

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

97. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to regulation of outdoor advertising; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.R. 9695. A bill for the relief of Carmelo DiFiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:
H.R. 9696. A bill for the relief of Cirino Carrocetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9697. A bill for the relief of Rita Del Grosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:
H.R. 9698. A bill for the relief of Christos G. Pappas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOWERS:
H.R. 9699. A bill for the relief of Catherine E. Spell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 9700. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jasmine T. Dillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Katarzyna Zerucha, Oleszyce, Poland, relative to widow's social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 1, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth with diligence; he that showeth mercy with cheerfulness.—Romans 12: 8.

O God, our Father, in whose love is our life, in whose service is our strength, and in whose will is our work, grant unto us increasing power that we may labor unceasingly for the welfare of our country and the well-being of all mankind.

Save us from discord and disunity, from pride and prejudice, from vice and violence. Fashion us into a people united in purpose and program to promote justice, to proclaim freedom, and to provide food for the hungry, housing for the ill housed, and jobs for men who will work.

May the spirit of wisdom abide in all our hearts that we may make decisions daringly, plan procedures patiently, and live with love the light in our lives.

In times of trouble let not our faith in Thee falter and in periods of prosperity let our faith find its fulfillment in humble service and a grateful spirit.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title:

S. RES. 175

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the former President of the United States and General of the Army of the United States.

Resolved, That as a token of honor to his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, his distinguished public service to his Nation, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public station in life, the Senate hereby expresses its deep sensibility of the loss the Nation has sustained by his death, and its sympathy with the family in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the two Senators from Kansas be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased, to be held at Abilene, Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. EDWARD JONES, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE ARMY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a shocking proposal has been brought to light in Army plans to require chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and religious philosophy in lectures designed to instill moral responsibility in our soldiers. I would hope that the Army has a greater interest in God than it has in the protests of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Apparently the Army is bowing to complaints from the American Civil Liberties Union. Fortunately, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird has ordered a high Pentagon review of Army plans and it is to be hoped that the plans will be dropped.

I find it extremely distasteful that the Army would feel a compulsion to bow to groups which object to religious teachings. The military services have an obligation to present inspiring programs of character guidance to members of the Armed Forces and this is particularly needful to the young men and women who first enter the service. Our Nation has a strong religious background and one of its principal strengths has been a firm faith in the Almighty.

I find myself completely out of patience with the Army proposal, and I have protested this action in strongest terms, both to the Army's Secretary and Chief of Staff and to Secretary Laird. America is not ready to give up religious teaching, either in or out of the Army.

CONGRESS MUST ACT NOW TO INSURE HEALTH AND SAFETY IN THE MINES

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was announced today that a fiery blast of methane gas trapped 145 to 168 men in a Mexican coal mine, located 75 miles from Eagle Pass, Tex. It may take as long as 15 days to reach all of them.

Mr. Speaker, other coal mine disasters in this Nation will surely occur unless Congress acts quickly to pass effective legislation, and the attitude of the entire coal industry changes. Every day that passes risks the danger in this Nation of a new and major tragedy in this most dangerous of all occupations.

Lots of coal mine representatives today, and even Members of Congress, are talking about the economic impact of increased safety, and the burdens that protection of health and safety may place on the coal industry. They should be talking instead of the human impact on the human beings who work in the coal mines.

Even if we pass a good law, it will not do any good unless there is a genuine will to safety on the part of the coal industry, the United Mine Workers, and the American people.

Every day that passes 28 more people are injured in the mines. Since the Farmington tragedy, 60 underground coal miners have been killed. I say in the name of humanity it is time that Congress act, and the American people back up action to clean up the coal mines and protect the safety of those who work in the mines.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S NOBLEST CHARACTERISTIC WAS HUMILITY

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend

his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, permit me to associate myself with the good and kind things which have been said here on the floor of the House about Dwight David Eisenhower.

Saturday night, March 29, I spoke to a junior chamber of commerce chapter at Clarksville, Va. A memorial service was held for General Eisenhower during the course of the meeting at which time I spoke briefly, and I should like to submit my remarks for the RECORD.

Of all the noble characteristics of General Eisenhower, perhaps his greatest was humility. Let me relate to you a personal experience that occurred during my term as national commander of the American Legion.

General Eisenhower gave me the opportunity to meet and discuss with him some of the problems with which we were faced at that time. During our discussion he evinced this humility in a remark about Gen. Omar Bradley. The general said:

When Stonewall Jackson was killed at Chancellorsville, General Lee is reported to have said, "With the death of General Jackson, I have indeed lost my right arm."

General Eisenhower continued—

Had I lost Bradley in Europe, I would have lost both arms.

General Eisenhower was a man of God who manifested deep feeling for his fellow beings. He served his Nation and the cause of freedom well. It is my prayer that God will grant him the peace and the rest that He has reserved for those who served Him well.

MISSILE TESTIMONY

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper reports that physicist Herbert A. York has seriously criticized Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard for trying to discredit his testimony on the anti-ballistic-missile system controversy. Mr. York startled the Senate recently when he testified before a committee that the main objections to the ABM is that the speed required to use such a weapon to knock down an oncoming enemy missile would not make it possible to bring the President in on a decision.

Apparently, what Mr. York does not understand and appreciate is the fundamental difference between the ABM Sentinel system, which is a defensive system, and the ICBM, the long-range intercontinental ballistic missile system, which is an offensive system.

Mr. York apparently is unwilling to understand that the Sentinel is designed purposely to be a quick response system so as to be able to intercept and render useless an enemy missile.

We have built into the ICBM a vast system of checks and balances to make sure that there can be no accidental launching of an ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile, because this missile could travel 6,000 to 8,000 miles over continents and involve this Nation in a

nuclear war. We properly feel that only the President shall have the right to make the decision for use of our ICBM's. But such precautions are not necessary in the Sentinel, where the long-range missile, the Spartan, has only a 400-mile range and could not possibly be detonated in outer space over any country outside this continent.

It is rather appalling that a noted physicist of the stature of Mr. York has been unable to draw this distinction, and Mr. York now continues to oppose the ABM on a totally fallacious and spurious argument. I think Mr. Packard was right, and I would like him to know that some of us in the House stand behind his judgment.

THE ABM SHOULD BE RENAMED

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, my contribution to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and the whole anti-ballistic-missile controversy might be summed up very succinctly. I think they ought to change the name of it from the Sentinel to "The Civil Servant," because it would not work and you cannot fire it.

CONGRESS NOT FOR SALE

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received in the mail a check for \$95 from an organization calling itself "Another Mother for Peace" along with a statement that this was a "final payment" on an "invest for peace" project. This check was sent to me, the group said, because of my vote against what it called arms appropriations. Since I have consistently voted for strong defenses for the Nation, I cannot understand where the group obtained its list of Congressmen to be so rewarded.

The activities of this group are a slur on the integrity of Congress, a petty and improper attempt at vote buying. I wonder how many other Members have received checks from this group. Also, why an odd amount such as \$95?

The implication of a final payment is that other checks had been sent; however this is the first I have ever heard about this organization and in checking with the House Internal Security Committee I find that they have no records on this group. It is lobbying activity such as this that damages the cause of those sincerely interested in promoting peace, and casts aspersions on Congress. In returning this check I am informing this organization that Congress is not for sale, that its votes for peace come from conscience, not contributions, and that the surest path to peace is a strong United States.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I received one of those

letters and one of those \$95 checks, and I promptly sent it back advising the organization that I do not accept money for any of my votes in the House.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

CHAPLAINS ORDERED TO ELIMINATE REFERENCE TO GOD IN LECTURES

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned through the alertness of the Honorable WILLIAM G. BRAY that the Army has ordered chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and religious philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this as one more step in the steady erosion of our moral fiber. I understand that this new policy was prompted by a complaint from the American Civil Liberties Union.

Having forced a major branch of the armed services to take this step, they are now asking that the Air Force and Navy do the same. I suppose that the next move will be to pull down the words above your chair and remove the same phrase from our coins and bills. It is inconceivable to me that we should so willingly submit to such demands. We cry out in remorse over the loss of our moral values and we deplore the ungodlike behavior of so many of our citizens and particularly our youth—yet the kind of action where we voluntarily omit any reference to the Almighty in trying to instill moral responsibility in our soldiers is conclusive proof that we are engaging in the abdication of a principle on which this Nation was founded. We are saying in effect "In God we no longer trust."

TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR THE MAKING OF FINAL REPORT BY COMMISSION TO STUDY MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(g) of the Act of May 7, 1968 (Public Law 90-301) is amended by striking out "Said report of the Commission shall be made by April 1, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Commission may make an interim report not later than April 1, 1969, and shall make a final report of its study and recommendation not later than July 1, 1969."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress enacted Public Law 90-301, there was included in this law a 15-member Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates, with particular reference to those which apply to mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration and insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The original law provided for a report by April 1, 1969. While the Commission has been diligent in proceeding in regard to making appropriate recommendations and findings, it is obvious it will not be possible to meet this deadline. The resolution which has been passed unanimously by the Senate extends the period of time by 3 months to July 1, 1969.

I know of no opposition to the resolution and hope that it may be promptly approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas if this will require any additional appropriation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir. This will require not 1 cent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CLAIM OF JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1507) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MUTUAL BENEFIT FOUNDATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN THOMAS COSBY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2401 of title 28 or any other statute of limitations or delay or laches or any prior release, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern Division of the Northern District of Alabama to hear, determine and render judgment on the claim of John Thomas Cosby, Junior, of Prattville, Alabama, based upon the injuries and disabilities suffered in an accident which occurred on or about October 28, 1955, in Birmingham, Alabama, when he was struck by a wheel which allegedly had come off a United States Post Office truck. The action provided for in this Act shall be instituted within one year of the effective date of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1721) for the relief of William J. Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Hurley of Los Altos, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$602.56 representing an overpayment of compensation as an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the period from July 21, 1964, through July 31, 1965, inclusive, which resulted from retroactive adjustment in his salary by reason of a change in the law made by Public Law 88-426.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said William J. Hurley, the sum of any amounts repaid or withheld from him by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENRICO DEMONTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2335) for the relief of Enrico DeMonte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the determination of the right of Enrico DeMonte, of Niagara Falls, New York, to widower's insurance benefits under section 202(f)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(1), as amended), the said Enrico DeMonte shall be held and considered to have been receiving at least one-half of his support from his late wife, Rose DeMonte, at the time of her death on October 15, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEASLEY ENGINEERING CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2876) for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2876

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Beasley Engineering Company, Incorporated, of Emeryville, California, the sum of \$23,746.55 in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for losses sustained as the result of damage or destruction of portions of the Dalles irrigation works being constructed under Bureau of Reclamation contract numbered 14-06-D-4014, specifications numbered DC-6004, as a result of floods and high waters during December 1964 and January 1965, which destroyed or damaged work already in place and necessitated reconstruction and repair of installations covered by said contract: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6: Strike "\$23,746.55" and insert "\$11,873.27".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY E. DOOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2940) for the relief of Henry E. Dooley.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CLAIM OF SOLOMON S. LEVADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3213) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANK KLEINERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3377) for the relief of Frank Kleinerman.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF PIERRE SAMUEL DU PONT DARDEN

The Clerk called the bill H.R. 3348) for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SFC. PATRICK MARRATTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3379) for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3379

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant First Class Patrick Marratto, United States Army (retired), of Springfield, Massachusetts, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$786.46, the amount of an overpayment of compensation as a member of the United States Army in the period beginning June 1, 1950, and ending May 24, 1964, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant First Class Patrick Marratto, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated by this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike "\$786.46" and insert "\$786.20".

On page 1, line 8, strike "May 24, 1964" and insert "January 31, 1967".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW BEDFORD STORAGE WAREHOUSE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3480) for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3480

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Company of New Bedford, Massachusetts, the sum of \$365.98 in full settlement of the claims of said company against the United States arising out of services performed for the United States Coast Guard, pursuant to Government bill of lading A-0022724. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY E. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3990) for the relief of Harvey E. Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby consents, for the purposes of the eighth clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, to the acceptance by Harvey E. Ward, United States Coast Guard, retired, of Taipei, Taiwan, from the State of Tasmania, Commonwealth of Australia, of the office and emoluments of teacher in the department of education in such State during the calendar years 1960 through 1964.

Sec. 2. Said Harvey E. Ward is relieved of any liability to the United States which the Comptroller General (in the decision numbered B-154213) held arose from his receipt of United States Coast Guard retired pay in violation of the eighth clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harvey E. Ward an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the liability to the United States specified in section 2 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REDDICK B. STILL, JR., AND RICHARD CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6400) for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF NURSING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6583) for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of The American Journal of Nursing, New York, New York, for an advertisement placed in its August 1966 issue of The American Journal of Nursing by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to allow in full and final settlement of such claim the sum of \$238.50. Such amount shall be payable from the appropriation "Hospitals and Medical Care, Public Health Service, 1970".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORBIE F. COCHRAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6584) for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3101, footnote), the advancement in grade of Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, an employee of the Department of the Army, Fort Eustis, Virginia, from GS-6 to GS-9, effective April 29, 1964, shall be deemed to have been in conformity with law, such advancement in contravention of said section 1310,

having been made as a result of administrative error without fault or knowledge of its illegality on the employee's part.

Sec. 2. (a) That the said Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, is relieved of any liability to the United States arising out of the advancement described in section 1 of this Act. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this subsection.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from amounts otherwise due him in partial liquidation of his liability to the United States referred to in subsection (a) of this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on accounts of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. A. F. ELGIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6585) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NOEL S. MARSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BASIL ROWLAND DUNCAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 165

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Basil Rowland Duncan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 13, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NGUYEN VAN HUE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 586) for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 586

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nguyen Van Hue may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Master Sergeant Norman Leon Snyder, [XXXXXXXXXX], United States Army, and Muriel Guest Snyder, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided*, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COSMINA RUGGIERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1437) for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cosmina Ruggiero may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by Giovanna Martignelli, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AI BOK CHUN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1708) for the relief of Ai Bok Chun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1708

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ai Bok Chun may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Carl and Gertrude Eggebeen, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 after line 10 at the end of the bill change the period to a colon and add the

following: "*Provided*, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARJORIE J. HOTTENROTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1939) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be an immediate relative and the provisions of section 204 of the Act shall be inapplicable in her case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO SANTOS GOMES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1960) for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1960

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mario Santos Gomes shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFINA POLICAR ABUTAN FULIAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2315) for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fuliar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josefina Policar Abutan Fulliar shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Fulliar, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA PRESCILLA CARAMANZANA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2948) for the relief of Maria Prescilla Caramanzana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2948

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Prescilla Caramanzana shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Adolfo Caramanzana, a citizen of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNG NAN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3144) for the relief of Sung Nan Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3144

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sung Nan Lee may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Frederick W. Uthe, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE OK JA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3212) for the relief of Lee Ok Ja.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3212

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Ok Ja may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by June Nelson, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA BALLUARDO FRASCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3464) for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Balluardo Frasca may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Frasca, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: Provided, That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANGELA ZABARTE FANDINO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3539) for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3539

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Angela Zabarte Fandino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 16, 1962.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ROBERTO DE LA CARIDAD MIQUEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3548) for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miquel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Roberto de la Caridad Miquel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 8, 1961, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the date "September 8, 1961": change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANA MAE YAP-DIANGCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of Ana Mae Yap-Diango.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana Mae Yap-Diango may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. Crisanto A. Mallihan, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMETROULA GEORGIADIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5072) for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetroula Georgiades (formerly known as Demetroula Demetropoulos) may be classified as a child within the mean-

ing of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Sophia Nicholas G. Georgiades, a lawfully resident alien and a citizen of the United States, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the name "Sophia" insert the word "and."

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZUMRUT SOOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5402) for the relief of Zumrut Sooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zumrut Sooley may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Frank N. Sooley, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: Provided, That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by reason of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER SLOANE (BOSMOS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6161) for the relief of Christopher Sloane (Bosmos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christopher Sloane (Bosmos) may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in his behalf by Marcia E. Sloane, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. OLGA CONCEPCION PEREZ DE LANIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6896) for the relief of Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on April 21, 1962.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6896, a private bill which provides that, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on April 21, 1962. If the legislation is enacted, the beneficiary would be eligible for immediate naturalization, provided, of course, she meets the requirements other than those relating to the period of permanent residence in the United States.

Dr. Lanio, a native and citizen of Cuba, first entered the United States as a parolee on April 21, 1962. After a 1-day journey to Canada on November 23, 1964, to obtain an immigrant visa, she was lawfully admitted to the United States as a permanent resident on that day. She now resides at 8810 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md., with her husband, Jose Antonio Lanio, an accountant, and their two children, Jose Antonio Lanio, Jr., age 16, and Maria Isabel Lanio, age 13. Both children were born in Cuba.

A dentist by profession, Dr. Lanio received her diploma from the University of Havana and gained several years of professional experience in her native country before coming to the United States. She is presently employed as a supervisor in a clinic of orthodontists located at 5010 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. She is not licensed to practice her profession in any State or in the District of Columbia.

The beneficiary believes that American citizenship, with all of its attendant rights and privileges as well as duties, would enhance her opportunities to study and work at the same time. In order to practice her profession in the United States she has determined that she would have to enter a university and take certain additional courses to satisfy curricular requirements.

As an American citizen and with a license to practice dentistry in the United States, Dr. Lanio would be able to help relieve the shortage of dentists in this country. She is aware of the many social action programs sponsored by the Federal Government which could utilize her services, and her interest at present leans heavily toward eventual employment in this field. She is convinced that she would be able to render better serv-

ice to the community as an active professional, and American citizenship would help immeasurably to her early attainment of this objective.

The same legislation as H.R. 14654 was passed by this body on July 2, 1968. It was not acted upon by the Senate before the 90th Congress adjourned sine die. Favorable action today on H.R. 6896 would afford the other body sufficient time in which to act. Enactment of this legislation would be beneficial not only to Dr. Lanio, but also to the country of which she desires so much to become a citizen. I strongly urge a unanimous vote for this private bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELISABETA HORWATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2464) for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4546) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ARANKA MLINKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6366) for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TERESINA FARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6670) for the relief of Teresina Fara.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE DESTEFANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6931) for the relief of Giuseppe DeStefano.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL PAY FOR CERTAIN NUCLEAR QUALIFIED SUBMARINE OFFICERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of March 27, 1969, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (H.R. 9328) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section: "§312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified submarine officers extending period of active service

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an officer of the naval service who—

"(1) is entitled to basic pay;

"(2) is currently designated 'qualified in submarines';

"(3) has the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants;

"(4) has not completed ten years of commissioned service; and

"(5) executes a written agreement to remain in active submarine service for one period of four years in addition to any other period of obligated active service,

may, upon the acceptance by the Secretary or his designee of the written agreement, in addition to all other compensation to which he is entitled, be paid a sum of money not to exceed \$3,750 for each year of the active-service agreement. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine semiannually the necessity for continuance of the special pay and the rate of special pay per year for such active-service agreements accepted within each six-month period. Upon acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary or his designee, the total amount payable shall become fixed and shall be paid in four equal yearly installments, commencing at the expiration of the initial obligated service; except, the Secretary or his designee may accept the active-service agreement not more than one year in advance of the expiration of the initial obligated active service and the amount may then be paid in five yearly installments, not to exceed \$3,000 per year, commencing with the date of acceptance of the agreement.

"(b) No more than one agreement for each officer shall be accepted under this section.

"(c) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy and subject to such exceptions as may be prescribed in those regulations, refunds, on a pro rata basis, of sums paid pursuant to this section may be required if the officer having received the payment fails to complete the full period of four years of active submarine service which he agreed to serve.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall alter or modify the obligation of a regular officer to perform active service at the pleasure of the President. Completion of the additional period of four years' active submarine service under this section shall in no way obligate the President to accept a resignation submitted by a regular officer at the end of the four-year period.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before July 30, 1973, execute the required written agreement to remain in active service."

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified submarine officers extending period of active service."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 9328, provides special pay to a small group of officers in the submarine service who are nuclear qualified.

This measure is urgently recommended by the executive branch as the proposed short-term solution to a serious problem confronting our nuclear submarine Navy.

RESIGNATION PROBLEM

Briefly, all of us in the Congress have heard rumors that an unprecedented number of junior officers who man our nuclear attack and Polaris submarines have submitted resignations requesting their release from active duty.

Unfortunately, these rumors are true. For example, almost half of year groups 1961 to 1964 have already submitted resignation requests.

The Committee on Armed Services was told that this officer community, that is officers who are nuclear qualified and assigned to our submarine service number fewer than 2,000. These officers currently man and operate 82 Polaris crews—41 SSBN's—and 47 nuclear attack—SSN—submarine crews. Nine more newly commissioned SSN's will require additional manning prior to June 30, 1970.

Since each of these submarines require a minimum of 11 nuclear qualified officers, it is evident that more than 1,400 officers are currently required to man these nuclear submarines presently in our inventory leaving precious few for necessary assignment to hard core shore billets and refresher training.

As a consequence of this circumstance, these officers have not been given the normal sea-to-shore rotation opportunity that is afforded their service contemporaries. Thus for example, there are officers in this program who have not been assigned to a shore billet in more than 18 years—an absolutely astounding and shameful situation.

The nuclear submarine program, by its very nature, requires officers of the highest possible quality and technical

competence. Yet, the best efforts of the Navy to date have precluded the development of an adequate inventory of trained officers to meet the critical manning demands posed by our vital nuclear submarine fleet.

There are many reasons given for this unfortunate condition all of which the Navy hopes in some manner to correct or alleviate. However, one of the most critical requirements is that these young men be given an additional substantial monetary incentive. Surveys and questionnaires made by the Navy gave every evidence that a substantial monetary incentive would go a long way toward stemming the flood of resignations now being received from officers in this program.

THE BILL

The bill before you today is directed to this problem and provides authority to the Secretary of the Navy to provide a bonus of \$15,000 payable in four yearly increments of \$3,750 per year for its submarine officers who are nuclear qualified and agree to extend their active service for a period of 4 years beyond their obligated service.

THE COST

The estimated annual cost of this program of from \$2.4 to \$3.8 million is almost negligible when viewed in the perspective of the alternatives.

It costs us conservatively \$124,500 to train one nuclear qualified submarine officer and bring him to the point where he is capable of becoming a department head or a commanding officer of a nuclear submarine. Therefore, if we can persuade only a few of these officers to continue their active service, we will have saved the Government a great deal of money and more importantly assured the maintenance of this absolutely indispensable strategic force capability.

VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS

I might also point out that the law presently provides a similar management tool in the case of enlisted personnel. This is the so-called variable reenlistment bonus which has been payable to enlisted personnel upon the occasion of their first reenlistment. The success of this management device in respect to enlisted personnel is eloquently demonstrated by the fact that we do not have any problem in retaining nuclear qualified enlisted personnel in our submarine program.

The Committee on Armed Services reported this bill unanimously and I therefore urge that you give it your wholehearted support and approval.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I agree with the basic purpose of this legislation, but let me ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services this question: When the men leave active duty on board nuclear submarines and become commanding officers not on such duty, would they receive the additional pay at that time?

Mr. RIVERS. No. They have got to be qualified in nuclear submarine operations

and remain in the nuclear submarine service.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When the gentleman says "remain in the submarine service," does that mean actually serving on board or does it mean something else?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, they have a system of rotation from ship to shore because these men study all the time. They go through this intensive training. As the gentleman knows all of the Polaris crews are divided into two parts, one at sea and one on shore. Also a very few are rotated to hard-core shore billets or to advanced or refresher nuclear training. They would receive it during such rotation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman for his explanation and I am in favor of this extra compensation. However, when a man has previously served on active duty with a nuclear submarine and subsequently attains the rank of captain and is no longer in the nuclear submarine service would he receive this compensation?

Mr. RIVERS. Oh, no; he has got to remain in the nuclear submarine service. If he goes into the nonnuclear submarine service or the surface Navy, he loses his entitlement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, he loses his extra compensation when he leaves active duty with the nuclear submarine service program?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Now, mind you—mind you—these junior officers have 10 years or less of service. To be a captain you have to have considerably longer service, 16 to 18 years of service ordinarily.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, when they go to the Pentagon and are no longer in the nuclear submarine program, they lose the pay also; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS. The answer to the question as posed by the gentleman is that they would not receive it. I would point out, however, that there are so few of them that there would be no place in the Pentagon for them. There are only 2,000 at the most, and they are all junior officers. So again I say to the gentleman that that would not occur.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my clear understanding, then, that when they get to a higher rank and no longer serve specifically in the nuclear submarine program that the extra pay would not go to their subsequent assignment?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct. It does not follow them. Let me emphasize that this is a one-time bonus proposition. That is, in accordance with the bill, an officer is not eligible for this one-time bonus unless he has, first, less than 10 years of commissioned service; second, is currently designated qualified in submarines; third, has the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operations, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants; and finally fourth, has executed a written agreement to remain in the active submarine service for one period of 4 years in addition to any other period of obligated service.

Moreover, the law specifically provides that no more than one agreement can be

made with each officer under the bill and that in the event he fails to complete the full period of 4 years of submarine service to which he agreed to serve, he is required to refund the bonus on a prorata basis.

Stated another way, the law is clearly aimed at junior officers, not captains. The Navy now has resignations from these junior officers amounting to more than 400, with new resignation requests being received at a rate of 30 per month. Thus, we have a very vital and serious problem confronting our nuclear submarine service and Congress must act immediately.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9328, and urge its unanimous adoption by the House.

The distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, has done his usual outstanding job in describing the purpose and justification for the legislation. Anything that I may say further in the way of explanation and justification would therefore be anticlimactic.

However, I think it particularly pertinent to emphasize the absolute urgency of this legislation.

On the basis of testimony received by the committee, it is abundantly clear that we may already be too late. Many of our highly trained nuclear submarine officers are disenchanting with their service life, and it is quite possible that this effort here today may not be satisfactory for some of them.

Yet, it is evident that we have no alternative. We must approve this legislation to make it possible for the Navy to attempt to persuade these young men to remain in their present profession.

All the members of the Committee on Armed Services on both sides of the aisle voted unanimously for this legislation. I am sure therefore that you will do likewise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 32]

Abernethy	Brown, Calif.	Dwyer
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.
Andrews, Ala.	Carey	Edwards, La.
Barrett	Celler	Esch
Bates	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Bell, Calif.	Colmer	Fish
Berry	Conyers	Flynt
Blatnik	Daddario	Foley
Bow	Davis, Ga.	Fulton, Tenn.
Brasco	Dawson	Gallagher
Brock	Dent	Garmatz
Brooks	Diggs	Gettys

Gray	Meeds	Rosenthal
Green, Pa.	Miller, Calif.	Roybal
Griffin	Minshall	Rumsfeld
Harvey	Moorhead	Ruppe
Hébert	Murphy, Ill.	Scheuer
Jones, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.	Schwengel
Karsh	O'Neal, Ga.	Shipley
Kirwan	Ottinger	Smith, Calif.
Kyros	Patman, Tex.	Snyder
Landrum	Pirnie	Sullivan
Long, La.	Pollock	Ullman
Long, Md.	Powell	Van Deerin
Lukens	Pryor, Ark.	Watkins
McClure	Purcell	Watts
Macdonald,	Rarick	Wyatt
Mass.	Rees	Wydler
Mathias	Reid, Ill.	Zwach
May	Ronan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-43) on the resolution (H. Res. 270) authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 270

Resolved, That, effective February 18, 1969, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by clause 11 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$425,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, 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 Internal Security 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.

Sec. 5. Effective January 3, 1969, funds made available pursuant to this resolution shall be available for expenses incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives as in effect during the period beginning January 3, 1969, and ending February 18, 1969.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$425,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000".

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California

(Mr. EDWARDS) for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for giving me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if given the opportunity at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this additional appropriation—the recommitment motion to require that the House Committee on Internal Security hold open hearings on the need for this money.

I refer to this legislation as an additional appropriation because that is what it is. The Committee on Internal Security is provided sufficient funds automatically under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as a standing committee of the House. The bill you are considering today is a request for additional funds.

In 1969 the Internal Security Committee will receive automatically \$166,340. To this must be added other automatic emoluments such as printing, stationery, stamps, telegrams, office equipment, furniture and office space. A modest estimate of these costs is \$75,000 per year. So we see that even if you deny this bill, the Internal Security Committee should continue to survive comfortably with an income of approximately \$20,000 per month.

I suggest that there is a sound legal reason why this additional \$400,000 should not be appropriated. A substantial part will obviously be spent on the "public" library maintained by the Internal Security Committee. Nowhere in the authorizing resolution for the committee is there authority to create and maintain this library.

I refer to the library as "public." The information is available to all Members of Congress and their staffs. The Congressman can disseminate the information as he sees fit. In addition, more than 40 Federal agencies or departments have access to the files with no apparent restrictions regarding public distribution of the information.

The library consists of hundreds of thousands of dossiers on individual Americans and organizations. Derogatory information is collected from newspapers, magazines, letterheads, the committee's investigation files, and presumably from unsolicited letters. I do not know if attempts are made to verify what is put in the files. What is clear is that the most outrageous gossip, innuendo, and outright lies have been distributed throughout the country as official House of Representatives information.

I hold here examples—excerpts from 30 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1963, purporting to prove that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is subversive and infiltrated with Communists. Among the NAACP leaders whose loyalty is impugned in the most reckless manner in these excerpts from HUAC files are Secretary Robert C. Weaver, Ambassador Ralph Bunche, Roy Wilkins, A. Philip

Randolph, Clarence M. Mitchell, and Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. I have asked unanimous consent that these excerpts be included in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

A recent example of the shocking methods by which these files are used took place last week in Sacramento, Calif. A subcommittee of the California State Senate was considering a resolution memorializing the tragic assassination on April 4, 1968, of Dr. Martin Luther King. One of the Senators presented to the subcommittee a file including information from the library of the House Internal Security Committee accusing Dr. King of having had Communist connections. I do not have to explain to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that all of the implications impugning the patriotism of this great American were false.

The additional money for the committee you are asked to vote for today supports this "public" library.

I recognize that the Internal Security Committee has a new chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), who is making efforts to maintain a dignity and decorum that the committee has lacked in the past. Mr. ICHORD has stressed, however, that he intends to preserve "the full jurisdiction and all the power it has possessed during the almost 25 years of its operation under its present mandate" including, we must assume, the library.

It is my position that this "public" library is unauthorized and that funds should not be approved for it. If the Committee on Internal Security wants to maintain such a library, then it should proceed as would any other committee and request the appropriate legislation.

We should refuse to authorize House Resolution 270 until we get a clear understanding of how the committee intends to spend its money.

That is the purpose of my motion to recommit—to hold public hearings on the committee's need for the money.

I urge a yea vote on the motion to recommit.

The material referred to follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D.C., as an economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on "The Federal Housing Program and the Negro" at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15-17, 1937.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes." The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: "From the

record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the "Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D.C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16-18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D.C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpoenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as showing "evidence of Communist penetration or control" according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942 (p. 7688). The special committee in report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contained in the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to "attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare" was "simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20-21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

The Washington Committee for Demo-

cratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D.C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that "A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges," the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

"The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

"This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U.N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche."

Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A-1.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Thurgood Marshall, director counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Educational Fund, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, *What Is the I.J.A.?* The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which "actively defended Com-

munists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the *Lawyers Guild Review* in the issue of May-June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the *Daily Worker* of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the *Washington Evening Star* (February 8, 1948, p. A-22 and February 12, 1948, p. A-82), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D.C.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The *Daily Worker* of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H.R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party "is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H.R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come." (Public hearings, pp. 2296-2302.)

It is noted by the *Daily People's World* of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, "blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful." The *Daily Worker* of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training.

FEBRUARY, 1956.

Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1961

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The *Daily Worker* of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that "Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself." The same information appeared in the *Daily People's World* of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Judicial Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Judicial Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12).

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

According to the *Daily Worker* of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The *Daily Worker* of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm

of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; and press releases on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled "1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes," he stated: "The greatest significance undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party," Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. "It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect on the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth." This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his

position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed."

George K. Hunton, testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *"

Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?"

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

"The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D.C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do

so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *." (Pp. 510-512).

A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D.C., January 6-8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, "7½ Million * * *" (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First U.S. Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26-28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee

on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69-71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

A letter head of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of *Fortnightly*, a publication of the college (p. 3).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17th annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by *New Masses*, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The *Daily Worker* of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

"In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for, in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations." Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the *Daily Worker* of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, *Second National Negro Congress*, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the *Communist* (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the *Daily Worker* of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The *Daily Worker* of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19-21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern

Conference for Human Welfare, April 14-16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The *Daily Worker*, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the *Daily Worker* of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as "one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war)." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102.)

The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1-5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, *These Americans Say*, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, Mar. 20, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, *Children in Concentration Camps*. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the *Daily Worker* of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

The United May Day conference was cited as "engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations" and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

The *Daily Worker* of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12-14. "The People Versus H.C.L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 9, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House is once again asked to appropriate funds for a standing committee of the House which throughout its history has infringed upon basic civil liberties embedded in the Bill of Rights.

The Committee on House Administration is recommending \$400,000. This amount is in addition to the funds auto-

matically provided under the Legislative Reorganization Act, which for 1969 will be \$166,340. This recommendation is the seventh largest request for a standing committee this year, and it is \$50,000 more than was appropriated to the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1967, and \$25,000 more than was appropriated to HUAC in 1968.

On March 13, 1968, when the appropriation request of \$375,000 was being considered for the predecessor of the Internal Security Committee, HUAC, I said that "this committee serves no useful legislative purpose"; that its purpose is "to harass and expose"; that it "flaunts our constitutional principles"; and that "it has brought discredit on the name of the House of Representatives."

As a result of the passage of House Resolution 89 on February 18, 1969, the name and mandate of the committee have been changed. According to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), the purpose of these changes was "to strengthen the committee in every possible way, clarify its mandate and eliminate any possible misunderstanding and confusion about the specific powers and jurisdiction of the Committee"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 18, 1967.

I know that several conscientious members of the committee, who have been recently assigned, intend to guard against the kind of outrageous denial of rights and due process which characterized the proceedings of HUAC.

However, this should not prevent us from confronting the basic issues which the House Internal Security Committee still presents to the House.

First, the mandate for this committee is open-ended, giving it significantly broader powers than rule XI formerly gave to HUAC. The committee's investigatory powers are no longer limited to a determination of the "extent, character, and objects of 'un-American propaganda' activities in the United States" and to investigation of the "diffusion of 'un-American propaganda.'" Its new mandate now permits it to investigate the activities of individuals or organizations, giving it sanction to initiate new investigations into civil rights, peace, student, and other organizations.

The powers of the House Internal Security Committee encroach on the jurisdiction of other committees of the House, particularly the Judiciary Committee, the chairman of which, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), made clear his objections to the powers assigned HISC during the House debate on House Resolution 89. Seven other members of Judiciary Committee, including myself, also outlined our reasons for opposing House Resolution 89 in a letter which we sent to our colleagues on February 13.

The Judiciary Committee has long had jurisdiction over matters of espionage, sedition, and the criminal penalties associated with these crimes. The fact that the Internal Security Committee intends to deal with these subjects as well constitutes a clear encroachment on the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee which will continue so long as the Mem-

bers of this body continue to fund the House Internal Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this request for additional funds cannot be considered in isolation from the record of the predecessor committee. That committee is, of course, HUAC.

As I have pointed out whenever appropriations for HUAC were before the House, this committee serves no useful legislative purpose. It serves to harass and expose, not to investigate. Its past activities have made a mockery of the most basic guarantees of justice and due process, bringing disrepute to the name of the House of Representatives.

If a committee is to be judged by its legislative record, then the record of this committee is almost completely devoid of any accomplishment. Throughout its existence only six bills reported out of this committee have been enacted into law. During the 89th Congress not one bill reported out by this committee was enacted into law; in the 90th Congress one bill was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law.

While the Congress as a whole considered 17,180 measures during both sessions of the 90th Congress, only 32 bills were referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee, the predecessor of the House Internal Security Committee. Of these 32 bills, 23 were either identical or similar to other bills, leaving the committee with a real workload of only nine pieces of legislation. Moreover, each of these nine bills properly belonged to the jurisdiction of other standing committees of the House.

The only bill, which was reported out and actually signed into law, extended the life of the previously dormant Subversive Activities Control Board, whose record of achievement, appropriately enough, is comparable to that of HUAC.

Let me outline briefly the nature of those nine principal bills which were referred to the committee.

H.R. 8, the pool bill, was opposed by the Departments of Justice, Defense, State, Treasury, and Commerce. Although it was reported out of committee on November 11, 1967, it was not acted upon by the House.

H.R. 735, a perennial bill to establish a National Freedom Academy, which belongs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, was reported out by the committee, but no rule was granted for its consideration by the House Rules Committee.

H.R. 5942 proposed restrictions on the travel of U.S. citizens to several countries in the Communist bloc. Passport legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 7025 is the so-called Klan bill.

During the legislative hearings in the 89th Congress on a bill identical to H.R. 7025, the Attorney General of the United States expressed serious apprehension at the vagueness of the bill and about its constitutionality. The language of the bill was such that both civil rights leaders and Government law enforcement officials feared that the legislation might be used against civil rights workers. Nevertheless, 1 year later, on October 21, 1966—only hours before the adjournment of the 89th Congress—HUAC

reported the bill out of committee. Due to the lateness of the session, the bill was not considered. This legislation was re-submitted in the 90th Congress, however, as H.R. 7025.

H.R. 12601, the lone HUAC bill to be approved by the 90th Congress, extended the life of the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board, which was about to expire for lack of renewal by Congress.

H.R. 11675, which proposed to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board, was obviously not reported out of the committee.

H.R. 15626 was aimed at overturning the Robel case decided by the Supreme Court in December of 1967 which declared unconstitutional certain employment restrictions embodied in the Internal Security Act. Some of its provisions, in addition, went far beyond the scope of the Robel decision in seeking to establish new restrictions on the employment of persons with controversial political affiliations in defense-related industries. Although the bill was reported out of committee, a rule was not granted.

H.R. 16030, which was introduced by former chairman Willis, proposed powers which could be used to dismiss summarily Federal employees who express or organize opposition to policies of the Government of the United States during wartime—whether or not an actual declaration of war has been officially approved by Congress. This legislation was clearly aimed at Federal employees who had organized opposition to the war in Vietnam through the peaceful and constitutionally protected dissemination of petitions and pamphlets. No provisions for due process or the right to a hearing were included.

H.R. 19646, submitted by the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), was to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act, which permits the incarceration of individuals for indefinite periods of time in the interest of "national security." This bill also was not reported out of committee.

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

It also had the fourth largest staff, employing more employees—47—on its payroll through December 31, 1968, than all but the Committees on Appropriations, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

This, then, is the record of the predecessor to the House Internal Security Committee—HUAC; the committee which again is before this body asking for more money. If the recommendation of the House Administration Committee is approved, the House Internal Security Committee will receive \$400,000, giving it the seventh largest budget of all of the committees in the House; larger than such important committees as the Judiciary Committee, \$250,000; the Committee on Ways and Means, \$50,000; the In-

terior Committee, \$115,000; the Agriculture Committee, \$250,000; and the Foreign Affairs Committee, \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker, this allocation is inconsistent with the legislative workloads of the various committees in the House. As I have pointed out, HUAC considered only nine bills of differing substance during the 90th Congress. The Education and Labor Committee, by contrast, received 836 bills. The Judiciary Committee received 2,656 public bills and 7,059 private bills. The Ways and Means Committee received 3,806 bills, and the Banking and Currency Committee 668 bills.

The abysmal legislative record of HUAC is reason enough to deny this request for \$400,000 in additional funds. But, in addition to that record, we must also bear in mind the discredit which the committee through the conduct of its hearings has brought upon the House. The hearings held in August of 1966—during which a member of the bar was forcibly evicted from the hearing room for protesting the sham which the committee was making of due process—is perhaps the prototype of the kind of hearings so long identified with HUAC. That spectacle led even Senator DIRKSEN, who is not noted for his opposition to HUAC, to comment: "This spectacle can do the Congress no good."

The most recent hearings of the committee, which were held last fall, provided yet another example of its singular unproductivity. Ostensibly called for the purpose of investigating the demonstrations which took place at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, hearings produced little more than acrimonious banterings between the witnesses and the committee members. The contrast between the style of investigation pursued by HUAC, and the well-reasoned and thoroughly documented report of the Walker Commission—which issued its report on the Chicago disorders a few months later—illustrates the point I am making—that there is no legislative justification for giving this committee one penny.

HUAC, it is clear, has seriously tarnished the reputation and prestige of the House of Representatives. Moreover, it has discredited the investigation processes which are so important to the formulation of meaningful and efficient legislation. Beyond this fact, however, we must consider the effect HUAC has had on the lives of the hundreds of individuals who have been called before its inquisitions during the past 30 years. Reputations have been tarnished and many lives lastingly and adversely affected by the actions of this committee. With its newly expanded mandate, the committee will be free to embark on still more witchhunts during the 91st Congress.

Since 1960, the committee has recommended that 130 individuals be cited for contempt of Congress. Despite the fact that only 10 of these citations have been upheld by higher courts, the reputations of those cited have been permanently damaged.

The House itself must accept the blame for the excesses and outrages of this committee. By its approval of funds, the

House has sanctioned the actions of this committee. It is high time for the House to withdraw that sanction.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this appropriation. Although the name may have been changed, civil liberties will enjoy no more protection under this version of HUAC than they had under the last. It is time for the House to write an end to this committee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the House has before it today a request for an appropriation of \$400,000 for calendar year 1969 for the House Committee on Internal Security. I do not see any reason why this appropriation should be approved by the House.

It seems to me that existing professional organizations such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation are doing as good a job now as they have done in the past of combating internal subversion of the Republic.

One of its sole aims seems to be to provide a forum for professional witnesses, glorifying in the process the very people it purports to investigate in the public interest.

Additionally, this committee in the past has played fast and loosely with the civil liberties of many individual Americans. In the name of liberty they have taken liberties which has lessened the quality of life in our country for many citizens. Such abrogation of freedom is not to be suffered any longer in silence or without opposition.

It is the duty of this House, in the name of the Republic and its institutions, to curb dictatorial excess, especially on the part of an organ of government. Approval in this case constitutes allowing license and standing mutely aside as excess masquerades under the name of legally constituted authority.

Now this body, acting as a Committee of the Whole, has the opportunity to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security. I hope and fervently ask that this appropriation be refused and voted down.

By such an act, we shall prove that we have no need for nor will we allow any star chamber proceedings, complete with conviction by publicity, of any innocent citizen. We shall also refuse a forum and glorification for those who could never hope for it in any other manner. Let us finally put a finish to the activities of this futile and grotesque parody of a congressional inquiring body.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 of this year, this House by an overwhelming vote of 306 to 80 adopted my resolution establishing the House Committee on Internal Security.

After listening to my three preceding colleagues, and with all due respect for their opinions, it appears to me today that this controversy is a manifestation of the frustrations of the more deter-

mined opposition to that resolution adopted so overwhelmingly by the House.

I recall the words of the past used to describe another frustrated group—

Each day they pray for their daily bread and then they pray for their daily illusion.

I think these gentlemen today are praying for their daily illusion. In view of the overwhelming vote by this House of Representatives and in view of the very recent nature of the action, I do not feel that this House, at least at this early date, would, in effect, reverse itself by denying the Committee on Internal Security appropriations or by starving the committee to death.

Now I do not care to become involved in any argument as to whether or not the House changed the name of the House Committee on Un-American Activities with a clarified mandate or whether it abolished the House Committee on Un-American Activities and established a new committee, the House Committee on Internal Security. Such arguments are, in my opinion, purely semantical.

Likewise is the argument whether you increase or decrease the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security. If one makes a broad interpretation of the word "un-American," then we decreased the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security. If one makes a narrow interpretation of the word "un-American," then we increased the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security.

Members of the House, what is important is the final result—the establishment of a House Committee on Internal Security with limited legislative jurisdiction in the very important area of criminal subversion. In addition the House Committee on Internal Security has been given certain permanent and defined investigative powers in the field of criminal subversion and thus it joins the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Government Operations as one of the three permanent investigating committees of this House.

The gentleman from New York has observed that this is one of the largest appropriations in the Congress for a congressional committee. Let me again remind the House that this is a permanent investigating committee. But this appropriation is not the largest, if the figures that have been provided me are correct.

On March 26, 1969, we approved the following:

Committee on Government Operations, \$850,000.

Committee on Public Works, \$486,000.

Committee on Banking and Currency, \$692,500.

Committee on Education and Labor, \$769,600.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, \$412,000.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce, \$595,000.

All larger than the \$400,000 requested by the House Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, since February 18 the committee has undergone a great deal of restructuring and reorganization, among which was the adoption of what I con-

sider the most comprehensive and the fairest investigating rules ever adopted by a committee of Congress.

On February 20 the committee ordered an in-depth investigation into the revolutionary violence in this Nation. On March 6 the committee ordered a full-scale investigation of certain specific organizations which were not named by the committee in the interest of an orderly and fair investigation.

Mr. Speaker, if the House desires these investigations to go forward, I ask that the previous question be voted up, and that the Committee on House Administration be supported.

Before closing, however, I would like to address myself to recent activities in opposition to my committee outside the Congress.

On March 19 my attention was directed to a meeting of the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities that was to be held on March 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C., when I received a letter from an individual stating that he was going to attend the meeting and would like to have an appointment with me afterwards. I was very intrigued about the meeting as it came so soon following the action of the House on February 18. The meeting was held and the committee is now known as the National Committee to Abolish HUAC/HCIS even though the House Committee on Internal Security is still in the organizational stage and has yet to hold a hearing. I have been impressed with the organizational ability of this organization, its apparently well-financed operations, the smoothness of its very expert lobbying activities, and was very interested in its esoteric argument that the House Committee on Un-American Activities should be retained in order that it might be abolished.

An observer who was in attendance at the open sessions has furnished me with a narrative account of the speeches and discussions which transpired. The very name of the National Committee to Abolish speaks for its primary purpose and is well known to all who are concerned with the internal security of the United States. The devices and tactics which the organization employs, and intends to employ, I feel are not well known. They are, however, of such significance to each citizen and his elected representative to Congress that they should be spread upon the RECORD. Surely each Member of this Congress has a vital interest in understanding the true nature and motivation of persons who visit his office, and in understanding the source responsible for the generation of mail in this regard. That the organization contemplates expansion of its targets to include Senate committees is also of interest. This account which follows, vividly depicts the strategy which the National Committee to Abolish intends to pursue to frustrate the House Committee on Internal Security. I am submitting this material for the RECORD in order to more fully explain the attacks that have been mounted against the committee which I head even before it begins its work. The report is very objective and reveals an extremely clever and effective lobbying

activity which I admire from the organizational standpoint. The account follows:

ACCOUNT OF THE RECENT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO ABOLISH THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

At 12:00 p.m. the convention was called to order. A very brief introductory statement was given by the Chairman, Professor Robert J. Havighurst. He then turned the program over to Frank Wilkinson, Executive Director.

Mr. Wilkinson first commented on the growing oppression that HUAC is perpetrating upon the citizens of this country. He then discussed briefly the format of the afternoon session and evening session. He noted that a majority of the people present at the meeting represented new and different faces from the group that initially formed the Committee approximately ten years ago. He traced rather briefly the approximate ten year history of the Committee, beginning with a synopsis of the endeavors of James Roosevelt, California Congressman, to the present. He noted they had 79 votes against H. Res. 89.

He placed great stress, as in his remarks later in the evening session, on the practical politics that the Committee is presently following. These practical politics were first enunciated by Aubrey W. Williams. The essence of these "practical politics" is that you do not hold meetings, demonstrations, etc. in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere, until you have done the essential homework of education in your own congressional district. The key is educate your Congressman. In conjunction, he noted that originally the tactics of the Committee were large meetings and demonstrations, in particular in Washington, D.C. The tactics have now shifted from defensive to offensive; from protecting people to actually attacking HUAC.

He noted that they now have a hard core of the congressional urban vote (against HUAC) in the Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York urban areas. He emphasized that they were weak in rural areas and had to have the rural votes. He further noted that they are strong on both the west coast and the east coast, relatively strong in the mid-west, but extremely weak in the south. He emphasized that they had to get the southern support. He suggested one tactic they should utilize is to demonstrate to people who are working in other related areas (i.e., civil rights, peace movements, anti-Vietnam, etc.) how the restrictions of HUAC hurt their cause. He emphasized that both Congressmen and their constituents must be educated to see that the First Amendment principles of freedom of speech and association comprise the fundamental underlying principles.

The next speaker was Lyle Mercer, Director, Western Regional Office. His comments traced the growth and development of both the ACLU and the Committee in the north-west. He noted that five of the seven Congressmen from Washington are Democrats and have taken some timorous steps in opposition to HUAC, in particular, voting to send the appropriations bill back to the committee. He also noted that two of the Democrats voted against H. Res. 89. He observed that there is an approximate membership of 25,000 to 30,000 members of the ACLU Chapter in the State of Washington and that this group is the backbone of the liberal movement in that State. In his opinion, the Western Region is the focal point or hub of the abolish HUAC movement.

The next speaker was Richard Criley, Director, Midwest Regional Office. His comments were largely directed toward organization of the various chapters of the Committee. He began by stating as a general premise:

every Congressman can be influenced to some extent by his constituents. He then built upon this premise the various arguments for, and methods of, influencing or educating Congressmen to vote for abolition of HUAC.

The first thing that must be accomplished is the development of an office geared to work on a congressional district level. The starting place in that office is a mailing list. He commented that they shouldn't just list a group of names of people thought to be sympathetic to the movement, but that they should be selective. In particular, they should find people who can influence other people. He singled out ministers, letter writers, and members of other organizations. Create a list of people who are opinion makers. He then discussed where the names of people for such lists can be obtained. He stressed that working relationships with people working for other organizations is critical. He again noted religious organizations working on social issues. He suggested that most people working in the social area, peace area, and civil rights area are particularly receptive to the idea of abolishing HUAC when they are educated and propagandized how important the right to dissent is to their movement.

He noted that the Committee has a potential constituency ranging from the far left to the far right, each wishing to abolish HUAC for his own particular reason.

In each Congressional District they should start with people who are closest to the heart of the political district's constituency (i.e., in a largely Irish Catholic District, start with Irish Catholics) and then work to represent all groups. He noted that published documents are a good source for names. He singled out Chicago and noted that there are published names of people working in the open housing movement and that these people have, or should be contacted to work for the Committee. He also noted that another source of names is people who write, what they consider, good letters to editors of various papers.

He then discussed the problem of getting the recipients to read the literature. He suggested that the best method is personal contact—to follow up every letter, where possible, with a telephone call. The problem is to get people from the position of sympathetic agreement to the position of action for the movement. As a practical matter, he noted that many people simply do not act. He stressed that they had to make things as simple and as easy as possible. They should begin with the most prestigious names on their lists in the communities with the thought in mind that most people like to associate and work in concert with important people. He suggested giving people lists of other people in the community working on the same project—power of association. Where possible he would like to have systematically organized small group meetings to further bring in the personal element. In synopsis, his approach would be from listing names to letter writings, to telephone calls, to small group meetings.

At this juncture, the meeting was opened for general discussion from the floor. Hereinbelow set forth is a synopsis of what each individual who spoke thought important to the movement to abolish HUAC.

A. A comment that their attempts had been directed for some time toward trying to influence Congress and the Executive Branch. Forty Federal Judges are to be appointed by the President within the next sixty to ninety days. This would be a good opportunity to try to press for selection of Judges more favorable toward, not only the Committee, but all liberal organizations or groups. He suggested that they should do everything possible to bring favorable witnesses to testify before the Judiciary Committee and that all possible pressure should be brought to bear on the Senators by letter writing. He noted that the areas of Civil Rights, Vietnam, and the activities of the ACLU were the

three principal areas toward which the prospective Judges should be favorably disposed.

B. A request for the names of any sympathetic influential people from Congressman Richard Ichord's district with, presumably the thought in mind of trying to form an organization or branch of the Committee in Congressman Ichord's own district.

C. A suggestion of reorganization of the Committee. He noted that in the past the Committee was democratically orientated, but suggested more work with the Republican Party. Also the suggestion was advanced of a more closely and formally organized National Committee with branches at the state and local political subdivision level.

D. This speaker, a Puerto Rican, noted that everyone present was Caucasian and asked why and how they should, or could, relate to Negroes, Japanese, Chinese, etc. Later in the proceedings there were two or three Negroes present.

E. The question was raised with some discussion thereon, about how to relate the advocacy of the position to abolish HUAC to the best interests of a Congressman. Also the question was raised as to how they should relate to "young people."

F. A very strong plea was made toward considering state and city legislation which pressed very hard on college students and black citizens. The remark was made that there is much state and city legislation now passed, or pending, which is directed toward repressing the younger generation.

G. The suggestion was made that the Committee should oppose not only the House Committee on Internal Security but, also, the Senate Committees of Senator Eastland and Senator McClellan and any such state committees. In short, work for the abolition of Internal Security Committees wherever they arise.

H. The point was stressed that when attempting to sell the principle of abolishing HUAC to any organization, it is extremely difficult, almost impossible, to sell that organization unless HUAC is at that time "attacking" them. In short, the best time to try to line up an organization in the fight to abolish HUAC is at the time when HUAC is investigating that organization.

I. The point was made that they should not be so negative in their approach. That is, not emphasize "abolish the committee," so much; rather emphasize the affirmative aspects of free speech and right to dissent. It was also suggested that they should consider the question of freedom to speak and dissent in the military.

J. There was some discussion about how broad or how narrow an objective the Committee should pursue. The issue in discussion was whether the Committee should branch out and pursue other related activities, or whether it should stick to the rather narrow objective of working to abolish HUAC. The consensus was remain with the singular objective of abolishing HUAC and other comparable committees.

K. Noted that press releases and press conferences are effective means to educate the public. The opinion was expressed that generally, the news media is rather sympathetic to the abolition of HUAC campaign.

The format then reverted to scheduled speakers, the first being Donna Allen, Washington Representative of the Committee. She informed the group that, while talking with some unidentified Congressman, he informed her that a member of the Supreme Court had called him and requested a copy of the bill he had introduced to abolish the House Internal Security Committee and for a copy of his speech directed thereto.

She then discussed how to influence Congressmen. She began by noting that their basic purpose is to abolish HUAC. Only Congressmen can do this. She strongly emphasized that there was not enough information coming from the field to the Con-

gressmen. She, in fact, termed it a dangerous communication gap. The Committee was doing a good job educating the public by making certain that they get appropriate material; but was not doing a good job of educating and sending material to the Congressmen.

She discussed how Congressmen should be informed. She emphasized that ridicule is one of the best weapons at their disposal. Anytime, she suggested, that a person comes across a satirical or otherwise ridiculing column, cartoon, etc., it should be clipped and sent to a Congressman. She noted that sending material to a Congressman serves three purposes: (1) It informs him. (2) He thereby knows that you know about that particular area, and (3) most important, it shows him that people aren't afraid to discuss this subject matter any more.

She then made a few comments and suggestions on what the people should do when they visit their Congressman on Monday. She suggested they ask each Congressman how his mail is "running." In her opinion, most of the mail received by the various Congressmen is anti-HUAC. A Congressman, therefore, has no justification for refusing to vote against the HUAC, if he is, in fact, against it. She suggested that if the Congressman states his mail is basically for HUAC, the individual should find out why, where it is coming from, etc. She suggested that, assuming the Congressman is against HUAC, the individual ask him what he can do to help. She noted that the individual should treat the visit to the Congressman's office not so much as an attempt to tell the Congressman what the individual thinks, but to ask him questions. Ask questions such as what do you think of the name change, of Congressman Ichord's promises of fairness, of witness procedures, etc. In short, find out what the Congressman thinks; get information.

She concluded by observing that she has detected a change in attitude from the congressional offices over the years that she has been here. When she first began her lobbying attempts, she noted that secretaries, when she showed up in an office, told her that a Congressman was pro or con and that he knew all about HUAC. She notes that now she tells the secretaries or the Administrative Assistants that she really doesn't care one way or another about HUAC, but she simply has some information for the Congressman and asks if she can come back from time to time with more information. Now the Congressmen "light up" and ask her, "What do you have for me today?" She said that the information that she carries to the Congressmen does the job, it speaks for itself.

Some of the comments that were made from the floor after Donna Allen concluded are worthy of brief mention. There was a suggestion that each individual talk to his Congressman when he returns to his district. A comment was made that Congressmen who voted in favor of HUAC are defensive about the position. Those who voted against it really love to talk about it. A suggestion was made that in any political campaign an anti-HUAC element should be injected with an argument raised that many politicians do not want it injected. A former Congressman, Charlie Porter, commented on how to "set up" a Congressman who is pro-HUAC. He suggested that individuals get the Congressman committed in writing. He said that a person should send back any form letter received from a Congressman, with comments thereon asking why he didn't bother to answer personally or actually answer the questions raised in the letter to him. Pin him down. He then stated that if the Congressman's answer is anti-HUAC that it should be taken to the newspapers, etc. If pro-HUAC, it should be given to the Congressman's opponent in the next election.

Following a break for lunch, Professor Hugh H. Wilson, Professor of Politics at Princeton University spoke. Among other things, he noted that HUAC had done its best to strengthen the anti-democratic elements, it has undermined our capacity for social discourse, and it has encouraged racist discourse. It has accomplished all this by silencing liberalism. It is more interested in destroying people than in furthering change.

The next speaker was Professor Oliver Clubb, Asian Studies, Syracuse University. The printed title of his dissertation was "On Foreign Policy." The whole dissertation was psychiatrically orientated with such theories as angelic forms overthrowing forces of darkness, forces of death and dissolution, and an interesting theory: all people have three layers—an outer layer of suppression, a second layer of violence, and an inner layer of biological functions. Since we all suppress our second layer of violence, we need some outlet. Wars form what we consider a legitimate outlet. HUAC perpetuates the war by stifling dissent directed thereto.

The next speaker was Abe Feinglass, Vice President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America. He spoke generally on the history of labor and HUAC. He was extremely derogatory to HUAC, blaming it on much of labor's ills. In particular he noted that HUAC had gone out of its way to "get" the CIO. He noted that many times HUAC had timed its hearings to coincide with strikes and organizational attempts. Further, that more than once news of subpoenas was leaked to management before they were actually issued. He alleged that HUAC played a major role in splitting the U.S. Labor Movement in the 40's and 50's. HUAC is, according to Feinglass, against everybody who wants progressive change away from, to use his terms, "rugged individualism and private enterprise." He further noted that HUAC has "destroyed" the labor leaders who today could or would have stood up and dissented in favor of the liberal movement. It was also his thought that HUAC utilizes political terrorism to stifle everything which he considers healthy to our society. He acknowledged that what he termed the "old left" through some mistakes has partially contributed to our present problems.

The next speaker was Professor Thomas I. Emerson, Yale University. His remarks centered around the new committee mandate. His initial comments were directed toward the First Amendment (freedom of speech and association) and the Fifth Amendment (due process of law as it is associated with constitutional notions of vagueness.) He gave a short lecture on the difference between the constitutionally protected right of expression and non-constitutionally protected right of action. He acknowledged that the new mandate is an improvement over the old mandate. However, in his opinion it "comes down" to much the same problem as the old mandate. He then analyzed parts of clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subparagraph (b) showing how various words or phrases run afoul, in his opinion, of the First Amendment's right of freedom of speech and association.

The concluding remarks at Saturday's session were given by Frank Wilkinson who went into a rather elaborately detailed history of the Committee. Perhaps the content of his dissertation could be summarized by his repeated emphasis that they should emphasize the First Amendment principles of freedom of speech and freedom of association to all other groups and organizations. The theory being that these other groups and organizations who are engaged in some sort of dissent, legitimate or otherwise, by whatever methods, should and would feel that any committee which could impinge or infringe upon those First Amendment principles could thereby impinge or infringe

upon their movement. This was a general tenor noted throughout the day's events, one of appealing to other groups and organizations who are engaged in dissent to show or illustrate to them that their right to dissent is impaired by the establishment and functions of the House Internal Security Committee and, therefore, it should be abolished.

The second session of the Convention was called to order on Sunday, March 23, by Chairman Phillip J. Hirschkop.

The first speaker was Lawrence Speiser, Director, Washington, D.C. American Civil Liberties Union. He spoke on "An Evaluation of the 91st Congress; What Can We Expect." In his opinion more of the same general type of legislation that emanated from the 90th Congress can be expected. In particular, general problems concerning law and order, crime, student and other demonstrations would be considered. He noted, with reference to the problem of crime in the streets, what he considered a trend to infringe on constitutional rights, rather than use the poverty program to get to the roots and cause of the crime. He discussed organized crime and attacked the wiretap laws. He pointed out that under the omnibus crime bill of last year, the states potentially have wider leeway than Federal authorities to wiretap. He discussed briefly student demonstrations and obscenity problems. In his estimation, Congress will probably legislate further in the area of obscenity. His concluding remark was: "... civil liberties are indivisible. What can be done to organized crime can be done to you."

The next speaker was Professor Arthur Kinoy, Rutgers University. He began by asking a question: "Is it relevant to fight to abolish HUAC today?" Citing examples from the last two weeks, particularly the Chicago indictments, he concluded that the Nixon Administration is moving, or is prepared to move, against the national leaders of all liberal radical movements. He feels there has been a major decision made to attempt to isolate and destroy the leadership of "peoples' movements." His analysis is that the Federal Government is unable to cope with the fundamental, exploding erupting problems of Vietnam, the new young generation in the universities, and the black problems; therefore their only answer is force to suppress those problems. One of the elements of the force to suppress those problems, obviously, is congressional committee investigations. Therefore, answering his initial question, the present struggle against HUAC is extremely relevant.

Mr. Kinoy noted three basic lessons which he feels have emerged from the anti-HUAC fight which should be taught to all new movements. First, and most important, don't be defensive, don't sit back and wait, fight back at the earliest possible opportunity. Take the offensive. The minute any governmental action is taken or even proposed, the group should ask the question "What are we going to do to get them back?" Second, Mr. Kinoy feels that the Committee will die without the unity of the "American peoples movements". They have a common enemy, HUAC, and should unite all peoples movements in the common fight against the common enemy. He noted that "the man" (President Nixon) is going to try to do everything within his power to prevent this unity. Third, in the "peoples' fight" there is no generation gap—the generation can be bridged. In Mr. Kinoy's opinion, the myth that there is a generation gap comes directly from "the man".

The next speaker was Jerry Gutmann who discussed rather briefly, and without much detail, the *Krebs*, *Davis*, and *Young*, and *Stammler* and *Cohen* cases. He noted that the *Krebs* case is now pending before a single District Judge in Washington, D.C. who has

already indicated that he considers the question moot. There are, he noted, additional questions of mootness because of the change of the committee name and the fact that the present Congress cannot cite contempt in those cases. They will not accept a disposition of the cases based on the issue of mootness. The real issue of the case is, not the power to cite contempt, but that of inquisition and interference with peoples' lives and First Amendment rights. He inferred that they will argue that it is really the same committee with the same powers, notwithstanding the name change. He mentioned either expanding this litigation, expanding other litigation, or initiating new litigation to include an issue of disposition of the House Internal Security Committee files. He argued there is no legitimate legislative purpose served by retention of these files. Therefore, a request will be made to seal the files or records so they cannot be examined without a court order.

He then discussed briefly the *Young* and *Davis* case, noting that a motion to quash the subpoenas had been overruled by the District Judge. He then discussed briefly the old HUAC motion to produce Dr. Young's bank account. He noted that when the motion was drawn, but not served, to quash, Congressman Ichord called and told them he was withdrawing the subpoena for a technical reason and, to date, no new subpoena has been issued. This was interpreted as a victory for the Committee.

He then discussed briefly the *Stammler* and *Cohen* case. He noted that these cases had been "knocked-out of court" on the constitutional theory that a Congressman cannot be sued—can't even be enjoined from pursuing unconstitutional matters.

The next speaker was William F. Kunstler, Esquire. He spoke briefly on legal problems arising in the Kentucky and Wisconsin areas. He noted that the Kentucky Un-American Activities Committee had been effectively destroyed because the Governor had cut off its funds. He emphasized the point, previously raised by Mr. Kinoy, of positive and offensive reaction at the first possible moment. He made some brief comments on the draft, noting that the draft statute was being used as an adjunct of the system in an attempt to destroy the "peoples' movement". In his opinion, the draft system is loaded with inequities and absence of due process at every level. He also made some reference to Kennedy's recent resolution with respect to the draft. He closed with the comment that "peoples' movements" must stand and fight in the most positive way. "The man" cannot be cajoled or intellectualized out of his stand, but he can be worn down. He can be tied down.

The next speaker was Donna Allen whose topic was "Pending Repressive Legislation and Hearings." She spoke briefly on S. 12 noting that it is the same as S. 2988. In her opinion, it contains every single repressive thing the authors of the bill can think of. She noted rather briefly the anti-riot bill passed as a rider to the Civil Rights bill. She then spoke briefly on six bills presently pending before HISC, all referred to it on January 3, 1969.

At this point, there was a break with some general discussion from the floor. The general tenor of the conversation was the undesirability of transferring HISC to the Judiciary. They do not want it under the respectability of the Judiciary. They want it to stand alone where they feel it is more vulnerable to attack.

The next speaker was Professor Thomas Emerson, Yale University. He began by noting that HISC is most interested at present in disorder on the campuses and demonstrations in general. He briefly discussed Congressman Ichord's bill to establish a Committee of seven Congressmen to review contempt citation requests. His only comment

was that it contains nothing really objectionable. He also noted Congressman Ichord's bill to amend the statute to subject a person who "misbehaves" before a committee to contempt charges. In his opinion, this is extremely vague and he didn't think there was any reason for it. He noted that other committees have gotten along without it.

Professor Emerson then discussed Congressman Gonzalez' bill (H.R. 46). He singled out four main provisions: (1) It reduces the power of a single member of a committee to take certain actions. It, in effect, eliminates the one-man subcommittee. (2) It contains provisions regarding the right of witnesses to explain answers, read or give statements at the end of testimony, and gives the witnesses' counsel right to question certain aspects of the Committee's jurisdiction. (3) It extends rather extensive rights to people (other than the witness) mentioned in committee proceedings, including right of cross-examination and right to call witnesses on his own behalf. (4) It contains provisions which provide, in part, for a court decision whether a witness would be held in contempt if he refuses to answer a question, before he in fact does refuse. In Professor Emerson's opinion, H.R. 46 would afford more substantial right to a witness called to testify before a committee than he now has. He then asked whether the Committee should support this bill. He noted that H.R. 46 goes to form (procedure) and not substance (abolish HUAC) and, therefore, answering his own question, he felt that no formal action should be taken to support it. He suggested that while it does give a witness more protection, the position should be taken that people shouldn't have to testify at all. The comments that came from the floor at this point seemed to be in favor of endorsing the Gonzalez' bill because, basically, it applies to all committees. There was some comment that it should be strongly endorsed. The Committee will, probably, endorse and support the Gonzalez' bill as a sort of secondary measure, retaining as its first priority its continued fight to abolish HUAC. The whole issue is one of emphasis or priority.

The next speaker was Professor Douglas Dowd, Cornell University. He spoke on "Attacks On Academic Freedom." He initially remarked that we live in a very dangerous period. He was referring to people with general indifference to, or support of, those attempting to suppress dissent. He noted that all news reports of events that he personally was acquainted with were distorted; therefore he assumes the rest are. He doesn't think any news reports are really reliable. When he reached this conclusion there was a resounding round of applause from the audience.

He then observed that, at the present time, there is no problem on the campus with respect to freedom of speech. In his opinion, people are free to say, and are saying what they want. However, this freedom of speech, on the campus, is now being used as a means of preventing change, not promoting change. This was the whole basis of his remarks.

He noted that today the youthful academic world is trying to stop and break up the corporate war economy. Students are trying to change things both on and off the campuses. He feels that the universities are now turning out people who will fit into slots, who will work and perpetuate the system, and the students want to change the system. The students are saying things must be changed and, many times, the faculty say "we agree," but present procedures to effectuate that change must be respected and obeyed. The students, however, see nothing change, or if the change does come, it is too slow or only temporary. Students are saying we want to change, we will use your procedures, but if they don't work, we will build up our own. The whole point, in Professor Dowd's opinion, is that many times the faculty agrees with the students that some change must be made, that something must be done, but they don't

do anything about it. In short, there is much free speech about what should be done, but such free speech does not accomplish anything. All the free speech results in is talk, talk, talk, but no concrete results. Therefore, the observation that, in effect, free speech is preventing, not promoting, change. Professor Dowd closed with the comment that when repression comes to the campus, it will come wrapped in a cloak of free speech. Talk, while necessary, is not enough.

The next speaker was Carl Braden who talked rather briefly about the Kentucky Un-American Activities Committee and how it is presently rendered ineffectual by the Governor's denial of funds. He again emphasized the concept that the first thing to be done when a "repression measure" is instituted is to counterattack. He advocates, as did everyone else, the theory that you fight both in the courts and on the street; using the term "fight" in terms of organizing and educating people—in short, combined legal, propaganda, and organizational techniques.

The next speaker was Ginny Guild, an associate staff member of the Southern Conference Educational fund. Her very brief general comments were directed toward the problems of organizing people against repression in the South. She noted that people should look at repression in its totality—wherever and by whomever it arises.

The next speaker was Jim Rowan, Chairman, Southern Committee Against Repression. He noted that they have made advances in the South in their coordination of groups. He made some general comments about what he called "creative losing" noting that the courts make an excellent forum from which they can express their views. He also touched rather briefly on problems created by state and city agencies.

The next speaker was Juan Lopez. He commented on the black and brown people's fear of concentration camps (Title II of the McCarran Act). He again asked the National Committee how they intend to relate to the black, brown, Chinese, labor movements, etc. He suggested that every time a group of people or organization is "oppressed" by a local, state, or federal authority, that is the ideal time to educate them of the evils of the McCarran Act. He closed with a suggestion that the Committee consider hiring black and brown organizers.

The next speaker was Terry Carter, from Camden, New Jersey. She began by telling of her experiences in the Civil Rights field in Camden, New Jersey, and how "they" brought in a "red scare" to break up the group or organizations. She noted that the "HUAC tactics" of name calling is particularly effective in the black and brown communities because of (1) their lack of education and (2) they have been subjected to the same "mom and apple pie" Americanism as the rest of us and are, in her opinion, more susceptible to the concept of this Americanism because of their constant struggle for equality. She noted that if you cannot convince the white middle-class community that the HUAC-type repressive and oppressive tactics are bad, how can you expect to convince the black and brown people. She noted they are simply too busy with the mundane problems of living to intellectualize with this problem.

She recommended a full-fledged campaign designed to reach the black and brown community at their level. The type of campaign launched against the white middle-class citizenry will not be effective against the black and brown community for the simple reason that they stand on two different levels of education. She noted that letter writing, phone calls, etc. will not work in the black and brown community. In her opinion, it is necessary to actually go in and personally talk with these people—and the organizers must be black or brown people.

She commented that in her experience HUAC "oppresses" black men by repressing

and oppressing the white liberal groups trying to help them. HUAC doesn't actually touch or interfere with the black people; therefore, the majority of the black community does not think that any of the HUAC action-type of activities, particularly she pointed out, the McCarran Act, Title II, pertains to them. She closed with a plea to organize the black community.

The next speaker was John Learner of the Students for a Democratic Society. He began by noting that imperialism, capitalism, and racism are the real problems in America today. He made some general comments about the present problems of the Washington Free Press, the SDS demonstrations which precluded Mayor Alloto from speaking at Georgetown University, and the Texas universities refusal to allow SDS to hold their March National Council meeting there. He also spent a few brief minutes discussing varying examples of what he considered to be repression of the SDS. Interestingly, he commented that the SDS knew the House Internal Security Committee is planning to investigate them, and made the comment that "we will learn very quickly how to respond to that form of repression."

He noted that the SDS is learning how to use the HUAC-type hearing for its own purposes, how to utilize it to show just how undemocratic and repressive those mechanisms of government really are. He further commented that history had shown them that the channels of petition for redress are not open to the SDS. He commented, "we are, in fact, a movement of people for power in this country." He concluded by noting that it is impossible to separate the attacks against SDS from attacks against any other groups and organizations for reform in this country. He made a plea for unity of all groups with the closing remark, "power to the people, by any means necessary."

The next two speakers, Wayne Holley of Utah and Scarlet Patrick, made a few brief general comments on "Defense Against Prosecutions Under HUAC's Revived Internal Security Act."

The next speaker was Milton Cohen, Social worker-executive, one of the plaintiffs in *Stammier, Hall and Cohen v. Willis*. It was his opinion that the "establishment" is trying to carry out a policy of [sharp] repression, because they can't solve the problems. He further noted that the change of name from HUAC to House Internal Security Committee is a sign of their strength and a sign of the Committee's weakness.

At this point, the group engaged in a rather general discussion over various issues that had been raised. The only thing of particular interest at this point was a question raised by an individual from St. Louis. He commented that when groups use more radical means to get what they want, people were asking him the question, "In pursuing your goals, you are violating my First Amendment freedoms to do what I want to, how do you justify that?" He then asked, "How do I answer a question like this?" It was extremely interesting that no one attempted to answer the question. In fact, the question was ignored with the next two people making eloquent remarks toward protection of the First Amendment freedoms, the need for a change in society, calling the Convention a victory celebration, and imploring a renewed emphasis on attacking the Nixon Administration and the House Committee on Internal Security.

There was, also, some discussion at this time regarding the direction the Committee was to take. The general question the members of the Convention discussed was how broad a front should be pursued. Should they limit themselves simply to attacking the House Internal Security Committee, or should they branch out and encompass more activities. There was really no answer given, merely much discussion.

The last speaker was Dennis J. Roberts, Esquire, Counsel, Law Center for Constitutional Rights. He noted that the Law Center has filed suit, in effect, against Title II of the McCarran Act. They are specifically after the "detention" aspect of Title II. He discussed briefly a hearing held about a week ago on the Government's motion to dismiss this suit and noted that the Judge had taken it under advisement. He inferred rather strongly that the Judge was kindly disposed toward the Plaintiff's view to declare Title II unconstitutional. He suggested that this suit be used as a unifying tool to unite all forces and all people against repression.

This concluded scheduled speakers and discussions of the assembled people.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this country is reaching fiscal extremes and the administration is attempting budget cuts across the board, I think it is incumbent on this body to closely scrutinize the pending request for a special appropriation of \$400,000 for the Committee on Internal Security. This committee already receives the statutory sum of \$166,340 in addition to the automatic amenities such as printing, stationery, stamps, equipment, furniture and office space allowances. There seems no reason why this committee should not be able to operate within its budget. Certainly, a special appropriation of about 250 percent in excess of the statutory allowance is unnecessary. This committee has the mandate to investigate internal subversion within the country and recommend necessary legislation. In past years, the committee operating under the title of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has indeed held many investigations. Its legislative accomplishments have not been overwhelming however.

There has been no explanation of why the committee cannot carry on its designated function within its regular budget. The only reason I can surmise for this request is to fund the extensive publishing activities of the committee. These publications do not fall within the authorized purposes of the committee, and in many cases consist of unverified allegations from dubious sources on the activities or associations of certain public figures. I can see no reason for Congress to fund the dissemination of conspiratorial theories advanced by private citizens or organizations.

For these reasons I would recommend the passage of the motion to recommit this additional appropriation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session of Congress I introduced a proposal, House Resolution 20, calling for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Recently, when the name of this committee was changed to the House Internal Security Committee, without any perceivable change in its functions or its mandate of authority, I introduced a bill, House Resolution 287, calling for the abolition of this newly named, but relatively unchanged, committee.

Today the question of appropriations for the House Internal Security Committee for this session is before us, and today I take the floor again to urge that we put an end to the activities of this committee. House Resolution 270, which we have before us today, would appro-

appropriate \$400,000 for the committee. I am sure that my colleagues are aware this authorization is not necessary to keep the committee in existence. This funding is in addition to the funds authorized for the committee—more than \$160,000 this year—under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In the 89th Congress, the Un-American Activities Committee received additional funds in the amount of \$845,000 by specific House resolutions. In the 90th Congress, it received additional funding of \$725,000. By comparison, the House Judiciary Committee, received an additional funding of only \$500,000.

It is incredible, Mr. Speaker, that so much money should go for such little legislative accomplishment. The functions of a legislative committee are to consider, report, and oversee legislation. Since its establishment as a standing committee in 1945, the Un-American Activities Committee—predecessor of the present committee—had to its credit two acts—the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Communist Control Act of 1954—together with four amendments to the Internal Security Act. Indeed, the last of these amendments, passed by the 90th Congress, was made necessary to keep alive the Subversive Activities Control Board because the Supreme Court found that the most important part of the Internal Security Act—that which sought to compel registration of groups and individuals with the Attorney General by order of the Board—violated the fifth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this committee, by the very kinds of investigations which it conducts, necessarily invades the area of first amendment rights—speech and assembly—which are specifically exempt from congressional action and therefore from congressional investigation.

This committee, by the very kinds of investigations which it conducts, unavoidably punishes individuals without due process of law in flagrant violation of the fifth amendment as well as of the constitutional prohibition against legislative punishment.

More than this, Mr. Speaker, we must ask whether we need this committee to expose subversive activities. Not only is the Federal Bureau of Investigation eminently capable of uncovering activities aimed at overthrowing the United States by force and violence and deception, but the kinds of activities at which the committee is now taking aim—protest and dissent by New Left groups—are not masked by front groups as was Communist activity in the past. When the committee interrogates protestors and agitators like Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden, it is not drawing aside a curtain of deception and exposing subversion to public view. These people are only too eager to state their views to the country and to the committee.

Not only does the legislative record of the committee fail to justify its continuation, but even the function of exposing subversion to which it has appealed for justification is rendered less necessary by the overt character of arrest, protest, and dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to

vote against House Resolution 270, for it is obvious from the past record of the committee that its activities tend to do more to weaken our constitutional guarantees of individual rights rather than strengthen the internal security of our Nation.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1969, the House overwhelmingly approved, by a vote of 306 to 80, the duties and jurisdiction of the House Internal Security Committee. This resolution today merely authorizes the money for the committee to do the job.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. ICHORD, has outlined to those of us on the committee a very comprehensive schedule of activity. The committee intends to hold hearings on subjects such as: The protection of national defense facilities; the security of classified information released to industry; Federal employment security; vessel, ports, and harbor security; the protection of our Armed Forces during periods of undeclared war; passport security; proposals with respect to the Emergency Detention Act of 1950; and the role the Federal Government should have in helping to stem the growing tide of revolutionary activity. In addition the committee has a responsibility, as do all House committees, to conduct legislative oversight hearings to see whether the present laws are adequately achieving their purpose and whether they are properly enforced.

Because of the nature of the field in which this committee is involved the investigations must be conducted in depth to assure that the committee obtains the proper information. I urge Members of the House to support this bill.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution now under consideration for the authorization of expenditures of \$400,000 by the newly named Committee on Internal Security, but the same old House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Ever since I became a Member of Congress, I have opposed this committee as one that is useless to the functions of the U.S. Congress. It has shown little for its expenditures of public moneys. But, it has been flamboyant in its conduct of committee business.

Of all the committees of this House, the House Internal Security Committee is requesting the greatest appropriation, for which we receive the least amount of legislative proposals.

I have felt that the powers of this committee could be well incorporated into the functions of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I still feel that way. Yet, in making a simple change in the name of this Internal Security Committee, we have given it the right to delve into the matters of espionage, a phase that was under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee for 42 years—and which still should be there. Are we going to chip away from the authority of the Judiciary Committee in small pieces and finally leave the committee nothing to do?

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly opposed to this resolution to provide \$425,000 to the Committee on Internal Security, known until recently as

the Committee on Un-American Activities. Last month we were asked to change its name, to provide it, in effect, with sheep's clothing. But the committee remains the same. If it exists at all, it should be a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, but I believe this committee is inappropriate to our constitutional system.

What upsets me, Mr. Speaker, is that we take up this resolution without regard to our own strictures for saving money. We all know the committee is notoriously unproductive of legislative proposals. We could very well begin cutting our budget right here. I am voting against House Resolution 270, Mr. Speaker, not only because I disapprove of the committee's investigatory procedures, but I believe the committee appropriately belongs under the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 270, which provides the funds for the operation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Out of habit I used the foregoing description, and I know I should refer to it as the Committee on Internal Security. While I supported the change of name, it was with some reluctance.

I have listened this afternoon to those few Members who have spoken against adequate funding for the Internal Security Committee. They are entitled to their views. I had great difficulty following their reasoning that the funding would undermine the civil liberties of everyone in America. On the contrary, the work of this committee has contributed significantly to strengthening the rights or liberties of all of us by ferreting out the enemies of this country who would destroy it.

It has just come to my attention that about a week ago there was a meeting here in the city of Washington by a group that call themselves, the Committee To Abolish HUAC.

While my information about what went on in the committee meeting is incomplete and admittedly based on hearsay, it comes from a source which is usually reliable. I believe what I have heard should be made a part of the record of this debate.

In the meeting the members of the Committee To Abolish HUAC were urged to talk to their Congressman when he returns to his district. They suggested that all Congressmen who vote in favor of HUAC are on the defensive, while those who voted against HUAC are proud to say they have opposed it. It seems that a former Congressman from Oregon, Mr. Charles Porter, was present and proceeded to point out the best way to "set up" a Congressman who is pro-HUAC. He advised those assembled in the Washington meeting to mail back to a Congressman any of his so-called pro-HUAC form letters and demand that the Congressman write a personal letter setting forth with particularity why he favored funds for the use of HUAC. The former Member from Oregon was very gleeful in telling how to hurt a Congressman. He said if the answer was anti-HUAC, take it to the newspapers. If the answer was pro-HUAC, give it to the Congressman's opponent for use in campaign material in the next election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, had there been any doubt in my mind how I intended to vote on this resolution, it would have been erased by the knowledge that the Committee To Abolish HUAC has been in session discussing ways to embarrass those who support adequate funding for this committee. I hope we can get a roll-call vote today on this resolution. I want my constituents and future opponents to clearly understand my position on this issue.

In the years that I have been in Congress I was privileged to know the former distinguished chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the late Mr. Walter. I knew the former chairman from Louisiana, Mr. Willis. I suggest today that our colleague the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), the new chairman of this committee, will carry the tradition of the former chairmen. He will lead the committee with fairness and objectivity. He will make a record that we can all be proud of.

Yes, I suppose we will always have a few opponents of this committee, whether it is called HUAC or the Committee on Internal Security. It is my observation that with the passage of time the opponents are becoming fewer. Anyhow, a rollcall vote would enable most Members to stand up to be counted in support of a committee which over the years has conducted many important inquiries which have contributed to the security of the United States.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. REID of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REID of New York moves to recommit House Resolution 270 to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there

were—yeas 74, nays 283, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—74

Adams	Gallagher	Nix
Anderson, Calif.	Gialmo	O'Hara
Annunzio	Gilbert	O'Neill, Mass.
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Ottinger
Bingham	Halpern	Pike
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Podell
Bolling	Hathaway	Reld, N.Y.
Brademas	Hawkins	Reuss
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Helstoski	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Hicks	St Germain
Button	Horton	St. Onge
Chisholm	Howard	Schwengel
Clay	Jacobs	Stokes
Cohelan	Karth	Thompson, N.J.
Conte	Kastenmeier	Tiernan
Corman	Koch	Tunney
Culver	Leggett	Vanik
Daddario	Lowenstein	Waldie
Diggs	McCarthy	Whalen
Eckhardt	Madden	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Charles H.
Eilberg	Mikva	Wolf
Farbstein	Mink	Yates
Fraser	Morse	
	Nedzi	

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Derwinski	Kyl
Adair	Devine	Landgrebe
Addabbo	Dingell	Langen
Albert	Donohue	Latta
Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Lennon
Anderson,	Dowdy	Lipscomb
Tenn.	Downing	Lloyd
Andrews,	Duncan	Lujan
N. Dak.	Edmondson	McClory
Arends	Erlenborn	McCloskey
Ashbrook	Eshleman	McCulloch
Aspinall	Evans, Colo.	McDade
Ayres	Fallon	McDonald,
Baring	Fascell	Mich.
Beall, Md.	Feighan	McEwen
Belcher	Findley	McFall
Bennett	Fisher	McKneally
Betts	Flood	McMillan
Bevill	Flowers	MacGregor
Blaggi	Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon
Blester	Ford,	Mailliard
Blackburn	William D.	Mann
Blanon	Foreman	Marsh
Boggs	Fountain	Martin
Bray	Frelinghuysen	Mayne
Brinkley	Frey	Meskill
Broomfield	Friedel	Michel
Brotzman	Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Mich.	Fuqua	Miller, Ohio
Brown, Ohio	Galifianakis	Mills
Broyhill, N.C.	Garmatz	Minish
Broyhill, Va.	Gaydos	Mize
Buchanan	Gibbons	Mizell
Burke, Fla.	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Burke, Mass.	Goodling	Monagan
Burleson, Tex.	Griffiths	Montgomery
Burlison, Mo.	Gross	Morgan
Burton, Utah	Grover	Morton
Bush	Gubser	Mosher
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan	Moss
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Myers
Cabell	Hall	Natcher
Caffery	Hamilton	Nelsen
Cahill	Hanley	Nichols
Camp	Hanna	O'Konski
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Olsen
Casey	Harsha	Passman
Cederberg	Hastings	Patten
Chamberlain	Hays	Pelly
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Clancy	Henderson	Perkins
Clark	Hogan	Pettis
Clausen,	Holifield	Philbin
Don H.	Hosmer	Pickle
Clawson, Del	Hull	Poage
Cleveland	Hungate	Poff
Collier	Hunt	Preyer, N.C.
Collins	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Conable	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Corbett	Jarman	Pryor, Ark.
Coughlin	Joelson	Pucinski
Cowger	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Cramer	Johnson, Pa.	Quillen
Cunningham	Jonas	Railsback
Daniel, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Randall
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Tenn.	Reifel
Davis, Ga.	Kazen	Rhodes
Davis, Wis.	Kee	Riegler
de la Garza	Keith	Rivers
Delaney	King	Roberts
Dellenback	Kleppe	Robison
Denny	Kluczynski	Rodino
Dennis	Kuykendall	Rogers, Colo.

Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebell
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa

Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt

Vigorito
Waggoner
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wydler
Wylle
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—74

Abernethy	Foley	Murphy, Ill.
Alexander	Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	O'Neal, Ga.
Barrett	Gray	Patman
Bates	Green, Pa.	Pirnie
Bell, Calif.	Griffin	Pollock
Berry	Gude	Powell
Blatnik	Hammer-	Purcell
Bow	schmidt	Rarick
Brock	Harvey	Rees
Brooks	Hébert	Reid, Ill.
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Ronan
Celler	Kirwan	Roth
Colmer	Kyros	Roybal
Conyers	Landrum	Scheuer
Dawson	Long, La.	Shipley
Dent	Long, Md.	Snyder
Dickinson	Lukens	Sullivan
Dulski	McClure	Ullman
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Ala.	Mass.	Watkins
Edwards, La.	Mathias	Watts
Esch	May	Wright
Evins, Tenn.	Meeds	Wyatt
Fish	Minshall	
Flynt	Moorhead	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Ronan for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.
Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Gray against.
Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Gettys against.
Mr. Scheuer for, with Mr. Griffin against.
Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Pirnie.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. May.
Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hammer-schmidt.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 51, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—305

Abbitt	Dickinson	Kluczynski
Adair	Donohue	Kuykendall
Adams	Dorn	Kyl
Addabbo	Dowdy	Landgrebe
Albert	Downing	Langen
Anderson, III.	Dulski	Latta
Andrews,	Duncan	Lennon
N. Dak.	Edmondson	Lippscomb
Arends	Erlenborn	Lloyd
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Long, Md.
Aspinall	Evans, Colo.	Lujan
Ayres	Fallon	McClory
Baring	Fascell	McCloskey
Beall, Md.	Felghan	McCulloch
Belcher	Findley	McDade
Bennett	Fisher	McDonald,
Betts	Flood	Mich.
Bevill	Flowers	McEwen
Blaggi	Ford, Gerald R.	McFall
Blester	Ford,	McKneally
Blackburn	William D.	McMillan
Blantton	Foreman	MacGregor
Boggs	Fountain	Madden
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Brademas	Frey	Malliard
Bray	Friedel	Mann
Brinkley	Fulton, Pa.	Marsh
Broomfield	Fuqua	Martin
Brotzman	Galifianakis	Matsunaga
Brown, Mich.	Garmatz	May
Brown, Ohio	Gaydos	Mayne
Broyhill, N.C.	Glaimo	Meskill
Broyhill, Va.	Gibbons	Michel
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Goodling	Miller, Ohio
Burke, Mass.	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Burleson, Tex.	Griffiths	Minish
Burlison, Mo.	Gross	Mize
Burton, Utah	Grover	Mizell
Bush	Gubser	Mollohan
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan	Monagan
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Montgomery
Cabell	Hall	Morgan
Caffery	Halpern	Morton
Cahill	Hamilton	Mosher
Camp	Hanley	Moss
Carter	Hanna	Myers
Casey	Hansen, Idaho	Natcher
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Nelsen
Chamberlain	Harsha	Nichols
Chappell	Hastings	O'Hara
Ciancy	Hays	O'Konski
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Olsen
Clausen,	Henderson	O'Neill, Mass.
Don H.	Hicks	Passman
Clawson, Del	Hogan	Patten
Cleveland	Horton	Pelly
Collier	Hosmer	Pepper
Collins	Howard	Perkins
Conable	Hull	Pettis
Conte	Hungate	Philbin
Corbett	Hunt	Pickle
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Pike
Cowger	Ichord	Poage
Cramer	Jacobs	Poff
Cunningham	Jarman	Preyer, N.C.
Daniel, Va.	Joelson	Price, Ill.
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Pryor, Ark.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Pucinski
de la Garza	Jones, Tenn.	Quie
Delaney	Kazen	Quillen
Dellenback	Kee	Rallsback
Denny	Keith	Randall
Dennis	King	Reifel
Derwinski	Kirwan	Rhodes
Devine	Kleppe	Riegle

Roberts
Robison
Rodlno
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Slisk
Skubitz
Slack

Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stagers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stucky
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Utt

Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggoner
Wampler
Watson
Welcker
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wolf
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Hammerschmidt with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dent.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Ottinger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 270, which has just been agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 3, TO MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 191

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1969.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from April 3 to April 14, 1969, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

NAYS—51

Anderson, Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bingham
Bolling
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Chisholm
Clay
Cohelan
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daggs
Dingell

Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Elberg
Farbstein
Fraser
Gallagher
Gilbert
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Koch
Lowenstein
McCarthy
Mikva
Mink

Morse
Nedzi
Nix
Podell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ryan
St. Germain
St. Onge
Stokes
Thompson, N.J.
Walde
Whalen
Wilson,
Charles H.
Yates

NOT VOTING—75

Abernethy
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Carey
Celler
Colmer
Conyers
Dawson
Dent
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Evin, Tenn.
Fish
Flynt

Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gude
Hammer-schmidt
Harvey
Hébert
Hollifield
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Lukens
McClure
Macdonald,
Mass.
Mathias
Meeds
Minshall
Moorhead

Murphy, III.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Pirnie
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Reid, III.
Rivers
Ronan
Roth
Roybal
Scheuer
Shipley
Snyder
Sullivan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watts
Wright
Wyatt

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ronan against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Hollifield against.

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

Mr. Evin of Tennessee for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Rees against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pirnie.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bates.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if there is any further business scheduled for either Wednesday or Thursday next, in view of the past resolution that we just agreed to?

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

Mr. HALL. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have completely disposed of all of the legislative business on the program for this week, there will be no further legislative business during the remainder of the week.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

It is understood that our meetings for tomorrow and Thursday will simply be pro forma meetings, with no legislative business to address ourselves to, barring some unforeseen emergency; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I know of none, I will say to the gentleman.

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

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 14, 1969, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON APRIL 16

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 16, 1969, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the last vote I was unavoidably detained on official business. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been here, I would have voted "nay".

TELEVISION NETWORKS

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, my col-

leagues and I have concerned ourselves with the television industry for some time now because we have not seen the improvement that we were promised after extensive investigations 2 years ago, and because our constituents are increasingly demanding some method of control that the industry has thus far refused to exercise over its own destiny.

I would be the last Congressman to advocate the increase of Federal control over any industry which continuously exhibits genuine concern for the public good and which implements sound judgment and constant supervision of what it considers to be in the public interest, but I must admit that I am apprehensive over the trend—when the most potent and powerful medium of communication we have yet devised seems to have directed itself toward chaos instead of any possible utopia.

There is an ancient expression, "I will not believe it until I have seen it with my own eyes." The electronic media has established a believability that has taken full advantage of this adage. We all know that the adage itself is false; we do not always see what we think we see with our own naked eye. The captioned picture tells you what the producer wants you to see and the commentators on television interpret the moving action for you according to their own personal judgment and taste; and within the framework of their individual network policies, aims, and particular mission at the time.

I believe that in some instances the network policies must be determined by the fantastic competition: The mission of the moment therefore overrides propriety and discretion. The competition must rank among the most harsh and demanding ever known in the business world, because it is fed and nurtured by vast advertising fortunes. To keep the millions of viewers watching, this competition therefore actually challenges the rights and principles of the same audiences.

The networks have seemingly turned a deaf ear to pleas for security and propriety with their repetitious trumpeting of a questionable axiom: "the public has a right to know." I think this has formed a mandate for them which does not now recognize a governmental—or even individual—right to any degree of secrecy—for privacy. At times, it seems to me, the network disclosures and their words and their pictures border on treason.

All media thrives on controversy, but the electronic media has become so steeped in the necessity to portray controversy that they contribute to controversy, they excite controversy, they accelerate controversy, they continue controversy, and they exploit controversy—with or without all of the facts and in or out of context, depending on what will best suit the script of the moment.

While I have concern as a parent and a citizen over the portrayals of violence and the vast amounts of time allotted by the networks to rioters and dissidents, I rise now to specifically voice my concern as a U.S. Congressman over the divulgence of classified materials, the callous disregard by the networks for our national security, and actual disclosures

on the battlefield, which may well have cost the lives of our soldiers.

From my experience as an Army officer, I was shocked and dismayed to witness television shots and listen to radioed reports, relayed via satellite from our embattled Marine outpost at Khesanh, describing the effect of Vietcong artillery fire on this exposed position. There they took pictures of installations and targets and broadcast information that we spent actual lives to procure in World War II. Taking advantage of the lack of wartime censorship, they broadcast the effect of enemy artillery fire so that in my opinion, the enemy artillery commander could easily consult his fire direction tables for a given day and determine his direction and azimuth for the next, after listening to the description of the effect of his fire, which he could not otherwise observe from the fog-shrouded hills he occupied.

I cannot accept the excuse that the permission of some headquarters presumes the license to operate in a battle area without restraint. We know that the military has long considered wartime censorship methods, but refrained from this imposition in light of the rather weird consideration of this conflict and the many restrictions placed upon such a tactic by various branches of the executive department. Thus, an added responsibility has been inadvertently placed on field commanders and small unit officers—to retain whatever degree of security they can amongst roving reporters and searching cameramen.

The military commander in the field is usually not prepared by training or through experience to cope with this new dimension which amounts to yet another "infiltration" of his position under friendly auspices, but with potentially disastrous results. The military commander, too, in a combat situation is a besieged individual in desperate circumstance and I think he has all he can handle with his troops, his tactics, and his strategy.

I have been to Vietnam on seven occasions and talked at great length to many of our commanders and I have heard some of their private opinions on the freewheeling camera coverage of the war there. I would rather not repeat some of their advice at this time.

I listened in despair to a network oracle as he criticized the tactics of an embattled Marine major during the battle of Hue and I listened to some of our electronic ambassadors, who seemingly lauded the effort of our enemy, questioned our policies, challenged our commanders and even misinterpreted some of the actions of our GI's in actual combat.

The straw that broke the camel's back for me was a recent airing entitled "First Tuesday in February." This televised fiasco purported to explore the mystery of the accidental death of some sheep in Skull Valley, Idaho, and utilizing this—now ancient—event as a newspeg, the network went on to clobber the Army's Chemical Warfare Service.

They delved into areas clearly marked "Secret" and ridiculed the "secrecy." They took airborne pix of storage site for so-called "nerve gasses" so that any of

our adversaries may plot these targets for future reference. They showed endless pictures of various animals struggling in death throes, supposedly from the introduction of nerve gas and they questioned people at length—without single success I might add—as to their part in chemical warfare studies. They even sought to pinpoint an island in the Pacific whereat various aspects of chemical warfare and delivery means were under study.

I doubt this exposure will rank very highly on any public opinion poll, either for the TV treatment or the contemplation of the work of our Chemical Warfare Service, but we cannot alter the fact that this weapon must be taken into consideration by our military: It is not the type of warfare we ever intend to initiate and certainly we do not broadcast our research, but we know the enemy has this capability and we must therefore consider both the potential countermeasures and the antidotes and other protective measures we may be forced to utilize for the protection of our people.

What possible public good was served by this disclosure? What might have been considered treasonable in past periods of our Nation's struggle for survival, is now seemingly accepted as an enlightenment of the masses for the good of mankind, and the hell with the United States of America.

NEXT COME BONFIRES OF BOOKS, AND OF MEN

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a report from California caught my attention. In it, the present Governor of California commented to the effect that political attitudes of applicants for teaching jobs at State colleges and universities must be considered before applicants are hired. He continued on to speak of the "one-sided ideological viewpoint" existing among college and university professors.

The good Governor contended that whether a potential teacher is a conservative or a liberal "must be a consideration in hiring of faculty." This statement was made by the chief executive of our largest State in spite of the fact that State statutes and the Federal Constitution both make it illegal to consider a person's political ideology as a criterion for employment as a State college or university teacher.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening statement, in direct contravention of America's history, her way of life and her heritage of civil liberties.

Ordinarily, I refuse to take such off-the-hip comments seriously. But coming from such a high source, I am forced to. Several years ago, the State of California was adorned by a glowing crown of education. Its most brilliant gems were professors who had won international acclaim and honor for their genius. Academic freedom flourished there, providing an atmosphere in which their ef-

forts could be utilized to break new ground for all men. Now that atmosphere is chilling and dissipating itself, and the ugly head of negative political reaction rears its head.

How can any institution of higher learning progress or fulfill its function if its faculty members must toe a political line or be subject to political judgments of the laity?

Albert Einstein looked very much like the "hippie" so many make a profession out of criticizing today. Almost every towering mind in the groves of academe has possessed and exercised various idiosyncrasies which puzzled and perhaps disquieted his fellows. Most of these intellectually gifted people have subscribed to various ideologies which have not hewed closely to the norm. Now the present Governor of California proposes to penalize today's academics job-wise because of it. Forget excellence. Replace it with conformity. Down with genius. Forward the mundane.

Mr. Speaker, New York State will be proud to welcome any of these scholarly gentlemen to its many excellent universities and colleges, where their political ideals will not deprive them of employment. We do not fear different ideologies. Our very differences have enriched us.

If California wishes to ship them east by the carload, we shall hail their arrival with joy. In fact, we shall be proud to have them among us. We may not have a year-round mean temperature of above 70 degrees, but we do not have anyone as chief executive of our State who acts, thinks, and talks like the present chief executive of California.

Aristotle once wrote:

The basis of a democratic state is liberty.

No greater or more precious form of liberty exists than the guarantee of academic liberty and freedom. Let us never forget that every dictator, from Phillip of Macedon to Nero; from Napoleon to Hitler; from Stalin to Mao; has begun to take freedom and liberty away by silencing and stifling the academic community.

TIRE SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide an effective and enforceable procedure for notification to purchasers and dealers of defects in automobile tires. This bill, a companion to a measure introduced in the Senate by GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, would amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 which has already established a similar system for other faulty automobile parts. My bill does what has already been done for automobile parts—and for an item which is at least as essential as any mechanical part to the safe operation of a motor vehicle. I believe it is not too much to say, Mr. Speaker, that a requirement for tire defect notification and recall is an absolute necessity to guarantee the safety of millions of Americans who

travel the highways of this Nation every day.

Senator NELSON, long an advocate of consumer protection legislation, has pointed to two recent incidents which illustrate clearly why a tire recall bill such as I am introducing here today is so vital to the safety of automobile-owning Americans. In a letter to Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, released on February 18, 1969, Senator NELSON described the all too common, and too inadequate steps which were taken by two of the Nation's major tire manufacturers today.

The first recall announcement came from Mohawk Tire and Rubber Co. Under agreement with the Department of Transportation, Mohawk originated a press release in Akron announcing that they were recalling 10,000 Airflo tires for a defect which could cause blowouts. In their release, Mohawk urged customers to return any of the suspect tires to their dealers immediately for replacement. Because Mohawk—and all other tire companies—do not keep records on where their tires go after they leave the factory, they said they had to rely on the public news media to spread this information to consumers.

It is, therefore, difficult to understand why a real attempt was not made to get this information out to as many of the media as possible. Instead, the announcement was made in Akron at noon on Saturday, January 18 by Mohawk. Copies of the release were not sent to any of the major metropolitan newspapers around the country. The timing of the release in combination with the poor distribution made it impossible to get adequate play in Sunday's newspapers. It was only the hard work of an enterprising reporter with an inside knowledge of the recall that brought the story to a prominent place in the New York Times and the Washington Post on Sunday, January 19.

On February 4, the second recall announcement was made in the same way. On that day, General Tire announced that they were recalling 40,207—the number was not disclosed in the release—General Jet Safety tires, manufactured between April 1965 and January 1969 because tests indicated that a number failed the endurance test. The fact is that 19 out of 21 tires tested blew out half-way through the test. This vital information was also not mentioned in the release.

Again with the knowledge of the Department, General Tire announced the recall in Akron at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Again no releases were sent to the major newspapers. The result was that the great majority of morning newspapers of February 5 carried no story at all. The New York Times and the Washington Post carried a totally inadequate wire service story, received late in the evening and with no mention of the blowout potential, in one edition.

Lest there be any question, Mr. Speaker, about the effectiveness of the recalls instituted by Mohawk and General Tire in the two instances described by Senator NELSON, I should complete the story. I have learned that as of last

week out of the 10,000 tires involved in the Mohawk recall, less than 200 were located in the hands of private owners. In the case of the General Tire recall, 42,000 tires were involved, but less than 500 were recovered. Mr. Speaker, those figures indicate that the present procedures for tire recall are a complete and total failure. It also means that there are many Americans riding around on defective tires, blissfully unaware of the danger they may be in. It is almost as if the tire manufacturers were saying: "Happy motoring—if you can find the flaw on your own."

The provisions of the tire-recall proposal, Mr. Speaker, are simple enough, and wherever possible are parallel to comparable procedures for notification of defective automobile parts. The Secretary of Transportation is directed to establish within 6 months of enactment of the bill procedures by which tire manufacturers shall notify within a reasonable time after discovering a defect affecting safety the last purchaser of such tire known to the manufacturer. The procedures will specify how manufacturers are to keep track of the names and addresses of purchasers of its tires. The bill provides that certified mail is the standard method of notifying purchasers of defects. Notification procedure will, wherever possible, be parallel to that required for other defective automobile parts.

Notification to the owner of the tires must contain a clear description of the defect, a reasonable evaluation of the risk to traffic safety presented by the defect, and a statement of the measures to be taken to repair such defect or to replace, if necessary, any defective tires. The manufacturer is required to furnish a copy of the notification to the Secretary of Transportation who is authorized to take such steps in publicizing the notification as he believes necessary to alert owners to the existence of the defect.

The provisions described so far, Mr. Speaker, contemplate a kind of self-enforcement system. They envision that manufacturers will in good faith notify consumers of defects which are discovered by the manufacturer in his own product. But this protection does not go far enough. The Federal Government itself carries on extensive research on the quality of automobile tires. Under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Secretary of Transportation is charged with establishing for the benefit of the consumer a quality grading system for motor vehicle tires. It would be both shortsighted and dangerous not to give American consumers the direct benefit of this quality grading program as part of the tire recall program.

For the reasons just described, Mr. Speaker, the tire recall bill I have introduced today provides that the Secretary of Transportation may, on his own initiative, inform a tire manufacturer that any or all of his products do not meet the minimum safety standard which the Secretary has established. Once the manufacturer is notified that the Secretary has found his tires defective, he is given time to reply and to

prove that the tires are not defective. If the manufacturer cannot prove this, the Secretary can then direct him to initiate the notification procedure described earlier. Thus the bill contains this additional safeguard to insure that the voluntary tire recall program of manufacturers is effective and enforceable.

It might be of interest, Mr. Speaker, in light of the controversy over whether the present administration is sufficiently consumer-oriented, to examine its position on tire recall. Before President Johnson left office, then Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd sent to Congress, along with his request for DOT appropriations for fiscal 1970, a bill to establish a tire recall program very much like the one Senator NELSON and I are proposing. When the Nixon administration took office, this proposal was withdrawn "for study." So far, Mr. Speaker, it has not been resubmitted to the Congress. I would hope that this "study" period will be brief; while the tire recall proposal is being "studied," there may be millions of Americans running the risk of blowouts—a risk of which they are not even aware. I would hope that within the next several weeks Secretary Volpe would follow the example of Secretary Boyd—so that all of us can buy and use tires without the fear that the next tire we buy will be our last.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Americans owe Senator GAYLORD NELSON a debt of gratitude for his initiative in proposing an effective tire recall program such as I have described. Personally, I am proud to introduce in this body the companion bill to Senator NELSON's own tire recall bill now pending in the Senate Commerce Committee, S. 661. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this long overdue piece of highway safety legislation. I know that every American who owns and drives an automobile will support it.

HALT THE ABM

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have reason to tremble at this critical juncture in history on account of the spiraling arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both of which in the past 2 years have instituted new generations of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems. By 1972, Red China is expected to become a nuclear power and thereby the existing so-called "balance of terror" between the two superpowers may be upset. As a result, yet another upward level of weapons and increased danger of a nuclear missile exchange may be in the making unless successful arms-limitation talks between us and the Soviet Union occur.

Tied in with any forthcoming negotiations and an interim policy which would contribute to the success of these talks is the pending decision by the U.S. Congress as to implementation of a new nuclear antimissile system.

At the heart of this particular controversial debate is the question of building a multibillion-dollar defense system to protect our offensive missile sites

and to try to protect our capability to retaliate if we are first attacked by enemy missiles.

Secretary of Defense Laird has advanced the assumption that the Russians intend to acquire first-strike power sufficient to destroy our existing retaliation capacity.

On the other hand, other witnesses who have testified before congressional committees disagree with this assumption and say it is extremely implausible; that our retaliatory capability is not in jeopardy.

However, I think some facts should not be overlooked. One fact is that if disarmament talks fail and it becomes clear we will have to defend our missile sites, then a much better ABM than the converted Sentinel system will be needed. Testimony indicates such an improved antimissile could be built at much less than the estimated \$2.1 billion estimated for the first phase of the proposed so-called "Safeguard" ABM.

Meanwhile, on the basis of the statement of Gerard Smith, Director of Arms Control and Disarmament, that a delay will not jeopardize the security of the United States, I continue to urge the Congress to halt the anti-ballistic-missile program except research to improve it, until joint nuclear disarmament talks with the Soviets have taken place. If in due course these talks fail, then let us reevaluate the need for safeguards and deterrents to enemy missile attack.

As it is, the existing U.S. retaliatory power is sufficient to deter any such attack.

COMMENDATION FOR THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us from time to time find it necessary to criticize some section of the executive branch of the Government, including the military. I am happy on this occasion to commend the Corps of Engineers for the splendid work performed during the recent major floods in my congressional district. I include herewith a resolution of commendation adopted by the Ventura County Board of Supervisors:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMMENDING CORPS OF ENGINEERS EFFORT

Whereas under the provisions of Public Law 875 and pursuant to the Declaration by the President of a disaster due to flooding in Ventura County, the Board requested and obtained the assistance of the Corps of Engineers for flood protection work; and

Whereas since its first appearance within the County in February, 1969, the personnel of the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, have effectively pursued the accomplishment of its assignment, both in flood protection and flood fighting within the watercourses of the County; and

Whereas expressions of appreciation of the Corps of Engineers' effort to date by the public at large have been made to individual members of this Board; and

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of this County desires to express its appreciation to the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District,

on behalf of all the citizens and organizations of this County: *Now, therefore,*

The Board of Supervisors hereby resolves to commend, and does commend Colonel Norman E. Pehrson, District Engineer, Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineers, and members of his Staff assigned to assist in the disaster work in Ventura County, including especially Mr. Kingsley Benham of the District Staff, for the responsive, effective, and cooperative effort expended to date to protect the citizens of this County from the dangerous effect of two consecutive disastrous floods in this area.

Passed, approved and adopted this 25th day of March, 1969.

J. N. APPLETON,
Chairman, Ventura County
Board of Supervisors.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PRIMARY CONCERN IS THE SETTLEMENT OF THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, three different articles by three highly respected journalists appeared last week in the Washington Post and I think they give testimony to the fact that the settlement of the Vietnam war is, and has been, the primary concern of the Nixon administration these past 2 months. And I think the course of action that President Nixon has adopted, while not explicitly laid out before us, is beginning to bear fruit.

There can be no question but that the President faces a highly complex and difficult situation in trying to bring a settlement to this war—a war in which it took us several years to become enmeshed, and from which it will take time and, above all, patience and self-restraint, to get out.

Don Oberdorfer's column of Thursday, March 27, indicated that Vietnam has been the major preoccupation of the new administration since shortly after Christmas. Clearly the President has been trying to use to best advantage the so-called honeymoon period to accomplish as much as possible in terms of moving the peace negotiations forward to some fruitful results. As Mr. Oberdorfer correctly points out—and I insert his article at this point in the RECORD—patience at home and a relative lack of controversy offer the President the maximum freedom of action to work out solutions. And I must say that I believe criticism at this time may inhibit the President's freedom of action and reduce the time available to him to work out those solutions. The article follows:

BASIC STRATEGY FOR SETTLING WAR DRAFTED BY MID-FEBRUARY

Three days after Christmas in the sunny screened porch of his new house on Biscayne Bay, Richard M. Nixon sat down with his chief foreign policy and defense advisers to begin to chart his course in the Vietnam War. At that meeting, Mr. Nixon and his colleagues decided on a systematic review of all practical courses of action as the basis for policy choices and new instructions to U.S. diplomats and generals.

From then until this week, a great deal of time has been devoted in high circles to this decision-making process—roughly half the time of the National Security Council staff, for example—but very little has been said about it. Mr. Nixon and his key men would rather talk about almost anything

else. This grave and most important public problem, the one which brought the Administration to power and may determine its chances for success, has provided the most notable exception to its effort to establish an "open government."

In discussing war and peace in Vietnam, Mr. Nixon has faced a dilemma. Any word or sign tending to reassure the American public is considered likely to reduce U.S. pressure and hence U.S. bargaining power in the negotiations at Paris. Any word or sign tending to enhance U.S. pressure and bargaining power, on the other hand, may bring forth an alarm at home. Controversy at home saps the thin public patience with Vietnam, reducing both freedom of action and the time available in which to work out acceptable solutions. This familiar ticking Vietnam clock—which finally ran out on the Johnson Administration just a year ago—is a vital factor in the calculations of the new Administration.

Those deeply engaged in the Vietnam problem with Mr. Nixon hoped for perhaps six months of maneuver time after Inauguration Day before the clock began to run for them. They acknowledge now they were probably too optimistic. In response to public uneasiness and Senatorial challenge, Secretary of State William P. Rogers is to appear in televised session today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss Vietnam and other matters. Preparing for this encounter, Mr. Nixon and his associates have begun to appeal for patience and to open the door a crack on their deliberations to date.

One result of the initial Key Biscayne meeting about Vietnam was a day-long session of the National Security Council shortly after Jan. 20 at which intensive discussion and study was devoted to four possible military options, and five possible international political results, in the Vietnam situation. In each case, consideration was given to the costs of the course of action, to the specific instructions, which would have to be given, and to the consequences of failure.

About the same time, a series of toughly-worded questions was dispatched to the major U.S. agencies dealing with Vietnam in an effort to establish the facts on which policy could be based. In Saigon, the field headquarters of each agency—including the Embassy, the military and the CIA—was encouraged to give its own honest assessment without clearance with the other. When the answers were in, they showed that the Vietnam-related empires of the U.S. Government do not agree even on the facts, much less on the solution.

By mid-February, it is said, Mr. Nixon had settled on the basic strategy he will follow for the foreseeable future in the attempt to settle the war. As it is now being signalled and explained, that policy centers on the negotiating process—though not necessarily in the Paris forum—and is designed for serious bargaining with North Vietnam about mutual withdrawal and other issues, while the Saigon government takes a larger role in the arrangements for a political settlement. President Thieu's announcement of his willingness to talk privately to the National Liberation-Front is greeted with knowing nods and satisfaction.

The Nixon strategy is not centered on the battlefield, it is said. There is a consciousness at the White House—if not in all ranks of the Pentagon—that the enemy is not going to collapse. The kill ratios so highly valued by the Johnson Administration are not read any more in the top reaches of the White House.

Beyond this, the plan which has been formulated is not being revealed. At the moment, the prime need is time for it to work or to fail. If a little bit of public discussion can buy time, Mr. Nixon appears to be willing. Even with leeway from the clock, though, his plan to negotiate an end to the war faces trying days. Somehow he must

convince the American people that he is eager to get out of Vietnam while convincing North Vietnam that he is not.

President Nixon has clearly opted for a political solution to this terribly frustrating war, understanding as he does that a military solution is both undesirable and impossible. He has thus far successfully resisted efforts to move him in the direction of military responses that might reescalate the conflict. And, while he has exercised self-restraint militarily, he has moved forward diplomatically. As Mr. Joseph Kraft pointed out in his article, the announcement by President Thieu of South Vietnam that he is willing to talk directly with the National Liberation Front is a most encouraging sign and a development for which I believe the President deserves considerable credit.

At the same time, I think we are finally making progress in Paris. Chalmers Roberts gives credence to this in his article on the Paris talks, stating that the four delegations at last appear to be in agreement on how to proceed with the talks. We must expect it will take some time for the talks to produce dramatic results but we should be encouraged by the fact that private discussions are apparently proceeding simultaneously. I believe we can be encouraged by all these developments taken together—they are certainly the most promising evidence of progress toward a settlement in Vietnam that we have seen to date.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Kraft and Chalmers articles at this point in the RECORD:

NIXON CHOOSES POLITICAL WAY OUT OF VIET WAR, NOT MILITARY WAY DOWN

(By Joseph Kraft)

The important thing about the latest Vietnamese developments is that the Nixon Administration is going for the political way out—not merely the military way down.

The President is aiming at the slow—but sure—exit of a settlement that will in some way change the nature of the South Vietnamese regime. He has, so far at least, not accepted the easy—but dubious—course of covering the mistakes of the past by going for a stalemate in the war.

The chief sign of the political emphasis lies in the press conference given Tuesday in Saigon by South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu. The mere fact that peace news was being made in Saigon was of itself significant. For the one thing Saigon can do—that no other capital, including Washington, can do—is negotiate on arrangements for the political future of South Vietnam.

That implicit fact was explicitly underlined by President Thieu. General Thieu said that he was prepared to negotiate "a political solution" in direct secret talks with the National Liberation Front—the Communist-dominated insurgency movement in South Vietnam.

That commitment takes on tremendous significance against the evolution of the past. Not very long ago, the Thieu regime was treating the Liberation Front as a gang of "bandits and terrorists" who could be dealt with only on an individual basis after they had laid down their arms—that is to say, surrendered.

It was considered a major concession only six weeks ago when Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky said the Saigon regime would deal with the Front as an entity, provided all North Vietnamese troops were pulled out of South Vietnam. Now President Thieu accepts to negotiate with the Front, without

any advance condition. It is logical to suppose that in time the Saigon leaders will extend even further openings to the leaders of the Front for some kind of political collaboration.

Sooner or later, the leaders of the Front are bound to respond—and respond favorably—to this kind of evolution. That much is acknowledged by virtually everybody with Tran Buu Khiem, the chief of the Front delegation to the Paris peace talks.

Khiem told this columnist, in the midst of a violent attack on the Saigon leadership during an interview about a month ago, that the Front would accept changes by the men of the Thieu regime "even at the eleventh hour." He then added: "Even at the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute."

But the process of blocking out a compromise between Saigon and the Front is bound to be slow and full of difficult times. And in the interim it is essential to keep the goal of a political settlement firmly and clearly in mind.

For there is another prescription, seemingly most attractive, which is now being put forward by the hawks of Saigon and the Pentagon and State Department in a last effort to make it seem they were right all along. According to this view, all the United States needs to do is to build up the South Vietnamese army, and then begin the withdrawal of American troops.

The South Vietnamese forces would supposedly be strong enough to hold the other side in a kind of military stalemate. There would be no need to take the painful compromise and adjustments that a political settlement would require.

The trouble with that view, of course, is that the stalemate is no more likely to be achieved than the other military prospects put forward by the hawks. By following the hawks' prescription, the American role in the war would go down. But it would not go out, and it might have to go up again.

It is a far better thing, difficult and slow as the course ahead is bound to be, to move toward a political settlement. And it is encouraging that President Nixon has so far had the strength and confidence to resist the pressure for a quick fix that would almost certainly lead to things getting worse very soon after they got better.

PARIS TALKS CLEAR HURDLE
(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

PARIS, March 26.—The Paris peace conference, it now appears almost certainly has cleared its first big hurdle in the way to ending the Vietnam war. The four delegations appear in agreement on how to proceed.

This is the net result of what has been said at the last two Thursday sessions of the conference, plus some discreet private meetings and finally the public statement in Saigon by South Vietnamese President Thieu that his government is ready to talk to the National Liberation Front (Vietcong).

Thus far there has been no public reaction by either the Front or the North Vietnamese to Thieu's statement. A Front spokesman said today that newsmen could ask questions about that during the press briefing sessions after the tenth conference session Thursday.

The fact that the Front has avoided any quick reaction is being taken here tonight by the Americans and South Vietnamese as an encouraging sign. They see this as meaning the communists are seriously considering the Thieu remarks.

Assuming the agreement on how to proceed—and it would be both a surprise and a major disappointment if it collapses—a series of secret meetings under cover of the conference structure should begin shortly. It is on these meetings that President Nixon has drawn a curtain of silence.

One set of meetings likely will be between the United States and North Vietnam on the problem of mutual withdrawal of troops. The

South Vietnamese are prepared to agree to such meetings on the presumption that they will be kept fully informed. It can be assumed that the Front will likewise hear from Hanoi about what is going on.

The other set of meetings will involve the more complex problem of the political future of South Vietnam. The crux of these meetings is that the Front and the Saigon government will talk to each other. This was the central point of the Thieu statement and of the Front representative's comment last Thursday that he was prepared to talk with all other delegations.

It is almost certain that neither half of such tandem talks will make progress unless the other half is making progress. After all, as American officials put it, why should Hanoi "remove the pain"—the force of their arms—until they have used it to produce the best political settlement they think they can get.

It is possible, of course that the Communists will attempt to bargain further on the nature of the two sets of meetings before actually agreeing to sit down to them. If so, even more patience will be required on the allied side.

On the matter of patience, the South Vietnamese here take the position that an agreement by the end of the year would be quite satisfactory. The Americans want to see an agreement well before that, but they have carefully avoided mentioning any possible date other than to indicate hope that concrete results will be discernible within six months.

It now has taken two months to create the framework for such private talks, again assuming that they will soon begin. The results on the battlefield in the coming months, as in the past two months, surely will be reflected in some way at the conference tables.

Unless there is a new hitch, the preliminary skirmishing is over and the real bargaining will begin. That, at least, marks the end of the beginning.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, after a detailed study and analysis of the Treasury Report on Tax Reform and after evaluating the various calls for tax reform from my constituents, I have this day introduced a comprehensive tax bill entitled the "Tax Reform Act of 1969."

I believe there are four important factors that must be evaluated by the Members of Congress serving on the House Ways and Means Committee relative to the merits of consideration of tax reform; namely, fairness, justice, equity, and simplicity.

The majority of people in our country today advocate tax reform and they have raised the question of whether our tax system accords each individual with a fair treatment of taxation—a loss of confidence and a system of inequity is a fair conclusion to draw from the loud voices of our constituents. In an effort to remedy this loss of confidence, and to endeavor to establish the principle of equity in our tax system, this Congress must move forward and carry out the will of the people and enact a comprehensive tax reform bill. My bill, in 12 areas of tax reform, has sought to attain the objective of the foregoing four important factors and thus remove this "crisis of confidence" among our people.

Estimates are contained subsequently that estimate the revenue effect on the U.S. Treasury relative to the enactment of each of the 12 provisions in my bill. Although the net effect of this bill would at first produce an adverse effect upon our treasury, one must evaluate the additional purchasing power that the enactment of this bill would generate which in turn would find its way into the gross income of our business enterprises and thus resulting in additional treasury collections by added Federal taxes based thereon.

Tax reform is developing as one of the major issues of the 91st Congress. Inaction in this area has taken place for nearly 10 years, ever since President John F. Kennedy advocated a comprehensive reform of our tax laws. The time for action is in this Congress.

A Nixon administration Cabinet member, Treasury Secretary Kennedy, stated a very practical analysis:

Are all Americans in similar circumstances paying approximately the same amount of income taxes?

The answer to this question is very clearly "No"—thus advocating the need for reform. Furthermore, he stated:

The American people are saying something and it is getting through . . . They are reading in the papers that a lot of rich people are getting away with not paying much in taxes.

My correspondence has reaffirmed this fact and also my statement herewith cites and sets forth this fact in the form of a chart of tax rates on incomes of high income individuals.

The summary of the revenue estimates which I have compiled relative to each provision in my bill and also my statement attributable to each provision follows:

Summary of revenue estimates for income tax provisions—Revenue effect on U.S. Treasury

[In billions of dollars]	
Individual income tax changes:	
Increase deduction for exemptions from \$600 to \$900	-9.0
Relief for persons in poverty—liberalization of minimum standard deduction	-1.1
Increase standard deduction from 10 to 14 percent	-1.4
Correct abuses of farm loss deductions	+ .145
Repeal of gasoline tax deduction for individuals	+ .310
Elimination of tax abuses:	
Imposition of minimum income tax on high income individuals	+ .420
Allocation of deductions to taxable income	+ .405
Corporation tax changes:	
Elimination of more than one surtax exemption	+ .235
Extractive industries—oil and timber; Repeal oil depletion allowance and allow deduction only for costs expended	+1.600
Eliminate 7-percent investment credit	+2.300
Repeal accelerated depreciation in year of purchase	+ .800
Foundations: Imposition of a 20-percent tax on gross income exclusive of contribution income	+ .300
Total net revenue effect on U.S. Treasury	-4.985

INCREASE DEDUCTIONS FOR PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS FROM \$600 TO \$900

This proposal, one of the most far-reaching in its actual effect upon the taxpayer, will provide tax relief to every taxpayer and in a proportionate amount to the size of each family by providing a 50-percent increase, from \$600 to \$900, in the amount that may be claimed as a tax exemption.

This provision will attempt to give consideration to personal and social factors such as: The increases in costs of living, students within a family, other dependent relatives, and equitable tax relief in general.

Revenue loss—estimated at \$9 billion per year.

MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

This provision would increase the minimum standard deduction by providing for an increase from \$200, plus \$100 for each exemption, to \$600, plus \$100 for each exemption, subject to a maximum of \$1,000.

This area of our tax code represents the most equitable and efficient method available of directing tax relief to persons in the lowest income ranges. This provision would greatly reduce the income tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level and would completely exempt from tax the majority of those persons below the poverty level who now pay income tax. This provision would be an excellent example of the social implications and principles that are incorporated into our Federal tax system.

It is estimated that 2.2 million families living in poverty are subject to Federal income tax; about 1¼ million would become nontaxable, and the remaining 1 million would receive "tax reductions."

Revenue loss—\$1.1 billion per year.

INCREASE STANDARD DEDUCTION FROM 10 TO 14 PERCENT

A liberalization of this area of the tax law would be obtained by the enactment of this provision which would increase to 14 percent, the standard deduction, with the imposition of a maximum amount of \$1,800.

Major factors why this provision should be enacted are: First, it would provide a simplification in filing tax returns because more taxpayers would use this provision. Second, the increase in rate would provide some relief for the effect that inflation and the rise in the cost of living has had upon our people. In addition, wages have increased, but the present maximum amount has been retained. Third, it would reduce the number of Internal Revenue Service audit of returns and thus provide a more efficient administration of our tax laws.

The Treasury report reveals that the number of taxpayers using the standard deduction has declined from 82.2 to 57 percent during the period, 1944 to 1969. In 1944, Congress enacted this provision to simplify the tax system which then resulted in this provision being used by over 80 percent of our taxpayers. The Congress must keep up with the changing conditions of today and adopt this provision which would result in its use

by about 80 percent of our taxpayers which would be equivalent to those that used it upon its original enactment. This year, there will be 65 million taxable returns filed—the simplification and efficiency of this proposal warrant its enactment into law.

The substantial impact of this provision would provide more than \$1.4 billion of tax relief to taxpayers in the income range of \$5,000 to \$20,000. With the present, unfair tax burden—Federal, State, and local—which this economic group is encountering, this reform would provide the needed practical tax relief that is necessary if we are to have an adequate working tax system in our complicated society of today. Our people are demanding reform, and this is one area where we can provide the needed tax relief of which they should have the benefit.

Revenue loss—\$1.4 billion per year.

CORRECTION OF FARM TAX RULES BY NON-FARMERS

The deduction of "farm losses" against nonfarm income would be limited to \$15,000 in any taxable year—carrybacks and carryforwards would not be effected. This limitation would be applicable to individually operated farms and to farms operated by a corporation or a partnership.

This proposal would effect about 14,000 taxpayers and would have little or no effect on taxpayers earning less than \$15,000 of nonfarm income.

SCHEDULE OF LOW-TAX RATES PAID BY HIGH-INCOME INDIVIDUALS

	Income levels		In millions	
	Over \$100,000	\$100,000 to \$500,000	\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$1,000,000 and over
Amended adjusted gross income.....	\$16,720	\$12,205	\$1,875	\$2,640
Taxable income (after deductions and exclusions).....	\$9,870	\$7,700	\$905	\$1,265
Tax as a percent of total income.....	28.2	29.2	26.1	25.1
Tax as a percent of taxable income.....	47.8	46.3	54.1	52.3

Source: Treasury Department Tax Reform Study.

An analysis of the foregoing table of income levels reveals the practical low effective tax rates actually being encountered by high-income taxpayers, when related to gross income—before exclusions and deductions. This provision would attempt to correct this tax avoidance scheme. Furthermore, it must be noted that these figures are only averages and do not reflect the real abuses which are sought to be brought more in line with the principle that every taxpayer should bear his fair share of the tax burden.

Revenue gain—\$420 million per year.

ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS OF HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER

Taxpayers with excluded income enjoy an unwarranted double benefit from that income inasmuch as no tax is paid on the excluded income and personal deductions are used to offset income from taxable sources as revealed by the Treasury Department tax reform study. To remedy this inequitable situation, high-income taxpayers should be required to allocate their nonbusiness personal deductions between income from taxable sources and income from non-taxable sources.

This provision would affect about

Revenue gain—about \$145 million per year.

REPEAL OF GASOLINE TAX DEDUCTION FOR INDIVIDUALS

I advocate repeal of existing law which provides that State gasoline taxes are deductible in computing Federal income taxes. This item of expenditure is more closely related to a personal item and should be within the same nondeductible status as other user charges such as highway tolls, State park fees, hunting and fishing licenses, and auto registration fees and drivers licenses.

Revenue gain—\$310 million per year.

MINIMUM INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Enactment of this provision is necessary so that "high-income individuals" who are not presently contributing their fair share of Federal income tax, would be required to pay an equitable share of the cost of government. The low tax rate encountered by this group of taxpayers results from various exclusions from taxable income and also from deductible expenses, thus further eroding their taxable income figure.

Current statistics reveal that "high income individuals," that is, over \$100,000 per year, pay a "low effective tax rate" in comparison to other taxpayers earning from \$10,000 to \$30,000 per year. Illustrative of the foregoing inequity, I would like to set forth the following table which highlights the low tax rate of this group.

400,000 taxpayers, and mostly, all those would be with incomes over \$50,000. Allocation would not be required unless the taxpayer had excluded items of at least \$5,000. The excluded items to consider would be: capital gains, State and local bond interest, percentage depletion in excess of cost, and appreciated property donated to charity.

Revenue gain—\$405 million per year.

ELIMINATION OF MORE THAN ONE SURTAX EXEMPTION

This proposal calls for the elimination of the ability of a controlled group or chain of corporations to claim more than one single surtax exemption. This provision would go into full effect over a 7-year period by limiting the maximum number of surtax exemptions that could be claimed in accordance with the following schedule:

Taxable years including the first Dec. 31 after—	Maximum number of surtax exemptions
Jan. 1, 1970.....	500
Second Dec. 31.....	250
Third Dec. 31.....	100
Fourth Dec. 31.....	50
Fifth Dec. 31.....	25
Sixth Dec. 31.....	10
Seventh Dec. 31.....	5
Eighth and subsequent Dec. 31's.....	1

The original congressional intent was to limit this special provision to small business as was stated in 1950 when this legislation was considered. However, many large corporate organizations have established a number of separate corporate units which are so arranged so as to produce an income of less than \$25,000 so that they can each qualify for the special tax savings under present law.

The value of the surtax exemption under current corporate rates is \$6,500, per exemption—26 percent multiplied by \$25,000.

Revenue gain—estimated \$235 million per year.

**EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES—OIL AND TIMBER—
DEDUCTION ONLY FOR COST EXPENDED**

This "special deduction," the "percentage of depletion," should be eliminated and in lieu thereof, a deduction should be allowed for these extractive expenses based on a "cost concept"—or known as "cost depletion."

It is a fact that 90 percent of the current percentage of depletion deduction allowed is not represented by any direct cost expenditure and would not be allowed under a "cost depletion" concept.

Revenue gain—adoption of the "cost depletion" provision would yield an estimated \$1.3 billion annually from all extractive industries.

Extractive industries should bear their fair share of the tax burden, which presently is only 21.1 percent, whereas "all industries" pay 37.5 percent. This favorable treatment must be corrected and an equitable provision enacted into our tax laws.

Revenue gain—\$1.600 billion per year.

SEVEN PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT

This special tax incentive provision should be repealed due to the inflationary circumstances confronting our economy today. The original purpose of enactment was to create increased equipment purchases and increase new construction in a lagging economy; this condition does not exist today. Ordinary accounting principles of reporting should be reverted to.

A special report, released on March 13, 1969, by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, revealed that American businesses have planned a booming 13.9-percent increase in investments in plants and equipment this year. This economic spiral of investments will not slow down one of the major domestic problems—the high increasing rate of inflation. This rate increase of nearly 14 percent in investments compares to a rate of 4 percent in 1968, and 2 percent in 1967. Planned investment in 1969 is \$72.96 billion; in 1968 it was \$64.08 billion.

Revenue gain—estimated \$2.3 billion per year.

Furthermore, added significance to the merits which warrant repeal of the 7-percent investment credit are set forth in a column by a leading economist, Mr. Paul A. Samuelson, which appeared in the March 31, 1969, issue of Newsweek magazine, the column follows:

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Inflation watchers were rocked last week by news from the SEC and Commerce Department that businessmen intend to in-

crease their plant and equipment investments by almost 14 per cent.

The new outlook for excessive investment spending should, in my opinion, cause President Nixon to suspend the 7 per cent investment credit temporarily. Here's why:

1. The economy is still on an inflationary binge. To bring the rate of price increase down from 4 per cent toward a more moderate figure of, say, 3 per cent, some actions are going to be needed. Every weapon counts.

2. Already the Federal Reserve is being called upon to take Draconian measures to fight inflation. This will mean not only painfully higher interest rates; it will also bring in most of the discomforts associated with the money crunch of 1966—uneven rationing of credit between new and old business, growing and stagnant business, small and large business.

3. Experience demonstrates that tight money takes for its principal casualty the housing industry. When there is a scramble for more resources than the total resources available, it is right that housing should share in the restraint. But it is not, in my judgment, good national policy to have housing starts cut by 40 to 50 per cent as happened in 1966. In the 1970s, with their bumper crop of young marrieds, we shall pay in higher rents and zooming residential costs for any serious diminution of home construction in the waning years of the Vietnam war.

4. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by adding onto the present surcharge another 5 or 10 per cent tax. But I see no evidence that this would be politically popular or feasible. Nor is it clear that consumer spending is the prime villain in the present inflationary scenario.

5. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by still further tightening of the Federal Reserve money screw. And the impact of such tightness on the housing industry could be alleviated by special financial subsidies to home construction through the Federal housing agencies, through the U.S. Treasury, or through the Federal Reserve. Since all such measures will add to the nominal public debt, I don't expect that anything but tokenism would, in fact, be politically feasible in this area.

Even if it were possible to cushion the impact of tight money on residential housing, to get the same restriction of aggregate demand from enforced reductions on plant and equipment spending would, I suspect, require very high interest rates. These will cause difficulties for our partners abroad. And they may hang on to plague us in the years to come when the winds may be blowing up deflation rather than inflation.

6. In September of 1966, to alleviate the money crunch and moderate what looked like an excessive fixed investment boom, the Johnson Administration did suspend the 7 per cent investment tax credit. Almost at once relief was felt in the money markets of the country. On the whole (despite the protests of the Treasury, which naturally found it a headache), the operation seems to have been a successful one in accomplishing its purpose—namely, ensuring against an overexuberant fixed investment boom.

So historical experience, as well as the common-sense view that firms will invest less when their returns from doing so are reduced, justifies suspending the tax credit.

What are the possible arguments against suspension of the tax credit?

1. The Nixon Administration might be regarded as a pro-business Administration. Why should it take from business this accustomed source of profit?

2. Perhaps the inflationary danger is being exaggerated. Perhaps it will involve overkill if suspension of the investment tax credit reduces investment severely.

3. Vigorous growth requires as much capital formation as we can get. Adjusting to inflation by reducing investment will reduce

our future capacity to produce an enlarged total of real national product.

4. It is a bad thing to use variations in the investment tax credit as a deliberate weapon of stabilization. Why? Because it is plain immoral. Because it involves discretion by government, which is wicked. Because it disturbs business planning.

5. Suspension creates administrative problems for the Treasury.

In economics, every decision involves pros and cons. Judgment is necessary. My advice to Mr. Nixon: suspend the investment tax credit.

SPECIAL DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS

Special depreciation deductions; namely, "accelerated depreciation" over straight line depreciation should be terminated inasmuch as the purpose for enactment of this provision has been accomplished—to stimulate new purchases of equipment and new construction. Our current rate of inflation warrants enactment of this provision.

Revenue gain—estimated \$0.8 billion per year.

FOUNDATIONS

A tax of 20 percent should be imposed on the total annual gross receipts—exclusive of contributions received—of foundations income. The nature of some of the items of income that would be included in the foregoing gross receipts are: Gross profit from business activities, interest, dividends, rents and other ordinary income.

In conjunction with producing an equitable tax distribution in our society, I believe it is imperative that foundations bear a share of the tax burden and thus serve to relieve our 65 million taxpayers of a comparable amount. Furthermore, the growth in the number of foundations, to more than 30,000 today, plus an estimated ordinary income of \$1.5 billion per year, exclusive of contributions, justify this provision in our tax laws. In addition, large amounts of assets have been accumulated, free of taxation, to the extent of a current value whose estimate may exceed \$18-\$20 billion.

Revenue gain—\$300 million per year, based on estimated ordinary income for the year 1970.

THE DECENNIAL CENSUS

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, beginning April 1, 1970, the decennial census will be taken. As you know, the 1970 census questionnaire will contain 67 subjects involving 120 questions. A good number of these questions are highly personal and many of the other questions are far from pertinent to a population count. As the law now stands, a citizen's refusal to answer any of these questions could bring criminal penalties of a \$100 fine, 60 days in jail or both.

The word has gotten out on this proposed census form and the newspapers are informing the people through editorials and columns of this lengthy questionnaire. The mail we are receiving in my office, and I am sure I am not alone in this, is reflecting the fact that our citizens have become aware. The folks in my district are protesting this plan, they

believe it to be an intrusion into their private affairs and are resentful of the imperative that all questions be answered under threat of fine or jail. Here are some excerpts:

It is urgent that you limit the census taking to the way it was in the past. I do not appreciate the plan to interfere in my private affairs

Another letter said:

There are seven questions I would answer without equivocation, name, address, age, sex, race, whether head of household, and visitors, if any, at the time of the Census.

Anything of common knowledge, I will answer. Anything else is an invasion of privacy.

Another:

Little by little we have lost our freedoms and it is a most distressing situation in this beloved country of ours. I trust you will resist vigorously any further invasion of our privacy. It is later than we think, to be sure.

And another:

I believe this is a little too much regimentation and an invasion of privacy that is not necessary. I hope that you will do what you can to help change this penalty.

And, a final excerpt:

Its been in the papers, also magazines, about this invasion of privacy in the 1970 Census. As the paper states, and I AGREE, there's about 7 questions that should be answered to give the information they are supposed to have, let the remaining questions be answered on a voluntary basis.

Now, we all know that the American people, on the whole, are patient and forbearing when it comes to putting up with bureaucratic plans and redtape but in these already troubled days my mail and personal conversations tell me that the people are not going to sit back and accept this compulsory demand that these prying questions be answered or else face the unduly heavy penalties, particularly, while hard-core criminals are getting the velvet-glove treatment for crimes of much greater magnitude than that of not answering a question about who shares your shower or whether you own a TV set.

I believe we must stop and recall that the original intent of the census under the Constitution is to provide an accurate population count for an equitable apportionment of the House of Representatives. And, as far as I know, this is still the intent of the census. We have to remember that this is a decennial census, not an industrial and commercial census which would be an entirely different matter.

I would further state that common-sense tells us that an unnecessarily lengthy and complex census will tend to weaken the system and bring about an inaccurate count which would ultimately affect other areas dependent upon the population count for the distribution of funds and other decisions.

Because I am deeply concerned that our citizens should not be subjected to an uncalled for invasion of their privacy and to mandatory compliance should they not wish or be able to answer some of the questions, I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill which requires that only seven questions, pertinent to the decennial census,

be answered with a penalty only for failing to respond to these seven questions. The remaining questions would be answered on a voluntary basis. I believe early consideration of this legislation is very important in order that the American people will not be compelled to accept this invasion of their privacy due to inaction in the House and Senate.

AMERICA'S 200TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin proposes that Congress recognize the role of historical societies in observance of America's 200th birthday, and he notes, too, the need for commemorating discovery and exploration—a century earlier—in the Mississippi Valley. I cite here, Mr. Speaker, a few such events which are today's historical legacy in nearly a fifth of the congressional districts:

First. In 1668 the Miami welcomed explorer Nicolas Perot to their village on Fox River—near present Berlin, Wis.—where the farthest French outpost toward the unknown Mississippi—St. Jacques mission—would be started.

Second. In 1669 Robert Cavalier de la Salle, led by Seneca over a portage to an Ohio River headwater in western New York, descended La Belle Riviere to the rapids—at Louisville—and was, perchance, first European on Hoosier soil.

Third. In 1673 Louis Jolliet and his expedition's Jesuit chaplain, Father Jacques Marquette, followed Miami guides over the short path—at Portage, Wis.—from Fox River and Great Lakes basin to Wisconsin River and Mississippi basin. Discovery of the Mississippi, the Indians' "Father of Waters," occurred—at Prairie du Chien—on June 17.

Fourth. In 1675 Father Marquette, now on his final journey, passed by canoe along Lake Michigan's southern shore, the first non-Indian known to reach Indiana—this, in the Gary area.

Fifth. In 1679 La Salle voyaged from Niagara across Lakes Erie, Huron, and Michigan to Green Bay, in the first sailing of these waters. In December he traversed the St. Joseph-Kankakee portage—at South Bend—his destination a suitable base on the Illinois—near Peoria. Miami—a people of the portages—were again encountered at this crossing.

Sixth. In 1682 La Salle descended Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico. His subsequent letter—from St. Ignace, Mich.—in October, indicates he had learned of still another strategic portage, which he describes as affording a shorter route from Canada to the Illinois. This ancient trail—called Glorious Gate by Miami and under their resolute guard—links Maumee River—at Fort Wayne—to Wabash River at the forks thereof—at Huntington—all within the district I am privileged to represent.

Mr. Speaker, no less than 103 Members of the House of Representatives share directly in the inspiring heritage

of these achievements. On behalf of my fellow citizens in one such district and because pride permits no other course, I warmly endorse House Concurrent Resolution 161 introduced by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, believing that our general support without waiting for "pressure from home," will move the resolution to early adoption.

CHANGE IN RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of the recent change which took place in the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. The subcommittee is no longer automatically requesting departmental reports on bills for aliens who entered the United States as visitors, exchange visitors, or students. This latter group is now subject to rule 6 of the rules of procedure as are crewmen, stowaways, transits, and surreptitious entrants who evade immigration inspection. A Member introducing such a bill is required to request a waiver of rule 6 and to show the extreme hardship on which such request is based. Until a report is requested, the alien's case is handled as if there were no bill. This means that if there is an outstanding order of deportation the alien will be deported.

Since March 12 a number of bills have been referred to the subcommittee, which are subject to rule 6, and for which there was no accompanying information to show extreme hardship. The subcommittee has assumed that this oversight was a result of the newness of the change and is notifying the authors of these bills of the necessity for additional information if they wish to have the subcommittee consider a waiver of rule 6. A prompt decision will be made by the subcommittee. However, I do urge that the Members be mindful of the fact that the mere introduction of a bill and furnishing the subcommittee with identifying information as specified in rule 4 will not stay the departure of an alien who entered as a visitor, exchange visitor, student, crewman, stowaway, transit, or surreptitiously evading immigration inspection.

For the convenience of Members, I am including in my remarks the text of rule 6 of the Subcommittee Rules of Procedure:

6. The Subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as visitors, exchange visitors, students, stowaways, in transit, or deserting seamen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

Exemption from this rule may be granted by the Subcommittee in cases where the bill is designed to prevent extreme hardship. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the Subcommittee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his request to waive this rule.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE: QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, early in February it was brought to my attention that I did not know very much about the chemical and biological warfare programs of the United States. Some disturbing public policy questions about the practices that govern their use, the activities of universities and public institutions, and public safety of chemical and biological activities became apparent at that time.

As a result, I asked the U.S. Army to give a briefing to interested Members of Congress on the public policy aspects of our chemical and biological warfare programs. On March 4, 1969, the U.S. Army presented a short unclassified general description of our activities in these fields and then a more detailed classified review. Although I had indicated in my request that the questions that needed to be considered did not appear to require classification, being of the same nature as the sorts of questions that we ask about deployment of our troops in Vietnam, Korea, and Germany or about the ABM or our Polaris submarines, the Army said that they believed that most of the briefing should be secret. It is my opinion, following the briefing, that the public policy questions do not require classified answers.

Nineteen Members of Congress and a number of staff attended the briefing. I indicated at the time that I did not believe that the public policy questions had been answered and that I would ask the Secretary of Defense and some of the other Department heads for their views on our policies in these fields. I will include the text of my letters to Secretary Laird and Secretary Rogers in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I have received interim replies from the Departments concerned indicating that they are preparing replies to my questions. I am pleased that the Departments of Defense and State are taking the time to give these questions the consideration they merit, for I do not believe that they should be answered hastily or without rethinking some of the policies that I believe we may have been drifting into without adequate consideration by our top officials and Congress.

Because I have not yet received answers to my letters, I do not want to go into a thorough review of the questions that I have raised. The U.S. Army has, however, asked that I place in the RECORD a copy of the unclassified presentation of March 4, 1969. This copy, of course, does not cover the questions that were asked concerning the unclassified briefing. It is not a transcript. I am glad to do this for the information of my colleagues who were unable to attend. I do, however, want to take this opportunity to point out some of the inadequacies of the presentation made by the U.S. Army and also to point up my growing concern about the safety aspects of

moving poison gases around the United States by rail.

I will include the Army's unclassified presentation in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

First, one of the more glaring inaccuracies in the Army's presentation is the statement:

Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The U.S. clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

This statement is preceded by the following statement:

The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

In fact, the French Army used tear gas grenades fired from rifles in August 1914. The German Army also used several forms of tear gas. And the U.S. Army's tear gas, known as CN, was developed by the United States in 1918. Large quantities of tear gas, an incapacitating agent by the Army's definition, were produced in World War I. Obviously they were available for consideration at the time that the Geneva Protocol was formulated.

Not only were the incapacitating agents available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol was signed; they were specifically included in the prohibition against the use of gas. Because some confusion had arisen on the question of whether the original treaty had included incapacitating agents, the League of Nations Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference that met in Geneva on January 15, 1931, discussed the problem at some length. The nations that had ratified the Geneva Protocol generally agreed that tear gas was covered by the protocol. Ironically, even then, the United States took an equivocal stand.

To briefly quote from the minutes of the Commission:

The British Delegation: "It may be recalled that, during the first part of the sixth session, certain delegations assumed that the intention was to prohibit the use of all chemical methods of warfare of every kind. On the other hand there were some indications that this view is not shared by all States. It is at least possible that this difference in interpretation owes its origin to a serious ambiguity in the Geneva Gas Protocol of 1925, as well as in all Treaties and Conventions regulating gas warfare signed since the war. In the Geneva Protocol of June, 1925, though the relevant portion of the French text is identical with the article quoted above, in the English text the French word 'similaires' is translated by 'other.' Basing itself on this English text, the British Government has taken the view that the use in war of 'other' gases, including lachrymatory gases, was prohibited. They also considered that the intention was to incorporate the same prohibition in the present Convention."

The French then commented:

The French Government therefore considers that the use of lachrymatory gases is covered by the prohibition arising out of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 or Chapter IV of the draft Convention.

The Yugoslavian delegation said:

We fully agree with the interpretation given by the British delegation.

The Spanish delegate said:

I agree with the British delegation's interpretation, because I think that the text approved at the second reading is so clear that it cannot give rise to any objections. It provides that the use in warfare of any kind of gas is prohibited—doubtless because it is very difficult to distinguish between lethal and non-lethal gases.

I will include the minutes of the Preparatory Commission relating to this question of whether tear gas was covered in the Geneva Protocol in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, second, the U.S. Army stated that herbicides have proved useful as defoliants and for use against Vietcong crops. The Army goes on to say:

They are harmless to the soil and to life and have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

Mr. Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture, reported in Science magazine the results of a survey that he made of the U.S. defoliation program in Vietnam. He comments that the mangrove tree is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangrove trees. He does point out that this tree is more easily damaged in this way than others. And he goes on to say that it takes about 20 years to grow a mangrove tree.

More telling, however, is this comment:

A single treatment with 3 gallons of Orange or White (the defoliants that we use) would not be expected to have a great or lasting effect on a semi-deciduous forest in Vietnam. Some trees would be killed, and the canopy would be less dense temporarily. But within several years the canopy would again be closed, and even a careful observer would be hard pressed to circumscribe the treated area. A second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect. (Emphasis supplied).

It is my understanding that we spray more than once. I will include Mr. Tschirley's article in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Third, although the unclassified presentation did not include a prepared discussion of safety measures taken to protect the American public against chemical or biological testing or possible accidents during the transportation of poison gas, the problem was brought up during the question period following the unclassified portion. We were assured by the Army that it had guards on trains that carried poison gas and that every precaution was taken to protect the American public.

However, I have learned since the Army's briefing that on the night of February 18, 1969, television station KBTR-TV received a call saying that there were open railroad cars containing cylinders and marked "poison gas" located on a siding in downtown Denver, Colo. The station sent a cameraman down to the yards. The cameraman arrived at the yards at 8 p.m. and found a string of open gondola cars filled with metal containers, each car bearing a ticket marked "poison gas." There were no guards in evidence around these cars, and the KBTR-TV cameraman climbed

up on one of the cars and photographed the cylinders.

When the cameraman returned to KBTR-TV with his film the station contacted the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to ask about the shipment. The Army admitted that it had shipped the material and said that it would look into the question of why it was unguarded.

The next morning, when the station again contacted the Army, the Public Information Officer stated that the arsenal's official position was that there were guards with the train.

I, for one, am not satisfied with this answer, and it is answers of this type that raise questions about the credibility of the responses regarding German gas warfare by the U.S. Army.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. LLOYD. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to indicate in his opinion there was not a security unit attached to that train?

Mr. McCARTHY. What I said was that the television station, KBTR-TV, received a call about these uncovered cars in a siding in downtown Denver. The station dispatched the cameraman, who arrived at the scene and experienced no difficulty and no prohibition, saw no guards, and went ahead and took his film without any questions being raised by anyone. I believe we can conclude from the testimony of the television station that at that time, at least, there were no guards in evidence.

Mr. LLOYD. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his diligence in pursuing this. I may say that that chemical agent was en route to the Dugway Proving Ground, which is in my district. When that information was communicated to the public, that there were no guards attached to that train, I made an on-the-spot investigation after the chemical agent had arrived at the Dugway Proving Ground. I interrogated the military.

At this point I should like to say, at no time was there ever an effort made by the military to prevent full disclosure to my inquiries. Their assurance to me was that there was a six-man security unit attached to that train, which obviously was not within camera range at the time the television station made these pictures.

I should like to assert at this point in the gentleman's very excellent presentation the fact that as an individual, I was satisfied in my own mind that the train itself was not lacking in its security.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. He would be interested to know that what prompted me to ask this question in the unclassified portion of the briefing was the awareness which I will cite here shortly of an alarming increase in the number of railroad accidents in the United States in recent years. There has been an 85-percent increase in derailments in the United States in the period between 1961 and 1967. This rate is continuing at the present time and actually is showing a sharp increase. They advised me that they were now putting guards on the trains. I wanted to know why they

thought this was necessary. It was pointed out that incidents had occurred. I asked, "Could you elucidate on those incidents?" They explained that in St. Louis apparently there was a sniping incident where apparently some derailed person had a gun and was attempting to puncture these containers containing poison gas. That is what prompted them to put guards on the train but we had no reason to dispute that until we were advised by station WTOP here in Washington, D.C., which obtained this film footage that this station in Denver took which showed there were no guards in evidence.

A further hazard to the public is brought out by the shipment of large amounts of this poison gas by railroad. The National Transportation Safety Board reports that the rate of derailments has increased 85 percent between the years 1961 and 1967. In 1967 there were 4,960 derailments. When these derailments occurred, there could have been great hazards to public safety.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the United Press International article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier Express concerning railroad accidents be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in Crete, Nebr., for example, a freight carrying anhydrous ammonia was derailed, losing the deadly ammonia gas in the town. Five persons were killed and 35 people were injured by the fumes. In Dunreith, Ind. a derailment caused a fire and explosions that caused over \$1 million in damage. However, there were more ominous aspects to this derailment.

This Dunreith derailment contained some lessons for us because of two factors. When the fire broke out on the cars that were derailed, the flames were so intense that the tickets, presumably bills of lading on the cars which described the nature of the hazardous materials in the cars, were destroyed or burned. The firefighters did not know what substances were burning and hence they could not use their equipment effectively. A similar fire might well destroy tickets on other cars carrying the Army's poison gases.

The second problem in the Dunreith incident occurred when a tank car carrying poisonous chemicals were punctured, and the liquid drained into the ground and entered the local water table. This chemical contained the poison cyanide. Local authorities became aware of the problem when dead farm animals were sighted in and along a nearby creek. This showed that the cyanide was entering the local river and that water supplies might be endangered. A total of 6,200 pounds of chemicals were added to the river in order to attempt to counteract the cyanide. Fortunately no human beings were killed as a result. The cyanide did affect the local water table, because wells had to be dug and pumps installed to take out the cyanide. Over 2 million gallons of contaminated water had to be taken from the wells. Is this a chance that we want to take?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I should point out in connection with the Geneva protocol of 1925 the record should show that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated during World War II that it is the policy of the United States to abide by the Geneva protocol of 1925, even though it had not been ratified by the U.S. Senate. And, as recently as 2 years ago the then Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance declared that it is still the policy of the United States to abide by the Geneva protocol of 1925.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem from the summary of the Disarmament Conference of 1931 that the United States is in fact not abiding by the Geneva protocol of 1925 at this time in Vietnam.

Finally, I have only touched upon a few of the questions that need to be answered with reference to a thorough examination of our chemical and biological warfare policies and I intend to discuss these questions more thoroughly when I receive answers from the departments involved.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. LLOYD. I think the distinguished gentleman from New York has made a very helpful and useful statement. It is not my intention to debate the issue in any way or to suggest that any of this information is inaccurate. I think that it would be well, however, on the record for me to state at this point that at many times since the sheep incident of about a year ago in Utah when about 6,000 sheep, or thereabouts, were involved in what the Army now admits, according to my understanding, was an accident in the spraying of this agent—in all of my inquiries of military officials I have never found any attitude except one of full disclosure.

I think it might also be well to say at this point that this chemical agent, an agent somewhat heavier than water, does not spray out into the air, unless it is sprayed by human action. It simply runs out on the ground if a container is punctured.

A six-man security unit, or more, on a 24-hour basis is assigned to take the necessary precautionary measures in dealing with the transportation of this agent. They are very carefully educated and prepared in the science of decontamination of these nerve agents.

In 1963 the then Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance while testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had this to say in justification of our chemical and biological warfare program.

As long as other nations such as the Soviet Union maintain large chemical and biological warfare programs we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability. It is believed by many that President Roosevelt's statement in 1943, which promised—

And this is quoting President Roosevelt—

"to any perpetrators full and swift retaliation in kind," played a significant role in preventing gas warfare in World War II.

And, Secretary Vance went on to say:

Until we achieve effective agreement to eliminate all stockpiles of these weapons, it may be necessary to be in a position to make such a statement again in the future.

So, I believe again that the gentleman in the well has made a very important contribution in requesting increased disclosure of all pertinent facts and in questioning whether or not so much information as is now classified should be classified.

I, myself, feel that it is in the public interest to release more of this information for the consideration of the public and for discussion by the public.

I am sure that the gentleman from New York would also agree that it is neither his intention nor certainly it would not be my intention to go beyond the statement of what the facts and reasons present and to be very careful that we do not spread unjustifiable and unnecessary alarm.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. I certainly agree with the gentleman in that I would like to see the cloak of secrecy removed from this program. I might say that the deeper we get into this the more convinced I become, anyway, that this program has been allowed to develop, especially in recent years, without serious consideration at the highest level of our Government.

We were told by one professor of biology, who is very familiar with the program, that a former White House official said that he just did not care what they did in this program so long as they did it behind closed doors.

I do not believe that, really, that is going to serve our purpose. I believe this is the kind of program that has the most serious implications in terms of international agreements, in terms of a breakdown of the consensus that prevailed during World War II, and prevented the use of gas or germ warfare agents.

I believe these things should be discussed, and certainly the public policy question should be discussed openly. We are not asking the Army for secret information. I do not believe that the type of gas or the quantities of it are relevant here, but what our policy is in this field is relevant.

At present the policy is vague. In the unclassified portion of the briefing the Army actually could not give us answers to questions such as what is our policy regarding retaliation in kind to a gas or germ attack, and many other questions that arise in the public policy sphere.

We do know about the ABM system, the Polaris submarine fleet, about our troop strength in Korea, Germany and Vietnam, but in this field it is hidden from public view.

Mr. Speaker, I become more convinced that if these questions were applied to public scrutiny, if hard questions were posed by intelligent experts, that this program would not stand up under that kind of scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I should state that our purpose here is simply to get this out into the open where it can be examined by the Members of Congress, and by the executive branch, and thus reach certain basic decisions about what

the policy of the United States should be in this field of chemical and biological warfare.

Mr. LLOYD. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to state that I trust that the dialog which he is continuing will be in the public interest.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material which I have referred to earlier for the information of the Members:

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
Department of Defense.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently my lack of knowledge of United States' programs and policies in the fields of chemical and biological warfare was brought home to me. I realized that I did not know, as I did concerning our ICBM's, our B-52 bomber force, our troops deployed in Germany or Vietnam, the basic reasons for these programs. I also did not know the policies that guide our use or non-use of weapons in these areas. And I did not know what safeguards are being taken to protect the American public from any danger from activities in these areas.

With the advice of my colleagues from New York State on the Armed Services Committee of the House, I asked the United States Army to give me and any other interested colleagues in the House and Senate a briefing on the basic reasons for, the safeguards, and the public policies that applied in the fields of chemical and biological warfare.

Apparently my interest was shared by many other members of Congress for 19 Members, 3 Senators, and 16 representatives from members' offices attended the briefing which was held on March 4, 1969. The number of staff would certainly have been larger had attendance even for the unclassified portions of the briefing, not been restricted to those with active security clearances.

In discussing the nature of the briefing with the U.S. Army, I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the nonclassified section of the briefing. I stressed that our national capabilities and policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public review, and constructive criticism as are our ICBM, Polaris fleet, F-111 bomber program, and ABM system. I deliberately refrained from raising questions which I believed would legitimately fall within the area of secrecy.

General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public policy questions remained unanswered. I am therefore sending to you for reply a list of the public policy questions, the answers to which are essential to an intelligent and rational appraisal by Members of Congress and the concerned public towards these programs. I would appreciate your considered answers to these questions:

1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a

nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fallout shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

4. We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

5. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

6. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

7. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

8. What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Are they inert? Are the chemicals moved in tanks under pressure? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

9. What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields. Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and research programs on ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can

be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

10. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nationwide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the fields of chemical and biological warfare?

11. Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

12. Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

13. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

14. Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently my lack of knowledge of the United States' policies in the fields of chemical and biological warfare was brought home to me. I realized that I did not know, as I did concerning our presence in Vietnam, our commitment to South Korea, our deployment in NATO, or our nuclear deterrent, the basic policies that guide our use or non-use of chemical and biological weapons.

With the advice of my colleagues from New York State on the Armed Services Committee of the House, I asked the United States Army to give me and any other interested Members of the House or Senate a briefing on the basic reasons for, and the public policies that applied in the fields of chemical and biological warfare.

Apparently, my interest was shared by many other members of Congress for 19 Members of the House, 3 Senators and 16 representatives of Members' offices attended the briefing which was held on March 4, 1969. The number of staff would certainly have been larger had attendance, even for the unclassified portions of the briefing, not been restricted to those with active security clearances.

In discussing the nature of the briefing with the Army, I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the non-classified section of the briefing. I stressed that our national capabilities and policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public review, and constructive criticism as are our strategic weapons procurement and deployment, and our foreign commitments. I deliberately refrained from raising questions which I believed would legitimately fall within the area of secrecy.

General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public policy questions remained unanswered. I subsequently sent to Secretary of Defense Laird and am sending to you for reply a list of the public policy questions, the answers to which are essential to an intelligent and rational appraisal by members of

Congress and the concerned public towards these programs. I would appreciate your considered answers to these questions:

1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do our civil defense policies make the statement that our efforts are purely defensive credible?

4. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

5. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

6. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

7. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nationwide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the fields of chemical and biological warfare, and do we make such a statement as a part of our foreign policy?

8. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

9. Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmament as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

10. Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense

with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

11. What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE BRIEFING
BY BRIG. GEN. J. A. HEBBELER, MARCH 4,
1969, AT REQUEST OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD MCCARTHY

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen, it is my privilege to appear before you today in response to Congressman McCarthy's request for a briefing on chemical and biological warfare and the basic reasons and necessity for a chemical and biological warfare program.

ELEMENTS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

We should keep in mind that we are talking about weapon systems in the same context that we talk about any other weapon; that is, we are talking about instruments of war, weapons specifically designed for use in war. However, effects of chemical weapons differ from those of biological weapons and from other weapons just as the effects of nuclear weapons differ from those of conventional weapons. So to provide a common ground and to help us understand these differences, I shall separate chemical warfare from biological and look at each in detail.

The first thing to bring to your attention is that we are not talking one system; we are talking many systems, all with different effects and different uses. Let us look at the offense first because only by understanding the weapons and their effects are we able to determine the defensive equipment and tactics associated with each category.

Some chemical weapons are categorized as lethal weapons which are designed to kill. The modern lethal chemical agents which are components of chemical weapons include the nerve agents, two of which have the symbols GB and VX. Both are liquids which are disseminated as aerosols. GB is a non-persistent material which is relatively volatile. It is put down in heavy concentrations to catch troops before they can put on their protective masks.

VX is a persistent compound which can penetrate the skin. It is complementary to GB in that it can circumvent the protective mask. It penetrates normal combat clothing.

Both agents are odorless, tasteless, and colorless. Consequently it is practically impossible to detect them with the unaided senses. They can enter the body through the respiratory tract, the eyes, and the skin. Action within the body is rapid. Very small amounts will cause paralysis, prostration, and death. Even microscopic quantities will impair vision, and cause nausea and muscular incoordination.

Why do we have a lethal chemical program? Mr. Cyrus Vance, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1967, before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, stated: "As long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability." Let us look at the nature of the Soviet Union program which constitutes a lethal chemical threat to the US, her NATO allies and other Free World countries.

Today the Soviet Union is better equipped militarily and physiologically for chemical warfare than any other nation in the world. She has placed a great deal of emphasis on these systems in her military machine. She envisions the usage of these the same as for conventional weapons.

Her planning at all levels, from the very top to the very low echelon units, includes considerations for chemical warfare training, offensively and defensively.

She has a wide spectrum of chemical munitions. She considers chemical tactical weapons to be used in conjunction with nuclear weapons or separately as circumstances may dictate.

Her agent stockpiles includes a spectrum of agents capable of creating military effects over a wide range.

The soldier is well equipped with defensive equipment. He trains vigorously and for long periods of time with this equipment. He looks upon chemicals as a real possibility in any future conflicts, and he respects his equipment.

The research program in the Soviet Union for chemical warfare has encompassed every facet.

The basis for these comments appears in the testimony of Willis E. Black before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1968.

In addition, we know that the state of Soviet chemical science which has direct application to chemical warfare technology is unsurpassed. I have here some physical evidence of their diligent and exhaustive effort in this field.

This stack of documents contains abstracts of translations of selected Soviet scientific literature which reflects the magnitude of this effort during the past several years alone. Each of these documents also contains abstracts pertaining to biological research which has military applications.

In summary, the USSR is well equipped to wage warfare with these weapons and indications are that they would be used if this served its purpose.

Other chemical systems employ incapacitating agents designed specifically to avoid killing—approach unique among weapon systems. These weapons suggest employment where military necessity requires control of a situation, but where there is a good reason for not harming the surrounding population or even the intended target troops.

Among chemical agents in the incapacitant category are some which exert mental effects, and there are some which affect the body. There also are types which affect both the mind and the body. Physical types have some advantages over the mental types, however, since the degree of incapacitation will be more apparent to the user.

Such agents would include, for example, those which would cause loss of physical coordination, paralysis, or loss of vision. The effects would be temporary and those exposed would recover without after effects. These agents are selected for possible use because of the wide safety factor between the amount of agent which incapacitates and that which would cause lethal effects.

Actually, many compounds have some temporary effects on mental processes as well as on physical performance. For example, the ability to concentrate on a given task may be severely limited at the same time that physical tasks may become more difficult to perform.

The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

These incapacitating chemical weapons would be a marked asset to US forces in military situations where it is necessary to gain control of an area in which both civilian and insurgents are co-mingled or where civilian and enemy military troops are inter-mingled. This would be particularly true on peace-keeping missions in underdeveloped nations where insurgency is a problem and where the US is asked to assist in maintaining stability of a state.

Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The US clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925; public statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance and

by Ambassador to UN Nabrit provide the basis for the US position. I will cover these later in a discussion of policy.

The riot control agents, used for control of civil disturbances and adapted for use in Vietnam operations, are designed to irritate, to cause people to move (vacate an area), with only temporary effects. The effects of CS, the standard military riot control agent, are pronounced and instantaneous—coughing, severe burning of the eyes, tightness of the chest, acute discomfort. These effects are much the same as the tear gas, CN, which has long been used by civil law enforcement agencies world wide. But CS works faster to temporarily disable and is much safer. In tests using troop volunteers, in actual riots, and in battle, there has never been a fatality attributed to CS.

In Vietnam commanders find CS a valuable weapon in combat situations when it is apparent that explosives are not the best weapon. Viet Cong have frequently forced women and children to accompany them as hostages; they do not hesitate to use them as protective shields against anyone seeking to clear their tunnel hideouts. In such situations, CS quickly proved its value. In one reported operation, 17 Viet Cong and some 400 non-combatants being held as hostages were forced from a tunnel complex by CS, with nobody wounded on either side. Again, 43 armed Viet Cong were captured with no friendly losses and one enemy killed when he tried to break away. These examples indicate that lives are frequently saved on both sides when CS is used as a weapon.

Herbicides have proved useful in Vietnam primarily as defoliants. Dense jungle, which is home to the Viet Cong, provides the enemy with effective ambush cover. Wooded areas along trails, roads, railroads, canals and powerlines have been hiding areas for Viet Cong units until the US Air Force began to spray defoliating agents. Removal of the jungle canopy and overhanging foliage permits a view for analysis of trail activity, storage site locations and targeting and exposes the ground area to photographic surveillance and direct fire. Army units use herbicides around local base areas to keep them clear for ground surveillance and fire lanes and prevent surprise. Herbicides have also been used against Viet Cong crops; they are harmless to the soil and to life and have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

The biological weapons are categorized by their effects against man, against animals and against crops. Biological weapons designed for use against man are further categorized by their effects as lethal or incapacitating. Again, lethal biological weapons are designed to kill; incapacitating to avoid killing.

Biological agents can be produced, can be stored under specific conditions, and can be disseminated effectively to cover large areas. Because of the delay between infection and symptoms, as well as the large area coverage capability, biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Biological agents, like the chemical nerve agents, cannot be detected by the senses. Being colorless, odorless and tasteless their early detection is a difficult problem, complicated by the delay which occurs before effects become evident.

There is a wide variety of bacteria, rickettsia, viruses and fungi which cause disease in man. Many of these can be used as biological agents. Examples of some that could be considered as lethal agents are plague, tularemia, anthrax, yellow fever and typhus.

In addition, it is entirely possible that mutant types of disease could be developed which would not respond to known methods of treatment. They would be difficult to diagnose. Diagnosis and treatment could be complicated by using mixtures of two or more agents.

Biological agents can be delivered in a variety of ways, such as aerosol generators and spray tanks. Generators and spray tanks could be carried in missile warheads and in manned or drone aircraft. Another possibility is the use of insect vectors, such as the mosquito, as a deliberate carrier of microorganisms.

In a different category are the biological incapacitants. They are designed to permit control of an enemy—to remove his ability and will to fight, with minimum risk of mortality. There are a number of mild diseases which will make a person very uncomfortable and make him inactive for a short period of time without serious effects.

In another category are the weapons which can be used to attack a nation's food sources—crops and livestock. These are generally considered weapons for strategic use.

Why do we have a program? We can refer back to Mr. Vance's statement which included both chemical and biological weapons and the need for a program in view of the large USSR program. We can also refer back to Mr. Black's testimony when he stated that "Today Russia is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical and biological warfare than any other nation in the world." However, it is even more important that one looks at the rapid advances being made in the bio-medical sciences. The US must keep an active and viable program in this field so that we are not technologically surprised and so that such surprise cannot threaten our national security.

From this brief review of the elements of the CB weapons program, it is evident that an increasing variety of effects have become available, with a consequent increase in variety of purposes to which they could be applied. The alternatives presented are now so many that distinctions between purposes have tended to submerge purely technical differences.

Thus, at one end of the spectrum, these forms of warfare might be no more than the small-scale use of a non-lethal chemical agent against an adversary to frustrate his purpose without maiming or causing fatalities. At the other extreme of the spectrum, it is possible to conceive of the use of a lethal biological agent against an entire nation without consideration of necessity or humanity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to weigh in a single balance situations so disparate in intent or consequences.

It appears, then, that with respect to chemical and biological systems one should look toward the *principle of proportionality*, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind or degree of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. In this context it would appear that the norm of proportionality could require controls to prohibit certain elements of the chemical and biological field, while others of the non-lethal type would be preferred over alternatives now employed.

DEFENSE

In developing a modern defensive posture, one must recognize the threat and the toxicity of current nerve agents. With these, even very low concentrations for short periods of time can quickly produce severe symptoms. Further, one must protect against absorption of these agents through the skin as well as by inhalation. As a result, a lethal chemical protective system consist of several interrelated elements. The total chemical and biological defensive system consists of detection, warning, protection, decontamination, and preventive medicine and medical therapy. Each of these elements requires available equipment and materials (alarms, masks, etc.) which must be integrated into an overall logistics system. The defensive

equipment requires concepts and doctrines for use which must be integrated into the training cycle. The lack of any element increases the vulnerability to a chemical or biological attack.

There are two implications to the complexities of equipment and training for defense against lethal chemical weapons.

For one thing, a force against which lethal chemicals are used will be at much lower combat effectiveness than will a force not suffering the same casualty threat with its attendant requirement for protective equipment and decontamination procedures. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 recognizes this as a basis for retaliation against the initiator of lethal chemical use. In the present era, a force without the option of chemical retaliation could well be forced to an alternative option of tactical nuclear employment, if that were available to him.

The second implication is that the cost of protective equipment is high and serves as a constraint on less affluent nations against initiating use of lethal chemicals, since use carries with it the requirement for protection against retaliation.

POLICY

What is our national policy in regards to these weapons and their use? We can turn to the statements of our Presidents and their Cabinet officers to explain a basis for our current policy.

First, we can begin with President Roosevelt's statement in 1943 when he stated: " * * * we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies." President Eisenhower re-affirmed the Roosevelt policy statement. Very few public statements have been made until recently when as a result of the Vietnam conflict, questions were raised.

Secretary of State Rusk in 1965 declared with respect to U.S. use of tear gas and herbicides that the U.S. was not engaging in gas warfare in Vietnam and that the country was not using gas "that is prohibited by the Geneva Convention of 1925 or any other understandings about the use of gas."

Ambassador Nabrit before the United Nations General Assembly in 1966 stated that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 does not apply to all gases and further "It would be unreasonable to contend that any rule of international law prohibits the use in combat against an enemy, for humanitarian purposes, of agents that Governments around the world commonly use to control riots by their own people. Similarly, the Protocol does not apply to herbicides, which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those used domestically in the United States, the Soviet Union and many other countries to control weeds and other unwanted vegetation."

Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance, in his 1967 testimony before Congress indicated "That we seek international understandings to limit chemical and biological warfare and that we have not used weapons of the sort condemned by the Geneva Protocol." He pointed out that "as long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability."

In line with seeking limitations, the most significant current action which may affect policy is the United Nations study on chemical and bacteriological (biological) warfare, requested by the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference. This study, intended to provide a technical and non-political appraisal of the effects of chemical and biological weapons, is being done by experts of fourteen countries, including the U.S. and the USSR. It is to be completed by July 1969, will be unclassified and will be given wide distribution.

Our posture today is concerned first with the development of a credible and viable

lethal chemical capability as a deterrent to the use of these weapons against us, and to give us the ability to fight effectively if deterrence fails. Further, it is essential that in the rapidly advancing technology of the biomedical-pharmacological sciences we not permit ourselves to be surprised by a capability in the hands of a potential enemy. And, finally, the exploitation of a chemical incapacitating capability may permit us to effectively control a critical situation while at the same time using weapons designed to avoid killing.

[Distributed to the Council and the Members of the League of Nations, Geneva, Jan. 15, 1931]

DOCUMENTS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

(Entrusted with the preparation for the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments)

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SESSION (SECOND PART) OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Memorandum by the British Delegation

The English text of the first paragraph of this Chapter, as agreed to at the second reading, is as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties undertake, subject to reciprocity, to abstain from the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases, and of all analogous liquids, substances or processes."

It may be recalled that, during the first part of the sixth session, certain delegations assumed that the intention was to prohibit the use of all chemical methods of warfare of every kind. On the other hand, there are some indications that this view is not shared by all States. It is at least possible that this difference in interpretation owes its origin to a serious ambiguity in the Geneva Gas Protocol of 1925, as well as in all Treaties and Conventions regulating gas warfare signed since the war. In the Geneva Protocol of June 1925, though the relevant portion of the French text is identical with that of the article quoted above, in the English text the French word "similaires" is translated by "other".

Basing itself on this English text, the British Government have taken the view that the use in war of "other" gases, including lachrymatory gases, was prohibited. They also considered that the intention was to incorporate the same prohibition in the present Convention.

From every point of view it is highly desirable that a uniform construction should prevail as to whether or not the use of lachrymatory gases is considered to be contrary to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and/or to Chapter IV of the Draft Convention.

The British delegation proposes, therefore, to invite an expression of opinion on this point from all the States represented on this Commission.

Note by the French delegation regarding the British memorandum

I. All the texts at present in force or proposed in regard to the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases are identical. In the French delegation's opinion, they apply to all gases employed with a view to toxic action on the human organism, whether the effects of such action are a more or less temporary irritation of certain mucous membranes or whether they cause serious or even fatal lesions.

II. The French military regulations, which refer to the undertaking not to use gas for warfare (*gaz de combat*) subject to reciprocity, classify such gases as suffocating, blistering, irritant and poisonous gases in general, and define irritant gases as those causing tears, sneezing, etc.

III. The French Government therefore considers that the use of lachrymatory gases is

covered by the prohibition arising out of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 or Chapter IV of the draft Convention.

The fact that, for the maintenance of internal order, the police, when dealing with offenders against the law, sometimes use various appliances discharging irritant gases cannot, in the French delegation's opinion, be adduced in a discussion on this point, since the Protocol or Convention in question relates only to the use of poisonous or similar gases in war.

[Discussion]

Lord CECIL (British Empire). This is not really a matter for me to make a speech about. The point is stated quite clearly. There is a little difference between the English and French text of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and there seems to be a certain difference in the practice of countries as to whether the prohibition extends or does not extend to those gases which are not dangerous to health. The French delegation have been good enough to circulate a statement in which they say that their practice is the same as ours in forbidding the use of all gases; but I do not know whether that is the case with other people, and my Government is anxious, if possible, to clear up the situation in that respect.

I have made my appeal here, and it is for each Government to say whether they feel able and disposed to make any reply to this appeal on the subject.

The PRESIDENT. The French delegation has already replied in writing, and Lord Cecil would like to know whether the other delegations can also state their views.

M. ANTONIADE (Roumania). My delegation was among those that proposed this prohibition, and I am therefore entirely in agreement with the construction which Lord Cecil has placed upon this article, which has also been explicitly confirmed in the note now submitted by the French delegation.

Dr. MARKOVICH (Yugoslavia). The Yugoslav delegation also urged the desirability of inserting in the Convention on the Limitation of Armaments an article dealing with the use of chemical arms. We fully agree with the interpretation given by the British delegation.

M. FIERLINGER (Czechoslovakia). I entirely associate myself with the declarations which we have just heard, for the simple reason that it would be very difficult in warfare to make a clear distinction between gases which are lethal and gases which are not lethal.

Proposal by the United States Delegation

The Honorable HUGH GIBSON (United States of America). I had hoped that it would not be necessary for me to make a statement on this subject, as I confess that I am not in a position to offer a sound and valuable opinion on the problem raised by the British delegation. However, as so many delegations have expressed their views on this subject, I feel there are certain considerations that should be laid before the commission.

The American delegation has examined with great interest and sympathy the memorandum on chemical warfare circulated by the British delegation. A very interesting and important problem is raised by this memorandum and one which it is essential to settle if we are to have the sort of clear-cut and straightforward international agreement on gas warfare which alone can be observed.

If, in the interpretation of the Gas Protocol, there is a broad border-line of doubtful cases, States, which endeavor to execute faithfully their treaty obligations, risk incurring the reproach of violation, if other States have a different conception of the scope of our agreement. I am particularly glad that the British delegation has brought this question forward now, and has asked for an expression of opinion from other del-

egations on the question of interpretation. This seems to me a distinctly useful step and I welcome the opportunity to lay certain considerations before the Commission, together with a suggestion as to how the whole problem may best be handled.

I confess that, after such study as I have been able to give to the matter, I find it extremely difficult to offer a useful opinion as to what sort of gas can be considered as falling within the scope of the text agreed to on second reading. This entire subject is so technical that I should like to lay before the Commission some of the problems involved in any decision, which, to my mind, show that any definite solution of this problem is beyond the technical competence of this body.

The primary question involved is as to the use of lachrymatory gases. While lachrymatory gases may serve some useful military purpose, for instance as harassing agencies, it is doubtless well-known to all my colleagues that the greatest use of lachrymatory gas is found, not in military service, but in police work either for controlling mobs, in which use it is certainly far more humane and probably more effective than the use of machine guns, sabres, or even truncheons, or it serves the purpose of effecting the capture of a barricaded criminal without bloodshed or loss of life.

Aside from this particular civil use of lachrymatory gas, the British document raises another far more interesting question of greater technical difficulty and wider ramifications. This question involves the use of smoke, which has a widely-accepted technical use for tactical screening purposes.

Smokes can either be chemical or mechanical in their nature and run the gamut from petroleum smoke, mechanical in character—inasmuch as it consists of particles of soot suspended in air—down the line to toxic smokes which are extremely lethal in character. In all probability, the most widely-used smoke for military screening purposes is white phosphorus, which has no chemical gas qualities, but which is a hideous and cruel agent if used against personnel before it has reached the stage of being a true smoke. Between white phosphorus and the true toxic smoke there exists an infinite number of gradations, most of which have well recognised chemical properties, and some of which are lethal in character. Logically, a statement as to the poisonous or non-poisonous or the lethal or non-lethal qualities, of smokes and gases, which might come under the terms of the text adopted of Chapter IV at second reading, would require prolonged study by technical experts with specialised knowledge of the subject, supported by expert specialised medical knowledge as to the properties and probable physical and pathological effects of these various agencies in normal and abnormal concentrations. I have sought to outline briefly some of the difficult problems with which the Commission might be faced, if we were to embark upon a general discussion of this subject now—difficulties which I fear we are quite unprepared to discuss without the backing of adequate technical knowledge. The problem before us is essentially one of doing away with agencies which cause unnecessary suffering, and it is important, if our prohibition of these inhumane agencies is to be all-inclusive and applicable, that we have definite knowledge of these various agencies and their effects, and of the ramifications of any decisions we may take. On the other hand we seek a maximum prohibition of inhumane agencies, but, at the same time, we should not be led to bring into disrepute the employment of agencies which not only are free from the reproach of causing unnecessary suffering, but which achieve definite military or civil purposes by means in themselves more humane than those in use before their adoption. I think there would

be considerable hesitation on the part of many Governments to bind themselves to refrain from the use in war, against an enemy, of agencies which they have adopted for peace-time use against their own population, agencies adopted on the ground that, while causing temporary inconvenience, they cause no real suffering or permanent disability, and are thereby more clearly humane than the use of weapons to which they were formerly obliged to resort to in times of emergency.

I have set forth the views of the American delegation on this subject at some length in order to lead up to a definite proposal. I think we are all in agreement as to the end in view. I hope the Commission will agree with me as to the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of our reaching a thoroughly sound agreement at this time, and of the need for mature scientific study.

I therefore venture to suggest that the British memorandum be noted in our report, that the importance of this subject be duly stressed, and that the various Governments represented at the Disarmament Conference be requested to give this entire subject careful study and consideration, with a view to arriving at that Conference equipped with adequate knowledge of the problem in all its aspects, in the hope that we may reach the sort of agreement we all desire.

[Discussion]

M. SATO (Japan). My Government agrees with the British interpretation.

M. COBIAN (Spain). I agree with the British delegation's interpretation, because I think that the text approved at the second reading is so clear that it cannot give rise to any objections. It provides that the use in warfare of any kind of gas is prohibited—doubtless because it is very difficult to distinguish between lethal and non-lethal gases.

I entirely agree with M. Politis that it would be very dangerous to try to make war less inhumane, but I would add that we must not do anything which represents a refinement of cruelty. In my opinion, nothing is more opposed to all idea of civilization than that scientific knowledge should be used to devise methods of destruction.

M. LOUNATCHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In 1929, the Soviet delegation proposed not only the renunciation of the use of gases in warfare, but also of their preparation in peace-time; this proposal, however, was rejected by the majority of the Commission.

We interpret this paragraph to mean that the use of all gases, including irritant gases, is prohibited.

As regards the text proposed by the French delegation, the Soviet delegation is of opinion that it is not for the Preparatory Commission to legalise the use of these gases by police forces, and it accordingly regards the third paragraph as unacceptable, particularly as one speaker referred to the use of gases by police forces for the purpose of controlling mobs.

M. MASSIGLI (France). As the French delegation has expressed its views in writing, I need not repeat that it is in agreement with the British delegation. However, we have just heard some very interesting statements, and Mr. Gibson has touched the core of the problem. A significant silence was also observed by certain delegations, which shows that they are not at present in a position to state their views on the matter.

I therefore approve Mr. Gibson's proposal to mention the British memorandum in the report, so that it may be submitted to the Conference.

As regards the remark made by M. Lounatcharsky, I would merely point out that I have never asked this Commission to interpret the 1925 Protocol in any way, still less to unify the police regulations of the various countries. I can assure him that if this ques-

tion arose, I should leave it to him to make proposals.

Dr. WOO KAISENG (China). The Chinese delegation is entirely in sympathy with the British delegation's memorandum. It also agrees with the views of Mr. Gibson, the United States delegate, and considers that chemical warfare should be prohibited, and that these questions should be carefully examined. It is also of opinion that the manufacture of all gases, both asphyxiating and poisonous, should be prohibited, or at all events, limited.

General DE MARINIS (Italy). As regards Chapter IV, the Italian delegation interprets the 1925 Protocol, to mean that "other gases" include lachrymatory gases—that is to say that, subject to reciprocity, the use of lachrymatory gases is prohibited.

I gladly associate myself with Mr. Gibson's proposal to refer the examination of this question and the final decision to the Conference.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada). Mr. President, I wish to thank the British delegation for giving us an opportunity of discussing this very important question. We are in entire sympathy with the interpretation given in the British memorandum. We also welcome the proposal of the United States delegation that all the delegations should come to the Disarmament Conference with as full and complete information on this subject as possible.

MUNIA BEY (Turkey). In reply to the British delegation, I desire to state that we also consider the use of lachrymatory gases prohibited by the Protocol. I should like to add, after hearing the statements made by previous speakers, that none of them seems to be opposed to the use of lachrymatory gases being prohibited. As certain Governments which signed the Protocol are not represented here, it is advisable that the result of this interpretation should be brought to the knowledge of those Governments, so that this Protocol may be interpreted in a uniform manner.

The PRESIDENT. I hope Lord Cecil is satisfied with the replies he has obtained. Judging from the discussion, I take it that Mr. Gibson's proposal, which is supported by M. Massigli, is approved by the Commission. The Governments are accordingly requested to study this question so that it may be settled at the Conference.

Lord CECIL (British Empire). I should like to say a word of thanks to my colleagues for the fullness with which many of them have replied to the question the British Government laid before them. I need not say that everything they have said will be brought to the notice of my Government and they will be as grateful as I am.

I entirely adhere to the suggestion of Mr. Gibson, and I venture to hope that those Governments whose delegations have not been able to reply on this occasion will convey especially to their Governments, and bring to their attention, all that has passed on the present occasion.

With regard to what M. Lounatcharsky and M. Woo Kaiseng said about the desirability of preventing the manufacture of these gases, I am in entire agreement with them, but they, too, will agree with me that the technical difficulties of prohibition are very great, owing to the course of science in matters which are quite removed from the manufacture of poisonous gases, but I quite agree that it is of little use to forbid the use of gases in times of war unless you can prevent their manufacture, and the preparation of their manufacture, in times of peace. The matter should be carefully studied, but it does not arise at this juncture.

The PRESIDENT. We can regard the discussion as closed.

I would draw your attention to one very important point—namely, that it is essential that the reservations made in regard to the various points of the report should be formu-

lated in very precise terms. I would therefore ask you to send them in this form to the Bureau, which will transmit them to the Reporters.

The Commission rose at 1.20 p.m.

[From Science Magazine, Feb. 21, 1969]

DEFOLIATION IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—The author is assistant chief of the Crops Protection Research Branch, Crops Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland. The assessment and report on which this article is based were prepared by the author when he served as an adviser to the U.S. Department of State. That report was released in September 1968 by the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.)

(By Fred H. Tschirley)

An assessment of ecologic consequences of the defoliation program in Vietnam was undertaken at the request of the U.S. Department of State. This article is based on a report made as a part of an overall review of the defoliation and crop destruction programs in Vietnam.

The timetable for completion of the policy review required submittal of a report 1 month after my arrival in Vietnam on 15 March 1968. The period from mid-March to mid-April was the end of the dry season when many tree species are naturally defoliated. This added to the difficulty of determining the effects of herbicides on vegetation.

The dry season, the short time available, and the difficulty of making on-the-ground observations were restrictive for an ecologic evaluation. Thus, this report is not a detailed analysis, but an assessment based on the observations that were possible and on discussions with foresters and others knowledgeable about the local situation. The observations were supported by scientific reports and personal research experience in ecology and the effect of herbicides on vegetation in temperate and tropical America.

There were no constraints placed on what I was permitted to see in Vietnam nor on what I reported. Some areas and vegetative types could not be visited because there was not adequate time, or because safety could not be assured in areas of military activity. In other areas, inspections were limited to aerial observations because the sites were not sufficiently secure to permit ground assessments. Civilian and military elements of the U.S. mission in Vietnam gave me all the help and cooperation that was possible. The military provided aircraft for aerial surveys of defoliated and nondefoliated forests, arranged transport to Special Forces camps and a security force for observations from the ground, arranged briefings on all aspects of the defoliation program, and made available whatever records I wished to see on where and when forests were sprayed with defoliants. Civilian elements of the U.S. mission provided background information based on their experiences in Vietnam, aircraft for additional aerial surveys, introductions to Vietnamese foresters, and background material needed for writing my report. Probably the best indication of the lack of constraints on my activities was that the report which I prepared was released, without a word having been changed, by the U.S. mission in Saigon.

This article is essentially the same as the report I prepared in Vietnam. Some material has been deleted because of space limitations, but my observations and conclusions do not differ from the original report.

DEFOLIATED AREAS SURVEYED

Time did not permit a survey of all the defoliated areas in Vietnam. Therefore, my observations were limited to those areas where large blocks of forest had been sprayed with herbicides. The ecologic consequences of the defoliation program would be expected to be most evident and most readily definable in such areas.

The most intensive defoliation treatments in the mangrove vegetational complex have been applied in the Rung Sat Special Zone, an area that surrounds the shipping channel into Saigon. Defoliation of the mangrove was started in 1966, but most of the defoliation flights were made after June 1967. A block of about 460 square kilometers had been treated by the end of January 1968. The Rung Sat Special Zone was surveyed from a helicopter ranging in height from treetop level to about 1000 feet. Mangrove on the Ca Mau peninsula was surveyed from a C-123 flying at about 2000 feet. This flight also permitted a survey of a 1962 herbicidal treatment of mangrove on both sides of the Ong Doc River.

The most intensive defoliation treatments on upland semideciduous forest have been applied in war zones C and D and in the Demilitarized Zone. My efforts were limited to war zones C and D. War zone C is northwest of Saigon between the Song Be River and the Cambodian border; war zone D is northeast of Saigon between the Song Be and Song Dong Nai rivers. Blocks of about 920 and 1920 square kilometers have been sprayed in war zones C and D, respectively. Some areas within those blocks have received two to four treatments. Defoliation in the semideciduous forest was observed from two relatively high-level flights in fixed-wing aircraft, six high- and low-level flights in helicopters, and observations from the ground in forests surrounding the four Special Forces camps of Thien Ngon, Katum, Tong Le Chon, and Bo Dop. Several hours were spent in the forest at each location to assess defoliation, refoliation, successional patterns, and to get an idea of the possible effects to the defoliation on wildlife. In addition to my own observations, men at the camps were questioned regarding the effect of defoliation on their operation, their impressions about the relative difficulty of human movement in the forest (a rough measure of the density and composition of the understory vegetation), and sightings they had made of wildlife.

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON CLIMATE

Not uncommonly one hears that large-scale modification of vegetation (forest to savanna or grassland, for example) or the vegetative denudation of an area will cause a change of climate, particularly in the amount of rainfall. The theory behind this statement is that as forest is converted to grassland or the soil is bare of vegetation, the evapotranspirational surface is reduced, and thus there is less moisture released to the atmosphere for subsequent precipitation. The fallacy of the theory is readily apparent when one considers the vast scale of atmospheric air flow, with the moisture it contains, and the relatively insignificant reduction in moisture that might be caused by reduced evapotranspiration from a small area. Some simple calculations point out the fallacy of the theory more explicitly.

By applying the reasoning used for an arid area,¹ let us apply some simple calculations to a forested area that is 100 kilometers on a side. If we assume, conservatively I think, that the total moisture in a vertical column of the atmosphere above the area has a depth of 3 centimeters and the air mass is moving over the area at a rate of 5 kilometers per hour, we can calculate that moisture is passing over the area at a rate of 4.17×10^8 grams per second. Now let us further assume that our hypothetical forest has been entirely denuded of vegetation and we reasoned that it may have been contributing 10 percent to the total atmospheric moisture. In other words, we expect a 10-percent decrease of rainfall after the vegetation is removed. Ten percent of the total atmospheric moisture would be 4.17×10^8 grams per second. In other words, our hypothetical forest would have to be contributing moisture to the atmosphere at a rate of 1.1×10^5 gallons per second. Such a figure is unreasonable. If we carry this calculation further and consider one tree with its branches in the upper or middle canopy for each 10 square meters, then evapotranspiration from each such area would have to be 417 milliliters per second. That is far beyond the measurements that have been made for salt cedar (*Tamarix pentandra*), one of the heaviest users of water.²

The work of Ohman and Pratt³ also lends itself to this discussion. They measured dew point over and downwind from a desert irrigation project covering some 100,000 acres near Yuma, Arizona [annual precipitation about 3 inches]. Despite application of annual totals of from 5 to 10 feet of irrigation water on this area extending some 20 miles parallel to prevailing winds for the summer months studied, all influence of the irrigated fields upon crop-level dew points became immeasurably small only 100 feet to the lee of the downwind edge of the entire area. And at 12 feet (3.6 meters) above the crop level, dew points were not measurably increased even at points inside the irrigated acreage. These measurements were made under midday conditions in July and August when monthly totals of irrigation varied between about 0.7 and 1.5 feet of applied water. These measurements show the small effect that artificial measures have on atmosphere moisture content.

My conclusion is that defoliation in Vietnam has no significant measurable effect on atmospheric moisture and thus would have no effect on precipitation.

Another point that refutes the evapotranspiration-precipitation theory is that water molecules are not motionless in the atmosphere. Sutcliffe⁴ estimated that the average time between a water molecule's evaporation into and its precipitation from the atmosphere was about 10 days. Thus, from consideration of the mean wind speed, the average water molecule must drift several hundred miles before it is precipitated.

Extensive defoliation would be expected to change temperature patterns through a forest profile simply because there would be less shielding of direct solar radiation. In addition, the average wind speed would be greater in a defoliated than in an undefoliated forest. These two factors probably would not have a great effect on higher plants and animals, but might temporarily affect lower life forms that are more dependent on specific microclimatic niches for growth and survival.

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON SOILS

One of the principal fears about exposing soil in the tropics is the possibility of increased laterization. The term laterite generally refers to an indurated concretary deposit, high in iron or aluminum oxide content, which has formed in place by the weathering of rocks. True laterite hardens irreversibly. Laterite has been found to be best developed when the following conditions exist:⁵ (i) The climate must have high rainfall and uniformly high temperatures. (ii) The topography must have been fairly gentle, penplain in nature. (iii) A well-drained soil must have been present. This is usually an alluvial soil, but soils high in iron content may be an exception. (iv) There must have been a uniformly fluctuating water table which had a definite low level during the dry season. (v) Stable geological conditions must have existed for a long time.

About 30 percent of the soils of Vietnam have a potential for laterization.⁵ Many of the red soils of Vietnam (often confused with laterite) dry out and become hard but soften again when wet. The soft doughy laterite, which hardens to a rocklike material when exposed to alternate wetting and drying, is not found in significant amounts in Vietnam.

Two kinds of laterite are found in Vietnam. Wormhole laterite is generally consolidated

Footnotes at end of article.

and occurs as massive beds, commonly at the bottom of a 1- to 30-foot layer of well-drained soil. It is red to brown in color, and has a sluggy appearance due to numerous holes, often interconnecting, and thus facilitate the passage of groundwater. Worm-hole laterite occurs throughout most of the Mekong Terrace region, in soils of both forested and cultivated areas.

Pellet laterite is unconsolidated and occurs as small pellet-like concretions in an iron- or aluminum-rich soil. The hard concretions are usually surrounded by fine-grained material that is generally clayey when moist. The coarser particles in this fine-grained material are commonly iron-stained quartz sand. Pellet laterite occurs on the iron-rich basalt plateau soils of the Mekong Terrace, the basalt plateau of Ban Me Thuot, the extreme western edge of the high plateau west of Pleiku, and in a small area around Quang Ngai. Pellet laterite has been observed forming on the metamorphic rocks near Bong Son and on some of the rocks near Qui Nhon. It is likely that worm-hole and pellet laterite could occur in the northeastern coastlands, but this has not been substantiated by field studies.

Laterization under natural conditions is a long-term process. The process is accelerated when soil is exposed to direct solar radiation and wind. I do not find it reasonable to conclude that the defoliation program in Vietnam would hasten the laterization process significantly because bare soil does not result from defoliation. It is possible, however, that laterization will be accelerated around base and Special Forces camps where the soil is maintained free of vegetation.

The amount of erosion that occurs as a consequence of defoliation depends on soil type, topography, relative degree of vegetative cover, and amount and intensity of rainfall. In general, erosion is greatest on steep slopes of bare soil, decreasing as slope decreases and as vegetation becomes more dense. It was not possible to examine defoliated forest in mountainous terrain for evidence of accelerated erosion. I did not detect such evidence during flights over the defoliated areas. Gully and sheet erosion were noted around camps where there was little or no vegetation, regardless of whether or not those areas were sprayed.

The possibilities of flooding or of changes in the water table as a result of defoliation are subjects that need careful consideration. The replacement of woody vegetation with grass in the southwestern United States has resulted in perennial flow of streams that were only intermittent before and also in the flow of springs that had been dry for many years. There are cases where harvesting trees increased stream flow⁶ and where clear-cutting resulted in a marshy condition unsuitable for desirable timber species.⁷ I mention these points because they have occurred elsewhere and could conceivably occur in Vietnam. But I do not know the local situation well enough to make a reasonable assessment of that probability.

Microorganisms are an essential feature of the soil system. A herbicide that killed the microorganisms would have a severe effect on soil ecology. What are the possibilities of destroying the microbial population in the soil with the chemicals being used for defoliation in Vietnam?

The code names for the defoliants used in Vietnam are Orange and White. The constituents of Orange are the normal butyl esters of (2,4-dichlorophenoxy)-acetic acid and (2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy)acetic acid, better known as 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, respectively, in a 1:1 ratio. The constituents of White are trisopropanolamine salts of 2,4-D and picloram (4-amino-3,5,6-trichloropicolinic

acid) in a 4:1 ratio. There seems to be no danger that any of these chemicals will kill microorganisms. Actually, numbers of soil microorganisms capable of inactivating 2,4-D apparently increase when 2,4-D is present in the soil. Thus, repeated applications of 2,4-D were less persistent in soil than the initial application.⁸ There are no reports suggesting that the effect of 2,4,5-T on microorganisms is significantly different from that of 2,4-D. Picloram does not destroy soil microorganisms, but neither is the microbial population enriched as a result of picloram application. Thus, picloram cannot be considered a good energy source for microorganisms. The decomposition of picloram is an incidental process in the breakdown of soil organic matter, requiring the loss of approximately 10,000 to 100,000 pounds of organic matter per pound of herbicide.⁹

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON PLANT AND ANIMAL POPULATIONS

The chemicals 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are highly selective herbicides, but picloram is somewhat less selective. Not all plant species react similarly to them. The differential susceptibility may be a function of such factors as time of treatment, nature of the leaf surface, variable capacity for absorption and translocation of the herbicide, biochemistry of the plant, or the nature of the herbicide itself. Some established annual and perennial grasses are tolerant to rates of application used in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN). Thus, in any vegetative type, one would expect that some species would not be killed; some would be killed easily; others with difficulty. Most species in the mangrove association are highly susceptible to the herbicides being used for defoliation in Vietnam, and thus represent an exception to the general rule. For that reason, and because the mangrove association presents a different set of ecological considerations than the semi-deciduous forest does, each will be discussed separately.

MANGROVE FOREST

Botanical considerations. The mangrove association is relatively simple floristically. The principal species include: *Avicennia marina*, *A. intermedia*, *Rhizophora conjugata*, *Bruguiera parviflora*, *B. gymnorhiza*, *Ceriops candolleana*, *Nipa fruticans*, *Phoenix* spp., *Lumnitzera coccinea*, *Sonneratia acida*, *Melaleuca leucadendron*, *Excoecaria agallocha*, *Carapa obovata*, and *Acrotychia laurifolia*.

Other plant species are represented in the mangrove type, but they are of lesser importance. Bamboo was not observed in the mangrove association.

Susceptibility to herbicides. The mangrove species seem to be almost uniformly susceptible to Orange and White, the herbicides used for their control in Vietnam. An exception is *Nipa fruticans*, which is reported to be resistant to White. Strips of mangrove on both sides of the Ong Doc River, sprayed with Orange in 1962, where of particular interest. The treated strips were still plainly visible. Thus, one must presume that the trees were not simply defoliated, but were killed.

Successful aspects. The mangrove type in the Republic of Vietnam occurs on about 2800 square kilometers.¹⁰ *Avicennia marina* is the pioneer species of the mangrove type, colonizing on the clay accretion areas at the sea face. At the 5th and 6th year *Rhizophora conjugata*, *Bruguiera parviflora*, and *Ceriops candolleana* will develop where there has been partial stabilization of the soil. At about the 20th year *Rhizophora* and *Bruguiera* will dominate the site. From that point on, further succession depends on the degree of silting and the consequent decrease of water circulation. As organic matter accumulates, conditions are created for the advent of other species into the mangrove complex. The final stage in the mangrove type is the cajuput (*Melaleuca leucaden-*

dron), found on the highest, most stable soil above high tide.

Seed production of mangrove species is annual and abundant to prolific, with seeds viviparous or otherwise, of high germinability and capable of remaining viable for long periods.¹¹ Germination and rooting are usually rapid and successful. In some locations, when the seeds are able to settle as a result of favorable water conditions, natural regeneration may become successfully established in less than a year. The movement of the water, however, may not only bring in seeds but may also carry them away before they can take root.

TABLE 1.—THE TOTAL CATCH, IN METRIC TONS, FOR THE PAST 3 YEARS IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Year	Fish		
	Fresh water	Marine	Others ¹
1965.....	57,000	289,000	29,000
1966.....	64,710	287,450	28,340
1967.....	54,300	324,700	31,700

¹ Including cuttlefish, mollusks, shrimp, crabs, and the like.

The most serious animal pest is the crab, which may entirely prevent regeneration by attacks on seedlings.¹² In Malaya two species of *Acrostichum* (a fern) may hinder the establishment of waterborne seedlings. The fern grows and spreads rapidly when the tree cover is removed. McKinley¹⁰ mentions two ferns (Choa, a creeping form; Don, an erect form) as occurring in the climax mangrove, but does not comment on their possible interference with regeneration.

Ecological considerations. According to the timetable discussed by McKinley, about 20 years are required for the establishment of a dominant *Rhizophora-Bruguiera* association. That timetable was established for a situation in which newly silted areas were colonized by *Avicennia* and then were replaced by *Rhizophora-Bruguiera*. It is not unreasonable to suspect that the same timetable might apply to areas in which the trees had been killed by herbicides. Dead trees do not hold soil as well as living trees do. The amount of soil removed would depend on the rapidity of tidal recession, which is unknown to me. The greater the amount of soil removed, the greater would be the time required for regeneration of a mangrove stand similar to the original.

The regeneration of mangrove since the 1962 treatments along the Ong Doc River was observed from an aircraft flying at 2000 feet (600 meters). Regeneration was apparent as fingers extending into the treated strip, but I could not determine whether regeneration had occurred across the entire breadth of the treated strip.

In the mangrove areas treated in 1962, trees of the colonizing species were not yet discernible from 600 meters on all the treated area. Thus, if the information provided by McKinley is extrapolated, 20 years may be a reasonable estimate of the time needed for this forest to return to its original condition.

There is little information available on the effect of killing mangrove on animal populations. In that regard, I considered the food chain among aquatic organisms. Although it was not possible to obtain information on the many links in the food chain, phytophagous and carnivorous fish would be near the top of the food chain. Disruption of lower links in the chain might be expected to reduce fish populations.

Information on fish populations is based on fish catch statistics provided by the Fisheries Branch of U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) (Table 1). Fish catch appears to have been increasing. The drop for freshwater fish in 1967 was at first a cause for concern. But the assistant chief of

Footnotes at end of article.

inland fisheries explained that the reduction was due to an absence of flooding in the Mekong Delta in 1967. When flooding does occur, fish are trapped in rice paddies and fishermen have no trouble catching them.

The statistics on the fish catch give a strong indication that the aquatic food chain has not been seriously disturbed. Data comparable to those available for fish were not available for birds and other animals.

The application of herbicide in strips or in a checkerboard pattern rather than large-area treatment would have an ecologic advantage. The trees remaining in untreated strips would provide a seed source for reforestation as well as a habitat for animals and lower plant forms. The ecological effects in large treated areas would be greater and recovery probably be slower.

SEMIDECIDUOUS FOREST

The Republic of Vietnam has a total area of 172,540 square kilometers, of which about 30 percent is forested¹⁰ (Table 2). Some coniferous forest may have been treated in strips along roads, but I have no specific information on that point. I am sure that no large areas of coniferous forest have been treated.

Botanical considerations. I will not attempt to characterize all of the vegetation types of the Republic of Vietnam. There are different forest types, but except for the pine forest, the differences are ones of degree rather than substance. My discussion of the forests in III Corps can be extrapolated to other semideciduous forests of RVN. It cannot be extrapolated to the pine forests or to the small area of rain forest that probably exists in a small area of the northwestern part of RVN, along the Laotian border.

The forests of war zone C are, for the most part, secondary forests with an admixture of bamboo, and semideciduous forest of *Lagerstroemia* and legumes (General Forest map of RVN, Phan Thuong Tuu, 1966). The forests of war zone D are moist forest over most of the area, and semideciduous forest of *Lagerstroemia* and legumes over the remainder.

There are obvious differences among the three forest types. The differences are taxonomic for the most part. Physiognomically, they are similar. In terms of ecologic considerations, therefore, they will be discussed collectively.

The three forests are similarly characterized by having members of the family Dipterocarpaceae as dominant trees in the upper canopy. This does not mean necessarily that dipterocarps are numerically superior. Other well-represented families include the Leguminosae, Meliaceae, Lythraceae, Guttiferae, and Sterculiaceae.^{10 12 14} Botanical composition, taxonomically and numerically, varies from one location to another.

The difficulty of a botanic description of the forest may be appreciated with the knowledge that about 1500 woody species occur in RVN.¹⁰ Moreover, I saw the forests at a time when identification was most difficult. Many species are normally deciduous during the dry season; many that are normally evergreen had been defoliated by herbicides or fire.

The period from mid-March to mid-April was not an ideal time to assess the ecologic impact of the defoliation program on the semideciduous forests of the Republic of Vietnam. The combination of natural defoliation, defoliation by herbicides, and defoliation by many, many fires (civilian and military caused) made the determination of the causes of defoliation difficult. A careful delineation of the causative factors within a 1-month period was not possible. An observer making an ecologic assessment

during the middle or latter part of the rainy season would not have to contend with the confounding influences of natural defoliation and fire.

Susceptibility to herbicides. Trees in the semideciduous forests of Vietnam are almost uniformly susceptible in terms of initial defoliation. But when defoliation and the percentage of plants killed are considered, the average susceptibility of the vegetative type is unknown. The best estimate I can obtain is an extrapolation of data developed in Thailand by Darrow *et al.*¹⁵ and in Puerto Rico by Tschirley *et al.*¹⁶

TABLE 2.—THE TYPES OF FOREST, THEIR AREA OF COVERAGE, AND THE APPROXIMATE AREA TREATED FOR DEFOLIATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Vegetation type	Coverage (km ²)	Area treated (km ²)
Open forest (semideciduous forest).....	50,150	8,140
Flooded area:		
Mangrove.....	2,800	960
Other aquatic plants.....	2,000	0
Coniferous forest:		
3-leaved pine.....	900	0
2-leaved pine.....	350	0

Darrow's tests in Thailand were conducted in a semievergreen monsoon forest having an annual precipitation of about 40 inches. Two hundred twenty plant species were identified from two test sites totaling 3400 acres, so species diversity was high. Darrow found that two or more gallons of Purple (same as Orange except that 20 percent of the 2,4,5-T is an isobutyl ester rather than *n*-butyl ester) caused defoliation greater than 60 to 65 percent for a period of 6 to 8 or 9 months. Percentages of kill were not given, but they would have been considerably lower than for defoliation.

My collaborators and I worked in a semievergreen forest in Puerto Rico¹⁶ having an annual precipitation of about 85 inches. Species diversity was high; 106 woody species were recorded on 2.4 acres, in an area adjacent to the aerial test pilots. We also worked in a tropical rain forest in Puerto Rico having an annual precipitation of about 120 inches.¹⁶ About 88 woody species were recorded for the rain forest site. Defoliation of the semievergreen forest treated with 3 gallons of Purple was 61 percent 6 months after treatment. In the rain forest, an equivalent rate of Orange provided 66 percent defoliation 6 months after treatment and 55 percent 1 year after treatment.

Thus, the defoliation obtained in taxonomically distinct forests in opposite parts of the world was similar. It is justifiable, then, to expect that average defoliation in the semideciduous forests of Vietnam would be about the same. Actually, I would expect defoliation in Vietnam to be somewhat lower because applications are made from greater height than was the case for the experimental work in Thailand and Puerto Rico.

Multiple treatments were not made in Thailand or Puerto Rico, so the effects of two and three treatments in war zones C and D can only be inferred from extensive experience in woody plant control in temperate zones and from my experience in tropical America, instead of being extrapolated from actual research data. But the inference is necessary because the ecologic impact becomes greater with each succeeding treatment.

A single treatment with 3 gallons of Orange or White would not be expected to have a great or lasting effect on a semideciduous forest in Vietnam. Some trees would be killed, and the canopy would be less dense temporarily. But within several years the canopy would again be closed, and even a careful

observer would be hard pressed to circumscribe the treated area. A second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect.

Research on a two-storied oakyaupon forest in Texas showed that the top canopy intercepted about 72 percent of the spray droplets and the understory intercepted an additional 22 percent. Only 6 percent of the droplets reached the ground.¹⁶ Thus, one would expect that the principal effect from an initial treatment would be on trees of the top canopy. As the density of the top canopy is reduced, subsequent treatments will kill more trees in the top canopy and have a far greater effect on the understory, regenerating vegetation.

The theoretical response to multiple herbicide applications was supported by my observations on the ground. The area visited at Thien Ngon was sprayed with Orange on 19 December 1966; the area at Katum was treated with White on 9 November 1966 and with Orange on 28 October 1967. Two areas were visited at Tong Le Chon; one was treated with Orange on 23 September 1967, and the other was treated with White on 7 November 1966. There were more dead trees and a higher percentage of defoliation at Katum than at any other site. Granting the inadequacy of the sample at each location, the difference between Katum and the other sites was obvious. Despite more defoliation and more dead trees at Katum, the ground was not bare. Many established grasses are tolerant to the herbicides used. In addition, grasses, sedges, and vines quickly occupy areas that have been defoliated. Grasses were abundant in all defoliated areas observed on the ground.

Successful aspects. I can think of no better introduction to this section than a quotation from Richards:¹⁷

"The process of natural regeneration in tropical forests is no doubt exceedingly complex, and though its practical importance to the forester is obvious, surprisingly little is known about it. Much of what has been written about the so-called 'natural regeneration' of rain forest refers to the reproduction of a few economic species under conditions rendered more or less unnatural by the exploitation of timber. Before regeneration under these artificial conditions can be understood or controlled scientifically, we need to know what happens under undisturbed conditions, and information about this is extremely scanty."

I must emphasize the last sentence of the quotation. Data on regeneration of tropical forests is indeed scanty—and particularly scanty for Vietnam!

There is general agreement that the usual successional series in a terrestrial tropical forest is grass—shrub—secondary forest—primary forest.^{14 17 18} The same successional series could be applied equally well to deciduous forests in temperate zones.

Because of the inadequacy of data about forest regeneration in Vietnam, perhaps an example in a different situation would be instructive. The island of Krakatau presents a good example of ecologic succession. Richards described the island as follows:¹⁷

"Krakatau is one of a group of small volcanic islands situated between Java and Sumatra. Early in 1883 it was about 9 km long and 5 km broad, rising to a peak 2,728 ft (822 m) above sea level. At this date the whole island was covered with luxuriant vegetation. About the nature and composition of this vegetation next to nothing is known, but there is every reason for supposing that it was mostly tropical rain forest similar to that now existing in the neighboring parts of Sumatra. In May 1883, the volcano which had long been regarded as extinct began to be active and the activity gradually increased until it reached a climax on August 26 and 27. On these two days occurred the famous eruption, the sound of which was heard as

Footnotes at end of article.

far away as Ceylon and Australia. More than half the island sank beneath the sea, the peak being split in two, though its highest point still remained. The surviving parts of Krakatau were covered with pumice stone and ash to an average depth of about 30 m and a new marginal belt 4.6 km² in area was added to the southern coast. During the period of volcanic activity the bulk of the vegetation was certainly destroyed."

For a while the island remained without any vegetation. The only living thing a visitor saw in May 1884 was one spider. In 1886 there was already a considerable amount of vegetation on the island and the succeeding seral stages have developed quite rapidly.

In 1964 Richards wrote about the ecology of Krakatau:

"The development of vegetation on Krakatau has not yet reached a stable climax stage, but the general course of future changes can be predicted with some confidence, at least for the middle and upper regions of the island. In the former it may be expected that the *Macaranga-Ficus* woodland will develop by a series of changes into a stable climax rain forest to some extent similar to the mixed primary rain forest of the neighboring parts of Sumatra and Java. How long this development will take is difficult to guess, but the study of secondary successions suggests that it will be much longer than from the great eruption to the present day."

The example of Krakatau cannot, and should not, be applied to the semideciduous forests of Vietnam for at least three reasons. (i) Defoliation does not destroy all vegetation; (ii) it does not cover the soil with pumice stone and ash; and (iii) RVN is not an island. Krakatau is merely an example of the relative time needed for the development of a mature forest when it must start from nothing. That is not the case in Vietnam.

There are a few records available for tree ages in tropical forests that give an indication of the time required for regeneration of a mature forest. An average individual of *Parashorea malaanonan* in the Philippine dipterocarp forest reaches a diameter of 80 centimeters in 197 years.¹⁹ The average maximum age of *Shorea leprosula* in Malaya is 250 years.²⁰ Both are primary forest species. The fast-growing trees characteristic of secondary forest have a shorter life than do primary forest species.

The principal ecologic danger imposed by repeated treatments with herbicides is that saplings and poles present in the lower story, and then seedlings, may be killed. If that happens in large areas, natural reseeding may be a problem. Dipterocarp seeds are disseminated by the wind and thus would be expected to be among the first tree species to repopulate an area. Seeds of other species, dependent on dissemination by small mammals and rodents and by birds, would probably not spread as rapidly. Seeds of some species would undoubtedly remain viable in the soil and would germinate after the last in a series of multiple treatments. Many species in the family Leguminosae have that capability. Less is known about seed characteristics in other families. Turrill²¹ reported it has been proved at Rothamstead that seeds of arable weeds remained viable in soil under pasture after 300 years in one area and 30 to 40 years in others:

"Little is known of the time scale of secondary successions in the tropics. Chevalier (1948) states that the forest on the site of the ancient town of Angkor Vat in Cambodia, destroyed probably some five or six centuries ago, now resembles the virgin tropical forest of the district, but still shows certain differences. In general, it seems clear that the longer the period between the destruction of the primary forest and the onset of the secondary succession and the greater the modification of the soil and the environment

in general during this period, the longer the time needed for the re-establishment of the climax."²²

The paragraph quoted does not apply to the forests being defoliated in Vietnam because the Vietnamese forests were not primary, but secondary, at the time of treatment. The time required for the establishment of a secondary forest is much less than for a primary forest.

The greatest danger resulting from repeated defoliation treatments in Vietnam is that such areas will be invaded by bamboo. The presence of bamboo is the most constant feature of the semi-deciduous forests I saw in Vietnam. Species of large bamboo (the most common being *Dendrocalamus strictus* and *Bambusa arundinacea* according to a local RVN forester) are particularly apparent in areas where the "rai" (slash and burn) system of agriculture has been practiced. But bamboo is not limited to areas that were previously cleared of trees. A small-stemmed bamboo is present as an understory in many forested areas and can be seen frequently where trees have been defoliated. In addition, the small bamboo *Schizostachyum sollingeri*, 10 to 15 feet high, was present in the forest at all of the camps I visited. The presence of bamboo in Asian forests is well documented.^{17, 23} Aerial observations in RVN suggest that it first invades new areas along routes of more favorable moisture supply. From there it can spread throughout the forest.

While making ground observations at the four Special Forces camps, I attempted to evaluate the relative density of seedling and sapling tree species in bamboo-infested sites. Although I have no quantitative data, seedlings were rare in dense bamboo, but frequent to numerous where there was no bamboo. Probably of more importance is the fact that saplings were rare in dense bamboo.

The length of time that bamboo might retard the natural successional progression is unknown, but I am certain it would cause a retardation. The following statement by Ahmed²⁴ may be cause for concern: "A bamboo will be the first member to colonize on a new site in a seed year and will be the last to leave it. Once established on a soil it is difficult to eradicate it."

The life history of different bamboo species varies, but usually culms die after flowering. The germination to flowering cycle may be from 30 to 50 years.^{17, 24} Flowering is gregarious (whole populations flowering in 1 year) in some species and sporadic in others. Most bamboo species have very efficient vegetative reproduction from buds on creeping rhizomes.

Seedling mortality of tree species is naturally high in tropical forests. A study of *Euterpe globosa*, a palm found in the American tropics, showed that the mortality of seedlings was 95 percent, of established seedlings 12 percent, and of shrubs 64 percent. Thus, only 1.6 percent of the seedlings survived to become trees.²⁵ Another study²⁶ showed the average half-life of all seedlings in test plots to be 6 months.

If it were not for the probable invasion by bamboo of severely defoliated areas in the forests of Vietnam, I am reasonably certain that the successional progression to a secondary forest would proceed without undue retardation. A reason for feeling so is based on data I obtained from plots in Puerto Rico that were treated at the rate of 3, 9, and 27 pounds per acre as follows: picloram, 5-bromo-3-sec-butyl-6-methyluracil [bromacil], 3,6-dichloro-*o*-anisic acid [dicamba], 3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea [diuron], (2,3,6-trichlorophenyl) acetic acid [fenac], and 2,4-bis(isopropylamino)-6-methylthio-*s*-triazine [prometon] applied to the soil. Two years after treatment, the plots were examined for the presence of seedlings. Many of the secondary forest species

and several primary forest species were present as seedlings. In addition, there was no apparent differential effect of the six herbicides.

The presence of seedlings on plots treated with such high rates of herbicides is an important point. Several of the herbicides, particularly fenac and picloram, persist in soil. There is no doubt that highly susceptible plant species would be affected by herbicide residues in the soil. But experience has shown that species commonly present in forests are not so susceptible that regeneration would be prevented. The small experimental plots in Puerto Rico were treated with 27 pounds per acre of picloram; one treatment with White in Vietnam would apply only 1.5 pounds of picloram per acre.

In conclusion, the time scale for succession in a semideciduous forest in RVN is unknown. Single treatments with defoliants should not cause severe successional problems but multiple treatments probably will because of site dominance by bamboo.

Ecologic considerations. The ecologic considerations as they apply to plant populations were discussed in the previous section of this article. The effect of defoliation on animal populations is truly unknown.

Men stationed at Special Forces camps have told me of seeing deer (two reports), birds (many reports), tiger (one sighting, several sound identifications), elephant (two reports), monkey (numerous reports), and cold-blooded vertebrates (numerous reports). I saw a tiger track in the road at Katum. There were no reports of bovines. It is possible that such bovines as the kouprey, gaur, and banteng, reported to be rare,²⁸ are no longer present in the defoliated areas in war zones C and D. But I suspect that bombing, artillery, fire, human presence, and hunting have had a far greater effect than has defoliation.

TOXICITY OF HERBICIDES

A discussion of ecologic effects would hardly be complete without mentioning the relative toxicity of herbicides being used for defoliation and crop destruction. The herbicides used in Vietnam are only moderately toxic to warm-blooded animals. None deserve a lengthy discussion except for Agent Blue (cacodylic acid), which contains arsenic. Inorganic arsenicals such as arsenic trioxide, sodium arsenite, lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, and Paris green are extremely toxic. Organic arsenicals, such as Blue, have a low mammalian toxicity. Two series of organic arsenicals are used as herbicides. The arsonic acid series is formed by a single organic group combined directly to arsenic; the arsinic acid series have two organic groups. By varying the organic group in either series, a wide range of phytotoxicities can be obtained in products with a relatively low level of mammalian toxicity²⁹ (table 3).

Toxicity studies for White have shown the oral dose needed to kill 50 percent of test animals to be (LD₅₀) 3080 milligrams per kilogram for rats, 2000 for sheep, and more than 3163 for cattle.²⁷ The oral dose for Blue is 2600 milligrams per kilogram for rats.²⁸ There is no evidence to suggest that the herbicides used in Vietnam will cause toxicity problems for man or animals.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

If my assignment had been simply to determine if the defoliation program had an ecological effect, the answer would have been a simple "yes," and a trip to the country would not have been necessary. But to assess the magnitude of the ecologic effect is an entirely different matter.

TABLE 3

The LD₅₀ (dose in milligrams per kilogram of body weight needed to kill 50 percent of test animals) for the herbicides used in RVN and for several other chemical compounds are as follows:²⁹

Footnotes at end of article.

Chemical:	LD ₅₀
Sodium arsenite -----	10-50
Paraquat ¹ -----	150
2,4,5-T -----	100-300
2,4-D -----	300-1000
Cacodylic acid ² -----	830
Aspirin -----	1775
Picloram -----	8200

¹ 1,1'-Dimethyl-4,4'-bipyridinium salt.

² Active ingredient of Agent Blue.

One must realize that biologic populations, even those remote from man, are dynamic. Seasonal changes, violent weather events, fire, birth, maturation, senescence, and death cause a continuing ecologic flux. Normally, the ecologic flux operates within narrow limits in a climax community. It is only catastrophic events that cause an extreme ecologic shift and reduce the community to a lower seral stage.

The defoliation program has caused ecologic changes. I do not feel the changes are irreversible, but complete recovery may take a long time. The mangrove type is killed with a single treatment. Regeneration of the mangrove forest to its original condition is estimated to require about 20 years.

A single treatment on semideciduous forest would cause an inconsequential ecologic change. Repeated treatments will result in invasion of many sites by bamboo. Presence of dense bamboo will then retard regeneration of the forest. The time scale for regeneration of semideciduous forest is unknown. Available information is so scanty that a prediction would have no validity and certainly no real meaning. Most of the defoliation treatments in the semideciduous forests have been made in strips along lines of communication. The ecologic effect of defoliation in those areas would not be as severe as in areas where large blocks have been treated.

The effect of defoliation on animals is not known, but it does not appear to have been extreme. I hasten to add that I know far less about animals than about plants. Fish catch has increased during a period of intensive treatment for defoliation, which surprised and pleased me. Actual data were not available for population trends of other forms of animal life. Large mammals have been seen recently in war zones C and D, the areas of greatest defoliation activity. Included were tiger, monkey, elephant, and deer.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The desirability of ecologic research in Vietnam after the war ends cannot be over-emphasized. The research should be administered through an institution that will provide continuity and breadth for the research program. The opportunity of establishing ecologic research under the International Biological Program should be explored.

(2) Continuing assessment of the defoliation program as it affects forestry and watershed values should be made. Ground observations are most desirable, but aerial surveys during various seasons of the year will contribute much good information.

(3) From an ecologic point of view, the concept of defoliating in strips or in a checkerboard pattern has great merit. Un-defoliated areas would serve as a seed source for regeneration and as habitat for wildlife.

FOOTNOTES

¹ J. E. McDonald, *Weather* 17, 1 (1962).

² J. P. Decker, *Plant Physiol.* 37, 393 (1962).

³ H. L. Ohman and R. L. Pratt, "The daytime influence of irrigation upon desert humidities," *Tech. Rep. No. EP-35* (U.S. Army Quartermasters R & D Command, 1956).

⁴ R. C. Sutcliffe, *Quart. J. Meteorol. Soc.* 82, 394 (1956).

⁵ J. F. Taranik and E. J. Cording, "Laterite and its engineering properties," *Mimeo Rep. 579th Engin. Detachment (Terrain)* (U.S. Army, A.P.O. 96491, 1967).

⁶ G. R. Trimble, Jr., K. G. Reinhart, H. H. Webster, *J. Forestry* 61, 635 (1963).

⁷ W. F. Johnston, *ibid.* 66, 566 (1968).

⁸ T. J. Sheets and L. L. Danielson, "Herbicides in soils," *Tech. Rep. No. ARS-20-9* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Washington, D.C., 1960), p. 170.

⁹ C. E. Youngson, C. A. I. Goring, R. W. Meikle, M. H. Scott, J. D. Griffith, *Biochemia* 1967 (No. 15), 19 (1967).

¹⁰ T. W. McKinley, *The Forests of Free Vietnam* (Ministry of Agriculture, Saigon, 1957) (In English and Vietnamese).

¹¹ *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 129 (1958).

¹² D. S. P. Noakes, *ibid.* 2, 309 (1957).

¹³ Thai Cong Tung, *Natural Environment and Land Use in South Vietnam* (Ministry of Agriculture, Saigon, 1967), p. 156.

¹⁴ L. Williams, "Vegetation of Southeast Asia—studies of forest types," *Tech. Rep. No. CR-49-65* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1965).

¹⁵ R. A. Darrow, G. B. Truchelut, C. M. Bartlett, "OCONUS defoliation test program," *Tech. Rep. No. 79* (U.S. Army Biology Center, Fort Detrick, Md., 1966), p. 149.

¹⁶ F. H. Tschirley et al., "Response of tropical and subtropical woody plants to chemical treatments," *Tech. Rep. No. CR-13-67* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 197.

¹⁷ P. W. Richards, *The Tropical Rain Forest—An Ecological Study* (Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1964), p. 450.

¹⁸ *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 59 (1958).

¹⁹ W. H. Brown, cited in (15).

²⁰ J. G. Watson, *Malayan Forester* 6, 146 (1937).

²¹ W. B. Turrill, *Gardener's Chron.* 142, 37 (1957).

²² L. Williams, "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico, and Texas," *Tech. Rep. No. CR-12-67* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 410; anonymous, *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 151 (1958); "Timber trends and prospects in the Asia-Pacific Region," *FAO ECAFE Publ. No. E/CN, 11/533* (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 1961), p. 224.

²³ K. J. Ahmed, *Trop. Silviculture* 2, 287 (1957).

²⁴ P. A. McClure, *The Bamboos, A Fresh Perspective* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966), p. 347.

²⁵ H. T. Odum, *Annual Report 1965* (Puerto Rico Nuclear Center, Rio Piedras, 1965), p. 220.

²⁶ W. B. House, L. H. Goodson, H. M. Gadberry, K. W. Docktor, "Assessment of ecological effects of extensive or repeated use of herbicides," *Midwest Research Institute Rep. No. 3103-B* (Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Mo., 1967), p. 369.

²⁷ G. E. Lynn, *Down Earth* 20, 9 (1965); J. T. Weimer et al., *Toxicological Studies Relating to the Use of White (Tordon 101) as a Defoliant* (U.S. Army Edgewood Arsenal Pharmacology Laboratories, Edgewood, Md., 1967).

²⁸ *Book on Organic Arsenicals* (Ansul Chemical Co., Marinette, Wis., 1965).

²⁹ H. M. Hull, *Herbicide Handbook of the Weed Society of America* (Humphrey Press, Geneva, N.Y., 1967), p. 293.

CHEMICAL CARGOES POSE THREAT—DERAILMENTS NOW GRAVE DANGER

WASHINGTON (UPI).—"In the past, it wasn't a big deal, but now if you have a derailment you might blow a whole town off the map."

Talking was a government safety expert investigating the growing number of disasters triggered by the derailment of railroad tank cars filled with volatile explosives, and lethal chemicals and gases.

TANK CAR SPLIT OPEN

In Crete, Neb., last month 19 cars of a Chicago, Burlington & Quincy freight jumped the track, sliced open a tank car parked on a siding, and let loose its cargo of anhydrous

ammonia, an acrid fertilizer used for its high nitrogen content.

The deadly ammonia seeped into nearby homes and killed five persons. Three others who had hitched rides on the freight died in the wreck and 36 other persons suffered injuries because of the gas.

In January, 15 cars of a Southern Railway freight train derailed at Laurel, Miss., rupturing a tank car filled with propane gas and setting off a chain of explosions and fires.

TOWN EVACUATED

The blast sent chunks of the tank car whistling through the air like mammoth pieces of shrapnel and a 10-block area of Laurel was set afire, but somehow only two persons were killed.

In Dunreith, Ind., the same type of catastrophe occurred in December, 1968, when a Penn Central freight train derailed, touching off a fire in a chemical-carrying tank car.

The fire caused an explosion and the entire town was evacuated. There were no deaths but the fire destroyed the town's major industry, a cannery, seven homes, and polluted a nearby stream. The total damage: over \$1 million.

The Interstate Commerce Commission says that the output of industrial chemicals has gone up 350 per cent since World War II. Nearly two billion pounds of industrial explosives are transported each year—along with a rising tide of military explosives. Added to this list of dangerous cargoes are shipments of rocket fuel, and radioactive material.

NEW POTENTIAL FOR DEATH

"It is now obvious that railroads derailment accidents, dangerous enough in themselves, have acquired a new and catastrophic potential for death and destruction previously unknown," said John H. Reed, a member of the national Transportation Safety Board.

In addition to the vastly increased number of dangerous shipments that could cause catastrophe in a derailment, there are now more derailments themselves than there have been in the past.

Between 1961 and 1967, derailment accidents increased 85 percent. In 1967, the last year for which complete figures were available, the railroads reported 4,960 derailments. Out of this total, 1,611 were caused by defective equipment.

RAIL INDUSTRY BLAMED

The Railway Labor Executives Assn. blames the railroad industry maintenance for the rising number of derailments. They are also highly critical of the lack of federal legislation to enforce rail safety.

Most railroad accidents are investigated by the railroads themselves and the results reported to the government.

"Clearly, self-policing by the railroads puts the public's safety in second place when it comes to the biggest cause of train accidents—faulty equipment and rail lines," the RLEA claims.

The National Transportation Safety Board also has warned Congress that because of the "relatively high rate of derailments, collisions and grade crossing accidents there appears to be a need for a general re-examination of existing railroad maintenance and operating procedures."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the recommittal vote on House Resolution 270, I was present and voted against recommittal. However, on final passage I was before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and therefore missed the vote on final passage of that resolution.

I would like to have the RECORD show

that had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The gentleman's explanation will appear in the RECORD.

REPORT ON REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure at your direction to accompany a group of Members of the House of Representatives who visited the Republic of Korea during the first week of March. All members of our delegation found the trip to be interesting, informative, and extremely worthwhile.

In order that we may properly report to you and to the House on our visit to the free and democratic Republic of Korea, I have taken this special order.

The visit of our delegation to the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea resulted from an invitation extended to the Speaker by the distinguished Vice Speaker of the Korean National Assembly, the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang, who suggested in his invitation that an exchange of views between our two legislative bodies would be beneficial to our respective countries.

The Speaker was unable to attend and he designated me to represent him and to serve as chairman of the group. The delegation from the House was made up of 23 Members of Congress who were invited after consultation with the Speaker the minority leader, and others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert the list of members of the delegation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF THE KOREAN DELEGATION DEMOCRATS

Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, chairman;
W. R. Poage, of Texas;
Melvin Price, of Illinois;
Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts;
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts;
Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey;
Joseph E. Karth, of Minnesota;
Richard T. Hanna, of California;
Edward J. Patten, of New Jersey;
Eligio de la Garza, of Texas;
Thomas S. Foley, of Washington;
Lee H. Hamilton, of Indiana;
David Pryor, of Arkansas;
Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina;

REPUBLICANS

Jackson Betts, of Ohio;
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey;
William S. Broomfield, of Michigan;
Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota;
Chester Mize, of Kansas;
J. William Stanton, of Ohio;
Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah;
Thomas S. Kleppe, of North Dakota;
John N. Camp, of Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, 16 committees of the House were represented in the group. The Members ranged from among the most senior to those serving their first term. There were 14 Democrats and nine Republicans.

Nearly all geographic areas of the

country were represented from the east coast to the west coast and from the North to the South.

Our delegation represented, in the very truest sense of the word, a cross section of the House, reflecting very accurately, I feel, the political philosophies and the regional as well as the national interests of this body.

We left the United States on February 28 and arrived in Korea to a very warm welcome on Sunday afternoon, March 2.

We left to return to the United States early in the morning on March 7.

We had no set agenda for our meetings and discussions and selected in advance no particular topics to be discussed.

It is impossible for me adequately to describe the enthusiastic and warm reception and hospitality accorded our group.

Never, in my experience, has any congressional delegation been given a more heartfelt welcome.

Never have any of us come away from a country with a greater appreciation and understanding for such a strong and gallant ally.

We were privileged to visit with the President of the Republic of Korea and other leaders of his government, as well as the Speaker and leaders of the majority and opposition parties in the National Assembly.

We received extensive briefings from the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defense, the Foreign Minister, the Economic Planning Board, and the CIA. We also received very informative briefings from our distinguished Ambassador to Korea, Hon. William J. Porter and from the able commander of U.S. and U.N. forces, Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel III, and their staffs.

Also, as I said, we met with the Speaker and leaders of both parties in the Korean National Assembly.

We discussed at length the great progress being made by the Republic of Korea.

Never have we seen a more energetic, more enthusiastic, more determined people than the people of the Republic of Korea.

The economic progress they are making is amazing.

On every hand we could see new construction and new development.

Private business is taking a new and very justified look at Korea for investment purposes.

The gross national product of the Republic of Korea increased over 13 percent last year; there was a 42-percent expansion in their exports and almost a 29-percent increase in manufacturing production.

Those of us on the delegation found these statistics to be most impressive.

Much of what has been done has, of course, been accomplished with the advice and assistance of the United States.

Korea is not yet to the point where it can do without our economic aid.

However, I am convinced that we can make no better investment than investing in the strength and prosperity of a friend and ally like Korea.

The country is developing rapidly and many members of the delegation had an

opportunity to visit national development projects, industrial plants, educational institutions, to see for themselves the progress which has been accomplished.

We were also privileged to visit the demilitarized zone marking the northern boundary of the Republic of Korea which is jointly manned by Korean and United States troops.

We visited both American and Korean units.

I can tell you that we came away from there with a great appreciation of the tremendous job our boys are doing and the tremendous job being done by our Korean allies in holding that line against Communist expansion.

ROK soldiers are among the finest on earth.

The Republic of Korea is the second-largest contributor of armed forces to the struggle in Vietnam.

Today, there are approximately 50,000 Korean troops fighting side by side with U.S. forces in Vietnam.

I believe we have virtually unanimous agreement among those of us making this trip that our military aid to the Republic of Korea should continue and, if anything, it should be increased, in order that Korean troops manning the barrier against Communist infiltration south of the demilitarized zone might have the best quality of weapons available.

We should make a special effort to see that these people, among the very best of our friends, are given the military capability to defend themselves and the free world against the Communist menace of North Korea.

They are a great people and a great friend and we should help them in every way possible.

Our relationship with the Korean people has been tested in two wars during the last 20 years. They have not been found wanting.

The Koreans are among the most fervently anti-Communist people of the world due to their own bitter experience with the North Korean and Red Chinese Communist invasion. They are stalwart and brave supporters of U.S.-Asian policies. We have no stronger ally and no finer friend.

This is evidenced, as I have said, not only by the enormous contribution they make to their own defenses with one of the world's largest standing armies, but also by their valiant efforts in Vietnam.

The leaders of our armies in Southeast Asia have uniformly expressed the opinion that there is no finer fighting man than the Korean soldier. He is tough, courageous, brave and well-trained.

We were, as I indicated, impressed by the economic growth being made in Korea. U.S. aid and assistance has helped, but as I tried to point out earlier, the progress which has been made is most truly reflected in the industry, intelligence, and inherent vigor of the Korean people.

If we have any regrets at all about our trip to Korea it is that we did not have more of an opportunity to visit informally with the Korean man in the street.

He is representative of a strong and great people whom we are proud to call our friends.

We were impressed also by the way the Korean people have moved during the last several years to elective representative government. They have displayed an increased political maturity and have a devotion to democratic principles unsurpassed in the world.

The Koreans are alert to the dangers of international communism and they are among the most ardent supporters of regional political institutions and collective security arrangements as a means of combating Communist aggression and expansion.

I cannot conclude my remarks without commenting on the hospitality and generosity of the Korean people and their Government. We were honored to be received by the President who gave us the highest honors within the power of his great country to bestow.

We were welcomed and honored by the distinguished mayor of Seoul and by the great Seoul National University.

I was privileged to address the Korean National Assembly on behalf of the Speaker and our delegation and I will include as a part of my remarks the speech delivered at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for making this exchange with members of the National Assembly of Korea possible through your acceptance of the invitation extended by Vice Speaker Chang. This exchange with our counterparts in Korea has made it possible for all of us privileged to make this trip to obtain a much clearer view of the task faced by the Republic of Korea in the fields of economic and social development as well as in security and other defensive needs.

It has provided us with an opportunity to bring about a better understanding of problems which give rise to misunderstanding and concern between our two countries and in the views of both our legislative groups, and it has greatly and very properly enhanced the possibility of a solution to any problems which might arise.

It is, Mr. Speaker, the consensus of our group that this exchange was indeed valuable and that in the future we should from time to time exchange views with such visits as this. It would be my hope that these exchanges could be continued and that sometime soon a delegation from the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea might be invited to visit the United States.

In that regard, I would like to read to the House from a joint statement issued at the conclusion of our visit by the Vice Speaker of the Korean National Assembly and myself:

During their visit to Korea, members of the American delegation had extensive conversations with their counterparts in the National Assembly and with many other high officials of government.

This group also had an opportunity to visit other parts of Korea to see at first hand the jointly manned military defenses as well as national development projects.

Both Koreans and Americans found these exchanges to be extremely informative, beneficial and meaningful.

It was jointly concluded that exchanges such as this should be continued.

The American group expressed the hope that a similar delegation from the Korean National Assembly might visit the United States and that future U.S. delegations might return to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it is on this note that I want to conclude my remarks.

Exchanges such as this should be continued. I hope a delegation from the Korean National Assembly can visit the United States and that future U.S. delegations might return to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that there may be inserted a copy of the speech which I made at the Korean National Assembly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT's speech before Korean National Assembly follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT TO KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ON BEHALF OF HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Speaker and members of the Korean National Assembly: It is a great satisfaction for all of us to have this opportunity to visit Korea and to have the pleasure of seeing for ourselves the visible and tangible evidence of the political progress and economic growth of which we have heard so much.

The Twentieth Century has been very unkind to a number of nations, great and small, in Europe as well as in Asia, but few have undergone such ordeals and suffered such devastation as the ancient nation of Korea.

Yet today we see the Korean people, who have fought so many battles not of their own choosing, fighting and winning the most glorious battle of all, the battle over the old enemies of hunger, poverty, disease.

Having suffered grievously from the evils of our century, you are now beginning to enjoy the fruits which the modern age can also offer.

You are demonstrating to other peoples how these fruits can be cultivated and harvested.

And you are doing this without sacrificing the unique culture which your ancestors developed over so many hundreds and thousands of years.

Wherever one looks in Korea today, one can see how much can be accomplished under effective leadership by an intelligent, capable and courageous people.

Many of us in the United States Congress have been deeply concerned that the military and economic assistance which the United States has been able to extend to its friends has not always served the purposes for which it was intended.

But here in Korea we can see a tangible demonstration of how judicious aid, intelligently used by a skillful and determined people, can help, among other things, to produce fighting forces of extraordinary effectiveness.

Today these forces not only defend a strategic area of the free world on the mainland of Asia but are also making a valorous and indispensable contribution to the free world's struggle in Viet-Nam.

And may I assure you that the American people will not forget your willingness to sacrifice your sons for freedom in the far-away jungles of Vietnam, just as we sacrificed ours nineteen years ago in the mountains and valleys of Korea.

Moreover, Korea today is much more than a bastion on the front lines of the free world; it is a success story in the vitally important area of economic development.

We can see here how economic aid has

helped to produce dramatic economic progress and a climate favorable for foreign private investment.

And finally I can see before me now the evidence of political progress and maturity, a democratically elected parliamentary body.

Twenty-four years ago, or even fifteen years ago, who would have asserted with confidence that in so short a time Korea could achieve so much in any one of these fields, let alone in all three.

The recent history of the Republic of Korea is, quite literally, the story of the transformation of a nation from devastation and dependency to economic progress, initiative, hope, and integration into the community of nations.

A visitor need be here only a few hours to sense the new, almost visible, feeling of self-confidence and self-assurance which permeates your country.

This remarkable transformation is, above all, a product of sound governmental policies and the qualities of intelligence, diligence, receptivity to advice, and openness to innovation which characterize the Korean people.

But it is also, I believe, a product reflecting the wisdom and soundness of the unique partnership for progress between the United States and the Republic of Korea, a partnership to which both countries have contributed over many years.

We now see the fruits of our joint efforts.

The United States is deeply gratified that the external resources which it has been able to provide have been used so wisely by the Korean people.

These resources have included grant aid in dollars and in agricultural commodities, development loans, technical assistance, as well as ideas and suggestions of all kinds.

Some of the ideas have been accepted. Others have been rejected as not appropriate. Almost all of what you have accepted you have modified to meet your particular requirements. And this is as it should be in the give and take of a partnership.

It is a tribute both to you and to the Americans who have worked with you that this open and genuine dialogue of ideas has never flagged.

Success would have been impossible without genuine cooperation in our efforts to solve problems of mutual concern.

All of us can remember the years when our joint programs were attacked on the grounds that the situation in Korea was hopeless, and that the infant Republic would never be able to manage its own economic and political affairs. Events have given the lie to such negative views. Today Korea is proudly fighting by the side of the United States in Viet-Nam, taking a leading role in regional cooperation in Asia, and experiencing a phenomenal rate of economic growth.

The Korean example has, indeed, had a marked effect on the rest of Asia. I am told that representatives of other Asian nations have been visiting your country with increasing frequency over the past few years, hoping to learn how your successes were achieved.

I might add that private business in the United States, in Japan, and in many European nations is taking a vastly increased interest in Korea.

This trend shows great promise for the future.

Progress on the economic front has been a major element in Korea's growing self-confidence.

I need not enumerate all the vital statistics, but I would like to mention that the growth in your Gross National Product of over thirteen percent last year, the forty-two percent expansion in your exports, and the 28.5 percent increase in your manufacturing production are statistics which I and my colleagues find most impressive.

Major developments in the political field have accompanied economic progress.

After fourteen years of negotiation, a rea-

sonable settlement was reached with Japan and normal relations restored.

This removed a constant source of irritation and uncertainty and brought both your country and Japan into closer and broader contact with the rest of Asia.

The agreement was a major achievement whose full benefits are only beginning to be felt.

The decision to send Korean troops to Viet-Nam was also a difficult decision to make, and I can well understand how carefully you had to weigh that decision in view of the aggressive forces poised to the north of you.

The fine performance of your soldiers on the battlefield in Viet-Nam has been a source of pride and satisfaction for both our countries, as well as for the Vietnamese at whose request both we and you are helping in the fight against the aggressor.

In June 1966 your government took an initiative which I particularly applaud. You invited the Foreign Ministers of seven Asian countries, including Japan, to meet in Seoul in order to form the Asian and Pacific Council. This concept of a meeting of Asian powers to discuss Asian problems was a purely Korean idea and dramatized your growing stature in international relations.

I have also been pleased to learn that there have been numerous other international meetings in Seoul, including the Asian Parliamentary Union and the 1968 Colombo Plan meeting. You are working effectively with an international Consultative Group under World Bank auspices. Korea has made the international scene. You in the south are very much a part of the larger world.

The only "Hermit Kingdom"—as our geography books used to call Korea—is the communist regime which still occupies the northern part of Korea.

All of your economic, political, and diplomatic progress has been accomplished while you were under constant threat and harassment from the North.

The response of the Korean people to the incursions from the North has been magnificent. There has been no panic in your response, only determination—determination to defend your hard-won accomplishments and to continue to build and to progress. This should truly be an inspiration to other peoples.

The primary credit for all these encouraging developments that I have talked about must go to the Korean people themselves, and I speak to them through you, their chosen representatives. It has been their intelligence, their hard work and perseverance, their interest in new ideas, and the quality of their leadership which have brought such satisfying achievements.

We, the Korean and American peoples, have travelled a difficult road since 1945.

While the focus of policy has shifted several times in both countries, there has been a constancy of commitment to our common goals. Our commitment and our partnership will continue. There is still much for us to achieve together, and together we will reach our common goals.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, who was a very strong and important member of our delegation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished majority leader for his remarks, which I thought were most appropriate and most accurate.

I think the gentleman has done a magnificent job in describing the actions of the committee, the findings of the committee, and the relations with our Ko-

rean colleagues, which I thought were most fortuitous.

I think the majority leader has done an equally magnificent job in depicting the economic recovery of the people of South Korea and the development of democratic institutions. I know of no other country in the world which, burdened with the great cost of an active military establishment, has made the economic progress which South Korea has made. Other countries who have not had that cost have made comparable progress, but they have not carried the load of economic development and of defense at the same time. It is a grievous load, but this country has done it. I congratulate the majority leader for his explanation, and I congratulate the Korean people and their leaders on their accomplishments.

At this time I wish also to add a word of commendation to the majority leader for his fine leadership of this committee. The Speaker authorized this committee and selected the leadership and did well in the selection. I think CARL ALBERT did an outstanding job in making it possible for this congressional group to see and to hear and to understand while we were in Korea.

I express my personal thanks and I know the thanks of all who went on this tour with the majority leader, who was also the leader of this group. Then let me compliment the members who made up this group. You selected able men, Mr. Speaker. Not one failed to measure up to the high standards you would expect of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

I would like also to point out, Mr. Speaker, as our leader has pointed out, that the whole background of Korean life is one of concern over the threat of Communist aggression from the north. The people of South Korea, or at least their leaders, full well realize what many of our people seem to be unable to realize and that is that the Communists are always probing for a weak spot and are always ready to take advantage of weakness whether it be in Vietnam, in Czechoslovakia, in Korea, or in the United States.

Most Americans apparently suppose that the war is over in Korea and that there has been 16 years of peace in that unhappy land. This is not true. There has been no peace treaty, although there is a cease-fire arrangement. That cease-fire arrangement is honored more in the breach than in the observance—at least in order to see that it is observed—both the United States and the Republic of Korea have been forced to commit thousands of men and billions of dollars and this commitment of men and resources continues. Every day there is firing along the so-called cease-fire line. Every night Korean and American troops patrol the south half of the so-called demilitarized zone. We have built no fortifications in this area because the armistice agreement prohibits it but we have fortified the line inside the Republic of Korea just south of the demilitarized zone. On the other hand, we know that the Communists have fortified the entire north half of the zone. We know that they seek to infiltrate into

the Republic of Korea both through our defense areas and by sea. Communist spies are continually captured in South Korea. They are equipped with the best weapons and intelligence instruments that the Soviet Union can supply. We know that the North Korean armies are equipped with the most modern Communist-made weapons of all kinds, including the best Russian rifles. The Communists on the other hand know that only a small part of our Korean allies have the best American equipment. Many of the South Korean troops are armed with Springfield rifles and I saw with my own eyes Korean reserves training with wooden rifles.

I think the United States is making a terrible mistake in not supplying these people with weaponry at least equal in quality to that which the Russians are supplying to the Communists in the north.

The South Koreans are ready, willing, and able to fight in their own defense but to do so effectively they must have weapons equal to those of their foe. I would rather supply the weapons rather than supply more American boys.

Since the end of World War II Russian troops have not fired a shot in co-operation with any of their satellites or allies but Russian guns have been used in almost every conflict around the world. The South Koreans are anxious to fight their own battles and they have proven their willingness to help the United States. There are approximately 50,000 South Koreans troops fighting with our boys in South Vietnam and every report I have had is that they are among the toughest and best soldiers in that conflict. One cannot, however, blame South Korea for their concern when they read that respected American officials are seriously advocating a pull-out in South Vietnam. Of course, if we pull out and let the South Vietnamese be overrun either directly by the Communists or be taken over by the kind of coalition government which brought Czechoslovakia into the Communist orbit, it is but natural that the Koreans would wonder how firm are our guarantees in Korea. And not only would our friends in South Korea wonder but our enemies in North Korea would unquestionably arrive at the same inevitable conclusion—that the United States is indeed a paper tiger.

I have not the slightest doubt but what, if we begin a disgraceful retreat from South Vietnam that we would not get all of our boys as far as Honolulu before the Communists would open an attack along the demarcation line in Korea—and here might well be the opportunity for a rapprochement between the Chinese and the Russian Communists. Here might be the place where two Communist giants would cease their conflicts and join in an attack on the rear guard of the retreating American forces.

Nor can the Koreans take any comfort from the trend of American-Japanese relations. Although the United States has helped Japan effect a most remarkable economic recovery, General MacArthur wrote into the Japanese Constitution a provision so limiting their

military activities that today Japan is able to devote all of her resources to her internal development. Japan does not bear the burden of expensive armaments as does the United States and the Republic of Korea. Now Japan asks and I feel sure the United States is already committed to the return of the great fortress at Okinawa. Of course, the United States does not want the responsibility of government in Okinawa but we do need, Japan needs, Korea needs, and all of Asia needs the stabilizing influence of this great base. To remove it will, the Koreans fear, and I fear, have an effect quite similar and probably much more far reaching than the British withdrawal from Singapore.

Koreans are not unreasonable or emotional. They simply recognize the facts. They see, as many of our own people who have never been invaded by communist hordes cannot see, that the Communists never fail to occupy any lightly defended areas that they want. The Koreans understand, just as the people of Czechoslovakia must understand, that placing a Communist in a position of power in a government is tantamount to turning that country over to the Communists. They understand, as some of our people cannot seem to understand, that you cannot turn your back on a pack of dogs and run away and leave your friends without being bitten yourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we had a far better understanding of this Korean feeling after our visit to Korea. I wish it were possible for every Member of this House to visit Korea and to see what the Koreans have done. They have done a great deal but they need the assurance that the United States is not a turncoat. They need the assurance that our country will keep its pledges. They get no comfort from what they are seeing or hearing at the other end of this Capitol and I get no comfort from it, and I do not believe that any good American does.

I congratulate the Koreans on all they have done. I am proud of them as allies. They are willing to work. Their great economic progress is based on hard work. They are willing to fight. Their very national existence is dependent on their willingness to fight for their rights. I want the United States and Korea to remain good allies and good friends. They are our kind of people. I believe visits such as this one which was recently made tend to improve those relations. Mr. Majority Leader, we thank you for your leadership and for your courtesy, and through you we thank our friends in Korea for their outstanding hospitality.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), for his very splendid contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman who was the ranking minority member on our trip although I may say that if there ever was a cohesive group with not the slightest partisan interest it was this informal group that went to Korea. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS).

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding

to me. At the outset I wish to say that I associate myself with his remarks. And that I am in complete agreement with what he has to say. I always preface any comments I make about the recent congressional trip to Korea by stating that I seldom travel. In defense of it, however, I have always felt that there has to be some benefit in seeing the world and trying to appraise some of the problems. My own experiences in connection with this trip have left some impressions which I feel will be valuable.

I certainly have only commendation for the chairman of our group, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) and I wish to express my thanks to the Speaker of the House and to Mr. ALBERT for asking me to go along.

The gentleman from Oklahoma always conducted himself with great dignity and eloquence on every occasion. I was proud to serve under him on this delegation. By necessity he had to make many appearances and many speeches and to be present on many occasions on behalf of our delegation. It just seemed to me that the Koreans felt we were representing the whole United States, so in a sense our chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), was really a representative of our country in Korea at that time.

For 4 days we were briefed by American military and Embassy officials, Korean legislative and executive leaders, and visited the demilitarized zone, including Panmunjom. In a few highlights, I can report only briefly on a few important subjects.

The people of South Korea are extremely friendly to Americans. When we landed at Kimpo Air Base, Seoul, we were met by bands, troops at attention, high Government officials, and little girls who gave each of us a huge bouquet. The streets of Seoul were decked with banners reading "Welcome U.S. Congressional Delegation." The Korean people remember the U.S. soldiers saved them from defeat at the hands of Communist troops and that U.S. taxpayers have contributed many, many dollars to the restoration of their economy. All of this was mentioned often enough to convince me that there is genuine feeling among South Koreans that there would be no Republic of Korea today, free of communism, except for the United States.

The economy of the country is progressing. I was amazed to hear high government officials say that U.S. economic aid will be phased out and that they are ready to go it alone. This was refreshing since so many foreign countries keep begging for our financial help. It is all the more amazing because South Korea is a relatively poor country. Communist North Korea is much richer with minerals and strategic hydroelectric power. Private U.S. and other foreign capital is being invested in South Korea. Super highways are being built through the mountains connecting the industrial cities with the capital and providing better means for the very poor farmers to market their products. The per capita wealth is rising, not rapidly but slowly and steadily. Of course, one is constantly reminded that all of this was made pos-

sible by the sizable contributions of U.S. taxpayers in the form of economic aid.

From a military standpoint South Korea has a tough fighting army. It has to. It is faced with a mighty and ever threatening Communist force from the north aided substantially by Soviet Russia, while across the Yellow Sea lies ominous Red China. The North Korean dictator has said that by 1970 he intends to unite all of Korea under communism. Seoul, the capital, is only 25 miles from the border separating the two countries. The present North Korean technique, in utter violation of the existing truce, is to harass South Korea with guerrilla raids. In doing this they aim, first, to terrorize the peasants into disenchantment with their own government and its ability to protect them; second, to discourage foreign capital from being invested in South Korea; and third, hopefully to force the United States to commit more troops, thereby causing withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam.

United States troops are conducting a grim and unpublicized operation. We visited with our soldiers at the frontlines, the outposts, and Panmunjom, and had lunch with them at their mess. At one of the outposts we saw U.S. soldiers patrolling the borderline on the side of snow-clad mountains, in bitter cold. Whether or not we agree with the policy, our boys are making a significant contribution to stemming the tide of communism.

To sum it up—I appreciate very much the opportunity to have made this trip. It showed me that the South Koreans are a friendly, energetic, and brave people. They love the United States and, most of all, are truly grateful for our help.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kind remarks, and for his contribution.

I now have the honor of yielding to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ethics and Standards, and one of the ranking members of the Committee on Armed Services, whose experience and knowledge were of valuable assistance to the entire delegation during our trip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to first compliment and congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma, as did our ranking minority member on the trip (Mr. BETTS), on the manner in which the gentleman from Oklahoma conducted this committee in its mission to South Korea. I felt it a privilege to serve on that committee.

I was impressed with the warmth and the genuineness of the reception we received, not only from the officials of the Republic of Korea and members of their National Assembly, but from the average South Korean with whom it was our privilege to come into contact.

I followed very closely the remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and the gentleman accurately stated the situation as we found it in that country. The gentleman also accurately stated the reception we received from the members of the National Assembly.

It was our privilege to visit with the Speaker of the National Assembly, the

Vice Speaker, the leader of the majority, and also the leader of the opposition party in their assembly. We found a stable government there. We found a good relationship between the executive and the legislative branches. We found most of all a genuine gratitude on the part of the people of South Korea for the contribution that we made in preserving their independence. We found that those people, having been assisted by us in maintaining an independent government, recognize the importance of other people lending a hand to other nations when their independence is threatened. That is the reason they have a large military force today in South Vietnam. That is the reason they understand what the problem is in South Vietnam. They understand aggression. They understand threats of aggression. They are prepared to fight not only to maintain their own independence, but to help others of their neighbors in Southeast Asia maintain their independence.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that actually the Korean war has been only a suspended war. Those of us on the committee who had the opportunity to visit the demilitarized zone and to talk with both our own forces and the forces of the Republic of Korea who are manning the demilitarized zone, understand that there is still a threat in that area of the world, and it takes watchfulness in every hour of the day to keep that threat from materializing into another all-out aggression.

I listened to the remarks of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) who was the ranking member of our committee. I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman when he suggests that we should do more in providing adequate equipment to the forces of the Republic of Korea.

We have provided those members of the ROK Army who are fighting with us in South Vietnam with the most modern of equipment, and I believe we should go further and provide the full military force of South Korea with the most modern of equipment because I know that this equipment will be used for the defense of free nations in Southeast Asia. With that strong military force maintained in South Korea, and mostly of their own personnel, we will have a bulwark of defense against further aggression in that country.

I know of nothing that will contribute more to security in Southeast Asia than providing adequate equipment and the most modern equipment to the ROK Army.

It was a distinct pleasure to go to South Korea to meet with their legislators. I might say that on the committee that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives selected to make this trip there were Members like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), who is chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and Members who sit on various committees in the House of Representatives. So it was a cross-section of committees. We found in the national assembly of South Korea almost our counterparts in government.

So it appears they have used as a blueprint the democratic form of government that they find in our country and are demonstrating it throughout the Asian world. They have their Committee on Agriculture. They have their Committee on Armed Services. They have their Committee on Foreign Affairs. The members of our group who serve on those counterpart committees in our House of Representatives met with these particular groups so that there was a good working relationship between the members of the National Assembly and the Members of the Congress of the United States.

We found that parallel, but most of all we found a strong feeling of alliance between the people of South Korea and the American people. I think we would do well to expand this feeling, to improve upon it, and to continue to hold the friendship of this great and wonderful people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a privilege for me to visit Korea for the first time as a member of a delegation of House Members led by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

It was unfortunate that you, Mr. Speaker, were unable personally to lead the group. However, you could not have chosen a more suitable stand-in. As chairman, the majority leader represented the delegation with intelligence and dignity, in a completely nonpartisan fashion.

As a group, the entire delegation—diverse with respect to political viewpoint, interests, age, and standing in the House—has only the highest commendation for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that understanding can be greatly enhanced by such parliamentary exchanges, even if on an irregular basis. This was no exception.

Mr. Speaker, this was a most appropriate time to send this delegation. South Korea is rapidly moving toward economic viability, and in recent years has begun to play a positive and active role in the international community. It has become a leading advocate for regional political and economic cooperation in Asia.

At the same time, however, it is experiencing increasing security problems with North Korea, which seems bent upon renewing hostilities. Notwithstanding this immediate threat, South Korea has contributed almost 50,000 troops to the free world forces in South Vietnam.

We share with the Republic of Korea many of the same problems and responsibilities. Our soldiers, under the banner of the U.N., man battle positions, shoulder to shoulder with the South Koreans along the demilitarized zone in Korea. We are fighting side by side in Vietnam. Our objectives are the same. We both seek a stable, peaceful, and independent Asia, and the Koreans determination to resist Communist expansion and aggression is as unwavering as our own. There is a lot at stake in our relationship with South Korea. I hope our counterparts in the Korean National Assembly are reassured as to our continuing deep interest and support.

I should like briefly, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to South Korea's important economic progress. It was a great pleasure for me to visit Korea and see firsthand the tangible results of U.S. aid, which I have so long supported. In Washington it is difficult to visualize the problems facing Korea along with its development needs and defense requirements. When you can see just how much is needed and how few resources are available to meet these needs, then, and only then, can there be a true appreciation of the immense accomplishments of this small nation.

AID officials in Korea described to us in considerable detail the many gains and dramatic improvements in the key economic indicators and in the people's standard of living. They pointed out, however, that Korea still faces many economic problems. But, they believe, with well-designed policies, hard work, and continued political stability, the situation will continue to improve rapidly. By 1971, Korea should be on the verge of self-sustaining growth.

Our assistance is still required. Loans and other forms of economic aid are needed to maintain the current level of growth. Materiel and equipment to maintain and modernize the military forces are essential if they are to remain a credible deterrent. I intend to support such assistance both in committee and on the floor.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the warm reception and kind hospitality of the Korean people. I shall long remember my visit with them. Also, I want to thank the many United States and Korean Government officials who made it possible for our short stay to be so productive, and mutually beneficial. Especial recognition must be given to the tremendous efforts by Speaker Rhee and Vice Speaker Chang of the National Assembly to see that nothing was overlooked in providing for our fruitful visit.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, in discussing the exchange trip we made early last month to the Republic of Korea, a spirited young democracy modeled after the political system here in the United States. In response to an invitation extended to Speaker McCORMACK by the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang, Vice Speaker of Korea's National Assembly, Mr. ALBERT led a delegation of 22 Congressmen to Korea the week of February 28–March 8 for an exchange of views with that nation's legislators. The trip, Mr. Speaker, far exceeded my expectations. Talking frankly with Korea's able legislators and administration officials, touring the country's cities and military bases, learning firsthand of the remarkable economic and cultural growth that has thrust Korea into the forefront of Asian nations, I found the trip one of the most meaningful and rewarding that I have ever experienced. Our talks with Korean leaders were quite unlike some informal intergovernmental conferences—conferences that, unfortunately but understandably, turn out to be little more than polite shams characterized by exchanges

of affable banter and other trivialities. The Korean conferences were candid, open, and lively. I feel sure our talks with National Assembly members will help strengthen the traditional political and economic friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

My first impression of Korea was its dramatic physical beauty: timbered mountains in the east, plains that sprawl out for hundreds of miles in the southwest, cities that present a striking mixture of graceful oriental architecture and giant skyscrapers. The climate—brisk and cold during our trip—is not unlike that of our own Northeast. The phrase "land of contrasts" is, of course, a cliché so worn that even magazine editors have abandoned it. Yet the saying fits Korea aptly. There you can find poverty next to affluence, sophisticated technological installations next to peasants' hovels, kimonos next to miniskirts.

The Republic of Korea faces a double challenge in the 1970's: continuing its economic growth while defending against the constant menace posed by its Communist neighbor to the north. North Korea's terrorist assaults against the Republic of Korea have been growing more and more frequent. Rattling its sabers and flexing its muscles at every opportunity, North Korea has made plain its intent to subjugate the struggling young democracy at its southern borders. What was once routine harassment near the demilitarized zone turned into armed clashes in the 1960's. The DMZ seemed to bristle with tension when we toured it last month. In 1968—the year North Korea stepped up its strident propaganda barrage against the Republic of Korea—it staged two spectacular acts of aggression: the attempted assassination of President Park and the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. Pledged to defend South Korea against armed attack, the United States remains that country's greatest ally in this era of new North Korean beligerence.

Despite the ever-present threat from its Communist neighbor, the Republic of Korea has made truly staggering economic gains over the past decade. The economic growth rate, for example, jumped all the way from 4.2 percent in 1961 to 13.1 percent in 1968. The investment rate—the fuel of economic growth—nearly doubled from 13.1 percent to 24.5 percent in the same period. And merchandise exports swelled from \$43 million to \$500 million, an increase of 12 times. The single most dramatic index of Korea's economic growth is its capital city of Seoul. Its buildings reduced to rubble and its people facing starvation at the end of the Korean war, Seoul is now a booming metropolis with a modern skyline. Korea's continued growth hinges on economic aid from the United States—aid that, quite clearly, must be continued. The great strides Korea has taken in economy have been matched in health and education. Korean life expectancy, for example, increased from 33 years in 1953 to 52 years in 1967. And, as just one further example, more than 95 percent of the country's school age youngsters are now enrolled in elementary schools.

All available evidence, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the Republic of Korea will continue its striking record of economic and cultural growth in the years to come.

I would like to express my gratitude to our host for the trip, Vice Speaker Kyung Soon Chang, to President Chung Hee Park, Prime Minister Il Kwon Chung, Speaker Hyo Sang Yi, and Deputy Prime Minister Chung Hun Pak, for their many courtesies.

I include in the RECORD at this point copies of letters I have received from Vice Speaker Chang; from Young Sam Kim, National Assembly floor leader for the opposition party; from National Assemblyman Cho Han Paik, and from Howard A. Rusk, M.D., chairman of the American-Korean Foundation, Inc.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
Seoul, Korea, March 10, 1969.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
The House of Representatives,
The U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: It was indeed my pleasure and honor to have been able to invite yourself and the distinguished members of your House of Representatives to Korea and I am sure that the pleasure and honor are also those of our National Assembly and the People of Korea. I believe that you now have returned back to your country safe and sound.

I personally wonder whether the accommodations we arranged for your comfortable stay in Korea had met your satisfaction. However, as I stated sometime while you were in Seoul, I expect the next chance of extending to the even larger delegation what we would not afford during your previous visit to our country.

As anticipated by myself and by the People of our country as well, throughout the entire course of your visit we did best of our efforts to let all of the visiting members look into the variety of realities we are facing with and listen to what Korea has to say about the betterment of the existing close ties between the two Countries. I firmly believe that our efforts have effectuated to a great extent in leading the occasion of the visit to the productive and fruitful result in this regard.

I sincerely hope that your recent visit will surely make a great contribution to the even closer ties between our Countries as well as to creating the most important motivation of cooperating by the legislative bodies for the interests of the two Nations. And I further believe that the visit will certainly initiate a step forward to the creation of the parliamentarians association which I proposed earlier.

Please allow me to extend my best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,

KYUNG SOON CHANG,
Vice Speaker.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
March 18, 1969.

DEAR HON. E. P. BOLAND: I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks for your visit to this country, and hope you have made a pleasant trip back homeland despite of the bad weather.

I am very sorry for that we have not had enough time to share more conversation with you due to your too heavy schedule. However, it is my great desire to get a chance to promote our friendships by opening the proposed next round table conference between the representatives of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

Hoping for your continued cooperation for the development of this nation, I remain.

Sincerely yours,
YOUNG SAM KIM,
Floor Leader, Opposition Party,
National Assembly.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLYMEN,
Seoul, Korea, March 13, 1969.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. BOLAND: It was my real pleasure to meet you when you visited Korea. It was also unforgettable opportunity that I was personally able to talk with you on various subjects including our son who is studying in the Harvard University.

Through such an occasion as your visit to Korea it will really improve our mutual understanding between the nations and will create important political relations among the democratic free world.

As our news papers have announced, it was the first and largest American Delegation we have ever received since 1882 in which we have signed a Treaty of Amity and Commerce with the United States. Your visit to Korea also emphasized that your country is the most reliable one among the friendly nations of today.

I am sorry that I was not personally able to treat you because of the heavy schedule you had. Mrs. Cho and I talked about you and we have decided to send you a small gift as a monument. This is the one I have personally ordered.

I am writing to my son, Sung Il, that he make a courtesy call to you at his convenience.

Meanwhile, I do wish you will be healthy and most prosperous in developing your political life.

Sincerely yours,

CHO, HAN PAIK.

THE AMERICAN-KOREAN
FOUNDATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 14, 1969.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Representative from Massachusetts,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was good to read of your recent visit to Korea. It occurred to me that you would be interested in the attached Annual Report of the American-Korean Foundation's activities there.

We at the Foundation are proud of our part during the past seventeen years in rehabilitating South Korea in the general areas of health, welfare, housing, agriculture and education.

If it is not too much of an intrusion in your busy schedule, I would appreciate any comments or observations regarding your trip that you may have.

Cordially,

HOWARD A. RUSK, M.D.,
Chairman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to enjoy a long association with the Republic of Korea and a close friendship with its people as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The economic growth and vitality of the Republic coupled with the patriotism of its people have been a continuing source of inspiration and encouragement to me.

I am deeply grateful for the Republic's willing contribution to the war in Vietnam and for the skillful and courageous performance of its 50,000 troops.

As a principal delegate to the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations

in 1967, I assumed with special enthusiasm the responsibility of presenting the arguments of the U.S. Government in opposition to withdrawal of U.N. troops from Korea.

For these reasons and a great many more I welcomed the establishment of an interparliamentary exchange between the Congress and the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. And, I was most pleased to be invited, Mr. Speaker, to join with my colleagues in this exchange.

Under the able leadership of our majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, our meetings with the members of the National Assembly and the other branches of the Korean Government were meaningful contributions to continued strong ties between our two nations.

The success of the exchange was due in large measure to the skillful preparation and thorough planning of our host, the Honorable Chang Kyung Soon, Vice Speaker of the National Assembly, and to the hospitality of all of the members of the Assembly.

Special contributions and insights into the goals and aspirations of the Republic were provided in meetings with the Honorable Park Chung Hee, President of the Republic, the Honorable Chung Il Kwon, Prime Minister, the Honorable Choi Kyu Hah, Foreign Minister, the Honorable Im Chung Sik, National Defense Minister, and many of the other distinguished members of the Government.

Through all of these discussions, Mr. Speaker, the reappearing themes were the Republic's remarkable economic vigor and its strong and determined defense posture.

In the midst of its second 5-year plan, the Republic is aiming for self-sufficiency in food-grain production, a doubling of international trade, and a 10-percent annual growth in gross national product through 1971.

Its economy rests on the solid foundation of a variety of major industrial enterprises including power, iron and steel, petrochemicals, and transportation. It is buttressed by rapidly expanding production of coal, fertilizer, cement, flat glass, and plywood, the latter a major export commodity.

New, large-scale harbor facilities are under construction in conjunction with the building of new petrochemical complexes, an integrated iron and steel mill, and cement plants. Multipurpose dams are being built for irrigation, electricity, and industrial water supply.

Railways are being expanded and electrified, and a massive highway construction program scheduled to be completed by 1971 will make virtually all major population centers accessible by a day's travel.

Credit for this remarkable recovery from the devastation in which the Republic found itself following the 1953 armistice belongs to the intelligent planning of the Government and the industry of its people.

Nevertheless, Americans can take a measure of satisfaction in the helpful role they played in assisting in this achievement. Like Taiwan, the Republic

of Korea is one of the finest examples of the wise and prudent use of foreign aid.

As U.S. grant aid is phasing out, the Republic is turning to the Export-Import Bank, international lending institutions, and private sources for financing these projects.

The scope of economic planning and activity reflects a high degree of self-confidence and optimism.

But, the Republic's confidence and tangible accomplishments must be viewed realistically against the perpetual threat of disruption and aggression from the north.

There has been mounting evidence since 1966 that the north is organizing its population, diverting its economic resources, and stockpiling armaments toward a massive increase in infiltration and terrorism.

The dramatic and highly visible prosperity of the Republic undoubtedly has helped encourage the north to attempt to disrupt the south's economy.

Infiltration has increased steadily since the October 1966 speech by North Korean Premier Kim Il-Sung calling for stepped-up guerrilla warfare against the south.

While the United Nations Command recorded 59 significant incidents of infiltration in 1965 and 50 in 1966, the figure jumped to 338 in 1967 and a near equal number in 1968.

Most dramatic and potentially explosive of these was the abortive January 31, 1968, commando raid on the Blue House, the official residence of President Park Chung Hee.

Two days afterward the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized, and on April 14 the north launched a surprise attack against U.S. security personnel at Panmunjom.

In late October a company-sized force of 120 heavily armed and highly trained guerrillas intruded through the eastern coastal area to revolutionize secluded mountain villages.

We can take comfort and encouragement, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that all of these aggressive forays were defeated by the concerted counteractions of the Government and the people.

While planes and equipment provided the Republic by the United States are in need of replacement and modernization, North Korea has been stockpiling significant quantities of conventional and sophisticated equipment supplied by the Soviet Union.

The north has hardened its defenses and dispersed its cities to protect against heavy air attack and coastal bombardment of the sort we delivered in Vietnam.

In addition, guerrilla battalions are being trained in the north with the assignment of total harassment in each of the eight provinces that make up the Republic.

It was from this guerrilla battalion that men were drawn to form the commando team that attempted to assassinate President Park last year.

And, despite an economy that is suffering from lack of growth, the north is devoting larger proportions of its budget to military purposes.

While we can only speculate about the long-range intent of this buildup, it is

clear that continued infiltration and terrorism in the countryside could interfere with the rate of foreign investment in the Republic which has grown steadily during the past several years.

At a time when the Republic is looking for alternatives to U.S. grant aid scheduled to phase out in 1970, a significant drop in foreign investment could seriously dampen its economy.

The dangers to the Republic from the north are both real and immediate. The outlook is for more infiltration and increased attempts at subversion.

The Republic faces the task of continuing to counter such dangers without jeopardizing either its economic growth rate or the measure of personal freedom its citizens now enjoy.

The Republic of Korea will require all of the material assistance and moral support that the United States, and others, can muster, if it is to be successful in this undertaking.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the firsthand look which this interparliamentary exchange provided key Members of Congress was so vital. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this type of exchange will become a regular and important part of our relations with the Government of the Republic of Korea. It is a foundation on which we can build enlightened and informed policy—policy which responds to symptoms of developing problems rather than crises.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to visit the Republic of Korea as part of the delegation headed by the distinguished majority leader. I commend him for taking his time to express our gratitude to our gracious and generous hosts and to inform our colleagues of the great strides being made in that nation. I benefited personally from this visit and am happy to have been able to add to my knowledge of Korea and Southeast Asia.

Our cooperative effort for the security of Southeast Asia makes the alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States strong and lasting, added to this, the friendship and understanding achieved by the Members of this body and our Korean hosts will, I am sure, strengthen the bonds between our two nations.

Our Government has assisted many developing nations around the world with varying degrees of success, but I am overjoyed to report to the Congress that our aid to the Republic of Korea is one of the most worthwhile investments ever made. From the ruins of the Korean war, the people and Government of Korea have developed a strong, diversified, and progressive economy. For the 5-year period, 1962 to 1967, the per capita gross national product has increased 7 percent each year. Agriculture production increased 25 percent in the 5-year period 1962 to 1967. The Central Government's domestic revenues increased 49 percent each year from 1964 to 1966, and what is definitely significant for our consideration is that the share of the Government budget supported by the U.S. aid program declined from 35.3 percent in 1964 to 11.8 percent in 1968.

I believe this is one of the finest ex-

amples of our aid assisting a nation in developing its own resources. The Republic of Korea gradually and increasingly is taking over those projects formerly dependent on U.S. aid. In truth we have helped Korea to help itself. This has been accomplished only because of the dedication and determination of the people of Korea and their chosen leaders. This former agricultural nation is developing industry and diversifying its economy and production. It is extremely gratifying to me to have seen the great economic growth of this constantly threatened nation. The Central Government hopes and is working for the day when U.S. aid will no longer be needed. They project and are planning for a date only 2 years hence.

The Republic of Korea is a bastion of strength in troubled Southeast Asia. Its Government and its economy are stable, progressive and enjoy the support of the people. They have proven themselves to be good and loyal friends. Their dedication to the cause of freedom and justice is evident. They have an open society and do not fear competition in industry, political parties, or the press. They have fought and been successful in suppressing the threat from North Korea and have withstood the constant harassment of infiltrators and terrorists. They appreciate and recognize the great need for the United Nations force within their country but are determined to bear the greatest portion of their nation's defense as they can.

We visited the demilitarized zone, and I was greatly impressed by the high morale of our troops and the Korean troops. I am sure, however, that both morale and effectiveness could be improved if the means for defense were updated. The forces of the Republic of Korea are now using to a great extent F-1 rifles. I believe it would be in our interest, as well as in the interest of Korea, to modernize the weapons.

American interests lie with a stable, progressive, and free Southeast Asia. Korea is the finest example of that wished for stable democracy. We must continue to help her help herself and must see that her need to defend herself does not negate her economic growth and political stability. What, perhaps, most impressed me was the overwhelming desire of the Korean people and their elected leaders to insure that political and economic growth were not endangered by the continuing need for defense. They are determined to remain free and democratic and are dedicated to both political and economic independence.

As varying pressures are applied to us to allocate funds for both domestic and international needs, we must set priorities. I am hopeful that continued aid to Korea will be high on the list of each Member. Korea's development is one of the finest examples of what American aid and cooperation with a dedicated and determined nation can achieve.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would like to add that every member of this delegation reflected a credit on the House of Representatives and on our country.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in thanking the Speaker for allowing me the privilege of participating in this meaningful experience.

I would like to compliment the Speaker, too, on the sensitivity that he demonstrated in making these meetings and this exchange possible. I know of no greater friend that the United States has in the world than South Korea and I know of no greater subject of greater importance that which our two countries attach to a mutual exchange of ideas and hopes.

There was a certain sadness about returning to Korea and to see, 17 years later, American troops and Korean troops still improving frontline foxhole positions, and in excess of 500,000 troops still maintaining the lines in what has been an uneasy truce for those 17 years. There is a sadness to see Korean men who have grown old maintaining the frontlines for their own freedom, a sadness also about the amount of material and expense, and the number of lives that have been poured into that area.

Yet, also, there is a sense of reality about it. There are people in our country who demonstrate for peace, yet, I know of no people who really want peace more than the South Koreans and I know of no other people who want peace more than the citizens of the United States of America. Yet the world demonstrates a different kind of reality. If those foxholes were not manned, if those lines were not patrolled night after night, day after day, terror would be streaming down from North Korea to kill our soldiers, to kill South Korea's soldiers, to assassinate their president, and to assassinate their officials. The harsh realities of the hostile world which faces the free world are summed up in Korea today.

Those people who think our presence in Vietnam is not a meaningful one, should see how meaningful our presence and the presence of troops are in maintaining the peace, the freedom and, yes, the very lives of innocent civilians in South Korea some 16 or 17 years after the firing supposedly stopped.

I know that other Members wish to participate in this discussion. But before I sit down I would like to join my colleagues in paying a high tribute to the majority leader of our party who was the chairman of our delegation. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been on many parliamentary exchanges. I know of no more important parliamentary exchange than this, and none has ever had greater leadership than our delegation had in CARL ALBERT. As a majority leader he has many roles, but I witnessed another CARL ALBERT in Korea, CARL ALBERT the sensitive diplomat, CARL ALBERT the leader of his country's delegation to one of our country's greatest allies.

I congratulate the majority leader for the way in which he was received and the way in which he responded to that reception. I can think of no one who could have conducted himself more responsibly or more responsively. Few diplomats in our State Department or in our

Government who could have represented the United States in better fashion.

There was another CARL ALBERT there also, perhaps different from the one we see here in the Congress. He was the man who returned to Southeast Asia with the great knowledge he acquired there while serving his country in World War II. He was a reaffirmation of what Rhodes scholars are made of, as he met there with his fellow Rhodes scholar, his classmate in the days when he was a student at Oxford with Dean Rusk, and the Rhodes scholar in charge there, General Bonesteel, one of the splendid military commanders of our Army.

From any aspect, I think exceptionally high marks have to be given to the chairman of our delegation, and also to our Speaker, because they have made a contribution by making it possible for us to know each other better—our delegation and the Korean delegation. We have exchanged new ideas, and because once more we have reaffirmed the principle that two great nations, whose blood is spilled on the many hills and plains of Korea, have fought for freedom while seeking only peace for our people.

While we all hope for peace, there is only one way in which we will see peace in our time in South Korea as well as in Vietnam. We must be strong and vigilant. Most of all, we must be awake to the realities that the world is not populated only with people who truly desire peace.

I think all who made this journey know the harsh realities in Korea including the fact that there are people in North Korea who would trample any hope for peace and who would trample all men's freedom. Peace will only come when people on both sides of the line recognize that peace is the most desirable commodity in this world. For just the desire for peace cannot bring peace; it demands full and complete reciprocity from the other side. Until then I think people throughout the world should know that America is ready to join in any peace movement anywhere.

Certainly we could have a true peace in Korea if the other side would recognize this. Similarly we will have a true peace in Vietnam if the other side recognizes the United States of America will walk 95 percent, if not 99 percent, of the journey, but it requires the two sides to find peace and to allow hope to renew itself throughout the world.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who, of course, is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and one of the most knowledgeable members of our delegation.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as one of those privileged to be included in the delegation which visited in Korea with our counterparts in the Korean National Assembly, March 2-6, I want to commend the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), for taking this time to report to the Congress on the trip.

In assessing this unique experience, I would first want to be a part of a sincere expression of gratitude to our hosts for

their gracious hospitality and their willingness to acquaint us with their plans, their aspirations and their special problems as they stand firm for freedom's cause against a constant challenge from the north.

In addition to being impressed by the friendliness and steadfastness of the Korean people, I would say one of the highlights of the trip for me was the opportunity to see firsthand the economic and industrial miracle which is taking place in South Korea.

Those with knowledge of the capital city of Seoul and the surrounding area in the strife-torn days of the Korean war between 1950 and 1953 would have to be amazed over the recovery which has been made. Seoul is now a modern, progressive city with a population of 4 million. There is little evidence of the damage and destruction inflicted when the North Koreans overran it in 1950 and the U.N. forces won it back. There are signs instead of prosperity and a business boom on every hand.

This comeback is a success story for American aid. Since 1953, the United States has extended economic assistance to the South Koreans to the extent of some \$4 billion. We have also been generous with our military assistance and have made it possible for the South Koreans to build up their forces and defenses to where they can handle almost any situation.

Private capital from foreign investors has also paid handsome dividends to those companies which took a gamble on the will and the energy of the South Koreans to establish their Republic and build an economy. Five-year plans have succeeded 5-year plans and are moving South Korea toward its goal of industrialization and modernization. It is expected that the Republic of Korea will soon reach the stage when our grants in aid can be terminated. "Soft loans" will still be needed for powerplants, water development, highways, housing complexes and more industries, but underwriting these loans is good business for the United States as we help a trusted ally in Asia.

This progress and success is galling to the North Koreans across the DMZ. They will do anything to disrupt it as their plots and counterplots of the recent past have shown. Their next target is the presidential election in 1970. President Park is prevented from succeeding himself for another term unless the constitution is amended. He is popular and is given credit for the stability and phenomenal advancement of the country. The North Koreans are expected to infiltrate and provoke incidents to disrupt the election. They have vowed to reunify the country under communism by violence.

The presence of the Communists is all too near. The demilitarized zone is only 30 miles from Seoul and there are occasional skirmishes which threaten the peace. One day out of our tour was reserved for a visit to the DMZ and the truce camp near the village of Panmunjom. We visited both the Korean and American forces patrolling the zone—the 25th Republic of Korea Division at Outpost 355, and Company B, 2d Bat-

alion of the 9th U.S. Infantry at Advance Camp H-127.

One of the highlights of the tour for me was the opportunity to sit down and have lunch with our men at this front. I was honored to be joined by two Kansans serving in these forces—Sp 4C. David A. Tarpley of Lakin, Kans., a recovery mechanic, and Pvt. Ronald C. McGoldrick of DeSoto, Kans., a track driver. We had a great time talking about Kansas and what is happening back home. I could tell they were both proud of what they are doing in the service of their country, but I was also aware that they are anxious to complete their tours of duty and get back home. I assured both of them that I would get in touch with their parents as soon as I returned to Washington.

These men of ours know they have the gratitude of the South Koreans for their help in preserving the peace so the country can grow and prosper. This outpouring of gratitude was evident to our party as well. All of the officials at all of the meetings and functions let us know how much their alliance with the United States has meant in establishing their sovereignty, in building their defenses and in developing their country. It is a unique relationship in many ways, but one built on friendship and trust and the overriding conviction that free men everywhere must join hands and take a stand against aggression.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Now I am very pleased to yield to one of the outstanding members of our group, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma very much for yielding a few moments to me. Certainly, of course, I want to join my colleagues in giving every praise possible to the majority leader for having done what I consider to be the most magnificent job in the exchange of relationships between governments that I have ever seen personally. I believe these are the sentiments that have been echoed by my colleagues as we discussed the trip we recently made to Korea.

Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say I was very meaningfully impressed by the warm, wonderful and hospitable people of South Korea. I believe for people who have suffered a devastation of their country a number of times, over a period of years, it does us good occasionally to go and meet, mingle, talk and exchange viewpoints with these kinds of people.

Here are people, Mr. Speaker, who have suffered probably like we in America have never suffered, and hopefully like we will never have to suffer. They are people who, because of their suffering, however, have learned to love their freedom in a way which is more than we as Americans can understand. They are people who have defended their nation time and time again against forces of superior strength but who in all instances and under all pressures have fought back to defend themselves against those who would suppress them.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it does

one good to go to a country which over a period of years our Nation has attempted to assist, and has provided some material defenses for, and find that they really love our country; to find that they are grateful and thankful that we have in fact taken it upon ourselves to assist them in defending them against invasion from the north.

Upon receiving the invitation to join this group to visit Korea, I tried to read everything that I could. I read everything that I got from the Korean Embassy here in Washington, and everything that I could get from the State Department. I even went to the Library of Congress and read a few things that neither one of them provided me with.

I thought I understood the situation very well before I left this country, but I was so pleasantly surprised, and I might say amazed, to find that what I read did not really do justice to that vibrant people, the people of the Republic of Korea. They are people who are among the hardest working, if not the hardest working, in that part of the world. They are hard working by any measuring device we could devise, and certainly they are hard working by the standards which we recognize in this country.

They want desperately to move their country forward; they want desperately to maintain their freedom by making their mark in that part of the world as a free nation, a leader of nations in a democratic society.

And so it was a great pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to go over there and meet with the leaders of that great country, to meet with the people and find out that they truly are friendly, that they truly are allies of this great country and find out too, that they are willing to work day and night, as many hours as are necessary, to continue to move their country forward in freedom; to develop their country agriculturally to a higher degree, to develop that country's economy and to develop, industrially too, so that they can withstand the juggernaut from the north which stands there ready to seize upon them at the first available opportunity.

And so it was a real pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank you very much for having included me in the group.

I might say that I had a pleasure that none of the other members of the group had because I was privileged to meet with the Minister of Science and Technology as a result of my committee assignment here in the Congress. I was greatly pleased to have met the Minister of Science and Technology. They now have more than 1,000 able, dedicated professional people working in that area, again for the purpose of moving that country forward industrially and in every other possible way. Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to predict that as a result of this effort on the part of that great nation, yea, even though they can hardly afford to undertake that kind of an exercise, the Republic of Korea will in the not too distant future be one of the leading countries in that part of the world in total industrial and economic development for the benefit of their people and for the benefit, therefore, of that part of the world as well.

So, it was a very enjoyable trip. It was one which afforded the members of the group to learn a great many things which one could not possibly learn from a book or from a periodical or from a paper.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we have the pleasure of having their leaders over here, and as a result of that provide other of our colleagues the opportunity to meet with some of them, our colleagues, too, will better understand what we are talking about when we talk about a very great nation, a very great people. People who are to be commended for the efforts which they are putting forward today, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can participate and provide hospitality equal to or perhaps I should say half as good as that which they provided us when we visited their country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a member of the recent House of Representatives special delegation to the United States-Korean Interparliamentary Conference in Seoul, Korea.

I welcome this opportunity to publicly thank the Vice Speaker of Korea and his many colleagues for their gracious hospitality. While southern hospitality in the United States is legendary, the warmth and graciousness of our South Korean friends has never been equalled, in my experience, anywhere.

I was most impressed with the industriousness and dedication to freedom, obvious both in and out of government, by our good friends and allies, the Koreans. Their anti-Communist posture is understandable. Their love for America is most genuine and their deep appreciation for our support in the past was very evident.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express to my colleagues here in the House my admiration and respect for the leader of our delegation to Korea, the great majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT. In accepting an honorary degree from the University of Seoul and in speaking to the Korean National Assembly, CARL ALBERT made us proud that we were Americans. He did an outstanding job in representing the United States of America and I consider myself most fortunate that this trip permitted me to become better acquainted with him.

It is my firm belief that time is definitely on the side of the South Koreans. We do face a critical danger in the next couple of years due to the aggressive and hostile actions of the North Koreans in their desire to militarily take over the South. I further believe that in several more years the South Koreans will be strong enough, both militarily and economically, to defend their own land against any invasion from the north.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, whose presence certainly added to the prestige and competence of our delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) at this time.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with all the very high praise which has been so generously but very justifiably lavished on the leader of this special delegation, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, our majority leader.

I want to say, as a part of this RECORD, that those who did not travel to Korea also served. Certainly I am most personally aware, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that this delegation would not have been possible had it not been for the warm reaction which was in your heart to the request which was presented by the Korean National Assembly; and it is out of your great understanding of their particular position and their peculiar problems that you were so ready and willing, and even anxious, that we should cooperate. I know that without your interest we would not have had designated such an outstanding leader of this group as you did.

I want to say also that the Ambassador of Korea, His Excellency Kim Dong To, was very active in encouraging this exchange. While he remained in Washington, it was through his good offices that the important preparatory work was done.

I know there was a great expectation, and great interest in Korea from the President on down. There was a great interest shown by the Prime Minister. Through his efforts it was assured that the programs would be productive and that they were of the highest quality. The cooperation given by Vice Speaker Chang was of inestimable importance to the tour's success.

I bring back a rather deep and rather sober assessment of this trip. I am mindful of the history we have had with Korea. It goes back long before the Korean war, Mr. Speaker. It goes far back in years. Unfortunately it is a history which is a collage of good will on the one hand and indifference on the other. There has been intrusion of military and diplomatic interests from time to time, of economic interest from time to time, but we have not had a sustained interest in the country and in the building of its institutions.

We can defend against the exploitations from outsiders by a military stance, but we cannot build within any country—that would be our ally and which hopes to help us defend freedom—this kind of response to the needs of freedom unless we help them build the institutions which are really the bulwark of freedom.

Freedom does not rest upon the guns and battlefronts alone. They can only provide the time period for the building of the concept of freedom.

Freedom is not rested upon any particular individual, no matter how great he might be. Certainly, contributions could not be more significant than you have made to the United States, Mr. Speaker, nor greater than the contributions the majority leader made as leader of this great group. But when all is said and done, the bastion is the institution of freedom which men build and to which they will adhere and serve.

These institutions are what Korea needs now. Korea has had our affection.

Korea has had our hope. Certainly on this trip there was a feeling of that warm affection. But Korea needs our respect. I think a new era is now possible between the United States and Korea, an era built not just on good will, not just on affection, but on respect—respect for the fact that they want to move ahead as a responsible unit in the free world. To do this they must have the kind of institution which lives beyond the life span of one man.

Korea in 1971 is going to meet a very demanding milestone. Can it handle the passage of power under a democratic institution in peace and in order? Their adversaries in the north do not want that to happen, Mr. Speaker. They do not want this to be a peaceful situation. Their provocative acts have picked up recently making it clear that the North Koreans will do all they can to prevent a peaceful transition.

We found this out, by being present there. We must not let them down in this immediate period, with the great burden they now face.

I certainly commend the Koreans for coming forward and initiating by their invitation this exchange, and saying to us, "Will you help us build the legal framework, as you have helped us with our military stance and as you have helped us with our economic development? Also help us to build the legal framework that will keep us a strong unit in the free world, to be sure that peace will ultimately prevail and that improvement for people will 'move forward even in the face of conflict in a hostile world.'" as my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER) stated so well.

Our visit to Korea could not have been more propitiously timed. This is so because as David I. Steinberg put it in his book, "Korea: Nexus of Asia":

The next few years will be crucial for the Republic of Korea. She will be sorely tested from the North. Efforts will be made at reunification. She will be subjected to internal pressures: politically during the all-important election of 1971 and before that time; socially, through economic growth unevenly shared; administratively, as she moves to meet with greater efficiency, hopefully within a democratic context, the demands of the developmental process.

The Republic of Korea's immediate political, social, and economic problems are compounded by the imminent threat from the north. They will add up to a test of both the Republic of Korea and the United States. For as Steinberg said:

The United States must meet the tests which the Republic of Korea will undergo, for in Korean and foreign eyes as well as in our American domestic politics, our commitment extends to Korean political and social development and our record is spotty at best.

Any assessment of the extent of our commitment to the Republic of Korea must include an analysis of what reciprocal commitments we can expect from it. In this connection, we cannot overlook the Republic of Korea's record—its unique record—of unrestrained and unswerving loyalty to our country. As for the future, I would call attention to a memorandum presented by the Honorable Park Joon Kyu, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Na-

tional Assembly of Korea. In it Assemblyman Park states that—

Korea will always stand ready to make its utmost contribution, as evidenced by our participation in the Viet Nam War. Our people did not forget the American sacrifices during the Korean War, and are keenly conscious of the value of the present United States presence and defense of Korea. Our capabilities are doubtlessly limited, but we will always act as a loyal ally of the United States, and the United States can count on it.

This definitive statement leaves no room to question Korea's commitment to our country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if this trip just concluded is to be termed "a junket," then we should have more such junkets, because this visit, in my judgment, has been a very constructive contribution that was made to the relationships which exist between nations, which was of the highest order and character and most needed at a time when the world must find a pattern for progress and a direction in which to go.

Mr. Speaker, I feel greatly honored that Mr. ALBERT asked me to go, and that I was able to be one of this outstanding group that was so ably led by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. LLOYD).

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be present here in person today to express the high regard which I feel, which has been expressed also by other of my colleagues on the floor, to the majority leader for the leadership which he gave to this most important and significant exchange and visit to the Republic of Korea by a delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives. I also express my appreciation to the Speaker for the opportunity he gave me of being a Member of this delegation.

Mr. Speaker, one must respect the diligent and responsible efforts of the leaders of the Assembly of the Republic of Korea to communicate as effectively as possible with the leaders and Members of the United States House of Representatives, for without such informed communication the investment which our two nations have made in the integrity of each other will not achieve its maximum beneficial results, and future relations might prove less relevant.

As a result of this communication in the form of a visit to the Republic of Korea in response to an invitation by the delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives there has certainly been a great input into the practical intelligence available to the Members of this House. In addition to this input of intelligence, the communication between the legislators of the two nations, has given more of us an understanding of the Korean people themselves, and of the mutuality of interest which unites our countries.

This mutuality of interest is the key in my judgment to continuing beneficial relations between us. First we have the historic fact of our joint effort, fighting side by side to save the Republic of Korea from aggression from the north and the mutual shedding of blood in that common struggle. In the sharing of that long and arduous experience under fire,

our two countries and our peoples have a strong and enduring bond.

This mutuality of interest, forged in the Korean war, is now riveted closer by the common desire to protect freedom and the opportunity for the individual to live in a society which is free rather than totalitarian. The future of our common bond is tied closely to the continuing desire of our peoples to remain free. The constant threat of an invasion from the north presents the people of the Republic of Korea with this continuing challenge to their conviction and determination.

For my own part, I returned from Korea convinced of the dedication of the leaders and people of the Republic of Korea to resist the Communist threat, and deeply impressed by the good will, the buoyant enthusiasm, the desire and the capability of the Korean people and their leadership.

I was impressed too by the stability of the Government, by the quality of its leadership, by the political competition of two strong political parties, and by the unity of the people behind its form of government and resistance to the Communist threat.

In our visit to the DMZ and to Panmunjom I was again deeply impressed by the debt which we owe to the brave men of our Armed Forces under the command of Gen. Charles Bonesteel III, commanding general of the United Nations forces and of the U.S. Armed Forces and with the other members of our delegation I hold in the most high regard the performance of the ROK Army which guards the major portion of the DMZ, and it should be mentioned here again that the Republic of Korea has 50,000 troops fighting with us in South Vietnam.

I express my appreciation and respect for the distinguished majority leader who led our delegation, to our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. HANNA) and others responsible for the scheduling which provided so much intelligence in a short time, and especially do I pay my respects to those leaders and members of the Assembly and the Government of the Republic of Korea whose good will and consideration for our interests made of this visit a most fruitful experience for the benefit of our two countries.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT). Going to Korea was one of the great experiences of my life. It became obvious to me that here is a nation in the free world that is truly making use of the military and economic assistance given to them by the United States. The fact that they are 2 years ahead of their second 5-year economic growth plan indicates their dedication to these objectives. This has been accomplished in spite of a rather serious drought in agriculture.

It is apparent when you look at the young people of Korea that they are being well fed and cared for. When you add to this their high rate of literacy it is easier to understand why they are making such progress and have such dedication to their freedom. I believe the

interparliamentary exchange was of very worthwhile importance. The friendship that emanated between the representatives of the two countries was certainly indicative of a joy that can come as a result of being a free people.

I want to add my commendations to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), who served as chairman for our congressional delegation on this trip to Korea. He represented our country and all of us in a very dignified and official manner. It is my honor and privilege to have been a member of this congressional group that visited Korea.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to serve as a member of the House delegation to the Republic of Korea, and I returned home with the knowledge that in that country we have a sturdy and dependable friend.

Out of the ruins left by Communist aggression the people of South Korea have built a progressive nation, an economically sound nation that is one of the outstanding success stories of our time. The ties of friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea are strong and enduring. They were strengthened still further by the exchange of views between members of our delegation and officials of the Korean Government.

Our hosts could not have been more gracious. I will never forget the spirit of hospitality with which they received us, and it is my hope that at some time in the future we will be honored by a visit from them in order that we will have an opportunity to reciprocate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with our distinguished majority leader and my colleagues in saying that the Korean trip that we made some weeks ago will hold for me a memory that will never be forgotten. To observe the advancements that have been made by the Korean people in the past few years is almost unbelievable.

The economy of their country has grown to a place that they are now holding their own under what looked like insurmountable odds a few years ago. The determination and courage of the National Assembly of Korea has brought this about.

The associations we had with the members of the National Assembly showed to us that they are a people of great courage and great determination. The spirit of the people of Korea is just unbelievable. They are imbued with a feeling of independence and liberty which is something to observe.

A country that is surrounded by nations not friendly to their thinking, under some circumstances might not have the feeling that the South Koreans have—a feeling that they want to keep their freedom and their independence.

From what I observed on the Korean trip, I feel that the Korean Government should be commended very highly for the progress that they have made over the last decade. Because of the Government's efforts, Seoul is now a city of many beautiful structures and an educational system of very high quality.

My association with the men in the Korean Government leads me to believe that they are one of our strongest allies,

and they will be a great factor in helping other countries become free nations.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Korea for their wonderful hospitality. No one could have shown us any more courtesies than we were shown by the people of South Korea.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and a pleasure to be one of the 23 Congressmen who made up the delegation which traveled to Korea last month for the purpose of participating in an interparliamentary exchange with members of the Korean National Assembly.

During my brief stay in the Republic of Korea I was immensely impressed by the great social and economic progress that this small nation has made in the space of less than two decades. Wherever we traveled in Korea, we saw evidence of the hard work that has been put forth by the Korean people in its concerted effort at nation building. In Seoul we saw new expressways being constructed to speed business and commerce, we saw streets and shops crowded with goods and people, we saw schools filled with children anxious to learn, and we saw universities making a coordinated effort to meet this developing nation's need for the highly trained manpower required to thrust it into the forefront of Asian economic development.

When visiting industrial cities, we saw, firsthand, the important part American economic assistance has played in the development of the Republic of Korea. We visited modern plants which were financed with long-term loans. We watched while grain grown on the American plains was converted into food products for Asian consumption.

All this notwithstanding, the most impressive feature of our visit to the industrial complex of Korea was not the hardware we saw, but rather the sight of what surely must be one of the most industrious people in all the world engaged in the pursuit of economic progress.

Korea melds the vibrance of a modern society on the go with the richness of a culture which is the product of centuries of existence. The beauty of Korean art and ceramics, in my experience, will admit the few equals.

Not long ago, another Asian nation touted their "great leap forward." As time passed, it became clear to us in the West that Red China's great leap forward was in fact more rhetoric than reality. As one who has visited in Korea, I can frankly say that if any nation has the right to boast of having made a great leap forward, it is the Republic of Korea. For it is the Republic of Korea which has made phenomenal social and economic progress over the past 15 years while at the same time building the constitutional democratic institutions required to insure that this economic progress will not have been made in vain.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in extending my appreciation to the people of the Republic of Korea, their President, Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Speaker, and Vice Speaker of the National

Assembly, the members of the Cabinet, the National Assembly, and other officials for the hospitality extended to the U.S. congressional delegation to the Republic of Korea during our visit from March 2 to March 7 this year.

Our South Korean friends showed themselves to be gracious and thoughtful hosts and each member of the delegation was almost overwhelmed by their many courtesies to us.

We each lived an unforgettable week. From the moment we touched down at Kimpo International Airport until we departed, we made and deepened friendships, we learned of the challenges of achieving security from aggression and national economic development facing the Republic of Korea, and we observed the committed energy, discriminating intelligence and high resolve the South Koreans display as they meet those challenges.

I came away strong in the belief that one of the great dramas in the postwar period of confrontation is being played out in this divided land.

Two impressions among many stand out in my mind about our delegation's trip.

First, I was impressed with the sense of purpose and nation-building displayed by the leaders of South Korea. The leadership has the enthusiasm of a group launched upon a high adventure. Several high-ranking Government officials I encountered, for example, were educated in the United States and held attractive jobs here. They returned to South Korea, however, to participate in the exciting and exacting challenge of building a new nation. In meeting after meeting, it was strongly impressed upon me that the leadership of South Korea had their eyes firmly fixed upon the target of a free, prosperous, democratic Republic of Korea.

Second, I was impressed by the competence of the leadership of the Republic of Korea. It became very obvious to me during the course of our visit that the top leadership of the Republic of Korea is knowledgeable and skillful. The oral briefings and the printed material provided for reflected careful thought. The needs and problems of the nation were clearly defined, goals firmly established, and alternative methods of reaching the goals carefully evaluated.

So I came away from the Republic of Korea assured on one essential requirement in order for the difficult national process of development to succeed. We all know that no country can ultimately succeed in the challenges of economic and social development, except by its own efforts.

I am persuaded that the leaders of the Republic of Korea want their country to develop on many levels: political, social, economic. They are willing to exert every resource to achieve their national development goals. Without that kind of commitment, development is simply not possible. With it, development is by no means assured, but a giant hurdle toward development has been removed.

We can only wish them well in their endeavors, commend them for their remarkable progress, assist them where we

can, and hope, with them, that the energies of 30 million South Koreans will be successful in achieving national economic development in order to achieve a better living for the South Korean people, and to gain a more secure position in the community of nations.

My newsletter for March 17 follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

I have just returned from an intensive study mission to South Korea, one of America's staunchest allies in Asia.

Korea today is a country of many contrasts, a harsh and rugged land inhabited by some of the most hospitable people on earth . . . a country steeped in ancient Asian traditions, yet adapting to new ways of life in order to survive in the modern world . . . a nation of fiercely proud people who have maintained their nationality despite centuries of invasions and occupations by neighboring countries . . . it is a nation which is divided at the 38th Parallel and reflects within its own borders the tragedies both personal and national, of the cold war confrontation between the Communist and free world.

South Korea exits today under continued, ominous threats of aggression from north of the 38th Parallel. The Premier of North Korea, Marshal Kim Il-Song has threatened to invade South Korea in the 1970s. He has backed these threats up with increasing efforts at infiltration into the South.

Despite these tensions, however, there is an impressive sense of purpose and nation-building among the leaders of South Korea. The leadership has the enthusiasm of a group launched on a great adventure. Several ministers were educated in the United States and held very attractive jobs in this country. They have returned to South Korea, however, to participate in the venture of building a new nation.

The major objective of the leadership is national economic development in order to achieve a better living for its people and to gain a more secure position in the community of nations. The Korean people are eager for this kind of recognition and their progress has been remarkable. Over-all growth has averaged a solid 8½ percent a year during the last five years. Industrial production has nearly doubled in that time, and almost every economic indicator is climbing rapidly.

The American investment in Korea is sizeable. Today, there are 50,000 American soldiers there and 11,000 other Americans, including dependents, who live in Korea, working on economic and technical assistance programs or at the U.S. Embassy.

Large sums of American money have been invested in South Korea to maintain its integrity as a nation. The United States seeks a free, independent, democratic Korea, peacefully unified through elections under UN supervision, with a national assembly and government which is representative of the people.

We have been concerned in the past two years with increased militancy on the part of the North Korean regime. Just this week, two days after I left Korea, gun fire broke out in the demilitarized zone. During 1967, for example, there were 566 incidents involving the use of force at the DMZ.

Perhaps the most blatant exercise of force came in January, 1968, when a specially-trained team of 31 agents attempted to assassinate Chung Hee Park, the President of South Korea. This act of aggression produced little comment in the U.S. because it was followed in a few days by the capture of the Pueblo.

It is obvious that North Korea's long range objective is the unification of Korea under Communist rule. In the short term, they hope, by infiltration, to tie down South Ko-

rean forces and to disrupt the economic and political processes which are taking place.

One of my six days in Korea was spent touring the DMZ, and I was impressed by the arduous duty American and Korean forces have in protecting South Korea. It is an uninviting land, and the duty performed by American servicemen is dangerous and difficult. I was reminded of this when I visited Panmunjom, the center of communications between North and South Korea. North Korean troops were very much in evidence and along the demilitarized zone a bank of powerful loudspeakers poured out a continuous blare of Communist propaganda.

I was one of a 23-member Congressional delegation, headed by House Majority Leader Carl Albert, who traveled 17,000 miles in eight days and spent six of them talking to South Korean leaders. Our meetings were with the President, the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the National Assembly, members of the cabinet and practically every high government official.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be among the 23 Congressmen who recently visited Korea. I can say without reservation that this was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. It is gratifying to know that we have friends such as we found throughout the Republic of Korea.

The South Koreans are an amazing people. They have used their own ingenuity in building a truly great nation. Within the last 15 years there is probably no group of people who have accepted the challenges and opportunities that lie before them as have the Koreans.

Mr. Speaker, everywhere in their country that we visited we were received with the finest and most gracious hospitality that could be imagined. It was clearly a demonstration of their friendship and the close bonds that tie our two countries together. It is our hope that not too long from now they may see fit to send their congressional delegation to our country. It was of great benefit to all of us to discuss our problems and theirs in an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation.

The untold acts of thoughtfulness and kindness extended to those of us who were a part of this mission will not soon be forgotten nor will we forget that South Korea has over 40,000 of their own sons fighting side by side with ours in Vietnam today. The South Koreans are aware, possibly more than any other nation, of the inherent and imminent dangers of Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation representing the United States reports to you and to this Congress that our mission was most successful in building bridges of friendship that will be long lasting and fruitful for generations to come.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to have been a member of the congressional delegation to the Republic of Korea. I regret that my participation in the visit was cut short by a family sorrow which required my return to the United States. However, I was in South Korea for a long enough period of time to be tremendously impressed by the energy of the Korean people—the plain, old-fashioned hard work with which they attack their problems—their warmth and courtesy and personal charm, and their bravery and courage.

I attempted to put some of this into

words in an article which I sent to the newspapers in my district in North Carolina. I wanted the people of my district to know more about our good friends in South Korea. The article was widely reprinted, and I submit it here for the RECORD. Two articles were sent to the newspapers. The first article concerned the trip over and our visit to Japan.

Each one of us on the trip thanks each of you in South Korea for your great courtesy to us. Each of us hopes that some day we can once again visit the "Land of the Morning Calm."

The report follows:

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN RICHARDSON PREYER ON CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO JAPAN AND KOREA—PART II

It is only 840 miles from Tokyo to Seoul, Korea. This isn't much of a trip for a jet plane ordinarily, but it can be a long and hard flight because the worst winds in the world—as far as flying is concerned—occur between Tokyo and Korea. For example, we had a 250 m.p.h. headwind on our flight.

The reception for the United States delegation at the Kimpo Airport in Seoul made it worth the rough flight. South Koreans love America and are deeply grateful to our fighting men and our country for making a free South Korea possible. The reception showed this: cheering crowds, bands playing, full military honors. Each Congressman was given a big bouquet of flowers by some young girls. A group of children held signs welcoming each Congressman individually. I gave my bouquet to the girl and boy—they looked to be 10 to 12 years old—holding the "Welcome, Richardson Preyer of North Carolina" sign. They were very courteous and well-mannered.

The City of Seoul was a battleground during the Korean War that changed hands four times from 1950-53. At the end of the war it was a shattered shell, its one million people facing famine. Today, it is a city of four million people—one of the world's largest—and is a city completely transformed. It is one of the world's great success stories. Everywhere you turn you see bulldozers and people at work. Our delegation arrived on a Sunday afternoon, and there seemed to be as many people at work as if it were a weekday. (Incidentally, Christianity is the leading religion in Korea, Christians outnumbering the Buddhists by about 1/2 million. As far as I know, this is the only country in the Far East where this is even close to being the case.) There is a handsome new skyline and new highways. There is intense interest in education, and the literacy rate is nearly 90% (from about 10% earlier). All of this has been accomplished by native energy and foreign aid. (This is one foreign aid success story.)

Yet despite its boom, Seoul lives in a shadow. For only 30 miles away lies the Demilitarized Zone, separating North and South Korea. Though a truce technically prevails, there are minor skirmishes across the line which constantly threaten the uneasy peace. Some 50,000 American troops are on duty and live under combat conditions. About 10 Americans are killed each month in these skirmishes. Infiltrators are a problem. In January, 1969, 31 North Korean guerrillas infiltrated into Seoul itself with the mission of assassinating the President of South Korea. They actually charged his official residence, after throwing hand grenades at two city buses (killing three passengers), but were all shot or captured. The guerrillas make an assassination threat an ever-present possibility, but they have had no real success because they have no way to live off the country when they get into South Korea; the South Korean people are fiercely loyal to their government and to America and so report them immediately.

There are 30,410,000 people in South Korea. This is more than double that of North Korea. They live in an area roughly the size of the State of Virginia. It certainly does not look like Virginia, however. When you fly over it, you see ridge after ridge of barren, snow-covered mountains; you wonder how our fighting men ever fought a war there. When you find a plain—or any small flat place—it is jammed with people. The Koreans would regard the 6th District of North Carolina—with its open land and relatively mild climate (Korea is hotter in the summer and colder in the winter than North Carolina) as paradise!

South Korea throughout all its recent history has been an occupied country. The Japanese most recently ruled the country until 1945 with an iron hand. As a result, they have had no experience with a democratic form of government. Nevertheless, they have done a good job in making representative government work. One of the purposes of the visit of our delegation was to discuss with the Congress (called the National Assembly) the problems involved in government, and to strengthen the prestige of their Congress.

In addition to making progress in democracy, they have made great strides in establishing a free enterprise economy. Nevertheless, there is serious reason for concern as they look to the future. For while the South Koreans are busy developing a free enterprise economy, the North Koreans are busy arming.

The North Korean armaments are superior to South Korea in both quantity and quality. This raises the spectre of another Vietnam type involvement for our country should North Korea march across the demilitarized zone into South Korea again. The seizure of the *Pueblo*, of course, was the latest of the North Korean war-like acts. It is important, in my opinion, that we help South Korea arm itself so that it can defend itself. For example, we should help the South Koreans to set up plants to manufacture rifles in South Korea. It means, too, that we shall probably need to keep our base at Okinawa so that we can have an immediate sea and air response should North Korea invade South Korea by sea. (South Korea has no navy that could stop such an invasion.)

Finally, some people may say, "Is it worth the cost to send a group of Congressmen to Korea, or to any other place? Why don't they stay in Washington?" In my opinion it is very much worth the cost and effort. In running a private business, you would feel that you were not doing your duty if you did not visit your operations and see on the spot whether it is being very effectively run. In government, we are spending millions—even billions—of dollars abroad. It is worth a few thousand dollars to make sure that the millions are being properly spent. Suggestions made by U.S. delegations as a result of these trips have resulted in saving the taxpayers' amounts far in excess of the cost of these trips.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Members of the delegation to Korea may appear in the RECORD in order of their designation by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject which we

have been discussing today under my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

THE MANDATORY OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that I was here today and had the opportunity to hear under this special order of the distinguished majority leader this dissertation on Korea.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for 10 years. We have had some bitter and bloody fights on the floor of the House with reference to these matters. The only thing I regret today is that this group could not have held off until just before we brought our appropriation bill onto the floor of the House. Some of us have lived with this problem of Korea for a great many years and have had some very difficult fights, as I mentioned earlier, with reference to the appropriations request on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I feel an obligation to respond to a lengthy and detailed presentation made on March 12. That presentation dealt with a subject with which I am greatly concerned: the proposal for a free trade subzone and oil refinery at Machiasport.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments for and against the Machiasport project are no longer new. The proposal's effects upon the consumer, the New England economy, the domestic oil industry, and the national interest have been examined by both sides, and by now the lines are rather firmly drawn. My own position in favor of Machiasport has been affirmed on several occasions and it is not my purpose today to tread the same ground again.

However, the statement that I refer to raised issues reaching far beyond the Machiasport proposal itself. As was correctly pointed out, that proposal must be seen in the context of our total Government policy toward the oil industry, and certainly in the context of our oil import program. The statement assumptions concerning the oil import program and other governmental regulations designed to protect the industry are so very different from my own, that I feel I would be remiss if I did not respond without delay and without equivocation.

Particularly because the presentation was the first major statement opposing the Machiasport project to relate that project to the total picture of Government oil policy, I feel that the time is right to present my own views and specific proposals on the future role of our Government in formulating policy toward the industry.

I would like to begin by tracing briefly

the history of our Government's intervention in the oil industry. Such an examination will help us to better understand how the various regulations and subsidies developed and what their effect on the industry and the country has been over the last several years.

The first significant entrance of Government into the oil industry came when that industry was quite young, during and immediately following the First World War. To encourage the exploration and development of our oil fields, percentage depletion allowance benefits were introduced as a tax subsidy. The Revenue Act of 1918 granted to oil firms a 100 percent tax-free income equal to discovery value of their oil property. In 1924, the tax-free income flow was changed to 50 percent of the property's net income. The present system of a 27½ percent oil depletion allowance—based on gross instead of net income—was adopted in 1926. Under this allowance, up to 50 percent of the net income from a property is tax-free. Thus, if a company claims the full allowance, its tax rate is cut in half. Other tax benefits, and complex devices for minimizing tax liability, have the effect of saving the industry millions of dollars in tax bills each year. The loser is Uncle Sam—and ultimately, all of us taxpayers who carry a heavier load to make up what the oil industry is saving.

In 1967, some of the Nation's biggest oil companies—including Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Standard of New Jersey, Union, Marathon, and Sinclair—paid Federal taxes of between 2 and 8 percent of their net income. Think of their incredible saving, especially when those rates are compared with the standard corporate tax rate of 52 percent.

In fact, one company—Atlantic Refining Co.—paid no Federal taxes at all between 1962 and 1967, despite total earnings of \$410 million.

Surely these tax benefits constitute the biggest windfall in our country's fiscal history.

As I indicated, the percentage depletion allowance was established to encourage discovery of our oil reserves. But a recent study has shown that at this point we are losing over \$10 in revenue for every \$1 of discovered oil reserves. This is insanity. It is high time that the depletion allowance be reexamined and sharply curtailed if not eliminated entirely.

To return to the historical picture, the effect of these tax subsidies after World War I was to encourage oil drilling and production at a breakneck pace. By the early thirties, the increased volume of oil available at a time when demand was declining led inevitably to a decline in the price of oil. The discovery of a vast oil field in east Texas in 1930 also contributed to depressed prices.

To check the frantic activity of oil producers which the depletion allowance encouraged, Government resorted to a second type of intervention in the form of prorationing regulations passed by the leading oil-producing States. Prorationing mechanisms function by limiting the total crude-oil production in a given State and dividing that total among the various wells and among the

producers in each well. The result is to deliberately slow down production.

Prorationing has two purposes. The first is to restrict production to the rate at which it is most efficient, in order to eliminate the waste which occurs when oil is taken from the ground too fast. The second purpose is to restrict production to that quantity which will meet current market demand at the existing price.

I believe that the first form of prorationing is justified; the second is not. Maximum efficient rate prorationing is clearly in the national interest because it conserves our oil resources. This was necessary because the drive to maximize short-term profits had driven many oil firms, especially jointly owned ones, to produce at the fastest possible rate, which, as I indicated is highly wasteful. However, market-demand prorationing has nothing to do with conservation or efficiency; its purpose is to artificially maintain the price of oil.

The reason behind market-demand prorationing is that it protects smaller and less efficient operators who otherwise would not be able to compete with higher production wells. In so doing, it compounds the problem by making those high-production wells inefficient themselves—they are held back for the benefit of the ones which cannot compete in a free market. Market-demand prorationing robs Peter to pay Paul.

Just how serious is the effect of market-demand prorationing on the economics of the industry? The average producing capacity of wells in the United States is about 14 barrels per day. This compares with over 5,000 barrels per day in the most profitable oil fields in the Middle East. Given a ratio of 14 to 5,000, it is no wonder that our domestic industry requires such massive tax subsidies and other benefits in order to compete. But here is the point: the only reason that our figure is so low is because of prorationing regulations. We have in this country wells which are capable of producing efficiently up to 1,000 barrels per day. They are restricted precisely to protect small, inefficient wells that can produce only 5 barrels per day. Given our economy, there is no excuse for this situation. If it were eliminated, the good wells would become much more efficient and profitable. Profits encourage greater exploratory activity and would in turn lead to new discoveries. The industry would in my view be far healthier if it were freed from the shackles of market-demand prorationing.

At any rate, the effect of the prorationing plans adopted by most of the oil-producing States a number of years ago led to artificially high prices for domestic oil. Naturally then, competition began to emerge from firms with foreign oil holdings, who found that their cost of producing foreign oil and shipping it to this country still enabled them to sell at prices below those charged by domestic producers. Thus, increasingly large volumes of oil were imported into the country.

The response of the domestic-based industry to this new threat was predictable: additional Government intervention

was sought to protect the domestic industry from foreign competition. Thus a third governmental step was taken in the form of a protective tariff on imported crude oil. This tariff has existed at a rate of 10½ cents per barrel since 1943.

The increased petroleum needs generated by the Second World War threw into sharp focus both the growing ratio of imported oil to domestic oil, and the implications of that situation for our national security. At the conclusion of the war, the Petroleum Industry War Council recommended that—

In the interest of maintaining national security it should be the policy of this nation to so restrict amounts of imported oil so that such quantities will not disturb or depress the producing end of the domestic petroleum industry, and only such amounts of oil should be imported into this country as is absolutely necessary to augment our domestic production when it is produced under conditions consonant with good conservation practices.

Modified to various degrees, this has been the policy of our Government regarding petroleum imports for the last 23 years.

The policy was given legislative reinforcement in 1955 when Congress wrote into the Trade Agreements Extension Act a provision known as the national security amendment. It gives the President authority to "take such action as he deems necessary" to adjust the level of imports of any article which, if imported in sufficient quantities, might "threaten to impair the national security." The national security amendment provided the machinery by which our oil import control program was established.

As soon as the act was passed, representatives of the oil industry began clamoring for its application to petroleum imports. In 1957, following the report of a Special Cabinet Committee, President Eisenhower announced establishment of a voluntary import program. The program lasted for 2 years and was a failure. Therefore, in 1959 the President created the mandatory oil import control program which remains in effect today. The voluntary program had applied only to crude oil; the mandatory one applies also to oil products and derivatives.

The mandatory program, as administered in the greater part of the country, restricts imports to 12.2 percent of domestic production. On the west coast, a deficit area, the percentage is left flexible. Import privileges are divided among participating companies, some receiving fixed allocations because of their "historical" position in the field, others using a sliding scale. While the 12.2-percent figure for controlled imports has remained constant since 1962, the program has become riddled with exceptions and special treatment situations, so that the true ratio of imports to domestic production is higher than 12.2 percent.

One important exception is residual fuel oil, a low-priced byproduct of crude refining. Imports of residuals have been handled separately since controls were instituted, and residual marketers have by this time been given virtually unlimited access to foreign supplies—although, of course, the import control mechanism means that those supplies

come in at artificially inflated prices. In 1966, imports of residual fuel comprised 84.4 percent of the total supply.

The reason why residual imports are so great is that the domestic industry under present circumstances is not interested in competing for the residual market, which is less profitable than the market for high-priced lighter oils such as No. 2 heating oil. I find it ironic that those who espouse the so-called "national security" argument that imports must be kept to a minimum—a very mistaken argument, as I shall demonstrate—have allowed imports of residual fuel to outnumber domestic supplies by 4 to 1.

Other exceptions to the quota limitations have been made for refiners in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for petrochemical refiners, and in situations where shortages or other unusual circumstances have occurred.

The import control program represents a fourth substantial step by government into the petroleum marketing process: and it is more complex and more controversial than any of the previous ones. It is this program that I would like to examine especially carefully today. First however, let me summarize very briefly my comments on the history of government activity in the oil industry. As we saw, it began with attractive tax subsidies designed to bolster a growing industry. These were so successful that pro-rationing plans were adopted by state governments to slow down production. Pro-rationing in turn led to inflated domestic oil prices, causing increased foreign competition. The latter led to government protection measures in the form of a tariff and, more recently, restrictions on imported oil.

It should be clear that we now have operating a vicious circle of government interventions. One form of intervention has led to another, and today we have an elaborate structure of regulations and subsidies.

THE IMPORT QUOTA SYSTEM

The "capstone," as one economist termed it, of the entire system of subsidies to the petroleum industry is the oil import quota system. It insulates the domestic industry from the free market and from the competitive impact of foreign oil. Were the quotas removed, simple economics would force the domestic industry to become efficient and meet the challenge of competition.

The cost of the protective quota system is borne by every consumer of petroleum and its products. To provide some indication of this cost, it is enough to compare the price of a barrel of crude delivered to a New England port now—about \$3.50—with the cost assuming there were no quota—about \$2. The exact figures vary according to whose estimate one takes, but it should be clear that there is a tremendous difference. Most persons will agree that there is a differential of at least \$1.25 between the world price of a barrel delivered to the United States and the current U.S. price.

When that differential is multiplied by the number of barrels that are sold each year, we arrive at an annual cost to the consumer of over \$4 billion a year. So

in the 10 years of its operation, the quota system has cost us in the neighborhood of \$40 to \$50 billion.

In addition to this enormous financial burden, the quota system imposes another kind of hardship that cannot be calculated financially. This hardship occurs especially in New England. The New England States are heavily dependent on oil heat—78 percent of homes in the region use it, and New England's 6 percent of the Nation's population consumes over 20 percent of its heating oil. Long and rugged winters place a heavy demand on fuel oil dealers and suppliers, who are far away from major sources of supply in the southwest. As a result, the New England area has on several occasions been plagued with serious shortages of fuel.

Without the quota system, greater volumes of imported oil would be free to enter the United States at east coast ports, some of them located in New England. Supply would be able to meet demand, and the threat of further shortages would be greatly reduced.

I remember especially well the shortage we in New England experienced during January of 1968. I had repeatedly expressed concern about the possible danger of a shortage, and had testified before the Senate Finance Committee the previous fall on the problem of making adequate supplies available. It was no great surprise to me when a shortage actually occurred.

Particularly instructive was the action taken to deal with the shortage. At my request and the request of other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the Oil Import Appeals Board issued decisions allowing 12 companies to import additional No. 2 fuel oil to meet the shortage. In other words, we turned to increased imported oil to bail us out because the domestic supplies in our area were not adequate.

To my mind, the fact that our situation got so bad that the Government was forced to liberalize oil import conditions is implicit recognition of the inadequacy, indeed the ludicrousness of the oil import quota system.

Why in the world do we have to wait until we are literally running out before we admit that the present ground rules cannot do the job?

The Presidential proclamation establishing the mandatory oil import program recognized the adverse effect of limiting imports and included language clearly implying that imports might be increased if oil prices went up after controls were instituted. Despite numerous price rises—which sometimes occurred in the midst of winter months when demand was greatest—the Government has not invoked the language of the proclamation in order to increase the ratio of imports to domestic production.

This is not to say that public officials have been unaware of the hardship and injustice that accrues to New England under the present quota arrangement. Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in his last news conference before leaving office, admitted that New England has "a very strong case for some kind of action" and expressed regret that

he had not acted earlier on the "nagging" regional fuel problem. Recognizing the blatantly unfair method by which quotas are now allocated, Udall proposed a plan to give independent terminal operators on the east coast a share of the import quotas—possibly to the extent of 30,000 barrels a day.

Likewise, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore has called for a close look at the import program with a view to numerous modifications.

But why attempt to continue patching up the quota system to meet each new set of needs as they come along? The plain fact is that the system is first, exorbitantly expensive; second, conducive to fuel shortages; and third, inequitable. Most important, it is unnecessary. Surely the time has come for more basic change.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The sole argument advanced to justify the import control program is that the national security requires it. Although I shall show that this argument is not valid, I want to make the point that it is the only argument that need even be discussed.

In its report on the program last year, the House Interior Committee stated:

Three Presidents of this Nation, beginning with President Eisenhower and continuing with President Kennedy and President Johnson, together with innumerable special task forces, commissions, and study groups, as well as several congressional committees, have all been of one mind on the objective of the mandatory oil import program. Its one and only reason for being is to insure the national security of this Nation by reducing this country's dependence on foreign imports by assuring a strong and vigorous domestic petroleum industry.

Secretary Udall, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1967, stated that national security "is the paramount—the only—reason why petroleum imports are controlled." And in his remarks a few days ago, the able Senator from Louisiana acknowledged that the threat to national security was the basis of his objection to the proposed Machiasport project. He listed nine ways in which he felt the Machiasport plan would affect national security. He stated that he had no objection to the refinery itself; it was the importation of the refined oil into the country—with its consequent effect on the quota system and hence on the national security—that drew his fire.

It follows logically, then, that if national security can be assured without the mandatory oil import program, then we could—and should—dispense with that program and all of its adverse effects.

Let us acknowledge that our national security does require that two conditions be met: first, we must have enough domestic oil to meet the Nation's needs in times of crisis; and second, the industry must be capable of delivering it expeditiously.

First, then, what is the present state of our oil reserves and potential reserves? How do they compare with our anticipated needs over the next several years and decades?

One reliable estimate places our present underground oil supply at approxi-

mately 300 billion barrels now. Ten percent of this, or 30 billion barrels, is "crude reserve"—in other words, it is "on tap." The remaining 270 billion barrels have not even been touched.

It has been estimated that we will consume 50 billion barrels in the next 10 years. At that rate, we have right now enough oil for roughly the next six decades. Of course, consumption may rise, but on the other hand we have not taken into account the probability of large new discoveries in the next several years. For example, the field recently discovered on the North Slope, Alaska, is sizable, and in time could produce between 5 and 10 billion barrels, possibly more.

Finally, and perhaps most promising, there is shale. If we take into account only the richest shale—that containing 25 barrels per ton or more—we have 600 billion barrels of potential oil from shale in the United States. One estimate has indicated that, given current production rates, there is 1,000 years' supply of shale in the country. Developing our ability to extract oil from shale will be a valuable safeguard to national security as well as a sound economic decision. Once the initial investments are made, it will be only a matter of a few years before we can depend on shale for large volumes of low-cost domestic oil.

It should be clear that we are in no danger of exhausting our domestic oil supplies. Given sound planning and technological advances, we will have enough oil to meet our needs for the indefinite future.

The only remaining consideration, then, is that the domestic industry be sufficiently healthy so that it can meet increased demand should some crisis occur which would cut off foreign supplies. This is really the heart of the matter, and not surprisingly, it is surrounded by a thick veil of misunderstanding.

For too long it has been assumed that without the quota system, the domestic industry's capacity would decline, its reserves would dry up, and its profits disappear. Happily, the facts, which are finally coming to light in view of increased public concern, indicate that the opposite is true. Spearheading the effort to establish the facts and bury the misconceptions is an able group of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress. In the Senate, hearings on Government intervention in the petroleum industry are being held by Senator HART of Michigan and others including my Massachusetts colleague Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. I want to express my gratitude and support for their actions, and my hope that we can work together to bring about constructive change.

Let us suppose that import quotas were removed so that the domestic industry had to compete in a free-market situation: we have seen that crude oil prices would drop by about \$1.25 per barrel. Would this decline wreck the domestic industry? Far from it. A leading economist's calculation released at the Senate hearings I mentioned—one of the first made—shows that oil prices could be reduced at least this much and that 95 percent of the oil produced in this country could still be sold at a profit.

In other words, only 5 percent of domestic production would be lost if we abandoned the costly oil import program. So under the present system, we are subsidizing 95 percent of the industry, to the tune of \$4 billion a year, to protect the remaining 5 percent. Even if these pioneering calculations are only approximates, their implications are absolutely astounding. Far from wrecking the domestic industry, the removal of the oil quota system would be the best thing that has happened to it in years. We saw earlier that the industry today is operating at a very low level of efficiency.

A free market would raise efficiency to a high level, by eliminating the least efficient producers who have been acting as a drag on the rest. With fewer wells, industry operating costs would be lower. Further, the need for market-demand pro-rationing would be obviated, meaning that the remaining wells would produce at a faster and more profitable rate.

Although I think it is clear that an efficient domestic industry could handle our national petroleum needs in the event of crisis, I would like to make some further observations that may put the national security question into perspective.

First, it should be noted that some of our imports are virtually as secure as domestic sources. For example, imports from Canada which reach this country by overland pipeline are unlikely to be disturbed in the event of an international crisis. Imports from Mexico are similarly more secure than those from other countries.

Second, it is highly unlikely that all of our import sources would ever be cut off at one time. For example, the Middle East crises of 1956 and 1967 did not interfere with our sizeable imports from Venezuela. And I wonder how many of my colleagues recall the enormous extent to which our Atlantic fleet depended on Venezuelan oil during the Second World War?

Third, stoppages of oil from the Middle East, although they are likely in view of past circumstances and present unsettled conditions, are not apt to last over a prolonged period. The reason is simply that economic pressure will dictate otherwise. Middle Eastern governments need the income which the sale of their greatest resource brings them—in short, they need our dollars as much, or more, than we need their oil. This would be demonstrated graphically in the event of a stoppage, because our supply patterns would shift away from the Middle East.

Fourth and finally—and I do not like to even think of such a disastrous possibility—in the event of a major global confrontation, the destruction that would take place in our urban areas and the probable elimination of much of our refining capacity would result not in a shortage but a surplus of crude oil.

I cite these considerations because I think that the national security argument has been abused and exploited. When someone suggests constructive change in our oil import policy, he is likely to be silenced with an imperious raise of the eyebrow and a reverential utterance of the sacred phrase. This should not be so, and I hope that in fu-

ture discussions reasonable men can examine the claims of national security objectively and recognize that they can be met without our present system.

If reason prevails, I am confident that others will agree that with sound planning and prudence we can go forward free from the shackles of the costly, inefficient, and inequitable mandatory oil import control program.

RECOMMENDATION

In the near future I shall introduce in the House a bill aimed at eliminating the mandatory oil import control program established in 1959. Fully realizing that abrupt change is undesirable and that the oil industry deserves time to adjust to a new marketing situation, my legislation will provide that the quota system be phased out over a 10-year period, by gradually raising the permitted ratio of imports to domestic production.

A gradual phaseout will not only soften the impact of the change on our domestic producers, it will also provide the oil industry—and all of us—with time to discuss and plan other long-overdue changes in Government policy toward the industry. I have in mind specifically Government tax laws as they apply to the industry, and Federal support of pronation plans.

My proposal is only a beginning. But we must begin somewhere. I am happy to note that the New England congressional delegation has already taken the initiative in this area and I am hopeful that my action will provide a further stimulus to the more comprehensive change that I believe is vital to our Nation and our economy.

CONCLUSION: MACHIASPORT

I said the outset that it was not my intention to speak at length on the merits of the Machiasport proposal. Machiasport is an imaginative, viable idea, and it will provide badly needed relief for New England. As long as this country is saddled with the import quota system, then New England deserves to have that system reflect her needs and interests as well as those of the Southwestern States. That is what Machiasport is all about.

I trust that I have shown, however, that our national interest requires more than Machiasport. Machiasport is an attempt to remove one glaring inequity from an outworn and costly system. It is my hope that before much longer good sense and sound planning will prevail and that the system itself will be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following newspaper editorials as further evidence of the widespread concern of New Englanders over the high cost of fuel oil under the present import quota system:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Mar. 25, 1969]

THE OILMEN ADMIT IT'S COSTLY HERE

It took the long controversy over the proposed foreign trade zone to do it, but the high cost of energy in New England finally has been confirmed by the people in the best position to know—the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., supported by East Coast refiners and marketers.

A just-released study by the foundation shows that New England consumers pay the highest prices in the country for their heat-

ing oil, about 6 per cent above the national average. At that, said the report, it is still less expensive than natural gas or electricity.

In an attempt to explain the high rates, the foundation noted that the biggest mark-ups are at the retail level rather than at the wholesale level where prices are more nearly comparable with those in the rest of the country. But since retail distribution costs are higher in New England, the report said, this does not necessarily mean that the retail profits here are greater than elsewhere.

However that may be, the fact is that higher-than-average fuel prices and a higher-than-average cost of living are a severe liability for New England in its attempt to compete economically with the rest of the country. As it happens, the region has other assets which are not to be found in New Mexico, let us say, or along the Gulf Coast. But higher prices for oil and gasoline, year after year, are a handicap for homeowners, businessmen and industrial developers which is hard to shrug off.

The documentation of higher prices in the Northeast was produced by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., as its contribution to the heated debate over the foreign trade zone (with an oil refinery complex) projected at Machiasport, Maine.

The same charges have been made many times before, but never officially acknowledged. It took a hassle of national magnitude to do it, but now the facts are on the record and we can go on from there to a possible solution.

[From the North Adams Transcript,
Mar. 25, 1969]

NEW ENGLAND OIL PRICES IN HANDS OF PRESIDENT

The winter's bitter cold has passed into history—presumably—and New Englanders perhaps will begin to feel less conscious of the high cost of fuel oil to heat their homes.

Maybe, though, they would be well-advised to remain aware of that household expense, and, more important, to watch what President Nixon does with the responsibility he has taken on himself to decide whether or not those fuel oil costs will be reduced.

He didn't put it that way, of course. What he actually did, four weeks ago, was to announce that he would review oil import policies and assume responsibility for all decisions concerning them.

He did that because of the dispute that started last September when the Maine Port Authority asked for a permit to establish a foreign trade zone at Portland and a sub-zone at Machiasport.

The Maine Port Authority planned to allow Occidental Petroleum Co. to build a 300,000-barrel-a-day plant at Machiasport to refine crude oil from Libya. The company then would send most of its product to New England, where fuel costs have been high.

If the permit is granted, and the refinery is built, authorities estimate that oil heating bills in New England would be about 10 per cent lower.

Opposition has come from a predictable source—other American oil companies. They say the competition would ruin the price structure of domestic oil (conveniently ignoring the fact that that price structure has been discriminatory in New England).

In view of all this, some facts concerning foreign trade zones may be of interest. This little-known aspect of U.S. trade policies was first authorized in 1934, during the depths of the Great Depression, when the U.S. share of world trade had dropped to less than 10 per cent.

It was hoped that the zones would encourage an expansion of U.S. foreign trade. Located on U.S. territory, but not subject to U.S. customs, a foreign trade zone allows foreign importers to have their products processed on U.S. territory before introducing them as imports to the U.S. market.

The device has proved profitable to all sides. The number in existence at a given time has varied. There were 13 at the beginning, and now there are 10. One is at New Orleans, La., for grain imports, which calls attention to the fact that Louisiana Sen. Russell B. Long has been a vigorous opponent of the Machiasport zone. Louisiana, of course, is an oil-producing state. Sen. Long has seen no danger to Middle West farmers because of the grain import zone at New Orleans.

The most recent permit granted was that given Dow Chemical Co. for a Bay County, Mich., zone. That would include a license to import oil, but there has been no outcry from the oil barons or Sen. Long.

They also have been strangely silent on the applications for zones for oil imports in Savannah, Ga., and Honolulu. Isn't it, then, a reasonable deduction that opposition to the Machiasport zone rests only on the fact that competition would lower the costs in this captive New England market?

President Nixon's decision should be watched closely, even though winter now has left New England.

PROBLEM OF OIL PRICES

Perhaps Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans was remembering former President Truman's discovery that the White House is "where the buck stops" when he decided to postpone consideration of a duty-free foreign trade zone in Maine until the administration had reviewed the oil import control program. But this time the buck could bounce right back.

At least the five Republican senators who visited President Nixon Wednesday went away hopeful that the White House would decide to separate the trade zone issue from the matter of oil import quotas for a proposed refinery in Machiasport, Me. The senators received no promises, but there was reason to believe that the administration could handle the situation in a way that would be fair to New England and to the oil industry—though the oil lobby would prefer that the whole idea be dropped.

New England has long been at a disadvantage in the matter of heating oil prices because of its distance from the refineries in this country. Not one of the 250 is located in this region, meaning that transport is a big cost factor. The oil lobby, fighting to preserve the status quo, has said its main objection is that Occidental Petroleum Corp. would get "preferential" treatment if the foreign trade zone were established.

Occidental does seek to build a \$145 million refinery at Machiasport, but according to Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Me., other petroleum firms are being considered, too. In the event the federal Foreign Trade Zones Board approves the state's application for the zone, a pool operation might be set up. But the oil industry, suggesting no alternative to the predicament of New England, does not find the idea appealing. The governor of Texas, in fact, sees a threat to the "national security" in the refining of imported oil in a foreign trade zone.

Granted, there would be some significant shifting of the fuel oil market in New England; but with the overall market constantly on the increase, the industry should be able to adjust without difficulty. And a long-standing price disadvantage to heating oil users in New England would be eliminated.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES OPPOSE SUBSIDY FOR NUCLEAR FUEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a small section of a proposed amendment to the regulations under section 103(c) of the

Internal Revenue Code relating to interest on industrial development bonds would permit a very large subsidy to certain nuclear power producers for the acquisition of nuclear fuel and for the reprocessing of such fuel. This subsidy would be possible by including in the definition for facilities for which tax-free industrial development bonds could be offered "a facility which reprocesses nuclear fuel that has been used and is to be reused in the electric generating plant furnishing electric energy." This overall amendment is required to make section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code conform with the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. A public hearing on the proposed amendment was held by IRS on February 18, 1969.

The definition of a "facility" was apparently enlarged to include a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant as a result of the opinion of the New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority that tax-exempt bonds could be issued by ASDA for the purpose of meeting its commitments under any nuclear fuel arrangement under negotiation, or contemplated, with any utility company in New York State. Opposition to the ASDA interpretation, however, by electric companies outside New York State became very evident during the February 18 public hearings at IRS. On March 9, 1969, the New York Times contained an excellent discussion of this controversy.

Unless there is objection, I will include the New York Times article at this point in my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

STATE'S TAX-FREE NUCLEAR ROLE REVIVES
PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER ISSUE
(By Gene Smith)

The Consolidated Edison Company of New York finds itself these days in the unaccustomed role of the knight doing battle with a many-headed dragon.

Charles E. Luce, who quit as Under Secretary of Interior in the Johnson Administration to become chairman and chief executive officer of the utility in 1967, has cast his lot behind the New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority against almost all of the nation's major utilities.

The issue stated simply is: When is a governmental subsidy not a subsidy?

POWERS EXPANDED

The Development Authority was established in 1962 with broad powers in the fields of research and development and the provision of services related to nuclear power generation. Under subsequent legislation in 1968 it was granted additional powers with respect to nuclear power generation to implement Governor Rockefeller's New York State Power Program, a joint venture of the private electric utilities, the State Power Authority and the Development Authority.

In May, 1968, the Development Authority was expressly empowered to acquire nuclear fuel and lease or otherwise make it available to others for peaceful use, including power production.

The Development Authority, acting as an instrumentality of the state, has proceeded on the belief that as such it is entitled to use tax-exempt bonds. This would have the obvious effect of making its lease prices lower than those of private companies in the nuclear fuel leasing business and that's where the battle lines have been drawn.

Oliver Townsend, chairman of the Development Authority, submitted a statement last Jan. 14 before the standing committee on

public utilities of the New York State Senate that said:

"It is our understanding that it is within the intent of currently applicable Federal law to preserve and perpetuate the tax-exempt status of bonds or notes such as those that would be issued by A.S.D.A. for the purpose of meeting its commitments under any nuclear fuel arrangement now under negotiation or contemplated with any utility company in New York State."

The Internal Revenue Service specifically included "sewage or solid waste disposal facilities or facilities for the local furnishing of electric energy, gas or water (and) air or water pollution control facilities" as being qualified for tax exemption in proposed amendments under section 103 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to industrial development bonds.

Utility opposition to this interpretation became evident at public hearings last Feb. 18. The industry's leading weekly magazine, *Electrical World*, reported in its March 3 issue that "a proposed ruling by the I.R.S. would kill the commercial ownership of nuclear fuel before it even gets out of its infancy."

COST ESTIMATED

N. Barr Miller, attorney for Northeast Utilities, told the meeting that "under your proposed rules, you are just transferring government ownership from the Federal to the state level."

The trade magazine further reported that a consultant to the Bankers Leasing Corporation of Boston predicted that the ruling would cost the United States Treasury "about \$4-billion in tax revenues over the next 10 years."

Sherman R. Knapp, chairman and chief executive officer of Northeast Utilities, said in an interview last week that this tax exemption would "give an unfair edge to New York State utilities and the result would be that Connecticut and all other states would want the same advantages for themselves."

"It would be the beginning of the end of private enterprise in the utility industry," Mr. Knapp added.

But Con Edison's Mr. Luce doesn't agree. Noting that his company was now negotiating for some \$100-million in nuclear fuel leases, he said:

"Whatever we eventually have to pay for this fuel, it would be substantially less if we can lease it through A.S.D.A. It would mean savings in the millions to the company, which would benefit our customers in the long run." Company officials working on the fuel lease contract estimate the savings would amount to about \$5-million a year for the company.

Mr. Luce pointed out that Governor Rockefeller's entire power program depends to a large measure on the ability of the Development Authority to issue such bonds. "It would be quite ironic if the I.R.S. ruled that A.S.D.A. was not tax exempt, which would leave the State Power Authority to continue to build entire plants tax exempt and we'd be left holding the bag. The present program, though a small step, does reduce somewhat the State Power Authority's advantages over us," Mr. Luce added.

Privately, most utility executives would concede that Mr. Luce has unusual problems in keeping down operating costs for his company. The more liberal executives would also point out that many utilities, particularly those on the Pacific Coast, have no hesitation whatsoever in partaking of the benefits that result from tax-exempt dams built for water supplies or for Government-owned flood-control and power programs.

But many executives see in this a revival of the old battle of public vs. private power.

OPPOSITION BACKED

Albert A. Cree, chairman of the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation, said he agreed 100 per cent with Mr. Knapp's op-

position to the rule change. "Financing of pure business operations by tax exempts has already been overdone," he stressed. "It ought to be contracted. I hope we never have to resort to anything like the New York plan in New England."

William G. Kuhns, president of the General Public Utilities Corporation, described the use of tax exempts as "raiding the Federal treasury . . . a crazy direction for the industry to move." He pointed out that his company had under construction four large nuclear generating units with an aggregate investment of more than \$600-million. It is estimated that fuel costs for these plants will be in excess of \$750-million over their total service lives.

Mr. Kuhns acknowledged that such tax exemption would appear beneficial to his operating companies in both New Jersey and Pennsylvania but added that the savings would have to be made up by other taxes. In a statement opposing the rule changes of the I.R.S., Mr. Kuhns pointed out that the proposals classify facilities that reprocess nuclear fuel for an electric utility as "a facility for the furnishing of electric energy."

"The facilities that furnish electric service are the generating, transmission and distribution facilities," he went on. "They do not include, in the case of a coal-fired generating station, the mining machinery that digs the coal or the rail facilities and trucks that bring the coal from the mine to the generating station. . . . How then can a facility that reprocesses nuclear fuel be deemed to be a facility for the furnishing of electric service?"

SIMILAR LAWS EXPECTED

He warned further that it "must be anticipated" that other states would adopt statutes similar to New York's which would lead to "a Gresham's law type of competition at a time when nuclear generation can, and should, stand on its own economic feet."

The Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago also filed a statement supporting Northeast Utilities' opposition. It pointed out that more than one-fourth of the cost of the heat output of nuclear fuel stems from the cost of carrying the investment in the fuel, and added:

"Accordingly, permitting that investment to be financed with tax-free debt instruments as opposed to a normal mix of taxable debt and equity will result in a misallocation of resources and a material loss of revenues to the Treasury. The investor-owned utilities provide one of the largest sources of Federal, state and local taxes. Erosion of this tax source will have serious long-run consequences."

Representative Craig Hosmer, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, said he was "not too happy" with the proposed rule changes by the Revenue Service.

"It would be pretty poor for the Treasury," the California Republican stated, adding: "You've got an energetic hyperthyroid agency in New York working with a bunch of whiz-kid bankers. The poor people in the smaller farm states would sure have to fumble around to get something else that would benefit them when they'd be building only one-tenth what is planned for nuclear plants in the East."

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED

Publicly, all of the New York utilities back Con Edison's stand as being equally beneficial for their own future nuclear plants, but the Long Island Lighting Company noted that it was committed to purchase the first two cores for its planned atomic power plants from the General Electric Company.

Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., is not directly involved although it has a 20 per cent interest in a planned atomic plant to be built by Con Edison. However, Richard D. Wilhite, president of the upstate utility, said he felt personally that "this is a funny way to single

out one single item for tax-free money. It will just transfer the bills from the back of the utilities to the public through increased taxes."

Henry Glendinning of the Walnut Leasing Company, which bid against the Development Authority for the Con Edison fuel contract, said his group "still believes that there may be certain factors that will let us be competitive even with their tax-free interest rates. Mr. Glendinning is a partner in the Philadelphia investment banking firm of Butcher & Sherred, which backs Walnut Leasing.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted from the New York Times article that William G. Kuhns, president of the General Public Utilities Corporation, described the use of tax exemptions for this purpose as "raiding the Federal Treasury" and "a crazy direction for the industry to move." I was particularly interested in Mr. Kuhns' statement because one of the subsidiary electric power companies of GPU—Pennsylvania Electric Co.—operates in my congressional district. I consider PENELEC to be an outstanding company which does a very commendable job of serving the electric consumers in our part of Pennsylvania reliably and at reasonable rates. It gives me personal pleasure to read a forthright statement such as this one presented by Bill Kuhns in opposition to a subsidy which might have been available to his company. In my opinion, this represents what might be called business statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I think other Members of this body will benefit from reading the entire statement submitted by Bill Kuhns to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on February 13. I will include the full text of his comments at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY W. G. KUHN ON BEHALF OF GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORPORATION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED REGULATION SECTION 1.103-8(f) (2) (III)

DEAR SIR: General Public Utilities Corporation ("GPU") is a New York corporation registered as a holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. It has four major electric utility subsidiaries which serve an area of approximately 24,000 square miles in Pennsylvania and New Jersey from Lake Erie to the Atlantic Ocean. Those subsidiaries have under construction four large nuclear generating units involving an aggregate investment of more than \$600 million. It is presently estimated that these four units will utilize over their respective service lives nuclear fuel with an aggregate cost on the order of \$750 million. Moreover, at the GPU system's present rate of growth, it is probable that the nuclear generating capacity of its subsidiaries will more than treble in the three decades prior to the year 2,000 and that there will be a corresponding increase in their investment in nuclear fuel.

GPU is opposed to proposed Regulation Section 1.103-8(f) (2) (iii) even though such proposed Regulation would appear to be beneficial to GPU by providing a subsidy for the acquisition by it of nuclear fuel and the reprocessing of such fuel. In GPU's view, the proposed Regulation would tend to undermine the sound public policy embodied in Section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code; it would convert what was intended by Congress in Section 103(c) (4) (E) to be a narrow exemption from the sweeping reform provided by Section 103(c) into a new broad invasion of the Federal Treasury.

In recent years the Treasury Department has repeatedly pointed out that Federal funds can be diverted into a particular channel quite as effectively by income tax exemp-

tions, credits and deductions as by the direct appropriation by Congress and that the exemption-credit-deduction method of diversion gives Congress much less control than direct appropriations.

For example, on January 23, 1968, the Treasury Department submitted to Congress a memorandum commenting on H.R. 11645 and a number of other bills which proposed the amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that industrial development bonds not be considered obligations of state or local governments, interest upon which would be exempt from Federal income tax. That stated in part:

"In all cases the exemption of interest on industrial development bonds from Federal income tax is simply a Federal subsidy to private corporations. The lower interest rates—which are passed on to the private corporations in the form of lower rental charges—are only possible because of the tax exempt status of the interest in the hands of the bondholders. Therefore, the full benefit derived by private industry is achieved only at the expense of a loss of Federal tax revenues. Moreover, it is a forced Federal subsidy. The amount of the subsidy, the beneficiary of the subsidy, or the use to which the borrowed funds are put are not considered in any way by the Federal Government. The sole decision as to whether or not to benefit a private corporation rests with the various State and local governments and, since industrial revenue financing imposes no direct costs on the issuing governmental units, there is no agency that has any effective interest in assessing the merits of extending Federal tax benefits to any particular private corporate beneficiary."

These comments of the Treasury Department are equally applicable to the exemption which would be provided pursuant to proposed Regulation Section 1.103-8(f) (2) (iii).

Section 103(c) was enacted in order to put an end to the cancerous growth of industrial development bond issues by state and local governments. Such bonds were being issued in rapidly increasing numbers to provide substantial economic subsidies and correspondingly competitive advantages to favored enterprises. They were resulting in economic dislocation, a waste of resources, and a wholesale invasion of the Federal Treasury.

In calling a halt to the abuse of tax exemptions by the issuance of industrial development bonds, Congress sought to provide protection to those existing areas of use of municipal bond tax exemptions which had a substantial background and historical justification. But Congress did not mean to create a brand new area of tax exemption for nuclear fuel for generating stations as the proposed regulation would do.

The language of Section 103(c) upon which the proposed Regulation purports to be based grants an exemption from the denial of tax exempt status to bonds whose proceeds are used to provide

"(E) sewage or solid waste disposal facilities or facilities for the local furnishing of electric energy, gas or water". (emphasis added)

The essential elements of this statutory language are that the proceeds of the exempt issue must be used (1) to provide "facilities", (2) that such facilities be employed for the furnishing of the specified utility services, and (3) that such services be furnished "locally". The proposed regulation ignores these elements.

Specifically, in the course of purporting to define the statutory language, the proposed Regulations use the term "any property" and it is our understanding that this phrase is viewed as embracing nuclear fuel itself. This stands in contrast with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which distinguish sharply between production and utilization facilities, on the one hand, and special nuclear material (i.e. nuclear fuel) on the

other hand. Nuclear fuel is clearly property, but it is not a facility and should not be so classified.

The proposed Regulations also depart from the requirement that the facility be one employed to "furnish" the specified services. They go so far as to state explicitly that a facility which reprocesses nuclear fuel for an electric utility subject to rate regulation is a facility for the furnishing of electric energy. This is unjustified. The facilities that furnish electric service are the generating, transmission and distribution facilities. They do not include, in the case of a coal-fired generating station, the mining machinery that digs coal or the rail facilities and trucks that bring the coal from the mine to the generating station. Nor do they include, in the case of an oil or gas-fired generating station, the drilling rigs that bring oil and gas to the surface or the pipelines that transport them to generating plants. How then can a facility that reprocesses nuclear fuel be deemed to be a facility for the furnishing of electric service?

Similarly, in the Conference Committee Report discussion of the exemption provided by subparagraph (B) for bonds issued to provide sports facilities, the Committee emphasized the necessity for a direct functional relationship between the facility and service it was to provide in stating:

"Facilities constructed in connection with, but not directly related to, a sports facility, such as a ski lodge to be built in connection with the development of a ski slope, are not to be considered sports facilities."

Again, in discussing the exemption provided by paragraph (C) for bonds issued to provide convention or trade show facilities, the supplemental statement of the managers on the part of the House Report noted that the exemption "applies only with regard to special purpose buildings and structures constructed for convention or trade shows. This means, for example, that the exemption does not apply to bonds issued to finance a hotel even though the hotel expects and does a major part of its business in catering to delegates or participants at conventions or trade shows."

In the same way the statutory requirement that the facility be one for the local furnishing of the specified utility service is ignored. The Conference Committee Report emphasized the necessity for the local nature of the service by explicitly stating that:

"Facilities for the local furnishing of electric energy, gas or water do not include facilities for regional or broader transportation of gas or water by pipeline or long-line transmission of electric energy." (emphasis added)

A nuclear reprocessing facility is not designed to serve only a local area; it is designed to serve, at a minimum, a regional or broader area.

If the proposed Regulation is adopted, it must be anticipated that in short order many States will adopt statutes for the creation of state or local agencies that will embark on the issuance of industrial development bonds to finance nuclear fuel and nuclear fuel reprocessing plants. No state or municipality will wish to deny to its own consumers the tax exemption subsidy enjoyed by residents in a neighboring State. GPU will then find itself in the position in which it must seek for its customers the benefit of such an exemption, even though GPU believes that exemptions of this type result in the misallocation of natural resources and lead to a Gresham's law type of competition at a time when nuclear generation can, and should, stand on its own economic feet.

If the Treasury Department believes that the proposed Regulation correctly reflects the intent of the Congress, we respectfully urge that the Treasury Department seek legisla-

tion to confirm this belief or, at a minimum, that it seek a confirmatory expression of views by the appropriate Congressional legislative committees. Unless and until such confirmation is obtained, we strongly believe that the Treasury Department should not take the step of opening the Federal Treasury as the proposed Regulation would now do.

As suggested by the Notice of Proposed Rule-Making, we are submitting these comments in quintuplicate.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some individuals who are not familiar with GPU might think this statement was made because that company has no direct interest in nuclear power development. In fact, Bill Kuhns pointed out to IRS that at the present time his company has four large nuclear generating units under construction with an aggregate investment of more than \$600 million. It is estimated that fuel costs for these plants will be in excess of \$750 million over their total service lives. He also acknowledged that while tax exemptions which would be available under the proposed IRS amendment might appear to be beneficial to the operating companies of GPU, the savings would have to be made up by other taxes.

At the same hearing on February 13, a spokesman for Northeast Utilities, another important group of electric companies, pointed out that if the New York State plan of using tax-free industrial development bonds to finance fuel elements and nuclear fuel reprocessing is accomplished, every major industrial State in the Nation will be under great pressure to adopt similar plans. If this development were pushed to its fullest, the Federal Government could lose as much as \$4 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that as a result of the sincere opposition expressed by many of the investor-owned electric companies to this proposed raid on the Federal Treasury, IRS will probably not include nuclear reprocessing plants in the definition of "facilities" eligible for tax-exempt industrial development bond financing. The new regulations, however, will not be published for a few weeks.

This is a very significant development because the long time effort to obtain commercial ownership of nuclear fuel by private industry was in danger of being killed before it ever really got out of its infancy. In 1964, the Congress adopted radical changes in the Atomic Energy Act, which since its enactment in 1946 had made mandatory the ownership by the Federal Government of all "special nuclear materials." The 1964 amendments adopted a new policy, which terminates by 1971 the ownership by the Federal Government of nuclear materials used as fuel in the electric utility industry and expressly provides for mandatory private ownership of all such nuclear materials.

The report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy at that time—Senate Report No. 1325, 88th Congress, second session—expressly declared the congressional policy of the 1964 legislation was to transfer nuclear material to private ownership and to permit "free market conditions" for its development as a competitive fuel for the production of electric energy. The Joint Committee

also seems to have anticipated the New York State proposal and expressed itself for private ownership of nuclear materials by private industry by saying:

It is generally believed that lease rather than sale of enriched uranium tends to discourage conservation of uranium and economic management of nuclear fuel inventories.

Private ownership legislation can thus assist in encouraging long-term planning for the development of nuclear power under conditions similar to those which obtain in the case of alternate sources of energy.

Thus, there exists a clear congressional mandate that nuclear fuel should be privately owned, and the further declaration that Government leasing of such fuel to the electric utilities is not desirable.

In the face of this declaration, New York State would try to get the taxing statute interpreted in such a way that the ownership of nuclear fuel for use by some electric utilities could pass from the Federal Government to State governmental units. In effect, the various States would thus be substituted for the Federal Government as the owners and lessors of nuclear fuel to private industry. It is submitted that such a result would nullify the fundamental objective of the Congress in its enactment of the 1964 amendments of the Atomic Energy Act. It is to the credit of so many of these electric companies that they opposed this section of the proposed amendment to the regulations under the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying that at this time when so many people and nations seem to have the "What's in it for me" attitude that we can have major business leaders coming forward to say, "We are opposed to receiving this additional subsidy for ourselves".

With the commercial statesmen such as William G. Kuhns, there may still be hope that our free, private enterprise system may long endure.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN REVERSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take these few minutes today to discuss two words, economy and efficiency, as they apply to a recent proposal to restructure or realign regional areas and to relocate required headquarters of several Executive Departments.

There is a difference between true economy and false economy, just as there is so-called efficiency that can be achieved only at the expense of losing sight of economy. When all is said and done both of these desirable objectives must be carefully appraised to see whether in fact economy is really achieved and what is the price tag or how high the cost of what is labeled efficiency.

The foregoing may seem somewhat complicated, but that is exactly how the proposal of the Nixon administration sounded, when on March 27 the administration through its Urban Affairs

Assistant, Mr. Moynihan, and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, proposed a restructuring of all Government services systems both as to regional boundaries and regional headquarters.

These gentleman talked in abstractions about such things as a vast reshuffling of regional boundaries so that they would be "co-terminus" with each other, which I suppose means all regions will have a common boundary.

Put in simpler language, among other things they said they meant to move the regional headquarters of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and the Office of Economic Opportunity from Kansas City to Denver and to create all new regional boundaries.

Some of us have had considerable difficulty getting a copy of the actual statements made at the news conference. We have had even more difficulty receiving from the Bureau of the Budget the maps which would show all the changes.

Put in simple, and I hope, clear and understandable language, the entire proposal makes no sense to move headquarters away from the population concentration these offices serve. The Kansas City Star, which is the metropolitan newspaper serving the area involved, and which it is my privilege to represent in part, was very considerate in their use of words in an editorial which suggested, "this move to reshuffle Federal offices is of doubtful merit." Some of us in the Congress who represent western Missouri and eastern Kansas believe this move is an expensive one which we can ill afford in this time of rising Government costs. Moreover, it would result in inefficiency rather than promoting efficiency because of the greater distances Federal workers would have to travel to reach the areas they serve. It is illogical to move the office away from the center of population to a remote area that is not as accessible as the present location, either as to transportation or communications. It is senseless to talk about economy or efficiency as the reason to justify these moves when in fact it can be readily and easily demonstrated that restructuring would be more expensive and, because of greater distances, be far less efficient.

A well-written editorial in the Star quite properly asks that the congressional delegation of Missouri and Kansas be given an explanation of the rationale behind the proposed moves. Try as they may, the new administration is going to find it difficult if not impossible to explain how they plan to promote better management and thus increase efficiency when the people in the offices involved will in the future have to travel about 1,000 miles from Denver to St. Louis, which is the heavy concentration of population served, rather than the present short trip from Kansas City to St. Louis.

So many things are wrong about this proposed move that I will not take time now to discuss all of them. But if we are all as interested in economy as we say, then it should be easy to recognize this proposal to restructure districts is actually moving in the opposite direction. It is economy in reverse. Moving costs

alone for over 800 families could run a minimum of \$1 million, and perhaps as high as \$3 million. This does not take into consideration the cost of moving the offices. Furthermore, the proposal is to move away from a city that has a new Federal office building to a city that has no existing facility to house these agencies. The cost of leased space, it is estimated, will run over one-half million dollars per year.

I have asked for unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, the editorial which I commend to all who are genuinely interested in economy and efficiency in government. The editorial follows:

A FEDERAL OFFICE MOVE IS A PLAN OF DOUBTFUL MERIT

The projected move of Federal regional agencies from Kansas City to Denver in a general realignment that is supposed to promote economy and efficiency needs much more thought and thorough consideration. On the basis of available information, we can see neither economy nor efficiency in the move. Evidence, in fact, would point to the contrary.

Naturally, the Kansas City area, on both sides of the State line, takes a particular interest in this plan that would transfer the regional headquarters of the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from this city. No community wants to lose regional offices that directly involve 825 jobs—many of them high-level positions. The presence of the offices is a distinct advantage to Kansas City and the States of Missouri and Kansas.

Yet if this rather odd shuffling of jurisdictions could be proved to be in the interests of "better management," as the administration says, we doubt that the complaints from this area would be especially strong. Of course there would be regrets. But under the circumstances we believe there is reason to expect the entire plan to be reconsidered and any quick transfer to be deferred. Certainly the congressional delegations from Missouri and Kansas will want the fullest explanations and clear evidence that the rationale of the proposed transfers is in line with the facts.

The new region, as outlined, would contain Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming and Utah. The present regional responsibility of the Kansas City HEW headquarters is Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa and Minnesota.

It is not clear what urban problems Missouri and Montana share. And urban problems, certainly, are a primary concern of HEW, Labor and the OEO. The people of one of the offices here make more than 1,000 trips a year to St. Louis and Jefferson City—the area of heavy population concentration for both the present and proposed regions. We fail to see how the same number of trips from Denver is going to accomplish great savings and promote better management.

As for economy, there is a new Federal office building in Kansas City. Space apparently would have to be rented in Denver. Nor is the cost of moving possibly 800 families to be dismissed lightly. Any transferred employee could take his family to the new locale for six days of house hunting at Government expense and per diem pay as well. The Government would pay the full expenses of moving; reimburse the transferee for any loss on the sale of his home and pay all real estate fees. This is economy? It seems difficult to reconcile these realities with talk of savings.

But basically the new region, as outlined, appears to be badly balanced in relation to the weight of the population to be served.

Kansas City—Itself a metropolitan area of more than 1,300,000—is close to St. Louis and the urban centers of Kansas, Iowa and Nebraska. Kansas City has the transportation facilities and central location suited for the present region.

Kansas City also has the regional offices of HEW, Labor, and the OEO—now. Entirely aside from matters of self-interest, we believe very persuasive arguments can be made for leaving the regional alignment as it is. Surely the administration will provide Kansas City the opportunity. And certainly Congress, even if its direct approval is not required, has a very direct responsibility to ask for the facts in the true light of efficiency and economy as these desirable qualities affect future programs and appropriations.

THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, established by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, received its initial appropriation late last year and has now begun operations in earnest. In a speech on Thursday, March 27, the new president of the Corporation, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., gave a summary of CPB's current operations and plans for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Macy's remarks, especially as they relate to the Corporation's initial efforts to strengthen local public broadcasting stations, would be of interest to Members of the House.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the text of Mr. Macy's speech to the press luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif., March 27:

WHAT'S AHEAD IN PUBLIC BROADCASTING
(Address by John W. Macy, Jr., president, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, before the press luncheon, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, March 27, 1969)

Public broadcasting is definitely moving forward. This motion is directed toward the public purposes cited by the Congress in creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in 1967. After an initial period of planning and organization the Corporation is a reality which, hopefully, can contribute motive power to all of the elements in public broadcasting.

There is now a realization on the part of people across the country that radio and television are communication assets which should be developed in the public interest. In this realization Americans are behind, not ahead, of their neighbors in other parts of the developed world. In this country the enterprise of American business has developed the commercial capacity of these communication media to a far greater degree than public leaders and educators have developed them in the public interest. There has been a tendency to believe that commercial and public broadcasting are eternal competitors or that commercial broadcasting should expand and deepen the segment of its broadcasting described as "public service." Today, however, there is an understanding that the two systems may function in a complementary fashion which provides the viewer or listener with a diversity which permits broader choice. There is an admission that there are certain public services which the commercial station should not be expected to perform and that public stations can offer more effectively.

It is the Corporation's view that public broadcasting must move forward to more

nearly meet the demands of the American people for diversity and excellence in the fields where commercial broadcasting should not be expected to move. It is essential that public broadcasting have the financial, technical and programming resources to move in the direction of this public demand. It is to that objective that the Board and officers of the Corporation are committed.

The forward motion of public broadcasting necessitates broad horizontal and vertical vision by its leaders. There is need to look at the nation as a whole, at its spread of markets and its distribution of population. It is necessary through this sweeping view to identify those communities or those groups of men and women who are inadequately served by existing public broadcasting outlets. There are many blanks on the national map of television and radio stations. There are many metropolitan areas of substantial population where the existing station is not sufficiently strong to meet even the most fundamental public needs. There are shortcomings in programming and capacity limitations in facilities which place the public station in the role of an underfed, younger brother with a weak voice in the community's broadcasting spectrum. The Corporation intends to work with local leaders to fill these blanks, to overcome these deficiencies and to strengthen existing stations.

INTERCONNECTION FOR NATIONWIDE SERVICE

In the vertical view the system calls for simultaneous motion on the national front and in the individual communities. From the national vantage-point there must be programming resources available for delivery by a national network of public stations. At that level there has already been motion by the Corporation. One of its specific statutory assignments is to achieve interconnection among public television stations to permit simultaneous delivery of programs on a national basis. Through a negotiated agreement with the telephone system an interconnection was inaugurated early this year for a trial period. This arrangement has opened up two hours of prime time five nights a week for distribution of national programming. Certain problems with respect to clearances and pre-emptions have developed during this trial run which have created difficulties for the Corporation and the stations. Next month negotiations will be reopened with the Bell System and the FCC for the solution of existing problems and for the possible extension of the interconnection service.

To permit significant program delivery over the network, the Corporation made a grant of \$450,000 for a special public affairs unit in National Educational Television (NET) to produce public affairs features during the trial period. This unit has been instrumental in bringing to public television audiences special coverage of such subjects as the Nixon Cabinet, the UN and the Middle East, the hearings on television violence and the debate on the ABM. But this new networking has not been for the exclusive purpose of distributing public affairs programs. It has delivered cultural and educational products of NET, the regional networks and individual stations.

MORE PROGRAMING FOR CHILDREN

In its current studies the Corporation staff is examining the present national productive activities to determine their future roles and missions and the areas where supplementary resources can be most productive in securing quality and balance. The Corporation has already decided to invest attention and resources in national programing for children. Favorably impressed with the initial work of the Children's Television Workshop, under the leadership of Joan Cooney, the Corporation will back that program which is aimed at preschool children and explore programing possibilities for providing new learning ex-

periences via television for our younger viewers.

THE LOCAL STATION—VALUABLE COMMUNITY ASSETS

But at the other end of our vertical relationship is the most important element—the local station. That station is a valuable community asset. This value should be enhanced in order to offer services to the men, women and children of that community. These individual units vary tremendously from city to city. Some are supported by a board of community leaders. Others are a unit in a state system. Still others are part of a university or board of education responsibility. Some have many years on the air. Others are preparing to deliver their first signal. Some are largely restricted to instructional broadcasting to the area's classrooms. Others provide a balanced program of public services. Some are on the very high frequency band. Many more are in the ultra high range. Some have the latest in equipment. Others are struggling with hand-me-down cameras and recording equipment. All suffer from financial anemia in striving for a goal of public service. All too many managers must devote valuable staff time to perpetual fund raising in order to pay the bills. Others find that their program planning must be shaped—sometimes distorted—to match inadequate funds.

In recognition of this common financial disability, the Corporation in one of its first actions decided to provide a \$10,000 grant to each station which could demonstrate an augmented service to the community through the investment of this sum. This amount has been described as diminutive in terms of public broadcasting needs, but we must realize that the average annual expenditures of the 160 television stations is \$100,000.

The first readings on the use of these grants have been reaching Corporation headquarters and they constitute a gratifying record of expanded community service.

In a number of cities this additional amount has permitted the viewing of local school boards in action; one station reports that such meetings are now known to local viewers as the "Tuesday night fights."

The station in Milwaukee has inaugurated a new program called "Project Understanding." This is a station production of one-half hour discussion of inner-city and ghetto problems tied in with 2,000 organized viewing groups across the city. After the initial presentation these groups discuss the issues and then phone in their questions for response on the screen by the experts present.

In several cities, for example, Chicago, Cleveland, New York and Boston, the grant has permitted special programming to reach the substantial black audiences. The new station in Baltimore will devote one-half hour of prime time nightly for an urban affairs series commencing in September.

In Madison the money is being applied to a vote-in program which brings to the screen the competing candidates for local office and has stimulated broader public interest in the electoral process.

These are illustrations of locally determined forms of augmented public service. They should serve to stimulate new programming in every community designed to gain the understanding and, hopefully, the participation of more citizens in community activities.

But now the Corporation and the station are entering a second phase of program consideration. Each station has been invited to present a proposal for a more extensive programming effort which will respond to local community needs. This proposal is to be shaped entirely by local judgment and using local talent and material. The subject matter may be aimed at a special group—children, young people, the disabled or the disadvantaged—or it may enrich the local offer-

ings through music, drama or other cultural features. The Corporation has asked the station managers to design programs which may ultimately be used for distribution over the national network. It is our belief that local stations should provide a significant portion of the programming contributions to the national network. This is particularly true of the key stations, like KCET here in Los Angeles, which have already demonstrated their capacity for quality productions in the work they have done for their own audiences or for NET in the past. A significant portion of the Corporation's resources has been committed to this local programming endeavor—a total of \$1,500,000.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING TALENT

If the goals of public broadcasting are to be achieved in the days ahead, there is need to encourage and stimulate the talented people already in the enterprise and to attract others to contribute their skills to this work. Broadcasting is a voracious consumer of talent. There is an ever-continuing demand for skilled men and women in engineering, management and program creation to say nothing of the performers themselves. With limited budgets public stations have been handicapped in the competition for these skills. The Corporation intends to extend a helping hand in this area. Already the Corporation has announced twelve Career Fellowships of up to \$10,000 each to speed the identification and development of young talent in public broadcasting. These Fellows will be on board in twelve of the stations by next fall. Other projects of this type are under discussion with station managers and the National Association for Educational Broadcasting.

But here in the film capital, special mention should be made of the Corporation's contribution to the art of filmmaking, a major contributor to television resources. In a novel joint venture with the American Film Institute in Los Angeles, the Corporation will encourage would-be filmmakers for public broadcasting. In addition, grants have been made to KLRN in Austin and WGBH in Boston for station-based projects in filmmaking.

CONTINUING EDUCATION THROUGH PUBLIC BROADCASTING

But what of the "educational" component of public broadcasting? After all, in many areas the public station was created to fulfill educational expectations in the community. There will also be increased attention given to this area. For the first time a complete review of such continuing education activities is being conducted with a view toward sharing program information throughout the country and identifying high priority needs for additional effort in covering new educational subjects or in reaching new and different audiences. This review will unquestionably reveal a broad range of educational offerings through television. I have been impressed by program segments I have reviewed which provide instruction for law enforcement officers, para-medical personnel, as well as approaches to educating on such difficult issues as drug abuse, intergroup tensions, and the like.

The basic purpose is to recognize that education in our society can never cease and to broaden the opportunity of all citizens to broaden their own understanding through the communication media. And this educational process should be more than placing the camera in the classroom. It should be possible to use the unique techniques of television and the values of the visual experience to make the learning experience more meaningful and more entertaining.

Although I have placed primary emphasis on the Corporation's plans in the television field, let me assure you radio is not being neglected. The Corporation has just received a comprehensive and penetrating study of public radio. This study reveals that there

is need for substantial assistance to the 400 public radio stations if that source is to contribute to public needs. In this day of the ubiquitous transistor the potential of radio as a public service is immense but only slightly developed. The Corporation has invited the stations to submit proposals, similar to those sought from television stations, for new programming. It has granted \$65,000 to the National Educational Radio network to be used in improved program elements for distribution to stations but with the findings of the radio study in hand a new and more comprehensive program must be formulated in the future.

KEEPING PACE WITH TECHNOLOGY

But any future view of public television must take into account the rapid-fire developments in electronics technology which will influence broadcasting in the early future. The possibility of a domestic satellite with available channels for public broadcasting, the capability of community antenna and cable systems, the continuing research in solid state physics all reveal the potential of technological improvements in broadcasting. The Corporation will be working closely with public and private agencies engaged in this type of research and development so that those agencies may be aware of the technical requirements of this enterprise and may direct their research to serve these public purposes.

Throughout my report, the financial theme has recurred again and again. This is because the necessity for increased financial resources is a dominant demand upon the Corporation. In the further advances in national and local programming are to be realized, these resources must be secured. The \$7 million available to the Corporation at this time constitutes only seed money. A genius of the Corporation is its ability to secure both private and public funds, but clearly the majority contributor must be the federal government. While the Corporation currently seeks funds from the Congress to support operations next year, it is moving ahead to develop with the Nixon Administration plans for long-range financing which will give the Corporation not only a rising curve of available funds but also the necessary independence to assure that public broadcasting is in no way dominated by the political process. Stability in financing will permit the Corporation to join with those engaged in the development of public broadcasting programs to realize a higher level of fulfillment in the potential of radio and television for public good. It will permit a turning of attention to the identification of citizen interest and need to be served by public broadcasting. It will permit the response to local and national community needs for public awareness and for the individual American's enriched participation in his own society.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I introduced a bill (H.R. 8515) to authorize an increase in the appropriation for acquisition of land in the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. Fellow Californians from the other side of the aisle, the Honorable DON CLAUSEN and the Honorable WILLIAM MAILLIARD also have sponsored this proposal and will be joined by several of their Republican colleagues in our very worthwhile, bipartisan effort.

Point Reyes is one of the few unspoiled areas on the entire Pacific coast. Its

beautiful beaches and coastal property, together with its proximity to major metropolitan concentrations of population, prompted the Congress to designate it as a national seashore in 1962.

Unfortunately, even as the Congress deliberated, the value of the park land skyrocketed, preventing the National Park Service from acquiring with the original authorization all of the designated park area. Approximately two-fifths of the property is in Federal ownership.

Our proposal is to increase the authorization by \$38,365,000, in order to assure that this valuable seashore property will be protected, as the Congress intended when it established the national seashore. I am pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, that the following Members from California are adding their sponsorship to this measure, and I hope that it will be the pleasure of the Congress to give its favorable consideration to completing the Point Reyes National Seashore in this session: MESSRS. GLENN ANDERSON, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, JAMES CORMAN, DON EDWARDS, RICHARD T. HANNA, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CHET HOLIFIELD, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, JOHN J. McFALL, GEORGE P. MILLER, JOHN E. MOSS, THOMAS M. REES, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, JOHN V. TUNNEY, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, JEROME WALDIE, and CHARLES H. WILSON.

FAIR SHAKE FOR SAVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to close the gap between what the Treasury pays in interest on savings bonds and what it pays investors who buy Government bonds in the market.

A 4.25-percent rate is paid now on series H bonds and on series E bonds that are held 7 years to maturity. This is the legal ceiling set in the Liberty Bond Act, the law under which the savings bonds are issued. Yet banks and other investors buying Government bonds in the market get a much higher return. Market reports as of today show 30-day bills now yield 5.80 percent, 90-day bills yield 6.02 percent, and longer term bonds return as much as 6.3 percent.

The time has come to stop penalizing millions of small investors for their thrift and patriotism. More than \$50 billion of the national debt is owed to holders of savings bonds.

For example, in 1968, approximately 10.3 million people purchased nearly \$5 billion in savings bonds. Two-thirds of these bonds were purchased through the payroll savings plan.

Included among the 10.3 million small investors who were penalized for their thrift and patriotism were 1.9 million servicemen—over 60 percent of all men and women in uniform today—who purchased \$353 million in savings bonds.

There are reports the Treasury is studying a modest increase in the rate paid on series H and E bonds. The Washington Post, in an editorial commenting on the reports, said the issue should be a

high priority item in Congress. It also said this about the effect of the present ceiling on the savings bond system:

Many people have continued to hold on to their savings bonds, despite the financial disadvantage, out of patriotism or for the purposes of convenience and safety. But there is doubtless a limit to their patience, as indicated by the fact that cash-ins substantially exceeded sales of such bonds during the first two months of 1969. Clinging to an interest rate that is now wholly obsolete could thus seriously impair the E and H bonds system.

It is not sufficient, however, simply to enact a small increase in the interest rate ceiling to make savings bonds more attractive to small investors. The only fair thing to do is to remove the ceiling entirely so that small or individual investors get the same return from the Government for the use of their money that banks and other big investors obtain.

This bill would strike the Liberty Bond Act provisions setting a savings bond interest ceiling and require the Government to pay comparable interest rates on bonds issued after the enactment of this bill. The yield of savings bonds, as a result, would approximate the interest rate obtainable in the open market, subject to periodic recomputation.

I include the Washington Post editorial entitled "Fair Shake for Savers" at this point in the RECORD:

FAIR SHAKE FOR SAVERS

The Treasury Department is quite properly studying a raise in the interest-rate ceiling on Government savings bonds. The present rate of 4.25 is actually less than the advance in the consumer price index last year, which amounted to 4.6 per cent. In effect, then, inflation is more than eating up the interest paid to small savers for use of their money.

Many people have continued to hold on to their savings bonds, despite the financial disadvantage, out of patriotism or for purpose of convenience and safety. But there is doubtless a limit to their patience, as indicated by the fact that cash-ins substantially exceeded sales of such bonds during the first two months of 1969. Clinging to an interest rate that is now wholly obsolete could thus seriously impair the E and H bond system.

Beyond this is the basic question of fairness. Anyone wealthy enough to purchase a 15-month Treasury note for \$1000 or more can collect 6.42 per cent interest. There is no excuse for maintaining such a wide spread between the interest paid on savings bonds, many financed through payroll-deduction plans, and the rate which the Government finds it necessary to pay in the country's money markets. A fair shake for the millions of savings-bond holders is entitled to a high priority in Congress, and the recommendations of the Treasury ought not to be further delayed.

JOB CORPS: A COMMUNITY ASSET

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have two Job Corps centers in my congressional district, the Colbran Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center operated by the U.S. Forest Service.

A recent editorial in the Pagosa Springs Sun states:

Few communities can boast of a comparable asset and certainly this community can feel fortunate that the Job Corps Center is here.

I am very pleased to note this acceptance of and praise for the Job Corps program in Colorado and I have every hope that its record of success there will continue.

At this point, under unanimous consent, I would like the editorial to be inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Pagosa Springs (Colo.) Sun, Feb. 27, 1969]

A COMMUNITY ASSET

The Pagosa Springs Job Corps Center is one of the community assets that is often taken for granted. When newly established the Center was often discussed and attracted more attention than it does at the present time.

The Job Corps Center has been good for the community in many ways. It is fairly easy to list most of the community projects accomplished that may have never been completed if the Job Corps Center had not been established here.

These projects have been numerous and they have been decided improvements. The amount of money that has accrued to the community because of the payroll, because of increased federal aid for schools, the direct sales to the Job Corps Center, and similar transactions have been very important to community progress.

There are other ways, though, that the Job Corps Center has been an asset that are a little harder to enumerate. These things are not physical things that can be measured. They are such things as community participation by Job Corps staff members; assistance with community programs such as Boy Scouts, Church, Lions Club, and the rodeo.

Then, too, there is the objective of the center to help young men better themselves and cease to be expenses to the taxpayer. The results have been very good in this Center in the program to make employable citizens of the Corpsmen. The Center has now been established long enough that there are definite records and reports that show that the Center has been successful in its program.

True, the dollar and cents statistics on the success of the program are very desirable. The human values are not listed anywhere and will never be a matter of record. There is no possible way to list, in a physical way, what it means to a young man to be able to make his own way, cease to become a burden to the taxpayers, and to have the pride that is a part of the American way of life.

Few communities can boast of a comparable asset and certainly this community can feel fortunate that the Job Corps Center is here. The community, too, can take pride in the fact that not only is the Job Corps Center here but it is operated properly, does achieve results, and is a definite benefit to the Corpsmen.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there has been renewed interest in the field of chemical and biological warfare as a result of a recent congressional hearing and subsequent discussions on the sub-

ject. I feel that it will be useful to the Members of the House to have access to an unclassified version of a statement given at the time of the hearing by General Hebbeler. To me, the significant thing is that chemical and biological weapons represent a field of warfare in which potential enemies have great capability. There is always the threat that, in the event of war, those enemies would resort to chemical and biological weapons rather than to risk mutual annihilation through atomic destruction. Consequently, I have felt that the United States dare not fail to maintain a reasonable capability for defense in this field. There are those who appear to be blandly indifferent to the terrible destruction of nuclear weapons, to the horror of burning by napalm, or even to the terrible effect of high explosives. But they evidence extreme excitement, even hysteria, at the mention of chemical and biological weapons, even when our interest is primarily in the development of a defense against them. This surpasses understanding.

I submit General Hebbeler's statement for reprinting in the RECORD.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE BRIEFING BY BRIG. GEN. J. A. HEBBELER, MARCH 4, 1969, AT REQUEST OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD MCCARTHY

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen, it is my privilege to appear before you today in response to Congressman McCarthy's request for a briefing on chemical and biological warfare and the basic reasons and necessity for a chemical and biological warfare program.

ELEMENTS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

We should keep in mind that we are talking about weapon systems in the same context that we talk about any other weapon; that is, we are talking about instruments of war, weapons specifically designed for use in war. However, effects of chemical weapons differ from those of biological weapons and from other weapons just as the effects of nuclear weapons differ from those of conventional weapons. So to provide a common ground and to help us understand these differences, I shall separate chemical warfare from biological and look at each in detail. To assist I shall use this slide which schematically shows the elements of chemical and biological warfare.

The first thing to bring to your attention is that we are not talking one system; we are talking many systems, all with different effects and different uses. Let us look at the offense first because only by understanding the weapons and their effects are we able to determine the defensive equipment and tactics associated with each category.

Some chemical weapons are categorized as lethal weapons which are designed to kill. The modern lethal chemical agents which are components of chemical weapons include the nerve agents, two of which have the symbols GB and VX. Both are liquids which are disseminated as aerosols. GB is a non-persistent material which is relatively volatile. It is put down in heavy concentrations to catch troops before they can put on their protective masks.

VX is a persistent compound which can penetrate the skin. It is complementary to GB in that it can circumvent the protective mask. It penetrates normal combat clothing.

Both agents are odorless, tasteless, and colorless. Consequently it is practically impossible to detect them with the unaided senses. They can enter the body through the respiratory tracts, the eyes, and the skin

Action within the body is rapid. Very small amounts will cause paralysis, prostration, and death. Even microscopic quantities will impair vision, and cause nausea and muscular incoordination.

Why do we have a lethal chemical program? Mr. Cyrus Vance, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1967, before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, stated: "As long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability." Let us look at the nature of the Soviet Union program which constitutes a lethal chemical threat to the US, her NATO allies and other Free World countries.

Today the Soviet Union is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical warfare than any other nation in the world. She has placed a great deal of emphasis on these systems in her military machine. She envisions the usage of these the same as for conventional weapons.

Her planning at all levels, from the very top to the very low echelon units, includes considerations for chemical warfare training, offensively and defensively.

She has a wide spectrum of chemical munitions. She considers chemical tactical weapons to be used in conjunction with nuclear weapons or separately as circumstances may dictate.

Her agent stockpiles include a spectrum of agents capable of creating military effects over a wide range.

The soldier is well equipped with defensive equipment. He trains vigorously and for long periods of time with this equipment. He looks upon chemicals as a real possibility in any future conflicts, and he respects his equipment.

The research program in the Soviet Union for chemical warfare has encompassed every facet.

The basis for these comments appears in the testimony of Willis E. Black before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1968.

In addition, we know that the state of Soviet chemical science which has direct application to chemical warfare technology is unsurpassed. I have here some physical evidence of their diligent and exhaustive effort in this field.

This stack of documents contains abstracts of translations of selected Soviet scientific literature which reflects the magnitude of this effort during the past several years alone. Each of these documents also contains abstracts pertaining to biological research which has military applications.

In summary, the USSR is well equipped to wage warfare with these weapons and indications are that they would be used if this served its purpose.

Other chemical systems employ incapacitating agents designed specifically to avoid killing—approach unique among weapon systems. These weapons suggest employment where military necessity requires control of a situation, but where there is a good reason for not harming the surrounding population or even the intended target troops.

Among chemical agents in the incapacitant category are some which exert mental effects, and there are some which affect the body. There also are types which affect both the mind and the body. Physical types have some advantages over the mental types, however, since the degree of incapacitation will be more apparent to the user.

Such agents would include, for example, those which would cause loss of physical coordination, paralysis, or loss of vision. The effects would be temporary and those exposed would recover without after effects. These agents are selected for possible use because of the wide safety factor between the amount of agent which incapacitates and that which would cause lethal effects.

Actually, many compounds have some

temporary effects on mental processes as well as on physical performance. For example, the ability to concentrate on a given task may be severely limited at the same time that physical tasks may become more difficult to perform.

The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

These incapacitating chemical weapons would be marked assets to US forces in military situations where it is necessary to gain control of an area in which both civilian and insurgents are co-mingled or where civilian and enemy military troops are intermingled. This would be particularly true on peacekeeping missions in underdeveloped nations where insurgency is a problem and where the US is asked to assist in maintaining stability of a state.

Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The US clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925; public statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance and by Ambassador to UN Nabrit provide the basis for the US position. I will cover these later in a discussion of policy.

The riot control agents, used for control of civil disturbances and adapted for use in Vietnam operations, are designed to irritate, to cause people to move (vacate an area), with only temporary effects. The effects of CS, the standard military riot control agent, are pronounced and instantaneous—coughing, severe burning of the eyes, tightness of the chest, acute discomfort. These effects are much the same as the tear gas, CN, which has been long used by civil law enforcement agencies world wide. But CS works faster to temporarily disable and is much safer. In tests using troop volunteers, in actual riots, and in battle, there has never been a fatality attributed to CS.

In Vietnam commanders find CS a valuable weapon in combat situations when it is apparent that explosives are not the best weapon. Viet Cong have frequently forced women and children to accompany them as hostages; they do not hesitate to use them as protective shields against anyone seeking to clear their tunnel hideouts. In such situations, CS quickly proved its value. In one reported operation, 17 Viet Cong and some 400 non-combatants being held as hostages were forced from a tunnel complex by CS, with nobody wounded on either side. Again, 43 armed Viet Cong were captured with no friendly losses and one enemy killed when he tried to break away. These examples indicate that lives are frequently saved on both sides when CS is used as a weapon.

Herbicides have proved useful in Vietnam primarily as defoliants. Dense jungle, which is home to the Viet Cong, provides the enemy with effective ambush cover. Wooded areas along trails, roads, railroads, canals and powerlines have been hiding areas for Viet Cong units until the US Air Force began to spray defoliating agents. Removal of the jungle canopy and overhanging foliage permits a view for analysis of trail activity, storage site locations and targeting and exposes the ground area to photographic surveillance and direct fire. Army units use herbicides around local base areas to keep them clear for ground surveillance and fire lanes and prevent surprise. Herbicides have also been used against Viet Cong crops; they are harmless to the soil and to life and to have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

The biological weapons are categorized by their effects against man, against animals and against crops. Biological weapons designed for use against man are further categorized by their effects as lethal or incapacitating. Again, lethal biological weapons

are designed to kill; incapacitating to avoid killing.

Biological agents can be produced, can be stored under specific conditions, and can be disseminated effectively to cover large areas. Because of the delay between infection and symptoms, as well as the large area coverage capability, biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Biological agents, like the chemical nerve agents, cannot be detected by the senses. Being colorless, odorless and tasteless their early detection is a difficult problem, complicated by the delay which occurs before effects become evident.

There is a wide variety of bacteria, rickettsia, viruses and fungi which cause disease in man. Many of these can be used as biological agents. Examples of some that could be considered as lethal agents are plague, tularemia, anthrax, yellow fever and typhus.

In addition, it is entirely possible that mutant types of disease could be developed which would not respond to known methods of treatment. They would be difficult to diagnose. Diagnosis and treatment could be complicated by using mixtures of two or more agents.

Biological agents can be delivered in a variety of ways, such as aerosol generators and spray tanks. Generators and spray tanks could be carried in missile warheads and in manned or drone aircraft. Another possibility is the use of insect vectors, such as the mosquito, as a deliberate carrier of microorganisms.

In a different category are the biological incapacitants. They are designed to permit control of an enemy—to remove his ability and will to fight, with minimum risk of mortality. There are a number of mild diseases which will make a person very uncomfortable and make him inactive for a short period of time without serious effects.

In another category are the weapons which can be used to attack a nation's food sources—crops and livestock. These are generally considered weapons for strategic use.

Why do we have a program? We can refer back to Mr. Vance's statement which included both chemical and biological weapons and the need for a program in view of the large USSR program. We can also refer back to Mr. Black's testimony when he stated that "Today Russia is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical and biological warfare than any other nation in the world." However, it is even more important that one looks at the rapid advances being made in the bio-medical sciences. The US must keep an active and viable program in this field so that we are not technologically surprised and so that such surprise cannot threaten our national security.

From this brief review of the elements of the CB weapons program, it is evident that an increasing variety of effects have become available, with a consequent increase in variety of purposes to which they could be applied. The alternatives presented are now so many that distinctions between purposes have tended to submerge purely technical differences.

Thus, at one end of the spectrum, these forms of warfare might be no more than the small-scale use of a non-lethal chemical agent an adversary to frustrate his purpose without maiming or causing fatalities. At the other extreme of the spectrum, it is possible to conceive of the use of a lethal biological agent against an entire nation without consideration of necessity or humanity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to weigh in a single balance situations so disparate in intent or consequences.

It appears, then, that with respect to chemical and biological systems one should look toward the *principle of proportionality*, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be

legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind or degree of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. In this context it would appear that the norm of proportionality could require controls to prohibit certain elements of the chemical and biological field, while others of the non-lethal type would be preferred over alternatives now employed.

DEFENSE

In developing a modern defensive posture, one must recognize the threat and the toxicity of current nerve agents. With these, even very low concentrations for short periods of time can quickly produce severe symptoms. Further, one must protect against absorption of these agents through the skin as well as by inhalation. As a result, a lethal chemical protective system consists of several interrelated elements. The total chemical and biological defensive system consists of detection, warning, protection, decontamination, and preventive medicine and medical therapy. Each of these elements requires available equipment and materials (alarms, masks, etc.) which must be integrated into an overall logistics system. The defensive equipment requires concepts and doctrines for use which must be integrated into the training cycle. The lack of any element increases the vulnerability to a chemical or biological attack.

There are two implications to the complexities of equipment and training for defense against lethal chemical weapons.

For one thing, a force against which lethal chemicals are used will be at much lower combat effectiveness than will a force not suffering the same casualty threat with its attendant requirement for protective equipment and decontamination procedures. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 recognizes this as a basis for retaliation against the initiator of lethal chemical use. In the present era, a force without the option of chemical retaliation could well be forced to an alternative option of tactical nuclear employment, if that were available to him.

The second implication is that the cost of protective equipment is high and serves as a constraint on less affluent nations against initiating use of lethal chemicals, since use carries with it the requirement for protection against retaliation.

POLICY

What is our national policy in regards to these weapons and their use? We can turn to the statements of our President's and their Cabinet officers to explain a basis for our current policy.

First, we can begin with President Roosevelt's statement in 1943 when he stated: " * * * we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies." President Eisenhower re-affirmed the Roosevelt policy statement. Very few public statements have been made until recently when as a result of the Vietnam conflict, questions were raised.

Secretary of State Rusk in 1965 declared with respect to US use of tear gas and herbicides that the US was not engaging in gas warfare in Vietnam and that the country was not using gas "that is prohibited by the Geneva Convention of 1925 or any other understandings about the use of gas."

Ambassador Nabrit before the United Nations General Assembly in 1966 stated that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 does not apply to all gases and further "It would be unreasonable to contend that any rule of international law prohibits the use in combat against an enemy, for humanitarian purposes, of agents that Governments around the world commonly use to control riots by their own people. Similarly, the Protocol does not apply to herbicides, which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those used domestically in the United States, the Soviet Union and many other countries to control weeds and other unwanted vegetation."

Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R.

Vance, in his 1967 testimony before Congress indicated "That we seek international understandings to limit chemical and biological warfare and that we have not used weapons of the sort condemned by the Geneva Protocol." He pointed out that "as long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability."

In line with seeking limitations, the most significant current action which may affect policy is the United Nations study on chemical and bacteriological (biological) warfare, requested by the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference. This study, intended to provide a technical and non-political appraisal of the effects chemical and biological weapons, is being done by experts of fourteen countries, including the US and the USSR. It is to be completed by July 1969, will be unclassified and will be given wide distribution.

Our posture today is concerned first with the development of a credible and viable lethal chemical capability as a deterrent to the use of these weapons against us, and to give us the ability to fight effectively if deterrence fails. Further, it is essential that in the rapidly advancing technology of the biomedical-pharmacological sciences we not permit ourselves to be surprised by a capability in the hands of a potential enemy. And, finally, the exploitation of a chemical incapacitating capability may permit us to effectively control a critical situation while at the same time using weapons designed to avoid killing.

THEY ARE NOT ALL BAD

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when one views the unlawful and repulsive actions of the vociferous minority group of peaceniks, yippies, and draft-card burners; when one reads of the abhorrent takeovers by unwashed and unruly mobs of our country's institutions of learning, the tendency is to assume a feeling of disdain toward young people in general. This feeling we must reject, of course, for we know the great majority of our young people find the actions of this minority just as repugnant as we do. We see proof of this every day in the actions of young individuals and young groups, such as the "Rally for Decency" in Miami recently; in the action of a group of students—almost the entire student body—demonstrating in support of the school's president.

We see evidence of it in heart-rending letters from young men serving their country far from home, who find it difficult to understand the actions of members of their generation back home; we see evidence of it in the patriotic plea of a young wife and mother to President Nixon, in which she asks the Chief Executive for his "pledge that our country will not be accused of slinking away from a task because of its difficulty, of renouncing several million people because they are unworthy, or of sacrificing my husband for expediency."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to number this patriotic young wife and mother among my constituents; and I am happy to have been provided with a copy of her letter so that I may share it with my colleagues, along with two other letters from members of the Armed Forces published in newspapers in my district, and

all of which point to the refreshing conclusion: They are not all bad.

I insert these letters in the RECORD at this point:

DANVILLE, VA.

DEAR MR. NIXON: I am writing to you as the wife of a prisoner-of-war. My husband, Captain F. H. Kushner, was stationed with the First Air Cavalry in South Viet Nam. On November 30, 1967, the helicopter in which he was flying crashed in Quang Nagi Province. Search and rescue operations were delayed because of the weather, and when the wreck was located, no trace of my husband was found. On March 5, 1968, I was informed by the Department of the Army that according to information furnished them by prisoners released by the Viet Cong on 23 January 1968, my husband's status would be changed from missing in action to prisoner-of-war. I was further informed that although he had been wounded, his physical condition was considered good. Since that time I have had no other information concerning my husband's welfare, nor have I been able to communicate with him in any way.

I would like to impose upon your time and patience and insert here an excerpt from my husband's last letter to me. I received it after I had been informed that he was missing.

"Nothing new to add, except that I delivered a baby down in the village today. A pretty difficult breech that the local midwife couldn't handle. It was done in a filthy hovel with dirt on the floor and stirrups made of tied-together rags. We used a flashlight. Had no ergot derivatives to stop bleeding and I thought she would bleed to death after the placenta came out. But it finally stopped and mother and baby fine. It was one of the most gratifying things I've ever done.

"Everyday I do things without equipment or facilities that I used to take for granted. Things that I wouldn't have believed possible in these circumstances. The things people can make out of ammo-boxes and nails, or 55 gallon oil drums and a welding torch are just amazing—and reassuring—that Americans are just as tough and strong as they ever were. And in terrible circumstances when the chips are down, they always come through. I'm terribly proud and chauvinistic; and thank God that I come from a family and a country that can make the best out of the worst. If we can teach our children to be good Americans and to have that strength and honor, and love of freedom that Americans by their nature and inheritance have, we will have done all that we need to. If we all get killed tomorrow, or if the Russians level the U.S. with ICBM's it would really be horrible, but not as bad as living the way these people do—in constant fear and oppression and tribulation."

Now Mr. Nixon, you know some more things about my husband. He is, to use a much maligned word, a patriot. He volunteered for duty in Viet Nam because he felt that it was in the best interests of his country. You have also, I am sure, ascertained that he is an M.D. He went to heal and succor, not to kill.

As to the purpose of this letter, I want my husband home. Lord knows I want him home. He brought into this world a healthy Vietnamese baby, but he doesn't know that he has a son almost nine months old. Our daughter has progressed from sweet babyhood and in this year has become a young lady. And every night I try to make another promise to God if only I could get my husband back.

But I don't want him home as the representative of a defeated country, as a monument to the former glories of America. I want my husband to return proudly, as a man who had accomplished the goal he had set for himself. My husband went to Vietnam to serve the interests of his country, in the short time that he was there he developed a deep commitment to the people of South

Vietnam. He wanted for them the same freedoms he himself enjoyed.

What I am asking for is your pledge that our country will not be accused of slinking away from a task because of its difficulty, of renouncing several million people because they are unworthy, or of sacrificing my husband for expediency.

I want to thank you for your indulgence in hearing me out, and tell you that my prayers will be with you throughout the difficult years ahead.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. HAROLD KUSHNER.

[From the Danville Register, Feb. 26, 1969]

SPECIALIST-4 CLEMENTS DESCRIBES SOLDIER: WHAT'S A GI LIKE IN VIETNAM? HE'S SCARED, A TOUGH FIGHTER—A CREDIT TO HIMSELF, COUNTRY

What's the GI like in Vietnam today?

In a letter to his sister, Elizabeth, at Wilmington (N.C.) College, Specialist Four Hugh T. Clements, Jr., has described the typical American soldier now fighting in that far-off Southeast Asian country.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Clements of Danville, SP4 Clements wrote:

"Well, in most cases, he's unmarried. His only material possessions of value are an old car at home and a transistor over there. His world is filled with ugly smells, and rock music, and laughter, and 105-mm. howitzers, and sometimes sobbing.

"He's just out of school, received so-so grades, played a little basketball, has a girl who promised to be true and who writes—sometimes.

"He has learned to swagger, swear, and drink beer because it's cold and it's the thing for a boy-man to do.

"He's a spec-four with one year in and one to go. Or maybe three.

"Back home he worked only when he had to; preferred waxing his own car to washing his dad's. He works now. From dawn to dark, every minute he's not fighting he's working. It beats thinking.

"He can dig a foxhole, first-aid a wounded buddy, march until he is told to stop, or stop until he is told to march.

"He has stood among hills of bodies and has helped make some of those hills.

"And when the somebody he knew was among those who died, he has cried. And cried.

"The boy who littered his back-home room with soiled stuff for mom to pick up now has two pairs of fatigues; he wears one while he washes the other.

"He sometimes forgets to clean his teeth but never his rifle.

"He keeps his socks dry, his canteen full; he can cook his own meals, fix his own rips—material and mental.

"He shares his water with anybody thirsty, splits his rations with anybody hungry, and throw you half of his ammo if you're fighting for your life.

"He does the work of three civilians, draws the pay of one, yet finds ironic humor in it all.

"He has learned to use his hands as a weapon and his weapons as his hands.

"He's pink-cheeked, tousle-haired, fight-muscled, 18 fighting to make 19, then he's 19 fighting to make 20.

"He's scared.

"He doesn't understand fighting no-win wars in unpronounceable places with less than our best weapons with fat targets off-limits. He doesn't understand killing Communists in Vietnam and tolerating them in Cuba

"Word from home is almost all about the home-front struggle among the Have-Nots and the Do-Nots and the Will-Nots and the Wash-Nots and the Work-Nots and the Nut-Nots.

"So he grumbles something.

"But then he gets a night's sleep, and a letter from home, and returns from a paddy

patrol still forked-end down and figures he's lucky. And he closes his eyes and thanks God and says a prayer—for us."

[From the Gazette-Virginian, Mar. 20, 1969] EDITOR.

The Gazette-Virginian.

DEAR SIR: Officer candidates are concerned with the problems of man and the state of affairs of his generation. Here is an article from the home town newspaper of Officer Candidate James H. Fullbright. It is a soul searching question well worth repeating.

MY GOD . . . HOW CAN IT BE?

That one boy lies rotting from malnutrition and torture in a jungle prison camp in North Vietnam—and another boy spits and tramples on the flag of his country on the steps of a university of learning?

That one boy lies sightless in a U.S. Army hospital from Communist inflicted face wounds—and another boy uses a Communist flag to drape his body in defiance of the laws of his country?

That one man of medicine begins his thirtieth straight hour standing over an operating table in hopes of life for a man serving his country—and another man of medicine inspires crowds of young men to refuse to serve their country?

That one Negro holds the face of his dead white comrade in his arms and cries pitifully in a dirty mud hole in Vietnam—and another Negro screams with hate against his white brother in the streets of countless American cities?

That one boy lies lifeless in a rice paddy because he believed in duty to his country—and another boy lies on a dingy cot giving blood to the enemy of his country?

That one man of God shields a wounded boy from an enemy bayonet with his body and dies—and another man of God uses his cloth as a shield to preach hate, dissension and lawlessness?

My God, How Can It Be?

Pfc. DEAN M. HOLT,
65th, Company, 6th Student,
Bn, (TCB).

FORT BENNING, GA.

THE GREAT OIL ROBBERY—OR—HOW TAXPAYERS ARE PERSECUTING AN OIL INDUSTRY WHICH ONLY SEEKS TO SERVE THEM

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor oil barons, as unjust accusations are hurled at them by taxpayers. How dare we cast aspersions upon these modern giants, who are serving us so well.

Do we boggle at new taxes piling up everywhere? Think of how much oil companies are paying. Did you pay an average tax rate of 25 percent of your income last year? Shed a tear, ungrateful wretch, for persecuted Shell Oil Co., which paid 13.1 percent of \$342,022,000 in 1967 in the form of Federal taxes. Weep for Union Oil Co., which paid 6.3 percent of its income in 1967 in Federal taxes. They only made \$163,820,000 before taxes. Rend your garments over how the Federal Government persecuted Marathon Oil Co. They made \$138,520,000 in 1967, and paid out 2.7 percent in Federal taxes.

Or how could we forget the terrible fate which overtook Getty Oil Co. in 1967. It earned \$132,762,000 and paid 2.8 percent in Federal taxes.

We ordinary taxpayers balk at the

surcharge of 10 percent, while these great altruists and public servants, the American oil industry, paid and paid and paid for the right to serve us.

Look at how the Federal Government persecutes them, hounding and asking them to explain a few pennies they manage to squeeze out in profit. For shame. Shall we not expand the food stamp program to include starving oil company executives and their ragged families, huddled in pitiful groups on the Riviera and in the Caribbean?

How can they keep polluting our beaches, killing wildlife, keeping out cheap foreign oil and taking that 27½ percent depletion allowance on a pitiful diet of filet mignon, pate de fois gras, and 10-year-old whisky? These are people who serve us. Patriots, selfless public servants, altruists, lovers of their fellow men and women.

Mr. Speaker, how can the American taxpaying public demand tax reform of these good neighbors and businessmen? So all can see how little they really earn

in income after taxes, I include here a list of major oil company taxes for 1967. Another little chart here lists their profits for the first half of 1968.

Majors' profits 1968, first half

Atlantic (plus 14.1 percent)-----	\$70,235,000
Amer. Petrofina (plus 14.7 percent)-----	7,126,014
Cities Service (plus 7.4 percent)-----	66,500,000
Clark (plus 11.4 percent)-----	5,686,905
Commonwealth (minus 5.5 percent)-----	9,621,629
Conoco (plus 11.3 percent)-----	73,600,000
Gulf (plus 9.8 percent)-----	311,144,000
Hess (plus 26.1 percent)-----	12,290,898
Marathon (plus 13.2 percent)-----	39,740,000
Mobil (plus 12.3 percent)-----	206,600,000
Phillips (plus 1 percent)-----	79,919,000
Shell (plus 11.3 percent)-----	153,797,000
Signal O&G (minus 2.5 percent)-----	23,217,000
Sinclair (minus 1.1 percent)-----	45,800,000
Standard (Ind.) (plus 10.2 percent)-----	160,400,000
Standard (N.J.) (plus 14.2 percent)-----	621,000,000
Standard (Ohio) (minus 5 percent)-----	29,009,000
Sun (plus 25 percent)-----	50,600,000
Texaco (plus 12.1 percent)-----	402,600,000

MAJOR OIL COMPANY TAXES, 1967

Company	Net before tax	U.S. income tax	Percent	Foreign, some states	Percent
Standard (N.J.)-----	\$2,098,283,000	\$166,000,000	7.9	\$700,000,000	33.0
Texaco-----	892,986,000	17,500,000	1.9	121,100,000	13.5
Gulf-----	955,968,000	74,142,000	7.8	303,539,000	31.8
Mobil-----	594,593,000	26,900,000	4.5	182,300,000	30.7
Standard (Calif.)-----	513,067,000	6,000,000	1.2	85,400,000	16.6
Shell-----	342,022,000	44,940,000	13.1	12,233,000	3.6
Standard (Ind.)-----	366,847,000	74,021,000	20.2	10,576,000	2.9
Phillips-----	227,766,000	52,255,000	22.9	11,496,000	5.0
Conoco-----	241,362,000	30,031,000	12.4	62,369,000	25.8
Cities Service-----	165,289,000	32,347,000	19.6	5,105,000	3.1
Union-----	163,820,000	10,400,000	6.3	8,457,000	5.2
Sun-----	146,946,000	24,700,000	16.8	13,670,000	9.3
Marathon-----	138,520,000	3,700,000	2.7	60,962,000	44.0
Atlantic-----	145,259,000	-----	-----	15,254,000	10.5
Sinclair-----	130,017,000	10,585,000	8.1	24,060,000	18.5
Standard (Ohio)-----	101,496,000	29,200,000	28.8	8,412,000	8.3
Getty-----	132,762,000	3,687,000	2.8	10,909,000	8.2
Ashland-----	72,212,000	23,718,000	32.8	3,952,000	5.5
Sunray DX-----	74,526,000	17,672,000	23.7	2,390,000	3.2
Total-----	7,503,741,000	647,798,000	8.6	1,642,184,000	21.8

Yes, they seek to serve all of us, all right. They even carry around a book instructing them how to serve us. One odd thing, though, is that it is a cookbook.

Filet of taxpayer and haunch of householder are on every oil company's menu every day. We pay and they play. We work and they profit. We struggle and they exploit. We count pennies and they bank billions. We cut corners and they clip coupons. It is an America of the oil companies, by the oil companies, for the oil companies. Let no one ever forget that.

Congress gave the oil depletion allowance and Congress can take it away. All we have to do is act. A bill is already introduced that simply would remove it.

TAX GIMMICK—MINERAL PRODUCTION PAYMENT

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to put an end to the use of a tax gimmick which is causing a serious and increasing loss to our Treasury. The gimmick is the mineral

production payment. It is a sophisticated tax device by which taxpayers have substantially reduced, and in some cases have entirely eliminated, payment of Federal income taxes on profits derived from mines and from oil and gas wells. In the Treasury report on its tax reform studies, the Treasury estimated that the use of production payments results in an annual revenue loss of between \$200 million and \$350 million.

Carved-out production payments—sometimes called forward sales of oil or other minerals—have been used principally to obtain a greater percentage depletion allowance than Congress intended to grant. They have also been used to increase the credit for foreign taxes. In the case of percentage depletion, the statute provides that the deduction in respect to any mineral property shall not exceed 50 percent of the profit—before depletion—for the taxable year from the mineral property. That is, the maximum benefit to be derived from percentage depletion during any one year is to cut in half the taxable income from a mineral property.

The sale of carved-out production payments has made a mockery of this statutory limitation of 50 percent. In the tax reform studies prepared by the

Treasury Department an example is given—on page 257 of part 2 of the Treasury report—of a corporation which derives all of its income from a lead mine which operates at an annual profit of \$1 million a year, having \$10 million each year from sales of concentrates and \$9 million of expenses. In the absence of carved-out production payments, the company would pay a tax each year on \$500,000—with a percentage depletion deduction of 50 percent of \$1 million. By carving out a production payment of \$8 million every other year, the company removes itself from the Federal income tax rolls. A net operating loss of \$7 million results in the year of the payout which can be carried back to obtain a full refund of the tax paid in the year the production payment is sold.

During the current hearings on tax reform a spokesman for the oil industry stated that he did not know of any case in the oil industry that was comparable to the lead mine example in the Treasury report. However, he did admit that production payments are carved out in the oil industry for the purpose of reducing income tax payments.

I should like to point out that in the lead mine example given in the Treasury's report, a part of the net operating loss deduction resulting from the carved-out production payment would go to waste, since the company did not have income from any source except the lead mine. But in the oil industry it is most likely that the full tax benefit is realized from carved-out production payments.

The following example will illustrate the complete tax benefit which an oil company can obtain from carved-out production payments. Let us assume that the oil company operates lease A which produces an annual profit of \$2 million, having \$10 million of oil sales each year and \$8 million of lifting costs and other expenses chargeable to the lease. Before applying the 50-percent limitation, the percentage depletion deduction on lease A would be \$2,750,000—27½ percent of \$10 million—but the 50-percent limitation in the statute limits the percentage depletion with respect to lease A to \$1 million—50 percent of the net profit of \$2 million. Let us also assume that the company owns lease B which has the same amount of income, expenses, and profit as lease A.

If the company operates the two leases in a normal manner, it will pay Federal income taxes each year on \$2 million on account of the two leases, with the percentage depletion deductions reducing the taxable income each year from the two leases by one-half of what it would otherwise be. But if the company carves out a production payment of \$8 million from lease A in every other year, and in the intervening years carves out a production payment of \$8 million from lease B, no incomes taxes will be paid on the profits from lease A or lease B following the year of the first carve out.

In the year of the payout of the production payment carved out of lease A, a \$6 million loss will be realized from the operation of lease A, for the expenses on lease A would remain at \$8 million but the income would be only \$2 million—\$8 million being paid to the holder

of the production payment. To utilize this \$6 million loss, the company carves out a production payment of \$8 million on lease B to be paid out of the following year's production. By the carve out, the percentage depletion deduction on lease B will be raised from \$1 million—50 percent of a net profit of \$2 million without the carve out—to \$4,950,000—27½ percent of \$18 million. The 50-percent limitation will not come into play because of the carve out. Thus, lease B will have a taxable income of \$5,050,000—\$18 million gross less \$8 million expenses and the percentage depletion deduction of \$4,950,000. The \$6 million loss from lease A will not only wipe out the taxable income from lease B but will leave \$950,000 of loss to be deducted from income from other sources.

The following year lease A will have a taxable income of \$5,050,000—for there will be a new carve out from lease A—but this will be offset by the \$6 million loss in that year from the operation of lease B.

Each year the company will have a book profit of \$4 million from the two leases, but by use of the production payments it will pay no tax on those profits and moreover it will have an unused loss of \$950,000 to deduct each year from income from some other lease or from non-mineral sources. No doubt the utilization of carved-out production payments is an important reason why Federal income taxes paid by oil companies are such a low fraction of their book profits. For example, one large oil company in its report to the SEC for the calendar year 1967 reported a net income—after all taxes—of more than \$130 million and a profit of \$8.56 per share. Yet the company paid no Federal income taxes for the year 1967—or for any of the preceding 5 calendar years. Its report to the SEC reveals that at the end of 1967 there were undischarged carved-out production payments of \$56,125,000.

Under my bill no tax benefit could be derived from the sale of carved-out production payments for the amounts received would be treated simply as loans—not as income subject to the depletion allowance. Treating a production payment as a loan calls for the same tax treatment which is applied under existing law whenever the payout of a production payment is in any manner guaranteed by the person who created it. Under present law the taxpayer has the best of all possible worlds. If he doesn't want to report taxable income on the sale of a production payment, he merely guarantees ultimate payment and the buyer most likely—on a producing property—is completely unconcerned whether or not the guarantee is given. If for tax reasons the taxpayer wants to report the production payment as prepaid income, he refrains from giving any guarantee. My bill takes away the option.

My bill will also eliminate the tax reduction now obtained by use of the so-called ABC transaction on the purchase of a mineral property. In an ABC transaction A, the owner, sells a mineral property to B—who will own and operate the property—for a small down payment and A reserves a production payment—bearing interest—for the major portion

of the purchase price. A then sells the production payment to C who is often a tax-exempt charity or pension fund. B operates the property and is not required under the court decisions to include in income the proceeds from the mineral property which are paid over in discharge of the production payment.

In a recent ABC transaction an oil company purchased all of the coal properties of another corporation, subject to a reserved production payment of \$460 million payable out of a large percentage of the net profits to be derived from the operation of the coal properties by the buyer. The Internal Revenue Service ruled that the buyer would not be taxed on the \$460 million of profits derived from its operation of the coal properties and paid over to the holder of the production payment. In addition, the Service ruled that all of the costs of mining the coal dedicated to discharge the production payment could be deducted by the buyer even though it capitalized those costs on its books as the cost of acquiring the coal properties. The buyer estimated that it would take 15 years to discharge the production payment out of profits derived from its operation of the coal properties and that it would capitalize on its books approximately \$128 million of the mining costs attributable to the production payment. After the ruling was obtained, the Tax Court held that a buyer in an ABC transaction must capitalize a proper portion of the lifting costs incurred in discharging a retained oil production payment.

As a result of the ABC transaction described above, no Federal income taxes were imposed on the coal company on its sale of the coal properties for more than \$460 million, since the company was liquidated under section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code. Moreover no income taxes at all will be paid on the \$460 million of profits derived from the coal lands and paid over to the holder of the production payment, since the holder of the production payment paid face value.

My bill provides that in an ABC transaction the retained production payment is to be treated as a purchase money mortgage. As a result, the buyer of the mineral property would include in income the amount it pays over in discharge of the production payment and in such case would be entitled, of course, to deduct all of the costs of mining the mineral which is applied in discharge of the production payment. This is the same result which has been reached under existing law in those cases where the Internal Revenue Service found—in alleged ABC deals—that the buyers had in fact guaranteed the payment of the retained production payment.

My bill does not apply to past transactions, but only to mineral production payments created after the date of its enactment.

AVIATION SAFETY

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, aviation

safety is a matter of growing national concern. Each year air traffic is increasing as more and more of our citizens use the national airspace system. In the next 10 years the number of revenue passengers and miles flown by air carriers is expected to triple. Virtually every area of air transportation is expected to grow at a phenomenal rate. We face a tremendous challenge to keep pace with this anticipated growth.

A modern air traffic system may well be the determining factor in the success or failure of our overall air transportation system. Since both airports and airways are already seriously overcrowded, we need to give very careful consideration to all proposals to improve aviation safety.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are moving far too slowly in establishing better facilities and equipment for air traffic control and developing new technology to keep pace with aviation growth. We are able to get the job done despite these handicaps because of the outstanding work of our Nation's air traffic controllers. These people work under great pressure. We rely heavily on their competence, but how long can we expect them to maintain control over a saturated transportation system that is growing by leaps and bounds?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) has introduced legislation to upgrade air traffic services and provide new benefits to air traffic controllers. While I think some changes in this bill should be considered, I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will take prompt steps to bring air traffic legislation before the House. I believe their hearings on this subject will make the need for action obvious.

I respectfully urge the committee and this entire body to make aviation safety, and especially better air traffic control, a top priority item for this session of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the disability insurance benefits paid under the social security program are intended to provide people who have long-term disabilities with an income when they are unable to work. In general, a disability for social security purposes is defined as an impairment which prevents a person from doing any substantially gainful work for 12 months or longer. Monthly benefits, however, are not paid until after the person has been disabled for 6 months.

The prohibition on benefit payments in the first 6 months of a disability came about because of the practical problems involved in determining the prognosis of many types of disability. There are, however, many types of illness or injury the course of which is reasonably certain from the very beginning. For example, an adult who is blinded in an accident has little or no chance of being able to

return to work within a year. In such circumstances, I believe that the 6-month waiting period in present law frustrates the purpose of the disability insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct this situation, I have introduced H.R. 9169. This bill would permit the payment of social security disability benefits without regard to the general 6-month waiting period in cases where the applicant is blind or has some other serious disability which is expected to result in his inability to perform substantially gainful work over a protracted period.

This bill is intended to provide seriously disabled people with an income at the time when their needs are greatest. It is in the first months of a disability that medical and hospital expenses are apt to be greatest, and that the expenses of adjusting to the new way of life demanded by the disability are incurred. The failure to provide disability insurance benefits in this period causes needless financial hardship and suffering. H.R. 9169 would eliminate this needless hardship and suffering and would do it for those with the most serious disabilities.

The next time the Committee on Ways and Means is considering social security legislation, I shall urge adoption of the ideas on which my bill is based. And I hope that my colleagues in the House will support me in my endeavors to speed disability insurance benefits to many people.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the 10th Missouri District are beginning to wonder what hit them. They are bogged down in confused desperation. First, the weather conditions have been so adverse that the Secretary of Agriculture declared the area eligible for disaster relief loans. Then the Department of Agriculture lowered the support price for soybeans from \$2.50 to \$2.25 and cottonseed from \$47 to \$37 further lowering the farmer's income. The only salvation for many seemed to be an emergency or operating loan from the Farmers Home Administration. After all, the Secretary of Agriculture had declared eight of the counties eligible for the disaster loans. With this financial prop they could hope to make a crop for this year. The applications were made and both the State and local offices recommended approval. On the understanding that they had a loan they began preparations for putting in a crop. Seed, fertilizer, feed, and other supplies were procured on credit, credit bolstered by the promise of a forthcoming loan. The final blow came when the "approved" applications were returned. No argument was made that the applicants did not meet the prescribed standards for approval, nor was it argued that the fund was exhausted. Instead, they were returned because the Bureau of the Budget was holding up the funds specifically

appropriated for the purpose of covering the loans pending a Presidential review of the budget. Commendable as a budget analysis may be, an emergency measure to assist the farmers should not bear the brunt of it. Time is of the essence. Planting cannot be indefinitely put off. If the loans are not made many of the farmers in my district as well as in the State and Nation will be driven out of the business to which they have devoted a lifetime of effort and investment.

Three thousand applications representing \$17 million have already been "approved" by the Farmers Home Administration and an estimated \$13 million in approvable applications are anticipated over the next 3 months. These applications represent farmers from all over the country. A total of 1,108 counties in 38 States have been declared eligible for purposes of the emergency loans.

It cannot be emphasized too much that the enabling act provided emergency relief to those who were injured by natural and uncontrollable forces. The freeze on the funds for this purpose by the Bureau of the Budget is, therefore, totally inconsistent with the intent of Congress insofar as it precludes immediate relief for those victims of natural disaster.

It should be perfectly obvious that the recipients are not getting something for nothing. This is certainly not a giveaway program. We are talking about loans, not grants. The repayment record for these borrowers has been an absolutely remarkable 96 percent. Furthermore, the interest on the loans has provided a profit for the Government of \$330 million; six times the amount of the losses.

If these farmers are allowed to go under for lack of a loan, the impact will be felt far beyond the farms directly involved. The money represented by the loans would be spent locally, thus supporting various local businesses whose profits and expenditures sustain still other businesses in a continuing upward spiral. It does not require a degree in economics to understand that the spiral can go downward as well. Farmers forced out of business are also forced out of rural areas and into urban areas where their agricultural skills are not needed, thus aggravating an already exceedingly troublesome urban problem. As was recently stated by a Department of Agriculture official:

The availability or lack of operating credit is far too often the final deciding factor in determining whether farm families continue to live and work in rural areas where they desire to remain or whether they become economic and welfare casualties in the slums.

If there are insufficient funds to cover all the loans which have been approved, then the Farmers Home Administration has the duty to come forward with a request for supplemental appropriation. The national debt limit has been raised and there is no reason why, if necessary, money should not be appropriated for such a worthwhile purpose. Something must be done and done quickly to alleviate this alarming and potentially tragic

situation. On March 17, 1969, I joined with the Missouri Senators in a letter to the President urging prompt release of the funds for emergency loans, and I again implore him to take action. Inaction by the administration is action of a most devastating sort. If the funds are held back much longer the time will have passed for putting in a crop for this year and the farmer as well as his tenants will be financially ruined.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously made vigorous pleas to the administration to reconsider its action pursuant to the reduction of the soybean and cottonseed loan supports. These pleas have been to no avail. My people in the 10th District of Missouri anxiously await the administration's response to this latest plea. We are not asking for a gift. We ask only for the exercise of prudent judgment and prompt action thereon.

At this point I include the text of the letters I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget, with copies to the appropriate congressional committees.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

HON. ROBERT P. MATO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I can understand the President's desire to review the budget and to establish his own priorities, but I implore you not to make the victims of natural disaster suffer for it. Eight counties of my district have been declared eligible for emergency loans from the Farmers Home Administration. According to the latest information I have \$660,720.00 in loans have been "approved" by the state and local offices of the Farmers Home Administration and would be made but for the action of the Bureau of the Budget. The farmers whose loans have been approved were so certain that the money would be forthcoming that many purchased fertilizer, seed, and other supplies on credit with the understanding that payment would be made from their loans. If the loans are not made these farmers will be out of business and unemployed.

I am aware of the myriad of demands on the budget, but I want to emphasize that the Farmers Home Administration Emergency Loan Fund is not a general purpose fund. It is an emergency measure designed to offer immediate assistance to farmers who have been victims of a natural disaster and cannot get credit elsewhere. A freeze of funds available obviously frustrates this purpose and thereby the intent of Congress.

It should also be pointed out that other farmers in my district had operating loans approved by the state and local authorities in the amount of \$126,210.00. These people are now in the same pathetic circumstance as those described above.

On behalf of the farmers in my district, and similarly effected farmers throughout the country, I urge you to take immediate steps to free the existing funds for the Farmers Home Administration loan programs.

Respectfully yours,

BILL D. BURLISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am taking this means to bring to your attention a matter

of utmost urgency to the farmers in Southeast Missouri and the nation as well. I refer to the freeze by the Bureau of the Budget of funds for the Farmers Home Administration crop loan program.

According to the latest figures from my district, \$660,720.00 in emergency loans and \$126,210.00 in operating loans have been approved by the local and state Farmers Home Administration offices. There was no question whether these farmers met the minimum standards for the loans, and in reliance of final approval in Washington, they obligated themselves for purchases of seed, fertilizer, and other supplies in preparation for putting in a crop. Now they have been told that the loans cannot be made because the Bureau of the Budget is holding up funds which Congress appropriated specifically for that purpose.

It is imperative that action be taken at once. If not, many farmers will be driven from the business to which they have devoted their lives. If the existing funds are not sufficient to cover the loans that have been approved, then the Department should request a supplemental appropriation. Should it be shown that this is the only way the loans can be covered, I, for one, will support the request. The national debt limit has been raised, and if necessary there is no reason why money for such a worthwhile purpose should not be appropriated.

Respectfully yours,

BILL D. BURLISON,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of March 31, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Vienna, Austria.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CONTE, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLLINS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, April 2.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 1 hour, on April 14.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 1 hour, on April 15.

Mr. MINSHALL, for 1 hour, on April 15.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARBSTEIN, today and tomorrow, for 30 minutes each.

Mr. STAGGERS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an article.
Mr. JOELSON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. RANDALL during consideration of House Resolution 270, following Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. MATSUNAGA to revise and extend his remarks immediately preceding the vote on the bill H.R. 6896, Private Calendar No. 37.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLLINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUILEN in four instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. DENNEY in two instances.

Mr. JONAS.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. WYATT in six instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. RUMSFELD in four instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. COLLINS.

Mr. MINSHALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KASTENMEIER in five instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in five instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. EILBERG in four instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. BURTON of California in two instances.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances.

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. NATCHER in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in four instances.

Mr. MCCARTHY in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. SIKES in six instances.

Mr. HICKS.

Mr. KYROS in three instances.

Mr. MIKVA in three instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.

Mr. MANN in three instances.

Mr. STEED in three instances.

Mr. HEBERT in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. STEPHENS in four instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.

Mr. CABELL.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in five instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. STUCKEY.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. COHELAN in four instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. KOCH in three instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 27, 1969:

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On April 1, 1969:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

635. A letter from the President and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 19th Annual Report of the Girl Scouts (H. Doc. No. 91-95); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

636. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 21st annual report on the national industrial reserve, pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

637. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees and nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. Report on the January 1969 Economic Report of the President (Rept. No. 91-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 270. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-143). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4153. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-144). 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. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9701. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9702. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9703. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 9704. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9705. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9706. A bill to amend title 18 of the

United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9707. A bill to provide compensation for firemen not employed by the United States killed or injured in the performance of duty during a civil disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9708. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of youth correctional programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9709. A bill to create a position of Assistant Attorney General for Organized Crime, to provide necessary personnel to carry out his responsibilities, to provide for training of State and local law enforcement personnel in methods of dealing with organized crime, to provide Federal facilities for protective housing of witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9710. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLERSON of Texas:

H.R. 9711. A bill relating to the disposition of the interest of the United States in the National Guard armory and motor vehicle storage building at Ranger, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9712. 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. CABELL:

H.R. 9713. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9714. 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. 9715. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 9716. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9718. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9719. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9720. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9721. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9722. A bill to liberalize section 351 of title 38, United States Code, relating to benefits for veterans disabled by treatment or vocational rehabilitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9724. 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. DENNEY:

H.R. 9725. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 9726. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purpose of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9728. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include drugs among the benefits provided under the supplementary medical insurance program established by part B of such title and to eliminate the \$50 deductible presently imposed as a condition to the receipt of benefits under such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of interest on certain delayed payments of benefits and assessment of interest against certain unrefunded overpayments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9730. A bill to amend section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rate of percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for periodic cost-of-living increases in monthly benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 9732. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit periods of honorable service in the U.S. Armed Forces by a legal resident of an area served by a post office of the first, second, or third class to be counted in satisfying the residence requirements applicable to appointments of postmaster at such post office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 9733. 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. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9734. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9735. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of mineral production payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 9736. A bill to amend sections 2(3) and 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. FINDLEY, and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend 8c(2)(A) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to include Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio among the specified States which are eligible to participate in marketing agreement and order programs with respect to apples; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9739. A bill to remove time limitations on correction of military records and provide a time limitation as to payments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9740. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9741. 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. HENDERSON:

H.R. 9742. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9743. A bill to amend section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9744. 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. KING:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 9746. 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. MCCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 9747. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 9748. 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. MIKVA:

H.R. 9749. A bill to provide an improved and enforceable procedure for the notification of defects in tires; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9750. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 9751. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9753. 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. NIX:

H.R. 9754. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the life and work of a man of peace, Martin Luther King; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9755. A bill to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department and postal field service be made on the basis of merit and fitness; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9756. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraph 11, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9757. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9758. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9760. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitations (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1969) on the payment of benefits to citizens of certain foreign countries having social insurance or pension systems of general application; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to achieve greater fairness, justice, equity, and simplicity in the Federal income tax laws through tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9763. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9764. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9765. 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. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9766. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 9767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the valuation of a decedent's interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 9769. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9770. 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. REUSS:

H.R. 9771. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that wages earned or self-employment income derived in any month by an individual who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits shall be reflected in his primary insurance amount (and all benefits based thereon) beginning with the following month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9772. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9773. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit members of the Reserves and the National Guard to receive retired pay at age 55 for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9774. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and dental care to dependents of certain members of the uniformed services for a period of 90 days after the date of separation

of such members from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9775. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9776. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs, a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9777. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9779. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9780. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailing applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9781. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9782. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9783. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul carnival, circus, and allied outdoor show business equipment, materials, and personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9785. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9787. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9788. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare,

and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:
H.R. 9789. 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. ROYBAL:
H.R. 9790. 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. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ROUBUSH, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 9791. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUPPE:
H.R. 9792. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of State-imposed restrictions on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCOTT:
H.R. 9793. A bill to abolish the National Capital Planning Commission and to transfer certain of its functions to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 9794. A bill to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H.R. 9795. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the wrongful disclosure of certain confidential agency decisions and rulings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:
H.R. 9796. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second- and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that industrial development bonds are not to be considered obligations of States and local governments, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 9798. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:
H.R. 9799. A bill to provide for the presentation of an award in honor of Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White II, and Roger B. Chaffee; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 9800. A bill to liberalize section 351 of title 38, United States Code, relating to benefits for veterans disabled by treatment or vocational rehabilitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):
H.R. 9801. A bill providing for the establishment of a pilot project of assistance to veterans' organizations operating centers for disabled veterans to gain experience in the

practicability of such a program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 9802. A bill to foster the exploration of outer space by providing for the presentation by the President of the United States, in the name of the Congress, of the Congressional Space Award to astronauts who contribute thereto; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H.R. 9803. 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. UDALL:
H.R. 9804. A bill to amend Public Law 394, 84th Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:
H.R. 9805. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:
H.R. 9806. 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.

By Mr. WOLFF:
H.R. 9807. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9808. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, with the cost of such increases being financed out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:
H.R. 9809. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 9810. A bill to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:
H.R. 9811. A bill to improve the effectiveness of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PELLY, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WINN, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 9812. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIESTER:
H.J. Res. 615. 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. BINGHAM:
H.J. Res. 616. Joint resolution to consent to, and enter into, the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:
H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the year 1970 as a period to honor the citizen juror and Edward Bushell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:
H.J. Res. 619. 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. KARTH:
H.J. Res. 620. 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. McCLURE:
H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):
H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol", and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:
H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution re-

affirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):
H. Res. 352. 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. PEPPER:
H. Res. 353. Resolution that the President should urge the governments of friendly countries to suspend air travel to and from countries which do not return hijackers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLD:
H. Res. 354. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

98. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to flood control and water reclamation assistance, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:
H.R. 9813. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:
H.R. 9814. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Coyne, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:
H.R. 9815. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Eaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:
H.R. 9816. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng Tsuau Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:
H.R. 9817. A bill for the relief of Clarence T. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9818. A bill for the relief of Cheng-hual Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:
H.R. 9819. A bill for the relief of Anoop Kumar Gupta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:
H.R. 9820. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Ernie D. Bethea, USMC (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Takoma, Wash., relative to development of a process for the clean conversion of coal reserves in the south Puget Sound region to energy and chemicals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

86. Also, petition of the City Council of Elizabeth, N.J., relative to sending offensive literature through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 1, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, offered the following prayer:

O Lord of creation and redemption, while the millions of mankind keep this holy week, enable us to make each day a holy day. Grant that every duty done, every service rendered, every word uttered, every decision made may have the sanctifying touch of the divine spirit. Renew us in the depths of our being that we may have a full share in the building of a nation whose soul is cleansed and whose mind is "stayed on Thee."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 27, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 28, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on March 28, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, April 1, 1969.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. LLOYD, of Utah, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The message also informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. LUJAN, of New Mexico, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and

for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Legion on its 50th anniversary.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, on Tuesday, March 11, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States adopted resolutions: 1) salut-