetary policy off course. The result, as always, would be further increases in interest rates, a dangerously overheated economic engine, and the threat of accelerating the advance of the price level. Because the problem of inflation was neglected far too long, we cannot risk even a neutral budget policy of narrow balance.

Only a combined policy of a strong budget surplus and monetary restraint can now be effective in cooling inflation, and in ultimately reducing the restrictive interest rates forced on us by past policies. This is fundamental economics, and we intend to deal with fundamentals.

We are determined to keep faith with America's wage earners, farmers and businessmen. We are committed to take every necessary action to protect every American's savings and real income from further loss to inflation.

The budget for the year beginning July 1, 1969, submitted in January, estimates the surplus at \$3.4 billion. However, current examination of this budget reveals that some of its estimates of expenditures were low. For example, interest on the Federal debt will be far more than was estimated. This, along with such items as an underestimate of farm price support payments and a substantial overestimate of offshore oil lease receipts,

means that a current analysis of the budget submitted in January shows a reduction in the surplus of \$1.3 billion for this fiscal year and \$1.7 billion for the fiscal year 1970.

Thus, half of the projected 1970 surplus has disappeared before the year begins. Similarly, more than half of this year's projected surplus of \$2.4 billion will not be realized—and for the same reasons.

On the matter of cutting expenditures:

To produce a budget that will stop inflation, we must cut expenditures while maintaining revenues. This will not be easy. Dealing with fundamentals never is.

I intend to submit budget revisions which will reduce Federal spending in fiscal 1970 significantly below the amount recommended in January, even before those previous figures have been adjusted to reflect current conditions.

On the matter of maintaining revenues:

I am convinced that the path of responsibility requires that the income tax surcharge, which is expected to yield \$9½ billion, be extended for another year. As I have said before, the surcharge is a temporary tax that must be ended as soon as our commitments in Southeast Asia and economic conditions permit. Because of budget and economic conditions, I reaffirm my support of the recommendation President Johnson made last January that the surcharge be extended, and I am transmitting to the Congress a request that this be done.

In addition, the scheduled reductions in the telephone and passenger car excise taxes must be postponed, and user charges equal in revenue yield to those now in the budget should be enacted. Together, these will produce close to \$1 billion in revenue next year.

On the question of tax reform, this Administration remains committed to a more equitable and more efficient tax structure. In the coming month, the first specific proposals of that reform will be coming up to the Congress from the Treasury Department.

Taken together, these actions to reduce spending and maintain revenues will produce the strong budget surplus urgently needed to meet the inflationary threat.

Moreover, by proving Government's serious intent to counter the upward spiral of prices and wages, we will create conditions which will encourage the private sector to stop assuming a high rate of inflation in long-range planning.

Courageous Government action will modify the inflationary psychology which now afflicts business, labor and consumers generally. It is particularly hard on small business, and those of modest means in the management of their incomes and savings.

This ordering of our economic house—distasteful as it is in many respects—will do much to slow down the rise in the cost of living, help our seriously weakened position in international trade, and restore the sound basis for our on-going prosperity.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 26, 1969.

**THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON
SURTAX**

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inflation which has been with us for more than 3 years has reached a new peak of intensity and peril. President Nixon has therefore seized this moment to lay a challenge before Congress and the American people and to spell out the course of action we must follow to bring inflation under control. A majority of us in this House voted last year to approve a 10-percent surtax on individual and corporate income taxes. That took political courage, but we later found that the voters did not visit retribution upon us. Now, with the inflation battle still to be won, President Nixon has exhibited the same kind of courage and has asked us to act in the best interests of the United States and its people. I do not think this House of Representatives will flinch from that responsibility. I feel certain Congress will do what we know to be sensible and right in this time of inflationary stress and psychology. There is no question that President Nixon has made the proper recommendation in urging a 12-month extension of the surtax at the existing level. And there is no question in my mind that Congress will approve that recommendation. We know what the evil consequences of runaway inflation would be. We know that if inflation forces are not thwarted, prices in this country will double within 14 years. We know that men and women who have set aside savings to live on in retirement will see half of those savings destroyed unless inflation is curbed. What Mr. Nixon has proposed in a consumer program—a program to protect what the consumer has to spend. This is not a problem that the President alone can solve. He needs the help of Congress and he needs the help of the American people. Business, labor, and consumers—all must make a commitment to the goal that President Nixon has set, that of erasing the current inflationary psychology and halting the steady erosion of the dollar's purchasing power. If America whips inflation now, Mr. Speaker, our people can have a strong, growing economy with low unemployment in the future. Mr. Speaker, let us all have the courage to back the President in the fight against inflation, for the long-term good of the Nation and especially the poor and the pensioners.

**THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON
SURTAX**

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, President Nixon submitted his message urging extension of the 10-percent tax surcharge for 1 more year.

Here we go again. When the surtax debate took place last year, we were assured that within the surtax year, the

administration would present a program of revenue-raising tax reform.

It was my expectation that these new tax reform revenues would replace the surtax in the second year. It appears from the President's proposals that this is too much for the American taxpayer to hope for.

I expect to vote against the extension of the surtax, since it has been an utter failure in controlling inflation. The American taxpayer has a right to rebel against this needless tax which sensible and proper tax reform would make unnecessary.

The taxpayer has a right to expect action on tax reform in this Congress. This is the very hour for performance. The extension of the surtax would only serve to extend the privilege of tax shelters which have eroded the integrity of our tax system and the public confidence.

The surtax has also served as a fiscal crutch. If it is taken away, revenue-raising tax reform becomes an immediate necessity. The Treasury loss of the tax surcharge could be easily replaced by suspension of the investment credit; the imposition of capital gains tax at death; the modification of the oil-depletion allowance; the imposition of a minimum tax on the super-rich; the elimination of farm loss abuses; and a limitation on tax-free bond holding.

Now is the best time for tax reform. The issue must not be delayed, detoured, or destroyed.

SPECIAL ELECTION

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to congratulate the good people of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee on the election of EDWARD JONES, Democrat, to Congress yesterday. I congratulate Ed JONES also and join my colleagues in welcoming him as a new Member of the House.

Mr. JONES, a farmer and former State commissioner of agriculture, carried 12 of the 14 counties in the large rural district which covers the entire western part of the State north of Memphis. Significant in the election is the fact that there were 11 candidates in the race, including a Republican, an American Independent Party candidate, and eight other candidates. Ed JONES won his nomination in open convention, campaigned as an organization Democrat and pledged to his constituents to support the Democratic Party. Ed JONES took the Democratic record of leadership and accomplishment to the people and won by a majority over both the endorsed Republican and the American Party candidate.

He ran his campaign by taking a stand on the issues and meeting the people to discuss with them the problems of the area. Again I congratulate Ed JONES and the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a table showing the election results on yes-

terday in the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee:

Jones	32,874
Davis	16,341
Dunavant	15,616
Lanier	2,018
Pickett	1,379
Total	68,228

CONGRESSMAN-ELECT ED JONES

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the dean of the Tennessee delegation, Congressman JOE L. EVINS, who is out of Washington on official committee business, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I inform the House that Mr. Ed JONES, of Yorkville, Tenn., has been chosen in a special election held yesterday to succeed our late, esteemed and beloved colleague, Congressman "Fats" Everett.

Mr. JONES, upon certification, will represent Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District.

This race had become nationally significant because it is the first special congressional election held since the presidential election last November.

As a consequence both major parties and the leading independent party made an all-out effort to capture this traditionally Democrat seat.

Former Gov. George Wallace called upon his supporters to back the American Independent Party candidate and visited the Eighth District in his support. The candidate failed to run as well as Governor Wallace had last November, but did run better than his Republican opponent.

This, despite an outpouring of Republican money, effort, and personages into the race in the GOP candidate's behalf and a visit into that district last week by our distinguished minority leader who stated:

This is the year for the Republicans in Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Ed JONES is a former commissioner of agriculture of the State of Tennessee and has been long and effectively active in civic and governmental affairs. He is a man with a great knowledge and broad understanding of the problems and aspirations of the people of his district. His election and service in Congress will provide his constituents with a worthy and able Representative and will add to this body a Member of proven ability and value.

CONGRESSMAN-ELECT ED JONES

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for Tennesseans and for this House, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce to the House the election of a great Tennessean and fellow Democrat to this great body.

Ed JONES won a sweeping victory, capturing 50 percent of the votes in a nine-man race, showing a 2-to-1 victory over the minority party candidate. This is truly indicative of the kind of man that Ed JONES is and how the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee feel about him. We welcome him to the Tennessee delegation.

I wish to remind the distinguished minority leader and other members of the minority party who recently visited Tennessee in behalf of their candidate of the statement he made as quoted in the news media and I quote:

Mr. Ford said, the election could establish Guidelines for the 1970 and perhaps the 1972 elections.

I wish to associate myself with that statement and concur wholeheartedly in its accuracy because I believe sincerely that this special election and Democratic victory is an indication of the outcome of the 1970 elections.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement, and his association with the views of the minority leader. I would like to associate myself with his views also because I believe this election did establish a guideline. The fact of the matter is that there were about eight Democrat candidates in that race. Mr. Speaker, on a business trip to Tennessee I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. EDWARD JONES. I was sure he was going to win, because of the kind of man he is. I believe it demonstrates the fact that the Democratic Party in fact is the party that is going to be the majority party down there in Tennessee for a long time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

I yield back the balance of my time.

MOORHEAD ASKS FOR VIETNAM MILITARY DEESCALATION

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago—on March 11, 1968—when there were press stories to the effect that the military was requesting an additional 206,000 troops in Vietnam, several of our colleagues joined me in cosponsoring a resolution that provided:

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe that our resolution made a contribution to the decision against further escalation of the war in Vietnam. Less than 3 weeks later the decision to restrict the bombing was announced and the initial steps were taken which led to the opening of the Paris peace talks.

The peace talks have been in progress for 10 months and Mr. Nixon has been in office for 2 months; yet the level of

the war and, more importantly the level of American participation in it continues unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, the time has again come for Congress to make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to express to the administration the desire of the American people to begin the process of deescalation of the American military effort.

Accordingly, on behalf of myself and 33 cosponsors I am today introducing another very brief resolution which provides:

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

I invite all Members who believe that the time has come to begin the deescalation of our military involvement in Vietnam to join with me in introducing similar resolutions.

The following Members cosponsored Mr. MOORHEAD's concurrent resolution: JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN H. DENT, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, JACOB H. GILBERT, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, EDWARD I. KOCH, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, ABNER J. MIKVA, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY T. MINK, JOHN E. MOSS, BERTRAM PODELL, THOMAS M. REES, HENRY S. REUSS, PETER W. RODINO, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, JEROME R. WALDIE, CHARLES H. WILSON, and GUY YATRON.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI SLANDERED BY CRUDE, UNFUNNY COMEDIAN

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening on national television, the State of Mississippi and her people were viciously slandered by a crude and very unfunny comedian.

I would suggest that the Senate subcommittee now investigating sex and violence on television might do well to turn their attention to this problem faced by Mississippians on Monday night.

No apology can erase from the viewers' minds that terrible, ugly remark about Mississippi. I think that Americans, in this instance, will consider the source of the remark and dismiss it accordingly. However, the State should be protected from any future comments of the same nature which might be made by someone standing a little taller in the public's esteem.

Mississippi has no practical recourse in this matter, and it should.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO REDUCE ADVENTURISM

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recent reports indicate that American top-level strategists are seriously considering expanding military operations in Vietnam to create—in their words—"greater pressures for a political solution."

This same sort of nonsense put the United States into the current muddle in Southeast Asia. It is the same sort of logic now being used to push the ABM system. And it is the same sort of idiocy, if allowed to continue, that will entangle this country again and again.

It must not be allowed to happen again.

Congress must take a positive stance to halt any U.S. escalation in Vietnam. Today I join with many of my colleagues in cosponsoring the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) stating the sense of Congress that military involvement should begin to be reduced in Vietnam.

I view the Moorhead resolution as a strong first step of congressional policy to end our tragic adventurism in Vietnam.

MIAMI TEENAGE RALLY FOR DECENCY

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday, the Members will recall, a great event which occurred in Miami last Sunday afternoon, when 30,000 teenagers gathered in the Orange Bowl in a great declaration for decency on behalf of the younger people in this country.

The young man who started this rally, Mike Levesque, lives at Hialeah, Fla., where the racetrack is located, I am proud to say in my district. I am advised that he is receiving thousands of letters and telegrams from all over the country, in which other young people are asking how did he organize this rally and how could they organize a similar one.

I thought Members might be getting inquiries of that sort. If they want to, they may send the inquiries to my able colleague DANTE FASCELL, or to me, or they can get in touch with this distinguished young man, 17 years old, a senior in Miami Springs High School, who did this great thing, Mike Levesque of Hialeah, Fla.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 30]

Anderson, Ill.	Casey	Diggs
Ashbrook	Celler	Esch
Ayres	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Bates	Colmer	Fraser
Bell, Calif.	Conyers	Gallagher
Brademas	Cowger	Gialmo
Byrnes, Wis.	Dellenback	Gibbons

Gray	Murphy, Ill.	Snyder
Gross	Murphy, N.Y.	Stafford
Hébert	O'Neal, Ga.	Stokes
Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger	Teague, Calif.
Kirwan	Pike	Teague, Tex.
Landrum	Powell	Watson
Lowenstein	Reid, N.Y.	Watts
McCloskey	Reuss	Wilson,
Mailliard	Ronan	Charles H.
Mann	Rumsfeld	Wright
Miller, Calif.	Scheuer	
Morton	Schwengel	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (8), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-131) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 214

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$900,000, including expenditures, for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is going to submit an amendment to House Resolution 214?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand there is a series of about eight of these authorizing or expenditure committee resolutions to be submitted to the House today?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is correct. The reason I have asked that further reading be dispensed with, after the amount is read, is because all of the resolutions are identical after that point.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I ask these questions only in the interest of expediting the business of the House—

Mr. HAYS. I understand.

Mr. HALL. Could the general statement be made that these expenditure resolutions are in the customary form we have handled for the committees in previous years and that there is nothing more than a so-called cost-of-living increase in the various committee proposals?

Mr. HAYS. I would not go so far as to agree with that 100 percent. I would say that none is above what the committee asked for. In all cases except one, I believe, both the minority and the majority agreed on a figure. In some cases they were cut. In some cases there was a substantial raise, as high as 30 percent over what was granted a year or so ago.

The committee felt the increases were justified, by the pointing out that they were going to undertake considerably more activity than undertaken in the last Congress.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have one final question.

Are these resolutions to provide expenses for the committees for the first session, or presumably for the entire Congress?

Mr. HAYS. For the first session only.

Mr. HALL. Then we may expect at the beginning of the second session further funding for these committees, with proper justification to the Committee on House Administration?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$900,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$850,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 189, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-132) on the resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 259

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 189 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$486,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 152

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-133) on the resolution (H. Res. 272) authorizing the expenditure of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 152, Ninety-First Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$300,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$300,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000".

On page 3, starting on line 1, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 152, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration,

tion, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-134) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 152, Ninety-first Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$442,500 for the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on voucher authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, immediately after line 8, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 200

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-135) on the resolution (H. Res. 273) providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 273

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 200 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$769,600, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Of such amount \$60,000 shall be available for each of six standing subcommittees of the Commit-

tee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed \$409,600 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXPENSES FOR CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 268

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-136) on the resolution (H. Res. 301) authorizing expenses for conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 268, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 301

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 268, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$412,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-137) on the resolution (H. Res.

315) providing funds for the Committee on House Administration, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, in carrying out its duties during the Ninety-first Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of \$300,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation on any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-138) on the resolution (H. Res. 320) providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 320

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 116, Ninety-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$595,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAXIMUM PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 337 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 337

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 337 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 337 to increase existing travel expenses for Government employees. The bill would increase the maximum per diem allowance within the United States from its present rate of \$16 to \$22 per day. Thus, where an agency or department determines that the expenses are warranted, any amount up to the maximum may be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a great effort being made to curb expenditures of the Federal Government, but I hope that the departments or agencies for which an employee is working will grant to that employee his actual expenses incurred up to the \$22 per day so that the employee will not have to bear that additional expense. I hope the authority will not be exercised to reduce this amount because I think the Federal Government has been making it necessary for faithful and loyal employees of this Government to go heavily into their savings or salaries in order to pay their necessary traveling expenses which they incur on their part. Even the \$22 a day, with the high cost of motel and hotel bills and traveling in the continental United States is really not enough for actual travel expense within the United States for Federal employees, and I certainly hope that the \$22 maximum which under H.R. 337 will not be reduced by the executive agencies of the Government.

When, due to unusual circumstances, the actual expenses of a trip within the United States are greater than the maximum per diem, the employee's actual and necessary expenses may be paid up to a present maximum of \$30 per day. H.R. 337 increases this maximum to \$35 per day.

When traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department determines to be adequate. There are occasions, however, when the per diem may be exceeded by the expenses. Presently the law permits

the payment of an additional \$10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. The bill if adopted, would increase the \$10 allowance to an additional \$15 per day.

The legislation makes the same changes in payment of travel expenses for intermittent employees of the Government, such as experts and consultants, as have been made for regular employees. Thus, the maximum per diem is increased from \$16 to \$22 per day and maximum actual expenses within the United States from \$30 to \$35 per day and, outside the United States, from the \$10 added to the per diem to \$15 added to the per diem for the country involved.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is legislation too long delayed by our Government and I hope this rule will be adopted so that H.R. 337 may be considered and I hope adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is rather interesting to note that the number on the resolution, No. 337, and the bill which we will be considering is the same, H.R. 337.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is to provide a rule with 1 hour of open debate for the consideration of the bill H.R. 337, having to do with the maximum per diem allowance for Government employees.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 337 is to amend current travel expense legislation for Government employees.

The per diem allowance is increased from \$16 to \$22 per day.

The maximum allowance on an actual expense basis is increased from \$30 to \$35 per day.

Finally, the bill increases the foreign travel allowance above the established per diem from \$10 to \$15 per day.

The estimated cost of the increases contained in the bill, exclusive of travel abroad, is \$27,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget expects the additional cost to each agency to be absorbed.

The bill is only slightly different than a similar bill which passed the House last year but was not acted on by the Senate. The difference is an increase in the per diem from \$20 to \$22 to reflect the approximate cost increase since 1967 when the last Bureau of the Budget study was completed.

There are no minority views.

The administration supports the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 337, with Mr. ANNUNZIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 337 would increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for civilian employees of the Government traveling on official business. Per diem, as we all know, is a flat-rate reimbursement which covers the average cost of subsistence when Government employees must travel in carrying out their responsibilities. This flat rate covers hotels, food costs, and certain other expenses. The present rate is \$16 per day set by the Congress in 1961. Last year we passed H.R. 13738, raising the per diem rate to \$20, but that bill was not acted upon by the Senate.

In summary, the bill, as amended by the committee, raises the maximum per diem rate from the present \$16 per day to \$22 per day and raises the maximum reimbursement for actual expenses—only allowed in unusual circumstances—from \$30 per day to \$35.

When our Government officials are traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department sets, but there are occasions when the per diem may be exceeded by actual out-of-pocket expenses. The law now permits the payment of an additional \$10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. H.R. 337 increases this per diem from \$10 to \$15 per day. The bill makes the same changes in the per diem rates and payment of actual expenses for intermittent employees of the Government, such as experts and consultants, as would be made for regular employees.

Other than the increase in the basic per diem rate to \$22 and the elimination of certain features of that bill affecting judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals and mobile employees of the Post Office, the bill is the same as the one which passed the House last year. The House-passed bill provided for \$20 per day. H.R. 337, as introduced in this Congress, called for \$25 per day, but the committee agreed with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget that the figure be set at \$22 per day. The Bureau reported that its studies showed a 10-percent increase in travel subsistence costs since our hearings of 2 years ago. The Government employee unions, however, all supported the \$25

figure and submitted their own evidence of the need for that maximum.

This bill, as we present it, is a very conservative one and may still be less than adequate to meet the expense of those Federal workers who must travel at the direction of their agencies. Action must be taken, however, to remedy the obvious inequity of the present \$16 per diem.

The action of the committee and our recommendation that this bill be passed by the House are based on the hard statistical facts of increased cost of travel that were presented to us during our hearings. They have been summarized in our committee report. The committee has always taken the position that Government employees should not be expected to pay out of their own pockets the cost of doing the Government's work. Travel is as necessary to conducting our Government's business as it is in private industry.

I would direct the attention of my colleagues to page 3 of the report which indicates the findings of the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Census and numerous independent accounting offices which shows that there has been an increase in the cost of travel and the cost of hotel and meals and other expenses over and above what the Bureau of the Budget reported in 1967. All other reports and investigations by outside agencies support the figures as provided in this bill.

May I also state, Mr. Chairman, that our former colleague, Chairman Ram-speck testified in support of this bill and he cited his own personal experiences in spending considerably more than \$16 per day in traveling on official business.

The Bureau of the Budget has estimated that the increase in the maximum per diem rates it recommended would add approximately \$27 million to the annual cost of official travel to civilian agencies. Since the provisions of the reported bill provide lesser increases than those recommended by the Bureau, the corresponding added annual cost should be somewhat lower than the above estimate. The Bureau expects the executive agencies to absorb the increased costs within available appropriations.

Payment of travel expenses such as hotel, food, and other subsistence costs to Government employees traveling on official business is authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949 and subsequent amendments, now codified in sections 5701 to 5708 of title 5 of the United States Code. The pertinent provisions affected by H.R. 337 are sections 5702 and 5703. The act provides maximum amounts which may be paid by departments and agencies and it was not anticipated by the Congress that the maximum would be set for all travel. Based on the expected costs of the particular travel, the agencies exercise their discretion to set rates that in many cases are lower than the maximum. Overall policies and regulations are made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Section 1 of the bill, as amended, raises the maximum per diem within the United States from the present \$16 to \$22 per day. Thus, where a department or agency determines that the expenses to be in-

curred warrant it, any amount up to the maximum may be paid.

Per diem is the customary way of paying travel expenses but the law provides that when the actual expenses of a trip within the United States are greater than the maximum per diem due to the unusual circumstances of the travel assignment, the employee's actual and necessary expenses may be paid up to a present maximum of \$30 per day. Thus, when the unusual circumstances of the travel or conditions at the destination result in costs to the employee that exceed the per diem, he may be paid his specific out-of-pocket expenses up to \$30 per day. The bill increases this maximum to \$35 per day.

When traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department determines is adequate. But there are occasions when the per diem may be exceeded by the expenses. The law now permits the payment of an additional \$10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. This bill increases the \$10 to an additional \$15 per day.

Section 2 makes the same changes in payment of travel expenses for intermittent employees of the Government such as experts and consultants as have been made for the regular employees by section 1. Thus, the maximum per diem they may be paid is increased from \$16 to \$22 per day. Maximum actual expenses within the United States are increased from \$30 to \$35 per day and, outside of the United States, from the \$10 added to the per diem to \$15 added to the per diem for the country involved.

Sections 3 and 4 have been deleted from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill, in my judgment, is a matter of simple justice and fairness to our dedicated and hardworking Government employees. In many, many cases and perhaps in the majority of cases, these employees, while traveling on official business, have had to spend personal funds beyond the per diem allotment of \$16 per day.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will be overwhelmingly passed by the House today.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BETTS. I wonder if the gentleman would explain the difference between Government employees and others as is set forth in the second section and why there has to be a discrepancy in the maximum allowances?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes; section 1 of the bill provides the regular per diem of Government employees and raises the per diem from \$16 to \$22 and from \$30 to \$35 under unusual circumstances. All of this was documented by actual experience by the commission.

Section 2 of the bill applies to intermittent employees such as experts and consultants. I might suggest that, while we fix a maximum of \$22 per day, each agency will establish regulations for its own travel and may well fix some lower amount if appropriate.

Mr. BETTS. I was just wondering why

there should be a difference so far as these travelers are concerned under section 2 and the Government employees? The only thing I can think of is that section 5712 of the code should be appropriately amended to follow this procedure.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I wanted a point of information, and I want it understood crystally clear that I believe all of those who travel on official business should have a better per diem rate as we of the Congress who travel on official business on rare occasions, perhaps once a month back and forth to our homes. But pertaining to the gentleman's comments about the Bureau of the Budget estimates, is it not true that the estimate made increase above or below the \$27 million because they estimated that there were 9 million man-days of travel each year by all classes of Federal employees, if I may use that term loosely, and that if we increased the maximum per diem allowance by \$6, as I understand this bill provides, it would cost \$54 million. However, the Bureau of the Budget estimates that only 50 percent of those who drew per diems last year spent more than the present \$16 per day maximum, while the other 50 percent were spending something less than 60 percent. So that they figured that on the average the employees would qualify only for a \$3 increase, or a total of \$27 million. Does the gentleman have any idea about how this \$27 million of additional cost in this time of approaching austerity would hold up under the sections of the bill?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman is correct in what he has reported, and I appreciate his comment and his support. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget suggested that their budget was \$27 million, and in view of the fact that we made a reduction in their proposal, it would be something less than that. They also suggested it was not possible to make an accurate and precise projection. This was their best estimate and they anticipated the agencies could absorb this increase within the existing appropriation. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget did not go beyond that.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 337, a bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business.

Sections 1 and 2 of the bill as amended by the committee would increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for travel within the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia from \$16 to \$22, or a 37½-percent increase, and it would increase the maximum allowance for reimbursement on an actual expense basis for such travel from \$30 to \$35 per day, or 16⅔ percent.

For travel outside the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia, the bill would increase the maximum allowance for travel on an actual expense basis from \$10 plus the established maximum per diem rate to \$15 plus the established maximum per diem rate.

Sections 3 and 4, as noted, were stricken from the bill.

Section 3 was stricken because it would amend section 3581(d) of title 39, United States Code, and thus is properly within the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Section 4 was stricken because it would amend section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, thus coming properly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Moreover, the provisions of section 4 have already been enacted as a part of Public Law 90-340.

There was complete agreement in the subcommittee with the need to raise allowances to keep pace with rising travel costs, and it was felt that the allowances proposed in sections 1 and 2 of the bill were appropriate.

The percentage increase, 37½ percent, from \$16 to \$22, for unlisted expenses, may seem large, but it must be remembered that 8 years have elapsed since the act was last amended, and the proposed changes do no more than reflect the present costs of travel. As a matter of fact, in the testimony—and this relates to the questions asked by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL)—in the testimony that was presented to the committee it was noted that in the spring of 1967 a survey was conducted by the Bureau of the Budget in which they requested 18 principal Federal agencies for information on subsistence costs representing over 12,000 employee travel experiences covering almost 64,000 man-days of travel.

An analysis of these data showed 6,171 travel experiences, 51.3 percent of the total, where subsistence costs exceeded \$16 per day, the average of these being \$19.21. On this basis, the Bureau recommended to the Congress a national per diem of \$20 in lieu of subsistence expenses last year. I presume that the \$27 million estimate was based on this 51 percent of maximum as exposed by this survey, and that it was assumed 50 percent of the potential \$54 million would bring it to \$27 million.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman's statement is correct, except for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget estimates that even if the per diem ceiling were raised \$6, as proposed, only 50 percent, or perhaps less, of those employees drawing per diem would get the maximum, and that 50 percent is why they reduced it to \$27 million.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think that is correct. I think there is also the possibility that because this money is going to have to be taken out of presently available funds, there may be some reduction in travel, because of the increased per diem allowance, that might otherwise have been authorized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, as long as we have interrupted the gentleman's remarks, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder—and as I stated in my first question to the gentleman from New York, I seek equity—I certainly do not want any of our employees paying money out of their pockets for expenses while traveling on official business.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That has been done on a number of occasions.

Mr. HALL. I understand that from the committee's well-written report.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, does this apply to members of the executive branch while traveling on official business?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It applies to all Government employees who are authorized to travel on official business in this way.

Mr. HALL. It is applicable to the judicial and legislative branches as well as the executive branch?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. My understanding is that it will be probably the executive alone, but perhaps the gentleman from New York can assist me in that regard.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, that was my understanding in April last year when we passed the previous bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It also covers the quasi-legislative bodies of the executive agencies.

Mr. HALL. There was for travel an increase in the travel budget of fiscal year 1969 over 1968 a total of \$2,050,000,000. Does the gentleman know what the figure is in the anticipated 1970 budget, and is it provided for?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know the figure in the 1970 budget. The anticipation was that this legislation would have no significant effect on the budget figure in the 1970 budget, again for the reason that the agencies would be required to live within the previous request they had made in preparation of that budget, and that only on the occasion of absolutely necessary overspending, where they would be obliged to come back and ask for additional funds, would those funds be considered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a final question, what I am trying to get at is whether this is a cost of travel or cost of living or inflationary increase in order to keep up with the actual expenditures or whether there is poor travel discipline in the agencies of the executive branch, and did the gentleman's committee go into this problem?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's committee did not go into this problem as to whether the travel expenditures generally had been authorized with circumspection by the various agencies.

This legislation, however, relates not to whether or not the agencies have been circumspect, but as to whether or not Federal employees traveling on per diem allowances were being compensated for the actual expenses incurred. In other words, the recommendations here relate only to the cost-of-living increase or the cost-of-travel increase, maybe I should say, in the per diem that has occurred

since the last authorization by this committee.

Mr. HALL. Of course it follows, therefore, that unless some circumspection or oversight or surveillance is exercised on necessary travel, if we recompense completely for travel, there might not be the restriction on unneeded travel, which would otherwise occur.

I am still not recommending that those who travel in the executive branch on necessary business be restricted or be underpaid; but just as in communications there must be some discipline exercised to see that unnecessary messages are not sent, the same is true with respect to travel in the executive branch. If it gets to be over \$2,050 million as an item in the executive budget per year, it is certainly worth oversight.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Since these increased individual allowances will come out of the requested budgets for 1970 rather than creating an increase in those budgets, it is assumed, at least for this first year, that any unnecessary travel will be spotlighted, because the agencies may be hard pressed to fit their travel requirements into the requested budget, in view of the fact that they made their requested budgets on the basis of \$16 per day rather than \$22 per day.

To continue with my statement in explanation of the various aspects of this legislation:

Finally, for travel outside the continental United States, the bill would increase the maximum allowable per day on an actual expense basis from \$10 to \$15 above the normal per diem rate for the locality involved. The Bureau of the Budget had recommended an increase to \$18 a day above the per diem.

Rates set for travel to States and U.S. possessions outside the continental United States are established by the Secretary of Defense, and they are established by the Secretary of State for travel to foreign countries.

While the figures agreed to in committee were not everything the employee representatives asked for, they appear adequate on the basis of statistics furnished the committee. Moreover, the more modest proposals of the committee assure a greater likelihood of congressional approval and hence are more meaningful to the Government employee.

In shaping the bill to its maximum acceptability the committee resisted urgings for an amendment that would ask agencies to encourage their professional employees to travel first on airplanes. The committee was not persuaded by the argument that such a fringe benefit would be helpful in retaining the best people in Government.

The committee rather felt perhaps we should keep some people in Government who are economy minded.

The annual additional cost of official travel to civilian agencies should be somewhat less than the \$27 million estimated by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau estimate was based on the figures which it recommended and which were somewhat higher than those agreed upon by the committee. The Bureau expects the executive agencies to absorb the increased costs within available appropriations. In some agencies it will have to

come out of substantive programs, but in some agencies it will come just out of the standard salaries and expenditures type of appropriation.

We feel that the increases are fully justified, if a bit on the conservative side. But in the face of the Nation's economy and the concern for our Federal deficits and our Federal budget this year, such conservatism appears fully justified in the interest of the taxpayers. There will still be cases in high-cost areas where Government employees may have to pay a part of their travel expenses out of their own pockets. This is to be regretted and avoided where possible.

The legislation represents, however, a reasonable compromise between equity and economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLNBORN).

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New York, the sponsor of the bill; the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of our subcommittee; and the gentleman from Ohio, who is handling the bill for the minority; on what I consider to be a good compromise that has led to the consideration of H.R. 337.

I hope this bill passes in this form, because it will grant more equity to Federal employees required to travel on business.

Mr. Chairman, this does represent a compromise. The gentleman from New York, its sponsor, I am sure, would like to have some higher figures in here. The Bureau of the Budget did recommend some higher figures in some instances. They had \$40 here as actual reimbursement, whereas the committee recommended and the bill contains \$35.

I hope that the other body will act with dispatch this year, in contrast to their lack of action last year, because it is not at all fair to require Federal employees when traveling to cover any part of their expense from their own pockets. They should be reimbursed for their actual expenses.

Testimony before our subcommittee was clear and uncontroverted that increases in travel cost, in hotel rooms and meals, make the present \$16 per day allowance no longer fair. We believe a maximum of \$22 will constitute a fair reimbursement for the cost of per diem travel.

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

Mr. ERLNBORN. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the subcommittee, I would like to express my support for this legislation and also to congratulate the leadership on both sides of the aisle on a job well done.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 337, to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the

Government traveling on official business.

Anyone who has traveled within the past few years knows that \$16 per day is woefully inadequate to cover the expenses of food and lodging in most parts of this Nation. I believe an increase to \$22 per day is the minimum we can do to make certain that our Federal employees, traveling on the Nation's business, are not forced to pay from their own wages a sizable part of the expenses they incur.

During the 90th Congress, Mr. Chairman, we acknowledged the fact that \$16 per day was insufficient to cover expenses of travel, and we passed H.R. 13738, which would have increased the amount to \$20 per day. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act. Two years ago, in considering the legislation, we were told that the Bureau of the Budget had determined after extensive study that the actual average total daily subsistence for travelers in 1967 was \$19.56. Today, 2 years of continuing inflation have again increased the figure, and I am convinced that \$22 per day is at best merely adequate.

Provision also needs to be made for the unusual situation when an employee incurs out-of-pocket expenses greatly in excess of normal per diem, for reimbursement of a greater amount than the \$30 per day present maximum. This amount, too, is raised in H.R. 337 to \$35 per day, and again I believe this is the minimum we can do to assist employees faced with such emergencies.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is long overdue, and should be acted upon favorably, not only by the members of this House but by our colleagues in the Senate as well, at the earliest practicable date, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$16" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25", by striking out "\$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$35", and by striking out "\$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15".

Sec. 2. Section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$16" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20", by striking out "\$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$35", and by striking out "\$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15".

Sec. 3. Section 3581(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15".

Sec. 4. The last sentence of section 867(a) (1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Upon his certificate, each judge, while attending court, or transacting official business outside the District of Columbia, is entitled to be paid all necessary traveling expenses and allowances as provided for each Justice or judge of the United States under section 456 of title 28."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$25" and insert "\$22".

Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$22".

Page 2, strike out lines 3 through 12.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 337, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CANADIAN AND MEXICAN COMMUTERS

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today along with 24 cosponsors, I have introduced H.R. 9505, a bill which amends the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection to section 212. The amendment is geared specifically to regulating more effectively the influx into the United States of nationals from Canada and Mexico under the so-called alien commuter system, which is administered by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This system—a creature of administrative ingenuity without a statutory base—permits Canadian and Mexican workers who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and who hold alien registration

receipt cards, commonly known as "green cards," to reside in Canada or Mexico and regularly commute across the border to places of employment in the United States.

Sample counts of commuters crossing the border have been taken periodically. On January 11 and 17, 1966, 54,375 commuters entered the United States, 43,687 of whom entered from Mexico. This number was slightly lower during November and December 1967, when 40,176 commuters from Mexico were identified and their green cards were suitably marked to distinguish them.

Regardless of the exact number involved, however, there is no doubt that the commuter movement adversely affects the wages and working conditions of our own citizens and residents, especially those living in the cities and towns along the Mexican border in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. The commuter movement from Mexico is a factor contributing to the grinding poverty, high unemployment, and low wages in the border areas.

Much of the border area has relatively large labor surpluses, partly because of the large number of low-skill U.S. citizens and resident aliens residing in the area. The impact of these commuters on the labor market has been enormous.

A report by the social action commission of the Catholic diocese of El Paso indicated that one of the reasons for the low wages in El Paso is—

The Mexican-American must compete with some 25,000 workers from Mexico . . . legal alien commuters, United States citizens, and illegal entrants . . . who daily cross the bridge from Juarez to work in El Paso. Generally speaking, the workers from Mexico find no inconvenience in working for the barest of wages in El Paso.

The employment of commuters in areas of high unemployment is a characteristic of the communities along the border area. Data published by the Texas Employment Commission in 1966 shows that the unemployment rate in the border towns was substantially greater than in the interior cities. Under unanimous consent I shall place a table showing unemployment rates in Texas border cities in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The impact of the commuter is particularly acute in agriculture where mechanization is rapidly reducing job opportunities. Due to the high concentration of farms along the border and the fact that commuters often work in the lowest skilled, lowest paid jobs, farmworkers, who are already underpaid, are the first to suffer competition from the commuters.

The bill we have introduced does not end the commuter system, but it does refine its operation. The bill simply provides that each commuter alien must be regularly certified every 6 months by the Department of Labor that his presence in the United States to seek or continue employment does not adversely affect wages or working conditions of U.S. workers similarly employed. In determining whether their employment does adversely affect wages and working conditions of American workers, the standard

would be the wages and working conditions of American labor similarly employed. Thus, the employer must pay his commuters wages commensurate with U.S. labor engaging in the same employment.

The bill applies to aliens having a "principal, actual dwelling place" in a foreign country. Thus, it is strictly geared to those commuters working in the immediate border areas who travel across the border regularly. This is the "commuter" in the true sense of the word.

It would be my hope that in implementing this bill, if enacted into law, there would be some period of phasing it into effect so that it would not suddenly impose a difficult burden on the aliens involved.

Section 2 removes a provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act that exempts from criminal sanctions individuals who willfully and knowingly employ aliens who have entered the United States illegally. Such an amendment is necessary since the number of immigrants illegally entering the United States from Mexico is rapidly rising. For instance, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended 115,000 illegal aliens last year. The majority of these illegal entrants come into the United States in hope of finding agricultural and factory employment. Many employers lure them into the United States to obtain inexpensive labor. Criminal sanctions against such employers would help stop the high number of illegal entrants.

Before closing, I must emphasize in no way does section 1 of this bill ban the use of green cards or terminate the commuter system. What it would attempt to do is to provide that holders of green cards will not use what is a continuing privilege in such a way as to depress wages and working conditions within the United States.

The combined effect of both sections will be to substantially improve working conditions in our border areas. We feel it is necessary legislation.

H.R. 9505 is cosponsored by Mr. CELLER, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON.

The table mentioned above follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN 22 TEXAS CITIES, 1966

City	Rate	Rank
4 border cities		
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	6.6	21
El Paso	4.4	17
Laredo	9.6	22
McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg	5.8	20
18 interior cities		
Ablene	3.6	11
Amarillo	2.9	4
Austin	2.6	3
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange	4.0	15
Corpus Christi	3.7	12
Dallas	2.5	2
Fort Worth	2.9	4
Galveston-Texas City	4.7	19
Houston	2.4	1

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN 22 TEXAS CITIES, 1966—Con

City	Rate	Rank
18 interior cities—continued		
Longview-Kilgore-Gladewater	3.3	8
Lubbock	3.8	13
Midland-Odessa	3.4	9
San Angelo	3.4	9
San Antonio	4.3	16
Texarkana	3.8	13
Tyler	3.3	7
Waco	4.4	17
Wichita Falls	3.0	6

Source: The Texas Labor Market, Texas Employment Commission.

UNIVERSAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years, we have seen the development of many programs aimed at providing the disadvantaged student an opportunity to attend college but they are grossly inadequate to meet the need of all high school students demanding additional free public education.

We have seen recently black students at Rutgers University demonstrating in support of the right of all black high school students graduating this June to enter Rutgers next September.

And we have seen middle-income parents complaining that their children, although academically qualified, are threatened with the possibility of being shut out of colleges and universities because of reductions in college admissions.

And finally there are the college administrators who are caught in the middle between aspiring disadvantaged kids and middle-class kids competing for college seats that are limited because of lack of funds, facilities, and personnel.

Just today in the New York Times, the chancellor of the New York City University is quoted as saying that hundreds of parents, alarmed by the possibility that the university will be forced to reduce the size of its freshman class, are urging that special programs for slum students be reduced before regular admissions are cut.

This is an intolerable situation. It pinpoints quite clearly the urgent need for a universal postsecondary education, available to all.

During the 90th Congress, we approved an amendment to the Higher Education Act which I sponsored and which requires the President to submit to the Congress on or before December 31, 1969, proposals relative to the feasibility of making postsecondary education available to all young Americans who qualify and seek it.

In view of the immediacy and urgency of this problem, which is affecting our colleges and universities across the Nation, I urge the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to come forward now with proposals on universal postsecondary education so that they can be considered by this body in the present session.

The situation is critical and the time is now, if we are to afford any relief

on this issue to our strife-ridden, anxiety-torn urban communities. Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access of education, and we must move quickly and decisively to see to it that access is made available next fall to every young American who has the will to learn.

Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of this matter, I have written the following letter to HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Over the years, and particularly in recent months, there have been periodic proposals to make universal educational opportunity at the post-secondary level a reality. The proposals range from outright grants covering all tuition and expenses—like the G.I. Bill, to various tax deductions, credit proposals, and loans of one sort or another.

Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access to education, and yet millions of students, black and white, are being denied this opportunity because of the lack of funds to finance their education. The Carnegie Commission report on Higher Education reported that almost half of the undergraduate college students in the United States now come from the country's highest family income quartile; and only seven per cent come from the lowest income quartile. There is an urgent need to change these long odds.

In recent months, we have seen New York City beset by problems arising from the controversy over the SEEK program and the City University's proposed One Hundred Scholars program, which would admit to the City University the one hundred top graduating students in every high school. This could mean that other students who might score higher on the New York State Regents or have higher scholastic averages would be displaced.

I am enclosing an article from the March 26th edition of the New York Times which indicates the pressure—justifiable or unjustifiable—from middleclass parents "urging that admissions to the University's two special programs for slum students—the College Discovery Program and Search for Enlightenment, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK)—be reduced before regular admissions are cut."

At the same time, disadvantaged black and Puerto Rican students in New York City are insistently demanding their rights to post-secondary education.

We have seen black students at Rutgers University demonstrating in support of the right of all black high school seniors graduating this June to enter Rutgers next September, regardless of test scores, etc.

It is hard to argue against the right of educationally disadvantaged kids to post-secondary education, and it is also equally difficult to ask middle-class kids with higher education attainments to step aside and give up their places in our free, tax-supported colleges. The only answer is a massive expansion of post-secondary education opportunities sufficient to provide universal education at the college or junior college level for all who desired it and could benefit by it.

During the 90th Congress, I sponsored an amendment (Sec. 508) to the Higher Education Act which requires the President to submit to the Congress on or before December 31, 1969, proposals relative to the feasibility of making post-secondary education available to all young Americans who qualify and seek it. I am particularly interested in knowing what steps have already been initiated by your Department to carry out this Congress-

sional assignment. I urge you also to consider making proposals along these lines to the Congress within the next few months so that they can be acted upon during the first session of the 91st Congress. Our already strife-torn and anxiety-ridden urban communities should not be called upon to face the resentment of large masses of middle-class students and underprivileged minority students competing for limited post-secondary education opportunities. The only answer is opportunity for all, and the urgency and critical need is now.

I would very much like to have the opportunity to discuss this matter with you.

With every warm best wish,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. SCHEUER,
Member of Congress.

Also illustrative of my concern, is the following article published in the March 26 edition of the New York Times:

BOWKER SCORED BY JEWISH UNIT FOR
PREDICTING RACIAL TENSION

(By Leonard Buder)

The Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress charged yesterday that Dr. Albert H. Bowker, chancellor of the City University, was "fomenting racial and religious tension by predicting it."

The council, in a sharply critical statement, challenged Dr. Bowker's comment on Monday that tension between Jews and Negroes in the city might "explode" if the City University were forced to reduce the size of its freshman class next fall because of budget cuts.

Dr. Bowker said that the University had received hundreds of letters and telephone calls from Jewish parents urging that admissions to the university's two special programs for slum students—the College Discovery Program and Search for Enlightenment, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK)—be reduced before regular admissions are cut.

"The surest way of arousing hostility between racial and religious groups is to forecast that it will occur," declared Theodore J. Kolish, chairman of the Metropolitan Executive Committee of the congress.

STATEMENT CALLED DAMAGING

"Mr. Bowker's self-fulfilling prophecy does a disservice to all of those—Jews and Christians, black and white—who have joined hands in opposing cutback in funds for the City University."

Asked to comment on the council's criticism, Dr. Bowker said this his statement on Negro-Jewish tensions was his paraphrase of one made earlier this month by 10 Negro and Jewish leaders.

The 10 leaders, who had formed the Temporary Committee on Black-Jewish Relations, said that potential cuts in the budget and admissions at City University threaten a new confrontation between religious and racial groups "that could exceed the destructiveness of previous controversies."

Among those who joined in that statement were Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League; Robert Bernhard, an investment banker and the president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, and Rabbi Abraham Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

Mr. Kolish said that the congress was one of nine major Jewish organizations that had urged Governor Rockefeller and legislative leaders to provide greater funds both for regular college admission and for the College Discovery and SEEK programs.

"But our organization," he continued, "does not believe the effort to frighten Albany into restoring the cuts by raising the specter of race riot is either good tactics or accurate sociology."

FISCAL STANDING EXPLAINED

In explaining the City University's financial difficulties, Dr. Bowker had noted that the university's original budget request this year was for \$270 million. That amount, the chancellor said would have accommodated 17,000 incoming regular students and 3,000 special students.

The chancellor said that cuts by the Governor's office in proposed state support reduced that figure to \$225-million, which would only accommodate a total of 14,000 students.

Further cuts by the city government, the chancellor said, would bring the projected total budget down to about \$180-million—enough, he said, to maintain operations but not enough to admit any new students.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS
HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY
COMMITTEE

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Frierson-Nichols Post No. 8, the American Legion, of Winter Haven, Fla., are among those many Americans who view with alarm the battle which must be fought in every Congress to protect the authority and the functions of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and now the authority and functions of the House Internal Security Committee. They are also alarmed by the increasing strength of the opponents of this important committee of the House.

I share the respect that these Legionnaires and other sound-thinking Americans have for the valuable work the House Internal Security Committee and its predecessor, the House Un-American Activities Committee, has done and is doing for our Nation.

I place in the RECORD at this time the resolution adopted by the Frierson-Nichols Post so that Chairman RICHARD ICHORD and his committee members will know of the strong support they have from these veterans of Winter Haven, Fla.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY FRIERSON-NICHOLS
AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 8, WINTER
HAVEN, FLA., MARCH 18, 1969

Whereas, the U.S. House of Representatives on February 18, 1969, passed House Resolution 89 changing the name of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) to the House Committee on Internal Security, clarifying its mandate, and retaining its independent status as in integral Committee, and

Whereas, the record of the House debate on the Resolution discloses that a number of House Members voted against its passage in the apparent attempt to defeat its passage and pave the way to have the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) abolished and its functions transferred to the House Judiciary Committee in a subordinate sub-committee status, and

Whereas, HUAC has been a constant target for communist and other subversive elements in their determined efforts to ridicule and downgrade its activities, to disrupt its proceedings, and to have it abolished, and

Whereas, in light of past and present communist and other subversive activities in the United States, in Communist Cuba, in countries of Central and South America, and elsewhere, and

Whereas, the United States is presently at War in Vietnam on the premise of democracy, self-determination, and freedom as opposed to communism, totalitarianism, and slavery, and

Whereas, the United States must have in its protective arsenal an effective, strong and dedicated House Committee on Internal Security to investigate, uncover, counter and defeat communist and other subversive forces who defy the authority of the United States government, create turmoil and strife in our cities and educational institutions, and direct their efforts to the overthrow of our form of government by force or otherwise.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Frier-son-Nichols American Legion Post No. 8, Winter Haven, Florida, go on record as strongly and determinedly opposing any Congressional action which would in any sense weaken or downgrade the House Committee on Internal Security, minimize its mandate, or abolish it and transfer its functions to another House Committee in the subordinate status of a subcommittee.

CHARLES L. McCARTY,
Post Commander.

PROPOSED MULTILATERAL TREATY TO BAR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FROM THE SEABED

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with the support of 12 of my colleagues, a brief concurrent resolution proposing that the United States actively seek a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the seabed. Such a pact would be consistent with our previous stance in concluding the Antarctic and Outer Space Treaties, and would contribute greatly to strengthening and extending the rule of law as a basic foundation for world peace.

As I noted last week, the United States gave an essentially negative response to a Soviet proposal at Geneva which followed this general line. Our initial position was apparently dictated largely by the Navy's concern for the submarine-detection devices it has already implanted on the ocean. It has also been suggested that a total ban on military installations on the seabed might even prevent the transmission of military messages through undersea cables. These, however, are clearly matters for conscientious negotiation. Only through detailed discussion can we learn what mutually acceptable definitions of prohibited military installations or activities can be reached, and whether in fact we can find agreement on treaty language that would in no way impair operations such as those outlined above.

I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we must negotiate from a position of support for the principle of full demilitarization of the seabed, and not from a reflex of resistance to the principle because it might inhibit full freedom of action for our military planners. I hope that other Members will share this view, and that they will add their voices in support of the resolution which we have offered today.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 184

Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the seabed

Whereas the United States has previously entered into treaties providing for the demilitarization of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and of Antarctica; and

Whereas the seabed should be kept free of military installations of all kinds so as to eliminate a source of potential conflict among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should actively seek to conclude a multilateral treaty, along the lines of those which govern activities in outer space and in Antarctica, which would bar all types of military installations from the seabed and would make appropriate provision for inspection to insure compliance.

WISDOM FROM THE OIL INDUSTRY—OR HOW TO STRETCH TRUTH LIKE CHEWING GUM

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to remove entirely the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion allowance. Recently a group of gentlemen representing the oil industry came to Capitol Hill to argue for retention of tax privileges this segment of our economy now enjoys at the expense of the entire American public. I was much moved by their reasoning. Reading their comments, I panted under the effect of their eloquence. Never was a more ignoble cause defended so ably. Unfortunately, their arguments are mere sleight of mouth. They plead poverty. They plead high operating costs. I would sooner believe that a barracuda is a vegetarian. I would sooner believe in perpetual motion or squaring the circle than accept their futile testimony.

It is almost tax time, and scores of millions of citizens are beginning to grope for cash to pay Uncle Sam. Let every single one of them take a close look at the American oil industry. See it for what it really is—a fourth level of government. A prime cause of inflation. A major reason why millions pay staggering taxes.

As taxpayers painfully look at their tax writeoffs, let them note the 27½-percent tax-free allowance given the oil industry annually to cover depletion of wells they drill and operate. Let them see a statutory provision enabling oil well drillers to deduct, in 1 year, most capital costs of their drilling that are spread out over a period of years in other industries.

Let them see how oil companies are allowed to deduct from taxes, as a credit, payments of royalties to foreign governments. Such business expenses in most industries are simply deductions from income, taken before taxes are computed.

Let lower and middle income taxpayers take a searching look at tax rates paid

by these companies, as they pollute our environment, raise gasoline prices at will, merge to form ever larger corporate units and fight desperately to keep cheap foreign oil out of this country because it would lower prices slightly to scores of millions of gasoline and oil consumers. Bulging with profits and swollen with privilege, they come to Capitol Hill, confident of their power and contemptuous of the vast majority of our American people.

As every man and woman in this country digs deep, deeper, deepest, for their taxes this year, I pray they will examine our American oil industry. It is a national scandal and outrage to allow this unbelievable situation to continue unchecked.

We are even now engaged in a search for tax reform. Let us be blunt, spelling out truth in the straightest terms. Oil industry privilege now rages unchecked at the expense of every citizen of this country. How long are we to tolerate this?

READIN', RITIN' AND RIOTIN'

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the news item I am inserting here in the RECORD were not such a tragic account, it would be a satire beyond belief. Had it been written a dozen years ago, no newspaper would have printed it because the editor would have been convinced the reporter was having hallucinations. But, time marches on in the Alice in Wonderland of Higher Education and the bizarre has now become the plain and ordinary. As Shakespeare put it—

O judgment! thou art fled to brutish
beasts

And men have lost their reason.

The modern-day brutish beasts have found a home, it would seem, at San Francisco State College, among other institutions which have specialized in permissiveness in the past. I am certain this article could have been written about a number of other colleges and universities because this kind of classroom conduct is permitted almost universally these days. Thank God for the few places of higher learning which continue to resist and attempt to cling to the old-fashioned concept of a school being a center of reason, logic, and learning.

The article referred to follows:

ALL IS "RACIST" TO BLACKS: HARASSMENT JARS
LIBERAL

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 24.—As Prof. John H. Bunzel faced his class for the first time in the semester at San Francisco State College, he knew he was in for trouble.

In the unusually large group before him he saw a sizable number of black militants—to whom, he knew, he symbolized the enemy.

For months now—ever since he had published an article critical of the black studies program as proposed by Associate Professor Nathan Hare—Bunzel had been a target of abuse and intimidation.

He had received anonymous threatening telephone calls at home and became accustomed to being called "pig Bunzel." His two cars were covered with the words "Fascist Scab" one night and all the tires were slashed. A homemade bomb was found one morning outside the office of the political science department, which he heads.

Nevertheless, Bunzel, 45, tall and tweedy, looked at the group before him calmly and began to explain what he had in mind for the course.

FLOOD OF HOSTILITY

His voice was drowned in a flood of hostile questions and remarks. Someone stood up and began to read aloud from "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung." Bunzel tried for ten minutes to restore order, then, stunned, he dismissed the class.

Two days later, on Wednesday, he tried again. The class now had become, for him, a testing ground of "whether those of us committed to the use of reason can still have his voice heard in an increasingly irrational environment."

He tried to respond to the hostile questions. The course, he said, was titled "community power and the politics of leadership." It would not deal with today's headlines (here a girl's hand shot up) but would follow an academic form and would prove the complexities of community, he said. Then he gestured to the girl.

"Some of the things you say we don't understand," she told him. "I'm asking you to come down to our level. And when we raise our hands, you should respond immediately. It took you about four minutes to respond."

"If it's all right, I'd prefer to finish a thought, then answer questions," Bunzel replied.

"Man, what you're saying doesn't mean anything anyway," a black student shouted. Others joined in a cacophony.

"I can't hear your questions," Bunzel told the class.

"Man, you haven't been hearing all your life," a student said.

TWO MILLION OMITTED

The black students demanded to know why no readings from Stokely Carmichael or Huey P. Newton were assigned. Bunzel replied that some two million other choices had been omitted.

The books on the list, the students charged, were racist.

C. Wright Mills and Talcott Parsons racists? By what standards? Bunzel asked. Had anyone read them?

"If you put it on the list, nine times out of ten it's a racist book," a voice replied.

At the end of half an hour, Bunzel dismissed the class, telling the students: "I intend to teach this course as it has always been taught."

"If we have to bring guns in here you won't teach it," a youth replied. "We'll teach you about community power."

On Friday, Bunzel again pleaded with the students to be allowed to begin. When the heckling continued, an administrative official was called and ordered two of the Negro students suspended. The class was again dismissed, with the first lecture still to be given.

INTIMIDATION CHARGED

At a press conference later, Black Student Union members declared that "black students were harassed, intimidated and suspended" in Bunzel's class that morning.

Tony Miranda, a leader in the Third World Liberation Front, said the militants were determined to "stop the functioning of the class and educate people on what the class is about. Any class he'll be teaching will have his attitudes and perceptions of our society and that is hurting the people. We're

saying he's in direct opposition to our struggle at this point. And as such he's an enemy."

Bunzel, a cool, calm scholar, is somewhat puzzled by the vehemence of the attacks against him, for he prides himself on his long liberal record—the fight he led for admission of Negroes into clubs at Princeton in the 1940s, his outspokenness against Sen. McCarthy and against the California loyalty oath in the 1950s, his support for a black studies program at San Francisco State College as long as four years ago.

He became a special target of the militant students last October, when he published that article in the quarterly, "The Public Interest." In it, he questioned whether the black studies program being drawn up for the College by Nathan Hare would allow for enough diversity in points of view on racial questions.

"It was a cautious piece, hardly something to provoke a kamikaze attack," he said.

Yet it is exactly that caution which angers the militants. For Bunzel, with his careful weighing of all sides of the question, represents to them a liberal enemy—the man in the middle who fails to take sides clearly and so blocks the revolution.

He not only questions their black student studies program but also has failed to support the American Federation of Teachers' strike, explaining that he believes "it is the wrong strike at the wrong time, and besides, I'm not completely persuaded that the industrial trade union model is appropriate to the academic community."

WORSE THAN WALLACE?

"He's much more a dangerous thing than a man like George Wallace," a BSU member told me. "With Wallace, everyone knows where he stands. But when Bunzel says something people say, yeah, he's a liberal so that must be right."

But to Bunzel, the right to say or write what he believes and to teach the class as he wants to is "the irreducible minimum of academic freedom."

"I will not be intimidated but I will not be afraid to acknowledge that sometimes I'm scared," he told me. "I've had police protection at home now for four months and that's a lousy way to live."

FASCELL INTRODUCES BILL TO ALLEVIATE INEQUITIES IN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

(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 introduce today legislation to correct a Government practice which affects only a few people but is of extreme importance to those few who are involved.

I refer to the policy of cutting off a Federal employee's pay as soon as he files a compensation claim for injury suffered on the job. In many cases the paperwork delay in processing a justifiable claim amounts to weeks or months. Meanwhile, the injured employee is expected to meet all of his continuing expenses—which may include supporting a family of many children—without any income.

Clearly this is an unfair and inequitable situation, since the employee is injured through no fault of his own. He was carrying out his official Government duties when injured, and therefore the Government has an obligation to provide

for his support until he is able to work again.

Under present practices, the Government's obligation to such employees is not being met. Rather, the faithful employee's urgent need during the critical period of his on-the-job injury is ignored as the Government slowly processes his justifiable request for compensation. We cannot allow this treatment to continue.

My legislation would allow Federal employees injured on the job to continue to receive their regular pay until there is a decision and compensation payments may begin. I think it is only fair that we enact this system so that an injury on the job will not result in an automatic lengthy cutoff of all income.

My bill would amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to accomplish this goal. It provides safeguards so that any differences or discrepancies would be adjusted by withholding portions of the compensation payments in a manner that will be equitable to the employee and the Government.

My bill also makes another amendment of the Compensation Act, to provide that employees who are on the compensation rolls will continue to earn annual and sick leave.

Under existing law, an employee receiving compensation payments because of duty-incurred injuries is deprived of the right to earn annual or sick leave for those periods which exceed 80 hours of leave without pay.

This practice is just the opposite when the employee is on annual or sick leave. When an employee is away from his job on such leave, he is earning more leave credits.

I fail to see why a different rule should apply to those who have been injured on the job. Consequently, I seek to amend the law to provide equal treatment for those who are injured.

I have introduced this legislation for the past several Congresses, but to date it has not become law. This session, I hope we can enact these needed reforms which will help produce equitable treatment for our injured Federal employees.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM CO., THE HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT AND U.S. RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year, President Nixon may be forced to commit our Latin American policy to a course that would irreparably damage future U.S. relations with that region. I refer to the April deadline upon which, under the statutory sanctions of the Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, the U.S. Government must suspend all assistance to the Government of Peru, if the conflict between that Government and the International Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, remains in stalemate. The IPC oil expropriation

case has made headlines in the United States and throughout Latin America, and well it should—it is creating perhaps the greatest crisis in United States-Latin American relations in our time, and the manner in which the U.S. Government reacts to this incident could propel us into a future of total alienation from the Southern Hemisphere.

In my mind, the IPC case points up the vital necessity of an immediate reassessment of U.S. policy toward Peru, and indeed, all of Latin America, and calls for, in particular, a thorough study of two aspects of that policy: first, the Hickenlooper amendment and its seriously negative effects on overall U.S. relations with Latin America; and second, the future course of U.S. private investment in that region, and U.S. Government policy concerning investment.

With regard to the Hickenlooper amendment, I seriously question the wisdom of such a statutory prohibition as an instrument of our foreign aid policy. Its application to the current IPC expropriation case is a prime opportunity to evaluate its validity in our aid policy and to determine its effectiveness in protecting and encouraging private investment in Latin America.

The confusing and complex issues of the IPC case have been aired many times in the press, and I will not attempt to explain them here. But I feel that the most important point, and one which many of us have lost sight of in the current hysteria of this confrontation, is that Peru's expropriation of the IPC holdings is a unique case, and it is regarded as such by the Peruvian Government. It is based on a recurring dispute between IPC and Peru that has persisted for 45 years. During that time, it has been a constant source of resentment on the part of the Peruvians against what they believed, perhaps unjustly, to be economic exploitation of their natural resources by U.S. business interests. It is not a preview of a new anti-American wave surging through Latin America and it will not result in a massive seizure of U.S. business interests in Peru and elsewhere, or in a general rejection of U.S. influence in the Latin nations unless the United States, through acts of sanction and retaliation imposed by the Hickenlooper amendment, causes that alienation to occur. I cannot emphasize this point too strongly—the manner of official U.S. action on this matter is all important—we must be willing to show the Peruvians and other Latin American nations that we are approaching this situation from a sound, reasonable policy, and that we are actively seeking a just and equitable negotiated settlement in the interests of both sides. The danger is in leaping too fast to impose punishment before there is a reasonable opportunity to settle the case by negotiation, and this dangerous leap is precisely what the United States must make if the provisions of the Hickenlooper amendment remain in force.

In the view of the current Peruvian Government, the expropriation of the IPC holdings was a lawful and just act to recover Peru's national rights. The act represents reparations for what the Gov-

ernment at this time believes—correctly or not—was IPC's illegal exploitation of Peru's oil wealth. Gen. Juan Velasco, Peruvian head of state, has stated his Government's position on the invocation of the Hickenlooper sanctions as follows:

As a free and sovereign nation, Peru is not able to understand nor can it accept the fact that a powerful nation . . . would attempt to enforce its laws outside its territory, and even worse, to use these laws to protect the interests of an enterprise which openly acts outside the Peruvian laws and morals and acts overbearingly without caring for the dignity and sovereignty of this country.

In his view, if the U.S. Government enforces the Hickenlooper amendment, it would be a clear case of economic pressure, aimed at usurping the dignity and sovereignty of a small nation.

And we are only deluding ourselves if we believe that the other nations in Latin America will be sympathetic to U.S. retaliation in Peru. The threat implicit in the Hickenlooper amendment has led to charges throughout the Latin nations of economic imperialism, a U.S. return to the big stick policy, and a modern version of landing the Marines. To say that enforcement of the Hickenlooper amendment would be gravely injurious to the U.S. image throughout Latin America is hardly an exaggeration.

The issue of foreign economic influence in Latin America, especially U.S. influence, is an extremely sensitive one. It has resulted in strong nationalistic sentiments stemming from a deep-seated resentment of the massive U.S. economic presence and the control exercised by outside business interests. The "big stick" method of the Hickenlooper amendment is contributing to this rising tide of Latin resentment, and fanning the flames of Latin nationalism and anti-Americanism. Peru's General Velasco is regarded as somewhat of a hero among his people and other Latin nations. Convinced of his righteous cause, he has dared to defy U.S. demands and strike back against the "Yanqui aggressor," regardless of the disastrous economic effects which that defiance will wreak on the Peruvian economy. For many Latin Americans, he is becoming a symbol of Latin courage and independence.

The intent of the Hickenlooper amendment was to protect our private investors against foreign expropriation without just compensation, while at the same time encouraging them to invest in foreign economies for the mutual benefit of the United States and the nations concerned. It was meant as a warning to foreign governments concerning the repercussions which such action would provoke in U.S. policy. In the case of Peru, its warning has proved to be totally ineffective—the Peruvian Government acted in reprisal for what it considered illegal acts, the Hickenlooper amendment notwithstanding. Moreover, the amendment is detrimental to the U.S. policy of encouraging private investment in the less-developed countries. Rather than encouraging a nation to solicit private investment, it serves to warn that nation that to encourage U.S. private investment is to incur the risk of being subject to U.S. economic pressures, supported by the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Government has always stood ready to support the American investor in cases where his property is illegally seized. Our Government has never accepted any principle other than fair compensation for expropriated property. There are well-established diplomatic and legal procedures for securing just settlements in these cases, and diplomatic channels have been successfully utilized in the past. The Hickenlooper amendment can only serve to impede progress through negotiation.

President Nixon has dispatched his special emissary, John N. Irwin, to enter talks with the Peruvian Government concerning the IPC case and other issues creating friction between our two nations. We place in him the highest hopes for an amicable solution to the problem and wish for the successful conclusion of this important mission. Diplomatic initiatives like this, and not arbitrary legislative enactments, are the way to solve delicate problems of conflicts between nations.

U.S. policymakers have consistently rejected such sanctions in our foreign policy on the grounds that they could seriously injure vital U.S. national interests, including those pertaining to our national security; that these sanctions subordinate the conduct of foreign policy and perhaps our entire relationship with certain foreign nations to a single foreign policy interest; and that by making it appear that U.S. aid programs are substantially motivated by a desire to protect U.S. private investment, provisions such as the Hickenlooper amendment play into the hands of the Communists, who have long alleged that U.S. foreign aid is actually designed to facilitate the exploitation of underdeveloped nations by Western capitalists.

It is my feeling that the existence of the Hickenlooper amendment is negating its own purposes, obfuscating a responsible U.S. position in this situation, and placing us on a direct collision course with Peru, and perhaps all of Latin America.

Such a dollar diplomacy scarecrow should be repealed before it does serious damage to U.S. standing throughout the world.

I would like to address myself now to another aspect of our foreign policy which, I feel, must be reassessed; namely, the future course of private investment in Latin America and what U.S. policy will be.

President John F. Kennedy once stated:

Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened U.S. businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital.

Peru, like the rest of Latin America, needs a tremendous amount of foreign capital investment in order to develop its resources and raise its terribly low standard of living. Much of this capital

must come from private sources, and Latin Americans generally acknowledge that U.S. business is beneficial to their nations. It has entered industrially depressed areas and raised the living standards of the people there; it has introduced modern methods and technical skills; it has stimulated local industry; it has created job opportunities for thousands of unemployed; it has helped train a managerial and technical class; it has improved the living standards of the small consumer; it has contributed to the beginnings of a modern industrial plant in many nations. All these elements are essential to Latin American development.

But American business has failed to make these accomplishments understood or appreciated by the great mass of Latin people. And Latin American business and government leaders, while appreciating the widespread benefits of U.S. business for their nations, do not want to be dominated by U.S. business. There is a broad spectrum of relationships between our investments and the economies of foreign nations, and I feel that these should be defined.

In February, President Nixon announced that he was sending Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, a man highly respected by Latin Americans for his knowledge and interest in their nations, on a formal mission to Latin America. Governor Rockefeller's trip is to be the first step in an administration plan to reassess our entire policy in Latin America and to discover what is lacking in that policy—why the Alliance for Progress has not been as effective as was hoped; why government instability persists in that region; why there has not been a substantially greater improvement in the lives of the people. I propose that a team of first-rate economists be sent with him to examine the aspects of U.S. private investment in Latin America, with a view toward further encouraging those investments. This proposal is wholly in keeping with President Nixon's announced goal of putting more emphasis on trade and business in Latin America.

It can be hoped that the Rockefeller trip, followed up by a comprehensive reassessment of the overall U.S. policy toward Latin America, will dispel widespread Latin criticism that the United States has turned away from its southern neighbors and is not concerned with their problems.

Our future policy toward Latin America is all important—not only with regard to the way in which we handle this explosive situation in Peru, or the formulation of a new posture toward private investment, but overall, in our concrete dealings with the people of that region.

Too long this Nation has lacked a strong positive policy toward Latin America. Too long our policy has been a meandering, inconsistent one. Too long that region has occupied very low priority in this Government. Too long the United States has lacked a positive image there.

In a recent speech in Washington, Galo Plaza Lasso, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, voiced concern about current United

States-Latin American relations. We would do well to concern ourselves with his statement:

Obviously it is in the United States' interest to have stable and prosperous neighbors, but it is also its obligation . . . to collaborate with its fellow men as they strive for a better life. Time is running out in which we can develop a policy of genuine benefit to the entire hemisphere and make an indispensable contribution to the peace and stability of the world.

I say that it is time that we in the Congress, those in the executive branch of our Government, and the people of this Nation apply our efforts to the task of creating an atmosphere of mutual respect and fraternity among the peoples who share this hemisphere. It is time that we begin to create a long-term, consistent policy toward Latin America, a policy in which we deal with our neighbors as equals and as partners in the desire to create, throughout the Western Hemisphere, a better and more creative life.

KOCH: NO MORE WAR APPROPRIATIONS FOR VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, here we are more than 2 months into a new administration. An administration that indicated in the course of the recent campaign that its goal was to bring the war in Vietnam to a conclusion. In the course of that campaign, everyone agreed, including the new administration, that a military victory was impossible and ought no longer to be discussed. Our generals have been saying for years that they can see the "light at the end of the tunnel." In truth, the tunnel has become an abyss filled daily with the blood of our soldiers.

Since March 1968, when President Johnson decided to pursue a negotiated settlement of the war, 11,500 American lives have been lost and 37,000 Americans have been seriously wounded in combat. Last week there were 351 deaths and 1,401 wounded. The week before there were 336 deaths and 1,694 wounded. And all for what? To keep in power two South Vietnamese generals, both of whom will do all they can to prevent peace from being achieved at Paris. Why? Because they know that in any settlement, they will be deposed. It is not in their self-interest to seek peace. Dictators thrive on war, and these two are no different.

We must demonstrate to the South Vietnamese military clique that they cannot depend on our bayonets and the blood of our soldiers to keep them in power and make it clear that we do intend to withdraw and withdraw completely.

I am in complete accord with the view of the junior Senator from South Dakota that—

We are trying to win, on the battlefield and in Paris, what the Saigon government long ago lost beyond all recall: the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.

Our policy must not serve the interests of these petty tyrants. Our policy must serve the interests of the American people. And without question, Mr. Speaker, the interests of the American people demand that we begin to withdraw our soldiers now.

If the Nixon administration will not promptly heed the anguish and anger of the American people seeking to terminate our military involvement in Vietnam, then Congress must exercise its power and refuse to appropriate the billions of dollars being spent for killing in Vietnam.

We must not defer to the insiders and the experts on this paramount issue. We know the magnitude of our blundering—we know the depth of our shame. I for one will vote against any appropriations for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war.

TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designed to stiffen U.S. policy in establishing and enforcing our territorial waters claims and ocean fishing limits.

This action is, in my judgment, required for two very good reasons. First, U.S. fishing boats are being subjected to outrageous humiliation by nations which themselves are undercutting our own fishing industry which is in a badly depressed condition.

Second, our shorelines are being subjected to intense electronic surveillance by Communist nations which enforce claims to territorial waters to far greater extent than we do.

International agreements and understandings with regard to territorial waters, if they ever were significant, today are without any meaning. Effectively every coastal nation sets its own claims without regard to others. This means chaos which will, if not corrected, become extremely serious.

My resolution proposes two steps. First, it says that we should adopt a policy of reciprocity in our territorial waters and fishing limits. This means that we would impose on any ship the same territorial and fishing limits which that ship's national government imposes in its own coastal waters. Of course we would in any case maintain our 3-mile territorial limit and our 12-mile fishing limit.

Second, my resolution calls for a new international conference for the purpose of reaching agreement between all coastal nations on territorial limits.

Mr. Speaker, the United States follows the normal traditional practice. This provides for a 3-mile limit for the purposes of sovereign territorial jurisdiction and for a 12-mile limit for the purposes of fishing.

Actually, we have entered into certain agreements liberalizing these limits. A Soviet-American fishing agreement in late 1967 provided that Soviet fishing trawlers could venture to within 6 miles

of certain areas off the Long Island and New Jersey coasts.

In exchange for this concession the Russians agreed not to fish certain other areas off Cape Cod, but proceeded to violate the spirit of the agreement by sending trawlers flying the Polish flag into the areas in which their own ships were prohibited.

Legitimate fishing is only a part of the consideration at hand, since it is common knowledge that Russian and other Communist fishing trawlers are fitted with highly sophisticated electronic surveillance equipment.

On February 8 of this year the Coast Guard observed a fleet of 60 Communist-bloc trawlers off the Virginia coast well within the 12-mile limit. It must be assumed they were both fishing and engaging in surveillance.

And we took no action to enforce the traditional limit. Clearly it is ludicrous to speak of any effective traditional limit either in terms of what we enforce on our own coasts or what others both claim and enforce.

Only yesterday it was reported that a fleet of some 175 Soviet-bloc trawlers were operating in a formation 40 miles long and 15 miles wide off the Virginia-North Carolina coast.

This represents a new high level of Soviet fishing strength in and near American waters. And although we are told these trawlers were some 35 miles off the coast, what assurance do we have that they may not venture up to within 3 miles?

And what assurance do we have that if they do indeed violate the 12-mile limit that we will take any action beyond yet another warning?

If the traditional limits were ever considered to be binding the day has passed when this is realistic. The brutal fact is that we invite, through our practices, both espionage and unfair invasion of our coastal fishing grounds.

Only 29 of 98 coastal nations of the world now observe the so-called traditional limits. The others all claim wider limits.

The 3-mile sovereign limit is a thing of the past. The U.S.S.R. and most Communist nations claim 12 miles. And we can be assured that the claim is rigidly enforced.

The *Pueblo* tragedy provides evidence that at least in some cases Communist nations are fully prepared to seize ships even beyond the 12-mile limit when they believe they can get away it.

Peru and Ecuador go to the extent of claiming 200 miles for both sovereign territorial waters and fishing limits. We all know of recent cases in which U.S. tuna boats have been seized when within these 200-mile limits but well beyond the 12-mile limit.

On February 15 a U.S. boat was attacked while located from 26 to 50 miles off the Peruvian coast. Again last week two more U.S. boats were seized at about the same distance.

It must be emphasized that these incidents are not uniquely recent. They have been going on for far too long. And so have efforts to correct the problem.

More than 2 years ago, in early March 1967, our Assistant Secretary of

State Lincoln Gordon spent 5 days in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador in an effort to solve the problem. Even at that time seizure of U.S. trawlers within 200 miles but well beyond 12 miles was a long-standing fact.

We were talking in those days about enforcement of the Kuchel amendment which requires that U.S. aid be cut off to any nation that seizes American property. We are today in 1969 still talking about enforcing the Kuchel amendment, and chances are that 2 and 5 years from now we will still be talking about it.

The "tit for tat" policy I recommend will, of course, not solve the entire problem. What it can be expected to do, however, is put some backbone into U.S. behavior on the high seas where other nations have come to believe that our patience is inexhaustible.

Just as important it could provide the thrust needed to convince other nations that a new worldwide agreement is needed. International conferences in Geneva failed to produce agreement in 1958 and again in 1960.

Presumably, one of the reasons they failed was that too many nations believed it was in their national interest to set their own policies while others, such as the United States, adhered to the so-called traditional international standards.

This issue is of serious concern to the American fishing industry. But it is an issue which transcends the interests of our country and involves world stability.

I earnestly solicit the support of this House in early consideration and approval of this resolution.

CONGRESS SHOULD CLOSE INCOME TAX LOOPHOLES AND LET THE SURTAX EXPIRE

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is being made clearer each day by various spokesmen that the administration will request the extension of the "temporary" 10-percent income surtax.

I cannot help but feel this is an "easy way out" which will bear most heavily upon the 50 million low- and moderate-income taxpayers who are being squeezed by inflation.

There is a better way, a more equitable way, of obtaining the additional money which is urgently needed to finance the added expenses of the Vietnam war.

I am proposing, through my bill H.R. 7045—and it is being proposed in similar bills—that this Congress let the surtax expire and obtain the \$9 billion in revenues which the surtax is expected to raise, by closing those tax loopholes for individuals and corporations who are profiting unduly at the expense of our overheated war economy.

Through these tax loopholes some giant corporations and millionaires escape paying taxes on most or even all of their income.

In a memorable appearance before the Joint Economic Committee on January 17, 1969, outgoing Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr warned of a brewing

"taxpayers revolt" incited by the flagrant inequities made possible by loopholes in the law. Mr. Barr cited chapter and verse and explained that in 1967 there were 21 Americans with incomes over \$1 million who paid no Federal income tax at all; there were 155 individuals with 1967 incomes of over \$200,000 who paid none.

Some corporations, too, have enjoyed special tax favors at the expense of other corporations and the low- and moderate-income taxpayers. Oil companies are especially notorious for their "piggy-backing" on the public. The Treasury Department estimates that the cost of the average oil well is recovered 19 times over. Through the 27½-percent depletion allowance gimmick the 20 leading oil companies in the United States, in 1966, legally paid Federal income taxes at the rate of 8½ percent on their \$4¼ billion profit. This is about the rate paid by a wage earner and his wife at a poverty-level annual income of \$3,000.

My bill would raise the \$9 billion in additional revenues which are needed to replace an expiring surtax by: reducing mineral and oil depletion allowances, eliminating a tax "break" for multiple corporations, repealing the 7-percent investment tax credit which is causing inflationary industrial overexpansion, limiting the "hobby farm" income-loss gimmick, and other unwarranted subsidies or preferences which enrich favored classes of people and firms. I believe these reforms could speedily be considered by Congress and enacted into law to replace the expiring surtax provision.

It is certainly not my intention that this tax reform bill be a substitute for the comprehensive revision of the income tax laws now being studied by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I would hope, however, that all the essential features of this bill would, at least, be incorporated in the long-awaited revision. They would be a long-desired first step to bringing a greater measure of justice to our tax system.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON TAX REFORM, LOOPHOLES, ETC.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and testified regarding the necessity for early action by the committee and the Members of the 91st Congress to enact effective legislation that will curtail and repeal some of the fabulous and, in many cases, fraudulent tax loophole bonanzas that have been placed on our statute books over the years. I appreciated the remarks and questions of many members of the Ways and Means Committee as to the necessity of effective Federal tax reform.

I include my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee this morning:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 26, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Chairman and the Members of the Ways and

Means Committee for giving me an opportunity to testify on this much-needed Federal tax reform legislation. I also want to commend your committee for calling these long-delayed hearings in order to secure firsthand information for the American public on the deplorable conditions which our Federal tax system has reached in recent years. During my 27 years in Congress I have been shocked by the gradual increase in power, year by year, of specially privileged and powerful segments of our economy slowly and cleverly securing favorable legislation until, in some cases, they are totally exempt on Federal taxes from their exorbitant profits.

Our Federal tax laws, as of today, have become riddled with tax concessions, loopholes, tax credits, and depletion exemptions to a favored few who have the finances to employ powerful lobbyists to relieve their clients of the responsibility for providing the revenue necessary to finance the enormous cost to keep our land the No. 1 nation in the world.

Former Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr revealed in January that 21 persons with incomes over \$1 million paid no taxes at all in 1967, while 155 with incomes of over \$200,000 also escaped taxes entirely.

When the wealthy escape taxes, it is the average taxpayer who gets hit for higher taxes to make up the difference. The best example of this is the 10 percent tax surcharge. Faced with the need for more revenues, the Administration came running to the average middle class taxpayer, while doing nothing to make wealthy foundations, oil millionaires, real estate speculators, and highly-paid corporate executives pay their fair share. Those with incomes of around \$15,000 a year or less already pay nearly two-thirds of all personal Federal income taxes, and the surcharge simply adds to their burden. But to the wealthy exploiter of loopholes the surcharge is no problem at all—10 percent of nothing is still nothing.

If just a modest number of the fantastic and excessive tax loopholes and exemptions were eliminated there would be no need for an extension of the 10% surcharge tax. I have introduced H.R. 9195, which if enacted into law would bring in more than \$9 billion in additional revenue by plugging 13 of the more notorious loopholes in our Federal tax system. This happens to be the same amount that an extension of the 10 percent tax surcharge would yield in fiscal 1970. Thirty-one other Congressmen have sponsored identical legislation.

Among the loopholes this bill would close is the depletion allowance for oil and other minerals. Largely because of the oil depletion allowance, the 20 largest oil companies in the country paid only 8½ percent of their net income in taxes in 1966. One large company with profits ranging from \$61,110,000 in 1962 and similar increased amounts of income in 1963, 1964, and 1965 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever.

Standard Oil of New Jersey had an income of \$1,271,903,000 in 1962 but paid only six-tenths of one percent of their fabulous profits. In the following four years their percentage tax on similar profits ranges as follows:

Year	Net income before tax	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Standard Oil (New Jersey).....		
1962	\$1,271,903,000	0.6
1963	1,584,469,000	4.3
1964	1,628,555,000	1.7
1965	1,679,675,000	4.9
1966	1,830,914,000	6.3
Atlantic Oil.....		
1962	61,110,000	0
1963	56,747,000	0
1964	61,081,000	0
1965	105,299,000	0
1966	127,384,000

Some companies do not do as well as the oil companies, however. Perhaps they do not have as powerful a lobby in Washington as "big oil."

The following statistics on three coal companies illustrate the contrast:

	Year	Gross profit	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Consolidation Coal Co.....	1964	\$44,863,073	26
	1963	39,568,737	28
	1962	32,918,065	26
Pittston Co.....	1964	13,721,024	30
	1962	14,699,420	35
Island Creek Coal Co.....	1964	7,713,060	18
	1963	5,149,930	24
	1962	3,459,563	(1)

¹ Lost by SEC.

The oil lobby will of course argue that the 27½ percent depletion allowance is needed to insure an adequate supply of reserve oil in emergencies, that it is vital to our national defense, that our economy will collapse without it. Fortunately the Treasury has just released a thorough-going study of the tax breaks currently enjoyed by the oil industry and their effect on the level of oil reserves. The study, done by the CONSAD Research Corporation of Pittsburgh, challenges these oil industry arguments, concluding that the depletion allowance and special expense deductions enjoyed by the oil companies add only a small amount to the Nation's petroleum reserves. Furthermore, the Report goes on, the depletion allowance encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources. I don't think this is a very good bargain for the \$2.25 billion worth of loopholes we gave to oil men in 1968. Big oil has been enjoying this financial bonanza for years. Real estate speculators are almost as generously treated at tax time as oil men.

Former Treasury Assistant Secretary Surrey, in a speech last year, said, "The Treasury recently examined the 1966 tax returns of 13 real estate operators, all of whom had very substantial gross incomes, and found that depreciation 'losses' reduced the tax liability of nine of them to zero and of two others to less than \$25."

Doing away with the accelerated depreciation gimmick on speculative real estate would head off operators of this sort and bring in an extra \$150 million in tax revenues each year.

Another gaping tax loophole is the 7 percent investment tax credit, enacted in 1962, which permits business firms to subtract from their tax bills 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was intended to stimulate the economy by providing a subsidy to private investment.

However, our economy has been overstimulated and we are now in a period of serious inflation, fed in part by the 7% investment tax credit. The credit concentrates inflationary spending power on precisely that portion of the economy that is already most overheated—the capital goods section in the first place, it creates a second round of inflation by causing business to hasten to invest before inflation drives up capital goods prices even further.

The Commerce Department Survey of business fixed investment plans for 1969, released on March 13, underscores the need for repeal of the investment tax credit. The survey predicted that total 1969 expenditures for new plant and equipment will reach a whopping \$73 billion, a 14 percent increase over 1968. This contrasts with year-to-year increases of only 4 percent in 1968 and 2 percent in 1967.

This survey indicates strongly that it is capital goods inflation that is most serious, yet the Administration still insists on a 10 percent surcharge on the average consumer to combat inflation. If it is inflation they are concerned about, why not get at the real culprit by repealing the 7 percent investment tax credit?

The list of tax loopholes can be extended almost to eternity, as this committee well knows.

Capital gains which pass through an estate at death are not taxed.

The unlimited charitable deduction allows many millionaires to escape taxation entirely.

Special tax treatment for stock options allows highly paid corporate executives to get tax advantages not open to the average wage earner.

The tax exemption for municipal industrial development bond interest encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations, while costing the Treasury millions in lost revenues.

As an example, certain states of the Union who enjoy the exemption privileges of Section B of the Taft-Hartley Law are paying sub-standard wages to millions of factory workers in their localities. These sub-standard wage workers are practically out of the buying market in regard to \$3-\$4 thousand dollar automobiles, \$400 refrigerators, etc., etc., and are adding nothing to the employment and prosperity in factory production of our Nation. This, of course, is an exemption over which the Ways and Means Committee has no responsibility. On the other hand, your committee has recommended, and the Congress has enacted, tax exemptions for municipal industrial development bonds. This exemption encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations and industrial factories to move into these 14B states. Thousands of towns and cities in these areas have taken advantage of the tax exempt industrial development bonds with cheap land and cheap wages to capture thousands of industrial factories from states paying a living wage to its workers. Multi-millions could be brought into the Federal Treasury by the repeal of the interest on municipal and other local civic bond promotion.

The hobby farm loophole allows wealthy part-time farmers to escape taxes by using fictional farm "losses" to offset income.

I will not take more of the committee's time by extending the list of loopholes, for time is something we don't have very much of because of the need for immediate action in repeal of tax loopholes, exemptions, etc.

The American people are weary of being told that we are all very concerned about tax reform, that we are working very hard on it, and that it is very difficult and complicated and it is going to take a long time. The tax-paying public is running out of patience, and the surcharge is doing little to make them more tolerant.

Therefore, I would urge the committee to act within the next two months on as many major tax reform items as possible. Tax reform should not be postponed until we can put together a neat, tidy, "skim milk" package that everyone can agree on. We will be here until the year 2000 if that is the goal.

I am not going to take the time of this committee in detailing the fabulous and fraudulent raid on the Federal Treasury by thousands of tax-avoiding estate foundations. A former Secretary of the Treasury stated before a Senate Committee that he could not speculate as to how many foundations are operating and enjoying tax exempt benefits. Some foundations are engaging in free enterprise industry in competition with regular tax paying corporation and non-exempt business and industries. One official in the Treasury Department testified that he could place the number of foundations enjoying tax exemptions at approximately 25,000. Congress-

man Wright Patman and other Members have gone into the foundation tax bonanza in detail before your committee, and I know your committee and all Members of Congress are familiar with its tax-avoiding ramifications.

Every tax dollar lost through these loopholes must be paid by another source. For the most part, this loss—and it has been estimated to be a whopping \$50 billion—is paid by moderate income groups, by small people with incomes of \$15 thousand and less, who cannot afford to hire high-priced accountants and tax lawyers to enact loopholes, credits and exemptions.

The House should be given an opportunity to work its will on tax reform at the earliest opportunity. I firmly believe that the heavy financial obligation of Government would warrant your committee concentrating on major loopholes which involves literally billions of escaped taxes by certain segments of our economy. Your committee, I hope will report a bill closing the top-bracket tax-escaping loopholes so the Congress can act immediately on the same. The minor loop holes can be taken up by your committee and considered later in the year. The American public has become familiar in recent years with the necessity of taking the gigantic tax load off the wage-earner and the salaried citizen while mammoth corporations and gigantic mergers of corporations profiteer on the American public. I do hope your committee will not submit a weak, and ineffective recommendation on the closing of the tax loopholes. As a Member of the Rules Committee, I for one, and I know of others that for the first time in years, will insist on an open rule on this legislation. This will give the other 410 Members of Congress an opportunity to answer the demand of the almost unanimous cry of the American public for effective tax reform.

It has been suggested by some Members that this legislation could be enacted in the next few months if the major loophole recipients, whose payments on their huge profits is but a pittance, would start paying into the Federal Treasury a blanket minimum Federal tax ranging from 15 percent to 30 percent of their profits. They then would join with the small businessmen and the wage and salaried citizen in supporting our huge domestic and foreign programs and Federal obligations.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order which I am about to undertake.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, the National Urban Coalition under the chairmanship of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, issued a report on progress made during the last year in meeting the challenges posed by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder. In area after area of domestic need—housing, education, unemployment, discrimination, pollution of our atmosphere and water—the report of the

Urban Coalition concluded that no progress had been made in the year since the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders issued its call to the Nation to respond to these pressing urban problems before our cities deteriorated beyond repair.

As the situation in our cities becomes daily more crucial, the war in Vietnam, which has consumed more and more of our Nation's resources and, even more tragically, cost the lives of over 33,000 American servicemen, continues. While our cities disintegrate and our country becomes increasingly disunited, a war which was ill conceived from the beginning rages on with undiminished fury.

From the beginning of this tragic conflict I have consistently warned of the threat which the war poses to both the welfare of the Vietnamese people and the stability and integrity of the United States. Since 1964 the domestic needs of our people have been neglected as our Nation's resources and energies have been committed to the Americanization of the war and the constant escalation of our military role—an escalation carried on with the consent, if not the advice, of the Congress, which, despite the opposition of a few of us, has readily authorized and appropriated some \$30 billion annually to conduct the war in Vietnam.

Last March, in the wake of mounting opposition to the war—opposition which spread from the campuses to important segments of the labor movement, business community, and even within the policymaking apparatus of the Government itself, and which was then finding expression through the political process—the Johnson administration changed course. The President declined to commit the 206,000 additional troops which General Westmoreland had requested. On March 31 he announced a curb in the bombing of North Vietnam, said he would move toward peace through negotiations, and removed himself from consideration as a candidate for reelection. A short time later, in May of 1968, the preliminary peace negotiations got underway in Paris.

For those of us who had long opposed our deepening involvement in Vietnam, and who had urged that the President stop the bombing in the North and rely on diplomatic means for a settlement of the war, the President's announcement appeared to signal a deescalation in the war and at least the beginning of a move toward a negotiated settlement.

That was 1 year ago.

What is the result of that "change in direction" today? Has the level of violence in Vietnam declined?

Last week, the Pentagon announced that 351 American servicemen had been killed during the week ending March 15. 1,401 Americans were wounded.

In the week previous to that, 336 Americans were killed and 1,694 wounded. And in the week ending March 1, 453 Americans died in combat and 2,593 were wounded.

This makes a total of 1,140 deaths during 3 weeks of the current North Vietnamese-Vietcong offensive.

These statistics by themselves, however, do not fully reveal the intensification of the fighting that has occurred since the so-called reversal of direction was announced by President Johnson. It is significant that almost one-third of the total number of 33,063 American servicemen who have died in Vietnam since 1961—10,565 men—have died since the preliminary Paris peace talks began on May 10, 1968.

As these grim figures show, despite the general expectations of the American public that the advent of negotiations would produce a deescalation of hostilities in Vietnam, the fighting has intensified to the point that 3,459 lives have been lost in the 3 months since South Vietnam joined the Paris talks on December 7.

Moreover, the death and suffering which have been the lot of the Vietnamese people for over two decades now continues unabated. The Senate Select Subcommittee on Refugees has estimated that between 3 million and 4 million people in South Vietnam are presently without shelter or occupation, with very little hope that their condition will improve in their own lifetime. No one knows how many Vietnamese have been killed or maimed during the past 4 years, but estimates run to the hundreds of thousands.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am rather disturbed that there are only about 20 Members on the floor for such an important address. If the gentleman wishes that I suggest the absence of a quorum. I will unless the gentleman does not care to have an audience.

Mr. RYAN. That is a point of order which the gentleman from Illinois may raise in his own discretion.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman will be discreet.

Mr. RYAN. A number of Members plan to participate in this discussion during the course of the afternoon, many of whom are on the floor already. Others will join us, and I assure the gentleman that we will be making recommendations to the Nixon administration and to our colleagues which I hope will be heeded.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has said that the blame for the renewed intensification of the fighting rests squarely with the "enemy." "I want to state unequivocally," he stated on March 11, "that if these attacks continue unabated, an appropriate response will be made."

President Nixon on March 14, also said that an "appropriate response" would be taken if the North Vietnamese attacks continued.

According to New York Post columnist James Wechsler, however, 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 attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks." Ambassador Harriman's comments echo an earlier warning which the New York Times made last

December 14, when it warned that an escalation in U.S. military activity—coupled with a decline in the number of battalion-scaled assaults by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong—was endangering the Paris talks. The editorial cautioned that an upset in the military balance in Vietnam in advance of a settlement “is bound to produce a reaction sooner or later” that could “wreck the chance for a negotiated peace.”

Stepped up offensive military actions by the United States is being used, however, to attempt to upset the military balance. In the hopes that the occupation of territory long held by the Vietcong will produce a settlement more favorable to the Saigon regime, the U.S. military has continued to make extensive use of aggressive “search and destroy” missions. In spite of the fact that in the past each U.S. escalation has been matched—and that the only result of an intensification of hostilities has been more death and destruction—the American military command appears to persist in its belief that “just one more sweep” will tip the military balance in their favor. This strategy has failed to produce any significant military gain in the past. For, as I have repeatedly stated in numerous speeches to this body, the Vietcong does not intend to dissolve in the face of U.S. firepower. The National Liberation Front, and its predecessor the Viet Minh, have been fighting for over two decades to rid Vietnam of foreign influence. Any amount of American military pressure, short of total destruction, will only produce an “appropriate response” on their part. And the destruction will go on.

A little more than a year ago, on March 11, 1968, when General Westmoreland was asking for an additional 206,000 troops, I said that the choice was clear. “Will additional thousands of American young men be sent to their death in Vietnam? Will more billions of dollars be spent, which should be spent on our domestic crisis, only to reach new levels of destruction in Vietnam, only to achieve a continued stalemate at a new plateau? Or will the administration negotiate a political settlement?” The lack of progress at the Paris peace talks and the actual intensification of the war since the talks began leaves little doubt that neither the Johnson administration nor the Nixon administration has taken the steps necessary to obtain a negotiated political settlement. Instead, more treasure has been spent, and more lives have been sacrificed.

At his last press conference on March 19, President Nixon ominously threatened that “he had warned North Vietnam once” and that he would not “warn them a second time.”

With the possibility increasing that President Nixon may take some retaliatory action against the latest offensive by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, it is imperative that the Congress make clear its opposition to any renewal of the policy which I described on March 1, 1966, as “mindful escalation.” As I have stated, such retaliatory action will only lead to a counterresponse and a new round of escalation of the war. And

the result will only be the unnecessary prolongation of the suffering of the Vietnamese population.

By speaking out now—before the Nixon administration takes such measures—the Congress can prevent any new escalation. If Congress fails to define our objectives in Vietnam, the President will have only the counsel of those in the Pentagon and the foreign policy establishment who have led us into this morass from the outset.

The presidential primaries of last Spring—in which both Senator Kennedy and Senator McCARTHY won decisive victories on programs advocating a deescalation of the war and an emphasis on diplomatic negotiation as the means to peace—made it clear that the American people want this war ended. Indeed, that feeling seemed to be almost universally accepted by all candidates.

As long ago as March 1968, in the course of the New Hampshire primary, Presidential candidate Nixon said, “The next President of the United States must end the war.” He declared that his statement about ending the war “was not a vague campaign promise.” “I do have some specific ideas on how to end the war,” he said. “They are primarily in the diplomatic area.”

In his testimony before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee on March 20, Secretary of Defense Laird said that if the Paris talks “failed to produce a negotiated settlement” of the war, the Nixon administration had “other alternatives” which it was prepared to pursue.

The Congress should demand that the administration make clear the nature of these “other alternatives.”

In March 1968, Presidential candidate Nixon had “specific ideas on how to end the war.” In March 1969 President Nixon has “other alternatives.” Vague “alternatives” are no substitute for a clearly defined statement of our goals and objectives in Vietnam.

It is time for the President to explain those “specific ideas” and “alternatives.” Moreover, it is time for the Congress to assert its own role in the formulation of foreign policy and insist that the administration take steps to get the Paris negotiations off dead center and on the road to a prompt and early settlement.

What should those steps include? For the most part, those of us who have long advocated an end to the war have already spelled out—on numerous occasions—what must be done to bring this war to an end. Let me reiterate them, however.

First, the Congress must refuse to approve any further appropriations for military activities in Vietnam.

As I said on May 5, 1965; March 1, 1966, March 2, 1967; and June 11, 1968—when I voted against funds for the Vietnam war—the authorization and appropriations process offers the only opportunity to debate our policy in Vietnam; it is the only way in which we can exercise influence over the administration’s war policy. We have never had before us the question of a declaration of war. Approval of appropriations for the war has been interpreted by President Johnson as congressional approval of the administration’s war policies. It will con-

tinue to be regarded as approval so long as we continue to vote funds for the war.

Proponents of the present policy have in the past attempted to pose the question of war appropriations as one of support for our boys who are fighting the war. No doubt they will continue to pose the question in this manner. But that ploy is nothing less than an attempt to hide the catalog of error and bland assurances of progress that repeatedly have been belied by events in the cloak of providing adequate protection for our fighting men. No one in this House has ever suggested that our courageous fighting men in Vietnam should not have whatever they need to protect and defend themselves. But the appropriations have been used to escalate the war. Let us not forget that our fighting men are not responsible for the policies that send them into battle to risk their lives. If those policies have resulted in the needless sacrifice of thousands of American young men, it is at least partially because Congress has been unwilling to halt those policies by halting the appropriations which support them.

Second, the administration must accept the participation of the National Liberation Front in the future political life of South Vietnam. Our present refusal to grant the NLF any role in the postwar political environment of South Vietnam is a major obstacle to progress at the Paris talks. To expect that either the NLF or the North Vietnamese will agree to a settlement which does not permit them a political role in South Vietnam after nearly 25 years of struggle on their part to achieve power is totally unrealistic and out of keeping with the political realities of South Vietnam. We do nothing to further the evolution of democracy in South Vietnam by proping up a regime so corrupt and unrepresentative that even its proponents believe it would immediately collapse in the face of United States military withdrawal.

So long as our own policy continues to emphasize military strategies over political compromise, the Saigon generals will retain the power to destroy the prospects for a negotiated settlement of the war. For, despite their undemocratic ways and lack of popular support, they seem to have prosecuted the war with greater efficiency than their predecessors. However, if the United States makes clear its determination to achieve a negotiated settlement of the war, Thieu and Ky would have no choice but to pursue a course of conciliation and compromise, since they are completely dependent upon support from the U.S. Government.

Once the President expressed his willingness to accept a coalition government in South Vietnam which included the NLF, the Saigon regime would have no recourse except to broaden itself to include those non-Communist elements which favor some sort of compromise with the NLF. For they could neither prosecute the war on their own nor hope to withstand the pressure from the Vietcong without the aid of those groups which they now imprison and repress.

What about the argument of those who say that a coalition government would only be rapidly taken over by the NLF?

I must say, in all candor, that I do not believe there is any way we can be assured that that will not happen. The NLF has sought to become the ruling force in South Vietnam for many years now. But there is reason to believe that the NLF would not be able to eliminate all political opposition in South Vietnam.

Richard Barnett, the codirector of the Institute of Policy Studies, who has recently met with both the North Vietnamese and the NLF negotiators in Paris, has said in a recent statement that—

The NLF is under no illusions that political opposition to them will disappear once the Americans leave. They are going to have to accommodate the various factions or else continue a bloody civil war which it is the interest of no Vietnamese to prolong.

Several of the religious groups are well organized and ready to compete for power once they no longer have to face the day-to-day harassment and persecution which the Thieu-Ky regime perpetrated against them. As Dr. Barnett concludes:

The sooner such groups are released from prison and harassment and can rehabilitate themselves, the sooner they can unite their forces and deal with the Communists from greater strength.

So long as the United States acquiesces in the face of the present regime's suppression of these groups, potential opposition to the NLF will remain fragmented and disunited.

A third important step by which the United States can advance the peace talks is by withdrawing significant numbers of troops from Vietnam. This would speed the belief in the mind of the North Vietnamese that the United States indeed intends to withdraw its troops from Vietnam, which, as James Reston pointed out on March 7, is essential to achieving a negotiated settlement.

In his March 19 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird revealed that the assumption of the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam—MACV—was "that no reduction of U.S. personnel would be possible in the absence of total withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops." If James Reston's conviction that the withdrawal of some U.S. troops is essential in order to convince the North Vietnamese of our willingness to eventually withdraw all troops is correct, then the military's "assumptions" will clearly prevent any progress at the talks in Paris. The result will be a continuation of the stalemate in Paris and the killing in Vietnam.

The time has come to indicate our commitment to a diplomatic settlement of the war by withdrawing a significant number of U.S. troops—at least 100,000—as soon as is logistically possible. Moreover, the withdrawal process should be continued by not replacing those portions of our military force which are rotated back to the United States after their tour of duty in Vietnam. This would have two effects:

First. It would provide concrete proof to the North Vietnamese of our sincerity in seeking to deescalate the level of hostilities on the battlefield and thereby expand the possibility of achieving a breakthrough at the Paris negotiations, and

Second. It would serve notice on the Saigon regime that the United States does not intend to remain indefinitely in South Vietnam and thereby accelerate pressures on the Saigon generals to broaden their own political base in preparation for serious discussions with the NLF. This strategy would additionally—and not unimportantly—greatly reduce the level of fighting which has characterized the war during the past 10 months.

To continue to pour vast amounts of men and money into South Vietnam in the ill-founded hope that the South Vietnamese Government will someday be able to carry on the war without U.S. aid is to commit this country to an indefinite presence in Vietnam and to condemn the Vietnamese people to still more suffering and destruction. My reply to Secretary Laird's statement that he was "encouraged and impressed" in his talks with South Vietnamese leaders "with their repeatedly stated desire to take on more of the responsibility for fighting" is to refer him to one of his predecessors, Robert McNamara, who said in June of 1965:

The South Vietnamese are fighting effectively. We continue to see increases in their recruitment. We continue to see some increases in their strength.

As the Washington Post said on March 20:

We've heard it all before.

How many times will we accept these bland assurances of progress, assurances that are repeatedly repudiated by the continued ability of the enemy to inflict high casualty rates on both American and South Vietnamese troops?

The Congress must reject the bankrupt solutions of the military strategists and make clear its own determination to end this tragic war by refusing to approve any further appropriations for the Vietnam war. The people of this Nation through the political process have repudiated the very policy which still prevails. Too many lives have already been sacrificed in a vain attempt to save the faces of those who conceived and carried out this wasteful war. The only recourse now is to promptly terminate this war and to turn our attentions to the urgent problems in our own society which are even now ripping apart the social fabric of the United States.

It is time to stop saving faces and to start saving lives.

Let me emphasize that I do not speak in a partisan way today. This war is not of President Nixon's making; he inherited it. But it is now his responsibility to follow the mandate of the American people and end it. If the President does not take immediate steps to get the Paris negotiations off dead center, he will be responsible for the continued death and destruction in Vietnam, and his capacity to direct the resources of this Nation to the solution of domestic problems will be curtailed, even as his predecessors' ability to respond to those problems was curtailed.

The message to the President from Congress must be clear: Get us out of Vietnam now, for the urgency of our crisis here at home demands your full energies and preoccupation. More importantly,

that message must be backed up by the exercise of the only power Congress has to regulate the conduct of foreign policy, the power of the purse. If Congress refuses to appropriate additional funds to prosecute the war, the President will withdraw troops because he will have no alternative. If Congress fails to end its support of the war, it cannot shift all of the responsibility for the continuation of the war to the President. Congress must recognize that it can stop the war and that, if it does not, it will be at least partially to blame for the additional violence and suffering that will ensue.

It has been argued that the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, before the security of the Saigon government is assured, would make all that we have poured into that country—including the men we have lost and the vast amounts of money we have spent—a waste. How could the American people ever accept this, it is asked. How could any American Government ever explain that the sacrifices made by over 33,000 young American men have been in vain? There is no simple answer. But pouring more and more money into this war, and sacrificing thousands more men, is surely no answer.

The blunt fact is unavoidable that this country has erred tragically in the conception and carrying out of this war.

There really are only two courses. We can continue—like the poker player who stays in the game for the one more deal that will salvage his losses—to pour more men and money into Vietnam in a foredoomed attempt to gain something from our sacrifices. Or we can admit frankly to the American people that the best way to correct bad policy is to simply stop perpetuating it. Surely our stature in the eyes of the world would be improved if we admitted the error of our policies and rectified them. I believe the American people as well would prefer that course to the continued destruction of Vietnam and indeed, our own society.

As I have said, President Nixon is not responsible for the tragic consequences of our policy. Yet, he has an unparalleled opportunity to correct mistakes that are not of his doing. So does the Congress. Both must exercise their mutual responsibilities of explaining to the American people that the war has been a disastrous and tragic mistake.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago next Monday an incumbent American President renounced renomination because the war in Vietnam had shattered his role as party and national leader.

Today we watch his successor closely, seeking assurance that the lessons of Vietnam animate President Nixon's search for peace.

Those lessons are:

An exhausting, cruel, and tragic war was fought for the empty delusion that American arms could impose conformity to our political ideas. We should ex-

pect other strange ideas in other strange countries. What shall we do?

Our military leaders, who promised a military victory time after time, have led us instead to a political catastrophe. We should weigh their advice more carefully in the future.

We have paid over 30,000 American lives and \$150 billion in this vain war effort. Comparable sacrifices for genuine domestic needs elude us.

We have been told that we should give the new administration 100 days in office before criticizing its conduct. I would wait forever to criticize our present policy in Vietnam if I thought such forbearance would end the war 1 day sooner. But the new administration gropes, with little apparent difference from its predecessor, toward an illusory military victory.

Peace will not come at the Paris conference table any more than it will come in the jungle fighting in Vietnam. Peace will come when we Americans begin to withdraw our forces—which are the only foreign troops in Vietnam—and let Vietnamese political processes achieve the equilibrium which arms could not impose.

It seems to me that the critical judgment is not necessarily whether they put all their energies into a peaceful settlement. I suspect that each administration, past and present, would assert that they did do that. But it may be that they misunderstood the nature of the conflict in Vietnam. Maybe they misunderstood what has to be done. It seems to me that the original mistake in 1954 was the belief that we could achieve through military means a political objective. We did not fully understand that we cannot decide for ourselves what style, type and quality of government there should be in another land.

And even if we were able to make that decision, as General Ridgway suggested, our military imposition was not manageable. We saw this from 1965 to 1968—the period of escalation—that the administration felt that we could achieve through military victory, a political solution. President Johnson finally determined that the military was leading him down a primrose path. He finally saw no success at the end of it, because a viable, tranquil peace can never be achieved in any country unless the people involved in that country are involved in trying to make that peace obtainable and workable.

The biggest stumbling block I think was not an inadequate desire to make peace but our inability to understand the nature, quality, and style of the government in South Vietnam. Until the elements of the populace in South Vietnam could join together, live together, and build together, their own political entity, there could not be peace. Our tragic misunderstanding was in not seeing that there could not be peace imposed at a military price that either the people of the United States were willing to pay or the world was willing to let us pay.

We should look to the past to see where we made our mistakes, but not to inquire to the motivations of the individuals involved. I would like to look to the future.

I think the Nixon administration ought to learn the lesson that others failed to learn: there must be a government in South Vietnam that is going to deal with all political elements. Past governments in South Vietnam simply were not going to take themselves out of office. I do not know how credible recent statements to the contrary are.

These governments knew that maintenance of the war and maintenance of their military posture kept them in a position of power. As long as they refused to deal with other elements in Vietnam society, there could not be a viable, meaningful peace. Yet only through such refusal could they keep their power. It may well be that President Nixon has secretly indicated or perhaps he could do it publicly also that the American Government is dissatisfied with the posture of the autocratic regime in South Vietnam. If we were to begin withdrawal of our troops, that regime would be pushed into a position of compromise. Other leaders could come to the fore in South Vietnam who would be willing to make a durable and lasting peace.

It may well be that that has happened. I certainly hope so. I believe President Nixon and his administration must be reminded that it cannot achieve a military victory, because it is absolutely unobtainable. We have to resort to the political process, painful as it might be. That is the lesson of Vietnam.

What type of government will follow from a coalition of political elements? What kind of peace will follow? It may be to our liking and it may not be to our liking. But the hard, cold fact is that we do not have a choice. We clearly cannot dictate the style and the quality of government they have.

I would hope that it would be a democratic government with legitimate representation of all interests in society there. It does not necessarily have to follow our style, but I think it should have at least a basic element of democratic representation. But if it does not have that, if it is something more than that or something less, whether it violates my own poor judgment is somewhat irrelevant. The Vietnamese will have to deal with their own government, as we must deal with ours, at their own pace, under their own conditions. We cannot impose our will there. Military events cannot be permitted to make policy in the United States. The President must clearly enunciate what American objectives are.

I commend the gentleman and his colleagues for taking this time to make these very important statements. I hope the message is clear for the present administration; we cannot sit back and let military events overtake policy.

To summarize, I urge our Government to make clear:

First, we want peace; second, we want it under conditions that are satisfactory to the people in South Vietnam; third, that it is our intention to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as rapidly as possible, and fourth, the Vietnamese must make their own way in the world.

As soon as Americans and Vietnamese understand that, the world will applaud us for supporting principles of democ-

racy and fair and honest and legitimate representation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I certainly think he has put his finger on the key element; that is, the determination of past policymakers to pursue a military victory and their failure to understand that this was essentially a political problem which required a diplomatic solution.

Furthermore, of course, there must be a recognition of the need to broaden the Government to include all elements of the population. The refusal on the part of the past administration—I hope there will be a change by this one, but so far there has been no indication of any change—to recognize that the NLF—the National Liberation Front—has a role in the future political life of the South Vietnamese people is, of course, the stumbling block, in my judgment, to a negotiated settlement. Once that is accepted, it may be possible to bring about a settlement.

The immediate withdrawal of 100,000 American troops from South Vietnam would make it clear that we do not intend an indefinite military presence in South Vietnam.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is one further point I want to make, to reaffirm the point made by Ambassador Harriman, who suggested, in an article published by the International Press, that, when President Johnson decreed there should be no bombing in the North, most of us felt there would be a reduction of military activity. What Governor Harriman suggested happened was an increase in our search-and-destroy efforts in South Vietnam, by which we replaced cessation of bombing in the North with increased bombing in the South. So, most regrettably, I think, we initiated increased military operations in South Vietnam, and that is contrary to what most Americans understood would be the situation when the President made that speech.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York and I subscribe to the remarks he has made thus far, and I would add the following comment.

I think this Congress must take an independent course of action. It cannot wait for the President to do what he said he would do; namely, end the war in Vietnam.

Though the Congress does not make foreign policy, we can seriously affect it by our power to provide or withhold the billions of dollars that the military wants for the further prosecution of the war.

When military appropriations are requested, we have the right to know how much money is specifically earmarked for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war. If this is done, I will oppose the appropriation of those amounts so earmarked. If such information is not provided, I will oppose the total appropriation.

I will not vote a single dollar for more killing—not a single dollar.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman, I agree that Congress must assert its role. Congress has acquiesced in this war by voting funds for it during the past 4 years. If Congress simply cuts off the funds for the war, then the executive branch will have to pursue a different policy.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, on the same day President Nixon announced he had decided the United States will not be safe unless we start to build a defense system against missiles, the Headstart program in the District of Columbia was cut back for the lack of money.

As a teacher, and as a woman, I do not think I will ever understand what kind of values can be involved in spending \$9 billion—and more, I am sure—on elaborate, unnecessary, and impractical weapons when several thousand disadvantaged children in the Nation's Capital get nothing.

When the new administration took office, I was one of the many Americans who hoped it would mean that our country would benefit from the fresh perspectives, the new ideas, the different priorities of a leader who had no part in its mistakes of the past. Mr. Nixon had said things like this:

If our cities are to be livable for the next generation, we can delay no longer in launching new approaches to the problems that beset them and to the tensions that tear them apart.

And he said:

When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is short-changing the American future.

But frankly, I have never cared too much what people say. What I am interested in is what they do. We have waited to see what the new administration is going to do. The pattern now is becoming clear.

Apparently launching those new programs can be delayed for a while, after all. It seems we have to get some missiles launched first.

Recently the new Secretary of Commerce spelled it out. The Secretary, Mr. Stans, told a reporter that the new administration is "pretty well agreed it must take time out from major social objectives" until it can stop inflation.

The new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, came to the Hill to tell the House Education and Labor Committee that he thinks we should spend more on education, particularly in city schools. But, he said, unfortunately we cannot "afford" to, until we have reached some kind of honorable solution to the Vietnam war. I was glad to read that the distinguished Member from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) asked Mr. Finch this:

With the crisis we have in education, and the crisis in our cities, can we wait to settle the war? Shouldn't it be the other way

around? Unless we can meet the crisis in education, we really can't afford the war.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird came to Capitol Hill, too. His mission was to sell the anti-ballistic-missile insanity to the Senate. He was asked what the new administration is doing about the war. To hear him, one would have thought it was 1968, that the former Secretary of State was defending the former policies, that nothing had ever happened—a President had never decided not to run because he knew the Nation would reject him, in despair over this tragic war we have blundered into. Mr. Laird talked of being prepared to spend at least 2 more years in Vietnam.

Two more years, 2 more years of hunger for Americans, of death for our best young men, of children here at home suffering the life-long handicap of not having a good education when they are young. Two more years of high taxes, collected to feed the cancerous growth of a Defense Department budget that now consumes two-thirds of our Federal income.

Two more years of too little being done to fight our greatest enemies, poverty, prejudice, and neglect here in our own country. Two more years of fantastic waste in the Defense Department and of penny pinching on social programs. Our country cannot survive 2 more years, or 4, of these kinds of policies. It must stop—this year—now.

Now I am not a pacifist. I am, deeply, unalterably, opposed to this war in Vietnam. Apart from all the other considerations, and they are many, the main fact is that we cannot squander there the lives, the money, the energy that we need desperately here, in our cities, in our schools.

I wonder whether we cannot reverse our whole approach to spending. For years, we have given the military, the defense industry, a blank check. New weapons' systems are dreamed up, billions are spent, and many times they are found to be impractical, inefficient, unsatisfactory, even worthless. What do we do then? We spend more money on them. But with social programs, what do we do? Take the Job Corps. Its failures have been mercilessly exposed and criticized. If it had been a military research and development project, they would have been covered up or explained away, and Congress would have been ready to pour more billions after those that had been wasted on it.

The case of Pride, Inc., is interesting. This vigorous, successful black organization, here in Washington, conceived and built by young inner-city men, has been ruthlessly attacked by its enemies in the Government, in this Congress. At least six auditors from the General Accounting Office were put to work investigating Pride. They worked 7 months and spent more than \$100,000. They uncovered a fraud. It was something less than \$2,100. Meanwhile millions of dollars—billions of dollars, in fact—were being spent by the Department of Defense, and how many auditors and investigators were checking into their negotiated contracts? Five.

We Americans have come to feel that it is our mission to make the world free. We believe that we are the good guys, everywhere, in Vietnam, in Latin America, wherever we go. We believe we are the good guys at home, too. When the Kerner Commission told white America what black America has always known, that prejudice and hatred built the Nation's slums, maintains them, and profits by them, white America would not believe it. But it is true. Unless we start to fight, and defeat, the enemies of poverty and racism in our own country and make our talk of equality and opportunity ring true, we are exposed as hypocrites in the eyes of the world when we talk about making other people free.

I am deeply disappointed at the clear evidence that the No. 1 priority of the new administration is to buy more and more and more weapons of war, to return to the era of the cold war, to ignore the war we must fight here—the war that is not optional. There is only one way, I believe, to turn these policies around. The Congress can respond to the mandate that the American people have clearly expressed. They have said, "End this war. Stop the waste. Stop the killing. Do something for our own people first." We must find the money to "launch the new approaches," as Mr. Nixon said. We must force the administration to rethink its distorted, unreal scale of priorities. Our children, our jobless men, our deprived, rejected, and starving fellow citizens must come first.

For this reason, I intend to vote "No" on every money bill that comes to the floor of this House that provides any funds for the Department of Defense. Any bill whatsoever, until the time comes when our values and priorities have been turned right-side up again, until the monstrous waste and the shocking profits in the defense budget have been eliminated and our country starts to use its strength, its tremendous resources, for people and peace, not for profits and war.

It was Calvin Coolidge I believe who made the comment that "the Business of America is Business." We are now spending \$80 billion a year on defense—that is two-thirds of every tax dollar. At this time, gentlemen, the business of America is war and it is time for a change.

Mr. RYAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York for her very stirring remarks. Her contribution is very valuable to this debate. She has brought deep understanding and compassion to the House which has strengthened our cause.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to join with him in what I consider a very important issue, or the most important issue today facing the American people. I would like to commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the American

public and to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am growing increasingly apprehensive over the Nixon administration's stand and activities on Vietnam and our involvement there. We hear of proposals by military people to bomb in Cambodia. We hear murmurings of hardening positions from the military. The pace of the war and attendant casualties have risen in an ever-ascending curve in recent weeks. I know that the President wishes peace. Nor do I question his good will. It is the methods and progression of events that cause my disquiet.

In spite of the fact that secret discussions are progressing, the casualty lists inexorably continue to appear in our papers, and the evening news reports continue to present the depressing sadness of the tragedy that is Vietnam.

During the campaign, Mr. Nixon said that "the best policy is to walk softly and carry a big stick." Perhaps so. But it seems that this big stick is not preventing American casualties.

In October, President Nixon said that he wanted a generous peace which won't destroy either North Vietnam or South Vietnam. It is my hope that with this thought in mind, we are acting accordingly in the secret discussions, aiming at a reasonable middle ground which will allow the United States to begin to phase out its presence there.

I also look with increasing impatience for signs that the armed forces of South Vietnam are carrying increasing portions of the defense of their own country. Certainly, this is one avenue of improvement we have every reason to believe the administration is pursuing.

I look with increasing impatience to the day we start bringing our boys home.

Mr. Nixon said at the National Republican Convention that Vietnam "was a war for people, not for territory." I yearn for a day when this will be a conflict strictly between the people of Vietnam and perhaps a coalition government that can settle the conflict there, and pray the administration is keeping this thought in mind during these talks. For the sake of seeing the beginning of the end of America's intervention in this internecine struggle, I am willing to restrain impatience for the immediate present. But I simply offer these figures to my colleagues, to the people, and to the secret negotiators and to the administration. From election day to today, approximately 4,200 Americans have been killed in Vietnam. Wounded for the same period are approximately over 25,000.

Since President Nixon was inaugurated until now, there have been approximately 2,600 Americans killed in action. The figure for the wounded is approximately 15,000 for this same period.

These are sobering statistics indeed.

I recall very well President Nixon in his campaign stated that he has a plan for the ending of the war. I only suggest to the President that in view of the acceleration of these casualty figures I believe it is time to divulge the plan now.

For now I shall say no more, except to hold up these figures prominently to

President Nixon, and remind him that many are remembering the campaign slogan about finding that new solution to Vietnam. They are also willing to wait the short-term outcome of these secret talks—but no longer. The voices of the generals of this country have been heard for far too long. The voice of the citizenry awaits its turn.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the contribution he has made.

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

Mr. RYAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year has now passed since the Vietnam watershed of 1968—the critical moment in American history when the United States admitted that military victory in Vietnam was not attainable at an acceptable cost and opted for negotiation as the only feasible path toward settlement. At the time of President Johnson's speech last March 31, the way seemed open to move seriously toward peace. Bombing of North Vietnam was curtailed. Talks began shortly afterward in Paris. But as spring and summer passed, men continued to die on the battlefield and hope for an end to conflict dimmed. Then, in the fall, bombing of North Vietnam was totally halted and the Paris talks were broadened. New hopes were raised. Now, these, too, have faded.

Since last March, nearly 12,000 Americans have died in battle, along with countless thousands of Vietnamese soldiers and civilians on both sides of the war. Every day during the past month, an average of 50 American soldiers have fallen. It behooves us to ask, Mr. Speaker, what is being accomplished by this continuing carnage. The patience of the American people, limited at best, is wearing dangerously thin. A recent Gallup poll graphically demonstrated American war weariness. Over three-fourths of those who expressed a view as to what the United States should do next in Vietnam felt we should either "go all out," "pull out," or end the war "as soon as possible." Alarming, the largest percentage—nearly one-third of all respondents—favored greatly escalating the war, a course which past experience has shown cannot bring about the victory it is intended to achieve.

Clearly, we cannot tolerate continuation of the appalling waste of human life that characterizes the scene in Vietnam. Nor can we simply continue the stately gavotte that passes for negotiations in Paris. Escalation is a dead end. What, then, should be our choice?

As I have previously stated in this Chamber and elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, we must make up our minds that the ultimate settlement in Vietnam will be political, not military. Once we fully accept this premise, we can more readily accept the scaling-down of American forces, and of military operations generally, which is its immediate corollary. This has always been a struggle without firmly fixed lines, in which the nominal control of a hundred villages more or less will have little if any effect on the final settlement. The monthly returns

from the Hamlet Evaluation Survey, for example, neatly cataloging "our" villages and "their" villages in hopes of showing an encouraging trend, are an exercise in self-delusion. This is an amorphous war, not given to facile quantification. Any of my colleagues who are inclined to take seriously these measures of "progress" would do well to ponder a recent report warning that the entire militia—half the armed force responsive to Saigon—might defect to the enemy if the National Liberation Front appeared likely to enter the government. Under these circumstances, how solid are "our" villages really likely to be?

At some point, whether tomorrow or next year or 5 years hence, American troops will leave Vietnam. The situation they leave behind will presumably be one which has been worked out by the Vietnamese themselves—Saigon, the NLF, and all the other groups who together probably represent a majority of the South Vietnamese people. If lives are to be spared, the process must begin promptly—and the fighting must be reduced or stopped while it is underway.

How can we move in this direction? An encouraging note has been sounded by President Thieu. His invitation to the NLF to meet in private talks suggests an initial recognition by the Saigon government that political settlement is inevitable, and that the NLF must be part of such a settlement. Until now, Saigon has been the greatest barrier to introducing political questions into the negotiating process. It is not surprising that this should be so. While the war continues, the present regime in Saigon has excellent prospects of retaining power. The Thieu-Ky government is probably the best one that the United States could find for the purpose of single-mindedly prosecuting the war. With the American support which results from this convergence of interests, they are relatively immune to internal challenge. Their principal opponents are either on the other side of the war or in their own jails. Any political negotiation must inevitably give those opponents new legitimacy and, eventually, at least a share in the power they now wield alone.

Nevertheless, it is clearly better for the Saigon government to negotiate under an American umbrella than to risk being left totally exposed if American war weariness were to dictate a rapid withdrawal from Vietnam. And it may well be just such fear of a change in the American national mood that prompted this limited first step by President Thieu. The invitation to the NLF will not be followed up by serious negotiations envisaging an eventual sharing of power, however, unless American pressure on Saigon is exerted in this direction. To date, we have all too often encouraged the South Vietnamese to take a hard line, for this has suited the convenience of our military commanders and matched the basic American preference for a "clean" military solution. Now, however, we must ourselves accept the full implications of the watershed decision of 1968 and move wholeheartedly toward

political settlement—and we must not permit Saigon to slow the pace, much less to exercise a veto.

Several immediate steps have been suggested before, Mr. Speaker, but warrant reiteration because they still point us in the necessary direction. First, the President should announce a schedule for initial withdrawals of American troops. Only as the protective umbrella actually begins to shrink will the Saigon government be given a real incentive for serious political negotiation. Withdrawals would thus combine a political benefit with the immediate prospect of reduced American casualties. Second, we should discontinue search-and-destroy operations or at least limit American participation in such operations to those directly concerned with the protection of American installations. Other than the past 4 weeks of the North Vietnamese-Vietcong counteroffensive, the distressingly high American losses in recent months were reportedly due in large part to stepped-up offensive operations by our forces. Since such operations cannot destroy the enemy nor seize and hold territory as a means of strengthening the South Vietnamese negotiating position, no rational purpose is served by permitting them to continue as before.

As a third step, we should propose an immediate cease-fire. This goes beyond the suggested withdrawals and limited offensive operations but like them is fully justified by the essential irrelevance of military actions in determining the future of South Vietnam. Military operations have become almost a reflex action—the opposing armies fight because they are there and because that is what opposing armies are supposed to do. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong seemingly came closer than did we to recognizing the lack of purpose in further fighting when they scaled down their own operations, and withdrew substantial forces beyond the borders, during the fall of 1968. Not surprisingly, they responded last month with a fresh offensive to prove their continuing military vitality when we failed to respond in kind to their tentative move toward disengagement. Since military operations are basically irrelevant, however, we should now take the further step of proposing a cease-fire as the only effective means for halting the death and destruction which now prevail in Vietnam.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Did I correctly understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) to state that last fall the North Vietnamese deescalated their troop involvement in the south and, if so, would the gentleman restate that so I may understand it more clearly? In the restatement, will the gentleman indicate what response and mutual deescalation, if any, took place either on the side of the ARVN forces or the U.S. forces?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is my understanding that the North Vietnamese did with-

draw a substantial number of troops last fall, that there was a slowing down of military activities on their part, and that this was not met by a corresponding deescalation on our side. But, on the contrary, we stepped up our bombing operations. We intensified the level of our activities, as is shown by the casualty figures, and this, by the way, was referred to not long ago in a column written by James Wechsler of the New York Post in which he quoted Averell Harriman to that effect. That quotation has since been confirmed. So I think it is fair to characterize, as I did, the recent North Vietnamese offensive as a counter-offensive.

Mr. BURTON of California. I commend the gentleman for underscoring this very important development which has been all but obscured from the American people, and I for one am most grateful to the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter to the attention of myself and my colleagues.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. On this very important point brought up by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), and commented on by the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), I asked the Library of Congress about the tonnage of bombs that have been dropped in Vietnam since the beginning of the war. They checked with the Pentagon and advised me that more bombs, the highest tonnage of bombs in the entire Vietnam war, was dropped in January 1969. And I might point out as an aside that all of these bombs were dropped on South Vietnam. So the only conclusion that one can arrive at is that there has been a huge escalation insofar as bombing is concerned in South Vietnam since the bombing halt.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

A cease-fire is, of course, peculiarly difficult to apply in a guerrilla war. Certainly, any cease-fire must include, at least in principle, an end to terrorist attacks as well as to larger scale military operations. It is an open question at best whether the other side would agree to such a restriction on their operations. Indeed, it is doubtful that they could afford to accept this kind of restriction, in view of the problems they would face in keeping a guerrilla force together under conditions of inactivity. But there is surely no reason why we should not at least propose a cease-fire. It would demonstrate our interest in stopping the needless killing now taking place, and, if accepted, would also create more favorable conditions for such programs as land reform and institution building which are the real keys to relative influence of the various factions in a final settlement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should add further weight to our insistence that Saigon negotiate the key political ques-

tions both promptly and meaningfully by insisting that the current repressive domestic policies of the South Vietnamese Government be abandoned. Unless the non-Communist opponents of the present regime are free to undertake political activity, the NLF will emerge from any settlement as the best organized political force in the country. Saigon, with its eyes firmly fixed on war, is doing all the wrong things in terms of preparing for peace. And these pragmatic considerations apart, it is certainly inappropriate, to say the least, for the United States to offer so enthusiastic an embrace to an ally which is behaving in so blatantly undemocratic and dictatorial fashion.

In addition, we should make clear to Saigon that talking with the NLF in Paris, while denying it a future political role in Vietnam, is not a realistic posture. For the NLF, with its established infrastructure and long history in South Vietnam, must inevitably play some part in the future of the country. To refuse this, as Saigon persists in doing, is to refuse the route of political settlement—and this is a course we cannot afford to tolerate.

Mr. Speaker, these proposed actions flow naturally from the basic decision taken a year ago to pursue a Vietnam settlement through negotiation rather than through interminable and costly warfare. They are actions which, indeed, should have been taken as an immediate consequence of that basic decision. The delay has already cost this country nearly 12,000 dead. There is no reason, and no excuse, for delaying any further.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this time.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from New York for their remarks.

Let me summarize briefly, Mr. Speaker, the three points which I think are basic to moving the Paris peace negotiations off dead center and bringing about a prompt settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

First. Congress must refuse to appropriate any additional funds for prosecution of the war in order to make it clear to the administration that this war must end.

Second. There must be immediate recognition on the part of the President, and a statement to that effect, that the United States is willing to accept a coalition government in South Vietnam, including participation of the NLF.

Third. The immediate withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops from South Vietnam as evidence that the United States does not intend to maintain a continued military presence and also to encourage the Saigon government to broaden itself in preparation for serious deliberations with the NLF.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for the leadership he has given us this afternoon in this very important discussion.

As the gentleman from New York knows, he and I have been two of the half dozen or so Members of the House who have opposed every single one of the supplemental appropriations reflecting the escalation of the most unhappy war in Vietnam. It was about 4 years ago this coming May, when we had the first supplemental appropriation sought by the then Democratic administration, that a number of us pointed out during the course of that discussion, that the war in Vietnam was essentially an indigenous conflict and that it would not be resolved until such time as the Nation Liberation Front would be involved meaningfully in the discussions. We said then that the Saigon government should be a participant in those discussions with the NLF.

I noted in reading the papers this morning that it has been announced that the Saigon government has finally openly admitted this course of action must be followed. I wonder if there is not some similarity between the response, or the leaking of the response, of the Saigon government late yesterday, immediately prior to the special order, and the releasing of information by the Defense Department just prior to the special order we had with reference to the mutiny trials at the Presidio of San Francisco.

Just 2 or 3 hours prior to the beginning of that discussion and debate the executive branch sought to take some of the sting out of the criticism that was to take place on the floor.

The gentleman from New York would agree, I am sure, that the executive department—and all too many of our colleagues in the Congress—made a very grave mistake when we began bombing the north in 1965 or 1966. It was this escalation of the war, this carrying of the military effort to the north, this widening the scope of the effort, which Americanized the conflict. In my judgment, the conflict has been, and still is, essentially a civil war.

We have sent over tens and tens of thousands of troops. Every time the situation did not reflect any particular improvement, the military experts would tell us, "Just give us a little more arms and a little more in the way of troops and we can bring this situation into focus." Time after time, month after month, year after year these military experts have been in error.

Our Democratic administration in the past, but for the events of March 31 and thereafter last year, all too often heeded the advice of these so-called military experts.

I am sure the gentleman from New York would agree with me that a number of us had hoped that the new administration, viewing the election results of the primaries, particularly of the Democratic primaries throughout the country, evolving around the candidacies of Senator McCARTHY and Senator Kennedy, would have gotten the message. The message becomes even clearer when coupled with the fact that they won the election, due in no small measure to the decision of a considerable number of persons concerned about the American involvement

in Vietnam that they either not support the Democratic candidate or they support a new administration that would hopefully provide us with a fresh look at this matter. A number of us had hoped this administration would, in fact, take a fresh look at this question. Being essentially unfettered, because it was not in power at the time the judgment was made, it might therefore hopefully bring a rational solution to and rational extrication from the American involvement in Southeast Asia.

I, for one, did not hold out much hope in this regard, but some hope I did have. I must confess the decision of this administration on the antiballistic missile system, coupled with the statement of the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, here within the last week, has pretty well disabused me of any optimism that this administration has any magic formula or is going to take any meaningful look at the American position in Southeast Asia.

I think the administration is making a very serious mistake. I think they are going to find that so many problems confronting American society cannot be and will not be resolved in any measure so long as we are involved in an effort costing us directly out of the National Treasury some \$30 billion or \$36 billion or \$40 billion a year.

I fear time is passing, time we had hoped would be used by this new administration to bring this very ugly war to an end.

I fear very profoundly that once again the military experts have won the battle in the policy councils of the Executive. I fear that this new administration, just as our previous Democratic administration, has been hoodwinked by the military experts.

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) noted that last November the North Vietnamese withdrew substantial numbers of their troops from the southern part of the demilitarized zone back across to the north.

This withdrawal was not met by reciprocal deescalation of the military effort either on behalf of the South Vietnamese Army or the American military presence. The American military experts have told us that this withdrawal was not a sign, as many of us viewed it, of the fact that the north was sincerely interested in deescalating the conflict but, rather, the military told us that it was merely because of the enormous pressure of the American military presence on the north that they had to take this action.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, when the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese Army do not engage in the shelling of cities or in massive or meaningful military offensives, our military says this is because we are so strong. I would prefer to think that on a number of these occasions this was an effort being made by the NLF through the Vietcong to invite a reciprocal deescalation on our part.

On the other hand, when these armies of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese engage in major actions like the Tet offensive, then our military experts tell us, "You see, you cannot trust them.

They say they want to deescalate and yet they proceed to escalate."

The long and short of all of this is that the American people want this war to end. The military experts have hoodwinked, in my view, the Executive under the previous administration and I fear are now doing it again. I must state that our American policy, I think, is dead wrong in Vietnam. I hope that none of our colleagues will pay heed to the so-called military experts who were wrong from the inception of this conflict about our ability to suppress this civil war. Who have been wrong throughout the course of the involvement. Who will be just as wrong today if they think there is a possibility that this matter can be resolved in any way but by a meaningful, negotiated settlement with the parties indigenously involved in this very unhappy situation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam and the military approach to foreign policy are being repudiated by thousands of citizens. Today, members of Women Strike for Peace are in Washington to protest the war and to urge the President and Congress to bring it to a prompt end. Mrs. Bella Abzug, chairman, National Political Action Committee, Women Strike for Peace, estimates that some 1,200 women are participating in this outpouring of concern.

Mrs. Abzug said:

We have given this day and made this journey to Washington to remind Congress and the President that the American electorate, especially the women, have rejected this immoral war. We demand that President Nixon move toward a political settlement and announce plans for the withdrawal of America from Vietnam. We will fill the gallery of Congress to demand that Congress use its power over appropriations to bring about peace by diverting the billions from the Vietnam war and the ABM missile race to the critical needs of the black, the poor, the hungry in our cities and throughout the land.

Mr. Speaker, Americans in increasing numbers are marching across the country for peace. It is imperative that the President and Congress respond to this call.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues who participated in this very important discussion this afternoon. Let us hope that our discussion will make clear to President Nixon and his administration that the Nation cannot afford to wait any longer.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the United States enters the fifth year as a combatant in Vietnam, I have come to the conclusion that the Nixon administration must immediately make a choice between continuing the tragic and immoral course of the past or charting out a new policy designed to get the United States out of the Vietnam quagmire. The Vietnam war is now the longest conflict in American history. It has now surpassed both World War II and the Civil War in length of time, and I find it distressing to compare the lofty ideals and goals of these two struggles with the in-noble aims of our Vietnam policy. This is no war to free the slaves and preserve the Union. It is no war to defeat Nazi

and Fascist aggressors and liberate millions of oppressed peoples. Rather, it is a war designed to maintain in power a group of generals in Saigon with questionable motivation, who for years have exploited their own people. If the militarist in Saigon had any popular support at all, the United States would never have had to send troops into South Vietnam in the first place. History will decree that no action ever squandered so many of its human and material resources in so unworthy a cause.

Before the United States became bogged down in the quicksand of the Vietnam conflict, it was interesting to note how administration officials and the Congress could heatedly argue and debate over spending an additional \$1, \$2, or \$3 billion on the needs of America, particularly to help the Nation's poor and underprivileged. Yet, within 2 years after the first American combat troops landed in South Vietnam, the administration was proposing and Congress was appropriating with scarcely a whisper of disagreement some \$20 billion per year for the war. Vietnam war spending today is running close to \$35 billion a year. I am appalled when I think of this money being spent thousands of miles away from home in what is literally a dot on the map to support someone like Nguyen Cao Ky, who once said that Hitler was his idol. If the executive branch and Congress had been as free with the purse string in waging the war on poverty as they have been in waging the immoral war in Vietnam, the year 1970 might have gone down in history as the year in which the bounty of America reached all of its citizens. And, again, it is so senseless to be contemplating a new cycle of military spending in the form of the antiballistic missile. If Congress approves this project, and I hope it turns it down completely, it will once again turn its back on the real needs of the Nation in favor of another scheme of the military-industrial complex designed to perpetuate its dominant position in American life.

It has never been more necessary for an American President to chart a new direction for the United States than it is for President Nixon to do so now. It is all very well to be cool and guarded in press conferences, to issuing warnings only once, to evince concern, to appear in control and build public support. But at some point the administration is going to have to choose, and it appears to me that the time has arrived. The President must first begin by disengaging the United States from Vietnam totally and permanently, leaving the Vietnamese people to settle their own internal affairs. It must be made clear that the United States has no desire to be engaged in an internal conflict of this type. The administration must alone draw a firm line against new, multibillion-dollar military projects such as the ABM. Finally, both the administration and the Congress must show the same zeal in attacking problems of America's needs as they have shown in throwing billions away in places like Vietnam.

America's vast problems can be solved but only if we, as a people, determine a

new path for the United States. At the end of this path should stand the elimination of human suffering at home—and not the decadent and immoral pursuit of power politics abroad. The Nixon administration won the November election by promising a new team and a new approach to the vital issues of the day. The time has come for the administration to deliver on its promise. The American people will settle for nothing less. The future of our country depends on this promise.

The time is at hand for an immediate and permanent cease-fire in Vietnam. Let us stop the killing, the wounding and the physical destruction in Vietnam. This should be our uppermost objective and the highest priority of action for America.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last several years I have registered my misgivings and my personal suggestions on Vietnam policies to high ranking individuals in the administration, including the President, and I have joined in introducing legislation in the Congress which called for greater effort on the part of our Government to place this issue before the United Nations.

I have never issued public statements approving or endorsing the conduct of the war unless I sincerely believed specific action on the part of our Government had been in the interest of the peaceful goal all of us seek.

It is my firm conviction that I have a responsibility to support the people's President in matters of foreign policy. I believe any disagreement should be—as it has been with me—a matter between me and the President and not between me and the press. In matters of foreign policy it cannot be my administration, your administration, or their administration. It is our administration, elected to represent us by a majority of our citizens.

Now we have a new administration. For myself, I pledge complete support to President Nixon in the conduct of foreign affairs. I will inform the President of my views and recommendations with full realization that he is the only man in this Nation with full access to all of the intelligence and other information on the situation in Vietnam and elsewhere. The final decision is his and I will accept it.

In regard to the Vietnamese situation, here are the recommendations which I am making to President Nixon. For the most part, I share the position of Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

We accepted the responsibility of assisting South Vietnam in its effort to defend itself. But we cannot be South Vietnam. We cannot govern South Vietnam. We cannot accept full responsibility for the war. Our commitment must be limited. The outcome of that struggle depends now, as it always has, on the courage, determination, and ability of the people of the South.

There have been many disappointments in our relations with the people and government of South Vietnam. We had hoped that we could help them to

help themselves build a nation and a government that could attract the support of its own people and achieve a political victory over the Vietcong.

Time and again our hopes seemed to be dashed by the apparent incompetence and corruption of our South Vietnam ally—a government, as Senator KENNEDY said, that “has consistently proved incapable or unwilling to meet the needs of its own people, a government that has demanded ever more money, ever more American lives to be poured into the swamp of their failure.”

Our Nation began taking steps some time ago to persuade the South Vietnamese to take eventual complete control of the war. We have helped and we can continue to help, but I believe it is imperative that we establish immediately a timetable for our withdrawal from South Vietnam. Although I continue to believe we have a responsibility to be of assistance, I think our responsibility is equally great to insist that South Vietnam remove itself from reliance upon us.

It would not be right to abandon them. I do not, therefore, call for immediate withdrawal, but for a systematic, orderly reduction in our participation and an increase in South Vietnam's own commitment to itself. We must begin now.

Further, I encourage the President to do anything feasible that might enhance the chances of success in the Paris peace talks including extension of the bombing halt. Of course, every precaution must be taken to protect the lives and safety of American boys whose only protection is provided by the cover of bombing.

Finally, after establishing a systematic timetable for the deescalation of our participation in the war, I believe we must follow it.

To those who ask, “Will this fulfill our commitment?” or “Would this be an honorable way out?” I respond “Yes.”

Never before in history has one nation done for another what we have done for South Vietnam. It seems to me that with our generous contribution of resources—human, monetary, and material—South Vietnam should have triumphed long ago if it had a government with the desire or ability to meet the needs of its people.

I do not think our limited commitment included or implied a commitment to take brinksmanship risks which could lead to a confrontation between the world's great powers in a third world war. Our commitment is to maintain peace, to withstand aggression, and to assist in preventing a lighted fuse for reaching the powder keg.

The new administration, I am sure, is taking a fresh look at our involvement and our commitment in Vietnam. It must review what has been done and, using the facts available to it, decide a future course. It cannot and will not be guided completely by past decisions, good or bad.

I have summarized for you the direction I hope our Nation will take in Vietnam. I submitted these proposals to President Johnson, and I will submit them to President Nixon. The President will have my support because he is the people's President and I have confidence

in his ability to steer this Nation toward lasting peace.

Let us begin now to end this conflict with action rather than words.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to elaborate in detail on the statements made today concerning Vietnam. Enough has been said on this floor—indeed, enough has been said in recent years—to impress upon us all the necessity for ending this tragic war.

Today, I want to associate myself with the desire for peace of the American people and the demand for peace being made here on this floor.

The events of the past few days once again give us hope that concrete steps toward a settlement will be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

President Thieu's stated willingness to meet privately with the national liberation front is encouraging.

Even more interesting is President Nixon's comment to the National Association of Broadcasters yesterday that "a few months from now, I think you will look back and say what we did was right."

I deeply hope that the President will be right and that is why I want to express my own support of the efforts being made by the administration to negotiate a settlement.

The experience of the past has taught us that peace in Vietnam is an elusive goal.

Diplomacy—whether public or private—is a difficult art, but I hope that the administration will employ every diplomatic means at its disposal to bring about a cease fire and a negotiated settlement.

At the same time, I think it is our responsibility here in Congress to remind the President and his advisors that business as usual will not bring the desired results. The policy of alternating military pressure with diplomatic initiatives has been the story of the past but it has, unfortunately, been a story without an ending.

It will not do to stop the bombing of the North while, at the same time, the volume of bombs dropped in South Vietnam and Laos is greater than it was when the North was being bombed.

It is somewhat inconsistent of the Saigon Government to express a willingness to negotiate privately while they have increased their demands for more American military support.

We cannot accept a policy which one day tells us that the troops will be coming home, only to say the next day that such a proposal is unrealistic.

We cannot pretend today that the South Vietnamese Army can take a fuller share of the military burden only to have our experts come up to Capitol Hill and deny that possibility.

We cannot seek peace in Paris and, at the same time, seek a wider war in Cambodia.

These are the type of inconsistencies which have marked the policies and pitfalls of the past.

But we are not here to regret the past. We are here to express a sense of urgency, to make responsible suggestions and to express our support of the administration's diplomatic efforts.

I hope that the President can end this war—speedily and honorably—so that we can get on with the urgent domestic priorities and responsibilities facing us as a nation.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has been with us so long it is difficult to remember when there was peace. It began hard on the heels of another war in Asia. And that war in Korea broke the short peace on the timeclock of history which followed the Second World War.

Through this whole period there has been the silent, chilling war of nerves, the war that we kept cold because the alternative was too terrible to consider. Perhaps we have forgotten the ways of peace. Perhaps war has been so much with us in the nearly 30 years since Pearl Harbor that we would be uncomfortable were we forced to live in peace.

But finally we must ask if this price we pay for the familiar, the comfortable, is too high. Indeed, if we cannot adjust to peace, if a world truly at peace would make us feel ill at ease, then we are living on borrowed time.

This seems to me, finally, to be the case in Vietnam. We are there on borrowed time, and we have borrowed time too long from the important task of facing up, finally and ultimately, to the question of war or peace.

The deception is easy. It, of course, is not ever really considered a matter of war and peace, but a practical, hard-headed matter of national self-interest, loyalty to friends, defense of the North American Continent. These are easy issues to deal with. They lend themselves to hardheaded practical answers, which we are good at. We approach Vietnam on that basis all the time now because we know, given this approach, the issue of war and peace need never really be faced.

But great men, and I number Lyndon Johnson among them, have chosen this approach only to learn too quickly that this really does not work. We must finally face up to the war, its horrible reality, its corruption of American life, its divisive nature in the land itself, the dead and the bleeding, the young widows and the mothers old before their time.

This was indeed the mandate that was given to Richard M. Nixon. He promised—or was it only a dark hint—a new approach to the war and to the peace that must follow.

Must we disabuse ourselves of that conceit?

There was a feeling on the land that with the Paris talks there would be peace. Oh, maybe not tomorrow, not next month, but certainly next year or was it the year after.

This has been the tone for months and the American people, despite the bitterness, the mourning, the new graves, waited patiently with trust, and more importantly, with hope.

I say to President Nixon that we are a patient people and we will wait—but how long must we wait? I ask are we going to kill more so that fewer will die? That is the algebra of field commanders, of generals who escalate.

We have been asked to defend the house of a friend. Whether he was a true friend or not is a question we no longer

ask. All we know is that he asked for help and we gave him help. But what is to be done now? We have neglected our own house, while shoring up his. We have given of our blood and strength while defending his house against marauders. We have been so zealous in our defense of his home, we have come to know it as our home too and we seem more zealous in its defense than he does. We have been gone for years to Troy and now long for home, where trouble and unrest threaten.

I caution President Nixon. He will not be a leader with a fresh opportunity for long. I do not say abandon Paris. Stay in Paris. Make them sit with us for long hours around the table. Paris may help. Take chances in Paris rather than risking lives in the Iron Triangle. I encourage President Nixon to explore private talks and unexplored avenues in Southeast Asia or anywhere else. I do caution him against old errors, old solutions which solved nothing.

This is not a bipartisan issue. The 33,000 dead do not array themselves on an aisle. They were Americans. The war must end. There is other work to be done and we must be around to do it. And the time is short.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago next Monday an incumbent American President renounced renomination because the war in Vietnam had shattered his role as party and national leader.

Today we watch his successor closely, seeking assurance that the lessons of Vietnam animate President Nixon's search for peace.

Those lessons are—

An exhausting, cruel, and tragic war was fought for the empty delusion that American arms could impose conformity to our political ideas. We should expect other strange ideas in other strange countries. What shall we do?

Our military leaders, who promised a military victory time after time, have led us instead to a political catastrophe. We should weigh their advice more carefully in the future.

We have paid over 30,000 American lives and \$150 billion in this vain war effort. Comparable sacrifices for genuine domestic needs elude us.

We have been told that we should give the new administration 100 days in office before criticizing its conduct. I would wait forever to criticize our present policy in Vietnam if I thought such forbearance would end the war one day sooner. But the new administration gropes, with little apparent difference from its predecessor, toward an illusory military victory.

Peace will not come at the Paris conference table any more than it will come in the jungle fighting in Vietnam. Peace will come when we Americans begin to withdraw our forces—which are the only foreign troops in Vietnam—let Vietnamese political processes achieve the equilibrium which arms could not impose.

OUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIETNAM WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to thank the gentleman from California for providing me this opportunity to speak on the issue of our involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, I directed an inquiry to the President of the United States as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The war in Vietnam has divided and troubled the American people as has no other war of the 20th Century. Many of our people regard the war as necessary and just, but many others are doubtful and troubled. Some are unconvinced that the Saigon Government is worth saving; some fear that the United States has inadvertently taken over the role of the old European colonial powers; some simply cannot understand what vital interests are served by sending American soldiers to fight and die in a civil war almost 10,000 miles away from their own country.

During the first three weeks of the current North Vietnamese and Viet Cong offensive, 1,140 American soldiers were killed, or just 219 fewer than died in the first three weeks of the devastating 1968 TET offensive.

Present realities require a revision of priorities in American policy. It is true that we cannot undo the past, but the assessment of past errors is absolutely indispensable to efforts to correct them and to avoiding their repetition.

Mistakes are not liquidated without a price being paid. No responsible critic of the war advocates a disorderly withdrawal of American forces and the abandonment of South Vietnam to the Viet Cong, but many point to the need for a peace short of absolute victory—on either side, for a peace involving some mutual concessions. A concession, however, is not a humiliation and may indeed be turned to one's own advantage, as General De Gaulle demonstrated by giving independence to Algeria and as Khrushchev demonstrated by proclaiming himself a peacemaker while yielding to the American ultimatum in the Cuban Missile Crisis.

It seems to me that the concessions we must make are necessary as an act of common sense; they are also honorable in a tragic situation.

I believe, therefore, that the key to peace is mutual disengagement through political arrangement for the neutralization of Southeast Asia.

It is my belief that the United States should pledge the eventual removal of American military forces from Vietnam in an all out effort to achieve meaningful results from the current negotiations.

The date and conditions for the removal of American military forces from Vietnam could be set forth in an international agreement defining the status of a neutralized South Vietnam and establishing certain international guarantees.

A forthright pledge to remove American forces is of great importance for the persuasiveness of peace initiatives because of the well-known Chinese and North Vietnamese fear that, despite assurances to the contrary, the United States wishes to maintain permanent military bases in South Vietnam.

If tangible evidence of progress is not derived from current peace talks within a reasonable time—perhaps a period of 60 days—it is suggested that, in addition to the current participants, the following countries should be represented in peace negotiations: The Soviet Union, China, France, Great Britain, Japan, India and Pakistan, and the

countries of the Southeast Asian mainland: Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma and Malaysia. The larger nations—that is, the United States, China, Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, Japan, India and Pakistan could be expected to act as guarantors of a final settlement.

These are alternatives that I have considered most carefully; alternatives that I believe could stimulate meaningful negotiations and result in an honorable peace. If, on the other hand, there are other alternatives under advisement which can also offer the prospect of an honorable peace in Vietnam in the foreseeable future, I, as a Member of Congress, would appreciate the knowledge of their status and whatever other particulars could be afforded me.

Respectfully yours,

MARIO BIAGGI,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California and my colleague from New York for providing this forum for the Members of Congress to discuss this most prominent issue in the world today, as it relates to all of us.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we are engaged in a long-overdue discussion of the single most important issue facing our Nation—the continuing war in Vietnam. This war has dragged on for so long that it threatens to become a permanent part of our existence, or nonexistence, as the case may be. This war continues to be an excessive moral, physical, and monetary drain on the resources and lives of all Americans.

A satisfactory conclusion to the war must be found, and it must be found promptly. There are too many demands here at home for the men and money we are pouring into Vietnam. Instead of perpetuating a stalemated war, the United States must take the necessary steps to secure the negotiated settlement that will finally end the carnage in Vietnam and bring about lasting peace.

Those of us in Congress who have in the past criticized American policy vis-à-vis the war in Vietnam find it ironic that our recommendations of 2, 3, and even 4 years ago are finally bearing fruit today. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam did bring a beginning toward peace negotiations and did not jeopardize the safety of our servicemen. Yesterday President Thieu publicly acknowledged a basic fact of life: the South Vietnamese Government and National Liberation Front will have to enter into private bilateral talks to ultimately bring an end to the war.

President's Thieu's announcement is, of course, most welcome. I applaud his frankness and hope this will expedite the negotiations. An appropriate response by the National Liberation Front would pave the way for a cease-fire and ultimately for a final peace agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I could well go on at length about the military and political problems of the situation in Vietnam. But this is ground we have traveled across time and again and my colleagues

are admirably discussing these issues today.

I should, therefore, like to direct my attention to an ancillary problem that will, in the final analysis, be as crucial to the future of South Vietnam as the fighting and the Paris negotiations.

I have reference, Mr. Speaker, to the failure of the South Vietnamese Government to establish the proper base for a free and democratic society and the directly related problem of continuing corruption and graft throughout South Vietnam. As long as these problems remain unresolved it will be impossible for South Vietnam to establish a viable social, political, and economic order. And without that foundation for a strong government no amount of military successes or diplomatic coups will provide South Vietnam with the basis for a viable government.

The most glaring and inexplicable example of how the basic principles of democracy are not being adhered to is the case of Truong Dinh Dzu, once a leading candidate for the Presidency of South Vietnam, and now a civilian prisoner of the military, sentenced to 5 years at hard labor in a closed, secretive military trial that completely ignored his fundamental rights.

Mr. Dzu, it is alleged, made treasonous statements against the South Vietnamese Government. When I was in Vietnam last December I visited with Mr. Dzu's family and returned to the United States, not with any knowledge of his guilt or innocence, but with the definite knowledge that Mr. Dzu was denied the most fundamental rights of a free society. It is imperative that he be granted a new, fair trial and I believe the United States should make clear to South Vietnam our unhappiness with the Dzu case.

It is most ironic that, according to news reports, the statements for which Mr. Dzu has been incarcerated directly parallel President Thieu's recent comments on the desirability of direct, private talks between the Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

As long as Mr. Dzu remains a political prisoner without fulfillment of a just demand for a fair trial there is serious reason to question whether South Vietnam will ever adhere to a democratic order. But, as a case in point, Mr. Dzu's imprisonment raises a more tragic and telling question: What, Mr. Speaker, have 30,000 American men died for? It must never be said that we have fought a war and given 30,000 American lives to substitute one "ism" for another.

And an equally important situation exists in Vietnam in the matter of uncontrolled, unpoliced graft and corruption. This problem moves vertically and horizontally through South Vietnam including private citizens, military personnel, and Government officials. And not only are the South Vietnamese guilty of laxity on this matter; the allied nations, including the United States, are also seriously implicated.

Recently the State Department notified me that on the basis of information I provided to the Department after my most recent visit to Vietnam that a major crackdown will be conducted against

American civilians who engage in the insidious practice of currency manipulation. This problem, like the general problem of the commodity black market, involves American, South Vietnamese, and allied civilian and military personnel.

The South Vietnamese must act and not delay any longer in implementing a greatly needed crackdown against war profiteering and corruption.

Not only are there substantial black markets in currency and goods, there is also the perpetual problem of diversion of commodities and military supplies shipped to Vietnam by the United States.

This war profiteering in its many ramifications aggravates a prior problem of graft and corruption in all levels of the South Vietnamese Government from the small village through the provinces to Saigon.

The values that obtain today in Vietnam are simply not conducive to the establishment of a lasting, free and independent nation. This is the unhappy prospect after 30,000 American lives have been lost and more than \$100 billion spent.

It is especially necessary, therefore, that the United States and our allies take the following steps without further delay: Decrease the level of military activity, escalate the intensity of negotiations, and dramatically overhaul the entire approach to civic action, pacification, and civil order in Vietnam.

To do anything less would guarantee the continuation of a war that is as costly, in lives and dollars, as it is unproductive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I call today upon the South Vietnamese Government to announce publicly at the Paris talks its willingness to include all South Vietnamese in free elections as part of any solution to the Vietnam war.

This does not mean imposing a government on South Vietnam, but it does mean the full exercise of the democratic process.

Anything less than full participation of all political factions would not be democratic. The goals of self-determination and democracy that we are committed to in Vietnam require that all the South Vietnamese participate in the electoral process regardless of political beliefs.

I am confident that free elections would affirm the South Vietnamese desire for a true democracy and reject Communist control of the country.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman's suggestions are indeed excellent and I certainly want to commend them to the attention of the Members of the House.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that March 1969 has brought forth a new upsurge of concern over the war in Vietnam; for this month marks the start of the 5th year in which the United States has participated in the role of a direct combatant. The Vietnam conflict is now the second longest war in American history, ranking behind only

our Revolutionary War in length of time. And the end is still not in sight.

Therefore, the new concern expressed over Vietnam comes at a most appropriate moment. Americans are weary of battle reports and mounting casualty rates. Many feel that our undue concentration on Vietnam has caused the United States to neglect its interests in other parts of the world, thus inviting new troubles in the 1970's. Americans have also concluded to a greater and greater extent that the United States has squandered too many of its material and human resources into this conflict and that it could have better employed them to solve our multitude of domestic problems. There is a growing belief that the returns on our nearly \$30 billion per year investment in Vietnam have been meager indeed, especially when one considers the vast possibilities for utilizing these funds in the United States to alleviate such social ills as poverty and the decay of the cities.

I share many of these misgivings. It has become more and more apparent to me that the United States cannot achieve its other objectives at home and around the world by continuing its present course in South Vietnam.

In Paris, we face the unhappy prospect that the negotiations will drag on for many months while the casualty rates rise. Since the bombing halt last November no significant progress has been made. I believe that the road to getting the Paris negotiations on the move lies in the United States taking a firm position with respect to our role in Vietnam.

Previously many of my colleagues discussed what that stand should be, and certainly I do not intend to disagree with them. However, I believe personally that the most significant and meaningful stand that the United States could take with respect to the negotiations is to reaffirm the principles as outlined in the 1954 Geneva accords. I think it is important to note that the violations of these accords is what led to resumption of the fighting in that war torn area.

Basically the principles of the 1954 Geneva accords which America should support are: an immediate cease-fire, and mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam, the establishment of international machinery under the United Nations and/or neutral nations agreeable to both North and South Vietnam to supervise the troop withdrawals and supervise national elections to resolve the political question and unify Vietnam.

The United States must then firmly and unequivocally state in public its intentions to abide by the results of any such election. The United States and the American people should not find this key to a political settlement in Vietnam overly troublesome, since we have already affirmed the principle of one man, one vote. I think that while we advocate this position we must realistically, in the absence of any progress, work toward disengagement on another level, and that is building up the ability of the South Vietnam Armed Forces to take over the combat burden from the U.S. troops.

To this end the Nixon administration must give the highest priority to improving the effectiveness of South Vietnamese fighting forces and develop a specific plan to phase-out all of the U.S. combat troops in South Vietnam. Regardless of what one may think of the Vietnam war, we have commitments in Southeast Asia. The task of the 1970's will be to preserve the freedom of Southeast Asia while avoiding another quagmire like that of Vietnam. To that extent I think it would be helpful if we, in anticipation of the conclusion of this war, would provide for a program of economic development to that area, coupled with an opening of recognition of mainland China with a view toward the resumption of diplomatic relations with them.

The voice of the American people has been heard long and loud in dissent to the war in Vietnam, and I think that what they are saying is that we in America must be the example not merely of peace, because we will not fight, but peace because peace is the healing and elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a nation being so right that it need not convince others by force that it is right. We are basically saying we do not wish our Government to abandon its interests in promoting freedom throughout the world, but we would rather do it at the negotiating table than on the battlefield.

Mr. BROWN of California. I wish to thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and my colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN) and the other gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for providing this opportunity for many of us in the House to express our views with respect to the war in Vietnam.

Our efforts in the past, I think, had some marked results in changing attitudes in the country and starting to reverse the policies of the previous administration. I am hopeful that the new administration will be responsive.

There is no question about it, it is time to end the war in Vietnam. Measured from the first combat death, this is the longest war in our history. It will soon be the fourth bloodiest. It is already the second costliest. If we add to the \$100 billion, the cost of a divided nation, of an alienated generation, of a nation diverted from critical domestic needs, of a country torn by self-doubt, this is surely the most devastating war for our national spirit in our whole history.

To what end? Whether we make the compromises necessary to terminate the war now, or 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, the settlement is unlikely to be any better. In the meantime, the costs and dislocations of the war will escalate in every aspect.

What is the new administration's response to the demands from all over the country that our policies be changed? What is the secret plan that the President promised, but withheld for fear of jeopardizing foreign relations, before his term began? Perhaps it will unfold at secret talks in Paris. I hope so.

But today we have only the evidence of deeds. That evidence consists of continued increase in search and destroy missions, continued increase of deadly fire on the towns and villages of South Vietnam, the apparent total capitulation of the Secretary of Defense to the machinations of the military-industrial complex, and utter silence in the face of dictatorial tactics by the South Vietnamese Government in censoring the press and jailing its opposition for merely talking of peace.

All this suggests that the "new" policy is simply more of the same.

I think we are strong enough and honest enough to recognize when we have made mistakes. I think, however hard the decision may be, a commitment at least for once to try genuine deescalation and genuine political negotiation based on the realities in South Vietnam is long overdue. It is certainly better than continued reliance on military solutions that prove so elusive and take the lives of hundreds of Americans every week.

We have just received the very discouraging disclosure that the American military command has asked President Nixon to approve plans to attack military bases in Cambodia—a request which is apparently receiving serious consideration at the White House.

This is further evidence that we are embarked on the same tragic merry-go-round which has characterized our involvement in Vietnam for the past 5 years, which prolonged and widened the war there; which disrupted our own economy, divided our Nation, alienated our youth, and diverted us from critical domestic needs: a policy of military action and response which can only lead to further escalation of the war and its terrible tolls.

It would seem each time political developments offer an opportunity to achieve a breakthrough toward peace, military counterpressure makes such a breakthrough impossible. So we find American deaths in Vietnam approaching the figure for the Korean conflict; the President denying any prospect of a reduction of U.S. forces in Vietnam; and the Secretary of Defense calling on Congress to provide more money to feed the fires of this war.

Can we, as Members of this Congress, simply sit by and silently accept the message that there is no prospect of withdrawing our troops; that there is no political initiative to be made to achieve peace; and that all of the discredited objectives of our past policies in Vietnam must remain intact today?

Are we really to pretend that nothing happened last year? That there was no election? That there was no mandate for change? That there is no new administration, no demand that this new administration deliver our Nation from the war that has so devastated the American spirit?

It is to the President's credit that he did not respond to recent Vietcong actions by renewing the attack on North Vietnam. But maintaining the status quo, if that is what we are doing in South Vietnam, is not sufficient. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam proved necessary to at least get the combatants

to the bargaining table, but an intensification of ground action, and especially a broadening of the war to Cambodia, may well preclude any further progress.

Why is it that we must accompany every gesture for peace with a contradictory military spasm that implies a wider war?

Yes, we stopped the bombing, and we went to Paris, but at the same time we vastly increased our offensive actions in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese made a gesture toward peace by withdrawing a sizable number of their troops, and instead of responding with a reduction of our own forces to achieve a mutual deescalation, which is the path many of our own experts in the Defense Department say is the way this war might be ended, we did just the reverse.

A change in Presidential personality and style is no substitute for a change in policy. The unrest and divisiveness in our Nation will not simply disappear because administration statements have been toned down and dissenters are no longer called "nervous Nellies."

It is time the new administration made clear its objectives in Vietnam. If those objectives are the same as those of the previous administration—an unachievable military victory and a total political defeat of the National Liberation Front, despite the realities of the NLF's influence in South Vietnam—Congress and the American people must know it.

If the President's objectives are more realistic, the entire world should know it, for such a policy change could create a climate in which meaningful concessions from the other side would be made.

If the war is to end during this administration, the President is going to have to arouse the American people from the long dream of our omnipotence and all-righteousness in Vietnam. He will have to admit the mistakes of the policies of the past and articulate sound, new policies for the future.

We have a responsibility to the American people to make the President see the urgent need for new directions and new initiatives in Vietnam, for a realistic strategy to end this tragic \$100 billion war.

Perhaps progress will be made in secret talks hinted at in Paris. We all profoundly hope so. But it certainly will not be achieved without basic changes in our policies and objectives which the American public must be made to understand if they are going to accept them.

Let us resolve that our discussion here today is just a start. The time is now.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join the gentleman from California this afternoon in his comments about Vietnam.

I should like to say at the outset, I am in my 11th year of service in the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), in my estimation, is without a

peer in his fearless, unremitting pursuit of world peace and particularly the question of peace in Southeast Asia. This is another reason why I am proud this afternoon to associate my remarks with his.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can say about the Vietnam war which has not been said before and said with much eloquence and deep conviction. For, after all, the war is not a new one. Vietnamese have been fighting and dying for almost 30 years, and we have been burying our own dead since 1961. Despite the bloodshed and the destruction in Vietnam, and despite the real price we are paying here in America by the rending of our own social fabric, there is still scant assurance that the end is in sight. The new administration's opportunity for bold action is waning, and with it, our hopes for a deescalation of the violence, and at least a reduction, if not an end, to the killing.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to fight a war we cannot win—not for lack of valor on the part of our servicemen, certainly not for lack of funds provided by this Congress, but for lack of political courage. It is the easy way out to continue to see military victory around the corner, or to be more in vogue, at the end of the tunnel; it is the easy way out to accuse the other side of actions we ourselves blithely engage in and conveniently overlook; it is the easy way out to stake our national prestige on the outcome of an internal conflict in a distant land, and to insinuate that critics of the war lack faith in America.

Mr. Speaker, we are once again on the escalation merry-go-round. It is now common knowledge that the bombing halt over North Vietnam has been offset by increased bombing elsewhere, inferentially in the south, and ominously in Laos. The announced reductions in battalion-size U.S.-initiated actions in recent months has been more than offset by increased small unit actions by our forces. But these hard facts are too conveniently ignored by our own Government. The latest Tet offensive attacks by the enemy have been described by Ambassador Lodge as not being a response to any recent Allied initiatives. They were instead, Ambassador Lodge insisted, the "long-heralded winter-spring campaign of 1969." But how can we be certain of this assumption beyond a reasonable doubt? A sharp increase in the frequency of American-initiated contacts since last November 1 has been clearly documented by our own military command. Such a knowledgeable figure as Governor Harriman is reported to have described the current enemy attacks as essentially a response to American actions, rather than a deliberate move to affect the peace talks. Not only is there doubt as to who is responding to whom, but we have not been told the exact nature of the understanding with North Vietnam which preceded our bombing halt.

Mr. Speaker, the new administration must decide whether it has sufficient courage to take over the conduct of the war from our professional military men, who, while admitting they do not like

the war, claim it is the only war they have—and indeed they seem to be making the most of it. When will we admit that our actions, since the bombing halt began, have not been particularly reassuring to the North Vietnamese that we desire peace? Have we been able to show by our deeds that we indeed are seeking a political settlement of the war, rather than a military victory?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our Government to be honest with itself, and to realize that there is a special kind of price to be paid for peace in Vietnam. It is not the price we would usually be called upon to pay in blood and treasure, but a price to be paid in false pride. Our Nation's greatness will in no better way be demonstrated, and our national interest will be no better served than by admitting to ourselves that we have made a mistake. Once we have done this, it should not be beyond our ingenuity to devise a means of extricating ourselves from what has become an untenable position. Instead of creating consternation among our allies, as has been forecast by those who would continue the war, this course of action should reassure our friends that we have not become the prisoners of our own rhetoric and self-righteousness, and that we will seek nonviolent solutions to world problems while continuing to adhere to our own basic principles.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's real strength lies in its dedication to the value of human life and the dignity of man. These noble aspirations are ill served by our current role in Vietnam. The problem is enormous—but it will not be solved by applying the tried and proven wrong policies of the past. A start must be made somewhere, and we are certainly in a better position to be magnanimous than the other side. At worst, we may be rebuffed, but we must be certain this time, beyond any doubt, that our deeds match our words. We owe this effort to ourselves, the world, our 33,000 dead, and to the young, here and in Vietnam, who will inherit the future we are preparing for them. Hopefully, they will be able to live in a less violent world.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks and welcome his contribution to this discussion.

I should like to point out that although this discussion has appeared to be rather one-sided this afternoon, coming entirely from the Democratic side of the aisle, there was in yesterday's RECORD a contribution by two of our distinguished Republican colleagues which I think is worthy of note. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) used the opportunity to discuss at length their own antipathy to the course of the war in Vietnam and to express their hope that we might be on the verge of a change in the policy which this country has been following. It should also be noted, I think, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) inserted in the RECORD yesterday the names and addresses of all of the 33,000-plus casualties that we have experienced to date in the war in Vietnam. I think

this was a worthy service in itself, because it points out to all of us in the most forceful possible way the impact that this war is having in terms of the deaths of some of America's finest young men.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my hope that this debate will not be construed as partisan in its nature or as an effort necessarily to attack the present President because he is of the opposite party. I think it is well known that many of us who are participating in this debate were just as strong in our opposition to these policies when they were the product of a Democratic administration, and I think we will continue to be equally strong in our efforts under a Republican administration.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), for his leadership not only today but through the entire course and period that the war has been going on.

I would like to make a note for the benefit of those who have just joined us that Congressman KOCH, of New York, informed me that there had been some temporary difficulty for some of those wanting to hear this debate. We brought this matter to the attention of our distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and discussed the matter with Speaker MCCORMACK, who indicated that he had been unaware that people were having to wait any undue length of time to hear the debate and he urged and ordered the Sergeant at Arms to open up the doors.

I might state preliminary when this special order was first set that we had no idea how many hundreds or thousands of people might want to come in from all over the country to hear it. As a consequence, there was some understanding that there would be an effort made to limit each group to 50 and require each group of 50 after listening to the debate for a while to move out so that others might hear it. It was not anticipated at that time, as we have experienced for the last half hour at least, that there would be some empty spaces in the balcony. And, for that reason, the Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts; and the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), when this was brought to their attention made sure that the Sergeant at Arms made these seats available.

I would like to note also, if I may, as my distinguished colleague from California is well aware, that earlier our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York, WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, held the floor for approximately 1 hour.

We have been debating or discussing this matter for something on the order of an hour and 50 minutes or 2 hours. Also, there are a good number of our colleagues who have already expressed their opposition to the war and there are still a few of our colleagues who will seek

recognition for the purpose of discussing this situation. Therefore, for that reason I yield back the time which the gentleman from California has so generously yielded to me.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) for his explanation of the situation and I appreciate indeed the contribution which he also made to the debate a little bit earlier.

I was trying to make it clear that while the proceedings this afternoon are not exactly in the nature of a debate and there is not an adversary present, that, nevertheless, the kind of views that are being expressed here are representative of a larger and larger number of Members of Congress who serve in the House of Representatives from both the Republican and Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that none of us wish to be in the position of attempting to pressure a new President at an early stage as he takes office and attempts to grapple with these extremely difficult problems. All of us are willing to be fair and be generous in terms of allowing an opportunity for policies to be developed. But I think at the same time all of us want to make it clear—and it is my opinion that the American people want to have it made clear—that we do not wish to see the continuation of certain policies, continuation of the same kind of military escalation, the same kind of intervention, resulting from certain foreign policies which have brought this country to the position in which it finds itself today.

I wish to make it clear that for my part—and I think this is true of most of my colleagues—this attitude does not stem from a lack of concern for America's security or for America's defense. All too frequently we find some who say that those of us who are critical of the Vietnam war are not concerned about American security and American defense. But, in fact, just the opposite is true. We are the most deeply concerned about America's security and America's defense.

We feel that if history demonstrates anything above all else, it is that a policy of unrestricted military intervention—or a semi-imperialist desire to have our presence felt around the world, that we should be able to exercise our control in every dispute or every difficulty that may arise in any part of the world—does more to undermine America's security than any other possible action that this country could take.

I think all of us who have studied intently the present policies and the present situation in Vietnam believe that at the root of this involvement lies a concern with the desire to continually expand America's power, to continually serve as safeguardian of the world.

I believe, and I think most of my colleagues agree with me, that no country in the world, no great imperialistic power in Rome, in Greece, in Britain, or in France, has ever been able to make this kind of policy stick. Hence, one essential aspect of ending the war in Vietnam is to look closely at the kind of

policies which have resulted in that involvement.

There have been a number of excellent articles written on this overall subject recently, and I would like to commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The distinguished former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Shoup, for example, in the current issue of *Atlantic Monthly*, has an excellent article on the way in which our militaristic policies—the very existence of the largest military force in the world—has led us into situations such as Vietnam from which we cannot extricate ourselves. I place the article in the *RECORD* at this point:

THE NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM
(By Gen. David M. Shoup)

(NOTE.—Its roots are in the experience of World War II. The burgeoning military establishment and associated industries fuel it. Anti-Communism provides the climate which nurtures it. "It" is a "new American militarism." General Shoup, a hero of the Battle of Tarawa in 1943, who rose to become Commandant of the United States Marine Corps for four years until his retirement in December, 1963, doesn't like it. He has written this essay in collaboration with another retired Marine officer, Colonel James A. Donovan.)

America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation. Our massive and swift invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, concurrent with the rapid buildup of U.S. military power in Vietnam, constituted an impressive demonstration of America's readiness to execute military contingency plans and to seek military solutions to problems of political disorder and potential Communist threats in the areas of our interest.

This "military task force" type of diplomacy is in the tradition of our more primitive, pre-World War II "gunboat diplomacy," in which we landed small forces of Marines to protect American lives and property from the perils of native bandits and revolutionaries. In those days the U.S. Navy and its Marine landing forces were our chief means, short of war, for showing the flag, exercising American power, and protecting U.S. interests abroad. The Navy, enjoying the freedom of the seas, was a visible and effective representative of the nation's sovereign power. The Marines could be employed ashore "on such other duties as the President might direct" without congressional approval or a declaration of war. The U.S. Army was not then used so freely because it was rarely ready for expeditionary service without some degree of mobilization, and its use overseas normally required a declaration of emergency or war. Now, however, we have numerous contingency plans involving large joint Air Force-Army-Navy-Marine task forces to defend U.S. interests and to safeguard our allies wherever and whenever we suspect Communist aggression. We maintain more than 1,517,000 Americans in uniform overseas in 119 countries. We have 8 treaties to help defend 48 nations if they ask us to—or if we choose to intervene in their affairs. We have an immense and expensive military establishment, fueled by a gigantic defense industry, and millions of proud, patriotic, and frequently bellicose and militaristic citizens. How did this militarist culture evolve? How did this militarism steer us into the tragic military and political morass of Vietnam?

Prior to World War II, American attitudes were typically isolationist, pacifist, and generally antimilitary. The regular peacetime military establishment enjoyed small prestige and limited influence upon national affairs. The public knew little about the armed forces, and only a few thousand men

were attracted to military service and careers. In 1940 there were but 428,000 officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy. The scale of the war, and the world's power relationships which resulted, created the American military giant. Today the active armed forces contain over 3.4 million men and women, with an additional 1.6 million ready reserves and National Guardsmen.

America's vastly expanded world role after World War II hinged upon military power. The voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent. During the postwar period, distinguished military leaders from the war years filled many top positions in government. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Taylor, Ridgway, LeMay, and others were not only popular heroes but respected opinion-makers. It was a time of international readjustment; military minds offered the benefits of firm views and problem-solving experience to the management of the nation's affairs. Military procedures—including the general staff system, briefings, estimates of the situation, and the organizational and operational techniques of the highly schooled, confident military professionals—spread throughout American culture.

World War II had been a long war. Millions of young American men had matured, been educated, and gained rank and stature during their years in uniform. In spite of themselves, many returned to civilian life as indoctrinated, combat-experienced military professionals. They were veterans, and for better or worse would never be the same again. America will never be the same either. We are now a nation of veterans. To the 14.9 million veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees, and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968 the total living veterans of U.S. military service numbered over 23 million, or about 20 percent of the adult population.

Today most middle-aged men, most business, government, civic, and professional leaders, have served some time in uniform. Whether they liked it or not, their military training and experience have affected them, for the creeds and attitudes of the armed forces are powerful medicine, and can become habit-forming. The military codes include all the virtues and beliefs used to motivate men of high principle: patriotism, duty and service to country, honor among fellowmen, courage in the face of danger, loyalty to organization and leaders, self-sacrifice for comrades, leadership, discipline, and physical fitness. For many veterans the military's efforts to train and indoctrinate them may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had—especially so for the young and less educated.

In addition, each of the armed forces has its own special doctrinal beliefs and well-catalogued customs, traditions, rituals, and folklore upon which it strives to build a fiercely loyal military character and esprit de corps. All ranks are taught that their unit and their branch of the military service are the most elite, important, efficient, or effective in the military establishment. By believing in the superiority and importance of their own service they also provide themselves a degree of personal status, pride, and self-confidence.

As they get older, many veterans seem to romanticize and exaggerate their own military experience and loyalties. The policies, attitudes, and positions of the powerful veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AM-VETS, totaling over 4 million men, frequently reflect this pugnacious and chauvinistic tendency. Their memberships generally favor military solutions to world problems in the

pattern of their own earlier experience, and often assert that their military service and sacrifice should be repeated by the younger generations.

Closely related to the attitudes and influence of America's millions of veterans is the vast and powerful complex of the defense industries, which have been described in detail many times in the eight years since General Eisenhower first warned of the military-industrial power complex in his farewell address as President. The relationship between the defense industry and the military establishment is closer than many citizens realize. Together they form a powerful public opinion lobby. The several military service associations provide both a forum and a meeting ground for the military and its industries. The associations also provide each of the armed services with a means of fostering their respective roles, objectives, and propaganda.

Each of the four services has its own association, and there are also additional military function associations, for ordnance, management, defense industry, and defense transportation, to name some of the more prominent. The Air Force Association and the Association of the U.S. Army are the largest, best organized, and most effective of the service associations. The Navy League, typical of the "silent service" traditions, is not as well coordinated in its public relations efforts, and the small Marine Corps Association is not even in the same arena with the other contenders, the Marine Association's main activity being the publication of a semi-official monthly magazine. Actually, the service associations' respective magazines, with an estimated combined circulation of over 270,000, are the primary medium serving the several associations' purposes.

Air Force and Space Digest, to cite one example, is the magazine of the Air Force Association and the unofficial mouthpiece of the U.S. Air Force doctrine, "party line," and propaganda. It frequently promotes Air Force policy that has been officially frustrated or suppressed within the Department of Defense. It beats the tub for strength through aerospace power, interprets diplomatic, strategic, and tactical problems in terms of air power, stresses the requirements for quantities of every type of aircraft, and frequently perpetuates the extravagant fictions about the effectiveness of bombing. This, of course, is well coordinated with and supported by the multibillion-dollar aerospace industry, which thrives upon the boundless desires of the Air Force. They reciprocate with lavish and expensive ads in every issue of *Air Force*. Over 96,000 members of the Air Force Association receive the magazine. Members include active, reserve, retired personnel, and veterans of the U.S. Air Force. Additional thousands of copies go to people engaged in the defense industry. The thick mixture of advertising, propaganda, and Air Force doctrine continuously repeated in this publication provides its readers and writers with a form of intellectual hypnosis, and they are prone to believe their own propaganda because they read it in *Air Force*.

The American people have also become more and more accustomed to militarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun, and to the violence of combat. Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth. Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior pro-

fessional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.

It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism. There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals, and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion. How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exert so much martial influence upon the government and life of the American people?

The military will disclaim any excess of power or influence on their part. They will point to their small numbers, low pay, and subordination to civilian masters as proof of their modest status and innocence. Nevertheless, the professional military, as a group, is probably one of the best organized and most influential of the various segments of the American scene. Three wars and six major contingencies since 1940 have forced the American people to become abnormally aware of the armed forces and their leaders. In turn the military services have produced an unending supply of distinguished, capable, articulate, and effective leaders. The sheer skill, energy, and dedication of America's military officers make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from the federal Cabinet to the local PTA.

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter for the rest of their careers they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions, or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques, or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others. Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions, and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The men who rise to the top of the military hierarchy have usually demonstrated their effectiveness as leaders, planners, and organization managers. They have perhaps performed heroically in combat, but most of all they have demonstrated their loyalty as proponents of their own service's doctrine and their dedication to the defense establishment. The paramount sense of duty to follow orders is at the root of the military professional's performance. As a result the military often operate more efficiently and effectively in the arena of defense policy planning than do their civilian counterparts in the State Department. The military planners have their doctrinal beliefs, their loyalties, their discipline—and their typical desire to compete and win. The civilians in government can scarcely play the same policy-planning game.

In general the military are better organized, they work harder, they think straighter, and they keep their eyes on the objective, which is to be instantly ready to solve the problem

through military action while ensuring that their respective service gets its proper mission, role, and recognition in the operation. In an emergency the military usually have a ready plan; if not, their numerous doctrinal manuals provide firm guidelines for action. Politicians, civilian appointees, and diplomats do not normally have the same confidence about how to react to threats and violence as do the military.

The motivations behind these endeavors are difficult for civilians to understand. For example, military professionals cannot measure the success of their individual efforts in terms of personal financial gain. The armed forces are not profit-making organizations, and the rewards for excellence in the military profession are acquired in less tangible forms. Thus it is that promotion and the responsibilities of higher command, with the related fringe benefits of quarters, servants, privileges, and prestige, motivate most career officers. Promotions and choice job opportunities are attained by constantly performing well, conforming to the expected patterns, and pleasing the senior officers. Promotions and awards also frequently result from heroic and distinguished performance in combat, and it takes a war to become a military hero. Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.

The professional military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures. Unlike some of the civilian policy-makers, the military has not been obsessed with the threat of Communism per se. Most military people know very little about Communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government. But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil. When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the armed forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from Communism. In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The armed forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its *General Purpose Forces* in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances. To do this it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the Unified Commands, and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Important features of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sea-lift forces and the Army-Air Force team of air-mobility proponents. At the senior command levels parochial pride in service, personal ambitions, and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe. The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves. This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic

in 1965 when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the Marines, and to attain overall command of U.S. Forces Dom. Rep." Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82nd Airborne Division to the scene, including a lieutenant general, and took charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965 the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Viet Cong and North Vietnamese aggression. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!) So by early 1965 the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims, and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause. Much of the reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes. In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in both North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people. Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots, and opportunity for career officers.

The highly trained professional and aggressive career officers of the Army and Marine Corps played a similar game. Prior to the decision to send combat units to South Vietnam in early 1965, both services were striving to increase their involvement. The Army already had over 16,000 military aid personnel serving in South Vietnam in the military adviser role, in training missions, logistic services, supporting helicopter companies, and in Special Forces teams. This investment of men and matériel justified a requirement for additional U.S. combat units to provide local security and to help protect our growing commitment of aid to the South Vietnam regime.

There were also top-ranking Army officers who wanted to project Army ground combat units into the Vietnam struggle for a variety of other reasons; to test plans and new equipment, to test the new air-mobile theories and tactics, to try the tactics and techniques of counterinsurgency, and to gain combat experience for young officers and noncommissioned officers. It also appeared to be a case of the military's duty to stop "Communist aggression" in Vietnam.

The marines had somewhat similar motivations, the least of which was any real concern about the political or social problems of the Vietnamese people. In early 1965 there was a shooting war going on and the Marines were being left out of it, contrary to all their traditions. The Army's military advisory people were hogging American participation—except for a Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron at Danang which was helping the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. For several years young Marine officers had been going to South Vietnam from the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa for

short tours of "on-the-job training" with the small South Vietnam Marine Corps. There was a growing concern, however, among some senior Marines that the Corps should get involved on a larger scale and be the "first to fight" in keeping with the Corps' traditions. This would help justify the Corps' continued existence, which many Marines seem to consider to be in constant jeopardy.

The Corps had also spent several years exploring the theories of counterinsurgency and as early as 1961 had developed an elaborate lecture-demonstration called Operation Cormorant, for school and Marine Corps promotion purposes, which depicted the Marines conducting a large-scale amphibious operation on the coast of Vietnam and thereby helping resolve a hypothetical aggressor-insurgency problem. As always it was important to Marine planners and doctrinaires to apply an amphibious operation to the Vietnam situation and provide justification for this special Marine functional responsibility. So Marine planners were seeking an acceptable excuse to thrust a landing force over the beaches of Vietnam when the Viet Cong attacked the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at Pleiku in February, 1965. It was considered unacceptable aggression, and the President was thereby prompted to put U.S. ground combat units into the war. Elements of the 3rd Marine Division at Okinawa were already aboard ship and eager to go, for the Marines also intended to get to Vietnam before their neighbor on Okinawa, the Army's 173rd Airborne Brigade, arrived. (Actually the initial Marine unit to deploy was an airlifted antiaircraft missile battalion which arrived to protect the Danang air base.) With these initial deployments the Army-Marine race to build forces in Vietnam began in earnest and did not slow down until both became overextended, overcommitted, and depleted at home.

For years up to 1964 the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was then one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia. In 1964 there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what has become the quagmire of Vietnam. The intention at the time was that the war effort be kept small and "limited." But as the momentum and involvement built up, the military leaders rationalized a case that this was not a limited-objective exercise, but was a proper war in defense of the United States against "Communist aggression" and in honor of our area commitments.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery, and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders. Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam, they have managed the details of its conduct; and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to question the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Some of the credibility difficulties experienced by the Johnson Administration over its war situation reports and Vietnam policy can also be blamed in part upon the military advisers. By its very nature most military activity falls under various degrees of security classification. Much that the military plans or does must be kept from the enemy. Thus the military is indoctrinated to be secre-

tive, devious, and misleading in its plans and operations. It does not, however, always confine its security restrictions to purely military operations. Each of the services and all of the major commands practice techniques of controlling the news and the release of self-serving propaganda: in "the interests of national defense," to make the service look good, to cover up mistakes, to build up and publicize a distinguished military personality, or to win a round in the continuous gamesmanship of the interservice contest. If the Johnson Administration suffered from lack of credibility in its reporting of the war, the truth would reveal that much of the hocus-pocus stemmed from schemers in the military services, both at home and abroad.

Our militaristic culture was born of the necessities of World War II, nurtured by the Korean War, and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc. Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope, and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives. The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and matériel development, and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts, and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single service doctrinaires, to create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anti-Communism, national defense, and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow, and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines and to self-maintenance and management. Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field test. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals. Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action. Being recognized public figures in a nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician. Flag officers are considered "experts," and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obliged not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive, and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems. Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them, are the rich and powerful defense industries. Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons, and lapel emblems, is a nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic, and well intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a

future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.

(NOTE.—The opinions contained herein are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.)

Mr. Speaker, another article appeared in last month's issue of Harper's—by Arthur Schlesinger, if I recall correctly—entitled "The End of the Age of Superpowers," in which it is pointed out that we have become a warrior nation, a nation concerned with militarism; that this militarism has become the dominant ethic of our society, and that it was the major factor which was leading us into the kind of difficulties that now face us all around the world.

On the long run, this kind of a development in America is bound to bring the United States into defeat and decay. It is bound to destroy our possibilities, our hopes of ever achieving the great strength which we all want to see for this country. It is this kind of concern we have—this kind of attitude toward American security. We desire to see America great because she has established her own greatness as a just power, as a power able to solve her own internal problems, and as a power concerned with liberty and freedom around the world; but not as a power concerned with enforcing by military means her own conception of what is good for a country.

These are the kinds of motives, the kinds of attitudes towards American security which motivate most of us who are opposed to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I could say a great deal more about this concept of security we find today—and I will not belabor it at great length—but we find today that the greatest demands upon the American budget—and this has been pointed out by many of the other speakers—are coming from our Department of Defense. We find that uniformly in the past requests for appropriations by the Department of Defense have been not only accepted by the Congress; they have even been added to. The militarists cannot seem to ask for enough money, even though they are now taking from a half to two-thirds of the total American Federal tax dollar.

This, of course, has happened because here in the Congress most of the leadership has believed that American security and American defense could be bought by a proliferation of additional hardware. But that is not true. It is impossible to buy defense against the kind of threats that exist in the world today by adding to the already bulging stockpile of nuclear weapons.

There is, of course, defense against conditions created by mass poverty, by mass hopelessness around the world and in our own country. However, there is no defense, in terms of bombs, against the power of ideas which seek to restructure the conditions of mankind. These things cannot be defended against by the expenditures now made by the Department of Defense.

If we do not recognize these concepts, then surely our security will become less and less strong in the years to come.

Unfortunately, what motivates a great part of the support by Congress for these huge military expenditures and what motivates the Department of Defense to a great degree to ask for these allocations is not really a concern for the defense of this country—even in military terms.

I do not think there is any rational Member of this body who thinks that any other country in the world is about to attack us. They did not attack us when we were a second or third or tenth rate power. There is very little logic in assuming that this great country, minding its own business, is likely to be attacked by any other power in the world.

Instead, what those people who seek high military appropriations want—and I think most of the time they perhaps do not even recognize themselves what they want—is to be able to continue down this road that America has been going on for the last generation—of putting a million or 1,500,000 troops overseas—of circling the globe with our Navy—of having bases in hundreds of locations around the world—of having our Air Force traverse all the skies of the world—and of being able to say that at any place in the world the end and the political goal which we seek will and must be obtained simply because of the fact that we have the power to obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a defense of America. That is a role of militarism around the world.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. I gather from the gentleman's statement that he has the same mistrust as I do with reference to the opinion of the so-called military experts—the experts who told us in February 1965, that if the Air Force were only unleashed that we would bomb the Northern Viets, the Vietcong, to the conference table; the experts who told the executive leadership and the congressional leadership of this country that only if we would increase our troop involvement, which at that time amounted to some 30,000 men—up to a quarter of a million men that we would prevail militarily; the military expertise that has been wrong time after time in their evaluation of this problem in Southeast Asia.

I wonder if the gentleman from California would comment just a little as to his view on just how much reliance the American people and the American political leadership should place on the opinions of our so-called military experts.

Mr. BROWN of California. I would be happy to do that. But let me say to the gentleman that what I am saying is not intended in any way to derogate the loyalty and patriotism or the honest desire of military experts to serve this country. It is only that they make their judgment within the framework that has only one value—the value of force. But today judgments can no longer be made on the basis of this one single value, even though there are other powers—other than the United States—which still feel this to be true that goals can be achieved in the

world by simple utilization of superior military power, and that superior military strength is all that it takes.

American military men are not unique in feeling that this is true. There are persons with a similar point of view in every country, including countries that we conceive of as being our enemies, and it is this attitude—both in the U.S. military and around the world—which must be reversed today. The concept of war involving nuclear weapons is no longer absolutely impossible to contemplate. War under these terms is obsolete today. This kind of war would mean destruction of the human race. Yet, instead of recognizing that simple and elementary fact and proceeding to establish conditions under which such war becomes less probable, we move in exactly the opposite direction and proceed with policies which make inevitable such a war within our lifetime.

I do not wish to elaborate at any undue length on this subject. I think it is important to recognize that it is my concern—our concern—for American security and for a realistic defense of America which prompts the kinds of expressions we have been making about the war in Vietnam, the anti-ballistic-missile system, the role of the military, and the extensions of American power around the world.

It is not a desire to have America show a lack of concern for defense or security, or to have America play a second- or a third-rate role in the world. America is and probably will be for many years the world's greatest power and should act as the world's greatest power.

But that does not mean that America should take upon itself to give answers to problems of every other country in the world.

By way of conclusion, I merely wish to say that it pleased me a great deal to have two Members of Congress arise earlier today and indicate in connection with their concern about Vietnam that they were not going to vote for war any more, and that they were going to refuse to approve any additional appropriations for the war in Vietnam. I wish to commend those two Members for their statements, and I wish to associate myself with them.

I have never voted for any money for the Vietnam War. I wish to go even further. I feel that under the present circumstances I cannot vote for any military appropriations which are part and parcel of the policy of American imperialism around the world. I can no longer support, nor will I vote for, additional taxes on the American people to uphold this kind of policy, and hence I will vote against continuation of the 10 percent tax surcharge, an issue which will come before the House shortly.

I can no longer vote to allow this country to borrow money for militaristic purposes. Hence I shall vote against any further increasing of the debt ceiling or against any bills which would make it easier to borrow money to carry on our adventurism. And, much as I hate to say so, I can no longer support a foreign aid program which is primarily the instrument of a bilateral policy aimed at carry-

ing out American security policies in the underdeveloped world.

So what I intend to do—and what I hope my colleagues will join me in doing—is to use the power granted to us by the Constitution to make clear our stand on these vital issues. If they do so, if they speak up as they should, I think that this great body will again assume the prerogatives which it was intended to assume under the Constitution. I look forward to that day.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am happy to have him here, and certainly hope that he will participate if he feels in the mood to do so.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not want the RECORD to show that I was silent, in view of what the gentleman said in reference to my presence in the Chamber. I came to the floor in an effort to be constructive. I would like the RECORD to show that I have cooperated in every way possible with the gentleman's special order today, particularly in arranging for the attendance of the ladies in the gallery. But I wish also to point out that my effort does not indicate my approval of the gentleman's statements.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the Speaker. The reputation for fairness and generosity of our distinguished Speaker, even with those with whom he differs, is very outstanding. We are, of course, very grateful to the Speaker for it.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleagues for having the wisdom and concern to reserve this important period for debate on our continuing involvement in Vietnam, probably the most critical issue facing this country today. It is certainly the responsibility of the Congress, as a full and equal partner in our balanced federal system of government, to consider and debate both domestic and foreign issues. With the Nixon administration now apparently conducting a full-scale review of Vietnam policy, I think it is very much in the national interest for us to offer our thoughts and our counsel in this effort to seek sensible goals and objectives. As a Member of Congress, I have given countless hours of thought and study to the questions surrounding our commitment in Vietnam; like many Americans who are looking searchingly at this issue, I have encountered much that is doubtful and little that is certain. I think the time is at hand for an honest appraisal of the situation and a frank discussion of our alternatives at this point.

In terms of human life we are bearing a tragic burden; in terms of economics we are bearing a dangerous burden. While the peace talks continue in Paris, our casualty rates are again reaching record levels; while our cities and our poor go begging, war spending is continuing at record rates.

Before and during last year's campaign, the general consensus of Ameri-

can opinion indicated rather strongly that patience with this war is wearing thin, and that our priorities are seriously inverted—that we have allowed what was intended to be a limited war with limited objectives to become an intolerably open-ended drain on our human and economic resources. I submit that we have no justification for allowing those conclusions to be ignored or forgotten while this Nation drifts toward foreign or domestic disaster. Instead, we must examine our commitment and our objectives in order to determine a reasoned set of goals and expectations.

I am unequivocally opposed to any further escalation of this war. Again and again we have escalated and again and again the enemy has matched us, man for man, weapon for weapon. The conflict is clearly a stalemate, with neither side able to declare victory or willing to accept defeat.

The lessons which the United States has learned in Vietnam have been bitter ones. The kind of allout military victory which we have achieved in past wars is not possible in this new guerrilla warfare except, possibly, through near-total destruction of Vietnam, both North and South. This is not our objective. We have also learned that even the mightiest nation in the world cannot expect to extend itself halfway around the world and easily thwart the plans of a small, relatively weak people. These lessons, unpleasant as they are, ought not to be wasted or rationalized; they should serve as an impetus for an objective reassessment of the situation leading to the quickest possible end of our involvement.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have consistently advocated full military preparedness and the strongest possible support of our troops wherever they serve. I do not, however, agree with those who view a desire for peace in Vietnam as being in conflict with these principles; full support of our troops certainly must include acting to bring them home.

In 1962, President Kennedy stated that though we could aid, support, and train South Vietnamese forces to protect their nation, it is still their war, and it must be fought by them and won by them. I think our experience in this war bears our late President out. The time has come for us to initiate a major shifting of responsibility from United States to South Vietnamese forces. Much was said recently about reducing our present combat force in South Vietnam, but it does not seem to be coming to pass. Though the President and the Secretary of Defense did talk earlier about significant troop withdrawals, they are now on record as saying there is no possibility of reducing troop levels now or in the immediate future. We have been told that the Army of South Vietnam has made a great deal of progress, but it is apparently not adequate to permit any changes in the number of American troops currently in combat. When will the progress be adequate? How soon will we be able to actually de-Americanize this war and allow South Vietnamese to determine South Vietnamese destiny? This is now the longest war in our history. I am

deeply concerned that a continuing and excessive fear of any Viet Cong threat in South Vietnam could solidify the foundations for an indefinite, costly commitment of men and materiel; in other words, a long, open-ended Asian land war against which we have been repeatedly warned for years by many leading Americans.

It is clear that the civilian and military ruling class of South Vietnam are not anxious to compromise with the enemy or witness a reduction in the level of our involvement. While billions of dollars continue to flow into South Vietnam, reports of corruption and war profiteering continue to flow out. The Thieu-Ky regime is a product of the American commitment, and that commitment is apparently the only force which can sustain that regime. Therefore, can we rightly claim that what we have accomplished in Vietnam is the creation of a stable, independent, and popularly supported government, or are we, in fact, really an occupying force sustaining a regime which will exist only as long as our force remains?

I am well aware that the forces of North Vietnam continue to be strong and determined; such a threat obviously does not disappear overnight. Nevertheless, I believe that the most rapid possible disengagement of American troops, with the Army of South Vietnam taking over the largest possible share of the fighting, should now be our primary objective. If the South Vietnamese are honestly intent upon defending their nation, the time is at hand for them to shoulder the responsibilities and assume the burdens.

President Thieu's recent offer to hold private unconditional talks with the National Liberation Front is, however, a hopeful sign. This conflict must ultimately be settled through negotiation, not escalation, and private talks with little fanfare or publicity are likely to be the real source of progress in Paris, rather than the larger, more open talks involving all parties. A logical objective for us to pursue would be simultaneous progress in both secret and official talks in Paris and in a program of military disengagement in South Vietnam. It is also worth noting that President Thieu now appears to accept the belief that escalation is not the answer, as he has now stated that, in his opinion, a resumption of the bombing of the North will not constitute an appropriate response to the enemy offensive in the South.

To those who continually insist that we are in too deep to turn back, I suggest the analogy of the cardplayer who, having bet the limit, decides to remain in the game despite the fact that he has already gone too far; he cannot retrieve his losses, but rather than accept reality, he digs in deeper, thinking he can reverse his fate. I am persuaded that our present dilemma in Vietnam is of a similar nature. To dig in deeper would be a tragic mistake. Other obligations, especially with regard to our domestic crises, are simply too urgent to permit such a massive war commitment to be prolonged or enlarged.

We are now at a crossroads; this is the time to initiate a prompt and decisive timetable for this disengagement. I fear the only alternative is to become hopelessly mired in the quicksand that is the endless squandering of our previous human and economic resources. To conclude that such a costly burden is in the best national interest of the United States would be a disastrous misjudgment.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war continues as the most urgent and pressing problem facing our country. That it must be ended and soon, there can be no doubt. The real question is the willingness of the American people to accept the realities of this war, and to acknowledge that indeed the political issues must be left to the people of South Vietnam to resolve by themselves. This is what President Johnson said when he reiterated so often the right of self-determination as belonging to the South Vietnamese. It appears still to be the position of the new Nixon administration. This I feel is the crux of the problem as well as the heart of the solution.

I am greatly encouraged to hear that despite all indications of a military escalation following the Tet observances, that private talks are now endorsed by both our Government and the Thieu-Ky Saigon regime. If indeed the military aspects can be resolved by the United States and North Vietnam, then it will fall upon the leaders of the NLF and the South Vietnamese Government to resolve the internal political issues concerning the future governance of South Vietnam. This is the prospect for peace that promises the greatest hope so that we shall be able as a nation to return to the real priorities of this century.

The peace conference in Paris must succeed. The military pressures within our country to escalate the war must be subdued. Instead we must use all our efforts to persuade our policymakers that indeed the people of this country are prepared to accept terms of settlement which will bring an end to our military commitment, by stages if necessary, and which will reserve to the people of South Vietnam the responsibility for determining the form and content of their future government. Once this determination is agreed upon, then I would hope that the United Nations would be called upon to preserve the stability of the settlement which has been achieved.

The formula for peace in Vietnam seems so obvious to me. I hope that it is as equally obvious to our new administration.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the year since former President Johnson's speech urging a prompt settlement of the war, and particularly in the 4 months since the bombing halt on Hanoi, our involvement in Vietnam has become more entrenched. The speech and the bombing halt seemingly deceived a lot of Americans—they thought the war would soon be over, and they have proceeded accordingly to halt the protests, stop the debate, and wait for the troops to come home.

The intent of this special order today is to alert the country to the continuing escalation of the war in Vietnam. For, while we had our backs turned on the war, the situation has deteriorated; more American boys have died; we have increased rather than decreased the number of battalion-sized operations by American and South Vietnamese troops; and we have allowed the Paris Peace Talks to dwindle to mere rumors of "possible peace in the unforeseeable future." I want to congratulate the various peace groups in the country, such as the Women's Strike for Peace, which have kept the vigil over the interminable war in Southeast Asia and have urged Congress to reopen the debate.

The war must be ended as soon as possible because so many things hinge on its settlement. We are pouring money, manpower, and lives into a hole that keeps getting larger; it can never be filled. The crisis in our cities demands attention before it, too, becomes totally unmanageable. We cannot seek "peace and democracy," if indeed, that is what we seek in Vietnam, while we allow the conditions which spawn tragedy in the cities to go unremedied. We must reassess our priorities, now—negotiate a settlement in Vietnam, and withdraw American troops as soon as possible, or we chart a perilous course for America which will cost us dearly in human suffering. We must obtain peace in Vietnam so that we can maintain peace in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, that we will never "win" the war in Vietnam, the enemy clearly is not on the run and is prepared to fight for another 10 or 20 years if we do not decide to come home. A negotiated peace among all the parties to the war will not create a loss of face for the United States. In fact, turning our attention and treasury away from Vietnam and back to our domestic crisis will probably increase our prestige among all those at home and abroad who are still trying to figure out what we were doing in Vietnam in the first place. No one respects a man who gambles away his assets while his children are starving.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may, in

noting the presence of the distinguished Speaker on the floor, I want to express my appreciation to him for having made the caucus room available to me today so that the ladies from Women Strike for Peace may gather there. I know that they also appreciate the courtesy which the Speaker extended.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. It is a pleasure to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Perhaps my presence on the floor is not as markedly evident as that of the Speaker, but I would like to suggest that when a colonel of infantry in World War II, who has done his share of killing and sending others into the horrors of war, joins in this debate as a friend of the man in the well and one who admires him for speaking out and speaking out now, I hope it will be noticed to some extent.

Justice Frankfurter said one time: Wisdom is a virtue which comes so seldom that even when it comes late, it should not be rejected.

I have gained considerable wisdom over the past couple of years. I went along with the designs and the desires of our military people and I supported my party and my President—I had hoped for the best.

During the course of my study of this conflict, I found we must do more than study and wait and support. And if a small collection of Members go into the well today to suggest to the State Department and to the Defense Department and to the administration that we have had enough of waiting and that peace is too precious to wait for in silence, then I am closer to the number engaging in this dialog than I have ever been before.

I have studied day by day the reports of the military in behalf of our forces and read the daily bulletins. I read that the B-52's are still striking day by day and province by province. I read that we are moving away from the old concept of search and destroy, but we are still engaging in what they call sweep and clear, or search and clear.

This may not mean much to the layman, but to me as an infantryman it means day-by-day offensive military operations.

I know belligerence begets belligerence, and at a time when we are discussing compatibility and exchange of ideas in Paris, I would hope that a restraint could intrude itself upon the military in their day-by-day operations in the theater of combat. I have not seen this in a sufficient degree yet.

I am constrained to object when the commander in chief of the Pacific, Admiral McCain, sets forth in no uncertain terms a statement of belligerence in behalf of my Government in the February Reader's Digest, I suspect Ho Chi Minh reads the Reader's Digest, or has it read for him, and when he finds out we mean to fight to the finish, and the peace talks should produce not just a peace, but some sort of determination of victory for our side, I think that probably has and

will cost us more American lives, because the North Vietnamese were moved to fight harder and to fight in response.

I do not think the peace policy of our country should be formed in the Reader's Digest. I would hope that would not happen.

I would hope that what the Secretary of Defense has learned from his recent visit to the theater of operations in Vietnam could just as well educate us as it educates him, and that his communication of knowledge would not be confined to the Armed Services Committee. Perhaps it would be fitting for him and for the Secretary of State to visit with us in this Chamber in executive session and tell us what their plans are toward peace and their plans toward the reduction in hostilities that they have in mind for us in the months to come. I would like to know.

I am not entitled to be privy to the high councils of our Nation in the search for peace, but I must respond to the people who have told me that mothers and fathers do not want to go any further with the war. I must respond to them.

What I know now disturbs me as I assess our recent operations in the field.

I read the calendar. I saw that there were ultimate preparations made to respond to the projected Tet offensive. I am wondering if some of our preparations did not add to the intensity and the ferocity of the enemy Tet offensive. Perhaps our preparations begot the offensive to some degree.

These are military operations which are beyond the knowledge of a Member of the House. I wonder how long we can allow these operations to be beyond the knowledge of a Member of the House if we are truly to represent all our people in the search for peace.

As I study the calendar I see we did respond in February to a degree to try to secure some reduction of hostilities. In the words of the last Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, I was told we were trying to bring about disengagement. I thought disengagement made sense. We tried it on a unit-by-unit basis, to pull our troops back and to pull them away, hoping the enemy would do the same. In some cases I was informed they did the same in response to our initiatives and casualties fell.

If this was possible under Secretary Clifford's policy, why is it not still possible today? Can we not engage in disengagement in that theater while we talk at Paris? These should be a parity of effort, so that we say what we mean in Saigon and we say what we mean in Paris, and do what we mean in Saigon as we say what we mean in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Post, written by Clayton Fritchey, entitled "Of War and Words," where our actions and our words are in diametric contrast.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

OF WAR AND WORDS
(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—Through the courtesy of official spokesmen, on the one hand, and the American press, on the other, this column brings you a special report on the progress of the Vietnam war:

"We have the enemy licked now . . . He cannot even mount another major offensive."—Adm. John McCain, U.S. commander-in-chief, Pacific, in the February issue of Reader's Digest.

SAIGON, March 6.—U.S. military forces in South Vietnam suffered 453 battle deaths during the first week of the Communists' current offensive. Not since last May have more Americans been killed in combat in one week. (Washington Post.)

SAIGON, February 27.—On Feb. 6 President Thieu said some U.S. combat units could begin leaving this year. Today he offered this clarification: one and possibly two U.S. divisions could leave South Vietnam during the last six months of 1969. (news dispatch)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—President Nixon said today there was no prospect for reduction of American military forces in South Vietnam in the foreseeable future because of the current enemy offensive. (New York Times)

SAIGON, January 3.—It is a large measure of agreement among military men that Viet Cong attacks these days show poor planning, poor execution and poor tactical leadership. (New York Times)

SAIGON, February 26.—More than 1000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese pushed to within 15 miles of Saigon today, seized a group of refugee villages in Bien Hoa and fought their way to the edge of the busiest American air base in South Vietnam on the fourth day of the enemy offensive. (Washington Star)

SAIGON, January 31.—Premier Huong declared tonight that his government's goal is to control 100 per cent of South Vietnam's population at the end of 1969. (Washington Post)

SAIGON, February 4.—Viet Cong terrorism increased nearly 30 percent in South Vietnam last month, allied officials reported this evening. (New York Times)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said today that he was accelerating the program to prepare South Vietnamese troops to replace some American soldiers . . . in Congressional testimony last May 28 former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford said that the South Vietnamese "are ready to bear an increasing burden and thereby enable us to level off and in due time reduce our contribution." (New York Times)

SAIGON, December 5.—South Vietnamese army desertions have climbed sharply in the last six months, allied military sources said today. (Washington Post)

"The enemy seems to be approaching a point of desperation," Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff, told reporters last year. (As reported in The Progressive)

SAIGON, February 25.—American casualties rose steadily today as the Viet Cong's new offensive continued for a third day. (Washington Post)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Chairman John C. Stennis (D-Miss.) of the Senate

Armed Service Committee yesterday asked the Pentagon to provide Congress with facts—no "rosy pictures"—on the Vietnam war: "We've gone along for years with the same rosy, rosy picture."

Mr. CAREY. I think to our friends and allies and to our so-called enemy alike, we had better begin saying what we mean, and that we mean peace, and that this be portrayed in actions consonant with the search for peace.

If I were a Vietnamese or a Vietcong living in Kontum Province or one of the other outlying Provinces 25 miles or more from Saigon, and I saw a B-52, with eight engines, drop its bombload on my neighborhood, whether under the military control of the Vietcong or not, I simply would not know and understand the bombing had stopped. It would not do me any good to know that the Americans are not bombing near Hanoi any longer or above the DMZ, because they are still bombing my hamlet, my village, my area.

As I study the calendar, again I say to my friend in the well, Mr. Speaker, the greatest day in the history of the world in the making of peace, the rebirth of man, is just ahead of us. Easter is coming, and Passover. And all men will commune with themselves and with their neighbors on what we have done to bring about the peace.

Perhaps this is a time for us to urge upon the Chief Executive of the United States and the administration now in power and upon the Secretary of State that there is here a chance for a new initiative.

If it is right to respond to the Vietcong, to the North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese, in order to suspend hostilities for the Tet holiday, and we are in doubt about who caused the offensive and who carried away the day, can we not, as Christians and Jews alike, celebrating Easter and Passover, call upon the world in the days of Easter and Passover to come, to reduce the hostilities now and forever, once and for all, with a cease-fire, a suspension of all bombing, and a disengagement of forces without delay, beginning during the week to come, Holy Week and Easter Week?

No one could mistake our meaning. No secret talks are needed, simply the appeal to conscience in the world.

I say again, if I have been late in coming to your numbers and adding to your words I will have to live with this for the rest of my life, with my family, with my children, and my countrymen, but there are too few here today to hear what you are saying and to join in what you are doing.

I am pleased at least on the minority side we do have Members present—not as many as there are on this side.

However, numbers are not important any more excepting the numbers that we hear day after day in terms of casualty reports from the other side of the world. There will always be another side of the world, Mr. Speaker, if we can take and continue to take joy or consolation or horror from the fact that we have outnumbered them in killing 10 to 1, that they have lost 300,000 and we have lost 30,000. The day of the body count must end. Every human being in this world is

entitled to another day of life. We gain nothing when we point to a victory against our so-called enemy. The world wants to hear only that we have stopped killing and that we have done our utmost to use our power for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman in the well for giving me this opportunity to say in this day and hour that I hope, I pray, and I aspire that your numbers will grow and that your words will be heard, because until they are heard I fear for my children and for the children of this world because the elders did not stay and listen.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) for his moving contribution.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from California in yielding, and appreciate this opportunity to comment today on events that crowd in on all of us.

We have come a year since the startling week when a shaken America lost Martin Luther King, Jr., and heard an incumbent President announce his decision to retire. What a year it has been.

We round now into another year with frustration and impatience abroad in the land; with fundamental problems unattended; with the national malaise poised, as it were, in midair; with the confidence of the people in their ability to affect the direction of their Government wobbling; with some men talking intermittently in Paris and others dying uninterruptedly in Vietnam.

Some have asked why those of us who are opposed to the war have seemed so quiet during the opening months of the new administration. Some have been quiet because of the patience traditional among Americans toward new Presidents as they assume office. Some have been quiet because in a national mood of expectancy and hope, noise might fall on ears determinedly deaf. Some have been quiet in response to President Nixon's suggestion in his inaugural address that affirmative virtue might in fact reside in a period of relative silence.

But if many have been quiet, none have become quiescent. And the quiet has come not because the American people will accept a decision to continue the war, but because they expect a decision to discontinue it.

Why then do some of us speak now, when clearly it would be unfair to expect a new President to bring peace overnight where there has been war for over a quarter of a century.

And indeed, the dilemma is a difficult one. For if we speak now, some will say our voices may undermine the negotiations and thus delay peace itself. And some may even say that we betray a lack of faith in the good will or the high purpose of the new President.

Yet, if we remain silent in the aftermath of recent remarks by the Secretary of Defense and in the backwash of developments in Vietnam, we may by that silence be helping to seal decisions by the administration based on miscalculations of the public mood. Should such

decisions lead to a repetition of the errors of the last years of the Johnson administration, we would all be ensnared in the spiral of calamities that must then befall America.

So there is a responsibility to speak now, to do what we can to make visible the fears and hopes of that vast number of Americans who participated in the events that led to the collective national decision to reverse course in Vietnam and to get on with the business at home.

And we speak in a spirit not of accusation against the President nor of attack against his motives, but rather in support of what we hope and believe from his inaugural address and from many of his comments since then, are in fact his goals, too.

We hope he will accept our suggestions and the public energies that will be displayed in furtherance of these suggestions as part of the effort to make it easier for him to do what he wants to do, to lead where he wants to lead, to make America what he wants America to be. For we know that President Nixon is a man who craves peace for his country and for the world as deeply as anyone; but we know that President Johnson before him was such a man also, and we know how far from peace his course wandered.

Thus the Johnson administration found itself caught in what became an endless circle of disaster—a disaster that became inexorable once policies were adopted that were based on logic that was as unyielding as it was faulty in its premises. Thus, the Johnson administration, in what must stand as a classic example of a syllogism in reverse proceeded with flawless logic from tragic error to tragic error, unwilling or unable to reexamine original defective premises on which the whole structure of its Vietnamese policy first foundered, tottered, and then collapsed. We speak now in the hope that the new administration is engaged in the kind of determined reexamination of those premises—premises about the nature of the war, about the requirements of national security, about the arrangement of national priorities, about the way in which America should face her obligations as a world power.

It seems inconceivable at this juncture that any such fundamental reexamination would not conclude that the purpose of negotiations about Vietnam must now be limited to three goals:

First. To make possible the orderly withdrawal of American troops.

Second. To provide protection for South Vietnamese who would rather relocate themselves than stay on after American troops have withdrawn.

Third. To allow time for the transition in both South Vietnam and the United States—time during which the present Government of South Vietnam could take over the war if it should decide to do so or could enter into negotiations for an acceptable settlement if it should choose to do that.

I would suggest that these goals are consistent with the original purposes of the American intervention in Vietnam and are in fact negotiable now.

If these are not the goals now being

sought by our negotiators in Paris, we must face again the consequences of an endless unwinnable and disastrous war, disastrous to the American people even as to the Vietnamese. But if these are the goals, the American people, even in their impatience to have done with war, will not begrudge the time necessary to achieve them.

Too much is happening to feel secure that these are in fact the goals. American offensive activities on the ground in South Vietnam have increased since the halt in the bombing of the north, and Admiral McCain, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and others equally eminent, have told us that this is necessary to secure a better bargaining position.

The Secretary of Defense has told us that he does not think there is a possibility "for any American troop withdrawal in any significant numbers," even as Admiral McCain assures us:

We have the enemy licked now; he is beaten.

So once again the familiar contra-punctual ambivalences of pronouncements of imminent success and predictions of long-range difficulties begin to rain upon the American people in the same disquieting pattern that led the Johnson administration from national consensus into credibility gap and eventually into discredited chasms where it was abandoned by the American people.

And so, with anniversaries pressing on the calendar, with young men dying in greater numbers than a year ago, and with confusion about the meaning of events and statements that threaten to drown out the President's own words, it becomes our obligation to discuss the situation and report the facts as we find them:

First. The cost of the war, still running at more than \$30 billion a year, still pre-empting the resources and energies of the Nation.

Second. The revolt of young people smolders in the mainstream and erupts with increasing irrationality and bitterness at the edges.

Third. The erosion of American influence in a world community faced with the great problems of Central Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa, continues, with sad consequences to the best interests of the American people and of countless other people elsewhere.

Fourth. The decline of the United Nations as an effective force for peace and social justice proceeds unchecked toward a point perilously close to no return, at the very moment when men concerned with survival itself should be harnessing their best energies to deal with the massive problems presented by new advances in technology and weaponry, by the population explosion, by the opportunities and challenges of outer space, and by the horrors of the widening gap between those who have and those who have not, all over the world.

Fifth. More than 11,000 American servicemen are now dead who were alive at this time a year ago. A thousand more die each month so that this week, the total of American deaths in Vietnam will

surpass the total of American deaths in Korea, and this year will surpass the total in World War I.

And all these facts, these leaden reminders that weigh on the hearts of so many men and women who love this country, are made ever more unacceptable by the additional circumstance that our people have in two presidential elections voted as clearly as our system made possible for change to policies in the direction of peace; and by the horrifying awareness that no additional number of killed or maimed Americans can in fact contribute to the national security or protect the national interest, or advance the national purpose.

So before thousands more are dead and thousands more are in exile or in jail, and before millions more have joined those who doubt the meaning of the electoral process itself; and before another anniversary has come round with another commission to report that we are not embarked on the great national agenda laid forth by the Kerner Commission, and before another administration finds itself trapped into inevitable error by choosing continually between false options and then defending false options with inconsistent and sometimes dishonest explanations; and before the very fabric of the unity of this Nation unravels in an acid sea of hate, and self-doubt, and self-recrimination, we address as urgently as words can manage this plea to the President to begin the implementation of the reversed course which will help to buy the time necessary to finish the reversing of course.

Soon we in the Congress will be asked again for the funds to continue prosecution of the war and then, as before, Members of Congress will face the most unacceptable of alternatives: for they will be told that to refuse to appropriate money to protect our fighting men is to consign to death yet more of those Americans least deserving to die—those Americans who in carrying out the orders of their Government have displayed a valor and a loyalty to country that in the face of the difficulties and uncertainties of the situation which they have been placed in must rank with the highest such response of our history.

Yet valor and loyalty do not make wrong things right, or senseless policies sensible, or hopeless pursuits hopeful. So there will be those who feel that to vote money for the further prosecution of the war is not to protect lives but indeed to make more certain that more lives will be pointlessly lost.

It is the imminence of this decision and the existence of stalemate and escalation in Paris and Vietnam that leads me then to urge upon the President the following steps:

First, the United States should begin at the earliest possible moment to withdraw with all deliberate speed as large a part of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam as would be consistent with the continued safety of those men who remain behind.

Second, this Government should make clear to those whom we have supported and opposed alike that it is our intention to continue to withdraw American

troops from South Vietnam until none shall remain, providing only that during this continuing withdrawal the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong will participate in good faith efforts to resolve by negotiation the negotiable questions mentioned above.

Third, the United States should reiterate its willingness to assist in the relocation of people who do not wish to remain in South Vietnam under new circumstances that must arise in any peace settlement and to assist through international agencies in the reconstruction of the land devastated by so many years of war.

I am convinced on the record of the past year that should these steps be taken by the President now, the effect would be to facilitate negotiations rather than to hinder them, to remove roadblocks between the American people and the most nearly satisfactory resolution of their most difficult dilemma, and to shorten the tragedy already too long in progress.

Should the President take these steps, it would signal at last the determination of the American people to let the Vietnamese people settle their own affairs, and would in fact "strengthen the bargaining position" of our negotiators in seeking on both sides the quickest possible end to war and the least painful transition to reconstruction.

Once these steps were taken and the American purpose were clear, there would be new unity in support of those who are negotiating, new hope for healing of the spirit of the land, an irrefutable rebuttal to those who have denied the efficacy of the democratic process and who would tear it down on the pretext that it has become irrelevant.

The money necessary for the protection of the lives of those Americans still in the combat area would then be voted without the haunting sense that each dollar proclaimed as protection might in fact increase the likelihood of destruction.

And above all, the President could get on with the pressing national business so long deferred and already so difficult to address. The recitation of this national agenda has become almost a national litany, repeated as if repetition somehow will remove the need for action.

The reform of electoral and legislative process; the reform of the tax structure; the end of compulsory military duty; the development of programs to end hunger and malnutrition and to place a floor below which no American need live; the building of adequate houses; the development of mass transport systems; construction of schools and the paying of livable wages to teachers and other public servants; the checking of the poisoning of the environment so we may again breathe the air, drink the water, and enjoy the beaches of this fair land; the ordering of our relationships with other nations in the tradition of the good neighbor; the reconstruction of the United Nations so that it can begin again the painful task of building world order where the words peace and justice will not ring as cynical reminders of lost dreams; and, above all, the beginning of

the healing of the national spirit, the beginning of the accomplishment of the revolution in attitudes and values that, accomplished in a spirit of national reconciliation, can alone make America what America must be if she is not to become the greatest monument to the failure of self-government in the history of the human race.

It is almost 1 year ago today that Senator Robert Kennedy, speaking in Kansas said:

But I am concerned . . . that the course we are following at the present time is deeply wrong. . . . I am concerned that, at the end of it all, there will only be more Americans killed, more of our treasure spilled out, and because of the bitterness and hatred on every side of this war, more hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese slaughtered; so that they may say, as Tacitus said of Rome: "They made a desert and called it peace." I don't think that's satisfactory for the United States of America. I do not think that is what the American spirit is really about. I do not think that is what this country stands for.

We are standing here in this House today in the absence of Dr. King and Senator Kennedy, with the memory what it was they told us to do and with the determination that what they wanted done will be done even with the greater difficulties that attend doing it in their absence.

It is because nothing less than the course of the history of this great land and its favored people is at stake at this moment of anniversary and rededication, of despair and opportunity, that we address ourselves so urgently and prayerfully to the President.

We attend his response, patiently, but in the hope that he shall not confuse patience with acquiescence in too long continuing a silence.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman and to commend him for his very thoughtful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that it is of the utmost urgency that the fighting in Vietnam be brought to a halt soon. I am hopeful that this discussion on the floor of the House today will have the effect of adding to the sense of urgency attached by the White House to achieving such a prompt cessation of hostilities.

Accordingly, I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. EDWARDS of California for arranging this special order.

Mr. Speaker, for almost a year the war in Vietnam has been practically a dormant issue. On March 31, 1968, then President Johnson announced a partial halt in the bombing of North Vietnam and said further that he would not seek another term as President. Within a few days the North Vietnamese had agreed to negotiations. And, in an instant, the differences between hawks and doves were blurred—no longer were doves those who favored a halt to the bombing and a negotiated settlement and the hawks

those who did not. In fact, since last March the only real discernible difference between hawks and doves has been the degree of willingness to tolerate continued death and enormous expense in Vietnam.

But because public positions have become less clear and public interest has appeared to wane, I do not believe it is correct to say that the American people attach any less importance to a cessation of hostilities.

The American people are fed up and embarrassed by the war. Moreover, they are even guilty, anxious, and tired just thinking about the war.

Vietnam has retreated from the front page. Most people have ceased to read the casualty reports and the battle accounts in the newspapers. The television news is less replete with film footage on the progress of the war.

How many people have lulled and sedated themselves to the issue, wishing only that it would go away?

As I sense the mood, the American people basically do not like the war. They are not convinced of its necessity, and they feel it is not worth the high taxes and inflation and death it has caused. But, most Americans, too, are stoic—almost as if the war were beyond their control. Protests and demonstrations are not their thing, and besides they seem not to work. And so it is, I think, that the American people have resigned themselves with a hope and prayer—a hope that their leaders will lead them out of the war, and back to the work of making American life a joyful, significant pioneer experience—a fulfillment of the Whitman vision and the American dream.

At this point what is needed is for this popular distaste for the war to be translated into a greater sense of urgency on the part of the new administration. The public does not condone a honeymoon of harmony but inaction on the Vietnam question. I would hope that this discussion today will help translate this popular sentiment into that greater sense of urgency.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House to suggest any strategic proposals for a solution. And while I seek to convey a sense of urgency, I do not intend to limit the public options available to the President. Only if time passes without sufficient progress, will it be appropriate to force specific suggestions upon the President's attention.

For the moment, then, I will content myself with one very significant procedural suggestion.

In my view the first step toward any solution in Vietnam is for the new administration to define its objectives in Vietnam. In this Congress can be of help.

It will not be possible to adequately assess any proposal, or to make any offer or counteroffer, unless and until we know what at a very minimum we are seeking in Vietnam.

This does not mean that it will be necessary to make public these conditions of a minimum acceptable compromise, but it does mean that within the administration it is essential that a minimum position be worked out.

Moreover, it will be necessary to decide what objectives in addition to these minimum conditions we would like to negotiate, and in turn to decide the relative priority to be attached to each of these additional marginal objectives. With these goals well in hand it will then be possible to make new and imaginative steps toward a negotiated peace, and to discard those past positions which bear no real connection with our minimum intentions.

In the formulation of these minimum and additional goals, I believe it will be necessary to assess long-range American policies in Asia—to put into perspective and real terms the roles of the United States, our present allies and our present adversaries. We will have to ask whether a particular approach to Vietnam negates another approach to the problems of Japan, or the Philippines, or Korea. We will have to ask whether a particular type of involvement in Vietnam will necessitate a similar continued involvement in other countries. In short, we will have to consider the Vietnamese questions in the whole fabric of Asian Pacific relations over the long term.

In the formulation of these goals, too, we will have to weigh the merits of solutions calling for a continued American involvement against those which would allow a larger involvement with domestic problems. We will have to measure the need for our resources in Vietnam against the needs for them in other parts of the world and at home. In sum, we will have to put Vietnam solutions into the context of competing demands on severely limited fiscal and manpower resources.

It will also be necessary to evaluate the situation on the ground in Vietnam today to formulate these minimum goals. This will mean not only evaluating the military situation, but evaluating the toll of more fighting on the morale of the Vietnamese people and the prospects of reconstruction of the Vietnamese nation. It will mean evaluating the possibility of imposing a solution on the competing groups or merely withdrawing ourselves and allowing the forces then existing to shape a solution. It will mean choosing ultimately between solutions more or less likely to yield pro-American regimes. But hopefully too, it will mean evaluating the costs of solutions which are relatively more likely to yield pro-American regimes against the backdrop of their costs in dollars and lives at home, and in loss of respectful public opinion at home and in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can find an acceptable solution in Vietnam if we make these evaluations, and in the process release ourselves from goals and strategies unrelated to prompt cessation of hostilities at minimum cost. I most respectfully urge the new President and his administration to carry out these evaluations and to seek these new avenues. The alternative is continued war, and perhaps as our patience wanes, a very great risk of further escalation in this already overheated conflagration.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am confident

that after this evaluation we will find that—as President Kennedy reminded us years ago—this is a Vietnamese war, and it will be won or lost by the Vietnamese. Our continued military presence can only sap the national spirit of the Vietnamese and allow a certain air of unreality to permeate the thinking of certain Vietnamese. The Vietnamese will be able to find a solution to this Vietnamese problem—and a continued American involvement may make it more difficult, rather than less difficult, to achieve this Vietnamese solution.

Despite the fact that the findings on reevaluation of our Vietnam objectives may be much different from our present and past objectives, I strongly commend the exercise to the new administration and to my colleagues here in the Congress.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman now in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), and others of our colleagues who have partaken in this discussion today.

The country ought to be grateful to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the three gentlemen from California (Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. EDWARDS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for providing an opportunity for this body to look at America's agony—the war in Vietnam. There are some who say that any discussion of the war by members of Congress is not met because the President is entitled to 100 days free of criticism. On the possibility that there is indeed something magic about 100 days—as opposed to 173 days—I would agree. Indeed, if the purpose of discussing Vietnam is to criticize President Nixon or criticism in general, I would agree whatever the time limit. Too many people in public life have suffered too much anguish from criticism for the sake of criticism about the war in Vietnam. If there is anyone who believes that any occupant of the White House can be comfortable while the war in Vietnam continues, my words cannot reach him nor are they intended to.

I assume that President Nixon, like his predecessor and like all of the other candidates for President, before and after the national nominating conventions earnestly desires to see a termination of our part in the war in Vietnam.

The purpose of this discussion rather is to remind ourselves and the people we represent that the burden is not only on the Chief Executive; that burden under our system must be shared by the legislative branch as well. Just as former President Johnson pointed to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as the authorization for our military activities in Vietnam, so the Congress continues to possess the awesome power to continue, modify or terminate our participation in the hostilities.

It has been argued that while the negotiations pend at Paris, any public dis-

ussion of strategies or fall-back positions is impolitic, if not downright treasonable. Those arguers forget that the great strength and weakness for democracy is that ultimate decisions are made by the people. I am not suggesting that this body or the other body deliver ultimatums either to our negotiators or their negotiators as to when a formula for peace must be reached ere some other alternative course of action is taken.

I am saying that every Member of Congress bears a joint and several responsibility for deciding, with or without the administration, the war and peace posture of this country as it relates to Vietnam. That decision cannot be delegated, not even to our negotiators at Paris, let alone to the negotiators for South Vietnam, let alone to the negotiators for the Vietcong or North Vietnam. Put another way, is there any doubt that at some point the best interests of this country, and indeed the world, would be served best by terminating our participation in the hostilities even if some other team of negotiators, allied or enemy, did not agree? I would remind the members of this body that former President Johnson stated over and over again that if the South Vietnamese Government ever told us to get out, we would get out. That pledge was not conditioned on any reciprocal action on the part of the North Vietnamese.

If our continued participation in the hostilities was then, and presumably is now, conditioned only on the will of the South Vietnamese Government, should it not be conditioned similarly on the will of the people of the United States? Is there not some point when our capacity to continue fighting in this war, either because of will or wherewithal, is just as relevant a consideration as the desires of the South Vietnamese Government—or the tractability of the North Vietnamese negotiators at Paris?

As the branch which authorizes the size of our Armed Forces, as the branch which allocates the wherewithal of this country, as the branch which states the broad policy aspirations, which the President seeks to execute, Congress cannot escape the responsibility for its decisions. No one will be around to justify or interpret the decision or lack of decision by this Congress either of which may cause the greatest recorded democracy to crumble into chaos. We must ask ourselves, and re-ask ourselves, what is our breaking point?

When is the plight of our cities and our schools so great that we must devote the money and manpower now seeking to save Saigon to seek to save Chicago instead or New York, or Detroit? When does the tension and hostility between the young and the not-so-young, the black and the white, the have-nots, and the haves, become so great that we must devote our wherewithal to easing that tension and hostility rather than finding a modus vivendi between North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese? When does the alienation of our youth become an anxiety so acute that we must turn all our attention to the tears in this society—even at the expense of terminating our involvement in Vietnam less than grace-

fully. The French left Vietnam less than gracefully; they left Algeria less than gracefully; who is so great a seer as to say they did not act from a desperate concern for the life of France as a country?

Those decisions—as to when and how, and whether—unfortunately are not the exclusive agony of the President; whether a President of 60 days, 90 days, or 5 years. So long as Congress retains the power that it unquestionably has, we similarly retain the responsibility. No one understanding our system can reject the proposition that Congress is more than a repository of advisory impotency. If the country's existence is indeed threatened by the Vietnamese venture, who says we are powerless? And if it is not so threatened, than why are the signs so ominous? Why do we now have a huge command center at the Pentagon for communication and deployment use for riots and disorders? Why does every large city in the country, including the District of Columbia, seek more policemen, more riot equipment, and express more concern about law and order? Why do most of the colleges and many of the high schools have one brush with disaster after another? Has the whole younger generation gone mad? Do we really think that all of the campus disorders are caused by a small group of revolutionaries operating with Cuban gold or Moscow gold? Or are the young people trying to tell us something? Are they trying to give us perhaps the last clear chance to restore domestic tranquility by devoting the great wealth and strength of this country to that prior item? There are courses that this Congress will follow and decisions that it will make. If and when it votes on a resolution—such as the one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) that it is the sense of Congress that we should commence phasing out the use of American troops in Vietnam—this Congress will act. If and when this Congress decides to appropriate such sums to carry on our participation in the Vietnamese hostilities as it deems proper, it will have acted. If and when it decides that the continuation of our involvement in Vietnam must be weighed against the possibility that we may not survive ourselves, it will have acted. No one denies the primacy of the President's responsibilities in terminating our involvement in the Vietnamese hostilities. That primacy however, does not permit Congress to cop out altogether. When all is said and done, our misery is less than the President's only because we have the company of 534 Members with whom to share that misery.

The people are no less anxious to end American involvement in the Vietnamese war than they were in the prior administration. Most people, as voters, were of the opinion that they expressed that anxiety when they elected the present administration and the present Congress. I know of few candidates who did not express themselves as sharing the people's anxiety. What better place to express a continued commitment to that anxiety than in this House—"Where the people shall govern"?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr.

Speaker, President Johnson won the 1964 election by more than a 15-million-vote majority. Yet 3 years and a few months later he found the country hopelessly divided under his leadership and he withdrew as a candidate for reelection.

I hope that President Nixon understands what happened to Mr. Johnson. It is important for his welfare and that of the people of the United States and of the world. Mr. Johnson entangled us in a land war in the morass of Asia—a war that cannot be won—a war where we supported one side in a civil war, a civil war that was none of our business.

Mr. Nixon won the 1968 election because the social, economic, and moral life of the United States was devastated by this cruel war in a small, poor, Asian country, a nation most Americans had never heard of before. Nearly 30,000 young Americans were dead by election day, 184,000 wounded. The dollar was under attack; inflation had sapped its buying power. Outrageous Federal taxes had sucked dry the reservoirs of capital needed by business and local governments to meet urgent needs in education, housing, transit, jobs, and environment. Solemn commitments to redress the grievances of black citizens had not been honored. The young people of America, dismayed by the draft, the war, and the threat of nuclear holocaust, were in various stages of unrest and revolt.

We trust that Mr. Nixon understands the roots of his minuscule victory over Mr. Humphrey. He won because Mr. Humphrey was looked upon by the American people as a coauthor of the Vietnam policy. Mr. Nixon did not win because of public dislike of Medicare, Federal aid to education, the OEO or the Democratic civil rights bills. He won because of the Asian war.

Mr. Nixon's credentials as a peace President are shaky. His past record is hawkish. In 1954 he wanted American troops in Vietnam to replace the withdrawing French. In 1964 he advocated carrying the war into the North. In last year's presidential campaign he wanted the war pushed harder.

But in the campaign he promised peace. He said he had a plan that could settle the war. The Republicans could not fairly be charged with the war, escalated to its present furious level by a Democratic President and Congress. And Mr. Nixon was elected because of his promise of peace and because he was the other choice.

It is now time for Mr. Nixon to produce the peace in Vietnam he promised. Any further delay in proceeding to the settlement is unacceptable as well as immoral. Last week 351 Americans were killed in Vietnam, the week before 336. Over 10,000 Americans have died in Vietnam since the peace talks started 10 months ago. At the present rate 8,000 more Americans will die in the next 6 months.

A further delay in achieving peace might be tolerable if the formula for settlement had not been spelled out—over and over again—by distinguished Senators, such as the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy and Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY, experts in Asian affairs, and

other men and women knowledgeable on Southeast Asian affairs.

The formula has to do with the present government in Saigon—the Saigon government wants a military victory so that it can maintain itself in power. For the Saigon regime only military victory can assure its continuance because it has little popular support and governs by terror.

Senator MCGOVERN said it best on March 17:

We are trying to win on the battlefield and in Paris what the Saigon government long ago lost beyond all recall; the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.

There is no more time for "considering military options," no more time for "improving the bargaining position." In the name of decency and commonsense, there must be no further continuation of the present war policy, however, disguised in rhetoric or more hollow predictions of victory yet to come.

At this important crossroads for our Nation, I would hope that America could reap the bright promise of the President's inaugural address; and that in the spirit of that excellent speech, Mr. Nixon will reject the counsels of war and move to end the killing, and turn American energies back to the solution of our own problems and the search for a more decent world.

The voices of the American military are once more telling their old, and sad story—"Escalate the war a little bit more, bomb Cambodia, start another offensive, resume bombing of North Vietnam, and we will win."

The truth is clear. Escalation will not win any victories in Vietnam. Instead, it will increase the total of the dead, American and Vietnamese. Today, we have more troops in Vietnam than we had in Korea, and we have suffered as many or more casualties, but we have no victory, not even a stalemate. The truth is American military forces cannot win a victory in Vietnam, except by either killing every Vietnamese, or placing one guard over every Vietnamese.

Mr. Nixon, the unholy record of Vietnam is clear.

The only option left is peace.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California. (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to express my own profound admiration and thanks to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS), not only for his leadership today in helping bring this dialog to those here in the Chamber and throughout the country, but much more importantly, for his leadership over the past 4 years in this hitherto somewhat lonely effort to arrest and change the direction of our country's policy in Southeast Asia.

His record has been one of courage and principle, his numbers have been added to in recent months, but there are many more of our colleagues—I am sure he will agree with me—whom we need before this battle can be won on this floor.

We are grateful to those who have recently joined our ranks, and we are even more grateful to those in the country—who with their letterwriting and communications have expressed their con-

cern that this war be ended and ended now. I am sure the gentleman shares with me my gratitude to all those concerned citizens in the land who have been so very helpful in this very, very important effort to achieve peace.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). I cannot add words that will say it any better.

I do hope this dialog we have had today with so many Members of the House of Representatives from every part of the United States participating, will have its effect throughout the land, and the Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—will be overwhelmed with messages from the people of the United States instructing us to do everything possible to bring peace—not next year, but this year, immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), for his very splendid statement this afternoon and for his abiding concern with peace and the question of Vietnam. The need to reassess past assumptions has been clear to the gentleman for some time, and he has constantly and forthrightly brought before the House his deep concern about the course of our foreign policy.

In these endeavors he has also been joined by two other distinguished Representatives from the State of California with whom I have been privileged to associate myself this afternoon, the gentleman from California, Mr. GEORGE BROWN, and the gentleman from California, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. These three distinguished Californians have been in the forefront of the battle to bring about a change in our policy toward Vietnam and have voted with me against appropriations for this war.

We were pleased that our colleague from California (Mr. BURTON) was selected last August at the Democratic National Convention to manage and lead the floor fight for the minority plank on Vietnam. He performed an excellent service in crystallizing for the American public the issues and in leading that fight.

Although the minority plank was not adopted by that convention, it is clear that the American people have overwhelmingly supported that plank and want an end to the war.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the presentation we wanted to make today. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE DANGER OF ARAB TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government now appears to be moving toward "Big Four" talks with the Soviet Union, France, and England in pursuit of peace in the Middle East. President Nixon recently met with Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban on this problem. And early next month, the President will see King Hussein of Jordan, who is coming to Washington as the official guest of this country.

I am confident that these initiatives taken by our Government to effect a settlement in the Middle East are based upon the soundest premises. I know the President is carefully assessing the problem and feel confident that we will not find ourselves in the position of being trapped into imposing a dictated four-power peace in the Middle East, when I am aware that many of my colleagues in Congress believe that peace in that area can only come from direct Arab-Israel negotiations.

Yet, even as these Mideast moves are taken, as a freshman Member of Congress, I am puzzled by certain policies initiated during the last administration—policies which I feel have borne no fruit. One such policy that is difficult for me to understand is our lack of response to terrorist actions and guerrilla warfare waged against Israel from bases in neighboring Arab States, especially the kingdom of Jordan. Sporadic Arab terrorism against Israel, of course, has existed for decades. This was true both before and after the establishment of the independent State of Israel. It was true both before and after the 1967 war. Terrorism is not a result of the 1956 or 1967 Arab-Israeli wars, but was one of the underlying causes of them.

The significant fact though, is that these terrorist activities have escalated in recent months, and have taken on new dimensions and gained new status since the 1967 6-day war. There is increasing evidence of new purpose, new direction, and new importance of terrorism in the Middle East. An activity that was largely sporadic, seems now to be assuming the proportions of purposeful policy.

Gen. Moshe Dayan, Israel Minister of Defense, has recently offered evidence to indicate a considerable number of Arab guerrillas have been trained in Communist China, and are now operating in Jordan as cadre elements. Techniques of the Vietcong are reportedly being used in underground terrorist warfare directed against Israel from Jordanian territory. There has been evidence that even Cuba is involved.

From June 6, 1967, to December 31, 1968, the time that an apparent new policy and direction of Arab terrorist activity was taking form, 1,288 acts of sabotage and border incidents occurred, in which Israel suffered 282 killed and 1,095 wounded.

On November 23, 1968, a time bomb killed 12 shoppers and wounded 60 other civilians in Jerusalem. On February 21, 1969, terrorists again exploded a bomb in a crowded Jerusalem supermarket killing two and wounding 33. On March 6, 1969, a terrorist bomb exploded in a Hebrew University cafeteria injuring 29.

A clear pattern to disrupt Israel's airline, El Al, is also apparently developing. The fleet of eight airplanes have been brought under increasing attack: a hijacking in Algeria, a machinegunning in Athens, and a machinegun and bomb attack in Zurich. This is only a rough outline of the occurrences of the past few months, but form a significant pattern.

In this same time there is increasing evidence to make it appear that terrorists have sought and found a privileged sanctuary in Jordan. This has occurred while Jordan is being supplied with U.S. military assistance, including Patton tanks, antiaircraft weapons, field artillery, mortars, communications equipment, radar, and jet aircraft. It has occurred at the same time that Jordanian Air Force pilots are being trained at U.S. bases under a military assistance program initiated during the last administration.

So we see a situation that even while Jordan is receiving the benefit of American weapons and training, Arab terrorist organizations operating from Jordanian territory, such as the "El-Fatah" and various other so-called national liberation fronts, are receiving arms and training from the Soviet Union and Communist China. The obvious conclusion is that either King Hussein is willingly permitting the terrorists to operate on his soil, or he has become so weak that he has no alternative than to permit such abuses. In any event, the terrorists of Jordan have virtually become a state within a state.

We see consistent terrorist violations of the cease fire agreement. We are told that they are operating independently of the Arab States or States from which their attacks are launched. We are assured by terrorist leaders that no cease fire agreement is valid, as they maintain that Israel has no right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, this is the picture that raises some vital questions that perplex me. What will be the value of the projected Four Power talks if terrorists do not consider themselves bound by any agreement which recognizes Israel's right to exist as a nation. I raise this question as it has been amply demonstrated that the terrorists influence the Arab governments, but where is it evident that the Arab governments either can or will influence Arab terrorists?

I question also the wisdom of training Jordanian military personnel at U.S. bases, at the same time we are training Israeli military personnel, especially pilots, in this country. I question the wisdom of a policy of selling both Israel and Jordan identical weapons.

I raise these questions as the facts indicate clearly that Jordan is part of a unified military command linking it with Egypt and Syria, nations whose military establishments are trained, equipped, and advised by the Soviet military establishment. The fact that the regime of King Hussein is so shaky that there is the strong possibility of our technical manuals and classified equipment becoming immediately available to pro-Soviet Arab officers and their Russian advisers, should also be given consideration. We are helping to arm Israel

through the sale of Phantom jets and the training of some personnel because of the obviously mounting Soviet threat in the eastern Mediterranean. We know that Moscow, both directly and through heavy support of the Arab States, is exerting not only an ever increasing pressure on Israel, but upon the entire Middle East. Should we then assist in this Soviet thrust with our arms and our training?

The United States should unequivocally condemn Arab terrorist harassment of Israel as inimical to peaceful, direct Arab-Israel negotiations, and as a threat to world peace. The world community which holds Israel responsible for acts of retaliation against this well organized Arab terrorism, should likewise hold Arab governments fully accountable for terrorist activities that are launched from bases in their countries.

Unless Arab violence can be effectively brought to an end by the Arab governments, the United States should view Israel retaliatory acts as justifiable and necessary responses to the condoned, organized harassment of her people and property.

Also, unless King Hussein can be shown to be taking effective steps to deal with terrorist groups which now flourish in his country, it would seem well to terminate the present program of military assistance with Jordan. For to arm both sides under the present situation is self-defeating. As to condemn one side for retaliating without condemning the other for terrorism is detrimental to world peace.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East is complex, but I believe that the responsibility of the United States there is clear. I believe we must pursue a policy of reducing tensions with the Soviet Union, so that we can take the Middle East out of the cold war. In this way alone, it seems to me, will the Arab States be persuaded to negotiate a meaningful peace. We must not seek to impose a settlement in that region, because it would be both unjust and transitory. No outside force can dictate the terms of relations between nations and expect them to endure. Meanwhile, we must see that the balance of power is not tipped in a fashion which would persuade the Arab states that they could win a war with Israel. We must, in other words, match Russian arms shipments, especially in modern aircraft. If we fail to prevent another outburst of hostilities, Mr. Speaker, I fear that the superpowers will inevitably become involved and that global disaster will ensue.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 21 years since the State of Israel came into being. Twenty-one years since the ram's horn sounded on the radios of the world proclaiming Israel's independence, while the Jews of the world wept and celebrated. It seemed then as if a corner had been turned in the long history of Jewish suffering at the hands of the Western nations.

Then the armies of seven Arab nations attacked the new state, with the avowed purpose of totally destroying her. And once again, the world stood by and watched the Jews fight alone. Those men

and women who only 3 years before had left the death camps of Europe were once again facing annihilation. This time, however, they also had the visible support of the world's Jews, which could be translated into money and weapons and volunteers. And this time there was no annihilation.

Twenty-one years have passed, and one must wonder: Was a corner turned, after all, on that historic day back in May 1948. Or must Israel become just another chapter in the Jews' long struggle to survive?

We look around at the world as it is today and we must wonder if all sanity has been lost.

We see the Security Council—including as it does the Russians, the French, the Arabs and the Asians—going through the motions of dealing justly with the Middle East. Going through the motions, I say, because no resolution condemning the Arabs is justified enough to even be submitted.

We see half the nations of the world falling all over each other to vilify and harass Israel at every opportunity, while blindly supporting and encouraging the Arabs. And we see the other half of the world bending over backward to appear objective or neutral or evenhanded.

We see the world's statesmen rush to excoriate Israel each time she employs her armed forces to combat the Arab terror. And we see the same statesmen hang back in total silence while the Arab madness reaches out of the Middle East to strike in Rome and Athens and Zurich and, yes, even in Los Angeles.

We hear the Soviets and the Arabs, echoed by the black nationalists and the mindless radicals of this country, call the Israelis "neo-Nazis" and compare the Arab refugees to the Jews of Europe as victims of a "Nazi-like genocide."

The Israelis are neo-Nazis? The Arab refugees are victims of Israel's Nazi-like genocide? I first heard those words with a kind of sick shock. And then I heard those words said again, and repeated, and then printed in the newspapers. And I asked myself: How is it the world can listen to those words and neither laugh nor cry nor roar with anger?

Is there no lie too big, no outrage too great, for the world to swallow when it is directed against the Jews, against Israel?

All the world is free to examine the strength and the depth of Israel's democratic society. And what is she surrounded with? For the most part, feudal monarchies and the military dictatorships. Nations where political prisoners are jailed without trials, executed in secret and hanged in the public squares. Where secret plots, political assassinations and bloody coups are a fact of life. Where the bullet-riddled body of a deposed, elected leader can be exhibited on television. Where the news media spews out vicious and obscene lies against neighboring states and all the countries of the west. Not only against Israel, but against fellow Arabs, too.

At this very moment, Israel's future may hang in the balance while representatives of the four powers confer. Two of them—Russia and France—are

totally dedicated to the Arab cause. Britain is, at best, indifferent. And what is the U.S. position?

If Israel was not Israel, but was instead some small Asian country, friendly to the United States, surrounded by countries which had been armed to the teeth by the Soviet Union, could we doubt then what the American position would be?

Suppose a neighboring government to the United States harbored terrorists who set off bombs in department stores and shopping centers, who machine-gunned American airliners in London and Paris, who planted land mines on roads traveled by suburban schoolbuses, and sent mortar shells across the borders into our farms. Suppose such a neighboring government permitted all this, and her prime minister praised the terrorists on national television, gave them weapons and money and all sorts of honors. Can any of us doubt then what the American position would be?

In view of all this, why has not Israel received more vigorous support from the democracies of the West? Why is it she stands virtually alone? Why has the most outrageous Arab propaganda fallen upon so many receptive ears?

We must insist that President Nixon keep his campaign promise and see to it that Israel maintains military superiority to the combined Arab nations, her only guarantee against annihilation.

We must insist that Arab governments be held responsible by the U.N. and the free world for the actions of the Arab terrorists.

We must insist that no outside powers impose a settlement on the Middle East which would, in fact, be a capitulation to and appeasement of the Arab nations, that any settlement be negotiated between and assented to by both parties.

We must never forget the Biblical injunction:

If I forget thee o Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the French capon acts as guide dog for the Russian bear. Of late I have been greatly saddened to see the United States succumb to French blandishments regarding major powers talks over the Middle East. France is not a major ally of the United States any longer. She works against major American interests at all times, as evidence of recent years amply shows.

France under De Gaulle is now acting in the best interests of the Soviet Union, slavishly obeying Kremlin orders in order to snap up a crumb from the tables of the mighty. Now she seeks a Czechoslovakia-style settlement at Israel's expense through four-power talks. She seeks to pull Arab chestnuts out of the fire of military disaster. France is seeking to set up a situation Russia can take advantage of for her own and Arab benefit at United States and Israel expense.

France seeks respectability by association with the mighty, not because she actually deserves consideration because of great military strength, moral force, or a powerful economy. The Gallic rooster is merely a barnyard relic, afflicted with

military mangle and drooping international feathers.

How many divisions does France have in being? How many thermonuclear warheads and strike forces for delivering them does she possess? Shredded in 1870, drained in 1918, flattened in 1940, and forced to run like a whipped dog from Vietnam, France has as much of a military reputation as a herring has fur. Her economy is weak. Her empire has vanished. All she now possesses are delusions of grandeur and a vindictive leader who seeks to ruin America, enshrine 19th-century realpolitik, and destroy Israel so Russia may dominate the Middle East.

The only powers who should negotiate are the United States and the Soviet Union. France is less than a cipher. Fortunately, the Israelis are already forthrightly telling all parties involved they will not for one instant be dictated to by such a gathering. They know better than to trust in the fruits of such bargainings. If Czechoslovakia was awarded a posthumous Peace Prize in 1938, Israel does not seek to match this dubious distinction in 1969.

As for France, I can only think with pity of the shades of her past glory, when a Frenchman would never stoop to crawl on his knees to the Russians.

Heroes of Valmy would blush with shame. The Imperial Guard which held the Charleroi Road until Napoleon could flee would down their bearskins in rage. Paris' defenders in the siege would not recognize their posterity. Those men buried in the Trench of the Bayonets at Verdun would only gaze in stupefaction and horror at recent policies of present day France. But Pierre Laval would gleefully understand today's French Government, recognizing them for what they are.

I do not want to see Americans seated at the same table with the De Gaulle regime, discussing the fate of the Middle East. France has no right to be there. Not by might. Not by right. Not by courtesy.

Let America look to her conscience. Let the Israelis look to their weapons. As for France, as Jim Fiske once said:

Naught is lost save honor.

One thing is certain, however. The price of a modern Judas has gone up. De Gaulle will surely get more than 30 pieces of silver. Perhaps 31.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with great interest the statement on Arab terrorism by Congressman HAMILTON FISH and feel that it is a valuable contribution to the formulation of policy in a very important situation.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have carefully observed the evolution of the current dilemma. Congressman FISH is correct in focusing attention on the role of Arab terrorists and the service these extremists are performing to the nihilistic Communist cause. Indeed, I feel that the proposed "Big Four" conference of our country with the Soviet Union, France, and Great Britain is jeopardized not only by Soviet and French bias favoring the Arab cause, but by the rise of the Arab terrorist movement. Even if the

Soviet Union, the French, the sovereign Arab States, and the State of Israel agreed on a settlement, it could be vetoed by the terrorists who proclaim themselves the only qualified spokesmen for the people of Palestine.

During the forthcoming visit of King Hussein to Washington, it is essential that we establish the extent of Communist supply of weapons to guerrillas and terrorists based in Jordan, the degree of Jordanian Government collaboration with such underground forces of so-called national liberation, and determine whether continued American arms shipments to the Jordanian Army, a force collaborating with Cuban-trained, Peking-trained terrorists, is indicated.

I urge a careful review of Congressman FISH's proposals in light of the foregoing observations and those of the executive department of our Government. The time has obviously come that some assessment must be made by our State Department of the insidious role of the Arab terrorist front.

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, there are renewed reports that the United States is taking the lead in imposing a four-power settlement for the Arab-Israel crisis. I need not remind you that this flies in the face of the Western World's staunchest ally in the Mideast—Israel. The Israelis want, and deserve, the dignity of coming face to face with their longtime tormentors. What kind of lasting settlement can we expect without the protagonists themselves coming to terms, among themselves? There are also indications that this settlement is to be worked out within the framework of the United Nations. The United Nations, through its Secretary General U Thant, has shown us how much objectivity we can expect from that organization. U Thant seems more concerned with Israel retaliation that he is with Arab terrorist provocations.

Finally, I would like to point out the inroads communism is making in the area. One of the Arab terrorist groups has finally surfaced as openly Marxist. This is the same group which claims what they call credit for attacking civilian-bearing El Al airlines.

As a matter of interest to the Members of this House, I am leaving for Israel on the 3d of April to see at first hand the situation as it exists and discuss the situation with Israel leaders.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Arab world are largely illiterate, wracked by disease and poverty, without the education and organization to enrich their harsh desert land. For decades, even the wealth of their oil fields has gone into palaces and Cadillacs, and above all into the armaments and trappings of war. For decades, irresponsible leaders have turned their people's frustration outward—toward the West, and to that tiny outpost of Western culture and ideals which is the State of Israel.

Israel has been fighting for her very existence too long. Only her arms and courage have allowed this tiny nation, with less than the population of New York City's Queens County, to defeat the armies of nations with total populations of tens of millions.

This gallant democracy, this nation of survivors from history's greatest example of man's capacity for senseless cruelty to his fellow man, cannot be allowed to succumb to the threats and assaults of her neighbors. And while this period of danger continues—until lasting peace settlement is achieved—we must maintain our vigilance in her behalf.

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East has been the setting for three bloody wars linked by border skirmishes and verbal threats. These conflicts have been both the flame and the fuel of an intense level of hatred in the area.

The loathing and hatred between Arab and Jew is an all-consuming thing. Why has such mutual hostilities developed?

As many of us know, the story goes back nearly 2,000 years to the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine by the Romans in the year 70 A.D. This Diaspora marked the birth of a dream harbored by Jews throughout the world that someday they would be able to return as a people to the promised land. At last, in 1917, their chance came. Britain consented to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

However, the Jews who immigrated to Palestine in the 1920's and 1930's, to buy land and to create a new state, were regarded as unwanted outsiders by many of the Arabs, who had been living in this barren land since the days of Christ. Under the yoke of foreign oppressors themselves for centuries, these Arabs dreamed too of an independent Palestine. Increasingly, growing Arab nationalism and Zionism clashed, often violently.

After World War II, under mounting pressure, the British proposed dividing Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish. The Arabs protested that they wanted nothing less than one Palestine under Arab control. It might be true, they argued, that the Jews had been persecuted terribly in Europe. But then let Europe bear the cost of solving its own conscience, not the Arab world.

Without first reconciling these grave differences, the United Nations adopted the British partition plan, and in May 1948, Israel formally became a state. Outraged, the Arab armies attacked the new nation, vowing to drive the Jews into the sea. But, Israel, even in its infancy, had much more spirit, zest, determination, and discipline than the Arabs. They were tougher inwardly and outwardly than the Arabs.

Israel did win the 1948 war, but peace in the Middle East was not realized. The Arab nations steadfastly refused to sign a peace treaty for this would have amounted to an unpalatable concession—recognition of the State of Israel. Instead, they declared they would not rest until our Jewish brethren were destroyed.

In less than a decade, the Middle East was ablaze again.

Following Egyptian President Nasser's nationalism of the Suez Canal in 1956 at which time he barred the passage of all Israeli ships, and his blockade of the

Gulf of Aqaba—Israel's only remaining outlet to the East—Britain, France, and Israel together invaded Egypt.

Within a matter of days, Israel had routed Nasser's Army and driven across the Sinai Peninsula to the Suez. But again victory did not result in a peace treaty. A cease fire was arranged which called for Israel to withdraw her armies, and the situation remained as explosive as before.

Since then, the Egyptian Army has grown in power—and continues to grow in power. Unified Arab command has forced Jordan to double the size of its Army. Sophisticated weapons—jets, guided missiles, and submarines—continue to flow in from the Soviet bloc.

These arms are a threat to peace. They waste valuable development capital; they threaten the only near Eastern state with traditions of democracy.

The irresponsible and dangerous nature of the course chosen by Israel's enemies is becoming more clear to the world every day. And our commitment to Israel must be equally clear; it must be a total one. We owe our Jewish brethren nothing less.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deep concern and outrage at the increasing level of terrorist attacks against the people and the State of Israel. These attacks indiscriminately made against civilian and noncivilian alike, are repugnant to any civilized human being. It seems almost impossible to comprehend the depths to which these killers and assassins have plunged. The blowing up of school buses full of young children or the exploding of bombs in a university are acts that only can be characterized as subhuman.

The responsibility for the murders committed by these packs of savages lies not only with the terrorists and their sympathizers—for they make up only a small percentage of the population of the Arab States—but with those that give them aid and shelter. These are the officials of the Arab countries that surround Israel who let themselves be caught up in the demagoguery of the terrorist leaders. The spilling of Jewish blood seems to have greater priority for them than the economic and social development of their countries. It is they that fan the flames of the Middle East crisis by refusing to stand up against the terrorist. I suspect if they did, the power of the terrorist band in their countries would subside.

Backed up by Russian and American arms, the Arab States are beginning to harass Israel with increasing frequency along its borders. They delude themselves into believing that they can one day exterminate the people and State of Israel as Hitler's Gestapo attempted to do 30 years ago. If they attempt this, their dream will turn into a nightmare.

These acts of terrorism must stop. If they do not, the situation in the Middle East will reach crisis proportions even beyond the current level. The Arab States must be induced to control the terrorists within their borders and to prohibit them from carrying out their missions of murder and destruction.

It is the duty of every civilized human being, no matter what his nationality, to see that these murders are terminated.

There is much that the United States can do to help leaders of the Arab countries face up to the terrorist marauders within their borders. One mechanism is to provide an economic incentive. To this end, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the able gentleman from New York. (Mr. FISH), for his presentation on the grave danger created by the unrelenting use of terrorism by Arab extremists.

It is especially appropriate that the gentleman has raised this question today. We have just received the sad news of the death in a Zurich hospital of a young Israeli commercial airlines pilot, shot from ambush by Arab terrorists when his El Al airliner was attacked on the ground at a Swiss airport last month. This cowardly attack represents the first instance in which a pilot has died of wounds inflicted by terrorist hijackers in this series of attacks by Arabs and pro-Castro Cuban fanatics.

A touch of irony is added by the receipt of additional news that the Chief of Staff of the Cuban Communist Army was wounded by Israel forces when he accompanied an Arab guerrilla raid into Israel. The Cubans apparently are training and assisting the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

I am in total agreement with the gentleman that our Government should review the provision of arms to the State of Jordan in the light of the obvious collaboration of the Jordanian Government with the terrorists. A first order of business during the forthcoming visit to Washington by King Hussein of Jordan would be to clarify this question of collaboration with terrorism. It appears to me that evidence is already compelling to the point that arms shipments to Jordan should be discontinued.

I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of this Congress to a report by Milton Friedman, a veteran White House correspondent, on the role of Communist China in the Arab terrorist movements. The report was published worldwide in the newspapers served by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

In the light of the obvious links between the Communists and the Arab terrorists, I feel that King Hussein must either stand up against the terrorists or face the immediate cancellation of American arms shipments.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Friedman's report for the information of all Members:

AID ARAB TERRORISTS: MAO EMERGING AS NEW FORCE BEHIND MIDEAST CONFLICTS

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—China's chairman Mao has incited and aided the Arab terrorist movement to such an extent that Washington officials are now newly assessing the Chinese role in the Middle East.

The Chairman wants much more than the liquidation of Israel. He hopes to embroil the United States and the Soviet Union in a fatal confrontation over the "Palestine Liberation" issue.

Chairman Mao's new line, as voiced by Radio Peking, is that Washington and Moscow, by discussing Middle East solutions, have actually entered "a criminal intrigue to establish American-Soviet hegemony in the Middle East by way of liquidating the Palestine question, stamping out the Palestine (Arab) peoples' armed struggle, and forcing the Arab nations to compromise with and surrender to the Israeli aggressors."

Aiming to perpetuate bloodshed between Israel and the Arabs, Chairman Mao has termed any pursuit of peace by Arab regimes or Washington as "counter-revolutionary political bargaining with the Soviet revisionists." Any political solution is rejected. The struggle must go on, until Israel is wiped out, he maintains.

The Chairman's thinking is that endless violence in the Middle East can be exploited by Peking. Moscow can be accused of "revisionism" and treachery if any accommodation is made with Israel. It is hoped this will force the Russians to identify with the terrorism and the rage Peking seeks to foment among the Arab masses. Such identification with Arab extremism may bring the Russians into an armed confrontation with Israel and the United States, he believes.

Peking's emerging line coincides with the disclosure that Communist China is arming, training, and instigating Arab terrorists. Hundreds have been to China and many are there now. Attacks on civilian airliners, bombing of supermarkets and universities, mining of roads—the strategy of terror perfected in Saigon—is designed, Mao-style, to convert Israel into "another Vietnam."

U.S. intelligence has substantiated Israel Defense Minister Moshe Dayan's recent charge that Arab terrorists are being trained and equipped in China. A pipeline has thus been established to transport terrorism from the Far East to the Middle East.

The growing Chinese involvement is one reason for President Nixon's desire to seek speedily a Middle East settlement. It is also a factor in Russian policy. But Moscow has yet to translate this into a settlement that Israel could accept. The Kremlin hopes to exploit what it sees as hysteria to avoid another Vietnam by getting Washington to impose unilateral pressure on Israel to withdraw from occupied territory without a genuine peace.

Peking's main assault, however, is not on the rulers of the Kremlin but against President Nixon. "Nixon's words and deeds indicate that U.S. imperialism will continue to go all out to foster Israel and back the criminal policy of the Zionist aggressors," he declares. The sale of Phantom jets to Israel "shows that U.S. imperialism will never change its ambition to use Israel as a tool for aggression and expansion in the Middle East."

In Peking's assessment, the President is manipulated by such persons as Sen. Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican. Sen. Javits is described by the Chinese as "a representative of the Jewish capitalist class." Peking has asserted in its broadcasts that the Arab people have seen through Israel and recognize it as a U.S. base that must be destroyed. The Arab terrorist movement, El Fatah, is being quoted in the Chinese capital as believing that "the policy of the United States is worked out by plutocrats and concerns of capitalism and imperialism."

The Radio voice of El Fatah, "Saut al-Asifah," is rebroadcast by Peking with an assertion that "whatever tricks the new U.S. Administration may play, it can never subdue the Palestinian people who are determined to carry their armed struggle through to the end."

China welcomed the condemnation of

Nixon by an important Iraqi newspaper, "An-Nu." The newspaper called on Arabs "to carry through to the end the struggle against Zionism."

Peking asserted confidently that, in seeking Arab favor, "no matter what tricks and sly measures Nixon might resort to, he can never save U.S. imperialism from defeat." In the Middle East, said Peking, Nixon "and Soviet revisionism have been colluding and struggling with each other with the purpose of redividing it and enslaving the Arab people."

Soviet "social-imperialism" has "stepped up its infiltration and expansion" into Arab states, said Peking. France hopes for "an imperialist return to the Middle East," as does Britain, according to Peking. So much for the Big Four.

Great changes are seen in Peking with "the daily awakening of the Arab people and the further development of the national liberation movement, particularly the surging of the Palestinian people's armed struggle . . . The Arab people are now rising up to master their own destiny."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in connection with my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

SOUTH AFRICAN AIRWAYS SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the inaugural flight of South African Airways to the United States has arrived today, March 26. We oppose this extension of the South African apartheid system to this country. We oppose this extension for several reasons.

First, this new relation with South Africa is inconsistent with our relationships with the black, independent states of Africa. This inconsistency is well known to African states.

Just recently, in the pages of the Nationalist newspaper in Tanzania, the editor wrote:

In the final analysis it is not only insincere but also criminal on their part to continue soliciting the goodwill and friendship of the Africans while at the same time they continue to hob-nob with the enemies of Africa.

He continued:

If the American government had any regard for the conscience of the Africans and the suffering of their brothers in South

Africa, it would not, in the first place, have continued to consolidate its relations with the fascists of South Africa.

These sentiments expressed by one of the leading newspapers in independent Africa echoed the sentiments of a recent resolution by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. This resolution stated:

The Council of Ministers has been informed of the air transport agreement concluded between the Pretoria regime and the government of the United States. The Council condemns this agreement, and deplores the uncooperative attitude on the part of the United States Government, which is contrary to United Nations resolutions, and to the assurances repeatedly given by the United States itself that it is only some U.S. private companies that still maintain economic and trade relations with South Africa. The Council addresses an urgent appeal to the United States Government to reconsider this agreement.

These sentiments are representative of the indignation felt by the governments of the African nations at the callous way in which our Government tries to play both sides of the street in Africa, or both sides of the color curtain.

The action by the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting South African Airways a permit was in clear defiance of a resolution passed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1962 which requested member states to act against apartheid and the measures specified included one which read:

To refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and companies registered under South African laws.

But it is not only our Government which is trying to play a two-faced role in Africa. It is also American commercial airlines which practice the same callous maneuvers. Pan American Airways, for instance, flies to a number of West African states and then uses the facilities in those West African states to fly on to Johannesburg. I am sure it will not be very long before they are faced with a choice between abandoning their South African trade in order to maintain their operations in West Africa. What is particularly ironic about Pan American's action is that while they have applied for an additional route to Johannesburg through Rio, they have also promoted one of their black employees to a high-level executive position to direct the development of black American travel through the use of Pan American facilities. How in good conscience can they advertise for the travel dollars of black Americans at the same time that they are planning to expand their service to South Africa, services that will not be available to black Americans. Black stewardesses, flying for Pan American in West Africa, have also been removed from the aircraft before it proceeds to South Africa.

Trans World Airways and Braniff are also playing this game. TWA has applied to the CAB for rights to fly to South Africa as an extension of its current route to Nairobi. They, too, are trying to play both sides of the color curtain in Africa. Braniff, meantime, has applied for rights to travel to South Africa via Bra-

zil. Does Braniff, too, mean to affront black Americans?

I am appalled by this callous disregard by both the American Government and three American airlines of the feelings of independent Africans and Americans of conscience, both white and black.

The second reason that we oppose this extension of the apartheid system to the United States is because of the manner in which it was carried out. It is certainly bad judgment and bad government when an official agency of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, can unilaterally act to extend our relationship with South Africa. The Board, in its own words, found:

It is in the public interest to issue a foreign air carrier permit to South African Airways, authorizing it, for an indefinite period, to engage in foreign air transportation . . . between a point . . . in the Republic of South Africa . . . and the terminal point New York.

This was their recommendation to the President who then issued the enabling order on November 7, 1968.

The American Committee on Africa has asked the President to now reconsider this order and to ask the CAB to reopen hearings on whether or not such granting of these facilities is in the public interest. The replies to the American Committee on Africa by the White House maintain that the President has no power to reopen the case before the CAB. The CAB, on the other hand, has indicated that "the matter is now under study."

I do not feel that the grant of these facilities to South African Airways is in the public interest. I know from personal experience that these facilities will be available only on a racially discriminatory basis. I do not believe that the bilateral air agreement, initiated in 1947, before the advent of the apartheid system, is conclusive evidence of the public interest. I support the request of the American Committee on Africa that they be allowed to testify on behalf of the public interest before the CAB. If this request is not granted, I will consider it necessary to examine this whole affair through the Subcommittee on Africa of which I am the chairman.

Indeed, it is time that the hearings on American-South Africa relations begun by my distinguished predecessor, Barratt O'Hara, be continued.

The third reason why I oppose the extension of apartheid by South Africa to our shores is because of the grave insult it represents to my fellow black Americans. Normally, I consider myself the representative of all my constituents, both black and white. But in this matter I feel a particular responsibility to voice the outrage of black Americans over this action.

The foreign policy of the United States should be a non-racial one. It should be a foreign policy which Americans of all races and creeds can find moral justification. This, and any, action which extends and expands the relationships between our country and the Government of South Africa are not sections in which we can find any justification. The inequities of the South African sys-

tem toward its nonwhite majority are well known. How then can we regard this latest action as any other than a callous insult by our foreign policymakers to the black citizens?

Already black Americans are sorely vexed by the inability of the establishment to respond to their very real needs and feelings. Black Americans can only regard the extension of racially discriminatory facilities to John F. Kennedy International Airport as a retrogressive step against the achievement of full human rights in this country.

The fourth reason which causes me to speak out against the latest racial injustice is that it disregards the growing prospects of a Vietnam situation in southern Africa. Already the prospects of a racial and ideological war in southern Africa loom large. The liberation struggle in southern Africa has begun. Freedom fighters representing the nonwhite majority are already on the offensive in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia and parts of South Africa. We should be supporting their struggle for freedom. Instead we find ourselves increasingly engaged on the wrong side. This extension of rights to South African Airways is just another accelerating step toward engagement on the wrong side of human justice and liberty.

This engagement with the suppressive regimes of southern Africa if it continues, will find us heavily involved on the wrong side in yet another country. We are not so naive to believe the development of American economic interest in South Africa does not carry with it the implied possibility of action to "safeguard" these interests at some date in the future. If that happens, then the just struggle for liberty and self-determination will take on unattractive overtones of race and ideology.

We cannot be comfortable with the knowledge that this new link with South Africa through the extension of South African Airways has just begun. The implications of this new engagement cannot be disregarded.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the subject, and also appreciate his alerting the members of the African Subcommittee to the fact that he would address the House.

I am sure the gentleman would not mind my making perhaps an observation just to keep the record clear.

Obviously the U.S. Government is not alone in granting air rights to the South African airline. I guess they do have an excessive area they serve; Australia, among others. They will be stopping in Brazil, I understand, on the flight up to New York.

It would seem we are following, rather than leading a trend of recognition—that is, through the CAB—of their service.

Is that not at least an accurate analysis?

Mr. DIGGS. Well, we need not follow the precedents of other countries with respect to granting of this airline per-

mit, if that is the gentleman's point. I can think of a lot of precedents that we have followed in the wake of policies of other countries from which I wish we could extricate ourselves. The situation discussed in the previous order, on our policy in Vietnam, is a classic example.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Again, if the gentleman will permit me, the thing which disturbs me is the fact that the CAB has a complicated enough procedure in and of itself. If it is to weigh our domestic political considerations or the domestic political complications in another land, this would place an intolerable burden on the technical problems which are in and of themselves quite great.

For example, I happen to be one of the Members who take a dim view of the Soviet airline flying into New York City, for reasons of the domestic policy of the Soviet Union.

Yet the CAB granted that permission over a year ago, and now the Soviets fly into New York. I think we are at the stage where we are faced with the facts of life. If in this particular case the South African airlines meet the technical criteria, I imagine on that basis the certificate was properly issued. This is an observation that I believe should be considered.

If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I was intrigued when the gentleman did advise us of his interest in this subject and pointed out the special concern he had that the South African Airways was completely owned by the Government of South Africa. Out of idle curiosity I did check all of the foreign airlines which have been granted permits to serve the United States and found something like 75 percent are entirely Government owned. So from a technical standpoint, at least, this fits the pattern. The lack of private enterprise investment is really not a major concern. I want to emphasize that I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his position and his responsibility in heading up our Subcommittee on Africa. I appreciate that he is always interested in having us probe these matters with as much objectivity as possible.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following list of the airlines I mentioned:

Percentage of ownership by foreign governments of airlines which have been granted permits to service the United States

[In percent]	
Argentina	100.00
Australia	100.00
Austria	79.58
Belgium (another 35 percent owned by Government in Congo)	65.00
Canada	100.00
Chile	100.00
Colombia	62.00
Costa Rica	33.33
Scandinavia (Norway, Sweden, and Denmark)	50.00
Dominican Republic	100.00
Finland	73.00
France	98.55
Germany	74.83
Guatemala	100.00
Honduras	19.00
India	100.00
Ireland	100.00

Percentage of ownership by foreign governments of airlines which have been granted permits to service the United States—Con.

[In percent]	
Israel	50.00
Italy	90.00
Jamaica	60.00
Japan	58.00
Mexico:	
Aeronaes	100.00
CMA	9.00
Netherlands	50.50
Netherlands Antilles	90.00
New Zealand	100.00
Nicaragua	10.00
Nigeria	100.00
Portugal	48.00
South Africa	100.00
Spain	100.00
Switzerland	30.00
Trinidad and Tobago	100.00
Union African et Malagache (12 African governments own a 6 percent share each)	72.00
United Kingdom	100.00
U.S.S.R.	100.00
Venezuela	55.00

Mr. DIGGS. Permit me to clarify my reference to the South African Government's ownership of the airline in question. It means that all policies controlling that airline, many of which are based on blatant racial discrimination, represent official South African Government policy. It is not a private enterprise over which the South African Government has no control.

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and to commend him for bringing to the attention of the House the matter of the South African Airways service to New York, which was inaugurated today.

As a member of the subcommittee, I am pleased that Chairman Diggs has indicated his intention to conduct a subcommittee investigation of the matter, if the CAB refuses to reopen the case.

I too am deeply disturbed about the implications of this decision in terms of our relations with other African states, and in the context of our own internal racial problems.

The United Nations General Assembly, in a 1962 resolution against apartheid in South Africa, specifically called upon the members of the United Nations "to refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and companies registered under South African laws." The CAB decision directly defies that resolution.

The South African Airways is a department in the South African Government's Railways and Harbours Administration, and thus is not only bound to follow the discriminatory policies of that Government, but is actually an integral part of it.

In my judgment, the U.S. Government should not expand official contact with the South African Government at this time, but should instead be reexamining those contacts which already exist.

In addition to these foreign policy implications, I am also concerned about the manner in which the decision was made by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and

question whether the public interest received adequate consideration.

It is my understanding that the testimony received on the proposed agreement was limited primarily, if not exclusively, to witnesses of airlines with direct private interest in extension of such service. On the basis of that investigation, the CAB unilaterally determined such service to be in the public interest, and submitted its recommendations to the President, who in turn issued an enabling order.

Since that time, representatives of the American Committee on Africa, the National Student Association, the United Automobile Workers, and the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church all have indicated their opposition to the order, and requested that the case be reopened to provide them an opportunity to present evidence as to why such service is not in the public interest.

President Nixon has already set a precedent for such action, in his reconsideration of the extended transpacific service, which was originally approved at the same time as the South African service.

I urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to reopen this case and am hopeful that the decision will be reversed in the best public interest.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there are several things disturbing about the authorization to South African Airways to initiate flights from South Africa to the United States.

The most disturbing is the way in which it reflects the growing engagement of our country with South Africa. It is often said that our relationships with South Africa are normal, and that in their normality we are neutral as to the internal affairs of the South African state. But "normal" relationships, as witnessed by the almost automatic award by the CAB of a landing permit to South African Airways, bring us closer and closer to acquiescence in the system of government in South Africa.

The administrative inertia set up by our agreements with South Africa compound the inevitable commercial pressure toward further engagement with South Africa. In the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and in the Department of Defense, our "normal" bureaucracy clears the way for a closer engagement with South African society and the South African Government.

In March 1968, for example, our Department of Commerce produced a report "Selling in the Republic of South Africa." This 16-page pamphlet facilitates the flow of American economic investment in South Africa. The American taxpayer, therefore, thus underwrites the continuation of a process of deeper engagement with South Africa.

An additional matter of concern with the award of a landing permit to South African Airways is the fact that this move by the South African Government—which owns the airline—marks the beginning of a new propaganda offensive in the United States. South Africa is seeking to clean up its name in international circles.

The South African Government is appealing to American tourists to visit South Africa in a very high-powered and high-financed public relations campaign. The South African advertisements are a cover up for racism. They are inviting only white Americans to use the facilities of South African Airways and to use the facilities in South Africa.

Not only will the average visitor, who will be mainly interested in the vacation aspects of his trip, be shown only the good side of South Africa, but he will come back and remark to others in his community as to how well he was treated by the white South Africans.

Since South Africa is a police state, these visitors will not see or hear the other side when they get there. Transit camps and black relocation areas are hidden in barren country far from the main centers. All nonwhite areas are off limits without an official permit. Not only will the U.S. tourist be unable to make inquiry to black South Africans about the social system in South Africa, but such inquiries, if made, would endanger the black South African, for they would be in violation of the laws of South Africa.

Even if a trip to South Africa does not mean conversion to a belief in its racialistic system, it does mean aid and comfort to the white South Africans instead of aid and comfort to the depressed black South Africans and to the freedom fighters who are now launching an offensive against the terrorism and suppression of the system.

There are other indications of the extent to which South Africa is prepared to go in its propaganda campaign. A recent issue of the South African Digest announced that the South African Tourist Corp. is about to launch its biggest overseas advertisement campaign in the United States. They plan to send a letter and brochure in a direct mailing to 250,000 Americans, 25 percent of which will be presidents of multimillion-dollar corporations and 40 percent of which earn more than \$40,000.

This is in addition to the almost \$2 million which has been budgeted by South African Airways for publicity related activities. South African Airways has engaged a Madison Avenue advertising agency, Harry W. Graff, Inc. Already enticing advertisements are appearing in the pages of Holiday magazine, Newsweek and the Sunday New York Times.

It is also worth noting the activities of the American-African Affairs Association. This group, which claims tax deductibility status, has, in fact, dedicated itself to the distribution of materials favorable to the racist regimes of southern Africa. In their recent report, they have indicated that they plan to expand their activities in the United States. Their budget for 1968 is about \$108,000, an increase of 40 percent from their 1968 budget. Their budget for publications is \$67,000, an increase of 80 percent over last year's.

This new propaganda offensive in the United States coincides with the new offensive of South Africa in southern Africa. I attach an article from the Tanzania Nationalist, which discusses the attempt of South Africa to create a coprosperity sphere in southern Africa.

Americans should be aware that the arrival of South African Airways in New York is only the beginning. It represents only part of the effort of South Africa to win friends for its vicious system of apartheid.

The article from the Tanzania Nationalist follows:

SOUTHERN AFRICAN COMMON MARKET

The white bloc in South Africa, consisting of the industrialists, financiers, farmers, landbarons, and intellectuals may differ amongst themselves on how best to keep down the 15 million oppressed. They continue arguing on this in their clubs and over copious cups of tea. But today there is one important area of agreement where Vorster sees eye to eye with the "progressive" Oppenheimer and that is the need for the establishment of a common market for Southern Africa.

This concept in its modern form originated in the fertile brain of the late Dr. Verwoerd, the architect of apartheid in its most brutal and vicious form. At first the Oppenheimers and the liberal establishment resisted the idea, not because they objected to it on principle, but with Verwoerd's apartheid policy having gained South Africa the well merited title of "The Polecat of the World" there was little chance of any state joining it voluntarily.

The common market pursued by the Pretoria planners since Verwoerd's death is visualized as consisting of South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Malawi and Zambia. This vast territory two million miles in extent world embrace 45 million people. The guiding principle governing the relationship of states in this common market would be based on political independence and economic interdependence. There would be no interference in the internal affairs of each state and they see believers in apartheid. (They prefer to call it separate development) working side by side with African states happily for mutual benefit. In fact, Vorster in his New Year's message forecast an era of unprecedented prosperity of black and white states of Southern Africa if they came together to fight "Communist terrorism."

The Pretoria planners argue rather eloquently that South Africa is linked with the rest of Southern Africa not only through trade but in other ways. Zambia for instance is connected by road and rail via Rhodesia. A gas pipe line through more than a thousand miles from Mozambique to the Transvaal. The giant Caborra scheme aimed at supplying electricity will strengthen the links further. The three ex-High Commission territories now independent use the South African currency. A road is being constructed from Cape Town to Luanda in Angola.

NEW ERA

These Pretoria planners while not blinking an eyelid at the brutal and inhuman exploitation of the millions in their own country, enthusiastically point out that with the formation of the common market a new era would dawn for all. There would be joint exploitation of international rivers, joint efforts at water and soil conservation and joint efforts at eradicating stock disease. There is certainly no shortage of "joint efforts", all of which are just paper blueprints.

In this scheme, there is little attempt to hide that it will be South Africa which will be the leader and pacesetter. Said Vorster arrogantly in only November 1968 at a rally in Nigal: "We are of Africa; we understand Africa and nothing is going to prevent us from becoming leaders of Africa in every field." The first step in this grandiose plan is to see that the Southern African common market becomes a reality.

Before we examine the implications of the Southern African market which will include

almost a third of Africa, let us examine the mini common market that has been in existence for sixty eight years between South Africa and the three ex-High Commission territories now Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

There is no need to emphasize that the people in those three territories had nothing to do with this. This customs union was foisted on to the three territories by British imperialism when it handed over political control to the whites of South Africa in 1910.

Its essential features have not altered to this day. The four aspects of this agreement are:

1. The maintenance of a common external customs tariff.
2. Free interchange for manufactured products of South Africa and the territories.
3. Payment by South Africa to the territories of a share of the total pool of customs revenue.
4. Conformity by the territories to the relevant tariff laws of South Africa.

In 1967, South Africa collected K300 million in customs and duties. Its share was 98.6% of the total. To put it differently it retained K296.1 million and gave the three states together K3.9 million. Of this Lesotho got K1.48 million; Swaziland K1.21 million and Botswana had to be content with K1.1 million.

The sheer inequality and the daylight robbery can only be gauged if we examine the estimated budgets of the four territories in the period 1967/68.

South Africa: estimated revenue K1438 million; Botswana K14.00 million; Lesotho K6.3 million and Swaziland K7.0 million.

This rich state can measure its revenue in terms of over a thousand million Kwacha, grabbed a lion's share and dropped a few crumbs to the three countries. This then is Vorster's idea of unprecedented prosperity for "Black" states.

The customs union envisages a free exchange of manufactured goods between South Africa and the three countries. It does not include primary products. But the three territories have no industry to speak of. The British government saw to that. Lesotho for instance had its first industry when a quarry was established with South African capital. In fact this provision had only one aim and that was to benefit South Africa for it allowed South African manufactured goods free entry in these three countries.

LION SHARE

But this free entry of South African goods came at a time when South Africa was developing its own secondary industry and therefore imposed tariffs on all foreign goods to protect this industry. What this in effect meant was that Botswana for instance was prevented from buying a blanket from Britain for K1.10 and paying K1.50 to South African manufacturers for a similar one.

The protection of secondary industry weighed heavily against the South African primary producers like the farmers. The result was that the South African government granted heavy subsidies to its local farmers. But these subsidies did not apply to the farmers in the three territories. Thus the latter had to pay 50% extra on a 100 lb. of flour and K1.25 on every 100 lb. of sugar.

And as far as the South African manufacturers were concerned they benefit for they were protected by a duty of 25% on clothing and soap; 30% on boots and shoes, and 20% on hardware and furniture. But the people in the territories lost correspondingly for the goods landed at a higher price, without the governments benefiting.

To illustrate what this means, let us take an example. In 1966, Botswana imported K12 million worth of goods from South Africa representing 65% of the total in that year. Her exports were negligible. If what she in fact has been paying to subsidise the South African manufacturers she imposed

a duty of 25% then on that alone she would receive revenue to the tune of K3. million. This is treble the amount of what she is at present getting from South Africa.

The imposition of this tax would make no difference to the standard of living for that is what she is paying now to buy South African manufactured goods. Her export to South Africa would not be subjected similarly for these are small, for Botswana has a large unfavourable trade with her powerful neighbour. It is not that Botswana, a leading cattle country has nothing to export to South Africa. Rather Botswana has been prevented from entering the highly profitable and lucrative market of selling her beef by the imposition of stiff quotas. This is being done to protect South Africa's own farmers.

The Pretoria "visionaries" are loud in their protestations that in the common market all relations would be conducted on a basis of equality. But what is the position in actual practice? In a common market, there is to be free movement of labour between the territories. But the citizens of the three newly independent states have learnt the hard way that independence has not altered one iota of South Africa's attitude to them. They are treated in the same way as the Vorster treats the oppressed blacks in South Africa. They are subjected to the rigours of the pass laws. Group areas Acts and Job Reservations. They are subject to the same humiliations and indignities as their 15 million black brethren who are still unfree.

No one could rightfully accuse Sir Seretse Khama of being an enemy of Vorster. He has stressed again and again that his relation with South Africa is good. But even he has complained. "If we go into South Africa officially, we do not know there is such a thing as apartheid—we are treated in the same way as we treat all people in Botswana. But if a non-diplomat crosses the border, he is immediately hit by discrimination. The "non-diplomats" Sir Seretse is referring to are the 50,000 Botswana who are driven to work in Vorster's South Africa.

This mini common market has been ruinous to the territories. Not only were they unable to develop their own secondary industry, but they were subject to legalised plunder for over sixty eight years. They have been bled white by the iniquitous customs agreement of 1910. Vorster rushed to grant Malawi a loan of K8 million. To the world at large he gave the impression that he was the blood donor. But that is not so for it is the three territories who are the true donors, for he has given to Malawi funds which he has appropriated from the three territories.

MINI MARKET

The Vorsters believe that the emergent African states attitude to economics is the same as in the mercantilist era where cattle, sheep and land were bartered for a few beads and trinkets. They believe the intricacies of high finance are beyond the comprehension of the African states. They believe that with a few concessions here and there to the governments they would keep quiet. But in this they are mistaken.

The three governments have seen through this agreement and they want a revision. But the Vorsters so keen to peddle the idea of a southern common market are in no haste despite repeated requests. Said Sir Seretse Khama in opening the third session of the National Assembly in Gaborone: "Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland are not finding it easy to negotiate a more favourable customs agreement with South Africa. In view of the frequently desire for friendly co-operation by South African government, I am hopeful for an imminent and successful conclusion to the present negotiations in the spirit of good neighbourliness . . ." And turning to Africa he added "In the meantime, Botswana will continue to ex-

plore means of improving trade relations with other African countries."

In two important respects, Southern Africa is tied to the apron strings of the Vorsters and Oppenheimers. These are through capital and labour. Although no precise figures are available for each country, it is well known that giant monopolies like the Anglo-American, Rembrandt, General Mining and other institutions like the Netherlands Bank, SANTAM have subsidiaries or branches in these territories. In Botswana these would be prospecting for diamonds and coal. In Angola and Mozambique, it is for oil. Some of the large capital projects like the Kunene Oxbow, and the Giant Caborra Bassa Dam are being backed with South African finance. Lesotho's first industrial enterprise, a quarry has been established with South African capital. In Swaziland one third of the country's agricultural exports are from South African farmers operating there.

Zambia has about K100 million invested mainly in the copper mines. In Rhodesia such has been the massive penetration of South African capital that the people in high places refer to Rhodesia's and South Africa's economies as being complementary which is another way of saying that this country has become the satellite of South Africa. And Smith has been told that should he settle with Wilson, then he could expect another "bonus" of over K100 million just waiting to be invested. Over K200 million is lying idle in South Africa and the financiers are reluctant to invest because the climate is not proper.

CHEAP LABOR

It was British imperialism that tied the various Southern African territories to the South African mining economy. This was over seventy years ago and they had to supply cheap labour to the then and now the largest industry in Africa. This employs over half a million workers ranking it in the same category as the auto industry in the USA. The tie was based on recruited system of labour and the worker was sent back to territories once there was no use for him.

Recruitment was developed into a fine art WANELA (Witwatersrand Recruiting Organisation) not reluctant to use aircraft to transport the thousands of workers from the most inaccessible places to the mines. In 1965, it was estimated that South Africa used 497,000 workers from outside of the territories of which 294,000 were recruited. A partial breakup of the latter figures show where the labour was recruited.

Lesotho: 61,000; Botswana: 20,000; Malawi: 30,000; Mozambique: 102,000 and Swaziland: 12,000.

These are figures of recruited labour only. Lesotho for instance with a population of 700,000 (1965) sent out 180,000 to work in South Africa. Malawi has over 80,000 of its citizens there, while Sir Seretse Khama has estimated that 50,000 of his citizens are in South Africa. Zambia on the attainment of independence stopped this recruitment to the anger of WANELA.

Today South Africa is proud when it is described as "the only industrial complex, south of Milan. It already produces 3.5 million tons of steel, uses 57% of the continent's electricity. It also boasts that its group industrial production is 80% of the entire continent. And there is no shortage of money in the large finance houses in South Africa. Oppenheimer who was not able to find a mere K20 million to expand the copper mining in Zambia and therefore had to borrow from Japan on unfavourable terms is building a mammoth complex of steel plants worth K117 million in the Transvaal. The financiers have plenty of capital to export.

This surplus capital has been generated due to an ingenious system of exploitation unparalleled anywhere in the world. Should

this be used anywhere else in the world, there would have been a scandal long ago. But it was possible in South Africa for the exploited people were black and those who benefited were the white financiers.

British imperialism evolved this system in the era of Rhodes and all the successive South African governments have continued with this outrage known as the migratory labour system.

It is well known that it is the labour power of the workers that create any wealth in society. But for the labour power to be generated continuously the worker has to be fed, housed and clothed. His wage is intended to cover that. But since it has to be continuous over generations this wage is intended to cover food, clothing and housing for the children and wife as well. It is on this that the minimum wage is calculated. Wives and children are included because they will provide the labour force of the future when the worker is himself too old to work.

MINIMUM WAGE

But the South African migratory system gets out of that in the most cunning way. They provide food clothing and shelter as long as he is in employment, and exclude his wife and children from their calculation, for they are hundreds of miles away. Under the migratory system the wives and children are left in the reserves or in the territories. Here they may have a patch of ground and a few animals if they are lucky. With that they have to feed for themselves. The worker on the completion of the contract joins them for a few weeks when economic considerations force him back to the land.

In practical terms this is how it works out. A white miner on the average gets K 140 a month. This is what the Oppenheimers regard as a minimum wage to feed, house and clothe himself and his family. But an African miner only gets K 14 a month. This is what the Oppenheimers think an African needs to clothe, feed and house himself. The apologists try to explain the difference by saying that the one is skilled and the other unskilled. That is not true for it is the blacks who do the skilled jobs in the mines.

In any event the ratio between the skilled and unskilled workers is that the latter gets 80% of the former in mines in Australia, Canada and America. Thus from the capitalists own standards, the Oppenheimers are guilty of the worst possible cheating known to modern history. They are guilty of pinching from the mouths of black children and their mothers. They take what belong to the worker's wives and children and pocket these in the form of higher dividends and increased profits. From the proceeds of this legalised robbery, they hand out a few thousands to various cultural, scientific and artistic bodies in order to worm their way as patrons of these.

The South African state legalises this robbery in a hundred ways, by not only enforcing this migratory system, but heaping law upon law specifically designed at controlling and suppressing him. Apart from the taxes, it shares in the exploitation in another way.

The task of a modern state is to see to it that those who produce the wealth in society are provided with certain basic essentials, necessary for their existence and development. Thus in all modern societies, provision is made in the budgets for the establishment of schools, hospitals, clinics, roads and other means of communications. But there is no such provision in the South African budget for the 497,000 migrant workers and their families. It is the territories to provide for all that for the worker and his family. When the children are grown up, that is when they are in a position to contribute to society by their own labour, South Africa now steps in and snatches them.

They are put to work to create the wealth for South Africa. They remain there as long

as they have the labour powers to create the wealth. Once they are sick, from the miners pthisis, or become too old to work, then they are dumped back to the territories. In other societies these workers get a pension, but then South Africa does not regard them as those who should get pensions. In any event it is the territories responsibility. They have to look after him till he dies.

The South African state makes the best of both worlds. It squeezes labour from about half a million workers without accepting one iota of responsibility. It appropriates the surplus which the worker generates while it gives to others the responsibility of care at a time when he cannot contribute to the society.

One of the reasons why the economies of these countries are not developed is precisely because the able bodied men who would produce the wealth in society are in South Africa.

STEP LADDER

The money which the South African state saves is really money that belongs to the territories. If it gives aid to Malawi, it is in fact giving what really belongs to the territories. It is appropriation of such surplus that South Africa from being a mere semi-colony has become one of the developed nations of the world. If it has climbed high then its step ladder has been the backs and shoulders of the African people.

It is this relationship which it wants to entrench in the Southern African common market. South Africa wants the black worker in the most productive years of his life, while before and after that is when young and old, the territories will be responsible. In this way, South Africa will become richer and richer while its "partners in the common market" will become poorer and poorer. In this way, South Africa hopes to dominate Africa, and at the same time become one of the richest countries in the world.

One obstacle that stands in the way of Vorster and his financiers schemes is ZAMBIA. Unlike some of the leaders of African states who have publicly stated their desire to join such a community," Zambia has made it clear that it will have none of it. This is despite the fact that departing imperialism had tied her economy to that of the south.

Zambia being landlocked had to rely on the south both for her imports and exports. Zambia began to look for alternative routes and when Smith illegally seized power in Rhodesia, Zambia realized how right it was in its original suggestion for Smith had blackmailed her on a number of measures. It was that Dr. Kaunda had in mind when accepting the principle of the construction of the TANZAM railway he said: "All we want to see is TANZAM railway being built so that we are never again dependent on the route to the south." Zambia thus looked to the North to Tanzania and the other East African states for co-operation and large regional unity.

The Pretorian planners cannot view the direction that Zambia is pursuing with alarm and hatred. It threatens their grandiose schemes and to reduce them to mere bubbles.

Firstly, on the attainment of independence, Zambia stopped WANELA, that recruiting organization from the Chamber of mines from operating in her territory. It rightly regarded it as an insult to the dignity of the young nation. But more was involved. In taking this action, Zambia was saying that it was possible for Zambians to live a life free from insult, discrimination, and degradation. WANELA's road was one where the workers would be doomed to lead a life of unskilled workers with a miserable wage. The new way that Zambia showed was that although there would be initial difficulty, it would be one where they could rise to the highest in Zambia society.

Now what worries WANELA and the others is not the number of those recruited, for in the overall picture these were small and hence could easily be replaced. But it was the principle of it. If Zambia could cut this tie forged by imperialism and get away with it, then other states who believed that they would become bankrupt if they stopped labour would also follow suit. If this came about, the whole edifice on which this system of exploitation had been built would indeed be in serious jeopardy. It would seriously affect the long term strategy of dominating Africa.

Secondly, Zambia is the only country whose resources are such that if and when completely harnessed could be a real competitor to South Africa. At present South Africa's revenue for her 18 million people is about K 1400 million (1968); Zambia with her 4 million stands at K 300 million, which is almost the same in relation to the population. In comparison, the total amount for Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland is under K 30 million.

REAL COMPETITOR

Today, despite South Africa's outward prosperity, there is increased poverty not only for the blacks which is well known, but also for the whites. The Tomlinson Committee's Report recently (not to be confused with the Tomlinson Commission's report) stated that half of the South Africa's farmers are bankrupt. Amongst other things, one of the chief factors has been the high cost of land. In this respect Zambia's agricultural policy is superior to that of South Africa, for it is based in co-operatives with state ownership of land.

Thirdly, Zambia through her deeds has shown what an independent African state can do if it has the resources. At present there are 70,000 Africans in secondary and high schools in South Africa. This is Vorster's boast of what he has done for the Africans. But this is almost after over sixty years of rule for over 13 million people. Zambia with less than a third of the population has 40,000 in this category within four years. It shows that Zambia is really interested, while in South Africa education growth has been deliberately stunted.

However, the biggest crime in their eyes is that Zambia has gone ahead with Tanzania and China to build the railway line. This was unpardonable in their eyes, for they have let China in the area which was regarded as the British sphere of influence.

TIE UP

It is for this reason that their strategy is one destruction of Zambia as a nation state. They would much prefer to change the government constitutionally through Mr. Nkumbula and hence alter its course. But failing that other means will be resorted to one of them being secession.

In this plan for a Southern African common market, the Vorsters have the backing of imperialism. It is not only that Britain and America have investments 70% of the total investments in South Africa, but also for military reasons. Vorster has been allotted the role to act as the policeman to safeguard their interests in Central, East and Southern Africa.

To the west, South Africa's strategic importance has been highlighted by the closure of the Suez Canal and the decision of Britain to withdraw her forces East of Suez. This leaves a vacuum in the western global strategy and it is here that South Africa is expected to fill the breach.

There is the Simonstown Agreement between Britain and South Africa to patrol the East and South Coast of Africa. Selwyn Lloyd, the architect of the agreement was royally received in his recent visit to South Africa. The Vorsters are banking on a conservative party victory to give full force to this agreement. Further, there is also a project defence

pact between France, Portugal and South Africa to guard the East and South Coast of Africa using France's naval base at Madagascar. The west knows too well that South Africa in Simonstown has a dry dock that is capable of handling heavy guided missile cruisers, while the one in Cape Town can service aircraft carriers and super tankers of 90,000 tons.

The aim of the Pretoria planners of the Southern Africa market is but a reflection of the needs of the South African white bourgeoisie. The common market will help to consolidate the system migratory labour, while at the same time it would be stable area of investment and a large hinterland to dump its manufactured goods. In this association, it will be South Africa which will play a dominant role, while the African states would be treated as very, very poor relations. The relationship which exists between it now and the three ex-High Commission territories is what it wishes to incorporate to the rest of Southern Africa. But this can only mean progressive enrichment of South Africa and the progressive impoverishment of the rest.

But the Pretoria planners and the financiers whose interests they serve in no uncertain terms, are mistaken. For one thing Zambia through Dr. Kaunda stated that there could be no compromise on principles. Vorster cannot come to a conference table after having wiped his boots on the necks of the 15 million oppressed people.

BURNING DESIRE

They also ignore the burning desire of the oppressed people of Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa to be free. Armed struggles have already been launched in these areas and in the two territories of Mozambique and Angola large areas have been liberated. All these are dealing death blows to their grandiose schemes.

This does not mean that a Southern African community will not arise in the future. It will and must arise. But it will be when S. Africa will be rid of the minority regimes and where new governments will arise based on the popular will of all the people irrespective of race, colour and creed.

In such a community, the nations will gather as equals, and discuss and plan as equals. That will be a really genuine Southern African community which will serve the interest of the inhabitants of their territories.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to join my colleague and chairman of the Foreign Affairs African Subcommittee today in support of his call for a reopening of the case of the permit granted last year by the Civil Aeronautics Board to South African Airways to fly into New York. It is the most direct route between South Africa and the United States permitted to date, and I am deeply concerned that its authorization has diminished our dedication to justice in the eyes of black Africans and black Americans alike.

Although the right of South Africa to fly into the United States was established by a reciprocity protocol under an agreement between the two Governments in 1947—a year before apartheid became the national policy of the Republic of South Africa—no route was defined. Since then this policy of injustice has become common knowledge, yet in 1968 the Johnson administration agreed to amend the 1947 agreement and define a specific air route for South Africa. This was the time for a review of the basic agreement, in light of the situation in

South Africa. Yet on November 7, 1968, the certification of a Johannesburg-New York air route was issued to South African Airways.

The permit to South African Airways has far greater implications than a mere commercial bid for business by an airline. It involves an action that can easily be interpreted by sensitive observers not only in Africa but also in the United States as official "sanction" of the system of apartheid which prevails in all institutions under the direct control of the Government of South Africa. South African Airways is administered by the Minister of Transport as a subdivision of the South African Government. Given the nature of the segregated and discriminatory conditions which exist in South Africa, the extensive advertising campaign being waged for American tourism is a bid for white tourism.

This policy of discrimination is in direct contradiction to the goals we have espoused and the progress that has been made by the civil rights legislation passed by the Congress. It is, in addition, in direct contradiction to our efforts in the foreign policy area to strengthen our relationship with the African nations. In the then Vice President Nixon's report on his trip to Africa in 1957 he said:

The understanding of the principles for which we stand as a nation is a tremendous asset to us in this area. The maintenance of (our) . . . prestige . . . will depend upon whether the people of the Continent continue to understand our dedication to the principles of independence (and) equality . . . to which they are so deeply devoted.

I certainly agree that progress to eliminate discrimination in the United States is vital to our good relations with Africa. Just as important, however, is that the need to demonstrate the sincerity of the principles we espouse extends beyond our efforts at home. We must also oppose discrimination in Africa itself, and a reexamination of permit to South African Airways would be an important step in this direction.

Section 402(b) of the Federal Aviation Act requires that a permit be granted if "such transportation will be in the public interest." As I have suggested, there is considerable doubt that the South African Airway route is truly in the public interest. Although the law requires furthermore, a public hearing when a permit such as that granted to South African Airways is under consideration, the general public learned of this action only after it had been completed. The public has, I feel, a direct stake in the basic issues involved in the granting of this permit and should be afforded every opportunity to give full and careful consideration to the case and to make itself heard.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and fellow Detroit, CHARLES C. DIGGS, for his leadership in this special order to protest the initiation of direct flights from South Africa to New York. His speech today is a small addition to his already outstanding record as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His constituents and black Americans across the country

greatly appreciate his action in bringing this very serious matter to the floor of the House of Representatives.

My colleague has eloquently stated our opposition to the granting of facilities at the John F. Kennedy International Airport, or any American airport. I join him and the American Committee on Africa in requesting that the Civil Aeronautics Board reconsider its decision to permit South African Airways the right to land at Kennedy Airport. Of all the places in the world with which the United States does not need a direct link, South Africa is undoubtedly the most undesirable. The Civil Aeronautics Board has certainly gone far beyond its authority as an agency of the United States in issuing a foreign air carrier permit to South African Airways—a firm which bears the name of, and is based in a country which we have severely condemned for its policy of apartheid. I have not found during my service in the Congress that the CAB has the right to make foreign policy.

The utter lack of consideration for the African nations with which we are friends is obvious. Some of these countries are in imminent danger of infringement of their territorial rights by South Africa and are no doubt appalled by this gesture of friendship toward South Africa. Direct flights between South Africa and the United States can only serve to heighten tensions in that area and to impair our own diplomatic relations with the African nations who abhor South Africa and everything it symbolizes.

I cannot express the frustration and disgust I have for the ludicrous idea of permitting anything that smacks of South African apartheid into the United States. Do we not have enough racial problems in the United States without seeking to create others? No black man is welcome in South Africa—are we going to see separate ticket counters instituted for white Americans who want to travel to South Africa and black Americans who want to go elsewhere? Or perhaps separate waiting rooms? It is bad enough that there are American airlines who fly to South Africa at all. I would hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board would not only rescind the permit to South African Airways and to Pan American Airways for flights to South Africa, but that it would not even consider issuing such rights to any other airline which operates in the United States, whether domestic or foreign.

I certainly hope that the CAB will hold public hearings on this matter and reconsider the issuance of this permit to South African Airways, so that the matter will not require a full-scale congressional investigation. I am gratified, however, to know that the distinguished chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has offered to the American Committee on Africa and all other aggrieved persons the recourse of an investigation by his subcommittee should the CAB fail to act in the public interest.

March 26 is, indeed, a dreadful day for America, especially for black America as it marks a beginning of a tie between our country and one which stands against

everything in which we believe. My opposition to these flights will not end until I know that the last South African Airway flight from New York has left and that no more shall come.

MOORHEAD AND 33 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ASK FOR VIETNAM MILITARY REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago—on March 11, 1968—when there were press stories to the effect that the military was requesting an additional 206,000 troops in Vietnam, several of our colleagues joined me in cosponsoring a resolution that provided:

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe that our resolution made a contribution to the decision against further escalation of the war in Vietnam. Less than 3 weeks later the decision to restrict the bombing was announced and the initial steps were taken which led to the opening of the Paris peace talks.

The peace talks have been in progress for 10 months and Mr. Nixon has been in office for 2 months; yet the level of the war and, more importantly, the level of American participation in it continues unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, the time has again come for Congress to make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to express to the administration the desire of the American people to begin the process of deescalation of the American military effort.

Accordingly, on behalf of myself and 33 cosponsors I am today introducing another very brief resolution which provides:

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

I invite all Members who believe that the time has come to begin the deescalation of our military involvement in Vietnam to join with me in introducing similar resolutions.

The following Members cosponsored Mr. MOORHEAD's concurrent resolution: JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN H. DENT, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, JACOB H. GILBERT, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, EDWARD I. KOCH, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, ABNER J. MIKVA, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY T. MINK, JOHN E. MOSS, BERTRAM PODELL, THOMAS M. REES, HENRY S. REUSS, PETER W. RODINO, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, JEROME R. WALDIE, CHARLES H. WILSON, and GUS YATRON.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) in cosponsoring his resolution expressing the sense of Congress

that the United States should make every effort to bring a reduction of our military involvement in Vietnam.

Obviously, because of the current situation where we are undertaking three offensive actions to forestall a threatened massive attack by the North Vietnamese, we recognize that immediate implementation of our objective is difficult. Military necessities and the need to protect our valiant servicemen fighting there now preclude precipitous withdrawal of troops.

But I most strongly believe that we must begin to bring home our U.S. and allied military forces as rapidly as possible. We all hope, I know, that the Paris negotiations—both the formal meetings and the private talks—will result in a settlement. In the meantime, however, we should not hesitate to begin a reduction of our military commitment to the maximum extent feasible without jeopardizing our young men now engaged in combat in the cause of freedom and independence for South Vietnam.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania which I hope will win prompt approval. It is right and proper at this time that Congress express its support of ending the Vietnam conflict by negotiation, not escalation.

A year ago this month I wrote the President and stood here in the House to urge that our Nation take the initiative in seeking a speedy resolution to the war which held the threat of steady expansion with no end in sight. Much has changed and yet little has changed in the long, tortuous months since then. The battles continue with their grim toll of suffering and death to our gallant young men and the helpless people of Vietnam. It is obvious that victory belongs to neither side, that the war is not winnable by either side. Clearly it is time to bring to the Paris talks the intensity of purpose, the sense of urgency for peace with which mankind always pursues military effort. The stakes are too high for us not to seize boldly this moment to work out a compromise settlement in Paris. Let us approve this resolution as an indication of the earnest desire of the American people for a genuinely negotiated settlement at Paris without protracted haggling and hair-splitting.

Over and above all men must learn in this nuclear age to substitute the rule of force with the rule of law. It has been truly said that what people can get in terms of a rule of law would contribute more to their security than what they have stockpiled in the form of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, when the Nixon administration took office, we looked to it for new initiatives to end the war in Vietnam. The President was unburdened by old commitments and imprudent allegiances. His newness gave him momentum. But more than 2 months have passed and it is difficult to discern a change in policy, either in Paris or on the battlefield. Some 300 of our young men are dying every week. Surely the casualties alone are ample reason for rushing this war to an end.

I cannot conceal, Mr. Speaker, my growing disappointment with the administration's failure to achieve peace. I think it is now time that Congress suspend its silence, lest the new government overlook our concern or mistake the nature of the mandate it received last December. Peace is the first order of business of our Government. It must not be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined a number of my colleagues who feel the same way I do in sponsoring a resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam. Almost exactly a year ago, I cosponsored a resolution in Congress "that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam." I believe our resolution then made some contribution to the decision against further escalation. The time has come for Congress to again make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. We must turn our efforts toward ending the war and to giving priority to the crises in our cities—to the needs of the poor, the hungry, and minority groups at home. I repeat, peace should be the first order of business of our Government.

SOME PERSPECTIVE ON "RIGHTS"—OUR RIGHTS COMPARED WITH OTHER'S RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the cavalier and uncaring attitude which some of our comfortable, affluent free citizens have assumed relative to the "freedoms" and "rights" of other human beings on our little planet.

I once understood that early Americans fiercely fought for certain individual freedoms and rights—albeit for themselves.

I once understood that our Nation fought and sacrificed the cream of her men and resources in several wars to defend and preserve certain individual rights and freedoms, for others—the French, the Belgians, the English, the Greeks, the Turks, the Filipinos, the Koreans, and others.

Once these freedoms and rights were as important as life and death to ourselves, our families, our countrymen, and others. Certainly if they were important to us, they were important to others.

Today there are individuals and groups of persons who know so little about a society devoid of those personal freedoms and individual rights and assume unconcernedly that they do not appreciate their rights and freedoms. These people take them for granted—or naively assume that they will remain inviolate forever.

There is also a cabal of malcontents and misfits who rant and rave and threaten to bring huge campuses or cities to a standstill because some fancied privilege must be slightly impinged in an ordered society.

There is a coterie of people who are so cozy and satisfied with their cherished

rights and freedom that they are not interested in helping others to secure comparable freedom or to preserve their rights because it would cost them something or interrupt their comfortable way of life.

I do not pretend to know all about an existence without freedoms or the best means to safeguard and preserve any particular rights. However, I speak with some experience and study. I spent 14 months under a totalitarian dictatorship—in a Nazi prison camp—where my individual rights and freedoms were severely restricted, although not nearly so completely curtailed as in Russia, China, or North Vietnam today. We may hate war with a vengeance; but we would hate even more the abolition of individual freedoms, if we only knew.

We, in the United States, probably enjoy more personal freedoms and individual rights than any other citizenry in recorded history. Just to mention a few—freedom of speech, which is so free that one can libel public officials, utter outrageous obscenities in public, or send vulgar pornography through the U.S. mails with impunity. Freedom of assembly—so free that large groups are often permitted to crowd others from public streets and buildings, even from private business property. Freedom of travel—so free that we can go anywhere without a single question asked or a single credential required. The right of privacy—no one can enter our home or touch our person, or tap our telephone, or inspect our bank account or tax returns, without our consent. The right to own and bear arms for the protection of one's self, family and property. The right of "habeas corpus"—a fundamental right "to have the body produced"—to require the presentation of a person for inspection or inquiry whether he be jailed, hospitalized or institutionalized; to ascertain where a deceased person is buried.

Freedom of the press—so free that reporters and photographers can report the minutest detail of our defenses—troop strength and condition at Khe Sanh—for not only their own profit but for enemy edification. The right of equal opportunity in education, public accommodations, jobs, voting, and office holding. The right to pursue a business of one's choice. Freedom from having militia quartered in one's home or business. Freedom from search and seizure of one's person, home or property. Freedom of religion—to practice and express one's personal religious convictions and to attend the church of one's choice—so free that one can criticize, even condemn, another's religious convictions with impunity. Political freedom—so free that anyone can advocate and practice any political philosophy he chooses. The right to vote by secret ballot. The right to seek and hold public office; the right to publicly criticize public officials—from unpaid irrigation district directors to the President. The right to petition the Government for redress of grievances. The right to sue our own Government. Freedom to marry whomever we please—and the right to rear our children in almost any manner we desire. The right to work or not to work. The right to own property

and to sell or exchange it at our own prerogative. The right to inherit property and the right to give it away. Freedom from arrest without a warrant or good cause. The right of reasonable bail and freedom from self-incrimination. Freedom from conviction without due process of law. The right to a speedy trial by a jury of one's peers. The right to be confronted by one's accuser and the right to call witnesses in one's defense. The right to equal protection of the laws regardless of sex, political party, religious persuasion, race, economic or social status, national origin, or age. Freedom from imprisonment for debt or political activity.

No other nation or citizenry has ever enjoyed so many rights or freedoms—or even a substantial portion of them.

It seems preposterous that anyone would do anything to destroy the system that has guaranteed these innumerable rights for so long. But many persons are doing just that—some intentionally, some unknowingly. Some who insist that all our rights and freedoms be preserved for their own benefit are absolutely unwilling to lift a little finger to insure these rights for others.

Students, for instance, have often asserted their "right to protest" and "academic freedom" to the extent of vulgarities, the interruption of the study of others, and the destruction of property simply because university officials denied absurd and outrageous demands.

Even the slightest imagined infringement of one right or one freedom brings howls from the mass media, massive demonstrations, sheets of petitions.

It seems strangely and terribly incongruous that the very people who are so quick to protest and demonstrate about the least impingement of one of their innumerable rights here, are the least concerned about the total, complete annihilation of every one of these individual rights and personal freedoms in the Communist countries of Russia, China, and Cuba, and North Vietnam.

In North Vietnam a citizen does not possess or enjoy a single one of the rights, freedoms, or privileges that we take for granted. No privacy—they can expect a knock on the door at any hour of the day or night—or more likely, governmental intrusion without even a knock. No right of assembly or petition; no freedom of speech or press. No one can travel 10 miles without close inspection and thorough verification of credentials. If a friend or relative disappears in a Communist country, there is no right or possibility that his body or burial place can be viewed or located. Jury trials and bail are unknown. Only the Communist elite could own property and this can be confiscated without notice. Even one's children are likely to be removed from the home. It is not simply a matter of a few rights being abolished; most freedoms which we have long enjoyed were never known; none are exercisable. Even if some semblance of a right is temporarily acknowledged or permitted, no right or freedom is secure. No right or freedom is guaranteed by written constitution or the consent of the governed.

It is little wonder that most human

beings would rather fight than exist under a system without even the most elemental individual freedom or personal right. In fact, what would there be to live for without the freedoms and rights which we take for granted—or which we expect our fellow citizens to preserve and defend for us.

Persons who have once known personal freedoms, individual rights and liberty, and then lost them, are likely to fight to the death to regain them whenever the opportunity presents itself—the Indonesians, the Hungarians, the Israelis. How can we become so exercised when one of our myriad rights is impinged, yet be so totally uncaring when all rights and freedoms of others are being completely destroyed?

If all of our rights and freedoms were being totally obliterated, would we solicit or welcome assistance?

I believe each of us should take a little time to contemplate the condition of our own personal existence if we were forced to live under the conditions now existing under a Communist regime—Russia, China, North Vietnam, or Czechoslovakia. Such a situation is almost impossible for us to imagine—but I believe you would rebel, you would seek assistance, and you would be eternally grateful for any aid. Ask yourself if you would want to be in the vanguard for assisting other human beings who are existing under terror and oppression without any of our personal liberties, individual freedoms and inalienable rights.

Before we abandon other people or nations who are struggling for the most basic of the many rights we enjoy, should we not consider what we would expect of them if our situations were reversed? Or should we perish such a thought?

SAGINAW, MICH., ALL-AMERICA CITY FOR 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, along with at least 10 other Members of this body, this is an exceedingly proud moment for me. It is with the greatest of pride to bring to the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives the selection of the city of Saginaw, Mich., as an All-America City for 1969. Only 11 cities are chosen each year by the National Municipal League and Look magazine to receive this distinguished nationwide honor.

I could not be prouder of my "hometown" and its 100,000 citizens who brought this tremendous honor to our community. Like many communities, Saginaw has had its difficulties, its differences, and its turmoil in recent years. Some old matters still must be resolved, others must be improved, and new situations must be confronted and conquered.

But, like thousands of others, Saginaw is trying and it was primarily for a complete community effort in bettering and easing race relations that it was one of the cities selected.

No one claims that Saginaw is a utopia. Not just yet. But Saginaw may well achieve that impossible dream in later years, because it already possesses the

most important ingredients—good, solid people.

In behalf of all Saginawians, I would also like to take this opportunity to "tip our hat" to the other 10 winners: Edinburg, Tex.; Savannah, Ga.; Snyder, Tex.; Jacksonville, Fla.; San Diego, Calif.; Cottage Grove, Oreg.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Danville, Ky.; Charlotte, N.C.; and New Albany, Ind.

CULVER PROPOSES TAX REFORM TO BENEFIT LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which will reduce the tax burdens on those individuals least able to pay taxes at the present level and still provide a decent living for their families—the low- and moderate-income taxpayer.

This legislation would increase the minimum standard deduction from \$200 plus \$100 for each exemption to \$600—\$300 for a married person filing separately—plus \$100 for each exemption. Because the present ceiling of \$1,000—\$500 for a married person filing separately—will be retained, the costs in lost revenue of this bill will be limited. Furthermore, the ceiling will insure that low- and moderate-income taxpayers—not those whose incomes place them in high brackets—will be the sole beneficiaries of this measure. Finally, the increased minimum standard deduction will enable many low-income taxpayers to shift from the complex itemizing procedure to the simple standard deduction procedure.

Under existing law taxable income is computed by subtracting a taxpayer's allowable deductions and personal exemptions from adjusted gross income. As an alternative to itemizing his allowable deductions, a taxpayer may elect to claim a standard deduction equal to 10 percent of his adjusted gross income up to a maximum of \$1,000. A separate minimum standard deduction provides that in all events an electing taxpayer is entitled to a minimum deduction of \$200 plus an additional \$100 for each exemption claimed subject to a ceiling of \$1,000. It is this latter provision that the legislation would alter by increasing the amount of deduction to \$600 plus \$100 for each exemption.

The Department of the Treasury has indicated that increasing the minimum standard deduction in this manner "represents the most equitable and efficient method available of directing tax relief to persons in the lowest income ranges." And in my judgment, that relief is urgently needed. Over 2 million families with incomes considered below the poverty level by one agency of the Federal Government are nevertheless taxed on those incomes by another Federal agency. With unanimous consent I place at this point in the RECORD table 1 which was prepared by the Treasury and which shows this result:

TABLE 1.—BEGINNING TAX LEVELS AND POVERTY LEVELS

Family size:	Exemption and minimum standard deduction	Poverty income levels 1969 ¹	Estimated number of poor family units (thousands)	
			Total	Presently taxable
1.....	\$900	\$1,735	4,620	1,150
2.....	1,600	2,240	2,600	620
3.....	2,300	2,755	880	150
4.....	3,000	3,535	640	120
5.....	3,700	4,165	520	50
6.....	4,400	4,675	430	40
7 or more ²	5,800	5,755	940	50
Total family units.....			10,630	2,180

¹ Assumed to be 6 percent above the HEW nonfarm poverty levels for 1966.

² Averages 8 per family.

The proposed increase in the minimum standard deduction would relieve this situation. It would reduce the income tax

TABLE 2.—EFFECT OF CHANGES IN THE STANDARD DEDUCTION UNDER THE PROPOSAL ON PERSONS BELOW THE POVERTY LINE, CALENDAR YEAR 1969

Family size	Exemptions and minimum standard deduction allowed		Poverty income levels, 1969 ¹	Estimated number of poor persons (in thousands) ²			
	Present law	Proposal		Total	Number of poor now taxable	Number made nontaxable	Number helped, but still taxable
1.....	\$900	\$1,300	\$1,735	4,620	1,150	550	600
2.....	1,600	2,000	2,240	5,200	1,220	790	430
3.....	2,300	2,700	2,755	2,640	460	400	60
4.....	3,000	3,400	3,535	2,550	490	360	130
5.....	3,700	4,000	4,165	2,620	270	220	50
6.....	4,400	4,600	4,675	2,590	250	180	70
7 or more ²	5,800	5,800	5,755	7,600	450	50	400
Total.....				27,820	4,290	2,550	1,740
Total family units.....				10,630	2,180	1,250	940

¹ 1969 poverty levels are assumed to be 6 percent above the HEW nonfarm level for 1966. This conforms to the method by which the number of poor was projected.

² Includes both adults and children.

³ Averages about 8 persons per family.

TABLE 3.—EFFECT OF INCREASING THE PRESENT \$200 PLUS \$100 MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION TO \$600 PLUS \$100 WITH \$1,000 CEILING

[Dollar amounts in millions; number of returns in thousands]

AGI (in thousands of dollars)	Present law tax	Tax decrease	Tax decrease as percent of present law tax	Number of returns with tax decrease	Number of returns made nontaxable	Number of returns shifting to standard deduction
0 to 3.....	\$1,159	\$415	35.8	9,760	2,025	870
3 to 5.....	3,177	420	13.2	7,870	320	1,120
5 to 7.....	5,439	200	3.7	5,940	15	980
7 to 10.....	13,925	95	.7	4,330		400
10 to 15.....	18,916					
15 to 20.....	7,550					
20 to 50.....	12,795					
50 to 100.....	6,326					
100 and over.....	6,202					
Total.....	75,490	1,130	1.5	27,900	2,360	3,370

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Treasury has cited a need for this type of legislation in its report of February 5, 1969, entitled "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals." With unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a Technical Explanation prepared by the Treasury which explains the proposal. A text of the bill is also included:

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

Under existing law each taxpayer may, as an alternative to itemizing his personal expense deductions, elect to claim a standard deduction equal to 10 percent of his adjusted gross income subject to a \$1,000 ceiling. For electing taxpayers the law presently provides

payments for individuals with moderate incomes above the poverty level; and it would completely exempt from tax the majority of those persons below the poverty level who now pay some income tax.

Some 28 million taxpayers, of which almost two-thirds have incomes of less than \$5,000, would benefit from the proposed changes—about 2.6 million of these individuals becoming completely nontaxable. In terms of family units, nearly 2.2 million families out of about 11 million poor families are taxed under the present law. Under this legislation, tax relief of around \$1 billion would result in 1¼ million families becoming nontaxable and about 1 million more families receiving tax relief although they would continue to pay some taxes. With unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point tables 2 and 3 prepared by the Treasury which show these effects.

a minimum standard deduction of \$200 plus \$100 for each exemption subject to a ceiling of \$1,000.

Under the proposal the minimum standard deduction available to electing taxpayers would be increased from \$200 plus \$100 for each exemption, to \$600 plus \$100 for each exemption. Thus, a single person would have a minimum standard deduction of \$700, a married couple \$800, a married couple with two dependents \$1,000.

A \$1,000 CEILING

The provision of existing law which limits the minimum standard deduction to \$1,000 would be retained. Thus a married taxpayer with two dependents would be entitled to a minimum standard deduction of \$1,000 and the amount of deduction could not exceed

this amount even if the particular taxpayer had more than three dependents. A married taxpayer with two dependents who did not itemize his deductions would be using the minimum standard deduction unless his income exceeded \$7,142. . . .

MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS

For a married taxpayer filing a separate return, the minimum standard deduction would be \$300 (rather than \$600) plus \$100 for each exemption and would be subject to a \$500 ceiling (rather than a \$1,000 ceiling).

As under existing law, if a taxpayer is married and files a separate return, he may not use the general standard deduction if his spouse itemizes deductions and may not use the minimum standard deduction if his spouse either itemizes deductions or uses the general standard deduction. If a taxpayer's general standard deduction is greater than the minimum standard, he may nevertheless elect to use the minimum standard if his spouse's minimum standard deduction is greater than the general standard deduction.

DEPENDENTS OF OTHER TAXPAYERS

Under the proposal the minimum standard deduction may not be used by taxpayers who are claimed as dependents by other taxpayers.

Under existing law a taxpayer is entitled to a \$600 dependency exemption for each of certain specified relatives who receive more than half of their support from the taxpayer and have less than \$600 of gross income.

An exception to the gross income limitation is made in the case of children of the taxpayer who are under 19 or students. As a consequence, under existing law children of the taxpayer may have gross income in excess of \$600 as to which they may claim their own \$600 personal exemption and also claim the minimum standard deduction even though they are supported by a parent who also claims them as a dependent for tax purposes.

The minimum standard deduction is intended to aid taxpayers and their families in the lowest income ranges. There is no justification for permitting that deduction to taxpayers who, while nominally in the lower income ranges, are in fact receiving in addition to their own income more than half of their support from parents. For example, were the proposed minimum standard deduction extended to such persons, a wealthy parent would be able to create \$1,300 of tax-free income annually for each child by transferring property yielding that amount to each child.

Under the proposal a dependent would still be permitted to claim a \$600 exemption against his own income even though the person supporting him also claimed a \$600 exemption, but the dependent would not be permitted to use the minimum standard deduction as an alternative to the general standard deduction.

PERSONS OVER AGE 65

Persons over age 65 will be entitled to the same minimum standard deduction as persons under age 65. . . .

EFFECTIVE DATE

The recommended changes in the minimum standard deduction would be applicable to tax years beginning after December 31, 1969.

H.R. 9523

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the minimum standard deduction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 141(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to minimum standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$200" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$600"; and

(2) by striking out "\$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300".

(b) Section 141 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to standard deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Dependents of Other Taxpayers.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the minimum standard deduction shall not apply in the case of a return of an individual, if a deduction with respect to such individual is allowed under section 151(e) to any other taxpayer for any period which overlaps in whole or in part the taxable year of such individual."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

OKLAHOMA'S WINNINGEST COACH

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 15, 1969, the Byng, Okla., girls' basketball team, coached by Mrs. Bertha Frank Teague, won the Oklahoma class A championship. It was the eighth State title won by one of Mrs. Teague's teams, making her the winningest coach in the history of Oklahoma basketball. During her 43 years of coaching at Byng High School, her teams have won 1,217 games and lost only 88. In addition to the eight State championships, her teams have won seven runnerup trophies and many other titles.

An article by Ernest Thompson in the Ada, Okla., Sunday News for March 16, 1968, describes Mrs. Teague's career. I am happy to commend it to my colleagues who, I am sure, will join me in saluting Mrs. Teague:

BYNG-O: BERTHA BOWS OUT

(By Ernest Thompson)

When one speaks of Bertha Frank Teague's record as a basketball coach, the supply of superlatives suddenly runs out.

She has been praised and eulogized by congressmen, college coaches, national magazines, U.S. Senators, metropolitan sports-writers, state athletic directors and just plain folks.

Saturday afternoon, as Mrs. Teague ended more than four decades as girls' coach at Byng High School, she received her last hurrah before a huge crowd at the Fairgrounds Arena in Oklahoma City.

Gov. Dewey Bartlett declared it "Bertha Frank Teague Day" across Oklahoma.

The State House of Representatives and Senate passed resolutions praising her.

Her girls team had put a storybook finish on the saga of Mrs. Teague by winning, once again, the state championship.

And, in an unprecedented move, a special ceremony was staged on the court following the championship game.

Never, in the history of Oklahoma high school athletics, has such an accolade been accorded an individual.

So, what's it all about?

It goes something like this:

Mrs. Teague coached 43 years at Byng High School.

She won 1,217 games.

She lost only 88.

She took eight state championships and seven runnerup trophies.

She appeared in the state tournament a record 22 times.

She won a national A.A.U. championship.

She won 40 district tournaments and 22 regional meets plus uncounted invitational tournaments.

She won 98 games in a row in the 1930s—still a record.

She founded the first girls' coaching clinic in the Southwest.

She launched the Oklahoma Girls' Basketball Coaches Association and was its first and only president to this date.

She authored what is believed to be the only book devoted entirely to girls' basketball (Basketball for Girls, Ronald Press, New York).

She is the only woman ever nominated for the National Helms Foundation Basketball Hall of Fame.

She is, in fact, the winningest coach in the history of Oklahoma basketball.

That covers a part of the story. It all began back in 1927 when Mrs. Teague moved to Byng.

A native of Missouri (Carthage), she graduated from Amity, Ark., High School. After teaching stints at Delight, Ark., and Cairo, Okla., she married Jess E. Teague in Arkadelphia, Ark., in 1926.

They came to Byng—he as superintendent of schools (a post he held for 39 years) and she as first-grade teacher (a position she was to keep 40 years).

As a sideline, she also began to coach basketball. In those days, Byng School was a tiny place, inhabited by about 220 kids. Few could foresee then the fabulous record in basketball Bertha Frank Teague would amass, or the incredible growth of the school to more than five times its size in 1927.

Things didn't really get going until 1936. That's when Byng won its first championship in girls' basketball. Many more were to come.

"I just got interested in it, that's all," Mrs. Teague says today. "I didn't really set out to coach 40 years of girls' basketball. It was sort of a sideline at first. But, I guess you can say I sort of fell in love with the sport and I learned how much good could be done for young women in interscholastic basketball. Besides, I'm competitive by nature and it was (and still is) fun."

It is said that winning is not the main thing in athletics, but few question that it's more fun to win than lose. Mrs. Teague has been having a lot of fun for 43 years.

After that first state championship in '36, Mrs. Teague's teams launched a string of records that made the school nationally famous in athletics. Even now, three decades later, longtime sports fans remember "those Byng girls back in the late '30s."

What happened was that Byng won three consecutive state championships and an unprecedented 93 games in a row in 1936-37-38.

Not only that, but in 1938, Mrs. Teague decided to go into the big time. She took her high school team to Wichita, Kans., to compete in the national A.A.U. girls' tournament.

A.A.U. women's sports were big things in those days. One just didn't have the effrontery to enter a high school team against all-star aggregations from across the United States.

Bertha Teague did. And she won . . . against industrial teams, college teams, state all-stars. In the final game, her club whipped the highly touted champion California All-Stars, 34-15. Nobody in the A.A.U. tournament laughed again.

Since that time, the name of Teague and "girls' basketball" have become synonymous.

Her reputation has grown to such proportions that Bill Mokray, information director of the Boston Celtics, famed pro basketball team, was moved to write a letter favoring her election to the National Hall of Fame.

Said Mokray, "No woman has ever been elected . . . but her reputation is such nationally that in any discussion of high school girls' basketball, one inevitably gets around to Bertha Frank Teague and her superb record."

She has also been nominated for the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame.

Austin Core, head of the sports department of *Look Magazine*, says simply, in his letter of recommendation to the Naismith Hall: "—I feel sure no coach in the United States can boast a record such as that of Mrs. Teague."

Carl Albert, majority leader in the U.S. House of Representatives, said: "She is highly esteemed as a leader in women's sports activities and as an outstanding humanitarian in her community and state."

Ray Soldan, assistant sports editor of *The Daily Oklahoman*, wrote: "I can think of no other coach, man or woman, other than Coach Henry Iba, who is as deserving of national honors."

Dr. Rhea Williams, who heads the Texas Athletic Association, noted: "Mrs. Teague is the most respected and honored girls' coach in the nation. I have never met a more remarkable individual."

Tributes also came from Lee K. Anderson, former czar of prep athletics in Oklahoma; Congressman Tom Steed; Sen. Henry Bellmon; State Rep. Lonnie Abbott; Gov. Bartlett; Lt. Gov. George Nigh; State Sen. George Miller, and many others.

How does Mrs. Teague feel about quitting what is not only her life's vocation, but, indeed, her "life" itself?

"Of course, I really don't want to quit," she says. "But, there comes a time in everybody's life when they must retire from the scene. I think it is better now than later. I will be leaving some good players for a young coach. That's better than quitting after you've run through a good bunch of material and then leaving your successor with players who may not be quite as good."

As for her 43 teams at Byng, Mrs. Teague, quite naturally, is not anxious to make comparisons.

Asked to do so, she exclaims, throwing up her hands: "Oh, law, that's the hardest question I was ever asked."

"Back in the old days, of course, we had different rules and different styles of play. Usually, we had a 'star' on the team—more often than not a tall post forward. Today, all these girls can hit the basket and they can handle the ball. Nobody's a star. They're all fine athletes."

How about individual players?

Mrs. Teague again hesitates. She mentions the stars of long ago, girls who won the A.A.U. and 98 games in a row—girls such as Emma Lela Fulkerson, Lorene Daniels, Evelyn Casey, Alma Landrith, Nora and Dora Munciel, Marguerite Eppler.

Casey still holds many state records. Daniels was a professional player and coach later with the All-American Red Heads. Landrith was the only freshman player in the history of the state tournament to make all-state as a freshman. Eppler is still regarded as probably the finest guard ever turned out in Oklahoma.

About the "later days," Mrs. Teague is also hesitant to pick out individuals, but some names keep cropping up. Names such as Christine Linker, now Pontotoc County tag agent, who led Byng to undefeated seasons in 1951 and 1952.

"Christine was probably the best all-around girl basketball player I've ever seen," Mrs. Teague says. "Even Abe Saperstein (founder and coach of the famed Harlem Globetrotters and the All-American Red Heads) was interested in her. He offered to train her in basketball, tennis, golf . . . anything she wanted to try."

Also mentioned is Bettie Taylor, who holds the state scoring record and paced Byng to championships only a few years ago. Offensively, Mrs. Teague says, she's never had a better one, not even the prolific Rebecca Kaiser.

Aside from the high school team, Mrs.

Teague has also coached grade school and junior high teams. Add to the 13,000 games she's coached in high school about 3,000 more for the lower grades and you come up with another astounding figure.

And, Mrs. Teague has also had time for her family, community and church.

Her daughter, Geneva (now Mrs. Ted Billey, Oklahoma City), played on her mother's teams in the early 1950s.

She has been an active member of the New Bethel Baptist Church since it was built in the 1930s.

She is also a member of the Ada Kiwanians and Pi Kappa Delta sorority.

When she's not coaching, Mrs. Teague may be found in Des Moines, Cleveland, Columbus, Chicago—just about anywhere a girls' rules meeting is scheduled. Some say she has practically rewritten the rulebooks.

Listening to her talk now, it hardly seems like she intends to sit around and twiddle her thumbs when she retires.

She and her husband, who retired in 1965 as the first and only superintendent Byng had up to that time, will probably do a bit of traveling.

And, don't be surprised if Mr. Teague often finds himself at a few state girls' basketball tournaments or at a national rules meeting.

Habits are hard to break, especially after 43 years.

CIVIL RIGHTS IN REVERSE

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, civil rights programs, ordered by the Congress, are in trouble.

Both in the areas of the title VI school desegregation program and in the field of equal employment, the Nixon administration is failing to meet necessary standards.

Sunday, March 16, the Washington Post carried what I believe is a very significant article on the school desegregation program. It is not a happy story. The final sentence tells the tale: "The desegregation program is in trouble."

And why is the program in trouble? There are several reasons, not the least of which is that in the 2 short months of the Nixon administration, the program has been administered so as to seriously cripple it. Until 2 months ago the program was picking up momentum and it was on verge of achieving substantial progress. HEW reported a 6-percent increase in school desegregation in 11 Southern States during the past year. We could expect more progress, if the program received the kind of support it deserves from the administration.

Sadly, the area of school desegregation is not the only area in which the administration is failing to carry out the goals of the Congress.

The New Republic in its March 22 issue spells out the failures in the area of equal employment opportunities. It tells the sad story of David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and his private and extra legal agreement with textile firms.

Mr. Speaker, I place the Sunday Washington Post article by Mr. Peter Milius and the March 22 article in the New Republic by Mr. Barney Sellers at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 16, 1969]

INTEGRATION RESISTANCE RISES

(By Peter Milius)

Outright Southern defiance of the Federal school desegregation guidelines has increased markedly in recent months.

More Southern school districts than ever before are flatly refusing to file acceptable desegregation plans.

Ironically, the new wave of defiance comes at a time when there are also more Southern districts than ever before complying with the guidelines; the five-year-old desegregation program is rather clearly at a crossroads.

The renewed Southern resistance is due in part to changes last year in Federal enforcement tactics.

Civil rights officials are now moving into the most recalcitrant Southern school districts, often those with Negro majorities, and are insisting on prompt and complete instead of gradual and partial desegregation.

There are thus more showdowns now than before.

At the same time, the Nixon Administration has shown signs of wavering on desegregation.

Some of the President's campaign statements last fall led Southerners to think he would let them off the hook if elected. The President has since taken a firmer position. But Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch's public statements on enforcement since the inauguration have dismayed some Southerners but have also been ambiguous enough to keep alive the Southern hope and the political support that lies behind it.

A high Federal civil rights official said last week that "there has definitely been a slowdown in voluntary compliance."

Last June there were 412 school districts that had refused to file acceptable desegregation plans and had either had their Federal funds cut off or were somewhere in the enforcement process that can lead to a cutoff.

Last week that figure had risen to 582 districts, an increase of 41 per cent.

Last spring HEW sent letters to about 320 districts, asking for complete desegregation plans. It got back acceptable plans from all but about 60.

Last fall, as the presidential campaign was beginning, the Department sent similar requests to another 350 districts, the last and stubbornest on its list of holdouts. About 220 have refused to comply.

EARLIER PLANS WITHDRAWN

More ominous, in the judgment of some civil rights officials, is the fact that some districts—a small but increasing number in Texas, Arkansas, South Carolina and other states—are withdrawing desegregation plans they filed earlier.

"The outcome," one official said last week, "is that Finch is going to have to cut off funds to a lot more districts than if he'd made clear what the districts have to do."

Finch has withheld or cut off funds to eight unbending districts since taking office two months ago.

RELAXATION SEEN

But Finch also, in a recent rambling, widely-read interview in *U.S. News and World Report*, said he is having the desegregation guidelines reviewed, that the salient issue is discrimination rather than segregation—a remark particularly heartening to Southerners clinging to freedom-of-choice—and that he is more concerned about the quality of schools than their racial makeup.

In the same vein, under pressure from key Southerners in Congress and some members of the White House staff, particularly Harry S. Dent, former administrative assistant to Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), Finch

has made himself and his immediate staff directly accessible to Southern delegations here to protest their treatment at the hands of regular HEW enforcement officials.

RIGHTS HEAD QUILTS

Ruby G. Martin, former director of HEW's Office of Civil Rights, refused reappointment and an increase in pay under the Nixon Administration, mainly because she felt high-level vacillation had undercut the office and robbed it of its effectiveness.

She said last week that the desegregation program has been set back one or two years no matter what Finch says or does next.

An Office of Civil Rights official noted several days ago that "they haven't made us buy any bad plans yet."

"But Ruby's right," the official added. "Those statements have set us back tremendously. . . . They're just killing us down South. Everybody believes there's going to be a change. As a result, they don't even want to talk to the people in our regional offices. They want to come to Washington. The problem is they can get away with it."

CHANGE IN TONE

Finch has said several times that he intends to uphold the law, that he is not going to back off from present target dates—complete desegregation by this September in most cases, next September at the very latest—and that the only real change he has in mind is in the desegregation program's tone.

A member of his staff noted last week that "there was nothing in that U.S. News interview directly contrary to the law."

Letters coming in to HEW suggest that the South may have read it otherwise. A Mississippi woman wrote "I'm glad to read you think segregation is legal." An Arkansas superintendent who was ready to desegregate said that the interview cost him three like-minded school board members. They were beaten in an election last week by three freedom-of-choice advocates.

MAIL IS BITTER

But most of Finch's mail from the South so far has been the other way, bitter and even vituperative letters of complaint about the cutoffs he has ordered.

The increased Southern defiance comes at a time when civil rights officials are starting to carry the guidelines into the North and the Nation's colleges, steps which may precipitate fresh opposition. There is also noticeable opposition for the first time from Negroes, those who have given up on desegregation and want now to go their own way. The desegregation program is in trouble.

"It's the pressure," one well-placed official said last week. "From Thurmond, from Tower (Texas Sen. John G. Tower, Republican), from all the Southern Republican state chairmen, from Dent in the White House."

"These people feel they stuck their necks out in the campaign. It paid off for Nixon. Now they want to see something indicating there has been a change."

"Finch is a political person, and all the political pressure's coming from one side now."

PACKARD'S DEAL WITH THE TEXTILE BIG THREE (By Barney Sellers)

By May 1, three of the nation's largest textile mills will report to David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, on their progress in meeting his fair employment standards. The reports will be filed as part of undisclosed, verbal agreements between Packard and the firms' chief executives to meet documented charges by the Department that the textile mills discriminate. In return for their efforts, Packard has awarded the firms—Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries, and J. P. Stevens—\$14 million in Defense contracts. When the reports are received only Packard will know whether they meet the original "terms." His cryptic an-

nouncement approving the new contracts abruptly killed a two year, multi-agency attempt to enforce the government's long neglected power over discriminating contractors and set a poor precedent for future enforcement action.

There are 7,000 textile mills in the country, located mainly on the East Coast and principally in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Though the industry has been traditionally competitive, with small, family-owned firms the rule, recent mergers and acquisitions have resulted in a decreasing reliance on labor-intensive methods and increasing mechanized production in large plants. While there are almost one million textile workers, many female, the work force is declining and dropped by about 15,000 last year. Labor relations in the industry have been marked by management's virulent anti-union policy, which continues to this day, and racial exclusion, which has been broken minimally within recent years. Today, about a tenth of textile jobs are unionized. In the past two decades Dan River, Burlington and J. P. Stevens have been found guilty of violating federal labor practice legislation. Since 1966, the NLRB has found J. P. Stevens guilty of illegal labor acts six times. Four of these findings have been upheld by federal courts and in 1968 the Supreme Court affirmed findings of "massive" violations of the National Labor Relations Act, including firing, demoting, threatening, unlawfully interrogating and spying on employees.

Since 1960 the growth of new Southern industry has created a tight labor market for the mills as white workers have moved to higher paying jobs in other industries. As a result, the mills have been forced to raise wages and break the near-total exclusion of blacks. Ironically, the token breaking of the race line has given management new problems: young black workers, inspired by the organized successes of the civil rights movement, have concluded their main hope for improved working conditions rests with union growth; picketing by black female production workers has received national attention.

In January 1967, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission launched its first industry-wide fair employment project. The textile industry was chosen because it is a major provider of jobs in the Southeast; it uses workers with a wide variety of skills; it traditionally serves as an industrial entry point for unskilled persons; and because it has had a pattern of discriminatory employment. As part of the effort, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which has authority for overseeing the government's contractor fair employment program, agreed to help organize field visits to eight major mills and to develop programs for change where they would be needed.

In January 1968, OFCC and the Defense Department—which is assigned review responsibility for the textile firms—agreed to visit a limited number of the largest textile mills in the South. The agreement reportedly was for Defense to visit the plants, document discrimination where it existed and consult OFCC prior to making final agreements.

Dan River Mills was picked as the model for the plants and a visit to five facilities was made in January 1968. The main problems found included a very low utilization of black female production workers (even in counties with a one-third black population); virtual exclusion of Negro women from clerical jobs; assignment of black males to low paying, low status jobs; and segregation of facilities, including company-owned housing. In one plant, for example, blacks working for twenty years were in lower paying positions than white employees hired in 1967. A similar pattern was found in 6 other South Carolina plants, where only 5 Negroes were working in almost 700 advanced job spots. (Discrimina-

tory treatment at an Alabama Dan River plant was also exposed in a Civil Rights Commission hearing in April 1968.)

After that field review, Defense made its findings known to the plants and a long series of calls, letters and conferences began in order to work out an acceptable plan. In 1968, Dan River was given more than six extensions of time to develop an adequate plan for change—in government terminology an "affirmative action" plan—even though the basic issues never really changed: how would the company act to redress the present effects of past discrimination, and when would it do it?

The company refused to meet these two key issues. It would not act to correct past injustices by giving black workers a compensatory chance for promotions or pay raises over white workers; it refused to propose time goals. Government officials who argued that present effects of past discrimination must be affirmatively removed relied on two federal district court cases decided last year, the essence of which was stated in a decision involving a paper union and the Crown Zellerbach Company of Bogalusa, Louisiana:

"Where a seniority system has the effect of perpetuating discrimination and concentrating . . . the effects of past discrimination against Negro employees into the present placement of Negroes in inferior positions for promotions and other purposes, that present result is prohibited . . . and must be replaced with another system."

The principle of this case, applying to actions by both unions and employers, was affirmed in mid-January 1969 by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and clearly supports efforts to overcome entrenched segregation and discrimination. The details of the discussions with Dan River were known to both OFCC, who reportedly urged that negotiations be dropped and sanctions started, and the highest Defense officials. The talks dragged on and were bucked back and forth in Defense until just past the 1968 elections, when a final meeting was held four days before the end of the Democratic incumbency. The company was required to reply to the government's proposals with a final response—one week after the new Administration was to take office. The final ingredient in the slowly escalating case was notice from the Defense Supply Agency—the Defense organ in charge of contractor employment—that the Department was due to award \$16 million worth of cloth contracts for uniforms, and the three low bidders were Dan River, J. P. Stevens, and Burlington. (During the one-year period of negotiation in 1968, Defense awarded almost 70 contracts worth \$77.5 million to the three firms.) DSA pointed out that maintenance of principle in this case might cost the agency \$800,000 if the low-bidders were bypassed. It was up to the new Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Packard, to decide.

Shortly after submission of the company proposal, essentially the same plan that had been discussed for over 12 months, the textile firms turned on the heat. Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.), contacted the White House to get Defense officials in his office to discuss the case. Senator John Stennis (D., Miss.), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, wrote to the Secretary's office complaining about the military need for the service uniforms and the "unreasonable" fair employment demands. L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, Stennis' counterpart in the House also indicated his displeasure. And finally, former Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens, now president of J. P. Stevens, visited several former colleagues in Defense. Senators Javits and Brooke, almost alone among the Republicans, urged Defense to take a firm position.

Packard's office announced a decision would be made on February 10, and Defense later indicated to civil rights groups, which

were preparing to muster support in Congress, that the decision would be delayed even further. On February 7 Packard's office announced the matter had been settled.

As a result of a session with the chief executive officers of the three firms, the Deputy Secretary "received assurances" the law would be met. No written agreement was made, even though one is required by federal regulations. No representatives of any government agency formerly involved in the case—including civil rights staff—were present. No subsequent information concerning the talks, other than the Secretary's press statement that he would give "personal attention" to the case, was released—even within the Defense Department. OFCC and the Secretary of Labor belatedly asked for copies of the "agreement." Though none was delivered, the arrangement was subsequently approved by Secretary of Labor Shultz. Labor and Defense announced that "to insure" company commitments would be kept, they would develop a quarterly report for the mills which would contain specific questions to be answered.

The tragedy of the case—the first major enforcement effort for Defense—is that it was unnecessarily bungled. Civil rights supporters in and out of government saw the issue as the Administration's test in employment enforcement and likened its importance to Secretary Finch's pending school desegregation decisions at HEW. The Defense decision made clear the new Administration's willingness to continue past government enforcement policies that allow more than a score of federal agencies to decide unilaterally when and how the law shall be enforced for minorities. There is even some indication now that Defense procurement officials are preparing to press for scuttling of pre-award compliance reviews.

More important, the decision's handling may reinstate personal law enforcement in civil rights—the government approach to civil rights enforcement wherein decisions are not made routinely and fairly, but through interventions by high political appointees. The danger of the personal approach are amply demonstrated in the past trials of Commissioner Harold Howe, who spent most of his time at the Office of Education denying he was an "integration czar." Decisions concerning law enforcement in civil rights, as in other areas, should be routinized through regular due process wherever possible.

Finally, Packard relied upon the good word of "fellow" executives in the industry. One need not distrust their personal honesty, but clearly, their economic interests (anti-union) and hiring policies (racist) argue against their ability or willingness to actively recruit, hire and promote blacks. Packard was dealing with the lives of thousands of present and potential minority employees who have traditionally been without support from these firms and who must rely upon the fair working of government due process to protect their rights. Who but David Packard will be able to judge the appropriateness of industry steps toward fair employment? And by what standards will those steps be measured? Gentlemen's agreements are no longer sufficient.

Further, Mr. Speaker I place the following letters, on the same subjects, sent by the Democratic Study Group to President Nixon be printed at this point in the RECORD:

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are disturbed to learn that Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Finch has deviated from the

procedures previously established to carry out Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits the use of federal tax revenues for programs which discriminate on the basis of color or race.

Effective and consistent enforcement of Title VI is essential if we are to end discrimination in America. Yet five school systems in Mississippi and North and South Carolina which have not complied with federal law requiring desegregation of schools have been afforded special treatment. These five districts, with which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had been negotiating for two years, had already exhausted the hearing and appeal procedures within the Department and had been adjudged not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. These school districts were notified on December 29, 1968 that procedures had been started which would result in a cutoff of federal funds on January 29.

While the order terminating federal assistance has been permitted to take effect, the school districts in question have been notified by Secretary Finch that if they come into compliance within 60 days they will receive the funds retroactively. In the meantime, the funds will be held in trust by the respective states. The Secretary's action is unprecedented and unwarranted since such fund cutoffs occur only after lengthy negotiations, thorough review of the facts, and persistent refusal by local school officials to obey the law.

Secretary Finch has declared that this action is being taken because he has not had time to review the facts of the cases. He implied that the new procedure is not a permanent deviation from established procedure. Nonetheless, his decision is regrettable because it will lead many school districts which are not in compliance to believe that the HEW guidelines will be relaxed.

This danger is heightened by several statements of Senator Strom Thurmond, who was closely identified with your campaign, suggesting that the Nixon Administration will not require full and effective compliance with federal desegregation requirements. An example is the enclosed copy of a news report from the December 19, 1968 issue of the Columbia, South Carolina newspaper, *The State*, in which Senator Thurmond is quoted as telling Southern school administrators to ignore HEW demands and "wait for a better deal" under the Nixon Administration. Senator Thurmond also expressed approval of Secretary Finch's action this week.

We therefore think it imperative, Mr. President, that you make it clear that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and HEW's guidelines for its implementation will continue to be firmly enforced, and that your Administration does not intend to establish a "better deal" for those who refuse to obey the law of the land.

Otherwise, there is great danger that the action of Secretary Finch and the statements of Senator Thurmond will stimulate further footdragging and evasion on the part of school districts which still discriminate against children on the basis of race. Also, as indicated by the enclosed editorial from *The Atlanta Journal* of January 30, vacillation on the part of the federal government would undermine the efforts of those Southern school officials who have attempted to obey the law.

Respectfully,

DONALD M. FRASER,
JOHN BRADEMANS,
JAMES C. CORMAN,
Members of Congress.

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you again about the matter of civil rights

enforcement. We are concerned that Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard's disregard of regulations established to carry out Executive Order 11246, which bans the award of federal contracts to companies which engage in discriminatory employment practices, may signal a serious breakdown in federal civil rights enforcement efforts.

Executive Order 11246, together with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, is designed to assure that the federal government will not subsidize companies which practice employment discrimination. The Executive Order directs that the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, Department of Labor, shall have supervisory responsibility over enforcement of the Order and will coordinate the efforts of the various federal contracting agencies.

In the past month, defense contracts totaling \$14 million were awarded to three textile firms—Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co.—despite the fact that investigations by the Defense Supply Agency revealed that all three companies discriminate in hiring, promotion and other practices. OFCC regulations of May 28, 1968, specifically provide that once a contractor is found deficient in civil rights compliance, "it must make a specific commitment, in writing, to correct any such deficiencies. The commitment must include the action to be taken and the dates for completion." (Sec. 60-1:20)

Compliance with this regulation is sorely lacking. On February 8, 1969, despite finds of deficiency, contracts totaling \$9.4 million were granted the three non-complying companies. Further, contracts totaling \$4.5 million were announced on February 19 and 20. In each case, the requirement of written assurances was ignored. Deputy Secretary Packard claims to have received oral assurances that the companies would henceforth comply with the Executive Order. Such a procedure is not totally inadequate, but is a gross violation of the OFCC regulation cited above. In addition, despite its responsibilities in this area, the OFCC was not even consulted regarding the decision to award these contracts.

Such actions seriously undermine federal civil rights enforcement efforts. As we pointed out in our letter of February 1, expressing concern at relaxation of Title VI school desegregation procedures, any letup in enforcement of civil rights inevitably leads those who would disobey the law to believe they can do so with impunity.

We therefore think it imperative, Mr. President, that you make it clear to all federal contracting agencies and the business community that Executive Order 11246 will be firmly enforced. Such action is necessary in order to correct any misimpression that may have occurred due to Deputy Secretary Packard's action in awarding the contracts without proper written assurances of compliance with the Executive Order.

Further, we understand that the Department of Defense may award several million dollars in additional contracts to the same three companies, as well as contracts to four of five other textile companies whose employment policies are now under review by the Department of Defense. We urge that these contracts not be awarded unless and until such time as the companies involved meet all legal requirements not to engage in discriminatory employment practices. Any other course of action would completely disrupt orderly governmental procedures and would give notice that federal laws against discrimination may be flaunted with abandon.

We understand that Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co. will be required to file periodic reports of their progress in eliminating discriminatory practices. Until such time as those reports are filed and evaluated by the Department of

Defense and the OFCC, further contract awards to these companies would be reprehensible. In addition, contracts should not be granted those companies now under investigation until it is found that they do, in fact, comply with federal law.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman.

JAMES C. CORMAN,
Secretary-Chief Whip.

JOHN BRADEMANS,
Vice Chairman.

DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Task Force on Civil Rights.

THE 1968 DEAL WITH HANOI IS OFF

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I took the well of this House to express my concern that if we did not respond promptly to Hanoi's obvious violations of the 1968 bombing halt agreement, the mutual concessions which that agreement represented would have in fact disappeared. I said then too, that if we could not count on Hanoi to carry its share of a partial deescalation of the Vietnam fighting—where we stop doing certain specified things, and they stop doing certain specified things—how can we possibly expect them to live up to any full-scale peace agreement?

Not many persons have stood up since then, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say, to echo that sentiment. But I was glad to see this morning that one distinguished commentator, Mr. Joseph Alsop, made precisely the same point in his column in today's Washington Post.

Because the point is one that goes to the very heart of the validity of an agreement with Hanoi, it deserves to be carefully considered by all who want a genuine—as opposed to a phony—peace in Vietnam.

I recommend the Alsop column to your attention, as follows:

THE 1968 UNDERSTANDING WITH HANOI HAS BECOME A DEAD LETTER

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is easy to guess the main topic of President Nixon's talks with Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Gen. Andrew Goodpaster. The all-important understanding with Hanoi, which permitted President Johnson to end all bombing of North Vietnam last October, has now become a complete dead letter.

To be sure, the South Vietnamese delegates still attend the meaningless meetings in Paris. But the military clauses of the Johnson understanding, which had very great meaning, are now being as flagrantly violated by Hanoi as the accord on Laos, which Averell Harriman negotiated in 1962.

Walt W. Rostow has correctly said that the greatest American error was the failure to respond, both vigorously and promptly, to Hanoi's instantaneous violation of all the most important clauses of Gov. Harriman's 1962 accord. These were the clauses by which Hanoi solemnly promised to withdraw all North Vietnamese troops from Laos, and never to use Laos as a troop-transit route to South Vietnam.

President Nixon must now face a similar

problem, but in much more acute form. The Johnson understanding, apparently reached with the Soviets as intermediaries, had two important military features. In return for the final cessation of the bombing, Hanoi was to refrain from two crucial kinds of activity.

First, there was to be no shelling or rocketing of the major cities of South Vietnam.

Second, the ludicrously misnamed Demilitarized Zone, on the border between North and South Vietnam, was not to be used for any military purpose, as agreed by Hanoi in 1954.

As might have been foreseen from Hanoi's way of keeping the promises so hopefully accepted by Gov. Harriman, the understanding that ended the bombing began to be violated not very long after the bombs ceased falling. The first probes—and that is really the right word—took the form of rocket and other attacks on various cities, finally including Saigon itself.

Though viciously cruel to some unlucky civilians among the cities' populations, these attacks on the cities have had little more military effect than Chinese firecrackers. Their sole purpose, so far as one can judge, has been to make headlines in certain American newspapers with strong Chicken Little tendencies. Because they had no military effect, their first violations were perhaps unwisely ignored.

What is happening now is altogether different, however. Reports have already appeared of ten or more North Vietnamese regiments massing above the DMZ using the rebuilt bases and restored communications which are owed to the final bombing halt.

In fact, however, the DMZ clause of the Johnson understanding is not just threatened with violations, as these reports suggest. It has instead been violated during the past fortnight in the customary flagrant, big-scale manner. In other words, whole North Vietnamese regiments have been crossing the DMZ, to operate in the two most northerly provinces of South Vietnam.

This is a very serious matter indeed. Because of the DMZ clause in the Johnson understanding, Gen. Creighton Abrams was able to reduce his forces in Quangtri and Thuatien provinces to the 3d Marine Division and the 173d Airborne Division, plus the excellent 1st South Vietnamese Division. With much reduced forces, great progress was nonetheless being made in rooting out the whole enemy structure in Quangtri and Thuatien.

All progress will of course come to an end, and acute dangers will of course arise, if entire enemy divisions begin transiting the DMZ in happy impunity, and in gross disregard of the understanding with President Johnson. This has, as noted above, begun to happen already.

It has the most vivid military significance, moreover. If it continues, for instance, it could force Gen. Abrams to go back to the fire brigade-like use of his forces to which Gen. William C. Westmoreland was too often driven by hard necessity.

Hanoi's motive for shifting the threat to Northern I Corps is pretty certainly the sanguinary failure, at least to date, of the first main thrust of the "winter-spring campaign" on the approaches to Saigon in III Corps. Once again, as in mid-December, there is hard evidence of the bitterest recriminations between the Communist high command, COSVN, and the enemy's divisional and regimental commanders in III Corps. These latter enraged COSVN by their reluctance to hurl their bomb-decimated units into suicidal ground battles.

That does not change the DMZ's challenge to the President, however. Either he must blandly ignore the total violation of

the Johnson understanding, thereby incurring very grave military risks, or he must authorize Gen. Abrams to respond to the challenge in a suitably harsh manner, "at a time and place of his own choosing."

SOME BALANCED THOUGHTS ON THE ABM

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much nonsense spoken on the subject of the ABM in recent weeks, some of it on this floor, and a good deal more of it in the other body, that it is refreshing to see in print a direct, simple statement of what is really the basic issue involved.

Such a statement appeared in Mr. Joseph Alsop's column of March 24 in the Washington Post. To add light rather than heat to the discussion of this vital issue, I hereby include the full text of the excellent Alsop piece:

ABM FOES ARE ASKING NATION TO GAMBLE WITH ITS FUTURE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The vice of the anti-ABM crusaders can be very simply stated. They are really talking about a subject of which they know nothing whatever: Namely, what the Soviets may do if they can believe they enjoy decisive strategic-nuclear superiority.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and Deputy Secretary David Packard have now testified that the costly Soviet weapons programs are clearly aimed to gain that kind of superiority. This has nothing to do, moreover, with the numbers of nuclear warheads in the U.S. and Soviet arsenals, a subject that the crusaders endlessly babble about.

The Soviets are spending their billions on weapons intended to destroy our *delivery systems*. And if the delivery systems can be destroyed by surprise attack, our thousands of warheads will of course be worse than useless.

As already pointed out in this space, moreover, the seemingly defensive ABMs that the Soviets are already deploying must be regarded, at least in part, as the other half of the above equation. No surprise attack can be counted upon to destroy all of our different delivery systems. But it can so enormously reduce the weight of the counterattack that an ABM defense will be rendered effective and useful.

These, then, are the real terms of the problems, which has one further, purely psychological, factor. American deterrence depends, in brief, not on what Dr. Jerome Weisner believes, but on what the Soviet defense planners believe. And these are not civilian scientists; they are the Soviet marshals, all of whom strongly resemble Gen. Curtis LeMay cubed.

Their types of expenditure, especially on "counterforce weapons," quite obviously reveal what the Soviet marshals believe they can achieve over time. So you come back to the problem of what the Soviets may do if they think, even if wrongly, that they enjoy decisive superiority.

No one at all can know with certainty the answer to this question, simply because until now, thank God, the Soviets never have enjoyed anything remotely resembling superiority. You can only say that the Soviets have been sharply responsive, in at least two great crises, to the strategic-nuclear superiority enjoyed by the U.S.

For first time, and perhaps the most interesting, was immediately after the death of Stalin. The aging paranoid had spent untold sums on the early versions of the MIG fighter, although these planes were actually incapable of laying a machine gun, so to say, on the American strategic bombers of that period. Obviously, the marshals did not dare to tell the truth to the terrible old man.

With Stalin gone, however, the truth was at last told to the no doubt horrified Politburo. The result was the most important tension-relaxing move the Soviets have ever made. Austria, in fact, almost certainly owes its freedom and unity to the poor performance characteristics of those early MIGs, which at that time left the Soviet Union naked as a jaybird in the event of U.S. nuclear attack.

The Cuban missile crisis was of course the second test above-mentioned. In 1962, the U.S. margin of strategic-nuclear superiority was still on the order of five to one. In his authoritative work "Power in the Kremlin," Michel Tatu leaves no room for doubt that the aim of the secret deployment of medium-range missiles in Cuba was to change this margin, so unfavorable to the Soviets.

Tatu leaves no room for doubt, either, that the greatness of the U.S. margin played a major role in the outcome. In this respect, however, there is much food for disquiet in Tatu's remarkable Kremlinological pendant to the late Robert Kennedy's account of the Cuban missile crisis.

There is food for disquiet because Tatu produces such detailed and impressive evidence that it was a "damn near-run thing," as the Duke of Wellington said of Waterloo. In other words, the Kremlin leaders were deeply divided, and it was touch and go for some time before the Soviet backdown that ended the Cuban crisis.

If it was touch and go when the U.S. margin was on the order of five to one, it really is rather urgent to ask oneself how the Soviets may respond in some future crisis, after they have changed the margin to favor themselves. Mind you, moreover, it will matter not one whit whether this change in margin is real, in the sense of being recognized by Dr. Wiesner.

What the Soviets think will be all that matters. Sen. Fulbright and the rest are in fact asking President Nixon to take pretty awe-inspiring risks with the U.S. future. But that is far more normal than asking Sen. Fulbright to do his homework, by reading Tatu.

THE HIDDEN WAR

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include an editorial.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, does anyone doubt that this hideous war has come full cycle? If so—if there are still doubters—I would like to recommend that my doubting colleagues read an article that appeared on the front page of the Wall Street Journal. The article described the operation of the elite "Phoenix" forces that hunt the Vietcong infrastructure in the countryside. Conceived largely by CIA men and other American planners and carried out by South Vietnamese, Operation Phoenix uses "calculated brutality applied to suspected Vietcong," and on-the-spot executions, while the participating troops indulge in the looting of homes and the "systematic destruction of village installations."

The Journal asks the question: "Because the Vietcong torture and assassinate, should the allies?"

Let us ask the question I posed before: When Americans are a party to assassination, torture, terror, and looting as a matter of military tactics can there be any doubt that this war has come full cycle and that we are truly the enemy of the country we went to defend?

I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and with the intent of his resolution. I include in the body of the RECORD the full article, "The Hidden War," that appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, March 25, 1969:

THE HIDDEN WAR—ELITE "PHOENIX" FORCES HUNT VIETCONG CHIEFS IN AN ISOLATED VILLAGE—RAID PROMPTED BY INFORMERS FINDS MOST OF FOG GONE AND NATIVES TIGHT-LIPPED—DEMOLISHING A VC MONUMENT

(By Peter R. Kann)

DON NHON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Was it a trap? There was reason for suspicion.

But the risk had to be taken. An unsolicited bit of information offered an opportunity to strike at the local unit of the Vietcong "infrastructure" (VCI), the clandestine political and administrative apparatus through which the enemy lays claim to control much of the Vietnamese countryside.

The affair began like this:

Two ragged Vietnamese, one short and squat, the other tall and thin, recently walked into Don Nhon, a village about 50 miles southwest of Saigon that is the capital of Don Nhon District. The pair told American officials that they wanted to talk about the VCI in their home village of Vinh Hoa, a nearby community of about 2,000 persons nestled deep in Vietcong territory along a Mekong River tributary. A Vietcong-sponsored "Liberation Committee" had been elected to govern Vinh Hoa five months previously, the informers said.

The U.S. advisers were dubious about taking military action on the basis of this intelligence. An ambush might be in the offing. Vinh Hoa was dangerous territory, several miles from the nearest government-controlled village. And the informers said they were refugees, rather than Vietcong defectors, who normally could be expected to be more eager to talk. But the two stuck to their story of overt Vietcong control in their village, and their information checked out with that in allied files.

HIGH PRIORITY

Vinh Hoa clearly was a target for "Operation Phoenix," the high-priority allied effort to root out the VCI across South Vietnam. The year-old Phoenix campaign obviously is related to the Paris negotiations. When peace comes, South Vietnam's claims to control the countryside will be strongest where the VCI cadre are fewest.

The Vietcong claim that about 1,800 governing bodies have been freely elected in "liberated areas" of South Vietnam. The U.S. dismisses most of the committee as fictions existing only on paper and claims VCI cadre are being wiped out at a rate of better than 2,300 a month. Total VCI strength is estimated at about 70,000.

Although conceived largely by CIA men and other American planners, Operation Phoenix is executed primarily by Vietnamese troops. Its methods range from after-dark assassination strikes by small killer squads to battalion-sized cordon and search efforts. A small strike clearly wasn't indicated for Vinh Hoa. The village might be heavily defended. U.S. officials finally settled on a plan for a daylight assault with helicopter transportation. The U.S. 9th Division would provide support.

HUNTING THE ENEMY

Phoenix operations are reputed to be highly sophisticated and productive affairs. The

Vinh Hoa effort proved to be neither. It involved intricate—and apparently flawed—planning, largely fruitless interrogation of fearful, tight-lipped villagers, calculated brutality applied to suspected Vietcong, the execution of one suspect, looting of homes by Vietnamese troops, systematic destruction of village installations and a largely unproductive hunt for Vietcong officials who apparently had fled by sampan long before the allies arrived.

The operation highlighted agonizing questions about Phoenix and the allied methods for waging war in Vietnam. Because the Vietcong torture and assassinate, should the allies? Is there value to an operation that "sweeps" a Vietcong area and then departs, leaving no permanent allied presence? Who should be considered Vietcong? Does the VC include a farmer who happens to own ancestral rice land in a Vietcong-controlled village and pays taxes to the enemy?

The counter-infrastructure experts are the Provincial Reconnaissance Units, called "PRUs." Along with the Vietnamese, they include Cambodian and Chinese Nung mercenaries. All are recruited, trained and paid by the CIA. In two days of planning the Vinh Hoa force grew to include about 40 PRUs, about 30 Vietnamese special combat police and a handful of interrogators from the Police Special Branch, Census-Gravance men and psychological warfare cadre. The Americans taking part in the operation were two civilian PRU advisers, two civilian advisers to the special police, two young Army officers working in Don Nhon District and several radio operators. Two companies of the 9th Division, about 110 men, were to form a cordon around the village to prevent Vietcong escapes.

THE LAST MEETING

Final plans were coordinated at the Tactical Operations Center of Kien Hoa province (which includes Don Nhon) the night before the strike, with more than a dozen Americans and Vietnamese attending or within earshot. The size of the meeting troubled CIA men. They worried, justifiably as it turned out, that confusion and intelligence leaks would follow.

At 7 a.m. the next morning, the operation force is waiting for its helicopter transport at the airfield at Ben Tre, the Kien Hoa provincial capital. And waiting. It turns out that the 9th Division is having difficulty arranging its "air assets." An outpost under siege in a neighboring province has to be aided.

The civilian U.S. advisers begin to get restless and irritable: "The U.S. Army is more trouble than it's worth . . . all their maps and charts and crap . . . goddamned army must have schools that teach delay and confusion . . . never seen a 9th Division operation go off on time. . . ."

One adviser spots a plane to the west circling roughly over the area of the target village. Fluttering from it are thousands of propaganda leaflets. He explodes: "Great. Just great. The army is really good at this crap. Pick up a paper and read all about it. Read about the operation that's coming in to get you."

The PRUs and Vietnamese special combat police are wearing a wild variety of jungle fatigues, flak jackets, bush hats, berets, combat boots, tennis shoes and sandals. Some are barefoot. Initially they are sitting in orderly rows along the runway. Soon they begin dispersing about the airfield.

The PRUs invent a game. As a big C130 cargo plane comes in to land, they sit on the runway, then duck their heads as the plane's wings whip past just above them. "They're the toughest men in this war," says one adviser. "They join this outfit because they want action."

The American points to a small Vietnamese half-doing on the grass. "That man used to be a VC. He got disillusioned with them, so they killed his family. He lit out for the bush.

Spent two years out there alone, conducting a private vendetta against Charlie. God knows how many VC he killed. Finally he came in and joined up with the PRUs. He wants to kill more VCs."

HOVERING CLOSE

Shortly after 9 a.m., two hours late, 10 helicopters arrive. The Phoenix force piles aboard and is flown for 15 minutes across flat rice land and coconut groves to the landing zone, a rice paddy less than a mile from the center of Vinh Hoa. The helicopters hover close to the ground, and the troops leap out, wading cautiously through thigh-deep mud and water toward a treeline from which they expect enemy fire.

There is no firing. At the treeline the troops are joined by the Don Nhon District U.S. advisers and the two Vietnamese informants who prompted the operation. They have been separately helicoptered to the scene. The informers, garbed in baggy U.S. Army fatigues, are to remain mystery men, for their own protection. Their heads are covered with brown cloth bags with eye and mouth holes. The two present a part comic, part frightening spectacle.

The local advisers have bad news. They say the 9th Division cordon along the southern fringe of the village didn't get into place until about 9 a.m., two hours late, leaving the Vietcong an escape route. (The 9th Division later denies any delay.) Now the informers claim not to recognize the approach being taken to the village. One American sharply questions them. Another is cursing the Vietnamese "psywar" operatives tramping along with the troops: "All we need are these god-damned guys with their leaflets. And they're wearing black pajamas. Beautiful. Now the army (the 9th Division troops) will zap 'em as VC."

LOOKING AROUND

Several of the Vietnamese special police have found an empty farmhouse, recently deserted judging by damp betel-nut stains on the floor. They are passing the time knocking holes in a water barrel. In another farmhouse, the occupant, an old lady, stares at a wall while two carefree PRUs boil eggs on her wood stove.

A lone PRU wanders along the treeline shaking his head and muttering, "VC di di, VC di di . . . (VC gone, VC gone)." The troops presently advance toward a cluster of houses nearer the village center. Spaced along the mud trails at intervals of about 10 yards are thick mud bunkers, each large enough for several men. The houses also have bunkers, inside or out. Vinh Hoa, being within an allied "free strike zone," is subject to air and artillery pounding.

No booby traps materialize. The troops arrive at a substantial farmhouse with flower beds in the front yard, a manicured hedge and pillars flanking the front entrance. It is one of many prosperous homes in Vinh Hoa—surprising, since Vietcong villages usually are poorer than government-controlled towns. Isolation from major markets, high Vietcong taxes and allied bombing are among the reasons.

Behind the house some leaf wrappings are found. "The VC must have been here," an American says. "That's what they wrap field rations in." (Leaves are used by most rural Vietnamese, VC or not, to wrap food.) The occupant of the house, an old man who stares at the interlopers through wire-rim spectacles, is shaking, through age, or fear, or both.

The aged Vietnamese is questioned briefly. "Bring him along," an American says sharply. "Let's move." Another adviser says, "That old man could be the top dog VC in this village. You never know." The old man totters along with the troops. He is released in mid-afternoon when one of the two informers claims him as an uncle.

INTERROGATION

At about 11 a.m., an American adviser and two special police turn up with three captives. "Found them hiding in a house," the American says. The informers inspect the captives and whisper, through an interpreter, that one is a Vietcong village guerrilla, the second a Vietcong "security section chief" and the third a non-Vietcong, perhaps a deserter from the South Vietnamese army.

The two identified as Vietcong are bound, and one of them, a narrow-shouldered, bent young man with protruding teeth, is leaned against a tree trunk. Several police interrogators and PRUs gather around him and fire questions. They want to know where Vietcong weapons and ammunition are hidden.

The suspect doesn't know or won't say. Soon the questions are interspersed with yanks at his hair and sharp kicks to his head, face and groin. The prisoner sags against the tree, face bloodied.

"Americans don't want to be here for any more of this," says one U.S. adviser, moving away. "It's a nasty goddamned business." He adds, "You know, it's a whole cycle of this stuff. Last week in another village near Don Nhon the VC marched five government sympathizers into the marketplace and beat their heads in with hammers. So we return it on this guy. It goes on and on."

By now the informers have gotten their bearings. They lead most of the troops along a trail to a hospital building behind a hedge of blue flowers. It is a straw-thatch structure containing eight wide plank beds separated by white plastic curtains. In one corner is a mud bunker, in another a crude case of glassware and medicine bottles, some with French and American labels. There are no patients or traces of them.

The Americans decide it is a Vietcong hospital for wounded enemy troops. "Burn it," an American adviser directs. Ignited with cigaret lighters, the hut burns readily.

VINH HOA VILLAGE

In single file, the troops wind along a trail toward the center of Vinh Hoa. Since there hasn't been any firing, the possibility of an ambush is discounted. Some of the PRUs and special police are carrying food and household articles taken from the outlying farmhouses. The "psywarriors" are strewing the trail with propaganda leaflets carried in plastic bags. Some of the PRUs have ringed their helmets with garlands of flowers. The procession takes on a festive air.

Ten minutes later the column reaches the center of the village, a small cluster of houses and shops facing a square that previously contained a covered marketplace. The marketplace has been bombed out. In the center of the square is a concrete obelisk about 10 feet high—a Vietcong memorial, say the Americans, dedicated to the enemy dead. It is one target of the Phoenix strike.

The PRUs and Vietnamese special police begin searching—and sacking—the homes. They are bored, and restless, because there has been no "action." The psywarriors' plastic bags, emptied of propaganda, are commandeered for loot ranging from clothing to chickens. "Trick or treat," say an American, not really amused. In one house, some of the Vietnamese troops are having a small celebration. They have unearthed a bottle of rice wine.

A few village residents, women, children and old men, are assembled along one side of the square. They squat on their haunches in the dust. Several male captives are bound a few yards away. Against a wall, the narrow-shouldered prisoner is rocking back and forth, a trickle of blood running down his head.

Amid whirling dust, a 9th Division helicopter lands in the square. A lean U.S. lieutenant colonel in polished boots and trim uniform steps out with aides in tow. Display-

ing a map marked with red grease pencil, he reports the kill totals of the support troops: "Charlie Company got three KIAs (Killed in Action), Delta Company two, we got one from my chopper. . . ." All the fatalities, he says, were armed Vietcong, carrying packs. They were shot trying to flee through the cordon. "They had low-level documents on them," the colonel reports. Presently the chopper leaves.

In the middle of the square, two Americans are strapping demolition charges around the Vietcong monument. A one-minute warning is sounded. Everyone takes cover. As the charge explodes, the monument disintegrates into chunks of brick and concrete. It is exactly noon.

THE VILLAGE CHURCH

The explosion seems to galvanize the foraging troops into action. "Don't they have anything to do but loot those houses?" an American PRU adviser shouts to a Vietnamese lieutenant. "Get the men out combing the rest of this village." Two search parties move out. A third group, mostly Americans, crosses a narrow footbridge spanning a canal to investigate a church.

Crossing the bridge, the Americans spot fresh footprints on both sides of the river connected with the canal. For the moment, they pose a mystery.

The church, a Roman Catholic structure, is bolted shut at front and rear. Just as two Americans warily advance to smash a lock, the front door opens and an elderly man in white pajamas appears, smiling as though to welcome parishioners to services. The inside of the little church is newly painted and neatly scrubbed. A row of angled bullet holes along the metal-sheet roof attests to a visit from a helicopter gunship.

In the rear are a large drum and a brass gong. An American points to them and questions the elderly church attendant.

"What are they for?"

"To call the faithful to worship."

"Did you see any people leaving the village this morning?"

"No. . . ."

"We have information on how much this church pays to the VC in taxes. How much do you say it pays?"

"Maybe the people pay 100 or 200 plasters (80 cents to \$1.60)."

"The church, how much does it pay?"

"The church does not pay taxes. The church never pays taxes."

"The hell it doesn't pay," the American says. "This may be a Catholic church, but it's Charlie's Catholic church."

A TACITURN LADY

The Americans follow a path past the church to a cluster of solidly built homes. Most are empty. In one, two candles burn before a postcard picture of Christ. In another, a picture of Pope Paul sits on a small altar beside a mud bunker. One house is occupied by a woman with six children. She is interrogated.

"Did you see people crossing the river this morning?"

"No, I was in my bunker."

"Where is your husband?"

"He went to the market at Cai Mang."

"Why?"

"He always goes when the soldiers come here. . . ."

"Do you know who are the VC in this village?"

"No. We don't know VC. We are Catholic. Catholics don't know VC."

"We know that a Liberation Committee was elected here. When?"

"I just heard about it recently."

"Who is the Vietcong village chief here?"

"I don't know. . . ."

"How much tax do you pay to the VC?"

"More than 1,000 plasters." (About \$8.)

"How often do Vietcong song and dance (propaganda) teams come and visit?"
 "Not often."
 "What do they say?"
 "They say the Americans will go home soon."
 "How often does your husband stand guard for the VC?"
 "Every five or six days."
 "How often do the women here have to make punji stakes (poisoned stakes) for the VC?"
 "Once or twice a year."

"That's pretty typical," says the American, heading back across the footbridge to the village square.

DISAPPEARING ENEMY

An American adviser has figured out the footprints on both sides of the river. There are no sampans around the village. Adult males except for old men, seem almost nonexistent. The village population is estimated at 2,000, but no more than 200 persons have been seen on this day.

The American finds a youngster hiding in a farmhouse. He poses a few perfunctory questions, then suddenly demands: "At what time this morning did all the people leave here by boat?" Perhaps startled by the suddenness of the query, the boy replies, "At four o'clock."

The conclusion: Most of the village's Vietcong guerrillas, VCI cadre and Liberation Committee members have eluded the Phoenix troops. "They just had to have that big meeting last night," fumes an American adviser, recalling the last planning session for the operation. "Everyone had to get in on this * * * operation. The VC must have known all about it by midnight last night. So they blew the place. Just sailed down the river on their sampans."

But there may be something to salvage from the operation. In the square, the group of squatting villagers has grown to 50 or 60. Census-Grievance operatives examine their identification cards. Few have them; in Vietcong-controlled areas, the enemy forbids the people to carry government ID cards and often punishes those who do.

The two informers, still with bags on their heads, stand behind a nearby wall, peering at the villagers. Occasionally they point to a resident and whisper to a PRU. Those put under suspicion are pulled to their feet, bound and taken aside to the prisoner group. The others remain on their haunches staring silently into the dust.

THE MOVING FINGER

One villager "fingered" by the informers is a bowlegged woman clutching a baby. She is identified as a member of the village "women-farmer association," a Vietcong citizen-involvement organization not normally considered important enough to classify as Vietcong cadre. ("No point picking them up," a U.S. official says later in Saigon. "They're more trouble than they're worth to process and hold.")

But the woman is moved to the prisoner group, clutching the baby. Her two other children, a boy about six and a girl about 10 years old, begin to cry loudly. A PRU raises a rifle butt over their heads menacingly, and the walls subside into muffled sobs.

From behind a nearby house two shots are heard. The narrow-shouldered prisoner has been executed. His body is dumped into a bunker.

One of the psywar operatives lectures the villagers on the perils of supporting the Vietcong and outlines the benefits of backing the Saigon government. Propaganda sheets bearing a smiling portrait of President Nguyen Van Thieu are handed out.

At one side of the square an American adviser muses about the operation and what it has to do with the war: "There are 30 people sitting around a table in Paris, and they just aren't going to hack it. How can

they solve this thing? The people in this village have been VC for 10 years, maybe 20. How are you going to change that? We come here on an operation, and what does it prove? We've got some crook sitting in Don Nhon picking up a salary every month because he claims to be the government village chief here. He hasn't dared to visit this village for seven years. The district chief was too chicken to come on this operation. So we come in, pick up a few Charlies and leave. The VC will be back in control here tonight. . . ."

HEADING BACK

At 3 p.m., with five prisoners in tow, the troops start hiking back to the landing zone in the rice paddy for transportation home. Near the paddy they meet two U.S. soldiers from the 9th Division cordon, leading two prisoners. Each of the captives wears a neatly printed "Detainee Card."

The taller and more talkative of the two informers is brought forward to examine the new prisoners. One is identified as a deputy Vietcong village chief, the other as a non-Vietcong. Both are placed with the other prisoners.

A deputy Vietcong village chief would be the most important captive of the day by far, the others being low-level cadre at best. "Hey, we got us a big one," says an elated American adviser, who then cautions nearby PRUs: "You keep this one alive, you hear. We want him alive."

Half an hour later the troops have been helicoptered back to their compound in Ben Tre, and the prisoners are on their way to the Police Special Branch interrogation center. Results of the operation: Eight kills, one after torture. Seven prisoners taken for interrogation. One war memorial dynamited. One hospital burned. No friendly casualties.

CULTURAL VANDALISM

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, every American aspires to preserve a national culture. I think this is best indicated in the grants by some tax-free foundations, through Federal subsidies and with tax-free bequests to improve the theater, making it more inviting to the average citizen.

Now it becomes apparent that the easy money is not being used to display our culture, advance the arts, or to improve the quality of the humanities but rather the programs are designed to destroy everything that is sacred, moral, and holy to the American people.

In just the past few days in New York the actors and all connected with the performance of "Che" were arrested on various charges of indecency.

In another region at New Orleans, La., the Repertory Theater, financed by \$1½ million in tax dollars, has been found so repulsive to the New Orleans community that the educational chairman of the women's auxiliary of the chamber of commerce is surveying the disillusioned community toward registering a formal protest.

It is time that someone in the leadership of this country take heed to what is going on and who is promoting it before the American people rise up to perpetuate their culture for the next generation.

Until such time as the drama leadership polices its own ranks I urge that

this administration cut off any further funding and that the Congress not appropriate any funds for theaters, drama and thespian arts.

Mr. Speaker, a UPI release from New York City of March 25, a copy of a circulated letter from New Orleans, and an article from the Summit, Miss., Sun for March 13, follow:

"CHE!" GETS ARRESTING REVIEW

NEW YORK.—Several policemen and a judge sat quietly through a performance of "Che!" last night.

When it was over police arrested the actors, the producer, the director, the writer, the set designer, the costume designer and the box office manager. They were charged with public lewdness, obscenity and consensual sodomy. Nine of the 10 persons involved also were charged with "unlawful dealings with a child"—a youth of 17 who was in the play.

The off-Broadway show is supposed to depict symbolically the last hours of Cuban revolutionary leader Ernesto (Che) Guevara. The on-stage "Che"—played by Larry Berowitz—devotes much of his time to stimulating sexual intercourse with Mary Anne Shelley. Both Berowitz and Miss Shelley played their scenes nude.

The play ends with an actor playing the president of the United States and wearing nothing but an Uncle Sam hat and a red, white and blue sash around his waist shooting Guevara.

A PARENT, NOT HYSTERICAL BUT VERY CONCERNED, PROTESTS ABOUT "PROTEST: MAN AGAINST SOCIETY"

Repertory Theatre was inaugurated to open the world of theatre to those who had rarely, if ever, had the privilege of enjoying live theatre. It was intended to preserve our cultural heritage. As such, one would expect it to be not only entertaining, but somewhat inspirational and pro-American since millions of tax dollars go to support it. (Locally, New Orleans Educational Laboratory Theatre has been federally funded with approximately one and a half millions of tax dollars.)

For several weeks now, Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* has been shown to high school students—public, parochial, and private—in the New Orleans Area. The selection of the play itself was amazing since the theme is pessimistic, biting ironic, scornful of those in authority and bleakly depressing. (Not exactly the type script that would make a theatre-goer out of a non-discerning teenager.)

Before attending the production, our high school population was given free a book entitled *Protest: Man Against Society. An Enemy of the People* (new translation by David Scanlan commissioned by Repertory Theatre, New Orleans—footnote, page 15) is printed therein, but so are essays completely incendiary in nature, violently critical of our democratic institutions, and encouraging revolt in our youth. But it is all done with finesse. Thus, the opening selection is Matthew's gospel wherein Christ commissions his twelve to go out and preach. In crescendo fashion, the essays become anti-democratic-state, more violently critical of our American institutions, more flagrantly revolutionary, until the book concludes with recommendations for militant protest.

Who are some of the authors? Robert Williams—now living in Communist China—a close friend of Mao Tse Tung. Andre Malraux—an active participant in the communist revolutionary movement in China, Southeast Asia and the Loyalist Cause in Spain. In *Man's Fate* Malraux portrays a man who realizes he must murder in cold blood for the good of the revolutionary movement. In the book, the reader is urged to subvert, to spread the ideology that would undermine

the American system and destroy her symbols—from draft registration, the Flag and even our currency: (page 159, line 7) Mario Savio—the leader of The Free Speech Movement (filthy speech) and one of the prime movers of the riots at Berkeley—is also included, as is Jerry Rubin—a well-known hippie or yippie, and a leader in the Chicago demonstrations and riots.

In his essay *What the Revolution Is All About or We are Vietcong and We are Everywhere*, Mr. Rubin does not attempt to be subtle. He describes America as being on the run—he claims that sex, rebellion, drugs, youth, music, open defiance, and giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our country is a combination that is hard to beat: (page 157, 5 lines from bottom of page).

There's more, much more, shock appeal in *Protest*. Of course interspersed with the authors mentioned are some who do not advocate the accomplishment of change through violence. Even Mayor Daley is a contributor, but the overall emphasis is on change through violence and civil disobedience.

Why not read the book yourself and decide if this is what you wish our children to be reading. Remember, it's paid for by You, the tax-payer!

AUXILIARY MEMBERS: This letter was referred to me, your Education Chairman. If you feel that the Women's Auxiliary of the Chamber of Commerce should register a complaint about *Protest: Man Against Society*, please check and sign the following blank, tear off, and return to the Women's Auxiliary, Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 30240, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130.

MARION DURST,

Education Chairman, Women's Auxiliary.

[From the Summit (Miss.) Sun, Mar, 13, 1969]

LOOKING AHEAD: THE MORAL POLLUTERS
(By Dr. George S. Benson)

In a University of Michigan auditorium crowded with men and women students and faculty, ten members of the cast of the stage play "Dionysus in '69"—six men and four women—performed naked according to the Associated Press, during 35 minutes of the three hour play. Several hours after the performance, they were arrested for "indecent exposure". University President Robben Fleming said, following the show and the arrests, that "academic and professional people regarded the production as worthy of serious consideration." Nudity is difficult to describe as obscene, President Fleming said, and the question was "the context within which nudity occurred."

The incidents of public display of nakedness at Ann Arbor followed several similar reported incidents on college campuses—some in which men and women university students were the "actors". A group of students gave such performances at the University of Wisconsin. The University of California at Berkeley and the University of Colorado at Boulder are reported to have permitted public nudity displays. Generally speaking, University authorities have taken a "permissive" attitude toward such activities.

REVOLUTIONARY "STANDARDS"

After the murder of a co-ed at Iowa State University at Ames, a County Grand Jury investigated and subsequently issued a report warning the parents of ISU students and the people of Iowa generally of "moral pollution by faculty and paid speakers" at the university. One of the documents in the Grand Jury's report was a news clipping reporting on a big campus event—a lecture by "Dr. Albert Ellis" of the "Institute for Rational Living, New York". The lecture was sponsored by the YWCA, YMCA and the University Lectures Committee. Ellis urged the young men and women students to throw off

the "old standards" of behavior and participate freely in sex "outside marriage". Those who didn't, he said, "need a psychotherapist". He advocated breaking down "taboos" and explicitly recommended that after marriage the man and wife should both participate in extra-marital sex; he recommended that "the husband and wife go out separately looking for extra marital sex." Undergraduate students and faculty crowded the university's Great Hall in Memorial Union for the lecture.

JURY REPORT ATTACKED

After the Grand Jury report, the University President W. Robert Parks attacked the Jury. "No amount of vague wording," he said "... can cloud the fact that the main thrust of the Grand Jury report is a demand for censorship. I need not point out," he said, "how dangerous to a free society the imposition of such controls can be—far more dangerous than permitting ideas to be heard with which we may not agree."

The foregoing facts of campus life in some Universities have been cited, and the permissiveness of some University officialdom documented, because the American people, especially the parents, need to know about the activities, the institutional attitudes, and particularly the forces working to expand the "moral pollution" and set the stage for revolution. Not enough Americans are aware of the fact that Communists are working to break down "old standards" of decency and morals as a means of creating and entrapping an army of young revolutionaries. The proof of this is voluminous and undeniable. Their participation in many college outbreaks is evident to all who investigate.

STRATEGY: POLLUTE MORALS

At a Seminar held by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California, 30 campus leaders from throughout the country discussed "Toward a Strategy of Disruption" and other revolutionary subjects. Devereaux Kennedy, Student Body President at Washington University, St. Louis, said that one of the strategies of student revolutionaries dedicated to overthrowing the United States was to establish University rules permitting men and women students to spend as much time as they wished together in dormitory bedrooms.

"If you want to get kids interested in the other kinds of issues (Ed's note: stopping the Vietnam war on Vietcong terms, overthrowing the United States), you have to show that your interests lie with them, too. And we all realize parietal hours (restricting unlimited bedroom "dating") are a big thing on campuses because kids want to get rid of them. So let's get rid of them! But let's not stop there." Then he spoke of revolution (the kind being organized by the Communists). "What I mean by revolution," he said, "is overthrowing the American government—starting up 50 Vietnams . . . black rebellions . . . giving these people guns . . . performing acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto . . ."

As parents and taxpayers, the mothers and fathers of America should awaken to what is happening to youth in many American Universities today.

MIAMI—OCEANOGRAPHIC CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the selection of Miami Beach, Fla., as the site of the Marine Technology Society's fifth annual conference and exposition during June 16 to 19, 1969, is fresh evidence of the fact that the Miami area has

become a center for the growing science of oceanography—truly, Miami is the oceanographic capital of the world.

Some 2,500 members of the society from maritime nations the world over will gather in Miami to discuss developments and techniques in marine technology anticipated during the next 10 years. The conference theme will be "The Decade Ahead—1970-80," and papers will be presented on such important subjects as national ocean policy, ocean law, education and training, marine science status reports, marine systems and technologies, economics and investments, review and forecast.

Since the United States has invited the nations of the world to participate in an "International Decade of Ocean Exploration," the discussions of the conference will be entirely appropriate for this monumental undertaking. Miami is indeed proud to serve as host for this outstanding conference, which points up that man's study of the ocean's depths ranks in importance with his exploration of outer space, for both are vital to his future.

For years, Miami has attracted oceanographers as a natural location and jumping-off point for their activities. Its geographical location and climatic environment are ideal for many oceanographic purposes; the climate which allows year-round research is essentially tropical, although Miami is situated 150 miles north of the Tropic of Cancer. It is one of the few North American areas from which it is possible to study, in nearby waters, living coral reefs, mangrove swamps, limestone rock formations, and other phenomena associated with tropical seas and shores. The Gulf Stream, with its almost boundless opportunities for oceanic research and study, passes almost within sight of shore.

Miami-based oceanographic research vessels can help man harvest the Continental Shelf, the vast sloping undersea area between the east coast land mass and the deep waters of the Atlantic, for food and mineral resources. Small craft and research vessels can easily reach the scientifically interesting Bahamas Banks, the Gulf of Mexico, and many Caribbean areas. Southeast Florida is also admirably located for deep sea studies in the area between West Africa, Brazil, Bermuda, and Florida, whose waters teem with a wide variety of valuable marine life.

One of the first organizations to take advantage of these natural conditions was the University of Miami, whose institute of marine sciences now ranks with such other respected marine research and educational institutions as Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, and the Scripps Institute in California. Its outstanding faculty and facilities have helped attract other oceanography-centered organizations to Miami in increasing numbers.

Located with the institute on Miami's Virginia Key is the Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory, an agency of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. The laboratory is engaged in oceanographic biological research activities including the

study of marine food resources of the entire tropical Atlantic Ocean; the design of research programs to support and increase the efficiency of the total catch by the Nation's commercial fisheries; the acquisition of knowledge for use both in harvesting and conserving stocks of surface schooling tunas in the tropical Atlantic and adjacent seas; and the aiding of the peoples of underdeveloped nations bordering the tropical Atlantic to find better means of acquiring protein rich resources near their shores.

A third major addition to this bustling scientific community will be the Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratories—AOL—of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—which recently acquired a 12-acre site on Virginia Key adjacent to the two other facilities. Miami was selected as the best location for this laboratory after keen competition among 114 other locations ranging from Maine to the Virgin Islands.

Now occupying rental quarters in the Miami area until a permanent \$2.5 million AOL building is constructed on Virginia Key are five major ESSA components: The Physical Oceanography Laboratory, the Marine Geology and Geophysics Laboratory, the Sea-Air Interaction Laboratory, the National Hurricane Research Laboratory, and the Experimental Meteorology Laboratory. Space is also to be provided in the AOL building for the southern regional office of the National Oceanographic Data Center. Housing all of these units in the same structure will immeasurably strengthen the stated national requirement for sea-air interaction studies.

The Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratories provide scientific services relating to the environment which are needed by the nearby Institute of Marine Science and the Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory, for their research on the ocean. In addition, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Discoverer* operated for the ESSA laboratories is already stationed at nearby Dodge Island, and the Survey's ship *Researcher*, for which construction funds have been appropriated, is nearing completion and will join the *Discoverer* in Miami early next year. These ships will utilize the shore "backup" facilities of the ESSA-oceanographic complex.

Thus, when AOL is able to locate on Virginia Key—hopefully, in the near future—a scientific oceanography community will be formed whose close association will allow many opportunities for mutually advantageous exchanges. The University of Miami supports this concept to the extent that it will move its Institute of Atmospheric Sciences to the key to join the "community" once the ESSA facility is there. In fact, the university plans to erect a special building very shortly, to serve as a center for the Government laboratories as well as the university's own facilities on the key.

These developments are all accomplished or in progress. Of course, Miami's role as the oceanography capital of the world envisions even greater progress in the future. For example, the January 1969, report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources recommended that a new agency be

formed—a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, which would combine and coordinate all of the existing Government functions and more. It would include, among other services, ESSA and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. If this recommendation is approved, the basic nucleus of the new Agency's field activities will already be clustered on Virginia Key.

Beyond this, Miami's visualize ultimate creation of a major oceanographic science park on Virginia Key which will be the hub of the international effort to harvest the seas. Such a park would be an outstanding asset for the scientific community. Tied in with a deep water seaport in south Dade County—and including a 25-foot-deep channel through Biscayne Bay—this park-port complex would attract a large percentage of the more than 400 national firms with sizable research staffs interested in one phase or another of oceanography, ocean engineering, or the manufacturing of equipment and supplies to support these fields.

Such a tremendous aggregation of Government, scientific, and commercial groups would provide a tremendous boost to the oceanographic field—which, unfortunately, has not received the Government support that most of us would like, in the past several years, due to the Government's fiscal difficulties.

By following through with this extraordinary plan of action, Miami can become an oceanographic capital of unprecedented scope, setting the international pattern for this increasingly important science. The many Miami's who have worked so long and hard to achieve our existing progress are continuing and strengthening their efforts to make this vision a reality.

The seas, earth's last great untapped resource, offer a bonanza of food and mineral wealth unrivaled in value and importance. Miami is proud of its status as the world capital of oceanography—the scientific key that can unlock this great treasure of the oceans.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—A CONTINUING NEED

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the need for congressional reform is a continuing one. For the record, I would recite an example that occurred just today.

The Committee on House Administration this morning voted favorably on House Resolution 259, to provide funds for studies and investigations by the Committee on Public Works.

Because requests by the minority for additional staffing had not been fully met, I had intended to file minority views in a report on this resolution; however, because both the committee and the House have acted immediately, I was not given an opportunity to file minority views. Without minority views, it would be difficult and futile, if not impossible, to explain to the membership sound reasons for not approving House Resolution

259, or amending it to provide for additional and badly needed staffing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the needs for minority staffing on the Public Works Committee can be worked out in the future by agreement. It is regrettable, however, that when situations like this do come up, it is not possible for a member, as a matter of right, to have time to file minority views which can be considered by the membership of this House when acting on legislation such as House Resolution 259.

FOREIGN POLICY: MORE EFFECT FOR LESS EXPENSE—A COMMENTARY BY AMBASSADOR BRIGGS

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk in recent months about "cleaning out the State Department." Most of it has been sloughed off in the press as the irresponsible remarks by the overly simplistic or the naive suggestions of well-meaning people who do not really understand the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this may sometimes be true, but before my colleagues in the House dismiss the matter as such, I hope they will take the time to read the following article which recently appeared in the March 1969 edition of the Foreign Service Journal.

The article is entitled "Why Not Give Diplomacy Back to the Diplomats?" and was written by one of America's most knowledgeable men in the field of foreign affairs, Ambassador Ellis Briggs of Hanover, N.H.

Ellis Briggs began his career in the Foreign Service in 1925, and in 1960 attained the rank of career Ambassador. During that period he served as Ambassador to seven posts, which I believe is something of a record. They included Uruguay, Czechoslovakia, the Republic of Korea, Peru, Brazil, Greece, and Spain.

Ambassador Briggs is also the author of two books, the most recent of which was entitled "Farewell to Foggy Bottom."

Here is a man who knows intimately the problems of diplomacy and policymaking. In this articulate, well-reasoned essay, he clearly demonstrates that there is in fact a need to clean out the State Department, the simple reason being so that it will function more effectively. I heartily commend his article to the attention of my colleagues for it provides some enlightenment on why our foreign policy does not always operate in the smoothest manner and in our best interests.

The article follows:

WHY NOT GIVE DIPLOMACY BACK TO THE DIPLOMATS?

(By Ellis Briggs)

(NOTE.—Ellis O. Briggs, writer and ambassador to seven countries, was born in Watertown, Massachusetts. He is the recipient of the Medal of Freedom for meritorious service as Ambassador to Korea in 1955. His prolific pen has produced numerous magazine articles and he is the author of two books, "Shots Heard Round the World" in

1957 and "Farewell to Foggy Bottom" in 1964.)

No one dealing with the operational aspects of foreign affairs can be unaware of the problem of personnel proliferation—the dismal and frustrating drag on performance resulting from too many people. It is therefore disappointing to find that the organization which purports to represent those engaged in American diplomacy—the American Foreign Service Association, control of which was recently captured in Washington by its junior State Department echelon—fails to cope with this major problem of excess staff and superfluous people. On the contrary, the drift of the Association's activities, which they have brought to the attention of President Nixon and his principal advisers, is that "modern diplomacy" will need even more people than there are on the payroll at present.

The facts of diplomatic life support no such conclusion.

The American Foreign Service, at upwards of thirty-six hundred commissioned officers, is already at least one thousand men and women too large. At every Embassy which the writer is familiar—as Ambassador to seven countries on three continents, plus continuing study of our operations abroad—the business of the United States could have been transacted more effectively by one half, or less, of the personnel assigned to each mission.

Outside the Foreign Service, overstaffing abroad by other agencies is even more serious. These Peripheral Performers—the dispensers of foreign aid, of development, of prescriptions for "emerging societies," of magic and martial music, of propaganda, and of the Crusading Spirit—are all more proliferated than the diplomats, and their ranks are in correspondingly greater need of fumigation and retrenchment. (Former President Johnson's 1968 reduction-in-force program, albeit in the right direction, turned out to be mostly hocus-pocus: the reductions were minimal, and the repatriates remained on the payroll.)

Just as during the so-called missile crisis in Washington in 1962, only a handful of persons were involved in decisions, so in even the most important of Embassies, confronting the gravest of situations, the Ambassador needs few aides to assist him. An Ambassador is supported by his Deputy, a seasoned and senior official, and between them they do what requires to be done with the Chief of State, the Prime Minister, or the members of the Cabinet of the country to which the Ambassador is accredited. In addition the Ambassador may be advised by the Political Counselor (or by the Counselor for Economic Affairs, depending on the subject matter) and perhaps by one or two subordinate Embassy officers who possess special training or experience in the area in question. Including secretaries, stenographers and clerks, an Ambassador uses a maximum of ten people to confront a critical or emergency situation; less, of course, for normal operations.

The rest of the Embassy cast contribute little except confusion, delay, cross-purposes and unread "position papers." In short, there is not enough substantive, useful, challenging or interesting work for an American Embassy of hundreds upon hundreds of people. The consequent featherbedding is as unprofitable to the taxpayers as it is stultifying to the individuals concerned.

The presence of these gigantic staffs in foreign capitals has an ill effect in another direction. It is a source of derision and disrespect on the part of the very foreigners whose good will the United States is theoretically cultivating. They manifest their attitude by destroying with monotonous and humiliating regularity such well-meaning tokens of the conspicuous American establishment as libraries and cultural centers, and even by attacking the Embassy premises. No other country in the world maintains out-

side its borders a fraction of the personnel camped in successive "Little Americas," where teeming administrators seek to reproduce the suburban way of life, but often merely succeed in reducing the natives to popeyed resentment. (Evacuating these communities before a threatened political upheaval costs the United States millions of dollars—for instance in the Near East in 1967.)

In searching for reasons why these truths, which are self-evident to so many professional practitioners, seem to have escaped successive administrations since World War II, it is clear that what is lacking is agreement as to the nature of foreign affairs, and above that, an understanding of the purpose of diplomacy.

The object of diplomacy is to influence the policy of another country, in ways favorable to the first country. It is as uncomplicated as that. That is the same object diplomacy has sought since cavemen inhabited adjacent cliffs, and pastoral societies coveted contiguous grazing areas. It is the same purpose that diplomacy will always have; the label "modern diplomacy" is therefore a misnomer, denigrating to the past and unhelpful to the future.

This definition of diplomacy as inseparable from policy, can be expanded to render it more specific. Take the statement: "the object of American diplomacy is to influence in ways favorable to the United States the policy of governments important to the United States." Such a declaration is both accurate and intelligible. It encourages the establishment of the priorities essential to the orderly transaction of business, without which American resources are in danger of being frittered away. It implies that the demands of Abidjan, Tegucigalpa and Reykjavik, although not necessarily unworthy, may nevertheless be less important to the American people than the problems emanating from Moscow, Rio de Janeiro or Tokyo.

Within this true definition of diplomacy, the foreign business of the United States is not ideological warfare, nor evangelism, nor huffing and puffing to accelerate alien development, nor the preservation of a balance of power or any rigid *status quo*. The business of American diplomacy is the promotion of the national interests of the United States, and the protection of those interests, in a changing and turbulent world, from whatever menace that is capable of producing an intolerable explosion.

Diplomacy as influencing the policy of other governments is hardly the definition that has prevailed in recent Potomac councils. For instance, the young soothsayers of the Foreign Service Association, writing in collaboration with assorted Peripheral Performers (who perhaps cannot be expected to advocate measures tending to thin their ranks or curb their activities), appear to view diplomacy, and especially what they characterize as "modern diplomacy," as something far more gaudy and uninhibited than influencing policy. Not content with that, they desire to transform institutions.

Now transforming institutions is a different proposition altogether from influencing policy, and it is at that point that the paths of diplomats and reformers most frequently diverge. Influencing policy involves discipline, analysis, understanding of facts and possibilities, and comprehension of their bearing on the national interests, seen in realistic perspective. It involves attention to detail, and patience, and "the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations."

Transforming institutions, in contrast, would seek for diplomacy—"modern diplomacy," to be sure—a worldwide hunting license of infinite scope and unlimited validity, encouraging the participants to thrash about in hemisphere briar patches, brandishing megaphones and bazookas.

Under that definition of diplomacy, a case can of course be made for the retention of almost limitless performers, all allegedly assisting the hunters; for an army of beaters, making the forests echo and startling the game from habitat to Helsinki; for guides tying goats to *ceiba* trees, scattering cracked corn on the ponds, and locating saltlicks; for researchers and biologists to plot the flyways and locate the spawning areas; and even for missionaries to explain to the penguins that they would really be happier if they laid their eggs along the Amazon River, where the water is comfortably warm, instead of along the shores of McMurdo Sound, where the water is uncommonly cold.

Under that definition of diplomacy, there is no end to the legions that can be recruited. Battalions of imagemakers, flashing their mirrors; gaggles of weakers-of-good, waving lofty intentions; regiments of attaches, measuring culverts and bridges; prides of welfare workers, one foot on the accelerator and one eye on the cookie jar.

That, in fact, is precisely what has been happening.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to trace how this came about, gradually, in the wake of World War II, sometimes over the protests of an ineffectual State Department, sometimes with its blessings. But come about it did, with results that now confront us.

The American Government has been in the transforming institutions business for nearly a quarter century. To show for it, the United States has a balance of payments problem, and microscopic return on an incalculable investment.

It is time for the American people to dedicate themselves not to "modern diplomacy" but to effective diplomacy, with less free-loading of international freight, and no free-wheeling by crusaders.

That does not mean abandoning compassion as a legitimate ingredient in the foreign affairs equation. It does imply that a decent regard for self-interest ought no longer to be considered discreditable and that a *quid pro quo* in the diplomatic marketplace should once again have value.

That does not mean the extermination of the Peripheral Performers, whose operations, nevertheless, should henceforth be understood as adjuncts of diplomacy, and no longer as controlling components. Projects to foster cultural osmosis, public relations planning (labeled propaganda when someone else does it), aid of one sort or another to selected developing lands, military assistance, credits, sharing of scientific knowledge and the paraphernalia of technology—each of those things, in given circumstances to be decided upon one country at a time—can sometimes provide fruitful though usually limited assistance in the functioning of diplomacy and in the conduct of international relations.

Thus, while peripheral activities should not all be abandoned, past experience with them, their cost and their limitations, ought to be brought into focus. And future operations should be both closely scrutinized and sharply patrolled by the Department of State. Moreover, most of the personnel concerned are not diplomats, and those who are not should be detached from the diplomatic establishment.

Tools needed to bring these things about are already at hand—two tools, forged during this decade. The first is the Presidential letter of May 29, 1961, outlining the responsibility and authority of the American Ambassador. Thus equipped, there is no reason why the voice of a determined representative abroad should be inaudible through the hum of Virginia Avenue traffic, or contradicted by the bleats of bureaucratic sheep folded in Foggy Bottom. The other is the charter of March 4, 1966, from the President to the Secretary of State. This, known as National Security Action Memorandum 341,

returns to the State Department the "overall direction, coordination, and supervision" of American Government activities overseas. NSAM 341 is a delegation of power of formidable proportions, but in the ensuing three years the State Department, its leadership mired in Asian dilemmas, failed to take advantage of this grant of White House authority.

These two existing directives constitute ample ammunition for a fresh President and Secretary of State to mount an overdue campaign against the entrenched agencies and organizations that for years have been chipping away at the State Department, invading its field, and seeking to substitute the activism of the eager beaver for the voice of experience. Today, shrinking the American diplomatic service to manageable dimensions and then returning to it the necessary attributes for achievement may not prove an easy task, but it is a job to be undertaken if diplomacy is to be of maximum value to the American people. It is a job for a new Secretary of State, unmortgaged by the mistakes of the 1950s and 60s.

There is no area of the federal government that has been the object of more solicitude on the part of uninformed kibitzers and aggressive reformers than the American Foreign Service. Most of them have operated under the banner of "modern diplomacy," discredited though that emblem may be as a result of costly, futile and interminable experiments. It may be that in the nature of his work, a diplomat finds himself unable to cultivate the kind of grassroots constituency that supports other government operations. He can boast of no lobby comparable to those beating drums for the Departments of Defense or Agriculture, for example. That does not mean that the Foreign Service must cultivate a supple spine, or that diplomats should hesitate to stand up and be counted. In fact if they do not stand up, they are likely to be counted out, and at no distant date in the future.

It is high time that diplomats do speak up, for improvements generated from within testify to the vitality of the organization, and moreover among the assets possessed by professionalism is an aroused awareness on the part of the American people of the importance of foreign affairs, properly conducted. That awareness should include simultaneous acceptance of the proposition that if an American householder has a broken-down furnace, he does not call in an astrologer, a paperhanger, or a professor-who-says-he-knows-all-the-answers. Nor does the home owner invite to his cellar a traveling circus. He summons a plumber who knows about furnaces.

It is perhaps reassuring to the general public that diplomats and plumbers have that much in common. At any rate, having tried without success practically everything else since World War II ended, it might be a good idea to try giving diplomacy back to the diplomats. There would be a saving in fuel oil, and they might even repair the furnace.

CONGRESS WANTS TO KNOW ABOUT CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is considering a number of major defense questions, from the merits of the ABM, the number of troops that should be kept in Vietnam, to the need to revise the draft. In each case, we have been able to obtain from the Department of Defense and the Department of State a rather thorough explana-

tion of the public policy questions relating to these problems. Although we may not have agreed with the position taken by these Departments, there has been no lack of information about them.

This has not been the case for chemical and biological warfare, however. When some questions were raised recently concerning the safety of the chemical and biological warfare programs being carried out by the United States, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) asked the U.S. Army to brief Members of Congress on the public policy and safety aspects of these programs. The questions to be answered were of the same type that we would normally ask about troop deployment in NATO, our commitment to South Vietnam, procurement of the ABM or similar military subjects.

The U.S. Army presented an interesting briefing, much of it classified for reasons not altogether satisfactory. I attended that briefing but was disappointed, as were others, for the briefing did not answer the public policy questions. It was not made clear, for example, whether or not we had adequate chemical warfare deterrent and whether or not we need such a deterrent.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), in his usual determination and diligence, has followed up this briefing by writing to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, and other agency heads for their answers to a comprehensive series of public policy questions on chemical and biological warfare. Answers to these questions should help Congress and the public make an intelligent evaluation of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare. I look forward with interest to the replies that the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) will receive.

The widespread public interest in this area is shown by the editorial that appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on March 10, 1969. I include the editorial in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

UNJUSTIFIABLE SECRECY

The stockholders of a corporation who found out its directors were hiding various expenditures, all for the same item, in order to deceive these same stockholders probably would find themselves a new board of directors.

This, in effect, is what is happening in Congress. The Pentagon, with the connivance of a few senior committee members, has been spreading expenditures of about \$350 million a year on chemical and biological warfare weapons.

It was like salting a mine in the days of the Old West. Nobody but the people who planted them knew where the nuggets were.

Now comes a congressman, Rep. Richard D. McCarthy, D-N.Y., whose wife saw a television program on CBW, as chemical-biological warfare is called. She asked her husband what he knew about it. "Nothing," he said, and meant it.

But McCarthy went to work and found out that during the last four years the Army, with the cooperation of senior members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, has managed to keep secret how much the Pentagon was spending on CBW research and production.

The funds were scattered throughout the defense budget in such a manner that it was virtually impossible for individual members of Congress to determine how much was being spent and for what. References to the over-all total were customarily censored out of the testimony given to committees.

At a hearing a Pentagon spokesman refused to disclose the amount spent, saying it was "confidential." McCarthy got around this by quoting from a Library of Congress study, which was not confidential at all, though it gave the information desired.

The reason for CBW development, said the Pentagon man, is that the Russians have enough of the stuff to kill everybody.

If we know this about the Russians, and surely they know about ours, why the secrecy?

The answer, of course, is that the Pentagon and its confidants in Congress would like to keep the matter secret from the American people, who get nervous about such things, who pay the bills and who must stand responsible if this kind of weapon is ever used.

We need more congressmen like Rep. McCarthy. Why should the military hide from us what it can't hide from the Russians?

THE BURDEN OF COLLEGE EXPENSES

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide tax credits to parents and students who are burdened with the heavy expenses of college education.

There is no question that the average family trying to put its sons and daughters through college faces a terrific strain on its savings and income.

Most tax credit proposals for higher education give some relief for expenses of tuition and fees. My bill would also recognize the unavoidable charges for room and board which are a major part of most college expenses—a major part of the burden.

According to figures provided by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there are now 4,975,000 full-time college students in the United States. About two-thirds of these students are in public colleges and universities, where they must pay, each year, an average of \$1,122 for tuition, fees, room, and board. Students attending private institutions pay an average bill that is more than twice that amount: \$2,389.

In my own State, California, students and their families must pay large amounts for 1 year at a university. At public universities like the University of California at Riverside, the annual cost, including the charges for room and board, is \$1,524. At the Berkeley campus, the financial burden on students and their families is \$2,031. Overall yearly expenses at private institutions, including charges for room and board, are even greater: for example, \$3,000 at the University of Southern California, and \$3,160 at Stanford University.

Whether their sons and daughters attend public or private institutions, American parents today are paying between \$800 and \$1,000 annually for each student's room and board, if the student is

not able to live at home. When this is figured into the average bill paid to a private institution, room and board is about 40 percent of the total cost; but it constitutes over 70 percent of the average financial burden imposed on students attending public colleges and universities.

In a short span of 4 years, families sending their youngsters to public institutions must, on an average, pay a \$4,488 education bill for each child. The 4-year figure at a private institution is \$9,556. And these expenses are increasing all the time. On a nationwide basis, it is estimated that college expenses go up an average of between 3 and 5 percent every year.

College expenses place a heavy strain on a family in a short period of time, with no relief comparable to relief that is available under present tax laws for medical expenses or casualty losses.

Many provisions in our present tax laws give tax advantages to wealthy individuals and corporations. Reporting on tax loopholes, a recent article in *Newsweek* magazine noted:

The low rate on capital gains costs between \$5.5 billion and \$8.5 billion annually. The tax exemption on interest paid by local bonds costs \$1.8 billion, the depletion allowance for oil and gas deprives the government of \$1.3 billion and the real-estate tax shelter takes away an added \$750 million in potential revenue.

Richard Goode, formerly a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution, who now is with the International Monetary Fund, has observed that—

The present tax treatment of educational costs gives rise to inequities and is especially questionable at a time when the need for highly trained persons is growing. . . . For example, a person who attends engineering school is usually not allowed to deduct his educational expenditures from his earnings, whereas a taxpayer who buys a truck can recover the cost through depreciation allowances.

The 1962 investment credit tax bill and revised depreciation guidelines provided over \$2 billion in tax relief for investment in machinery.

Yet the ordinary taxpayer continues to be taxed at full rates. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the best form of investment we can make is our investment in education. In sheer dollar economy, it is estimated that the college-educated wage earner will earn \$200,000 more than the noncollege man, over an average life span. This would mean a long-term gain in Federal revenue of at least \$40,000 for each college-educated youth. Even granting maximum credits, under this bill, of \$440 a year for 4 years, the Federal Government would get back \$40,000 for each \$1,760 it loses in allowing credits to the student or his parent.

The tax credit method of offering relief to parents is clearly more equitable than the tax deduction method, because tax credits, unlike deductions, give uniform relief, without regard to the taxpayer's tax bracket. A credit is subtracted directly from the amount of tax paid by the taxpayer. A deduction, subtracted from total income, would grant proportionately more relief to high-income families than to low-income fam-

ilies, giving the largest benefits to those with the least need for assistance.

Under the deduction method, a wealthy taxpayer in the higher income bracket, who may be paying taxes that amount to 50 percent of his income, for example, could deduct a \$1,400 college expenditure and save half of that amount, \$700, in taxes. A parent with a much smaller income, in the 20-percent bracket, would save only \$280, or 20 percent of the same deduction. Under my bill, both taxpayers would save the same amount—\$390—in taxes.

Again quoting Richard Goode:

A considerably greater part of the total tax reduction would accrue to low-income and middle-income families under a tax credit than under a deduction plan costing the Government the same amount of revenue.

I grant that tax credit legislation is not the complete answer to college expense burdens. It would give no direct assistance to the small proportion of students from families with incomes so low that they pay no income tax. It would not give full advantages to those whose tax liability is less than the amount of credit.

Ways must always be sought to help these particular students, who already are the principal beneficiaries of scholarship aid. But tax credits to taxpayers will help in this area, too. Dr. Roger A. Freeman, a senior staff member at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, located at Stanford University, points this out:

The granting of tuition credits would not only free more scholarships for students from a low-income background, it would also stimulate thousands of potential donors to offer scholarships to needy students for which they would receive credits on their income tax.

While tax credits under this bill would provide greater dollar benefit to those paying high college costs, they provide a relative greater benefit to the student in a low-tuition university or college; the less he pays, the greater percent of his cost he gets as credit.

Dr. Freeman also notes:

Tax credits would provide assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about Federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations.

In other words, a relationship would exist only between the Internal Revenue Service and the individual taxpayer. Dr. Freeman adds:

Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

My bill would allow the taxpayer—the parent, the student himself, or any other person who pays part or all of the student's expenses—to receive a tax credit up to a maximum of \$440 for up to \$2,400 in school-year expenses, including room and board. I note that this maximum credit is close to the amount, \$450, recommended in the past by the American Council on Education.

Taking public and private university and college students together, the average annual expense per student, living away from home, is \$1,544. Thus the average credit to be allowed under this bill would be \$414 per student, the

amount that would be granted to taxpayers for a \$1,544 expenditure.

I recognize that the total relief to those who support students in higher education could amount, roughly, to \$2 billion a year. But this investment, as I have said, would offer many returns. It should be a new commitment in the interest of education, a commitment to help families making large sacrifices for higher education. Let me emphasize that it should not be an excuse to cut back on direct Federal aid to higher education. Tax credits should be taken at their face value, as a sensible way to bring help to families burdened by college expenses, and not to the institutions themselves. Other programs help the institutions.

Help to families paying for education is needed just as much and in some cases more than the relief afforded to other taxpayers under existing tax laws. And if we can talk of investing in a multibillion-dollar program in the national defense—in dubious, costly, and often obsolete devices such as "thick" and "thin" anti-ballistic-missile systems—we can give priority to our best defense—affordable education for the young.

AUTHORIZING PROFESSIONAL PAY AND CONTINUATION BONUSES FOR JUDGE ADVOCATES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing professional pay and continuation bonuses for judge advocates in the uniformed services.

In short, the bill provides retention incentives for attorneys in uniform at the rate of \$50 per month through the grade of captain—lieutenant in the Navy; \$150 per month for the grades of major and lieutenant colonel—lieutenant commander and commander in the Navy; and \$200 per month for the grades of colonel or Navy captain and above. Additionally, the bill authorizes the payment of a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year up to 6 years which the judge advocate agrees to remain in active service, first, beyond his obligated initial service, and second, beyond the time he becomes eligible for voluntary retirement. Under my bill the payment of the second retention bonus is not contingent upon the officer having received or having been eligible for receipt of the first bonus. I should also mention that my bill allows the service Secretaries to establish regulations for the administration of the continuation bonus program. This is designed to assure that only qualified officers who have demonstrated their worth by performance will be offered the retention bonus.

The purpose of the bill is to make legal careers in the services more attractive as the present retention rate is critically low. As a former judge advocate in the Air Force, I am personally acquainted with this personnel sieve and its ill effects upon the quality of the administration of military justice. From 1951 until 1964 the

retention rate of attorneys in the Army was only 12½ percent. As of late last fall the Navy had only 38 regular lieutenants out of 630 lawyers on board. Since 1960 the Navy has retained an average of only 12 attorneys a year. One could hardly be sanguine about the Air Force situation. Exclusive of recallers, that service over the last 13 years has retained only 14 percent of its judge advocates.

These are alarming statistics. And the problem is decidedly more real than apparent. Since 1951 with the advent of the Uniform Code of Military Justice the need for experienced attorneys in the armed services to make workable an enlightened system of justice has ever increased. From the statistics I have related it is evident that as the need grew the supply of experienced attorneys diminished. The action of the 90th Congress in passing the Military Justice Act of 1968 renewed and strengthened the commitment of the Congress and of this Nation to provide for our men in uniform a judicial system modeled fully after the present Federal court system. That action was unquestionably right. But it added a requirement for more than 700 additional military lawyers.

The true test of our resolve comes then in this Congress, not the last. It was easy and painless enough to write judicial guarantees into the law. But where are the means to make those guarantees meaningful? Where are the military judges and counsel which we guaranteed to the serviceman in the last Congress. The rights are hollow indeed if there are simply no attorneys in uniform to effect the reforms we decreed.

The bill I introduce today hopefully will provide a solution to the critical problem of lawyer retention in the armed services. In fact, my solution is the very one recommended by a Department of Defense study group in late 1968, after being specially commissioned in 1967 to study the problem. As I have indicated before, events have now overrun the study and over 700 more uniformed lawyers than the study ever contemplated are now required.

I am sure that many of you will be surprised to learn that professional pay in the Armed Forces is now authorized for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, but not for attorneys. Is it small wonder that the services are faced with a virtually hopeless retention problem with lawyers? The special pays for these groups of officers in other professions range in amounts from \$100 to \$350 monthly. My proposal for lawyers is more modest as it provides for a maximum of \$200 per month professional pay. You might also be surprised to learn that physicians and dentists receive longevity pay credit for their advanced education; lawyers do not. My bill does not address this subject. Additionally, I should mention that the cost of this legislation is not large for I am speaking of a total of some 3,800 military lawyers through the entire Department of Defense at this time.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not disagree with the concept of professional pay for the categories of officers I have mentioned. But I want to

make it equally plain that I strongly believe we must provide attorneys in uniform substantial equality with their professional brothers both because it is right and now because it is patently necessary to secure to our servicemen the judicial rights to which the Congress has determined they are entitled.

It has been my observation that Congress has generally been the instrument for leading in the effort to guarantee to every serviceman his full constitutional rights. And unless I seriously misjudge the relative interests of the branches of our Government in the area of individual rights, I rather suspect that it will also fall to the Congress to spearhead this effort to provide resources for assuring that these rights are not illusory, but real and meaningful. As is apparent, this case virtually argues itself. I am confident that this proposed legislation, supported as it is by the American Bar Association, the Judge Advocates Association, and numerous concerned organizations across the country, will also have the support of this body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOLEY, for the balance of week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business in district.

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. ALBERT, for 60 minutes, on April 2, 1969.

Mr. MOORHEAD, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TALCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIGGS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 1 hour, on March 27.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on March 27.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 30 minutes, on March 31.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATSUNAGA and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the Extensions of Remarks:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. COUGHLIN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. MACGREGOR in two instances.

Mr. BETTS in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. HOMER in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. OLSEN in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. CONYERS in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. MIKVA.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. BURTON of California in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY.

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. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.),

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1968, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During Calendar Year 1968, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

1. Extraordinary contractual adjustment authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board.

Under date of December 27, 1968, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for the fabrication and delivery of earth station receivers and associated test equipment with RCA Victor Co., Limited, of Montreal, Canada. Relief was granted on the ground that the parties to the contract were mutually mistaken in failing to foresee the extent of engineering development work required to overcome state-of-the-art limitations which were not apparent when the contract was negotiated. Relief was authorized only in an amount which may fairly be regarded as representing that portion of RCA's engineering development loss which is allocable to the effort expended in actually seeking to overcome the state-of-the-art limitations. The precise amount of relief was left to be determined by the Contracting Officer through discussions with RCA. It is expected that this amount will not exceed \$144,000, the amount of relief originally requested by RCA.

2. Actions under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at Cape Kennedy, Florida.

Under date of September 26, 1962, the Administrator of NASA made a determination pursuant to the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-804), that from and after September 26, 1962, all contracts, or amendments, or modifications thereof, for the performance of construction work at the Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Kennedy, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, should include a clause requiring contractors and all subcontractors thereunder to abide by money provisions of a Project Stabilization Agreement, to the extent such money provisions are determined by the Government to be reasonable. The Project Stabilization Agreement referred to is an agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractor's Association and other local and national associations of contractors, and the Brevard Building and Construction Trades Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO. The purpose of this agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy of performance of contracts involving construction work at Patrick Air Force Base and the Cape Kennedy complex. The agreement was originally negotiated in 1962, and amendments were re-negotiated again on April 1, 1964 and April 1, 1967.

Pursuant to this determination, two NASA contracts for construction work in the Cape Kennedy area, of a total value of \$13,854,271,

which were awarded during 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the above Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase or decrease in costs under the contracts involved in an amount not readily determinable, the purpose of the Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

3. Action under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility.

Under date of June 22, 1967, the Deputy Administrator of NASA made a determination similar to that described in Paragraph 2 above with respect to contracts and subcontracts for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, in implementation of a revised Project Stabilization Agreement dated July 1, 1966, which had been negotiated for that area. (The original Agreement expired on June 30, 1966.) Pursuant to this determination, one amendment to an existing contract and one contract was awarded for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, of a value of \$850,000, which was executed in 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the revised Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase or decrease in costs under the contract involved in an amount not readily determinable, it is noted again that the purpose of negotiating a Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

Sincerely,

T. O. PAINE,
Acting Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

623. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of financial statements of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1967, Department of Transportation (H. Doc. No. 91-93); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

624. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233 a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

625. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 for the period January 1-December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of Public Law 88-558; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

626. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

627. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of action taken during calendar year 1968 under the authority of section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-804) (72 Stat. 972), pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

628. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia City Council, transmitting the

first annual report of the City Council, pursuant to the provisions of section 402(10) of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1967; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on the future of U.S. public diplomacy (Rept. No. 91-130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 214. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-131). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 259. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189 (Rept. No. 91-132). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 272. Resolution authorizing the expenditures of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-133). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 271. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-134). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200 (Rept. No. 91-135). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 301. Resolution authorizing expenses for conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 268 (Rept. No. 91-136). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 315. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration without amendment (Rept. No. 91-137). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 320. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 91-138). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 8794. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4148. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-140). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9328. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service,

and for other purposes without amendment (Rept. No. 91-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REDD of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9505. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9506. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9507. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the uniform application of selective service policies, to raise the incidence of volunteers in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9508. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9510. A bill to improve the accounting systems used by agencies and departments, to reduce waste and inefficiency in the use of Government funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9511. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of State for Food and Population, an Assistant Administrator for Population in the Agency for International Development, and a National Council on Food and Population, and to amend the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 related to family planning and population control programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9512. A bill to include air traffic controllers within the provisions of section 8336 (c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of certain Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. PRICE of Texas):

H.R. 9513. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9514. A bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9515. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9516. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish an equitable survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age, to increase the outside earnings permitted without loss of benefits, to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits, and to pay benefits despite marriage or remarriage if it occurs after attainment of age 55, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3- and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9518. 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. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9520. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9521. A bill to regulate trade in drugs and devices by prohibiting the dispensing of drugs or devices by medical practitioners and their participation in profits from the dispensing of such products, except under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9522. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 9523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the minimum standard deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9524. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9525. 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. DOWDY:

H.R. 9526. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions

do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9527. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9528. A bill to require students and teachers in the District of Columbia public schools to wear protective devices for their eyes while engaged in certain activities in those schools; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9529. 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. EILBERG:

H.R. 9530. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 9531. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sale or delivery of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9532. A bill to alleviate certain hardships to employees in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9533. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9534. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9535. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9536. 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. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9537. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9539. 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. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include certain joint hospital laundry ventures among the cooperative hospital service organizations en-

titled to tax exemption thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9541. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of law under which assistance is provided for the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9542. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9543. A bill to add a new title XII to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9544. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9545. A bill to designate certain lands in the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine as "wilderness"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9546. A bill to amend section 4 of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9547. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with a supplementary loan to the King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9548. A bill to amend section 15-503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9549. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9550. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9551. A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9552. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 9553. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to authorize the computation of overtime compensation for hospital employees on the basis of a 14-day work period; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9554. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of certain nonimmigrants into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9555. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9556. A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination, to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities, to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources, to establish the National Council on the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 9558. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon the railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9559. 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. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9560. A bill to authorize the acquisition and maintenance of the Goddard rocket launching site in accordance with the act of August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9561. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9562. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs which require a doctor's prescription, and which are prescribed by their generic names, among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H.R. 9563. A bill to repeal percentage depletion for oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9564. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9565. A bill to amend section 837, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain acts involving the use of incendiary devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9566. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit deceptive practices in news broadcasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9567. 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.

H.R. 9568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9569. A bill to amend section 809(c)

(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat retrospective rate credits as return premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9570. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 9571. 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. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9572. 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. ZION:

H.R. 9573. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at or near the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9574. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9575. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 9576. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9578. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9579.—A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 9580. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9581. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9582. 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. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9583. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to foster and promote broadcasting in the public interest and to prevent conglomerate organizations from impairing regulation of broadcasting in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9584. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information

Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 9585. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9586. A bill for the establishment of a Commission to study and promulgate a national policy respecting dispersal of population and industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution, reciprocity in U.S. territorial waters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the sea bed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN,

Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 341. Resolution to provide for an International Conference on Problems of Human Environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 342. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 343. Resolution creating a special committee to conduct an investigation and study into the legal, political, and diplomatic status of lands which were the subject of grants from the King of Spain and from the Government of Mexico prior to the acquisition of the American Southwest as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo concluding the Mexican-American War in 1848; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 344. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 345. 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. PATMAN:

H. Res. 346. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Report of the Joint Economic Committee"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ERLBORN):

H. Res. 347. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of production of foreign-made goods competing with domestically produced goods and of new developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

93. Mr. ULLMAN and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorial-

izing the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to refrain from implementing the recently proposed increase in fees of grazing on public land because the agricultural sector of this Nation's economy is undergoing a period of recession, and the increase would have such detrimental economic impact on the livestock industry that the entire profit margin in many livestock operations would be removed, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular 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 (by request):

H.R. 9587. A bill for the relief of James J. Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 9588. A bill for the relief of John Acerbi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9589. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Blasi and his wife, Grazia De Blasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9590. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9591. A bill for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9592. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Muscas and his wife, Christina Muscas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9593. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9594. A bill for the relief of Iraj Rigi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9595. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Guisappa Guarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9597. A bill for the relief of Rafael Martinez-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9598. A bill for the relief of Sea Oil & General Corp., of New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 348. Resolution to refer the bill H.R. 9598 entitled "A bill for the relief of Sea Oil and General Corporation, of New York, New York" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TIME TO STOP THE NONSENSE ON CAMPUS

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, throughout our Nation thousands of concerned

citizens have gazed in wonderment at the brazen destruction of property and thoughtless disruption of the learning processes on our Nation's college campuses.

Few, if any, of our people question the right to dissent and to make grievances known through peaceful means. But the right to dissent does not include the right to destroy. The case for change confers no privilege to invoke anarchy,

for if there is to be reasoned change, orderly processes must be preserved.

I am happy to say that in my own State, school administrators, faculty, and students have thus far succeeded in reaching mutually satisfactory solutions to campus problems. Needless to say, I hope this atmosphere of cooperation continues.

The Washington Post on March 17 published an editorial entitled "Time To